U.S. Congress
11

Appendix

Department of Defense Appropriation Bill, 1956

SPEECH
OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see my distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] exercise his usual good judgment. I think his amendment, which is offered as a clarifying amendment, is a good one.

I had no thought that a simple effort to insure that Congress would be more fully informed on major changes in operating procedures in the Department of Defense—to insure that we in Congress would know something about what happens to the money that we appropriate would precipitate such excitement in some quarters, including my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. I have high affection and esteem for this great and distinguished citizen. As a matter of fact I have followed his guidance pretty closely for nearly 15 years. I think this, however, is an appropriate time for him to follow mine.

We are discussing a very simple proposal. Here is the actual language of the bill:

SEC. 639. No part of the funds appropriated in this act may be used for the disposal or transfer by contract or otherwise of work traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense unless it has been justified before the appropriate committees of Congress that the disposal is economically sound and that the related services can be performed by a contractor without danger to national security.

And here is the statement in the report which explains very clearly what is involved:

Section 639: Attention of the committee has on a number of occasions been directed toward plans within the Department of Defense for the disposal or transfer by contract or otherwise to contract operations of the work traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense. The committee recognizes that there may be circumstances which make a contract operation more desirable than continuations of work by civilian personnel within the Department. In some instances, this, however, represents a radical departure from established customs and it is conceivable that contract operations could, if carried to extremes result in a loss of trained personnel and know-how within the departments with the dispersal of tools and facilities and result in an actually greater cost to the Government over a period of years. Particularly would this be true in the event of a sudden emergency which would require rapid expansion of "on-base" activities. The committee has no desire to hamper legitimate transferal of Government activities to private business where it can properly be shown that this is economically sound and that the related services can be performed by contract without danger to national security. In view, however, of the Government's great investment in its own shops and facilities and the know-how of its civilian personnel and because of this committee's responsibility in the matter of appropriations it is felt that a justification of transfers before the appropriate committees of Congress is proper before the transfers take place.

There is nothing here to keep Government in business; nothing to discriminate against private industry; nothing to prevent any legitimate transfer of an activity now performed by Government to private business. I have no desire to hinder such transfers. I simply want the Congress to know that they are proper transfers which will be performed without loss and with proper security to the Government. This language would require that at least one committee in the House and one in the Senate should be made acquainted with reasons and justification for changes in operating procedures of the type covered herein before they are made.

Now we know very well what all this opposition is about—and I am greatly surprised that my wise and astute friend from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] could be taken in by such maneuvering. Big business does not want any stumbling blocks placed in the way of the give-away programs. His business does not want any possible interference from Congress. They know nothing about this section. They never saw it. They have no idea what language it carries. But apparently they have been told by the Department of Defense that section 639 could upset the gravy train; might put a stop in the handing out of nice, fat, juicy plums. So they, or people in the Department, have been pulling strings all over the Nation. As a result a mounting flood of telegrams has been piling up, protesting this section.

Undoubtedly some of those people have been getting rich or anticipate getting rich through contracts with the Department of Defense.

To me it is rather significant that other wires have been coming to Washington on section 629 also. They are wires from plain people; wires from working people. They want the Government's interests and the taxpayers interests to be protected. I think their wishes are going to prevail here today.

No; I am not against private business. I am not against business taking over any function now performed by Government that business can do legitimately without jeopardizing national security and without costing more money. If however the primary objection to section 639 is based on the assumption that the transfer of Government activities to private business will automatically generate savings, I suggest that you let me quote from a directive which was issued by the Department of Defense—and I did not get this from official channels as you can well imagine. Here is what it states:

As a matter of general policy it is considered that only in exceptional cases should cost be considered a significent factor, and only in very unsual circumstances will substantial savings be the sole criteria for justification of continued operation of a facility.

If savings are not to be the criteria; just what is to govern considerations? In any case, should not the fact be known to Congress?

Let me go just a little further. We in the Congress have responsibility for the funds we appropriate for the Armed Services. We know of many instances where projects which have been justified before the committees and brought to the Congress in good faith by the committees are not carried out by the Department of Defense. The funds are diverted to other purposes, and the Congress is not consulted in any way. Is that a proper thing which helps prevent waste?

No, I am not trying to keep the Government in business. I just want Congress to know what is being done with the astronomical amounts of money we appropriate. I think we have a right to know, and that is all this language does. I am sick and tired of the secretariat of the Department of Defense and of other Departments of Government usurping the privileges of Congress, ignoring the Congress, and refusing to advise with the Congress when major changes are made in their spending programs.

This language is only a 1-year provision. The committee of the gentleman from Georgia will have ample time in that year to bring out corrective legislation to supplant section 639 if they desire to remedy the problem. Congress will be adjourning in a very few months. There is little liklihood, in view of our busy schedules henceforth that permanent corrective legislation will be enacted before we leave here. If section 639 is stricken from the bill, we may be in the position of locking the stable door after the horse has been stolen.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I am trying to get the situation straight in my own mind.

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Is the gentleman speaking for the language in the bill or for the language in the Rivers amendment?

Mr. SIKES. I do not object to the language in the Rivers amendment. It is a clarifying amendment.

Now, this in conclusion: What can possibly be wrong in having the military authorities justify to the appropriate committees of Congress the disposal by contract or otherwise to contract operations of the work traditionally or customarily done by civilian personnel?

I propose nothing that is obstructive, or time consuming, or that will hinder any proper transfer of activity. I do want Congress to be informed on the major changes in the military program, changes that affect not only spending, but changes that affect the lives and the families and the incomes of the people whom we represent.

The Uniform Code of Military Justice Should Be Reviewed Immediately by Congress

---

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, ever since Congress enacted the Uniform Code of Military Justice, each year as I take my active duty for training as a Naval Reserve captain, I am confronted with criticism of the code from officers of all branches of the armed services with whom I come in contact.

As yet I have not found a single officer who favors the code in its present form.

In fact, many officers urged me as a member of the House Armed Services Committee to interest my colleagues in Congress in seeking a careful review of the code to the end that it may be substantially revised.

Mr. Speaker, the Uniform Code of Military justice made little change in the substance of the criminal law which governed the armed services prior to and during World War II, but it did make tremendous procedural changes in that law.

It is in the field of procedure that changes are now required.

Present procedure imposes a great burden upon the United States, a burden which results in no compensating benefit to anyone.

This burden is a costly one.

It is estimated that the annual cost of administering the Uniform Code of Military Justice in the armed services is at least $158 million.

This estimate includes only those items of cost which are susceptible to exact computation, namely, the costs of trial, the costs of operating places of confinement, and the wages paid persons in confinement.

This sum, $158 million, would provide pay and allowances for 90,000 enlisted men of the lowest pay grade for a year; it would pay for all the gas and oil used by all Navy and Marine Corps aircraft for 1 year; it would purchase 930 training aircraft.

The burden imposed by the code is costly, too, in that it has increased the time spent by personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps in confinement.

Before the code came into effect the Navy and Marine Corps confined an average of 3.5 persons per thousand.

Now the Navy and Marine Corps confine an average of 8 persons per thousand.

The incidence of confinement has more than doubled.

The burdens which the code places upon the United States are such as no civilian criminal jurisdiction could tolerate for any appreciable length of time.

For example, no civilian jurisdiction could operate its criminal code for long without recourse to bail.

There is no equivalent for bail in the criminal code of the armed services.

Military offenders must be confined if they are escape risks.

Most are escape risks because 80 percent of them are guilty of some type of absenteeism.

Ordinarily civilian criminal codes do not require mandatory reviews of the record before the sentence can be executed.

After conviction by a criminal court a civilian offender may begin to serve his sentence.

This is not true in the military practice.

Before the sentence may be executed there are certain reviews that must be accomplished.

The record must be reviewed by the officer who convened the court; in most cases there must be a review by a supervisory authority as well; and in cases approaching any degree of severity of sentence there must be a review by a board of review in the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the service concerned.

Superimposed upon all of these mandatory reviews there is a 30-day appeal period during which an accused person may file a petition for a review by the United States Court of Military Appeals.

This period must be allowed to elapse in appropriate cases before the sentence may be executed.

During the time consumed in making mandatory reviews of the record and during the mandatory appeal period the United States must keep its military prisoners confined.

There is no bail.

However, the sentence of confinement, if any, against an accused person begins to run from the date he is sentenced by the court.

This, of course, is fair and should remain in effect.

Ordinarily in a civilian criminal practice, it will cost an accused person something if he wishes to appeal.

There are likely to be costs of court for him to pay, and he will in most instances be faced with the necessity of employing a lawyer.

These costs will not be encountered by a military offender.

There are never any circumstances under which any court costs are are paid by an accused; and, unless he wishes to employ civilian counsel, the Government will furnish him counsel free, not only for his trial but for the entire appellate procedure as well.

Financially speaking, therefore, there is no impediment upon an accused person appealing his case all the way, even if he entered a plea of guilty at his trial.

Perhaps the most significant and important procedural defect in the uniform code of military justice lies in the fact that the appellate bodies provided by the code are in no way protected from frivolous appeals.

It has been pointed out that there is no fiscal impediment to appeal.

There is no essential impediment, either.

There need be no real cause for appeal.

A petition to the Court of Military Appeals will come about upon the simple announcement by an accused that he wishes to appeal.

He need specify no reason; in fact, he need not have a reason.

The procedural difficulties previously discussed, namely, no bail; multiple mandatory reviews of the record of trial; a mandatory appeal period; no costs to an accused person; and the fact that appellate bodies are not protected from frivolous appeals; combine to place a burden upon the United States which is unreasonable and harsh and does no one, not even the accused, any good.

It is a common problem with the services to find an accused who wishes to have his sentence finally executed but who cannot be accommodated, although the Government is willing, because of the procedural requirements which must first be satisfied.

The cost, the wasted time are serious burdens imposed by the new code.

However, a more lamentable result of the code has been that although it was designed to make things easier or fairer for accused persons, its net effect has been to make Federal criminal offenders of many young men who, but for the code, would have had their cases disposed of by a commanding officer and would thus have avoided a record of conviction by court-martial.

The Uniform Code of Military Justice is said to apply adversary proceedings to the trials of persons for crimes in the armed services.

It surely does this.

Its adversary proceedings have replaced for the Navy and Marine Corps the procedures under the Articles for the Government of the Navy which are often described as paternal procedures.

A paternal procedure for administering discipline is not a bad system.

In replacing the Navy's and the Marine Corps' paternal systems with the adversary system of the uniform code, the powers of commanding officers to dispose of cases of infraction of discipline without reference to a court were greatly reduced.

This has inevitably resulted in more punishment by court-martial in cases which in the past would have been handled by the commanding officer himself.

The men have suffered.

More of them go before courts and become convicted of Federal offenses.

The code is an important Federal criminal statute.

Men convicted under it enter the category of those convicted of violations of such Federal statutes as the Lindbergh Act, the Dyer Act, the Mann Act, and others.

Actually most military offenders are mere juvenile delinquents, mere wayward boys guilty in 80 percent of the cases of some form of absenteeism which in civilian practice is not a crime at all; and yet the delinquent boy achieves the role of one convicted of a Federal offense.

His commanding officer has no alternative unless he will excuse the offense or inflict completely inadequate punishment, either of which will ruin the discipline of his command.

For the reasons I have cited, the Uniform Code of Military Justice should receive careful scrutiny during the present session of Congress with a view to substantial change.

The feeling in this regard is greatly strengthened by an opinion that the code's cumbersome procedures, burdensome and time consuming as they are, could not stand the test of mobilization.

The strain of mobilization would result in a breakdown of the code's processes and leave the services with no formal machinery for the maintenance of discipline and good order among its members.

The Administration's Proposals for Cultural Interchange To Meet the Challenge of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks both William Randolph Hearst, Jr., and Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff have made important proposals for winning the cold war, and Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democratic leader of the Senate, has called for the greatest political offensive in history to win the cold war. General Sarnoff, in a memorandum presented to the President on April 5 urged that an amount equivalent to 5 or 7½ percent of military defense appropriations be granted to a strategy board for political defense. This, of course, without reducing the military budget and not counting foreign military aid and point 4 types of expenditure. General Sarnoff said:

I am convinced that if the American people and their Congress are made fully aware of the menace we face, of the urgent need for meeting it, and the possibility of doing so by means short of war, they will respond willingly as they have always done in times of national crisis. They will realize that no investment to win the cold war is exorbitant when measured against the stakes involved, and against the costs of the bombing war we seek to head off.

I have introduced several bills in this Congress which are designed to enhance the cultural and artistic prestige of our country for I am convinced that this is as important as any of the "guns and butter" programs which we support. One of the major ways in which we might turn reluctant and uneasy allies and the millions of uncommitted peoples into friends is to earn their respect for our own culture. It is obvious, however, that if we have no respect for, and are officially indifferent to, our own best cultural efforts, if we show no concern as a people and as a nation with our own contemporary culture and our living artists, then the peoples of other countries are hardly to be blamed if they ignore and are indifferent to the cultural contributions which we have to give the peoples of the world. We have only ourselves to blame, for they take their cue from our own Federal Government. In this situation the Communist Parties in the various countries and the U. S. S. R. find it extremely easy to spread their lies that we are gum-chewing, insensitive, materialistic barbarians.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 19, 1955, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has this to say:

Mr. President, I have been pleased to note the increasing evidences of America's counteroffensive against the worldwide Soviet cultural propaganda effort. That Soviet effort is two-pronged. It is (a) designed to defame American culture as allegedly "crass" and "materialistic"; and (b) it is designed to paint a rosy picture of what is actually the barren and enslaved so-called culture of the U. S. S. R.

I am glad to say that an invaluable instrument in our own accurate worldwide cultural effort is the American National Theater and Academy, which was wisely chartered by the Congress under a bill signed by the President of the United States as far back as July 5, 1935.

General Sarnoff states that:

Before essaying a breakdown of cold-war methods and techniques, we should recognize that many of them are already being used, and often effectively. Nothing now underway needs to be abandoned. The problem is one of attaining the requisite magnitude, financing, coordination, and continuity—all geared to the long-range objectives of the undertaking. The expanded offensive with nonmilitary weapons must be imbued with a new awareness of the great goal and a robust will to reach it.

As early as 1948 John Foster Dulles wrote that:

We need an organization to contest the Communist Party at the level where it is working and winning its victories. * * * We ought to have an organization dedicated to the task of nonmilitary defense, just as the present Secretary of Defense heads up the organization of military defense. The new department of nonmilitary defense should have an adequate personnel and ample funds.

Perhaps the most important of the bills I have introduced in the present Congress is H. R. 5040 which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. A subcommittee has just been established to consider the administration's bill to establish a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the other bills before the committee which provide for a program of cultural interchange with foreign countries to meet the challenge of competitive coexistence with communism. The chairman of the subcommittee is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY]. With the growing recognition of the importance of these proposals and the challenging plans of Mr. Hearst and Mr. Sarnoff before us it is high time that hearings were held and that meritorious legislation be reported to the floor for consideration by this Congress.

I include here editorials from the New York Herald Tribune, the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star, and the Washington Post and Times Herald which discuss the administration's proposals and the other bills before this Congress. Also included is an article from the Chicago American, by David Sentner, chief of the Washington bureau of the Hearst newspapers.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 15, 1955]

OUR CONGRESS COPES WITH CULTURE

(By Jay S. Harrison)

The traditional lethargy that inevitably smothers the question of governmental assistance to American artists and art has recently been dealt a decisive jolt. Though they have achieved no especial notoriety, several bills, motions, and suggestions have in the last month been discussed in Washington that point to a renewed interest on the part of our lawmakers in the forces and functions of culture. In fact, they are so many and their stipulations so elaborate that only a few, at best, can be summarized here.

On April 20 Representative STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, Republican, of New York, introduced a bill, thereafter referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, which was designed to "provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes." In part, it stated:

"(A) That the growth and flourishing of the arts depend upon freedom, imagination, and individual initiative."

VITAL TO GENERAL WELFARE

"(B) That the encouragement of creative activity in the performance and practice of the arts, and of a widespread participation in and appreciation of the arts, is essential to the general welfare and the national interest; and

"(C) That the encouragement of the arts, while primarily a matter for private and local initiative, is an appropriate matter of concern to the United States Government."

Having thus lucidly established its premise, the measure declares in the second section:

"There is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts. * * * The Commission shall be composed of 21 members, appointed by the President, from among private citizens of the United States who are widely recognized for their knowledge of or experience in, or for their profound interest in, one of more of the arts."

STUDIES OUTLINED

And as to the bill's meaning, the following explanation is made in section 3:

"The Commission shall undertake studies of, and make recommendations to, appropriate methods * * * for encouragement of creative activity in the performance and practice of the arts and of participation in and appreciation of the arts. Such studies shall be conducted by special committees of persons, expert in the field of art involved, appointed by the Secretary after consultation with the Commission."

The remainder of H. R. 5756, for so the bill is numbered, devotes itself to the implementation necessary to setting the Federal Advisory Committee on the Arts on a footing sound and firm.

The administration's bill, H. R. 5756, was further accompanied by an excerpt from the President's state of the Union message delivered to the Congress under date of January 6, 1955:

"In the advancement of the various activities which would make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation."

These sentiments alone, formulated by an eminence in our political hierarchy, indicate that the Government has seriously begun to concern itself with an enterprise previously left pretty much to its own tottering devices. And as if this healthy sign were not enough, the current issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, published May 9, contains a lively debate on the construction, in Washington, of a civic auditorium "including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center." Holding to the view that such a hall is necessary to insure that the District of Columbia become an authentic cultural capital, Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey—who, incidentally, has introduced several excellent bills similar to Representative WAINRIGHT'S—has this to say:

"One of the major ways in which we might turn reluctant and uneasy allies and the millions of uncommitted peoples into friends is to earn their respect for our own culture. It is obvious, however, that if we have no respect for, and are officially indifferent to, our own best cultural efforts, if we show no concern as a people and as a Nation with our own contemporary culture and our living artists, then the peoples of other countries are hardly to be blamed if they ignore and are indifferent to the cultural contributions which we have to give the peoples of the world.

"The fine arts are a unifying force, as Washington and Jefferson knew, and they are especially important to us now when our country is assailed from within and from without by divisive and undemocratic forces from the right and from the left."

These, clearly, are the words of an enlightened man. They reflect a judgment that knows art, understands what its powers are. And Representative THOMPSON'S is no voice crying in the wilderness. Given time, one suspects he will be joined by a hale chorus of supporters sharing his goals and supplementing his ideals.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 16, 1955]

FOR AN ARTS COMMISSION

The hope of a civic auditorium and fine-arts center for Washington was pushed a tiny step forward last week with House passage of a bill creating a Commission to form plans for such a project. Planning is an indispensable preliminary. But the Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts urged by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message last January is still a radiant but remote vision. Representative STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, a Republican, has introduced a bill drafted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which embodies the President's ideas in this connection. Its merit is attested by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, a Democrat, who some time ago made a rather more comprehensive proposal for an arts commission plus an auditorium and art center for the Nation's Capital.

The President was right when he said in his state of the Union message that "in the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities." We believe that governmental encouragement and stimulation—something altogether different from the regimentation and control characteristics of totalitarian states—can give great impetus to the arts. And we heartily agree with Secretary Hobby's observation that "encouragement of the arts is a demonstration to itself and to others of a nation's belief in its spiritual resources and creative destiny."

No better beginning could be made by a Federal Acts Commission than the creation of an auditorium and art center in Washington. This is why we prefer Mr. THOMPSON'S bill to Mr. WAINWRIGHT'S. The need for such a center was underscored this week by the Metropolitan Opera Co.'s recourse to a motion-picture theater for temporary accommodation here. The opera, and other forms of art, need a home of their own in Washington.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of May 11, 1955]

AUDITORIUM STUDY

Washington's lack of a civic auditorium adequate to the needs of a city of this size and importance long has been of concern to public and private interests. Demands for a hall large enough to accommodate unusual national or local events, such as inaugural balls, operas, expositions, and the like, have been recurrent over recent years. There never has been a special study of the various problems involved in a major project of this kind, however. Therefore, the House has taken a step in the right direction in voting to create a 21-member commission to consider the auditorium problem.

The move is timely because of the possibility of fitting the project into the broad program for redevelopment of Southwest Washington. The Zeckendorf plan envisions a large meeting hall and cultural center in the heart of the rebuilt community along the water front. Sites in other parts of Washington have been suggested from time to time, including one near the East Capitol Street Bridge. More vexing than the site question is the problem of financing so huge an undertaking. Always in the past any proposal for Federal or District financing has withered under the drought of funds for nonessential improvements.

Lately, however, there has been talk of interesting private investors in a community auditorium enterprise. There have been reports that outside promoters have made inquiries into the availability of suitable sites and into economic aspects of such a plan. The proposed commission can help to clear up the confusion over location, sponsorship, financing, and uses of a great hall for public and commercial gatherings in the Nation's Capital. Until some authoritative information on the project is prepared, the auditorium idea is not likely to make much headway.

[From the Chicago American of April 29, 1955]

HOUSE GROUP OKS PLAN FOR CULTURE HALL

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, April 29.—Representative THOMPSON, Democrat, of New Jersey, urges congressional action to promote American culture and sports.

The action would be in line with the program for competitive coexistence with Red Russia advocated by W. R. Hearst, Jr.

The House District Committee favorably reported out THOMPSON'S first bill on the subject. It provides for creation of a Federal commission to formulate plans for construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium. The latter would include an inaugural hall of presidents and a music, drama, fine arts, and mass communications center.

WARNINGS CITED

THOMPSON asked the House to heed warnings by the editor-in-chief of the Hearst newspapers and by Olympics Committee President Avery Brundage that this country is in danger of losing supremacy at the international games.

THOMPSON said his legislation is designed to put into effect the proposals made by Hearst upon his return from behind the Iron Curtain, where he interviewed the four top Russian leaders.

The proposal would create a National Advisory Committee under the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop a program with the States that would make the public more sports and culture conscious.

Six million dollars in Federal funds would be used to match money raised by the States to promote the work.

Welfare Secretary Hobby has approved a bill, introduced by Representative WAINWRIGHT, Republican, of New Jersey, for establishment of a Federal commission on the arts and for other purposes.

However, Representative THOMPSON and his Democratic colleagues do not think this administration bill goes far enough in activating a dynamic competitive coexistence blueprint.

RUSSIAN LEAD

Brundage said the Russians are almost certain to dominate the 1956 Olympic games unless there is a sudden reawakening in this country.

THOMPSON declared:

"The huge Russian sports program is based on a broad and comprehensive system of physical training for everyone in the U. S. S. R. regardless of age or sex.

"Undoubtedly one of the results of this system, started more than 20 years ago, was a substantial contribution to the success of the Soviet armies during World War II. No country is stronger than its people.

"In his speech at Washington's National Press Club, William Radolph Hearst, Jr., after his Russian trip, said sports are a front on which the commissars are moving ahead full speed.

"America, he said, has dominated the Olympic games since their inception. It has been a source of prestige throughout the world, especially with sport-conscious young people.

"Mr. Hearst asked: 'How will the youth of the world feel, especially in doubtful areas, if the Russian team ends America's long sway at Melbourne in 1956?'

"Mr. Hearst advocates the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence with the Communists."

THOMPSON added that the legislation introduced by himself, Representative ROOSEVELT, of California, and Representative REUSS, of Wisconsin, is designed to carry out the excellent proposals and timely warnings of Mr. Hearst.

Dulles—A Successful Contrast to Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by David Lawrence, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Friday, May 13, 1955, is, I believe, worthy of special attention:

DULLES' ACCOMPLISHMENTS PROVE VALUE OF HIS TRAVELS

(By David Lawrence)

PARIS, May 12.—There is something very impressive and of incalculable value about the new-fashioned diplomacy which brings the Secretary of State of the United States to Paris for informal talks with the Foreign Ministers of France and Great Britain as well as with the top men of other countries that comprise the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Critics may say the head of the State Department should not travel around, but it is difficult to imagine how any progress could be made any other way in solving present-day problems among the Allies.

Unfortunately, lots of mischievious rumors and some distorted reports reach back home to the parliaments and to the American Congress. It is not always easy to overcome the handicaps that interference, even by American legislators, sometimes brings. But if the Members of Congress who are so reckless with their comments on world affairs, especially the carping critics among the Democrats, could attend a press conference held here by the Secretary of State, they would come to realize how delicate and complicated are most of the questions tackled by the Foreign Ministers.

THE INDOCHINA PROBLEM

This last week has seen many important conferences, but they are not unlike several meetings held here before. They are all significant. The modern way is for the top representatives of the Allies to sit down together and thresh out their differences behind closed doors. They talk frankly and at times heatedly, but they come out of it as a rule with a clear understanding of the viewpoint of their respective countries.

Perhaps the most ticklish of all the questions this week was the problem of Indochina. Neither the French nor the American Government could afford to place itself in the position of trying to settle the internal affairs of south Vietnam, as this would only intensify Communist propaganda there. But certain parallel or common policies were agreed upon which may help to bring stability to the situation in the southern part of Indochina. For, although the desire is to see some form of democratic government chosen, it is not easy to establish at once an electoral machinery such as exists in a European parliamentary system. But out of the turbulence of these last few weeks may come a representative system for south Vietnam, and that is the objective now.

Despite the newspaper reports about a grave crisis in the relations between France and the United States over the Indochina question, it is a fact that both Governments recognized all along how important it is to reach an understanding and not to allow the Indochina dispute to impair their working arrangements on many other questions of far greater importance to both.

The American people can rest assured that Secretary Dulles handled himself very creditably here. Notwithstanding some garbled impressions that came to certain Senators, there was no mistake made here by Mr. Dulles in talking firmly where firmness was necessary. Those who heard his reply, for example, in the North Atlantic Council meeting to Foreign Secretary Spaak of Belgium on the Formosa question said it was an excellent rebuttal to a statement that completely misconstrued the American position.

NOT STAMPEDED

Nor is Mr. Dulles stampeded or pushed around by the Soviet tactics. He was clear cut in his announcement here that he wouldn't go to Vienna until the Austrian treaty provisions had been finally set down on paper ready for signing. He is equally determined not to become involved in a protracted discussion in Vienna about the details of the forthcoming four-power conference.

There is a restraint and a forbearance about Mr. Dulles' manner in these top-level negotiations, and at the same time such an earnest reflection by him of the truly American viewpoint in international affairs, that that the American people can well be proud of their itinerant Secretary of State.

Balance Sheet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with my own remarks I am including a column by Stewart Alsop entitled "Balance Sheet," which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Monday, May 16, 1955.

This article is disturbing, not to say alarming. If the statements therein are true, then we are foolish in reducing our appropriations for the armed services for the ensuing fiscal year. If they are not true, then the Department of Defense and the President should tell the people of America the truth about Soviet capabilities and not try to palm off on them the milk-and-toast pap that comes from the Secretary of Defense. The Department of Defense, I trust, has more information about Soviet capabilities than they do about the Navy warehouse in New Orleans and the amount of hamburgers, canned beef and gravy, and canned cheese on hand.

The article follows:

BALANCE SHEET

(By Stewart Alsop)

The Russians are talking peace. But they are preparing for war. And their preparations are not only more intentsive than ours. They are also—hard as this is for Americans to believe—technically far ahead of us in many important ways.

That was the real meaning of last Friday's cryptic Pentagon announcement about "new aircraft developments in air parade formations over Moscow." In a final reduction to absurdity of the secrecy nonsense, the Pentagon at first tried to keep the details about the flights over Moscow—witnessed by some 6 million Russians—secret. But, of course, the facts came out. Briefly, they are as follows:

There were a number of flights over Moscow before and after May Day. The most important were: One flight of 10 and another of 8 type 37's (comparable to our heavy B–52); 1 flight of 36 type 39's (comparable to our medium B–47); a low-altitude flight of a big, very fast pursuit; from its configuration, an all-weather fighter; a flight of a large turboprop plane, comparable to our K–99 refueling plane.

These facts sound dry enough when recited. But they were enough to throw the Pentagon into one of the worst flops in recent years. For they make it necessary to recast all previous estimates of the American-Russian air-atomic balance. The balance sheet now reads, in the light of the Moscow air show, about as follows:

Our atomic stockpile is still several times as large as the Soviet stockpile. But this is ceasing to matter very much, since the Soviets are reaching the point where they will have enough atomic and thermonuclear weapons for all needed targets. Therefore delivery and defense capabilities are now the decisive factors.

Overall, the Soviets have several times more jet fighters than we do, and, more surprisingly, about twice as many jet bombers. This is somewhat deceptive, however, since the bulk of the Soviet jet bombers are two-engined IL–28's which can reach all targets in Europe or off the China coast, but cannot reach this country.

The bulk of our jet bombers are medium B–47's, of which we have well over a thousand. With air refueling, the B–47 can reach Soviet targets and return. The flight of 36 Type 39's indicates the Soviets are catching up fast with the B–47, and the flight of the turbo-prop tanker indicates that they are learning air-refueling techniques, too. Yet, assuming that the Soviets have not produced more than a hundred or so of these medium planes, we still have a big lead in this field. It is quite literally the only real lead we have left.

For what really shook the Pentagon was the two formation flights of apparently fully operational B–52-type heavy bombers. This means that we are at best neck-and-neck in the race for the intercontinental jet bomber, which will certainly be the decisive factor in the air-atomic balance until the arrival of the intercontinental missile. And what shook the Pentagon even more was the appearance of the entirely new all-weather fighter.

For the existence of such a plane argues the existence of the immensely complex weapons system of which an all-weather fighter is only a part, including early warning and ground control systems. The intelligence confirms the probable existence of fully mature Soviet air defense (which this country will not have at least until the summer of 1957). Against a Soviet air defense, built around all weather fighters, this country's reserves of comparatively slow B–36 heavy bombers must be virtually written off as a factor in the air-atomic balance.

But the most disturbing aspect of the situation is the technical brilliance displayed by the Soviet air engineers. Both the Type 39 and the Type 37 do the same jobs as our B–47's and B–52's with half the number of engines. This means that the Soviet engineers have developed jet engines with twice the thrust of any yet achieved in this country.

Finally, contrary to recent sunny Wilsonian emanations from the Pentagon, there are very strong indications that the Soviets are ahead in the race for the intercontinental missile, which will certainly determine the air-atomic balance in the end.

Perhaps President Eisenhower's sixth sense is right, and things really are "on the way up." Perhaps peace is just around the corner. But surely, in view of the above, it would be unwise to act blindly on this assumption.

Career of James Morgan Is a Legacy for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article on the death of James Morgan appearing in the Boston Globe of May 13, 1955.

The whole life of James Morgan was associated with the Boston Globe. For many years he was recognized as one of the outstanding members of his profession.

I also include in my remarks an editorial on James Morgan appearing in the Boston Globe of May 13, 1955.

The article and editorial follow:

CAREER OF JAMES MORGAN IS A LEGACY FOR ALL—HIS WARM, WISE COUNSEL SET TRADITION OF THE GLOBE—JUSTICE IN HUMAN AFFAIRS THE CORNERSTONE OF HIS LIFE

"We are not responsible for the binding of our book of life, but we are for the contents," wrote James Morgan in a Christmas message, when, at 90, he confessed he was "still waiting for old age to begin." For him, in spirit, it never did.

Nor did his view of the responsibility of the individual alter: What he professed at four score and ten, he had live through the long years since the rumbles of the Civil War muted away from his boyhood recollections. The hint of Benjamin Franklin's famous epitaph contained in Mr. Morgan's philosophy was, in a sense, almost lineal:

His own life, together with those of this father and grandfather, spanned the entire history of the United States, from the American Revolution to our own day.

Dean of America's journalists, friend and advisor of a long succession of Presidents since the midseventies, scholar, historian, traveler, he moved with old-fashioned southern courtesy among the high and the lowly alike, as alert and interested in the views of the taxicab driver as he was in those of Supreme Court Justices and famous leaders of Government whom he numbered among his intimates.

Through his signed writings in the Boston Globe, which he helped to build, under the guidance and friendship of its founder, the late Gen. Charles H. Taylor, he was, during nearly 75 years, the familiar of hundreds of thousands of New Englanders, who delighted in his sanity of view and unflagging championship of justice in human affairs.

There was an appropriateness about James Morgan's ties with New England, especially with Boston and Massachusetts. It was to Boston, in 1636, that his ancestors came, as settlers from Wales. Nearly 250 years later, he himself closed the cycle of family migration by returning as a young man in his early twenties to the Hub to begin his career on the Boston Globe.

In the midseventeenth century, the two brothers in the original settler's family of Boston moved to the Connecticut Valley, where they helped found what is now the city of Springfield. From one of them was descended the late financier, J. Pierpont Morgan. The other pushed on into Kentucky, where James Morgan's ancestral family established itself in the mideighteenth century.

It was in Kentucky, on December 18, 1861, that James Morgan was born. Soon thereafter the family, being of strong Union sympathies, moved into central Illinois where he spent his boyhood, underwent very brief schooling, helped his father as clerk in an express office and, at 10, found the magic key which was to unlock the future and shape his life's work.

It was a telegraph key which helped James Morgan to his path of self-discovery. First in his hometown of Champaign, Ill., and later in adjoining communities, he made friends with the local railway telegraphers, who permitted him to learn how to operate this fascinating machine. By the time he was 15, he was a regular substitute and relief operator for the Illinois Central Railway. At 17 he shifted from railway telegraphy to commercial dispatch work at Des Moines, for the Western Union.

He was on his way now with a vengeance. James Morgan's skill at the telegraph key next opened the way for an assignment to the Washington office, whither he betook himself at the age of 19. He was already deeply informed in national politics because of his handling of political dispatches. He knew every Member of the lower House of Congress in 1880 by name and record. Incidentally, he had also made the innovation in press dispatches of adding political identification to public figures' names such as Representative Black (Dem., Ark.). This touch continues in political reporting down to our own day.

While immersing himself in political affairs, which were to become one of his abiding interests, the youngster from Illinois, still in his early twenties, proceeded to open still another path of interest—historical exploration. The youthful telegrapher could not wait until the morning after his arrival at the Nation's Capital to see Government in action: he rushed to a night session carrying his traveling bag from the station. Similarly, he proceeded to employ all his free time journeying to such historic shrines as Mt. Vernon, Monticello, and other spots near Washington made famous in the Nation's history.

This passion for a rummaging through America's past on the spot persisted until the very year of his death. In later years, after his arrival in New England, he was to develop, under its urging, a personal acquaintance with shrines, biographies, geography, history, and regional traits of character which was undoubtedly unmatched.

While on a hasty visit from Washington to New York City, in 1883, James Morgan first met the founder of the United Press, Walter Phillips, who was partly responsible for the later meeting with General—then Colonel—Charles H. Taylor and the decision to abandon telegraphy for a career in the newspaper profession.

James Morgan came to the Globe first as exchange editor, a role which was one of tremendous importance in days when the telephone was still a dream in the mind of its inventor. His flair for politics and his enormous erudition in that field, soon induced the publisher of the Globe to assign him to cover statehouse affairs, where the 23-year-old speedily began a new enlargement of his acquaintance with political leaders of both parties, from senators down to ward bosses.

With this preparation, a year later he was sent to take charge of the paper's Washington Bureau, which he proceeded to make outstanding in the Nation in national political reporting. Thereafer, he covered the capital during the sessions of Congress, and returned to New England every summer, interspersing work on the road during campaigns. His byline was now attracting wide attention.

In 1890, the Uncle Dudley signature on the Globe's two-column long Sunday editorial made its first appearance. What part James Morgan played in creating this column, and what part represented General Taylor's inspiration, will never be known, for both were reticent about the column's origins.

But the Uncle Dudley column bore from the outset the unmistakable stamp of James Morgan's wisdom and personality, and expressed fully the philosophy of the Globe's founder, who envisaged it as a venture in friendly counseling and well-tempered suggestion, rather than as recourse to dogmatic lecturing of the public.

This oldest editorializing column in the Nation undertook to fill the vacuum left by the vanishing personal journalism of such great editors as Greely and Dana; the journalistic are which Marse Henry Waterson still plied famously in the South. In 1913, on the eve of World War I, Uncle Dudley became a daily feature on the Globe's editorial page with James Morgan presiding over its destinies as director.

In 1894, Mr. Morgan, then at the age of 32, married Miss Helen Dailey, of Cambridge. Thereafter, throughout the rest of a long and extraordinary productive life, the two were inseparable coworkers, sharing adventures on journeys which carried them into far corners of the earth.

James Morgan had been, from his youth, an eager and unusual traveller. Equipped with a memory of encyclopedic proportions, he never visited a city, or a spot notable in human annals, without saturating himself in its history and storing away in his mind a surprising wealth of information about it.

This trait has already been noted with respect to historical spots in our own country. It was emphasized again on the 50th anniversary of the Civil War, when James Morgan conceived the idea of a day-by-day story of that struggle, written from the old battlefields. But in 1913 the greatest adventure in travel he was to experience opened for him.

General Taylor decided that the approaching anniversary of the Battle of Waterloo and the downfall of Napoleon, warranted special notice as a news feature. Accordingly he startled James Morgan one morning by informing him that he and Mrs. Morgan were to pack up and go to Europe. There they were to begin at Napoleon's birthplace on Corsica, and follow the trail of the Little Corporal's destiny through to his tomb at Les Invalides in Paris.

This journey of 20,000 miles occupied the better part of a year. In preparation for it, James Morgan assembled and read hundreds of histories, biographies, and memoirs. The results began to flow into the Sunday Globe from his wandering pen a few months later. They continued, one whole page article after another, week after week, down to the centenary of Waterloo.

It was one of the most prodigious feats of journalism in the annals of the American press; and not the least remarkable part of the undertaking were the vibrant, colorful, fascinating style of the writing, and the shrewd historical and political wisdom displayed by the author.

"The Path of Napoleon" took Mr. and Mrs. Morgan through Europe, into the Mediterranean, Egypt, up the Nile, and into the Holy Land. They followed Napoleon's star to Austria and Poland, to Moscow, Waterloo, and Saint Helena. Twice James Morgan was arrested by suspicious national police, who thought him a spy because of his intense curiosity and his insistence upon digging into out-of-the-way corners of the Napoleonic legend.

Then, returning home just as World War I began to throw its approaching shadow across Europe, James Morgan shut himself up in a hotel room, together with a newly assembled library of Napoleona, and proceeded to rewrite his adventure for book publication.

This book was not the first of his literary ventures. Beginning in 1905 he turned out successively Theodore Roosevelt, the Boy and

the Man, Abraham Lincoln, the Boy and the Man, the Life of Edward O. Moseley (1913), a Life of Gen. Charles H. Taylor (in 1923) following the publisher's death, Our Presidents, a highly popular series of biographical studies, and The Birth of the American People, a study of our Colonial and Revolutionary beginnings as a Nation, in 1930.

In 1926 Mr. Morgan was given the honorary degree of Master of Arts by Tufts College; and in 1938 Williams College awarded recognition to him for his work as a newspaperman, scholar, and historian by bestowing upon him the honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters.

Paralleling this continuous interest in matters literary was Mr. Morgan's unremitting production for the pages of the Sunday Globe, where his range of learning, lively style, and robust wisdom spotlighted week after week the events of the Nation and of the world. He continued to write these pages almost down to the week of his death, without the slightest faltering of his pen.

As his biographical studies and his histories suggest his main and abiding interest lay in political affairs. From the days of President Rutherford Hayes, he covered every national political conveytion held by both the Democrats and the Republicans down to 1949, hustling his dispatches off from the convention press box page by page as energetic at 75 as he had been in his thirties.

His skill at political reporting won for him the accolade from the late William Allen White, famous editor of the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette, as "the best reporter in the country." Mr. Morgan was then in his early eighties. When age prevented his personal attendance at the conventions, he secluded himself in a Boston hotel room and, with a special installation of radio and television, supplemented by long-distance telephone, did the job there.

Two Roosevelts, Theodore and Franklin D., were among the Presidents who called James Morgan to the White House. His advice was sought by Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in Washington from many States of the Union on matters of legislative policy and political strategy. Through his friendship with Senator Norris, of Nebraska, one of James Morgan's great campaigns to modernize the Federal Government achieved victory with the adoption of the "lame duck" amendment to the Constitution. This amendment put an end to the 18-month-long interlude between the election of new Members of Congress and their assumption of duties. He had urged this for a decade.

On the occasion of his 90th birthday, this native son of old Kentucky and rehabilitated New Englander received messages of congratulation from editors and statesmen, educators, and Supreme Court Justices, political leaders, and literary pundits all over America. They honored him not merely for his unusual achievement but equally for the graciousness, unfailing humor, and wide humanity of his character.

His personal reticence did not obscure a warm heart, a confident spirit, and a never-absent kindness of manner. His passing, alike to the members of the Globe family who were honored by his friendship and to the nearly 1,000 others who personally shared with them the richness of his personality and wisdom through intimate acquaintance, is less a signal for grief than a reason for thanksgiving that opportunity was given them to know and love one of such tempered wisdom and diverse qualities.

J. H. P.

JAMES MORGAN

It is difficult to appreciate so soon that James Morgan's help will no longer be available. It always has been at hand in the memory of the oldest Globe employee.

Wherever he was a phone call would bring a quick answer to the most difficult question, coupled with a careful, friendly explanation, offered with easy courtesy. Increasing age never reduced his alertness; rather it gave further depth to his understanding.

For what he said had authority. That stemmed not merely from a newspaper career of nearly 80 years, which he began as a telegrapher in the days when the effective use of the telegraph was comparatively new to journalism. Behind his experience there also lay his immense historical study, which helped him furnish the correct background for any picture that might emerge in the news.

He always searched out the fundamentals. It was characteristic of him that when he briefly investigated the subject of law he studied Blackstone's Commentaries. It was such searching self-education that developed Mr. Morgan, who had no formal education after the age of 9, into the elder statesman of American journalism and a successful author, to whom Williams College awarded a degree of doctor of humane letters.

His contribution to the Globe was immense, beyond possible assessment. This newspaper's policy of friendly, objective discussion, and avoidance of heat, is certainly in accord with his personality. With the late Gen. Charles H. Taylor, he founded the Uncle Dudley column 65 years ago.

That he will be missed goes without saying, but what he taught his colleagues over the years will long be remembered, for it forms a sure foundation. We prize a heritage, while we mourn a counselor and friend.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Biscuits and Cornbread for Coal Miners and Other Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 3706, similar to several others of equal intent and purpose, seeking to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to process our surplus grains, now owned by the taxpayers but which are no more useful than a miser's coins under the floor board, in order that those grains may become flour and meal for our unemployed coal miners and for other Americans. Like the hoarding miser, we know the grain is ours somewhere in nice storage piles, but in our inner wisdom from the Lord, we also know that such stored grain will never be useful until placed in channels of human consumption at home or abroad. And I for one believe in being good to our own before we hunt for recipients for our goods in Turkey or Pakistan. I do hope many Members of this body will give much thoughtful consideration to the desirability for this type of legislation during these days of unemployment in our great coal industry. If we encourage Venezuela by permiting that country to ship unlimited quantities of residual oil into America to compete with our domestic coal industry, then we ought to encourage our own unemployed coal miners by enacting legislation authorizing the processing of surplus grains into flour for biscuits and into meal for corn dodgers for the worthy families of some of the best Americans this side of Paradise, the mining people of southeastern Kentucky and of other sections of our coal-mining regions.

Mr. Speaker, I do not claim to be a poet. But once I was booked for a memorial address at a little mining community down in Whitley County, Ky., in honor of the departed coal miners all of us had known and loved as neighbors and friends before they were called to that mystic bourne from which no traveler has ever returned. So, I came up with a little poem honoring the miners we proposed to remember on that occasion. It follows below:

THE MINING MAN

(By EUGENE SILER, Williamsburg, Ky.)

(Read at homecoming of Bon Jellico miners on September 17, 1950)

Miner, miner shining bright
Down in caverns of the night.
How could wheels make their turn,
How could bright fires dance and burn
Without you, O mining man?

War or peace must have your coal,
A world is waiting for black gold.
So make a cut and shoot it down,
Load it up to go to town.
Blessing on you, mining man!

Toil and danger both you know,
Sometimes joy and sometimes woe.
But light of night comes by your hand
And with your help we run this land.
Hail to you, O mining man!

So now, Mr. Speaker, I trust this body at the proper time will not merely consider doing the Democratic thing or the Republican thing but rather the Christian thing toward the unemployed "mining man" and others in giving support to the legislation I have mentioned. I have decided that during my own congressional career, whether short or long, I do not intend to be pro-labor nor pro-capital nor pro-conservative nor pro-radical, but I do intend to be very pro-Christian and very pro-American. And I believe this legislation I have mentioned is both Christian and American in its basic character.

How's Benson Doing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED MARSHALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the May 7, 1955, issue of Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead. Many of those who support the Eisenhower administration farm program of flexible price supports have asked us to wait and see how the program will work. They have indicated that a program of flexible price supports will reduce production and increase consumption with-

out lowering the income of farm families. The article I am including in my remarks shows that this is not the case. It follows:

HOW'S BENSON DOING?

How is the Benson farm program working? His hope is that by lowering the price of farm products you can reduce production and increase consumption without too much injury to farm income.

Look first at the drop in support prices and intended acreage for 1955:

	Drop in price (cents per bushel)	Shift in acreage
Corn	4	No change.
Oats	14	Up 1 percent.
Barley	21	Up 9 percent.
Soybeans	21	Up 7 percent.
Sorghum	28	Do.

So far, the drop in support price has been accompanied by an increase instead of a decrease in intended acreage.

What about the dairy situation? The price has dropped but has production been cut?

In the marketing year ending March 31, 1955, milk production held about steady. Actually it rose a little, by half a billion pounds. In the first quarter of 1955, milk production was off 2 percent from the high first quarter of 1954.

But cow numbers are still high, and the April, May, and June production may equal last year's. If last year's drought is not repeated, milk production for all of 1955 may easily run ahead of 1954.

The cut in dairy product prices a year ago has made little difference in production and has helped to increase consumption slightly. To pay for these results, dairy farmers have taken a cut of 10 percent or more in net income.

Is the Benson plan working? Not with feed-grain crops certainly. And it shows only meager results in the dairy field at a high cost to dairy farmers.

Progress Report on Desalting Sea Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, in the last decade the diminishing water supply in this country has become a matter of great concern. To realize there is good cause for this concern one only needs to examine past history where whole civilizations have vanished from certain areas of the earth because their water supplies were exhausted.

As the water needs of our country grow, as agriculture and industry require more and more water and our available supplies dwindle, the importance of water to our well-being and to our overall national economy is impressed upon us more and more. Expansion of our industries, our growing populations, and expanding agricultural production have increased tremendously the demand for large quantities of fresh water. This continued growth and expansion has placed a severe drain on water resources in certain areas. The sources of water on which we normally rely are gradually being exhausted and, through use and reuse, the supplies derived from these sources are being contaminated. There is an urgent need then for finding additional fresh-water sources.

Last year thousands of cities and towns throughout the Nation were forced to adopt measures curtailing water use. The availability of water has become a major factor in the location of industry, as industrial water needs rapidly expand.

In the face of this alarming water situation, there is encouraging news for many of the areas most concerned over their dwindling water supplies. These are the areas that have an unlimited source of water but up to now this water has not been useable because of the salt content. There is enough fresh water in 1 cubic mile of ocean water to supply the entire Nation for 8 days. The problem then is to separate the pure water from the salt and this problem is well on the way to being solved.

On June 2, 1952, this body—House of Representatives—passed legislation establishing a research program with the objective of developing economically feasible processes for converting saline or salt water to fresh water. This legislation was enacted and became known as the Saline Water Act of 1952. I am happy to report that progress under this research program has been encouraging. No longer does any area have to face the possibility of running out of water as long as there are supplies of salt or saline water available. Economic demineralization of saline water is in sight.

By this program initiated by the Congress in 1952, the foundation is being laid for realistic development of practical conversion processes. At the beginning of the program the cost of converting sea water to fresh water by the best processes in use was estimated at about $400 to $500 an acre-foot. The initial cost goals for the program were set at $125 per acre-foot for municipal water and $40 per acre-foot for irrigation water on the basis that these amounts represented about the maximum that could be borne by these types of use. These goals are in sight and it is believed that they can be reached and lowered if the research is continued.

In accordance with the Saline Water Act of 1952, the research program is being accomplished under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior through, first, federally financed contracts for conducting scientific research with private scientists and engineers, educational institutions, scientific organizations, and engineering firms; second, encouraging development of saline water conversion processes by correlating and coordinating efforts in this field; and third, stimulating the interest of private and public organizations and individuals in the program. Some of the outstanding scientists in the country are working on the problem. In addition, there is a group of eminent leaders of educational, scientific, and industrial organizations serving as an advisory board to provide the Secretary with advice on broad policy matters relating to the program. The research and development now in progress is being watched with much interest by those engaged in similar projects in a number of foreign countries and there is cooperation between this Government and those abroad having mutual interest in this problem.

Many ideas and processes have been studied. Some have shown promise and some have been discarded. The processes under study include: First, electric membrane processes; second, vapor compression distillation; third, solar distillation; fourth, critical pressure devices; fifth, osmotic processes; sixth, solvent extraction; and seventh, separation by freezing. The technical details of these processes for those who are interested may be obtained from the printed hearings before the Interior Committee or may be obtained from the Department of the Interior.

The program embodied in the 1952 act was for 5 years and called for the expenditure of $2 million over the 5-year period. H. R. 2126 would amend the Saline Water Act of 1952 to provide for uninterrupted continuation of the saline water conversion research program. This legislation would modify the basic act by extending the period of the research program by 5 years, by increasing the amount authorized to be appropriated from $2 million to $6 million, and by permitting research to be carried on to a limited extent in existing Government laboratories.

Under the provisions of the 1952 act, all research activities and field tests, including reports thereon and the correlation and coordination of all data, must be completed prior to July 15, 1957. It is necessary that extension of the program be authorized at this time if it is to continue without interruption. Under the existing law, most active research contracting would have to be terminated by about December of this year to permit completion of the work under the contract and final reporting of the results and conclusions by the deadline of July 1957.

Unless the program is extended, it would be terminated just at a time when the need for advance research and development of the most promising processes is expected to be paramount. Up until now, most of the research and development on processes has been on a relatively small-scale laboratory basis. Much of this exploratory research needs to be continued; however, in addition a few processes have shown sufficient promise to warrant the installation of pilot plants or the undertaking of field tests. Such plants and tests are essential in order to obtain reliable cost estimates and information on the durability of the unit, production capacity, power requirements and other data necessary to demonstrate the feasibility of large-scale conversion.

The need for authority to use Government laboratories to a limited extent is primarily for the purpose of making unbiased comparisons of processes in confirmation of research results.

With the encouraging results from recent advancements, primarily as a result of the legislation passed in 1952, I do

not hesitate to predict that this research program, if it is continued, will result in development of processes which will, within the extension requested by this legislation, produce fresh water for municipal use in certain areas at a cost that is competitive with other sources and will produce fresh water for agricultural purposes in certain areas from brackish water at a cost which will be feasible.

Don't Turn Diverted Acres Into Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our present Federal farm programs have not solved the many problems facing the dairy farmers of the Nation. In fact, some elements of the general farm program not related to dairy farming actually impose new problems for dairy farmers and the dairy industry. I refer specifically to the problem of diverted acres from other types of farming. It appears that in the past the diverted acres have been temporarily turned into use for dairying. This, of course, intensifies the problems of farmers normally and regularly engaged in dairy farming.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the May 7, 1955, issue of the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer which discusses this problem. Here is the full text of the editorial:

It is true that the milk surplus picture looks a bit brighter than in 1954. However, there is still a big black cloud hanging over the dairy future.

The thought of 30 million diverted acres is a continuing worry to dairymen. These are the acres taken out of corn, wheat, and cotton production by farmers who comply with Federal crop controls.

Government policy is to get these extra acres into hay and pasture crops. This is good for the land but it is sure to mean extra competition and more milk surpluses.

More acres of hay and pasture are sure to mean more meat and milk. The only thing to do with forage is to feed it to cattle and sheep. Some of those added cattle will be dairy cows.

We hate to see these diverted acres shifted from corn, cotton, and wheat and put into milk production. Competition is tough enough as it is.

Acreage taken out of those crops should be taken completely out of circulation. Otherwise they solve one problem only to create another.

I wish to point out to my colleagues that I have introduced a bill, H. R. 5942, which I believe solves the problem of diverted acres. Briefly, my bill calls for the Secretary of Agriculture to annually determine and proclaim prior to November 15 of each year a national conservation acreage reserve for the succeeding year. The Secretary of Agriculture, after surveys, will determine how many acres of land are needed for current production needs and how many acres of land are to be diverted into the conservation reserve.

The national conservation reserve will then be broken down into State allocations. The States in turn will allocate the reserve acreage to counties in the same ratio as the previous year's acreage in national production totals. County farmer committees will then allocate the county's conservation reserve to individual farmers on a similar basis.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into annual agreements with individual farmers for the making of incentive payments to farmers who agree to put the specified number of acres into a conservation reserve on their farms. Such incentive payments will be based on the value of the customary landlord's share, in the area where the farm is located, of commodities which the Secretary determines would be produced on the reserve acres if they were used for commercial production for the crop year on which the contract is made. The bill limits incentive payments to $2,000 for any farm operator's unit.

I believe if my bill is adopted it will solve the problem of diverted acres—diverted acres that in the past have sometimes been turned into dairying or other types of farming. Under my bill diverted acres will be used for a conservation reserve. It is a reserve plan that will protect our top soil when we need it for an emergency or in the not too distant future to meet increased population of the Nation.

Developing a Sound Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. F. SISK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I have just had the pleasure of having as my guest on a radio program for the people of my district, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of this House. I was so struck by his informative discussion of our farm problems that I would like to repeat here some of the ground we covered and plead for quick and vigrous action by this Congress toward developing a sound farm program.

In casting my vote for H. R. 12, which would restore 90-percent parity price supports for basic agricultural commodities and put a floor of 80 percent under dairy supports, I am not under any illusion that this measure is any more than a step in the direction of adequate farm income security. I would like to make it clear that I do not consider price supports, whether fixed at 90 percent or flexible, as anything more than a temporary prop to try to keep a large number of our farmers from going bankrupt and losing their farms during the period before we can work out a sound, permanent, and effective program.

In the first place, I am unhappy because H. R. 12 makes no provision to help agricultural industries outside the so-called basic crops and dairying. I believe that other farmers, raising other crops, are as much entitled to help as are the producers of the basic crops. In my own district we have large production of grapes, raisins, fruits and vegetable crops and the farmers who are supplying these essentials to the Nation have problems equally difficult with those of the producers of cotton, wheat, corn, rice, and peanuts, and I believe their economic welfare is as important to the Nation as is the survival of farmers producing basic commodities.

I think it must be apparent that if price supports are to serve any effective purpose in saving our farm families from going under, they must be at 90 percent of parity. Actually, the difference between the 90 percent and the 75 percent or 80 percent they would receive under the flexible support program is the amount keeping them alive and eating and able to operate their farms. For a large percentage of our farms, it is the slim margin of survival. The Secretary of Agriculture has publicly stated that the policy of the administration is to eliminate 10 percent of farm families. That means about 500,000 families, about 2 million men, women, and children of America who have chosen farming as a way of life. The Secretary of Agriculture also advocates the flexible price support program and it is apparent he and the administration propose to use this device as a means of accomplishing his purpose to drive farmers away from their farms.

Recently President Eisenhower delivered a message to the Congress endorsing a program of farm help put together by Secretary of Agriculture Benson. After wrestling with the problem of what to do with our farmers who are on the verge of going under, what do they come up with? A proposal that the Federal Government assist them by educating them not to be farmers. They propose we solve our farm problem by educating farmers to be laborers or mechanics—not by helping them to be better farmers, or trying to solve their price or distribution problems. This would sound ridiculous if it were not tragic confirmation of the existence of an administration program to liquidate farm families. Actually, it fits into a program which also is designed to pinch off and abandon reclamation, which would put water on millions of acres and in many instances convert them from marginal to fine, producing acres, helping to solve the world's food shortage.

May I recall to you the prediction of former President Truman when he dedicated an important reclamation dam in 1952 and told his listeners to mark it well, for if the Republican Party gained power, they would not see another dam like it? How well he knew the plans of the present administration is shown by the fact that there has not been a single new reclamation start since January 1953.

All this fumbling with our farms adds up to an administration philosophy I think is unknown to many of our farm-

ers. It amounts to a plan to drive farmers out of business and herd them into industrial pursuits. As tools to accomplish this purpose we have flexible, bankruptcy price supports, stopping reclamation programs which would create new irrigated farms, and proposals to recruit farmers into industrial plants. Instead of a program to keep farmers in business producing food and fiber, we are asked to go along with a program to drive them off the farms. This is the opposite of a farm program as I see it.

Since I have been in Washington I have been astonished and aghast at the hopeless, helpless attitude of the Department of Agriculture. I wish our farmers generally could see the callous and cold reaction of the leaders in that Department to the human problems they should be trying to solve. Believe me, when I take up with officials of the Department of Agriculture the acute and immediate problems of a major segment of agriculture, the turkey industry, and am informed the Department proposes to do nothing to cooperate with the industry, I cannot accept their plan to shake out less efficient producers—to solve the problems by permitting chaos in the industry this fall, with inevitable bankruptcy for thousands.

The fact of the matter is that a continued program of price supports is necessary at this time primarily because the administration has completely failed to develop a farm program. It appears we cannot expect such a program from the hopeless, helpless group now charged with this responsibility. As I see it, development of a long-range farm program is up to us and we cannot expect cooperation from the administration. When such a program is developed, we no longer will be concerned with either flexible or rigid price supports on their present basis, and I, for one, will be happy to see the end of this artificial emergency aid.

How shall we go about working out a farm program? Certainly, we have a valid objective, and that must be to provide a farm economy in which every hard-working farmer will know that by proper, efficient farm management, he can recover his costs of production and receive a profit sufficient to raise and educate his children under a standard of living we want in an American home.

Because we have proof with which we cannot argue that the world as a whole has a serious food shortage, we must grant that our local situation, with what appears to be surpluses, can be smoothed out by proper distribution.

Reciprocal trade provides the basic tool for foreign agricultural distribution, and it is too bad the Department of Agriculture continues to drag its feet in developing world markets for our surplus farm production.

We need also to encourage marketing agreements, cooperative marketing associations, advertising and distribution programs to knock off the peak of surplus production and fill in the valleys of underproduction.

We must curb food profiteering and speculation abuses and cut the costs of distribution, so that consumers can get food and clothing at fair prices while farmers receive a fair return. I am most happy to learn from Congressman COOLEY that the Agriculture Committee of this House is embarking on a program to study consumer and farm prices, and I have every hope that legislation to deal with this problem will result.

We need more advance planning of projects to convert marginal land into good farms, through increased soil conservation and a renewed program for reclamation, and we must overcome and throw aside the reluctance of the present administration to go ahead with these vital projects.

In the face of a hopeless, helpless administration, the need of action by this Congress is urgent, lest delays wreck our farm economy and change our most basic strength into an agricultural shambles.

Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert a very excellent article written by the Honorable Stanley K. Hornbeck entitled "Formosa" and which was published in the spring issue of World Affairs magazine.

Mr. Hornbeck has had a distinguished career in the Foreign Service of our country. He served as the Chief of the Far Eastern Division in the Department of State, as a Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, as a member of the American delegation to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference in 1944, and as United States Ambassador to the Netherlands from 1944 to 1947.

I recommend Mr. Hornbeck's article to all who are concerned and interested in the present situation in the Far East:

FORMOSA

(By Stanley K. Hornbeck)

Nature placed it in the geographic orbit of the Asiatic mainland. Human adventuring, pioneering, and settling brought it long ago into the ethnic orbit of China. Portuguese mariners gave it the name by which we know it: Formosa. To the Chinese and the Japanese it was and is Taiwan. Spaniards, Netherlanders, Englishmen, Japanese, Americans, and Chinese have given it a place in history. A war and a treaty drew it 60 years ago into the political orbit of Japan. Another war evoked from the major powers on what became the winning side a declaration of purpose that it be restored to the Republic of China, brought about relinquishment by Japan of any and all claim to it, rendered it de factis a province of China, and left in suspense the question of its status de lege.

Karl Marx, Lenin, the Communist conspiracy and the evolution of the Communist empire have made of it and its environs a focal point in the current phase of the ages-old struggle between, on the one hand, men and ideas contending for human freedom and, on the other hand, men and ideas committed to procedures and practices of enslavement.

The 8 million Chinese now on Formosa—many of whose leaders are American educated—live, toil, think, fear, and hope within the orbit of the free world. To most of them that island is homeland; to some 2 million newcomers a land of asylum. It and they, together with the nearby Pescadores and a few small islands along the China coast, have become a symbol, a rallying point, and a test case for the cause of freedom in relation to the largest and oldest of Asian nations, China.

The "problem" of "Formosa" is now a subject of concern throughout the world. Are Formosa and the other islands now held by the Nationals, are they, all or some, are they and the people on them to remain "free" and within the free-world orbit; or are they to be dragged—by force—into the orbit of the Communist world? Implicit in and inseparable from that "problem," there are for the free nations the enduring problems of freedom, peace, security, and justice; and for the rulers of the Communist world the problem of consolidating, maintaining, and expanding their enslaving empire.

Among the issues in the conflict of proposals and policies relating to or bearing upon the future of Formosa are those of freedom or enslavement for the 8 million Chinese on that and the smaller islands; of perpetuation or destruction of hope for freedom for 500 million Chinese on the mainland; of encouragement or discouragement for peoples free or hoping to be free elsewhere in Asia; of more of security or less for men and nations everywhere; of increasing or decreasing the safeguards of world peace. All of these issues are, of course, of concern to the Government and people of the United States.

The foreign policy of the United States is rooted in Christian concepts of personal, national, and international morality. The people of the United States believe in freedom, peace, security, and justice, not alone for themselves and their country but for human beings and national groupings everywhere. They perceive that in the world as it is today all Communist regimes are dedicated to the destruction of freedom and are a menace, globally, to peace, security, and justice in any setting or context.

The Government of the United States has decided that it is essential to the security of the United States and desirable in the interest of peace that conquest of Formosa by Communist armed forces not be permitted. This Government has now concluded (in February 1955) with the National Government on Formosa a treaty committing the United States and the Republic of China reciprocally and in common to principles and purposes of mutual defense. The Congress has already indicated, by passage of a joint resolution and by the Senate's ratification of the treaty, that it concurs in the estimate and it approves the action of the Executive in the taking of this step.

The objective of the United States in this and in other contexts is, as President Eisenhower has declared, "honestly and hopefully to prevent war." The people and the Government of the United States want peace; our allies want peace; most of the members of the United Nations want peace; all civilized and right-minded folk want peace. But peace can be had only at a price; either contend for and defend freedom or tolerate and accept enslavement.

Should there come an effort by Communist China to take Formosa by armed assault the United States thus plans to make common cause with the Nationalist China in armed resistance to that attack. Should that be war or lead to war, the United States will not have gone to war to defend Formosa; we will have been forced by the Communist world to fight in self defense—to fight in defense of our right, a part of the right of all mankind, to freedom, peace, security, and justice.

I Won't Sell My Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the publication of volume 1, No. 1, of the Westover News, a new civilian weekly newspaper edited in the interest of Strategic Air Command personnel now taking command of Westover Air Force Base at Chicopee Falls, Mass., in my district. I want to extend a hearty welcome to Col. E. D. Reynolds, wing commander of the 4050th Air Refueling Wing, to his staff officers and enlisted men moving into Westover. I am sure that they will soon learn, as did personnel of the recently departed Military Air Transport Service, that the civilian populations of the nearby communities of Chicopee, Springfield, West Springfield, South Hadley, Granby, and Ludlow, are most friendly, neighborly, and cooperative. I also want to extend my congratulations to the Westover Publishing Co. of Chicopee, and John J. Ryan, Jr., a well-known Springfield newspaperman and the Westover News' civilian editor, for the superb job in editing and publishing the first edition of this unofficial base newspaper. I wish the newspaper staff success for the future. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have printed in the RECORD the first editorial appearing in the Westover News which was reprinted from the American Weekly Magazine and is captioned "I Won't Sell My Citizenship."

I WON'T SELL MY CITIZENSHIP
(By Sgt. Wilbur F. H. Radeline)

At any time in the past 30 years I could have inherited a fortune if I had been willing to do one thing—give up my American citizenship.

I would not do that and I did not speak about it to any but a few close friends. Recently, however, the story has received some publicity and several hundred Americans have written me to suggest what they think I should do. In writing this I want thank them—and to explain why no amount of money is worth the price I would have to pay.

I was born in a county poorhouse in Pennsylvania. My mother was an immigrant servant girl. My father was Count De Brogna, a Sicilian, who died in Italy in 1923.

He left me an estate which has been estimated at $300,000 in citrus farms, cash, an ancestral mansion, and family jewels.

Yes—he was my father. But he would not give his name to the girl he said he loved, nor to his son, because of the vast differences in their stations in life. For he was not an American.

But foster parents adopted me, gave me their name, and helped my mother—for they were Americans. They gave me love, a home and happiness.

I have tried to get the estate. I consulted outstanding Republican and Democratic Members of Congress, and was even referred to Cordell Hull when he was Secretary of State.

The answer was the same in very case: the will is valid; I could only inherit by complying with the terms my father set down.

That I will never do. I am a sick man. I have what is called osteoarthritis. My wife suffers from epilepsy and frequently—sometimes 2 or 3 times a week—tears her clothes. It is hard to replace them on a sergeant's pay. I need the inheritance money very much.

But no amount of need can tempt me to surrender my citizenship.

I have seen Americans work, live, and die for my country, America, and for what it offers to all, not just a select few.

Where else in the world can an ailing man, over 50 years of age, and his sick wife look forward to security and peace of mind, and soul in the eventide of life?

That is why I thank God I am an American, and pray that I will always be a good one.

Milk Prices Will Increase if Surplus Decreases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the May 7, 1955, issue of the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer. The editorial follows:

Should milk supports be boosted back up to 90 percent of parity? No one would blame a Wisconsin farmer for quickly answering "Yes" to that question. However, it is not that simple.

In April 1954 Secretary Benson cut supports from 90 down to 75 percent of parity in a single day. We argued that the drop was too far and too sudden and unfair to dairying compared to other farm products. We still feel that it could have been done differently.

How does the situation look as of May 1955? Is this the time to push for a return to 90-percent supports?

People are definitely using more milk, butter, and cheese than before the price drop. Production has leveled off. So the surplus picture has improved.

Milk checks took quite a beating during the past year. Dairymen realize more than anyone just how much that hurt.

But we must keep two things in mind. First, there is no chance politically of getting 90-percent supports without controls on production. Second, if production isn't controlled, the country might get fed up with dairy-support programs and we would lose what we have.

Congress will vote 90-percent dairy parity only if the program carries built-in controls on milk output. Do you want to be told how much milk you may produce?

There is a tool which would solve surplus troubles. It is production payments and it should have been given a trial long ago.

Let the market drop to where it will. Then let the Government make direct payments to farmers to make up the difference between market price and support price.

Once that surplus is handled, dairy supports and prices can again work their way higher, where they belong. Not only 90 percent but 100 percent of parity.

The editorial, as you will note, correctly observes that dairy products will never be supported at 90 percent of parity unless there are production controls and marketing quotas applied to the industry in the same manner as basic commodities are supported.

I do not know if the majority of the Nation's dairy farmers are willing to accept controls and marketing quotas. The reason that I do not know is because the Nation's dairy farmers have never been given the opportunity to discuss the pros and cons of such a program. It is my hope that the Dairy Subcommittee of the House will hold some hearings this year out in th country to get grassroots thinking of dairy farmers on this and other related problems.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 4360, which will make dairy products a basic commodity and which provides for control and marketing quotas. If the program is approved by Congress, dairy farmers will receive compensation through incentive payments, as suggested in the editorial quoted above.

I believe H. R. 4360 has considerable merit, but before action in Congress on it I would like to have it fully understood by the Nation's dairy farmers. If the majority of dairy farmers do not want such a program—and we don't know at this time what their thinking is on this matter—then the issue would be resolved on this approach. Until such time as we have sufficient opinion from all of the major dairy producing areas we cannot say that dairy farmers favor the program or that they oppose it.

That is why I hope the Dairy Subcommittee will hold the hearings I have suggested to get the broadest possible view of dairy farmers on support programs.

Genevieve Blatt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include from the Carlisle Sentinel a well-deserved editorial tribute to the Honorable Genevieve Blatt, secretary of internal affairs for Pennsylvania, one of the ablest citizens of Pennsylvania:

MISS BLATT TAKES OFFICE

Pennsylvania now has a woman in a major elective State office for the first time. She is Genevieve Blatt, Pittsburgh, who was inaugurated last week as secretary of internal affairs. An attorney by profession and a politician by choice, Miss Blatt is fully qualified for the position; she knows Pennsylvania well and has a wide acquaintanceship with the women of the State. For many years she has been a leader and official in the Democratic Party of Pennsylvania and once before was a candidate for State office. That she will make her department of maximum usefulness is to be expected; for one thing it may be able to gather and supply information for attracting new industries to the State. Her predecessor was given four 4-year terms; whether Secretary Blatt fares as well in that respect only time will tell, but it is possible.

Who Is the County Agent?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the county agent has for many years played a vital part in the agricultural life of our country. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. G. B. Gunlogson, a friend and constituent, who is well qualified to write on this important subject of our agriculture. He understands the problems from a practical standpoint because he has owned and operated farms for many years and in addition is one of the leading advertising counselors in the United States. His informative article is included herewith:

Anyone acquainted with the great changes that are taking place in farming must be impressed with the growing complexity in the operating end as well as on the business side of farming.

New practices and better ways of doing things appear somewhere almost every day. These are often so decisive that they may determine the difference between profit and loss for the farmer.

There are new chemicals, new crops, new seed varieties, new machines, and new economic situations. Every farmer today must have knowledge of each in order to plan his operations and make management decisions.

This reminds us of the situation nearly 50 years ago when similar changes, though fewer and less complex, led to the employment of agricultural advisors. New crops were being introduced in some areas. More legumes, diversification with livestock, new rotation systems, hardier seed strains, more efficient machinery which enabled farmers to cope better with weeds and to improve culture—all these and many other practices held new promise, particularly in view of declining soil fertility which was then widespread.

How to demonstrate these practices and bring them to more farmers was the challenge to which the county agent became dedicated in his new job.

FARMERS FORM COOPERATIVE GROUPS

The deterioration of fertility and yields caused by single cropping and improper soil management had created an alarming situation. In fact, it was this concern more than anything else which prompted farmers in many counties, some years before the Cooperative Extension Act was passed in 1914, to organize their own cooperation programs for crop and soil improvement.

To spearhead this work, men trained in soil and crop management were employed, and they became the first county agents or farm advisors.

Many of these organizations were known as county associations or farm bureaus. Some of them were known as soil-improvement associations. In fact, as the movement developed, literally thousands of soil-improvement associations and other organizations were formed to deal cooperatively with various farm problems and improvements.

COUNTY AGENTS ENCOUNTER DIFFICULTIES

It should not be assumed that formation of this vast network of farm organizations and establishment of the county agent system in thousands of farming communities was accomplished without difficulties. Sometimes political wrangling and factionalism arose.

The county agent was often caught between two opposing forces. He sometimes was required to devote his time to tasks which could not be classed as agricultural. Often the control of the county organization fell into the iron grip of a few men to the detriment of the service and of other farmers.

The county agents were not supermen. Most of them were good men with general agricultural training and farm background. However, out of this endeavor of ideas and purposes emerged an institution which has played a vital role in advancing the economic and social welfare of the American farm family.

ADVICE MUST BE PRACTICAL

The county agent soon learned by experience, if he didn't know it before, that his recommendations or advice had to be practical from the standpoint of both agriculture and the pocketbook. He also knew that most measures which may improve something at one point usually have a chain reaction and that the end results must always be recognized.

Soil improvement measures are usually tied up intimately with the whole production program on the farm. The introduction of legumes and grasses might bring a new system of crop rotation. This, in turn, often called for more livestock, fencing, drainage, and special equipment. In fact, it had a bearing on the whole farm operation and even on marketing.

I have asked many farmers what help or service from the county agent they valued most. The most common answer was to the effect that whenever they contemplated a change in their farm program or the adoption of a new practice, they would talk it over with the county agent. These farmers believed he had a better overall picture and could usually visualize how the changes would fit into their whole farming program.

AGENTS WORK WITH FARM GROUPS

The county agent has been especially active in organizing and working with farmers' groups. Frequently the more successful farmers in the county became the leaders in these groups. This helped greatly in carrying out on-the-farm demonstrations, in introducing new practices, and in working out balanced farm programs.

There was no end to the new services which the extension service through the county agent was to bring the farm community. It branched into home economics, youth organization, and 4–H Club work, to say nothing about the endless jobs entirely outside his official role which were crowded on the county agent.

The public has far too little information about the work and the contribution which the county agent and extension specialist have made to agriculture and to farm life. As early as 1915 the work of county agents in 15 southern States had included such diverse activities as these, to name but a few: Direct demonstrations conducted on 105,000 farms; 500,000 visits made; nearly 3,000 silos built under their direction; more than 75,000 hillsides terraced; approximately 65,000 acres drained; about 500 communities organized to engage cooperatively in some special work.

AGENTS KEEP UP IN AGRICULTURE

Every succeeding decade has brought new needs and new progress. The county agent more than any other single institution has helped to keep pace with these changes and with technical advances which have included every phase of farming. He has served as a bridge between the offerings of science and industry and the farmer. He is the fellow who has been right at the farm front helping farmers to translate these developments into better farming and better living.

Nor does this discount the contributions of the farm press and other agencies which also have been a part of the team.

It may give us a clearer perspective on American agriculture if we recognize that it has grown from three great sources of strength. Of these, the farmer himself is first.

Individual resourcefulness and initiative, with willingness to venture and accept losses along with gains, will continue to be essential qualities for the successful farmers. Most farmers would agree, I am sure, that he should continue to stand on his own feet and apply his own judgment.

The second source is Government and education. This, of course, includes the great land-grant college system with its research, agricultural education, extension, etc. In the category of Government may also be mentioned various other agencies dealing with the more transient symptoms in agriculture.

INDUSTRY IS IMPORTANT

The third source of strength is modern industry. It is contributing millions of dollars annually in search related to agriculture, and this is rapidly expanding. It has contributed the mechanical power and equipment which make modern farming possible. It is providing modern fertilizers, chemicals, feed, seed, etc., to say nothing of its educational promotion and selling which continue to accelerate the farmer's stride.

What the future holds for the county agent can be judged at least in part by his service in the past. This 40-year record has not been faultless or without errors, but is a record of great accomplishments. It deserves to be much better known to the general public as well as to our legislators and policymakers in Government.

More basic, however, in the future of the county agent are the future trends and prospects in agriculture. The vast array of new things along the whole agricultural front present almost unlimited opportunity for better farming and better living for those families who have the requisite skills and initiative. This, it seems to me, offers a greater challenge than ever for extension.

FARMING ENTERS NEW ERA

If anyone doubts that we stand on the threshold of a new era in farming, he need only read the What's New in Farming columns in farm papers or the reports from our experiment stations. On the way are new seed strains which promise to give new boosts to crop yields and which may, in a few years, change completely the characteristics of some important field crops. New types of fertilizers offer great potentials.

In the last 5 years no less than 25 new chemicals for weed and pest control have been made available and the laboratories have many more to release shortly. It will take years for the possibilities as well as limitations of these chemicals to be realized by farmers.

Antibiotics and new high-power feed additives which have been introduced within the last 2 or 3 years will have far-reaching effects on feeding practices and on the utilization of feed materials. What's going on in the poultry industry as well as in upbreeding of livestock is still in its earliest stages at the farm level. More highly specialized farm machinery and other farm equipment promise new economy as well as crop and labor savings.

FARMER FACES NEW OPPORTUNITIES

All these developments and the economic adjustments that will follow present opportunities and challenges which farmers have never faced before. Moreover, no farmer can escape the sharpened impact of national and international trends, such as expanding population, rapid growth, and decentraliza-

tion of industry, increased demand on water supply, and changing political moods.

In recent years the county agent has been called upon to help organize and to work side by side with various farm agencies which were created to deal with certain economic or surface symptoms of agriculture. In the past these agencies too often have tended to go their own way, causing confusion and inefficiency. Obviously, these services when and where needed can be more effective if coordinated into a common purpose of serving the farmer.

COUNTY AGENTS CAN SEE NEEDS

This holds true of activities which are organized on a watershed basis as well as those which fall within county lines. A watershed may spill over into several counties but the county agents still have the overall grasp of needs and conditions to give their farmers the best representation. Because of the cooperative base on which the extension service operates, the county agents and extension specialists are in a position to harmonize the agricultural interests and objectives involved.

No wonder the farmer has stood by the county agent although in recent years he has often been handicapped and his service curtailed by overwork and shortage of help. Fortunately, the Department of Agriculture has now recognized the new responsibility which extension must carry in this modern drama of agriculture, and Congress has wisely authorized some expansion in the extension forces.

Essentially, the county agent is the farmer's representative. With increased facilities, his office can become more than ever the farmer's center in every county for farm information, and his service can be broadened to meet the needs of modern agriculture.

A Free Press: Liberals' Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an editorial from the Frontier magazine for May 1955. This forward looking publication has for some time had a special concern with the press of the country and especially the press in the area of California with which it is most familiar. This editorial represents the opinion as it has progressed to date and it is my thought that it would be worthwhile reading for all who have a concern for a free press. Surely, this category must take in most everyone, even though free opinion, like a free press, may well differ in detail.

The editorial follows:

A FREE PRESS: LIBERALS' DILEMMA

(By Gifford Phillips)

I

The effect of the recent demise of the Los Angeles Daily News on the liberal community in southern California is similar to what happens when a man with chronic anemia has to give up eating meat: It makes a bad situation worse. The pro-Democratic dailies in metropolitan Los Angeles were outnumbered 4 to 1; now the score is 4 to nothing. Liberal Angelenos should take little comfort that what happened to them is happening throughout the country. PM, the New York Star and the New York Compass went under in rapid succession. So did the Philadelphia Record, the only pro-Fair Deal paper in that community. Marshall Field saved the Chicago Sun by merging it with another liberal newspaper, the Chicago Times. He had to buy the Times to do it.

Liberal newspapers have not been the only ones to fail. The trend to monopoly in publishing has swept up everything in its way, and that has included journals of all political shadings; but the ranks of liberal publications have been hit hardest because there were so few newspapers in this category to start with.

The number of daily English-language journals has decreased in the United States from 2,042 in 1920 and 1933 in 1930 to 1,765 in 1955. During 1954, 20 dailies ceased publication (10 morning papers and 10 evening papers). This was the largest decrease since 1943 when 33 papers went under due to severe wartime publishing conditions.

The increasing monopolization of the media of public information has constitutional liberals of all parties very disturbed. Justice Holmes believed that the vitality of our democratic institutions was dependent on a free competition of ideas in the intellectual marketplace. This has become a widely accepted idea, but today one must ask how free is the marketplace?

What about the journalistic marketplace? How politically biased are the Nation's newspapers? We know that in the 1952 presidential election over two-third of them with 80 percent of the circulation supported the candidacy of General Eisenhower. But what about their news coverage? Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalism fraternity, proposed a study of press performance in the 1952 election, but dropped the idea under pressure from the American Society of Newspaper Editors and the American Publishers Association. Irving Dilliard, editor of the editorial page of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch was moved to comment: "The press tends to have one standard when it measures the performance of officials and public figures and another standard when it comes to measuring its own performance, or to put it another way, the press holds other institutions up to searching scrutiny but is unwilling to have the same scrutiny applied to itself."

The situation on the west coast is perhaps the worst in the country. A special survey made for Frontier (reported in the January 1953 issue) revealed a bias so evident that only the very cynical could fail to be disturbed by its findings.

In Los Angeles 4 of the 5 daily newspapers supported Eisenhower. The four supporting Eisenhower had a combined circulation of 1,229,094. The Daily News, supporting Stevenson, had 109,165. On the basis of circulation, Eisenhower had 86 percent support. (Survey covered 1 week.)

The Los Angeles press gave the Democrats only 33 percent of the total column inches devoted to the campaign, only 33 percent of the front page space, only 38 percent of the photos. Democratic stories were fewer, shorter, and fewer were on the front page.

These figures do not tell the entire story by any means. Slanted headlines and loaded stories were used extensively to promote Eisenhower and knock Stevenson. Even if space had been allotted equally, slanted heads and propaganda-type stories have made a mockery of the free-press idea.

The same story occurred in San Francisco. In the final month of the campaign, Hearst's San Francisco Examiner gave the Democratic side 1,250 column inches of space, the Republicans 3,400. Front page, for example, in this paper, gave the Democrats 150 inches, the Republicans 650 inches. Hearst's evening Call-Bulletin gave the Democrats 850 inches in this period, and the Republicans 1,600. The Chronicle gave the Democrats 1,800 inches and Republicans 2,200. The Scripps-Howard News, supporting Eisenhower, was just about even in its coverage, which was good. Its bias cropped out on the front page with a 2 to 1 advantage for the Republicans, but compared to the other papers, the News was excellent. Slanted headlines and loaded stories appeared in the Hearst papers.

II

The hard truth is that the press situation is getting worse and Democrats and liberals don't know what to do about it. For years Democrats brushed off the problem as annoying but not critical. These were the green years of 1932–52 when they were winning elections. (Furthermore they muffed an opportunity during this period to restore some balance to the total political equation when they failed to enact stringent legislation limiting campaign contributions.) Today with the Federal administration and the majority of newspapers on the same side of the political fence, Democrats are bucking a power combination with implications they are just beginning to understand.

To readers of the Republican press it is obvious Mr. Eisenhower can do no wrong. Today the publishers act as the President's first line of defense, personally shielding him against any criticism whatsoever. The President's judgment is depicted as infallible. In the present international crisis involving Formosa all would leave the matter solely in Mr. Eisenhower's hands. Some opine he will decide for peace, others for war—either way it is all right with them as long as it is Mr. Eisenhower who is doing it. In fairness to the President there is every evidence that he wants peace (contrary to the desires of some of the people around him), but should he ask the Nation's press to whip up a war hysteria, is there any reason to suppose they wouldn't oblige?

If the problem of the press is becoming clearer, the solution remains as clouded as ever.

Seven years ago a distinguished group of nonprofessionals headed by Robert Hutchins, with Zechariah Chaffee, Jr., as vice chairman, formed a commission subsidized by Time, Inc., to report on the state of the American press. The commission stated its belief that the press should be both free and responsible. They felt that it came closer to filling the first requirement than it did the second, but they had equal conviction that to try to make the press more responsible through legislation would make it less free.

This is the heart of the liberal's dilemma. During the New and Fair Deals liberals turned to government to seek redress for social and economic injustices and to promote the general welfare, but the Hutchins commission found governmental action relative to improving the press an awkward implement and one frought with perils to freedom.

The commission spent considerable time discussing possible use of the Sherman Antitrust Act to break up newspaper empires. It concluded that since the Sherman Act had been relatively ineffectual in breaking oil and steel combines, there was no reason to believe it would be any more effective against newspaper chains. Furthermore, the commission reasoned, there was even less reason in the case of newspapers to believe that the quality or price would improve as a result of the action. Neither was there any substantial basis on which to predict a change of ownership would mean a change of viewpoint.

The commission looked into possible application of the "common carrier" concept of the antitrust laws to newspapers. In the Chicago Sun case the Supreme Court had held that the Associated Press must sell its service to all applicants at a nondiscriminatory price. Similar devisions have forced radio and television net works to sell to all outlets, movie distributors to offer their products to all theaters, etc. Could this

principle be applied to make newspapers carry news stories relating to all sides of a controversial matter? The commission decided it would be extremely difficult to enforce such a ruling without bias, deliberate or unconscious. Zachariah Chaffee has described how this law might work.

First, think what a trial under this law would be like. Suppose a hot controversy over peacetime conscription. The Gazette supports it with GI testimony about the fascinations of training in 1942 and 1943 but entirely omits the intense boredom felt by intelligent draftees in the truly parallel situation of the peacetime draft of 1940–41. The Independent denounces conscription as unnecessary without a word about the size of the Red army. The Department of Justice with commendable even-handedness prosecutes both papers. Each trial would be as much a field day as the Dreyfus case. Generals and pacifists would throng the witness stand. The guilt or innocence of the newspapers would soon be forgotten in a bitter contest over the merits of peacetime conscription.

"The probable result of such a law would not be openmindedness but skillful hypocrisy, leaning neither to partiality, on the one hand, nor to impartiality, on the other. Controversial news would be like Dr. Johnson's reconstruction of parliamentary debates in the Gentlemen's Magazine. Many years later when he was praised for the way he dealt out reason and eloquence with an equal hand to both political parties, he remarked, 'I saved appearances tolerably well; but I took care that the Whig dogs should not have the best of it.'"

To some the views of Hutchins, Chaffee, et al., may seem overly conservative. They might point to the success of partial application of the common-carrier principle relative to the Federal Communications Commission's regulation of radio and television stations. The GCC requires that during political campaigns a station must make available an equal amount of free broadcast time to each party. Furthermore, in the granting or renewal of a license to broadcast the FCC may take into consideration the operator's proposals or his record relative to public service, which includes fair apportionment of broadcasting time to proponents of all points of view, representatives from all groups, etc.

Chaffee points out, however, that in the first instance the regulation, unlike proposals for newspaper content, is easy to enforce. It is simply a matter of measuring the amount of time allotted to Republicans against the amount allotted to Democrats and other legitimate parties.

In the second instance, the power of the FCC is only partial and stems entirely from its role of traffic regulator. Since there are a limited number of air channels, they should be allotted to the most deserving applicants. Although opportunities for favoritism in the granting of licenses by the FCC do exist, they occur infrequently and as a rule the criteria for acceptance are quite concrete and not subject to arbitrary interpretation.

Because the peculiar physical nature of radio and television makes it subject to a certain amount of regulation in the interests of public service, Democrats, liberals, and members of political minority groups in general should take full advantage of whatever limited opportunities exist here to compensate for the discrimination they receive from the press.

By and large the Hutchins Committee's fear of Government regulation of the press seems warranted.

There is ample evidence of what has happened in Soviet Russia, where the government-owned papers are merely mouthpieces for Communist Party leaders. It is true that publicly owned journals in a democratic society might fare better, but there are virtually no examples extant which can be used for reference.

Moreover, 7 years ago, when the Hutchins committee reported, the internal Communist scare had not yet developed. Since then we have witnessed harassing investigations by Senator McCarthy of James Weschler, editor of the New York Post and of Cedric Belfrage, editor of the National Guardian, by the House Un-American Activities Committee. Recently (on March 22) Senators Olin D. Johnston, Democrat, of South Carolina, and Margaret Chase Smith, Republican, of Maine, introduced a bill in the Senate to ban from the mails and from interstate commerce all publications, foreign and domestic, which "promote the cause of world communism." Johnston said the bill was aimed specifically at the Daily Worker, but the worlding could include all publications, as well as periodicals, books, films, which the Post Office might define as "communistic propaganda matter."

Editor & Publisher, influential trade journal, commented:

"We have pointed with pride to the fact that * * * we tolerate all shades of opinion. Now we are on the verge of telling the world we can no longer put up with a spokesman for the Moscow party line in our midst. * * * We don't think the Post Office should be entrusted with dictating our political or ideological reading fare."

The direction which Government control can take becomes appallingly clear, and the conservatism of the Hutchins committee becomes the better part of democratic wisdom.

III

We may reject government control, but the threat of concentration of newspaper ownership to our democratic institutions remains. The Hutchins committee opined that the press might become more responsible of its own accord but there is not much overt evidence that this is happening. The greatest sin of the American press continues to be its sensational handling of the unevaluated news stories. Professor Chaffee, writing on The Hutchins Report—Five Years Later in the Nieman reports finds this practice still prevalent.

"If Senator A says in debate that B, a private citizen, is a hired helper of the Soviet Union, the press report that the Senator did say this is a fact. Yet it may not be a fact at all that B did these bad acts. It may be an outrageous lie. B's behavior is a second fact. In spite of the legal immunity of the newspaper from libel suits, can it rightly ignore this second fact? When the paper already has information about the credibility of the statement, or could easily obtain such information, a few additional sentences on that point would be of great value to its readers. The constant repetition of defamatory statements about American citizens by newspapers who suspect with good reason that these statements are largely untrue, is not a performance of which the press can be proud."

The practice of printing unevaluated charges in our press has in fact become epidemic. How can one doubt it for a minute when we have before us the most dreadful example of them all, the case of Senator McCarthy. McCarthy's whole career is attributable to the sensational coverage afforded him by the press. He is the very creature of the press, a pygmalion in reverse.

IV

What is the answer? A clue may be afforded by examining the economic conditions which produce our best newspapers, and our worst ones. The best ones like the New York Times, the Washington Post, and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, are located in generally large markets, are economically secure, but have newspaper competition. Many of the worst ones are economically marginal operations in highly competitive markets like Boston, New York City, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. The large markets produce both the best newspapers and the worst ones, but, with some notable exceptions, the best ones are more economically secure than the worst ones. This makes sense if one stops to consider the necessity of papers that are losing money to pander to the worst human instincts in order to sell papers: Murders, divorce, and war and Communist scares are rife in their pages. They are also more susceptible to dictation from advertisers, therefore less independent politically.

Marginal papers operating in a highly competitive market are generally worse journalistic specimens than monopoly newspapers which usually enjoy economic security. If the latter are generally superior from a professional standpoint, although they don't rate as high as papers with some competition, they represent a far greater potential damage to our democratic institutions because of their monopoly voice. Attempts to start competing newspapers in these communities in recent years have generally met with failure because of the high cost of producing a newspaper nowadays.

This last is the essence of the problem. Costs of producing newspapers have soared to new all-time highs since World War II. The cost of newsprint, machinery, and labor have multiplied prodigiously. Publishing today is for millionaires only.

If something could be done to bring down the cost of publishing, the situation would improve almost overnight. Marginal newspapers in highly competitive markets would become more secure, would no longer have to rely on the poison of sensationalism to sell extra papers. It would become economically feasible to start up new, competing papers in markets where there is presently a monopoly. It is along these lines that liberal groups should bend their efforts.

The possibility of direct subsidies and tax considerations to smaller, poorer, newspapers has been proposed by Morris Ernst. This idea was rejected by the Hutchins Commission as opening the door to favoritism. But what about a subsidy to all publishers? In the case of papers making a profit the money would come back to the Government in the form of higher taxes.

There is also much to be said for indirect subsidies. Suppose the Government were to meet part of the cost of newsprint and machinery, part of the weekly payroll? There are other industries that receive indirect subsidies from the Government: farming, livestock producing, oil drilling, mining and others. Are these more important to our democratic way of life than a free and responsible press?

Another line of inquiry which might prove fruitful lies in new machinery which would bring down the cost of production—automation, in other words. There are rumors today of new electronic methods of printing which are being held off the market by pressure groups. This should be investigated immediately by Congress.

Frontier urges all Democrats (and Republicans, too, who value our free institutions) to go to work on these matters without delay. We cannot survive in the manner in which we are accustomed without a free and responsible press, and the trend right now is moving rapidly in the opposite direction.

Holy See and the Vatican State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me by

unanimous consent of the House, I include the following article entitled "Holy See and the Vatican State," by Rev. Robert A. Graham, S. J., which was contained in the May 1955 edition of the Catholic Mind:

HOLY SEE AND THE VATICAN STATE

(By Robert A. Graham, S. J.)

When the future Pope Pius XII, the then Cardinal Secretary of State Eugenio Pacelli, was about to wind up his precedent-making visit to the United States in 1936, he was received at Hyde Park by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. There is no published account of the conversation that ensued on that occasion between the two men whose paths were destined to cross again with the outbreak of World War II. There is reason to believe that the subject of diplomatic relations between the United States and the Holy See was touched upon. It would be surprising if the Pope's first minister, himself a diplomat of long experience, did not raise the question in one form or another. In any case it was reported by diplomatic correspondents in the European press some time later that President Roosevelt had on this occasion lightly dismissed such a suggestion. He did not believe that the Pope could properly have official relations with the United States. The Vatican State, he was reported to have said, was but an "honorable fiction," to have to say, a construction that does not one any harm but remains nevertheless a fiction. The President saw no call for the United States to have official relations with such an entity.

We know that within a very few years Mr. Roosevelt was of quite another frame of mind. On Christmas Eve, 1939, the first Christmas of the war, he announced the appointment of Myron C. Taylor to be his personal representative to the Pope, with the rank of ambassador. It would be safe to say, however, that even today many Americans regard the international position of the Holy See as based upon a fiction, the fiction of the state of Vatican City. The following paragraphs essay to clear up some misconceptions in this regard and to put the international role of the Popes in a more correct perspective, particularly in the diplomatic field.

It has been over a quarter of a century since the Lateran Treaty brought the celebrated Roman question to a definitive end with the creation of the State of Vatican City. From 1870 until 1929 the Popes had protested the seizure of the papal states at the hands of the Italian Nationalists. The occupation of Rome by the army of the King of Italy on September 20, 1870, was accomplished by force and in violation of international law and agreements. But the chief ground of protest, which gained force with the course of time, was that in being deprived of his own territory the Pope had by that fact become a subject, legally and politically, of one civil power. For the Catholic world this meant that the supreme head of their church and the guide of their consciences was at the mercy of this political power and to that extent deprived of the liberty and independence which he needed to carry out his religious office. The legitimacy of this complaint was finally acknowledged by Italy and by the international community generally. The solution, representing concessions by both the Holy See and Italy, was achieved on February 11, 1929, when, in the Lateran Treaty, the State of Vatican City came into being, under the sovereignty of the Holy See.

TEMPORAL POWER

The long years of the Roman question were therefore a time of preoccupation with the temporal power of the Popes. After 1929 the papal authorities took immediate measures to underline in visible form the territorial independence recovered by the Holy See. Coins were issued—an act that has for a long time been considered as appertaining only to sovereign rulers. The Vatican State early became a member of the Universal Postal Union. Its stamps, sold throughout the world to collectors, were another graphic reminder to the general public that the Pope was once more prince as well as pontiff. The lawyers went to work seriously at the drafting of a constitution for the tiny state, in which only 1,000 persons lived. Conditions of Vatican citizenship were spelled out. These and other means were sought in order to dramatize the independence and sovereignty of this creation of the Lateran Treaty.

This preoccupation with the State of Vatican City has tended to obscure the very reason for the Temporal Power, namely, the Holy See itself. Today it is generally conceded by international lawyers that there are present here not one but two international personalities or subjects of international law. One of these is the State of Vatican City, which fulfills the minimum definition of a state. The other is the Holy See, which may be described as a nonterritorial international personality exercising sovereign prerogatives, including sovereignty over the Vatican State. Some writers term the Vatican a "vassal state," not in the sense that it is subject to another state (for the Holy See is not itself a state) but in the sense that it is subordinate to and serves the purposes of the Holy See. As the standard manual Oppenheim-Lauterpacht points out, the Vatican State is exceptional because as a state it is "an entity pursuing objects essentially different from those inherent in national states." Its unique function, as the history of the Roman question abundantly demonstrates, is to guarantee the Pope's independence of any civil power.

No religious leader in the world enjoys a position in international law comparable to that possessed by the Holy See. Even those who owe the Popes no religious allegiance cannot challenge the historical fact. The Popes have over a long period of time and through a series of major historic events demonstrated an authority and exercised an influence in world affairs which compel states to accord them treatment normally reserved to civil rulers.

International law does not, of course, commit itself to any theological position. Its recognition of the status of the Papacy cannot be construed as having any confessional implication whatever. Nevertheless, international lawyers do acknowledge that the Pope has this position precisely as a religious prelate. Over the centuries they have come to understand the foundations of this authority. Without wishing to pass any judgment upon its theological justification, they content themselves with registering the fact and acknowledging the significance of this fact for international law.

PRIMACY OF JURISDICTION

What is the Pope? The Pope, or the bishop of Rome, is the supreme head of the Catholic Church. He is the successor of St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, and vicar of Christ on earth. In virtue of this apostolic succession the Roman pontiff exercises a primacy of jurisdiction over the bishops and over the faithful. His is not merely a primacy of honor, according to which he would be first among equals in relation to the other bishops.

His jurisdiction extends not only to matters affecting faith and morals but also to all those matters which pertain to the discipline and the law of the church throughout the world. He has at his command the wide complexus of canon law. When pronouncing ex cathedra, or with the plentitude of his apostolic powers, on matters of faith and morals, the Pope is infallible. The Vatican Ecumenical Council of 1870 greatly clarified the prerogatives of the Pope and dealt a death blow to various doctrines which in the past had sought to minimize the authority of the Papacy in the universal church.

It is in virtue of this wide religious authority that the Popes have exercised their distinctive role, not only in the universal church, but indirectly, in the affairs of the world generally. This power and influence is independent of the possession of the temporal power, or of any fiction. It was exercised by the Popes in the early centuries before they came into the lordship of any temporal domains. This authority remained unchanged by the loss of the papal states in 1870. It was not augmented or altered by the rise of the State of Vatican City in 1929. Modern international law has been an uncommitted, at times even a hostile, observer of this phenomenon. In the end it has recognized the juridical sovereignty of the Holy See as a moral and religious authority, without, as I have said, attempting to pass judgment on the legitimacy of its theological basis. It finds no need to create any kind of honorable fiction for the purpose of legitimizing the international standing of this essentially religious institution.

The Pope is, therefore, a religious authority whose nonterritorial sovereignty is acknowledged. But since 1929 the Pope is also a temporal sovereign. The Annuario Pontificio each year notes, among other various papal titles of possession, that the currently reigning Pope is sovereign of the State of Vatican City. The relationship between the two sovereignties is not accidental. As we have already noted, for six decades the Roman Pontiffs carried on an historic fight with Italy and before the bar of world opinion and international law for their right, precisely as spiritual leaders, to enjoy immunity from the territorial jurisdiction of any purely human authority. In practice this meant the right to be sovereign of their own territory. Against all odds the Holy See was successful. Subsequently, the Lateran settlement passed safely through several crises.

The Second World War could easily have undone the work of 1929. The tiny state could have been swept into the maelstrom of hostilities since it was successively surrounded by Fascist, Nazi, and then Allied forces. The anti-Fascist and antimonarchist reaction in postwar Italy could easily have led to a repudiation of the Lateran agreement. These storms were weathered triumphantly and the crises only provided a dramatic confirmation of the real if intangible moral authority of the Pope and the rightness of his demand for his own territory, however diminutive.

History, therefore, shows that it is a gross misconception of the unique position of the Holy See at the present day to imagine that it is based upon the Vatican State. The Pope was a spiritual sovereign before he was a temporal sovereign. As one writer expressed it: "The Pope is not sovereign because he is the ruler of the Vatican State; he is the ruler of the Vatican because he is a sovereign."

PAPAL DIPLOMACY

The international character of the Holy See is manifested, among other ways, by the diplomatic relations which the Pope entertains with the various states. The primacy and universal authority of the Roman pontiffs have led quite naturally to what is called the papal diplomacy. For centuries the Popes have dispatched their representatives on temporary or permanent missions to various parts of the world. Frequently these agents were accredited to the rulers of the territories where they resided. It was the contention of the Popes that the very nature of their religious authority required this system of representation. The classic formulation of this viewpoint was given by Pius VI in his brief, Responsio Super Nunciaturis, of 1789. "The Roman pontiff," declared the Pope, "has the right to have persons, especially in distant places, who represent his

absent person, who exercise his jurisdiction and authority by a regularly established commission and who, in short, take his place. This is deduced from the essential force and nature of the primacy, from the rights and privileges connected with the primacy, and from the constant practice of the church from the first centuries."

These envoys or legates were not at first diplomatic representatives, in the modern sense. The institution of permanent diplomatic missions dates back only to the end of the 15th century. It was a natural development when the papal representatives became integrated with the diplomacy that took its rise at that epoch. The European community was thoroughly familiar with the diplomatic activity of the head of the Catholic church and saw nothing unusual in it. The loss of the temporal power in 1870 was not regarded as any reason why the Pope should cease to deploy this diplomatic representation for ihe conduct of the affairs of the Catholic church. That is why in 1922 Sir Ernest Satow in his standard work, A Guide to Diplomatic Practice, was able to say: "The right of the Holy See to diplomatic representation has not been affected by the annexation of the States of the Church to the Kingdom of Italy."

At this point it is useful to clear up an ambiguity that has for some time plagued discussions on the Pope's international position. There are several senses in which the term "Vatican" can be employed. For brevity's sake there is a widely spread practice of referring to the "Vatican" when the Holy See is meant. It is customary in diplomatic practice for governments or the chief administrative organs of a government to be described informally by the name of the street or locality identified with that organ or ministry. Thus the French foreign office is known in journalistic as well as diplomatic language as the Quai d'Orsay, because this is the street along the left bank of the Seine where is located the Ministère des Affaires Etrangères. The British foreign office is located in Whitehall and is frequently so referred to. The Austrian foreign ministry has long been known as the "Ballhusplatz," from the name of the street or square upon which it is situated. The former German chancellery, located on the Wilhelmstrasse, was often so designated in diplomatic shorthand. Americans know that when one speaks of the "White House," reference is made to the President of the United States or at least to the President's aides and staff in general.

The term "Vatican" was used to designate the Holy See long before there was any thought of a "State of Vatican City." This usage dates back to 1870, at which time the Pope took up his permanent residence in the palace situated alongside the Basilica of St. Peter on the Vatican Hill. Previously the principal pontifical residence had not been the Vatican Palace, but the Quirinal Palace, a more convenient structure on the hill of that name in the center of Rome. This building was taken over by the Italian Government in 1870 and became the royal residence. The long struggle over the Roman question that ensued became known, not inappropriately, as the fight between the Vatican and the Quirinal.

Manifestly, as there was no such thing as a State of Vatican City, the term "Vatican" meant nothing more nor less than the Holy See itself, or the papal authorities generally. It did not connote the temporal power, even in the minds of the Italian Government. Prior to the Pope's transfer to the Vatican Palace in 1870, one term frequently used to designate the Holy See in diplomatic language was the "Court of Rome." The accidental circumstance that the new state emerging from the Lateran Treaty in 1929 also included the word "Vatican" in its title has tended to generate understandable confusion in the minds of persons not familiar with diplomatic usages. At the present time it is frequently only the context which will tell the reader whether by "Vatican" is meant the State of Vatican City, on the one hand, or the Holy See and the papal authorities on the other.

NUNCIO'S MISSION

The nature of the Pope's ambassadors, or nuncios, as they are termed, corresponds to the nature of the sovereign spiritual authority whom they represent. This is an elementary principle and needs no development. The mission of the nuncios (and internuncious, or papal diplomats of lesser diplomatic rank) is, according to Canon 276, the following: (1) to foster, according to the usual rules of the Holy See, good relations between the Holy See and the civil government to which they are permanent envoys; (2) to watch over the state of the church in the territory assigned to them and to report to the Roman pontiff thereon. Besides these powers and duties, the papal diplomats also receive from the Pope certain special delegated ecclesiastical powers which vary according to the circumstances. It has already been noted that the Holy See enjoys the right of diplomatic representation independently of the temporal power. The nuncios are, therefore, accredited by the Holy See, and not by the State of Vatican City.

The papal nuncio is essentially an ecclesiastical official, even in his diplomatic status. The nuncio has from time to time been the object of controversy in various countries. One of the grounds of complaint is based on the fact that traditionally a diplomat is supposed to confine his activities exclusively to the foreign ministry. But a nuncio, besides being accredited to the government, has responsibilities toward the church of the country. It is alleged sometimes that this is a type of internal interference which is forbidden to a nuncio as a diplomatic officer. As recently as February 1954 some criticisms were voiced in the French press when the nuncio in Paris traveled to various parts of France and there convened high church authorities in order to intimate to them the desires of the Pope on the problem of the "priest-workers." It was charged that in so doing the nuncio had transgressed the bounds of an ambassador and was interfering in internal French affairs.

Such criticism of the nuncio's role is unjustified. In the first place, recent diplomatic practice is more liberal in conceding to diplomats the opportunity of going directly to the people. This relaxation the American envoys abroad have been the first to use with greatest advantage. But in any case it is absurd to contend that the nuncio, in exercising the authority of the Pope, is in any way interfering in internal affairs of a country. In matters affecting the Catholic Church the Pope is not a foreigner.

Even those who wish the nuncio to confine his contacts exclusively to the foreign ministry and the head of the state do not deny that the Pope's representative is an ecclesiastical officer. (All nuncios and internuncios today are archbishops, or at least bishops, usually without residential sees.) For in Europe the nuncio has long been regarded as a representative of the church. In a draft code of international law prepared before the fall of the papal states in 1870 the celebrated Swiss jurist Bluntschli noted that the nuncio in his day was primarily an ecclesiastical official. It is a curious fact that the enemies of the papacy, after 1870, found it to their political interest to emphasize the religious aspect of the nuncio's mission. This line of argument served to undermines the papal protests against the loss of the temporal power. It was a strong argument whose major premise the papal protagonists could not challenge, because it was true, although they could challenge the inference drawn therefrom.

It is sometimes argued that the nuncio is not on a religious mission because he is accredited as a diplomat to a civil government. His diplomatic status, it is said, makes his function a political one, by contrast with the apostolic delegate, who has a purely religious missison. Such an objection is based on the erroneous notion that only states can send diplomatic representatives and that therefore the nuncio, if he is a diplomatic agent, must be accredited by the Vatican state. But as already seen, the Holy See, the nonterritorial international personality, has the right of diplomatic representation independently of the Vatican state.

APOSTOLIC DELEGATE DIFFERS FROM NUNCIO

The contrast with the apostolic delegate is also not pertinent. This kind of papal representative differs from the nuncio in not having any diplomatic character. He is not accredited to any government and has no official relations with the civil authorities. His work is confined to the bishops, clergy, and faithful of the region assigned to him. In that sense the apostolic delegate is sometimes said in Vatican documents to perform an exclusively religious mission. In the context, however, it is perfectly clear what this means. The apostolic delegate has no political mission, in the sense that he has no official relations with the government. The nuncio, as ambassador, does have such a mission, which can in a sense be termed political. He does not cease to be an ecclesiastical officer for being accredited to a government. The nuncio can represent the highest church authority before the government just as well as before the clergy and faithful.

Though the nuncios are not formally accredited by the state of Vatican City, it does not follow that they are not charged from time to time with the interests of that state. In fact, the Vatican state has no foreign ministry or foreign service of its own. The fundamental statutes provide that its relations with foreign governments shall be dealt with through the Secretariat of State of His Holiness. The nuncio to Italy is particularly called upon to undertake such negotiations with the Italian Government in matters affecting the territorial and material interests of the Vatican State. This is bound to be, because of the geographical situation of the Vatican in the city of Rome, wholly surrounded by Italian territory.

Do negotiations of this sort make the nuncio any less exclusively an ecclesiastical agent? It would not seem so. The special nature of the Vatican as a sort of vassal state to the Holy See puts the material interests of the Vatican in a separate category. During the recent World War, for instance, did the nuncios in the various capitals of the belligerents carry on a political function in taking all measures to defend the neutrality and inviolability of the Vatican territory? Yet, technically speaking, the neutrality and inviolability of territory per se appertains to a state. Governments today recognize that in defending the interests of the State of Vatican City the papal diplomats are only maintaining the integrity of one of the many sovereign rights possessed by the Holy See, the right to territorial independence.

DEAN OF THE DIPLOMATIC CORPS

One final point may be raised to exemplify the religious or ecclesiastical nature of the apostolic nuncio. This is the deanship which this officer enjoys in the diplomatic corps. The nuncio is automatically the dean or spokesman of the body of diplomats accredited in a given capital. This deanship is not dependent upon seniority when there is question of a nuncio. Though the prerogative is of purely ceremonial importance

today, it illustrates how the European governments, Protestant as well as Catholic, recognize the nuncio as the representative of a primarily religious sovereign.

The exceptional privilege of the deanship was recognized and confirmed at the Congress of Vienna in 1815 by a commission representing 8 major European powers, of whom only 4 (Spain, France, Austria, and Portugal) were Catholic, while the rest (Great Britain, Sweden, Prussia, and Russia) were non-Catholic. It was recognized that the nuncio was in a class by himself (outside the ordinary line) by the fact that his sovereign was primarily a religious chief, and could not be compared with the other European rulers. The Vienna regulation has never been superseded. On the contrary, several recent concordants have seen this privilege confirmed in modern times. If the nuncio was thus recognized as being in an exceptional case at the Congress of Vienna, the present situation of the Pope as the sovereign of an infinitesimal state highlights only the more strongly that the nuncio today as well is outside the ordinary line.

The case of the Holy See is, of course, unique in contemporary international law and diplomatic practice. The interpretations put upon its role in the light of modern theories have naturally varied. Many people find it difficult to conceive that a religious leader should exercise in the international community a role that they think is proper only to states. In the United States an attempt is made to rationalize the situation through the idea of the honorable-fiction theory attributed to Franklin D. Roosevelt. Americans can conceive of United States diplomatic relations with the State of Vatican City but not with the Holy See. This shows how long a road must yet be traversed before the real position of the Holy See is as fully understood in the United States as it is understood in other countries, including Protestant ones, which have had a longer experience in the realities of international life and a better comprehension of the historic role the Roman pontiffs have exercised and continue to exercise on the world scene.

Administration Gives Only Lipservice to Career Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the present administration has built a reputation for giving lipservice to many fine principles, and then by its actions completely and callously disregarding these principles.

The list of examples is long. Nowhere is it more in evidence than in connection with the civil service. From the President on down, and from the President's Silver Spring, Md., campaign speech in 1952 we have heard very high-sounding pronouncements, with which we may all agree, about the administration's devotion to strengthening the civil service; and more about eliminating favoritism, political and otherwise, in the selection and promotion of career employees.

Last year it was the infamous Willis directive, issued from the White House, which gave the career service a body blow. This year it has been the fine print in Executive Order 10577 which has brought so many complaints and charges of favoritism and discrimination in connection with the conversion program to the offset of those Members representing districts where there are a number of Federal employees.

The National Civil Service League, a nonpartisan organization composed of some of the most outstanding people in the country, has proved to be a good watchdog, and constantly calls our attention to abuses by the administration.

Mr. James R. Watson, executive director of the league, discussed some of the more flagrant cases of abuse in a speech he made before the Society for Personnel Administration. In so doing he called the roll of the many instances where practice has differed sharply from the lip service of the administration.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a news account of Mr. Watson's remarks written by Joseph Young in the Washington Evening Star for May 12, 1955:

POLITICAL FAVORITISM CHARGED IN PROMOTIONS

(By Joseph Young)

The executive director of the nonpartisan National Civil Service League charged today that partisan politics and favortism are influencing the promotion and appointment chances of Government career employees.

James R. Watson, executive director of the league, told the annual meeting of the Society for Personnel Administration:

"This is where the patronage problem is especially serious. * * * It is impossible to sufficiently emphasize the demoralizing effect of such efforts.

"If we are to have a system whereby certain so-called career people must get political indorsements and be subjected to political tests before receiving appointments to career positions, then we will never achieve the advancements in the civil-service system which we need."

The official of the 80-year-old business-supported organizaiton called on the administration to clarify its policy regarding the career service and remove any cause for suspicion of partisan influence which will prevent the constructive programs now under way from realizing their full potential.

AFFECTS SELECTION

"If the career service is to be subjected to political tests, Philip Young and his staff at the Civil Service Commission might as well abandon their progressive efforts to improve executive development and training," Mr. Watson said. The public cannot afford to train executives in the career service who will be subjected to political suspicion by future administrations. Adequate selection of people for training cannot be accomplished where political favortism is involved.

If there are to be political tests, then President Eisenhower might as well discontinue efforts for the President's incentive award program. What kind of incentive award system can we have if every person receiving an award is going to be suspected of being a political favorite?

Mr. Watson cautioned Government personnel officials not to resist changes in the civil-service system that will make the system more dynamic and workable.

HELD TO NEED IMPROVEMENT

Declaring that civil service "needs improvement," Mr. Watson added: "Just as we guard against favoritism, we must also be careful that we do not view every proposal for change as a raid on the merit system. In other words, civil service must be protected from the entrenched bureaucrats just as much as it must be protected from the pious politician who is going to save democracy from the civil service."

Mr. Watson observed that political patronage, rather than civil service, was on the defensive these days, because the American public and the Nation's press are strong supporters of the merit system.

PROGRAMS STALLED

At yesterday's afternoon session in the Hotel Statler, CSC Chairman Philip Young told the SPA the current hassle over Federal pay-raise legislation threatens to delay action this year on other administration employee-benefit proposals, such as group health insurance and employee training programs.

Mr. Young also declared that the present system of having Congress adjust classified and postal salaries is too slow and cumbersome. He urged consideration of plans to place all Federal agencies on a full or partial wage-board basis, the same as is the base for per diem workers.

Acknowledging that such plans offer some practical difficulties, Mr. Young said that might be adaptable within a general framework of congressional control.

The CSC Chairman also said that a number of difficulties have to be ironed out before the Government joins in the single-packaged community charity drive. Mr. Young emphasized he is not opposed to a single-packaged drive. He said, however, the problem must be carefully studied and worked out before it is put into operation.

Mr. Young also strongly praised the administration's constructive personnel program for Government employees during the past few years, citing the numerous fringe benefits given to Federal workers.

Federal Control of Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following statement of Dr. Leona Baumgartner, commissioner of the New York City Health Department, regarding the Salk vaccine situation.

Dr. Baumgartner's statement appeared in the New York Times of April 22, 1955:

DR. BAUMGARTNER'S VIEW ON FEDERAL CONTROL OF VACCINE

We need more than anything else facts about how much vaccine there is and will be in the next 3 months and when and at what rate it will be delivered here. We hope that the meeting in Washington tomorrow (Friday) will clarify this and resolve unanswered questions. We hope that effective leadership developed there will provide accurate and complete data about the vaccine supply and be inventive enough to find a means of control which will assure the protection of the susceptible groups in order of their susceptibility.

I believe that to avoid further confusion and improper use of the limited supply of poliomyelitic vaccine it is essential that some national unit of Government establish rules for its distribution and for its use in the most susceptible age groups. The job has become too big for voluntary or local effort alone to handle in this temporary period of shortage. If Government can handle the problems of shortages of copper, aluminum,

or iron, certainly it can find ways to handle shortages of polio vaccine.

The situation since the announcement on April 12 has been a continuously confusing one, because it has been impossible to put together in any satisfactory way the pieces of information that have been available from different sources. We have been compelled to do our work and planning in this atmosphere. Some things are clear.

1. It is important to inoculate first the most susceptible children no matter who gives the vaccine. The most susceptible are the 5- to 9-year-olds, among whom polio occurs over 50 times more frequently as it does in adults over 30. By treating this group of 665,000, or about 8 percent of the total population, one protects the group in which 33 percent of the cases occur. This clearly protects those children in greatest danger and at the same time uses the limited supply of vaccine in the most efficient manner. The facts concerning other age groups are summarized in the attached group. Eighty percent of the cases occur in children under 15. Out of every 100 persons stricken with polio 40 never develop any paralysis, and of the rest half have only a mild paralysis from which they recover completely. In other words, children have a prior right to this vaccine.

VACCINE BELONGS TO PUBLIC

2. We must recognize that the public feels the vaccine is theirs. Its development was speeded by a huge voluntary effort. People gave their money, their time, and even their children. It is indeed theirs.

3. There are difficulties associated in launching any new project as large and complex as this. There is an inevitable shakedown period while adjustments in production, distribution, etc., are worked out. What we have forgotten in our anxiety to get the vaccine is that we are indeed fortunate that safeguards have been set up so that the vaccine that will actually be used is both effective and safe. It would be tragic if we were to do anything to break down the safeguards or shake confidence in the safety and effectiveness of the new product.

4. The feeling of urgency to get the vaccine immediately has complicated the situation. Polio is a late summer disease in New York. We are fortunate that there is some evidence that immunizations given as late as July will help protect. In fact, Dr. Salk has recommended that the vaccine be given during epidemics.

The situation in New York is this:

1. We do not know when the foundation vaccine will be available. But we expect it to arrive in time to go through, before the end of school, with our schedule of inoculating the first and second graders who are not otherwise provided for and whose parents request that the inoculation be given in the school.

2. The city has tried to place an order for 500,000 cubic centimeters, but has received no assurance that such an order can soon be filled. The State has ordered vaccine, but similarly has no assurance of delivery.

3. The health department here has no vaccine now.

4. The 5 to 9 year olds not otherwise provided for and whose families request help will be protected before the polio season begins if: (a) The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis supplies for the first and second graders come through; (b) the State furnishes vaccine for the third and fourth grades, and (c) the city gets its order before July 1.

5. It is and has been expected that private physicians will inoculate their own patients.

BLACK MARKET IS POSSIBLE

6. It is possible that a black market could develop. This does not imply at all that doctors will be responsible for it. There are many other opportunities for "leaks." For this reason the mayor asked that city officials investigate the possibilities of protecting everybody against this potential danger. The board of health has been asked to study the problem and to consider requiring polio vaccine to be handled by prescription as barbiturates and other medical supplies are.

Now for a personal note—perhaps not news in your sense, but in my opinion—an important aspect of the Salk story.

Last year we undertook an important nationwide, scientific experiment that proved the effectiveness of the Salk vaccine; perhaps just as important was the demonstration of a new technique in research. Last year proved that if the people of our country are told simple facts clearly, they are willing to volunteer even their children to test the value of a new tool for human betterment. This is important to know, for it may speed up the testing of other tools that hold promise for benefit of mankind.

This year we are in the midst of another great experiment—an experiment that, alas, has not been so clearly understood. What we are testing this year is whether we, as Government officials, as newspapers, radio and television people, as parents, as politicians, as manufacturers and distributors of vaccine, as doctors and as just Americans, can at a time of shortage of a product important in the protection of children forget our individual interests sufficiently so that those in greatest need shall be the first to be protected. This is truly a test of our integrity and of the value that we put on human beings. I believe we will rise to this challenge if we realize clearly what the facts are.

Table given by Dr. Baumgartner on the incidence of polio in New York City:

Poliomyelitis 1951–53

Age	Average annual number of cases	Annual case rate per 100,000
0 to 1	8	6
1 to 4	153	28
5 to 9	227	39
10 to 14	126	26
15 to 19	63	13
20 plus	105	1.8
Total	682	8.4
15 to 44	38	7.1

Irresponsibility at HEW

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvanians were justly proud last week when Gov. George M. Leader and the general assembly jointly honored one of our fellow citizens, Dr. Jonas Salk, for his contribution to the miracle of the polio vaccine which bears his name.

Pennsylvanians—along with all Americans—were saddened at the mess that has originated in Washington in the program for fair distribution and adequate inspection. All Americans were anxious to see the inoculation program get under way as rapidly as possible so that the areas and children of greatest need could be served first in an orderly program.

It is a crying shame, Mr. Speaker, that the supposedly responsible officials of the administration have permitted their sacred-cow attitude toward a catchphrase to place a roadblock in the path of this great blessing to humanity.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a pertinent and timely editorial on this subject which was published in Labor's Daily on May 13:

THE MISSING MRS. HOBBY

(By Willard Shelton)

The thing lacking in the polio-vaccine program has been the one thing the public had a right to demand—a sensible and responsible overall policy by the Government. That means, for specific purposes, a policy established by Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Here we have a situation in which the scientists, notably Dr. Jonas Salk, developed a vaccine which in large-scale tests seemed to hold the promise of preventing most cases of paralytic polio.

Every mother in the country, naturally, wanted to know when and how her own children would receive the necessary inoculations.

Since there was bound to be a shortage at first, a system of priorities was desirable. It is common decency, surely, that the shots should go first to children in the age groups where polio strikes most frequently.

There is not the slightest doubt that the people would have accepted priorities based on common decency. Few are selfish enough to want to grab for themselves, or their own children, the scarce vaccine that should properly have been allocated first to perhaps younger children.

It made sense for the manufacturers to try to ship vaccine first to the Southern States, where the polio "season" comes earliest, then gradually to move north until all children in the important age groups had received their first two shots.

But no plan was worked out to assure that this system would be applied. There were gross overestimates of early production. And no advance program of testing each batch of vaccine was created by the Government health authorities.

For this, the United States Public Health Service cannot be held responsible, nor can the head of that service, Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, the Surgeon General.

There is no more devoted public servant than Dr. Scheele—but he cannot do, under Secretary Hobby's administration, what Mrs. Hobby will not allow him to do.

Why didn't we get a well-organized program out of Mrs. Hobby's Department? Because she shares, along with others in the Eisenhower administration, an abhorrence of Federal action. Because she imagines that in order for the Federal Government to do anything it must create a vast bureaucracy.

No bureaucracy was needed at all. What was needed was a policy, established by a small, representative group convened by Secretary Hobby and clearly enunciated for local health officials.

What was needed was an accurate estimate of production and necessary vaccine controls and a priority system to assure the flow of production to the place it was needed first and in largest quantity.

Secretary Hobby does not share the warmth, the quick sympathy, the determination to safeguard the well-being of children that are supposed to be the natural attributes of women in politics. Her own attributes are coolness, reserve, and a true Eisenhower dislike of the Federal Government.

As Representative BOLLING, Democrat, of Missouri, pointed out, she thrust out Dr. Scheele to answer all questions, and hid herself, but the responsibility was still hers—and she failed.

The Importance of Selling to Our Economy—A Winning Essay From South Gate, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am very happy to be able to present to the attention of yourself and my other distinguished colleagues in this great legislative body, the text of a winning essay on the subject of The Importance of Selling to Our Economy, by Miss Jean Felt, a student at the high school in my resident city of South Gate, Los Angeles, County, Calif. Accompanying said essay, which I have the permission of Miss Jean Felt to insert in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is her letter dated April 26, 1955, in response to my letter of congratulations to her. Also please note her recital of the facts and regulations governing said essay in the competition.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the recognition of we, as Members of Congress, of the achievements of the young people of high-school and college age in our respective congressional districts by reason of asking their permission to insert in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD such winning essays as that of Miss Jean Felt, is not only a matter of worthy recognition of an important young American citizen, but, the text of these winning essays and compositions coming back here to our attention at the Nation's Capital through the reading of them in the daily RECORD, helps us to keep in touch with the thinking of the young citizens of high-school and college age on these very, very important subjects which we are many times concerned at the level of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is one reason why I, on several occasions heretofore, and now again on this occasion have real pride and satisfaction in being able to present a winning essay by some high-school or college student from one of the school groups of the 23d Congressional District, California.

APRIL 26, 1955.

Mr. CLYDE DOYLE,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you very much for your kind letter of congratulations. I was very happy and surprised to hear from you.

Thank you, also, for considering my essay for insertion in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. My parents and I will be very happy to grant you the authority to do this, and we consider it a great honor. I am enclosing a list of rules and regulations in answer to your request for a little more information on the contest.

Mr. Anastassiou, our salesmanship teacher here at South Gate, was the school sponsor of the essay. It was he who told us of the opportunity to write for this contest.

Writing the actual essay was a long but interesting process. The study of our economics proved to be a very fascinating topic. I learned a great deal about our cycle of economics from the thought, writing, and research of the essay. Our American economic system is something all America can really be proud of.

The essay took quite a while to write but it was well worth it for it made me more aware of the really wonderful economic system that is ours to enjoy. We can really learn appreciation of what we have through better understanding.

Yours very truly,

JEAN FELT.

FACTS AND REGULATIONS

Name of organization offering contest: National Sales Executives, Inc.

Name of contest: Importance of Selling to Our Economy.

Number of words: 1,000 words.

Chief purpose of contest: To interest high-school youth in the importance of selling, and our economy.

Date due: April 1, for national contest. March for local.

Judging: Thought, sincerity, simplicity, and clarity of expression.

Prizes: Local awards. First price $100. National awards. First prize $1,000, plus all-expense paid trip to New York City for 3 days. Second prize $250. Third prize $100. Seven $50 each prizes and 50 certificates.

Who can enter: 10th through 12th grades of United States high schools.

THE IMPORTANCE OF SELLING TO OUR ECONOMY

(By Jean Felt, age 16, grade A–12, 9409 Hildreth Avenue, South Gate, Calif.)

You and I are living under a great economic system—and selling is the hub around which the great wheel of economics revolves.

During the growing years since the industrial revolution, there has come the need for a media by which our products can be distributed in mass volume. This media has grown until it has become the very basis of our present cycle of economics. This media is selling. Selling is the foundation upon which our economy lies. It is a major part of our free enterprise system.

A good salesman actually sells economy. He must give the public a better product for less money. This creates competition. Selling, therefore, can be said to be basically responsible for giving us better products at lower costs. This is one of the major reasons why selling is so important to our economy.

Selling, however, does more than just improve the quality, usefulness, and value of today's products. This is merely part of the great service selling renders to mankind. Through great selling, mass production can be maintained. More selling and more production bring down the cost of the goods. The more things we can buy, the higher our standard of living will become. Salesmanship is responsible for the high American standard of living we know today.

Selling gives us an outlet for the things we produce. Without good salesmanship in our present-day economy, our industries would be at a standstill. People would not be naturally inclined to buy fast enough to justify our mass production economy. Good volume selling is basically responsible for the high employment statistics in America.

Income from employment gives the people the means with which to buy the necessities and luxuries of life. A good salesman who understands why, how, and when his product may be used to its fullest extent, can help us to receive a great deal more use and value from the products we buy. In addition, a good salesman must believe in what he is selling. He must sell effectively and well, for people must buy to keep our cycle of economics in motion.

The process of selling begins with the manufacturer. The producer of goods and services sells these to a wholesaler or jobber. In the transfer of the goods to the wholesaler, the producer reaps a sufficient profit to pay for the cost of producing the goods and to make an income for himself. The wholesaler, in turn, sells the goods for a profit to a retailer, who in order to reap a dividend sells to the public at a higher price than what he paid for the goods from the wholesaler. People all along the line are living by selling. If there was no large final market for the goods, neither the wholesaler or the retailer would buy from the producer. If the producer would make no profit by producing—production would stop. Income would become scarce. Buying power would be definitely reduced, and our standard of living would go continually down. The producer, the retailer, the salesman, the public, and all business would be lost without buying power. Our whole chain of economics is linked together by the process of selling.

Selling is essentially basic. It is responsible for the numerous products we all enjoy. Everything which is produced on a large scale today, once had to be sold for the first time. The dynamic sales power of the originators of such things as the automobile, steamship, railroad, washing machines, refrigerators, etc., made these wonderful conveniences available for us today. Our salesmen are steadily paving the way to even better products for tomorrow's markets.

Selling is responsible for everything we own and use. Buildings must be built by builders whose services are sold. Materials for their construction, their furnishings and equipment, their modern conveniences and machines—all must be sold. The more that is produced and sold—the lower the price of the product. A pair of shoes might have cost approximately $50 to produce before the industrial revolution by the old hand method. Mass production, and great selling, working hand-in-hand, have made it possible to purchase shoes and many other products at a fraction of the original cost.

Large-scale production calls for large-scale buying and selling. Production must have labor, and labor pays dividends. With the dividends, the people buy—and to the people who wish to buy the salesman sells. Selling is the very beginning and heart of the cycle of economics. Salesmanship plays a very important part in our economic role.

Good selling makes for sound economy. More and more young people are looking upon salesmanship with keen and growing interest. People everywhere are constantly becoming more and more aware of the major importance of selling to our economy. Selling is the foundation and the heart of our economic system.

The Conference at the Summit—Its Basic Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 15, the Polish American Congress of 400 organizations of Americans of Polish descent, held appropriate ceremonies in Cleveland commemorating Polish Constitution Day. It was my privilege to be the speaker on that occasion. My remarks were devoted to an expression of the unbreakable connection between the spirit of human freedom as expressed in the Polish consti-

tution and the current struggle in which are are now engaged to save individual liberty and the free institutions as we know them. Our participation in any meeting involving the masters of the Kremlin, whether it takes place at the summit or in a more realistic atmosphere of open covenants, openly arrived at, must be based upon a clear recognition that the cause of freedom is both indivisible and timeless. Since I offered what I consider to be some practical suggestions for the administration in connection with the possibility of such a conference taking place, under unanimous consent, I include my address in the RECORD:

THE CONFERENCE AT THE SUMMIT—ITS BASIC ISSUE

I am honored to be able to join with you today in commemorating Polish Constitution Day. One hundred and sixty-four years ago Poland established a constitution which, in its basic essentials, reflects the great moral and political principles of our own American Declaration of Independence.

This constitution was enacted at a time when Poland was under an alien occupation, by a parliament of true and patriotic Poles, who were determined to create an indelible instrument to stand as a symbol of the great Polish spirit.

The magnitude and enduring quality of that constitution is attested to by the fact that it has endured as an indestructible symbol of the Polish nation.

It would do us well today to examine, for a moment, article 5 of the Polish constitution. Article 5 best expresses the form of government which the framers of this constitution intend for Poland and which, in my opinion, is a true reflection of the Polish spirit throughout all of recorded history.

Article 5 reads as follows:

"All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on lasting foundation."

It is clear that the will of the people was the determining element in all matters requiring parliamentary action or civil authority.

Our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, and our Bill of Rights are, above all other things, founded upon the basic concept that the will of the people is paramount.

We are saddened today as we see the Polish nation suffering under a new occupation—Russian communism, the most cruel, barbarous, inhuman, evil tyranny ever visited upon any people or nation in the long history of mankind. We recall that in the period between the two World Wars, there was a rebirth of Polish independence and an almost unprecedented revival of the rich and generous culture of the Polish.

We also remind ourselves that when the conspiracy of communism was probing into the nations beyond the confines of the prison of nations which we know as the Soviet Union, the Polish nation remained staunch and fearless in its treatment of the threat of communism.

It is an undisputed fact of history that communism was never an internal threat to the security of the Polish nation and that the Polish Government never feared to call the hand of the Russians on any matter affecting the security of Poland.

This is a lesson which we, the people of the leading Nation of the world today, should carefully consider and reflect upon in these trying times.

We also recall that with the rise of Hitler and his anti-Christian theories of naziism, the Polish nation stood firm in the face of this new danger.

When Hitler, encouraged and stimulated in his plan of aggression, by the demonstrated lack of moral courage and principle on the part of western statesmen, made threats against the Polish nation, he learned that the Poles intended to fight for what was right.

The Polish nation was caught in the merciless vise of the dictators, Stalin and Hitler.

It is a fact of history that when most of the larger and more secure nations of Europe were urging that Poland take a conciliatory tone towards Hitler in order to prevent the outbreak of war, the Polish people did not hesitate to stand up for those basic principles upon which the cause of human freedom depends, and without which the tyrant and despot makes easy prey of nations and men.

It was in these circumstances that heroic Poland, standing fast in defense of the cause of justice and freedom, was invaded by the overwhelming power of the dictators, Hitler and Stalin.

It is therefore accurate for us to say that World War II was fought for the cause which Poland so nobly represents even though the Polish people received the most frightful rewards in the postwar period.

The great event in history which we commemorate today would be a very shallow affair if we did not ask ourselves these questions—what are the hopes for Poland in the foreseeable future? What have we done? What can we do to bring the Polish nation back to its well deserved place in the family of free and sovereign nations?

These may not be popular questions and indeed they may be questions which frighten the more timid of men who, in any case, have never been defenders of the cause of individual liberty or the rights of nations.

But these are questions which disturb the conscience of all free men. Finding the answers to these questions, in my opinion, will likely spell the difference between peace and war.

It is part of our great American heritage that we seek peace and comity among all nations. But it is also part of our heritage that we have the courage to stand up for what is right regardless of what the immediate cost may be to us.

During the last session of Congress, I was a member of a select committee which did attempt to find the answers to these questions and consequently made an exhaustive study of the entire background leading to the loss of individual liberties and national sovereignty by Poland and all the other non-Russian nations now enslaved within the empire of communism.

After completing that study and hearing the testimony of hundreds of eye witnesses, we concluded the following, among other things:

"That the continued occupation of the captive nations by Soviet Communist power is the basic cause of the growing menace of war and stands as a threat to the security of the United States. This threat is increased in direct proportion to the time and opportunity afforded the Communists to digest and consolidate their gains, and to use these gains as bases for further and greater aggressions. This threat is diminished in direct proportion as the Communist hold on the captive nations is weakened by a positive policy that promotes the forces of national independence behind the Iron Curtain."

This committee also recommended that our Government, in the interest of preventing world war III, undertake a political action program against the international Communist conspiracy. It charted a specific course of action involving 13 principal points and urged that the Government immediately undertake that course of action in the interest of peace with freedom and as a means of preventing world war III.

Now, against that background, we have heard a good deal of talk in the last week or two about what is being called a conference at the summit. In language that you and I can understand, this means a meeting of the leaders of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union.

A great number of important questions have been raised in connection with this proposed conference. For example, where is the summit; and if the place finds a geographical location, what is the meaning of the word "summit"?

Could this term have the meaning of old Greek mythology that the gods were meeting at the high point of land.

There is also a practical question raised as to who, if anyone, can speak for the masters of the Kremlin.

In my considered judgment, the most important question of all is, What are those who participate in the conference going to talk about and what are the prospects that such a conference might, in any way, contribute to man's age-long quest for peace and freedom.

In this connection the Select Committee of the House of Representatives To Investigate Communist Aggression, which I have referred to previously, made this, among other, recommendations:

"That in the advancement of the American program for world peace and freedom all efforts therein be measured against the criteria of whether they assist the captive peoples to hasten the day when they may achieve their liberation, and that all acts or omissions which tend to confirm their enslavement be rejected."

I do strongly commend this recommendation as the steady guidepost to President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles to be used in all their advanced preparations for the conference, as well as such deliberations as may develop as a consequence of the talk now going on about a conference at the summit.

If we, as a Nation, fail to do less than follow the course which this recommendation clearly charts, we will, in my opinion, have deserted our fundamental traditions and political institutions.

The many enslaved nations which cry out for the emancipation of their people look to the United States as their last great hope.

The people of Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Slovakia, Chechia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, and other enslaved nations suffering under a common tyranny, have the common aspiration for those freedoms which are reflected in the spirit of the constitution of Poland which we commemorate today.

When these nations are freed from the chains of Russian communism and have, by the unqualified exercise of the principle of national self-determination, regained for themselves and their posterity the benefits of liberty and self-government—only then will we have opened the door to a just and enduring peace.

The spark of individual liberty and love of human freedom has burned brightly in the breasts of all true Poles down through history. It was this spark which brought General Kosciuszko and other Polish heroes of the Revolutionary War to our shores. It was this same spark which brought thousands upon thousands of the sons and daughters of Poland to America to help build this great democracy which we today so cherish. It is this same spark burning in the breasts of mankind which will eventually put us on the path to peace and freedom—a goal which will be attained only when all the enslaved nations are liberated.

Davy Crockett Was a Tar Heel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the Davy Crockett smash-hit song has focused the attention of the American people on the life and exploits of one of our most colorful early pioneer heroes.

The passage of time has somewhat dimmed the record of Davy Crockett. Although he was one of the best known of all the frontiersmen of the early 19th century, historians have not given his life the attention it deserves. Until just a few weeks ago, the mention of Davy Crockett would hardly have stirred a ripple of interest. Today his name is a household word—at least in every household where there are youngsters.

It remained for a talented songwriter, recognizing the dramatic appeal of the Davy Crockett story, to capture the imagination of the American public by depicting the highlights of Davy's career in a song that has literally taken the country by storm.

As proof that interest in Davy Crockett is not confined to boys and girls, I remind you that on last Thursday the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], speaking in the well of the House, paid his respects to the memory of Davy Crockett and reminded us of some of the lessons we can learn from the example of his record and career as a Member of Congress more than 100 years ago.

Davy Crockett is generally understood to have been a native of Tennessee. The author of the song says that he was born in that State, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] spoke of the pride Tennesseeans have for him as a native son.

I cannot contradict the claim that Davy Crockett was born on soil that is now Tennessee. But, the statement that Davy was born in Tennessee does not tell the whole story. At the time Davy Crockett was born on August 17, 1786, the State of Tennessee was not in existence.

Davy Crockett was born a resident of the great State of North Carolina and remained a citizen of our State until 1790 when Congress accepted a deed of cession from North Carolina for the territory which is now Tennessee.

Indeed, we have even closer ties than this with the Crockett family. Davy's father lived for a time in my home county of Lincoln in the State of North Carolina. He fought against the British and Tories at King's Mountain in a battle which, incidentally, was the turning point of the Revolutionary War and led directly to the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown.

Tradition has it that Davy's father struck up a close acquaintance with some of the men who came across the Blue Ridge Mountains from the then western territory to help fight the British at King's Mountain, and, after the war, he was persuaded to return with them to the territory which a few years later became Tennessee.

Although Davy Crockett is said to have been illiterate, he was sufficiently educated to write a very readable and interesting autobiography. He did not have the advantage of much formal schooling, but acquired his education in the same way that Abraham Lincoln did. If his autobiography was not written in classical language, it shows that he possessed great native intelligence and a ready, if rustic, wit.

The following sentences are quoted out of context from Davy Crockett's autobiography to show something of his style of writing and as evidence on the question of his nativity:

My father's name was John Crockett, and he was of Irish descent. He was either born in Ireland or on a passage from that country to America across the Atlantic. He was by profession a farmer, and spent the early part of his life in the State of Pennsylvania. * * * He fought in the Battle of King's Mountain, against the British and tories, and in some other engagements, of which my remembrance is too imperfect to enable me to speak with any certainty. At some time, though I cannot say certainly when, my father, as I have understood, lived in Lincoln County, in the State of North Carolina. How long I don't know. But when he removed from there, he settled in that district of country which is now embraced in the east division of Tennessee, though it was not then erected into a State.

I was born, according to the best information I have received on the subject, on the 17th of August, in the year 1786; whether by day or night, I believe I never heard, but if I did, I have forgotten. * * * At the time my father lived at the mouth of Limestone, on the Nolachucky River.

Davy Crockett was elected to Congress as a supporter of Andrew Jackson, and the district from which he came was predominantly Jackson territory. However, when President Jackson departed from what Davy Crockett believed to be right, Davy vigorously opposed him. Davy's strong opposition to some of the policies of President Jackson brought down upon him the displeasure of the administration, and in his autobiography Davy credits his defeat for reelection to the active fight made against him in the campaign by officials of the administration.

It was after his return to private life that the struggle of the Texans for independence attracted Davy Crockett's attention. He says in his autobiography that he was appealed to by Texans to come to that territory and help them in their fight for independence. He threw himself into that struggle and gave his life in the cause of liberty, just as he sacrificed his political career because he would not surrender his principles to hold public office.

This is the great lesson we can all learn from the life and career of Davy Crockett.

Davy apparently kept a diary during the battle of the Alamo, because the closing chapters of the book contain a day-by-day account of the siege. His last entry in the book was made on March 5, 1836, and in the closing pages he described a sortie from the Alamo in which Davy and several companions ventured out into "no man's land" to rescue a member of the besieged party who was returning to the fort following a fruitless effort to get help.

The following is the last entry made by Davy in his book:

March 5. Pop, pop, pop. Bom, bom, bom, throughout the day. No time for memorandums now. Go ahead. Liberty and independence forever.

Norway Independence Day in Greater New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me today by unanimous consent of the House, I include with these remarks the following greetings of the Norwegian Government delivered yesterday afternoon by the Honorable Thor Brodtkorb, consul general of Norway at New York, at the Norway Independence Day celebration held at Leif Eriksson Square in Brooklyn, N. Y.:

This is a year of celebrations in Norway. We not only celebrate—as usual—the Constitution Day, the 17th of May. In addition to that proud anniversary we remember that 50 years now have passed since we and our Swedish friends decided to break up our union; thereby laying the foundation not only for our full independence but also for a much stronger and ever-growing friendship between our two brother nations.

Furthermore, we do not forget that we, 15 years ago, were brutally assaulted by Hitler and his Nazis and had to fight to preserve our freedom, and we have just celebrated the 10-year anniversary of our liberation in May 1945. Last, but not least, in November this year our great King, Haakon the 7th, has been our King for 50 years.

This coincidence of a great number of anniversaries in 1 single year offers a golden opportunity to review and evaluate the importance of the act that took place on the 17th of May 141 years ago. Instead of concentrating on that single act we can now see a whole string of historic events which clearly depict the road our nation has followed during this 1½ very important century in our history. It is like watching a movie instead of a still picture.

The constitution of 1814 surely was a democratic constitution (based as it was on the then very radical ideas of civil liberties and human rights which earlier had led to the Constitution of the United States and to the French Revolution. It gave us certain guarantees), but it did not in itself, and alone give us democracy. The democratic form of life and government can never be established through the writing of a constitution however democratic this constitution may be. Democracy belongs to life itself. It is the highest and most difficult form of life and government we know. If a people does not live its democracy in its daily life, no help will come from a solemn document called the constitution.

To appreciate this we can only look back on our own history. When the historic and heroic days of 1814 were gone and the nation settled down to the day-by-day humdrum routine of managing its affairs under

the new constitution, it suddenly realized what a difficult task it had taken on itself.

We had no experience of self-government and no political parties. There was no general understanding in the people of the expenses of managing a country, and we were very poor as a result of prolonged wars. In short, the people of Norway found itself in a position very similar to the one we know from the history of these United States some 25 years earlier. There were moments when good men and women doubted that we could go through with it.

From that start, we have during these 140 years, guided by the high principles laid down in our constitution, built up the modern, democratic state of Norway we have today. Our country is economically and politically sound, and we are proud of our achievements up to now.

When we celebrate our Constitution Day we include in our thoughts all the progress that has taken place since 1814, and we also set our minds on the task ahead on our march, along with other freedom-loving peoples, towards still greater freedom and a better life for all of us; but we do it in deep gratitude to the men who had so much foresight and gave us, on the 17th of May 1814, a constitution that has made this progress possible.

That ladies and gentlemen, is in short the idea behind our celebrations today, and I extend to all of you who have come here to celebrate with us hearty greetings from Norway.

Bandung and Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of April 22, 1955, is deserving of our attention:

BANDUNG AND ISRAEL

The political Committee of the Asian-African Conference at Bandung has approved a resolution, backed by a strange combination of Arab and Communist states, supporting "the rights of the Arab peoples in Palestine" and calling both for the implementation of the United Nations resolutions on Palestine and for a peaceful solution of the Palestine question. The Arabs hail this resolution, now likely to be passed by the conference as a whole, as a victory over Israel. In the interest of such victory they do not gag at accepting the aid of a tyrannous and aggressive force which their own statesmen denounce as a new colonialism threatening them as well.

But it will be noted that, thanks to Prime Minister Nehru's first constructive action at the conference, the resolution is a double-barreled one and contains the overriding demand for a peaceful settlement of the issues involved. Such a settlement has been the constant demand of Israel. The resolution bars the constant border clashes, for which both sides have been censured by the United Nations. But it also calls for a start of actual negotiations to convert the precarious 6-year-old armistice into a real peace. On that scare the Arab States themselves have been most amiss.

The Arab States declare that before they can even consider negotiations Israel must consent, among other things, to a readjustment of the present Palestine demarcation lines in conformity with the original United Nations partition plan and to repatriation and compensation of the Arab refugees. The Israelis declare themselves ready to make some concessions along these lines. But they also point out that the United Nations partition plan was rejected by the Arabs themselves; that there was a war as a result, and that this war was terminted by armistice agreements which, while disclaiming any intent to establish political or territorial boundaries, do not presume to prejudice the "rights, claims, and positions" of either party—thereby putting the Israeli claims on a par with those of the Arabs.

If, therefore, the Bandung call for a peaceful settlement is to be honored by the Arabs themselves they will have to enter into negotiations with Israel on a basis that does not prejudice the Israeli position, but rather permits the reconciliation of rival claims in the interest of peace on which depends the welfare of both sides.

Non-Federal Development of Snake River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I am inserting the following letter which was received in today's mail:

RESOLUTION OF UNITED ASSOCIATION OF JOURNEYMEN AND APPRENTICES OF THE PLUMBING AND PIPE FITTING INDUSTRY OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA, LOCAL UNION NO. 243, LIVINGSTON, MONT., MAY 11, 1955, FOR NON-FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT OF SNAKE RIVER

Whereas Idaho Power Co. has been trying for 3 years to get permission to build dams in the Snake River of Idaho to help solve the power shortage of the Pacific Northwest in general and its own territory in particular; and

Whereas it would spend its stockholders' money and money borrowed from insurance companies and banks to carry out its development program, which would, incidentally, add tax dollars to the Government treasuries; and

Whereas the cost of building a high dam in the Snake River by the Federal Government would be nearly a half billion dollars of public funds and the dam would not be subject to taxation, so we members of this local want it to be known that we favor the plan of Idaho Power to develop the middle stretch of the Snake River, and, furthermore, we desire that the people be informed of our continued belief in private ownership and development of the resources of this country. This system is what has made our country great and we believe Government competition in business with private citizens cannot but weaken our economic structure.

So, we also resolve that the Government be taken out of business in competition with its citizens in general, and, finally,

Speaking in our own behalf as laboring men, we believe it is easier to arrive at agreements with employers of private businesses than with supervisors in Government, regarding wages and other matters too.

The undersigned was instructed to send copies of this resolution to all members of Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs.

J. O. MALSTROM,
Financial Secretary.

Antitrust Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary and also chairman of its Antitrust Subcommittee, I insert the following statement I made at the opening of the hearings on emerging antitrust and monopoly problems:

Our Antitrust Subcommittee in opening the first hearings of a substantial character to be held by the House in the last 3 years on emerging antitrust and monopoly problems, plans to probe deeply into the operation and enforcement of the antitrust laws at this time. Many questions come to the fore. Have our antitrust laws been adequate? If adequate, have they been effectively used to track down violations and violators? If they have not been adequate, in what way can they be made adequate? We hope this inquiry will provide the answers.

During the 65-year period since the Sherman Act was enacted in 1890 there have been several notable investigations. The Industrial Commission in 1898, the Pujo Committee before World War I, the Temporary National Economic Committee before World War II, and in more recent years the Senate Judiciary and the Senate and House Small Business Committees in addition to our own committee on the Study of the Growth of Monopoly Power during the 81st and 82d Congresses—all conducted extensive inquiries and made recommendations which resulted in major additions to the Sherman Act as, for example, the Clayton Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, and the Celler-Kefauver Anti-merger Act. Just recently the House passed two more bills bearing my name. One of these bills increases the fine for an antitrust violation tenfold. The other authorizes Government suit for damages and establishes a uniform statute of limitations in private antitrust actions.

It is our hope and plan that these hearings will carry on the tradition thus notably set and will further broaden and strengthen our system of free competitive enterprise.

All of these inquiries began by listening to recurrent waves of criticism that the antitrust laws should be weakened or abolished. But in each case it was found upon thorough examination of the facts that the principles embodied in our antitrust laws were the pillars upon which our entire competitive business and economic structure rested. All of them resulted in recommendations and legislative, administrative, and judicial activities strengthening the antitrust laws and their enforcement.

Today our country is again going through a wave of mergers. During the last 2 years, in fact, nearly as many mergers have taken place as during the entire decade from 1938 to 1948. In fact one has to go back to the period from 1928 to 1931 to find industrial empire building going on at a comparably hectic pace.

This spate of mergers must give us pause. It is worthy of note and rather strange that not too infrequently whenever antitrust cases are lost by large entities, their executives and attorneys step up the clamor that our antitrust laws are confusing, and contradictory and stand in the way of progress. The financial editors of some big city papers and some not too disinterested trade journals echo the cry. Presently there seems to be in the air a concerted effort to make a

vigorous assault upon our antitrust fabric. I've been amused to see history in this regard repeating itself—or would be amused if it were not for the tragic fact that during World War II the world received a triple-plated education in the principle that abandonment of free competitive enterprise handed nations lock, stock, and barrel into the clutches of fascism and communism.

Megalolatry—the cult that whatever is bigger is better—has too many ardent devotees.

I am amazed that some American pundits and publicists should blithely join the cult. We observe that the American Government broke up big cartels in Germany and Japan and this effort in no small measure has contributed to the degree of prosperity enjoyed by these countries. They are swinging over to the principles of free competitive enterprise. Germany, Italy, France, Britain, and Sweden have given extensive study to our antitrust laws. Some have adopted anti-cartel legislation, notably Sweden, Germany, and the Benelux countries. Others are considering similar legislation. What is needed here in the United States is not an attack on but a strengthening of our laws designed to foster free, efficient, independent competitive enterprise.

In order to document at this time the political and economic implications of concentrations of economic power, our committee plans in these hearings to survey the entire field, getting advice from political, industrial, agricultural, and labor experts concerning the new types of problems they find themselves compelled to handle because of the new forces now transmuting the economy.

Inasmuch as the principles underlying our antitrust legislation are the living, flexible fundamental, without which neither economic nor political freedom can exist or flourish, what adjustments, if any, are now advisable? A new defense industry bigger than any other will for a considerable time to come form an integral part of the economy. How can free competitive enterprise best coexist with the H-bomb, new vaccines, the wonder drugs, electronics, univacs, automation, supermarkets, bank consolidations, giant multiproduct conglomerates, and discount houses? What are the remedial measures, if any, that most deserve intensive examination?

We hope, as a result of these hearings, to know the areas to which we can most productively devote our limited time and money so as to make the most effective contribution now possible toward dovetailing the legal framework of our antitrust legislation to the requirements of an ever-changing, dynamic economy.

Those of us who believe in the maximum practicable diffusion of economic and political power and decision-making are determined that, so far as lies in our power, our system of free competitive enterprise shall continue to demonstrate its maximum possibilities for the enlargement of human productivity and individual freedom.

We are in fearful competition with a totalitarianism where decisions are centralized in concentrations of economic and industrial power coextensive with the state in that competition we cannot, we shall not, we dare not come out second best.

A year or so ago I wrote a book, one chapter of which is headed:

"Oh, it is excellent
To have a giant's strength; but it is tyrannous
To use it like a giant."
—*Shakespeare: Measure for Measure.*

It is my purpose to make this the guide for our committee.

Norway Independence Day in Greater New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday afternoon at Leif Eriksson Square in Brooklyn, N. Y., the Norwegian-American 17th of May Committee of Greater New York, 1955, celebrated Norway's Independence Day. There was an immense colorful parade and a gathering of at least 20,000 people who listened to the program at the parade's conclusion. My good friend and distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] and I were accorded the honor of addressing the huge assemblage. The program read as follows:

PROGRAM

(Leif Eriksson Square, Brooklyn, N. Y., Sunday, May 15, 1955—3 p. m.)

Star-Spangled Banner: The Freeport High School Band, Dr. J. Maynard Wettlaufer, director.

Introduction: Einar Bredland, cochairman, 17th of May Committee.

Master of ceremonies: Edward C. Halvorsen, chairman, 17th of May Committee.

Invocation: Rev. Leif T. Gulbrandsen, pastor, Trinity Lutheran Church, Flushing, N. Y.

Welcome and opening remarks: S. A. Haram, president, the Norwegian Children's Home Association.

Greetings: Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, Member of Congress.

Greetings, Norwegian Government: Hon. Thor Brodtkorb, Consul General of Norway.

Ja, Vi Elsker Dette Landet: Viking Junior Band, Irving Bardon, director.

The Norwegian Singing Society: O. William Erickson, director.

Greetings: Hon. John J. Cashmore, president, Borough of Brooklyn.

The Freeport High School Band, entertainment: Dr. J. Maynard Wettlaufer, director.

Greetings: Hon. JOHN H. RAY, Member of Congress.

Seventeenth of May Sermon: Rev. J. Ingvald Opsal, pastor, Our Saviour's Evangelical Lutheran Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Gud Signe Noregs Land (first verse): The Freeport High School Band.

America (first verse): The Freeport High School Band.

Crowning of Miss Norway: By Consul General Thor Brodtkorb (sponsored by Scandinavian American Business Association, Inc.).

Selections by Peder Tonnesen, tenor.

The following were my remarks on this occasion:

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, my distinguished friend and colleague, Congressman RAY, the Honorable Consul General of Norway, Commissioner Nolan, all the distinguished guests here on this platform, ladies and gentlemen:

It is indeed a privilege and a high honor to address this distinguished gathering at this wonderful parade today which commemorates the 141st anniversary of Norway's Independence Day, May 17, 1955. Especially is it so for one born here in Brooklyn of Irish parents who has had the opportunity to visit beautiful Norway on three occasions over the years.

I am grateful to your chairman, Mr. Halvorsen, Mr. Bredland, Reverend Opsal, Reverend Gulbrandsen, and all the members of your committee for their kind invitation to address you briefly on this historic occasion. I have always followed the developments and activities of Norway with a great deal of admiration, and I applaud the achievements of Norway's stable and democratic government in a world faced with strife and discontent in many areas, particularly those unfortunate nations behind the Iron Curtain.

Throughout the past 141 years the Constitution of Norway has withstood the test of time. The people of Norway have decisively rejected communism and all other forms of government alien to their democratic ideals and principles. As a matter of fact they have made the ideals of democracy a living and revered reality.

We in the United States shall long remember the determined and courageous stand of the Norwegian people against Nazi Germany, both in combat and in the tenacious unrelenting underground struggle in the years that followed. The people of Norway not only vigorously fought and opposed Nazi Germany but also have consistently defied Communist Russia, despite the fact that Norway has a common boundary with the Soviet monster and is menaced by the huge Red army which is in such close proximity.

Not only have the people of Norway demonstrated rare courage and bravery in war and in the potential threats of this cold-war period, but equally important, they have created an example of democracy that serves as an inspiration to the freedom-loving people throughout the world.

Americans of Norwegian birth and descent have made great contributions toward the things that make for a better life here in the United States. They have played a decisive role in the enrichment of our lives by their culture, their music, their industry and their strong religious and moral convictions. Because of these strong convictions and their love of American ideals they have given us many notable and effective leaders in our Government and in our public service.

This is truly a heartwarming and inspiring patriotic demonstration. I not only extend congratulations to the people of Norway on the anniversary of their constitution but also my friends here in Brooklyn of Norwegian birth and descent.

My fervent wish for Norway is that this annual celebration shall stand as a symbol of the continuing close association between our two countries in defense of that political liberty for which the Norwegian constitution stands. May all of us be blessed by the establishment of peace and freedom everywhere, and a world in which peaceful citizens and nations need no longer be on guard against aggression and tyranny.

Collector of Customs Appointment for the Idaho-Montana District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ORVIN B. FJARE
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD,

I would like to include a letter I have today sent to the Honorable George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury. Yesterday a gentleman from Idaho was nominated to be the new Collector of Customs at Great Falls, Mont. We in Montana regard this as one of the few Federal jobs that rightfully should be filled from our great State, and consequently I am vigorously protesting the nomination from our neighboring State of Idaho.

The letter is as follows:

MAY 12, 1955.

The Honorable GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have been informed that an Idaho man has been nominated for the position of Collector of Customs for the Idaho-Montana District, with headquarters at Great Falls, Mont.

I want to vigorously protest the nomination, and ask that the nomination be reconsidered, because this position has historically belonged to Montana. We have the great majority of interest in every respect in this position, by virtue of miles of boundary served, number of ports of entry, volume of traffic, and flow of commerce.

Your careful reconsideraiton of this nomination will be greatly appreciated by me.

Sincerely yours,

ORVIN B. FJARE.

National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics 40th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics has now reached its 40th anniversary. It is difficult to assess the tremendously significant part this organization has played in the progress of aviation in this Nation. The great strides that the aviation industry has made could not have been possible without the research and advice of the NACA. Its contribution to the national defense is incalculable. The NACA is the Government agency charged with the responsibility for conducting an adequate program of scientific aeronautical research. It was established in 1915 to supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight with a view to their practical solution. The committee serves without pay; its only compensation being the great satisfaction it receives from the importance of its work and the success of its research. Its membership is comprised of its Chairman Jerome C. Hunsaker, Vice Chairman Detlev W. Bronk, Joseph P. Adams, Allen V. Astin, Preston R. Bassett, Leonard Carmichael, Ralph S. Damon, James H. Doolittle, Rear Adm. Lloyd Harrison, Ronald M. Hazen, Vice Adm. Ralph A. Ofstie, Lt. Gen. Donald L. Putt, Donald A. Quarles, Arthur E. Raymond, Francis W. Reichelderfer, Oswald Ryan, Gen. Nathan F. Twining.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times in its issue of May 13, 1955, tips its editorial to the NACA on the occasion of its 40th anniversary.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

NACA AT FORTY

One of the bulwarks of our national defense and a spearhead of our peacetime progress in the air is celebrating the 40th anniversary of its establishment. This is the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics founded by act of Congress and first appointed by President Wilson in 1915. Serving without pay, the committee operates like a board of directors, establishing policy and planning the research programs to be followed by the 7,000 civil-service personnel who make up the technical and administrative staff. The programs have resulted in developments without which we would have lagged behind both in the weapons which have protected our freedom and in the great network of commercial air transport which knits the Nation so closely and binds us in so short a space of time to the rest of the free world.

At the great Langley Aeronautical Laboratory in Virginia; the Ames Aeronautical Laboratory at Moffet Field, Calif., and the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory at Cleveland, many of the enormous forward strides in aerodynamical design which make possible today's flight above the speed of sound and in engines and rocket-power plants have received their initiative and progressed through technical guidance from the committee. As Representative VINSON, of Georgia, has well said, "There is not a military or commercial plane flying today in this country which does not reflect in some way the research of the NACA."

Echo Park Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in every mail I receive letters from the people of Chicago protesting against the proposed demolition of the Dinosaur National Monument to construct a dam at Echo Park. I am extending my remarks to include a letter from the president of the Metropolitan Chicago Council of the American Youth Hostels, a nonprofit association in the field of educational travel, group recreation, and community service. The letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Our organization is composed of many teen-agers and young adults. Our main function is the promotion of low-cost trips by bicycle, canoe, and hiking in many State parks, national parks, and national forests. No summer ever goes by without a group of our members visiting one of our grand national parks.

Therefore, it is with great concern that we have learned of the plan to build a dam at Echo Park in Donesaur National Monument, in western Colorado, as part of the bills on the upper Colorado River project.

Our group has members in many parts of the State. We ask you to vote for deletion of the Echo Park Dam both on the floor of Congress and in any joint Senate-House conference.

We oppose Echo Park Dam because—

1. It would set a precedent to build other dams in our national parks. Eleven others are planned.

2. It would destroy a great scenic canyon; people will travel thousands of miles to see the unusual.

3. The dam will not provide a teacup of water for irrigation purposes.

4. It is not a case of water or a park—other sites are available at far less cost.

5. It would substitute a muddy lake for the splendid and unique resources which now exist. Two milion people may visit huge Lake Mead for a few hours, just as many people visit the Empire State Building. Such recreational facilities may be had at scores of other sites. It is not necessary to destroy a park to provide what is available elsewhere.

We are concerned with the spiritual, inspirational, and educational values of our primeval parks. Therefore, we ask that you support legislation and appropriations which will make Dinosaur National Monument one of our finest and most popular parks.

For 40 years Congress has protected our national parks against those who would destroy them. We urge you to carry on the task.

Truly,

BOB SWANSON,
President, Metropolitan Chicago Council, American Youth Hostels.

Norway Independence Day in Greater New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following proclamation issued by the Honorable John Cashmore, president, borough of Brooklyn, city of New York, on the occasion of Norway Independence Day:

PRESIDENT OF BROOKLYN, CITY OF NEW YORK—PROCLAMATION

Whereas the borough of Brooklyn in the city of New York is the home of many thousands of loyal, patriotic, and freedom-loving citizens of Norwegian ancestry; and

Whereas Brooklyn is grateful for and takes pride in the contributions they have made through the years to the spiritual, cultural, civic, and economic life of this great community; and

Whereas it is never to be forgotten that during World War II thousands of Brooklyn citizens of Norwegian ancestry served in the Armed Forces of our Nation and that many made the supreme sacrifice; and

Whereas while always providing outstanding examples of good citizenship and devotion to American ideals and principles, Brooklyn's families of Norwegian extraction have maintained an abiding interest in the history, traditions, and folkways of the land of their forefathers; and

Whereas it is the custom of the Norwegian people to observe the 17th day of May as the day of independence in Norwegian history which marks the adoption of the constitution of 1814; and

Whereas in observance of this anniversary the Norwegian population of Greater New York is sponsoring a celebration on the said day; and

Whereas it is ever appropriate to promote and strengthen the spirit of freedom, and especially so at this time when the peaceful and liberty-loving nations of the world have taken steps to defend, preserve, and protect their God-given and fundamental human rights and to resist the forces of tyranny and armed aggression:

Now, therefore, I, John Cashmore, president of the borough of Brooklyn, do hereby proclaim Tuesday, May 17, 1955, as Norway Independence Day and invite the people of our borough to note this anniversary and encourage the purpose for which this day has been designated.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the borough of Brooklyn to be affixed this 5th day of April, 1955.

JOHN CASHMORE,
President, Borough of Brooklyn.

Attest:

JOHN F. HAYES,
Assistant to the President.

Vast Hoard of Tinned Hamburger Needs Grain of Salt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, amid all the fanfare resulting from the charge that the Navy has hoarded a supply of tinned hamburger sufficient to last 60 years the following article by Bill Gold appearing in the May 13, 1955, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald is a humorous and timely comment:

THE DISTRICT LINE

(By Bill Gold)

VAST HOARD OF TINNED HAMBURGER NEEDS GRAIN OF SALT

For several days the Navy has been under attack for its wasteful stockpiling of a vast hoard of tinned hamburger—enough to last 60 years at the present rate of consumption.

Defense Department officials have been slow to put the facts into proper perspective.

But I suspect that you and I ought to take this mountain of hamburger with a grain of salt.

In peacetime the armed services serve fresh meat almost exclusively. The amount of tinned hamburger used last year (present rate of consumption) if divided into that vast hoard will indeed yield a quotient of 60.

But a reserve of tinned meat must be stockpiled anyhow—just in case. And by a curious coincidence, the present supply stands at 886,000 pounds. Curious, because there are approximately 886,000 men in the Navy and Marine Corps.

So if the Navy suddenly had to fall back on its reserve, this vast hoard would last through two meals. After each man had been served an 8-ounce portion at lunch and another at dinner, the reserve would have vanished.

A friend of mine was musing about the matter last night. "What worries me," he said, "is that my wife will find out that I have accumulated a vast hoard of white ties. Enough to last for 100 years at the present rate of consumption.

"You see," he explained, "the only time I wear a white tie is to a Gridiron dinner. A tie ought to be good for 100 wearings; I attend 2 formal dinners a year; and I have accumulated a stockpile of 2 white ties.

"That's a 100-year supply, all right. And I shudder to calculate the life expectancy of my pearl studs and cuff links."

Perhaps what the Navy ought to do is serve everybody under its jurisdiction a couple of portions of tinned hamburger, use up its entire hoard—and then start all over and really lay in an adequate supply of the stuff. With catchup.

Iowa Manufacturers Important in Nation's Industrial Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, Iowa has long been recognized as the leading agricultural State in the Nation but few realize the extent of Iowa's industrial development.

Hundreds of Iowa's industries are nationally known, and several rank as the biggest of their kind in the Nation. For instance, Iowa has the largest cereal plant, washing machine industry, fountain-pen manufacturer, door and millwork factory, fresh-water pearl-button industry, popcorn processing plant, processor of honey, plastic fiber skate-wheel plan, silvery iron factory, independent pork processing busines, wringer manufacturer, wheel tractor manufacturing plant, single operated packing plant, manufacturer of portable crushing and screening plants, aluminum plate rolling mill, warm air heating systems manufacturer, poultry equipment manufacturer, cellophane producing plant, rotary pump builders, producer of automatic valves and regulators, 2- and 4-cycle gasoline engine manufacturer.

With 3,736 manufacturing plants located in 588 cities and towns, there is a wide and even distribution of industry throughout the State. There are 2,270 different products made in Iowa, and world trade carries the products of 539 Iowa manufacturers who are directly engaged in exporting.

Since Iowa produces 10 percent of the Nation's food supply, food manufacturing and processing leads all other industries in the State, accounting for more than half of the value of the State's manufactured products. But food is just one of the major manufacturing industries.

BIG STRIDES IN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

During the post-World War II years, nearly 900 new industries have set up shop in Iowa, affording more than 35,000 additional job opportunities and creating an additional annual payroll in excess of $120 million. Figures indicate that the growth and development of Iowa is going forward at a faster rate than the Nation as a whole. With the value of Iowa's manufactured products exceeding the value of her agricultural products, the State has a fine economic balance.

A Story of Greatness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a travelog written by Dr. and Mrs. George S. Reuter, Jr., of Holden, Mo. I believe this travelog will be of more than passing interest:

A STORY OF GREATNESS

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., and Mrs. G. S. Reuter)

There are many outstanding ministers in our great Nation, but none greater than Dr. Lee Roberson. On our recent trip, we saw in person God at work in a mighty way.

Dr. Roberson is pastor of the Highland Park Baptist Church and president of Tennessee Temple Schools—both of Chattanooga, Tenn. Dr. Roberson, who has been the shepherd of this church of over 12,000 members for 12 years, has seen his institution lead all southern Baptist churches for 11 years in conversions. The schools constitute elementary and secondary levels, a college, and a seminary. While the schools were organized in 1946, they already are universally recognized, by the leading men of God, as outstanding.

Rock City is a marvel of beauty in this area. Among the outstanding scenes at the former are: Grand Corridor, Needle's Eye, Deer Park, Gnome's Overpass, Shelter Rock, Swing-Along Bridge, High Falls, Lover's Leap, View of Seven States, Fat Man's Squeeze, 1,000-Ton Balanced Rock, Observation Point, Rainbow Hall, Hall of the Mountain King, Moonshine Still, Fairyland Caverns, Goldilocks, Cinderella, and Snow White.

Ruby Falls on this same mountain (Lookout) is also very interesting. It is unique and different from any other cavern in that the stream drops a sheer 145 feet, presenting the world's most spectacular underground scene. The massive chamber which houses this 145-foot waterfall is 1,120 feet below the surface of the earth. Solomon's Temple, the Hall of Dreams, and Onyx Jungle are all interesting scenes within.

Places on Lookout Mountain have already been described. This mountain has an altitude of 2,100 feet. Here is the Moccasin Bend of the Tennessee River. Here is the site of the Civil War Battle of Lookout Mountain of November 24, 1863, which is also known as the Battle Above the Clouds.

Point Park, Ochs Memorial Museum, Umbrella Rock, Chattanooga and Lookout Mountain National Park, New York Peace Monument, Cravens House, Sunset Rock, and Lula Falls are some impart scenes. Also, the incline railway is a great thrill.

Just south in Georgia a few miles is Chickamauga Battlefield, just beyond Fort Oglethorpe. The greatest success of the Confederate Army in the West was their victory here. It gave new hope to the people of the South after the defeats at Gettysburg and Vicksburg in the summer of 1863. This 2-day battle was one of the fiercest single engagements of the Civil War.

We then went further south to Rome, Ga., where Ellen Axson Wilson is buried. She was the famous first wife of Woodrow Wilson. Although she died in 1914, there was a wreath to mark her grave. Her noted brother, Stockton Axson, for many years on the faculty of Rice Institute and Princeton University, is buried on that lot, as well as

the Reverend and Mrs. S. E. Axson and another.

Then further south in Georgia is Warm Springs. The Little White House stands to tell the world many personal and wonderful events concerning Franklin D. Roosevelt. Mrs. Roosevelt, who recently was warmly received with Mr. Clarke M. Eichelberger at Little Rock, Ark., for a Workshop on the United Nations and a major address You and the United Nations, shared in these memories.

From there, we drove to Dayton, Tenn. The great opportunity of visiting with Mr. F. E. Robinson, of the Robinson Drug Store, came our way. It was in this store where the John Thomas Scopes trial was planned. Mr. Robinson is now a dignified white-haired gentleman. The table is thus marked for the world to see. The home where William Jennings Bryan died has been torn down, but the same Rhea County Courthouse remains. The beautiful new William Jennings Bryan University is being physically built although the institution has been in operation since 1925.

We then went to Oak Ridge, Tenn. The American Museum of Atomic Energy is a sight worth seeing. Then, we saw York Institute.

Then we drove to Mammoth Cave National Park in Kentucky. This cave was discovered prior to 1799 and became important in 1812 as a chief source of nitrous earth for the making of gunpowder for the War of 1812. Explorations and developments have gone on until there are now more than 150 miles of charted avenues. There are three possible trips.

From here, we drove to Nashville, Tenn. We, of course, remembered that Dr. Edward Byron Reuter (1879–1946), noted sociologist and our relative is buried on Fisk University. Here, is the beautiful capitol of Tennessee. There stands on these grounds a monument to Andrew Jackson that is exactly the same as the one in Jackson Park in New Orleans. Also, on the grounds, is the tomb of President and Mrs. James K. Polk. Although Polk left his Nashville home to the State of Tennessee, when he died to become effective when Mrs. Polk died, the will was not carried out. Thus, Mr. Polk's remains were removed from the tomb on the grounds of his home and placed on the capitol grounds. He died in 1849 and Mrs. Pork in 1891.

The ancestral home of President Polk is at Columbia, Tenn. He lived here until he became President. We found the home a fine place to visit. The home next door, which formerly belonged to his sisters is now owned by the society but is not yet opened to visitors.

We left for home thinking of a story of greatness. Great living and dead people, great institutions, and great natural beauty. Our wonderful Nation has such a proud heritage.

The Scintilla Division of Bendix Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, in the village of Sidney, in Delaware County, N. Y., which I have the honor to represent, the Scintilla division of Bendix Aviation, is to receive its second star on their civil-defense flag.

We are very proud of the Scintilla Division in Delaware County. Their factory is ideally situated in a beautiful village of 5,000 and their labor-management relations have always been of the best.

Mr. John A. MacLachlan, the publisher of the Sidney Enterprise, in a recent letter to me, has this to say about Scintilla:

Scintilla division of the Bendix Aviation, which as you know is our big Sidney industry (employment about 4,000 people) is to be honored next week by receiving the second star in their civil-defense flag. The presentation is to be made by Lt. Gen. C. R. Huebner, New York State, director of civil defense.

Scintilla is the first industrial plant in New York State to achieve the honor of being a three-time winner. First the flag, then one star, and now the second.

Polio Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article from the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel entitled "Polio Politics."

The Democrats are having a hard time finding issues when they have to make the polio vaccine matter party politics.

The editorial follows:

POLIO POLITICS

The ever control-happy left wing of the Democrat Party in Congress is trying to make a political catspaw of the Salk vaccine situation.

This noisy gang which thumped tubs for Old Doc Truman's attempt to socialize American medicine is now bleating for Federal regulation and control over distribution of the antipolio development.

This is simply the latest demonstration of their apparent lack of faith in, and understanding of, the free atmosphere in which this, and myriad other medical advances, have been made possible—for the benefit of all mankind.

In their very transparent eagerness to make political hay, they fail to base their arguments on the one real issue—the current apprehension over the safety of certain batches of the vaccine. Instead, they are off on their usual unrealistic tangent of seeing black markets and human suffering under their campaign bandwagons.

They're laboring to smear President Eisenhower by way of Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Hobby. She is charged with having "stirred up a witch's brew of uncertainty and confusion."

Mr. Eisenhower is charged with being "not without responsibility for the actions of his agent, Mrs. Hobby."

Whenever politicians hurl their heavy feet into something as delicate and ethical as medical science—and the health and safety of our American children—a danger lurks.

In trying to get to Mr. Eisenhower, by way of Mrs. Hobby, the danger may be to those who attempt it. For it must be remembered that Mrs. Hobby is of their own political party—a Democrat.

The Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, today there is much discussion of the farm program, and in many quarters there seems to be proposals arising to change or radically curtail the various policies of the Nation in regard to agricultural production and marketing quotas.

While all such discussion is good and should be considered, it is not proper—nor would it be profitable for the Nation or for agriculture—for any new program to be adopted quickly and without full and lengthy consideration.

In this connection, I am pleased to place in the RECORD for the study of the Members, a letter I have received from Mr. Lloyd Godley, of Osceola, Ark. Mr. Godley is one of the outstanding farmers in the midsouth and is a student of farm programs and agricultural policy. His letter, while dealing specifically with the cotton farmer, indicates some of the problems that must be faced in the changing of any of our farm programs.

Mr. Godley's letter reads as follows:

OSCEOLA, ARK., *April 28, 1955.*

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR "TOOK": There seems to be a great campaign in progress to "soften up the cotton farmers" for low-support prices and unrestricted acreage or greatly increased acreages. The power behind the campaign comes from the cotton trade and from others who have long opposed our price-support program and control program.

It is surprising that Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND would appear to turn his back on a program that has meant so much to the South. He is quoted as saying, "For a long-term program, I favor unrestricted production at competitive prices and moderate support price levels as against controlled production and high rigid supports." No doubt Senator EASTLAND is speaking in what he considers the cotton farmer's best interest, but there are a number of factors which indicate that such a change in our program would not work to the cotton farmer's advantage.

1. A system of a so-called free market with no controls and no price supports was in operation up until 1933, and the result was poverty for the South and complete price collapse every few years, with burdensome surpluses.

2. It is doubtful if our speculative cotton marketing system should be considered a competitive marketing system when an offering of futures on any day in excess of the futures demand on that day, can decisively lower the price of cotton.

3. Much has been said to the effect that our control program plus 90 percent supports has caused a great increase in foreign production. This same line has been used by the cotton trade and others since 1933, but we are still in the cotton business strong.

4. The theme seems to be that we have priced ourselves out of the world market. American cotton sets the world price. If we lower our prices with the objective of running other nations out of the cotton business, we will most likely find that they will accept

our challenge and continue to lower their prices to undersell us. The end results will be poverty for those who grow cotton.

5. Industry has at all times a control program and a pricing program that works. International Harvester, John Deere, et al., do not compete on the price of tractors. They fix their annual quotas and their prices. When farm prices go down and demands drop off, they do not lower tractor prices. They cut production.

The cotton farmer cannot of his own will cut cotton production nor control prices.

To be assured of a fair return, he must have a program of at least 90 percent of parity.

To protect from over-production, he must have a system of acreage controls.

6. We should not be in and out of a control program, but should have quotas each year. We will then avoid surpluses and will do a better job of diversification which means maintaining soil productivity.

7. Relaxing or abandoning controls will give the new cotton areas of the West an opportunity to overwhelm us in cotton acreages and production.

8. Cotton farmers like the present program as shown by their response in voting controls by such a great margin.

9. Before we had a farm program most of those who did the field work in producing cotton were in rags because they could not earn enough to buy cotton clothing to hide their nakedness. Now there is not one patch on the seat of a thousand britches. The women folks have lost the are of patching because it is easier now to buy a new pair of britches than it was to buy the thread for the patch in 1933.

10. Before the farm program a large percent of the children of those who worked the cotton did not attend school because it was necessary for all to work, and they had no clothes fit for school. Now, all such children—black and white—attend good schools and wear good clothes.

11. A few days ago I attended the funeral of the father of a laborer on my farm. The church was filled with tenant farmers, sharecroppers, and farm laborers—all well fed and well dressed. There were flowers on the casket from a commercial florist. The remains were brought to the church in a Buick hearse by a professional undertaking company. Every person there came in a good automobile.

On observing all this, my mind went back to 1933 and the conditions under which this person would have been buried then. I remarked to a friend, "My, what wonders, under God, man has wrought in such a few short years."

I wish the Secretary of Agriculture and all those who are opposing our program could visualize as you and I do conditions in the South today as contrasted with conditions as they existed in 1933.

It seems that the most reactionary would not want to turn the clock from a time of unprecedented plenty back to a time of poverty, ignorance, and suffering.

Pardon me for taking up your time, but I get so damn mad, I must let go. The support of men like you in Congress is all that will prevent our program from being destroyed and agriculture again being made desperate.

Sincerely yours,

LLOYD.

Lt. Gen. Alexander R. Bolling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was informed not long ago that our commanding general in the Third Army area, Lt. Gen. A. R. Bolling, will retire in August. We, in the Third Army area, are going to miss General Bolling. He has exterted every effort to make the Third Army one of the very best. From his headquarters at Fort McPherson, near Atlanta, Ga., he has been constantly on the move visiting various units in the field and promoting excellent relationship with all civilian authorities. General Bolling is always on the job, easy to reach and sympathetic to any problem, however minor, under his jurisdiction. He has upheld the great traditions of the American Army. He will go down in history as one of our greatest soldiers. The soldiers and civilians of the Third Army area are wishing for him, Mrs. Bolling and his splendid family the very best always. My best personal regards go with General Bolling wherever the future leads.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a brief sketch of his distinguished career:

LT. GEN. ALEXANDER R. BOLLING, COMMANDING GENERAL, THIRD ARMY

Alexander Russell Bolling was born in Philadelphia, Pa., on August 28, 1895. He was commissioned a second lieutenant of Infantry in the Officers' Reserve Corps on August 15, 1917, and received a Regular Army commission as second lieutenant of Infantry on October 26 of that year.

His first assignment was with the 4th Infantry Regiment at Gettysburg, Pa., and he was transferred with the unit in its move to Charlotte, N. C., and to Newport News, Va., during that year. On April 6, 1918, he went with the unit to France and participated in the Aisne-Marne defensive, the Champagne-Marne defensive, the Chamagne-Marne offensive, the St. Mihiel offensive, and the Argonne offensive.

He was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the Nation's second highest decoration, "for extraordinary heroism in action" in constantly exposing himself to enemy artillery and gas attacks while checking the condition of the men of his three widely scattered platoons.

General Bolling's assignments after World War I included the 24th Infantry at Columbus, N. Mex.; Camp Shannon, in the same State; Governors Island, N. Y., and Fort McPherson, Ga.

In addition, he was plans and training officer for the 16th Brigade at Fort Hunt, Va., in 1928, and later that year commanding officer of headquarters company, United States Army, in Washington, D. C., which he commanded until 1932. This unit was the administrative command for personnel assigned to duty with the War Department.

From July 1932 to June 1933 he attended the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga. In August 1933 he entered the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., remaining there until June 1935.

In 1935 he was ordered to Hawaii as regimental adjutant of the 19th Infantry. The next year he was named commanding officer of headquarters company and provost marshal of Schofield Barracks. From August 1937 to June 1938 he was a student at the Army War College in Washington, D. C. In 1938 he was named Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence, of the First Corps Area at Boston, Mass., serving there until 1940.

From September 1940 to December 1943 he was Assistant Chief of Staff, Personnel, of the Army Ground Forces, at Washington, D. C. He returned to his first choice, the Infantry, in June 1943, when he was appoint assistant division commander of the 8th Infantry Division at Camp Young, Calif. The following November he became assistant division commander of the 84th Division at Camp Claiborne, La.

General Bolling assumed command of the 84th Infantry Rail Splitter Division in June 1944, and in November of that year he led the unit into combat in Europe, remaining in command until after VE-Day.

The division received numerous commendations from the commanding generals of the Army Ground Forces, the Ninth Army, and VII and XIII Corps.

His promotions, from lieutenant colonel in 1940 to lieutenant general today, were rapid; colonel on December 24, 1941; brigadier general in August 1942; major general (temporary) in January 1945; permanent major general in October 1948, with date of rank from October 10, 1944; lieutenant general on August 1, 1952.

Following World War II, General Bolling's first assignment was as Chief of Special Services and Army Exchange Service for the European command. He returned to the United States for assignment as Deputy Director of Intelligence, War Department, in 1947. In August 1950 he was named Assistant Grief of Staff, G–2 (Intelligence), Department of the Army, which position he held until he assumed command of Third Army on August 22, 1952, with headquarters at Fort McPherson, Ga., where he had served as a lieutenant 25 years before.

In addition to the Distinguished Service Cross, General Bolling has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal with an Oak Leaf Cluster in lieu of a second award, the Silver Star, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, and Purple Heart, receiving the latter for wounds in action in World War I. His foreign decorations include the French Legion of Honor, Croix de Guerre with Palm, and Croix de Guerre with Star; Netherlands Order of the Orange Nassau; Belgian Croix de Guerre with Palm; Czechoslovakian War Cross; and the Russian Order of the Red Banner and the Order of the Fatherland.

On June 1, 1953, General Bolling was awarded an honorary degree as doctor of laws at Westminister College, Fulton, Mo.

General Bolling is married to the former Miss Mary Josephine Hoyer, of Chambersburg, Pa. His son, Maj. A. R. Bolling, Jr., Infantry, is now serving as battalion commander, 3d Battalion, 29th Infantry Regiment, at the Infantry Center, Fort Benning, Ga. His two daughters are married to Armed Forces officers. Josephine Bolling Wetherill is the wife of Col. Roderick Wetherill, Field Artillery, and Barbara Bolling Thomas is married to Lt. Col. Clarence L. Thomas, Air Force.

Illinois Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs Support Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution of approval at the State convention of the Illinois Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs:

Whereas there exists at the present time, two Territories of the United States, namely Hawaii and Alaska, each of which is desirous of having bestowed upon it the status of statehood; and

Whereas each of these Territories has proven its ability to assume such status: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Illinois Federation of Business and Professional Women go on record as supporting statehood for Hawaii and Alaska; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative of Illinois, to the Governor of each said Territory of Hawaii and Alaska, and to each of the presidents of Business and Professional Women's Clubs of Hawaii and Alaska.

Norway Independence Day in Greater New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following address delivered on yesterday afternoon, May 15, 1955, by Mr. S. A. Haram, president, the Norwegian Children's Home Association of Brooklyn, N. Y. These opening remarks were delivered at Leif Eriksson Square, in Brooklyn, N. Y., on the occasion of the celebration of Norway Independence Day:

Friends, on behalf of the Norwegian-American 17th of May Committee of Greater New York, I greet you and wish you welcome and I wish to congratulate you on the outstanding and magnificient showing in putting on this greatest-of-all 17th of May parades.

It is great to be a Norwegian in Brooklyn today.

The committee is to be congratulated for this splendid arrangement such as we have never witnessed before. It is really something to be very proud of. The large participation by churches, organizations, and groups from all parts of Greater New York, Westchester, Long Island, and New Jersey and elsewhere is gratifying.

It is particularly encouraging to see so many young people take part in the parade.

The committee has worked very hard and they have also worried a great deal—wondering if they were going to get your support.

The showing you have made today by this large participation convinces all of us that the faith in the ideals and principle laid down by our forefathers at Eidsvold 141 years ago are as strong today as they were then.

What we are celebrating here today is a loyalty to the ideals laid down by our forefathers. Ideals and principles which have stood the test of time for 141 years.

We are proud of the heritage which we inherited from our parents, a heritage which we want to hand down to our children.

We are marching and celebrating here today not as citizens of Norway, but we are marching as citizens and believers in the ideals laid down by our forefathers at Eidsvold, and we should also include the American ideals and principles as well. The ideals of the founders of our adopted land, U. S. A., are much like the Norwegian ideals. They both stand for liberty and equality. It is said that when the Norwegian Constitution, "Grunnlov," was written in 1814, the United States Constitution was studied and was, what you may say, used as a model for the Norwegian Constitution.

What is happening here today is good for us as a people. It gives us a chance to reaffirm our faith in the things our forefathers believed in and in the things we believe in. It is good for us to show our children, neighbors, our community, and country that we stand together in respect and loyalty for the ideals of our forefathers. Let us always live up to these ideals and principles, both the Norwegian and American. Let us dedicate ourselves to both, and we will make better citizens.

So, finally, my friends, my message to you today is let us continue to march on the 17th of May in commemoration and respect for the ideals and principles laid down by our forefathers 141 years ago, and thereby hand down to our children and to future generations the beautiful dedication adopted at Eidsvold in 1814.

"Enig aa tro intill Dovre faller"—United we stand until the Dovre Mountains fall.

Our forefathers were willing to fight for these ideals. Let us continue to live and march for them.

Public Law 24, the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, thinking it will be of general interest to my colleagues, I am extending my remarks to include a tabulated summary of the appropriations provided for in Public Law 24, the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act. This was compiled at my request by Elizabeth Elward, of the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. It follows:

Public Law 24, 84th Cong. (2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1955)

CHAPTER I

Department of Agriculture:	
Agricultural Research Service	$650,000
Agricultural conservation program	* (1)
Total, ch. I	650,000

CHAPTER II

Department of Commerce:	
Office of the Secretary	* (2)
Civil Aeronautics Administration: Claims, Federal Airport Act	* (2)
Civil Aeronautics Board:	
Payments to air carriers	8,900,000
Maritime activities:	
Operating-differential subsidies	50,000,000
Salaries and expenses	400,000
Repair of reserve fleet facilities	970,000
Repair of reserve fleet vessels (liquidation of contract authorization)	* (3)
Bureau of Public Roads:	
Federal-aid highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	95,000,000
Forest highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	3,500,000

Footnotes at end of table.

Public Law 24, 84th Cong. (2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1955)—Continued

CHAPTER II—continued

Bureau of Public Roads—Continued	
Public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	$875,000
Total, Department of Commerce	159,645,000
Independent Offices—Small Business Administration:	
Salaries and expenses	* (3)
Revolving fund	----------
Department of Defense, Civil Functions—Department of the Army, Canal Zone Government: Operating expenses	230,000
Total, ch. II	159,875,000

CHAPTER III

Department of Defense—Interservice Activities:	
Claims	(4,320,000)
Retired pay	(8,000,000)
Do	(14,000,000)
Military personnel, Army	(150,000,000)
Military personnel, Air Force	(110,000,000)
Total, chapter III	7 (286,320,000)

CHAPTER IV

Foreign Operations—Mutual Security: Contributions to the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance	8 (6,500,000)
Independent Offices—Export-Import Bank: Administrative expenses	4 (55,000)
Total, ch. IV	(6,500,000)

CHAPTER V

Independent offices:	
Federal Civil Defense Administration: Surveys, plans and research	----------
Federal Communications Commission: Salaries and expenses	85,000
Federal Power Commission: Salaries and expenses	100,000
General Services Administration: Expenses, general supply fund	9 (200,000)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics: Salaries and expenses	240,000
Soo Locks Centennial Celebration Commission	15,000
Veterans' Administration:	
Compensation and pensions	240,000,000
Readjustment benefits	155,000,000
Grants to Republic of Philippines	611,000
Total, Veterans' Adminstration	395,611,000
Total, ch. V	396,051,000

CHAPTER VI

Department of the Interior—Bureau of Land Management: Management of lands and resources	350,000
National Park Service: Jones Point Bridge	600,000
Department of Agriculture—Forest Service: Salaries and expenses	2,570,000

Footnotes at end of table.

Public Law 24, 84th Cong. (2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1955)—Continued

CHAPTER VI—continued

Independent Offices—National Capital Planning Commission:	
Salaries and expenses, Washington regional mass transportation survey	$200,000
John Marshall Bicentennial Commission	10,000
Total, ch. VI	3,730,000

CHAPTER VII

Department of Labor—Bureau of Employment Security:	
Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration	* [10]
Unemployment compensation for Federal employees	7,500,000
Total, Department of Labor	7,500,000
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:	
Office of Education:	
Payments to school districts	20,000,000
Assistance for school construction	48,500,000
Public Health Service:	
Assistance to States, general	* [11]
Indian health activities	[12](100,000)
Social Security Administration—Bureau of Public Assistance: Grants to States for public assistance	238,000,000
Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance: Salaries and expenses	[4](10,620,000)
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services	----------
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	306,500,000
Railroad Retirement Board: Salaries and expenses	[16](256,000)
Total, ch. VII	314,000,000

CHAPTER VIII

Public Works—Department of the Interior—Southwestern Power Administration: Operation and maintenance	400,000
Total, ch. VIII	400,000

CHAPTER IX

Department of State:	
Salaries and expenses	[17](750,000)
Contributions to international organizations	----------
Missions to international organizations	[18](12,500)
International contingencies	[19](100,000)
Department of Justice:	
Legal Activities and General Administration:	
Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals	300,000

Footnotes at end of table.

Public Law 24, 84th Cong. (2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1955)—Continued

CHAPTER IX—continued

Department of Justice—Con.	
Legal Activities and General Administration—Continued	
Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals	$200,000
Salaries and expenses, claims of persons of Japanese ancestry:	
1954	198,267
1955	870,000
Federal Bureau of Investigation: Salaries and expenses	1,100,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service: Salaries and expenses	1,250,000
Federal Prison System:	
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons	180,000
Support of United States prisoners	600,000
Total, Department of Justice	4,698,267
The Judiciary:	
Supreme Court of the United States: Care of the building and grounds	12,500
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals: Salaries and expenses	13,300
Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services:	
Salaries of judges	900,000
Salaries of supporting personnel	86,000
Fees of jurors and commissioners	380,000
Travel and miscellaneous expenses	45,000
Salaries of referees	[20](20,800)
Expenses of referees	[21](34,575)
Total, the Judiciary	1,436,800
Total, ch. IX	6,135,067

CHAPTER X

Treasury Department:	
Bureau of Accounts: Salaries and expenses	85,000
Coast Guard:	
Operating expenses	[22](1,100,000)
Retired pay	[13](584,000)
Reserve training	[12](46,000)
Total, Treasury Department	85,000
Post Office Department: Foreign mail transportation, 1947	[14](25,000)
Independent offices — Tax Court of the United States:	
Salaries and expenses	63,000
Total, independent offices	63,000
Total, ch. X	148,000

CHAPTER XI

District of Columbia:	
Operating expenses:	
Office of Corporation Counsel	[23](2,500)
Metropolitan Police (additional municipal services, American Legion Convention)	* [15]
Department of Public Health	(650,300)
Public welfare	(152,900)

Footnotes at end of table.

Public Law 24, 84th Cong. (2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1955)—Continued

CHAPTER XI—continued

District of Columbia—Con.	
Operating expenses—Con.	
Settlement of claims	($28,008)
Judgments	(10,587)
Audited claims	(155,095)
Total, operating expense	(996,890)
Capital outlay: Capital outlay, miscellaneous	(26,500)
Total, ch. XI	[23](1,023,390)

CHAPTERS XII AND XIIA

Legislative branch:	
Senate: Salaries and expense allowance of Senators, mileage of the President of the Senate and of Senators, and salary and expense allowance of the Vice President:	
Compensation of Senators	320,001
Compensation of the Vice President of the United States	1,667
Office of the Secretary: Joint recording facilities	3,905
Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: For adjustment of salaries	140
Joint Committee on the Economic Report, salaries and expenses	3,800
Contingent expenses of the Senate:	
Furniture	5,000
Miscellaneous items	51,950
Packing boxes	500
Postage stamps	115
Total, Senate	387,078
House of Representatives:	
Salaries of Members	1,468,000
Coordinator of Information	2,000
Majority leader	5,400
Folding documents	10,000
Total, House of Representatives	1,485,400
Capitol Police:	
Capitol Police Board	21,139
Capitol Police Board	38,972
Total, Capitol Police Board	60,111
Architect of the Capitol:	
Capitol Buildings	16,000
Capitol Grounds	611,000
Senate Office Building	53,000
House Office Buildings	----------
Additional House Office Building	5,000,000
Additional Senate Office Building	----------
Total Architect of the Capitol	5,680,000
Government Printing Office:	
Printing and binding	700,000
Total, chapters XII and XIIA	8,312,589

CHAPTER XIII

Judgments and authorized claims:	
Judgments and authorized claims	3,234,377

Footnotes at end of table.

Public Law 24, 84th Cong. (2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1955)—Continued

CHAPTER XIII—continued

Judgments and authorized claims—Continued	
Judgments and authorized claims	$6,269,842
Total, chapter XIII	9,504,219
Grand total	898,805,875

*Indicates transfers, limitation increases, etc.

[1] Continues available uncommitted balances through Dec. 31, 1955.

[2] Authority to transfer not to exceed $110,854.

[3] Authority to transfer not to exceed $840,000.

[4] Increase in limitation.

[5] Increase of $75,000 in limitation.

[6] Authority to transfer an additional $224,000.

[7] To be derived by transfer from available appropriations.

[8] To be derived by transfer from "Mutual Defense Assistance, Southeast Asia and the Western Pacific, 1955."

[9] To be derived by transfer from "Defense Public Works, community facilities."

[10] Language change.

[11] Increases limitation for personal services from $2,400,000 to $2,418,000.

[12] To be derived by transfer from "Retired pay of commissioned officers," fiscal year 1955.

[13] To be derived by transfer from "Acquisition, construction, and improvements."

[14] To be derived by transfer from "Railway mail service, 1947."

[15] Language making this appropriation available for the payment of members of the uniformed force of the Fire Department.

[16] To be derived from the Railroad Retirement Board (trust fund).

[17] To be derived by transfer from "Government in occupied areas," fiscal year 1955.

[18] To be derived by transfer from "Contributions to international organizations," fiscal year 1955.

[19] To be derived by transfer from "Educational aid for China and Korea."

[20] To be derived from the referee's salary fund.

[21] To be derived from the referee's expense fund.

[22] Increase in limitation for settlement of claims.

[23] Unless otherwise provided, District of Columbia appropriations shall be paid out of the general fund for the District of Columbia.

NOTE.—Continues antistrike provisions.

Resolution Approving H. R. 5297 Adopted by Department of Illinois Reserve Officers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the Appendix of the RECORD, a resolution approved by the Department of Illinois, Reserve Officers' Association, in a legally convened assembly, on May 7, 1955:

Whereas the Armed Services Committee of the United States House of Representatives has approved H. R. 5297;

Whereas this legislation will for the first time provide for adequate procurement of necessary officers and enlisted personnel for the security of this Nation;

Whereas the preservation and protection of the United States of America demands the enactment into law of H. R. 5297; and

Whereas the more than 2,500 members of the Department of Illinois, Reserve Officers' Association each desire the enactment of this H. R. 5297 into law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Department of Illinois, Reserve Officers' Association, in legally convened assembly, this 7th day of May A. D. 1955, Do hereby petition the Congress from the State of Illinois for the enactment of this legislation; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each Member of Congress from the State of Illinois.

Done this 7th day of May A. D. 1955.

DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS RESERVE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION,
LOUIS L. MASON, *President.*

Attest:

REX YOUNG, *Secretary.*

United States Should Be Proud of Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an interesting article by David Lawrence concerning our distinguished Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. The articles follows:

UNITED STATES SHOULD BE PROUD OF DULLES—TRAVELING SECRETARY HANDLED HIMSELF CREDITABLY AT PARIS PRESS CONFERENCE

(By David Lawrence)

PARIS, May 13.—There is something very impressive and of incalcuable value about the new-fashioned diplomacy which brings the Secretary of State of the United States to Paris for informal talks with the Foreign Ministers of France and Great Britain as well as with the top men of other countries which comprise the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Critics may say the head of the State Department should not travel around, but it is difficult to imagine how any progress could be made any other way in solving present-day problems among the allies.

Unfortunately, lots of mischievous rumors and some distorted reports reach back home to the parliaments and to the American Congress. It is not always easy to overcome the handicaps that interference, even by American legislators, sometimes brings. But if the Members of Congress who are so reckless with their comments on world affairs, especially the carping critics among the Democrats, could attend a press conference held here by the Secretary of State, they would come to realize how delicate and complicated are most of the questions tackled by the foreign ministers.

This last week has seen many important conferences, but they are not unlike several meetings held here before. They are all significant. The modern way is for the top representatives of the allies to sit down together and thresh out their differences behind closed doors. They talk frankly and at times heatedly, but they come out of it as a rule with a clear understanding of the viewpoint of their respective countries.

Perhaps the most ticklish of all the questions this week was the problem of Indochina. Neither the French nor the American Government could afford to place itself in the position of trying to settle the internal affairs of South Vietnam, as this would only intensify Communist propaganda there. But certain parallel or common policies were agreed upon which may help to bring stability to the situation in the southern part of Indochina. For, although the desire is to see some form of democratic government chosen, it is not easy to establish at once an electoral machinery such as exists in a European parliamentary system. But out of the turbulence of these last few weeks may come a representative system for South Vietnam, and that is the objective now.

Despite the newspaper reports about a grave crisis in the relations between France and the United States over the Indochina question, it is a fact that both governments recognized all along how important it is to reach an understanding and not to allow the Indochina dispute to impair their working arrangements on many other questions of far greater importance to both.

The American people can rest assured that Secretary Dulles handled himself very creditably here. Notwithstanding some garbled impressions that came to certain Senators, there was no mistake made here by Mr. Dulles in talking firmly where firmness was necessary. Those who heard his reply, for example, in the North Atlantic Council meeting to Foreign Secretary Spaak of Belgium on the Formosa question, said it was an excellent rebuttal to a statement that completely misconstrued the American position.

Nor is Mr. Dulles stampeded or pushed around by the Soviet tactics. He was clear cut in his announcement here that he wouldn't go to Vienna until the Austrian Treaty provisions had been finally set down on paper ready for signing. He is equally determined not to become involved in a protracted discussion in Vienna about the details of the forthcoming four-power conference.

There is a restraint and a forbearance about Mr. Dulles' manner in these top-level negotiations, and at the same time such an earnest reflection by him of the truly American viewpoint in international affairs, that the American people can well be proud of their itinerant Secretary of State.

Trade Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include a letter from John W. Evers, president of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, which I am sure will be of general interest to my colleagues. The letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: This association supports the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation as incorporated in part III of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, as entered into at the recent Geneva

meeting by Assistant Secretary of State Samuel C. Waugh, subject to the concurrence of Congress.

It seems to us logical to have something such as is proposed in the OTC to administer the General Agreement and to perform the following additional functions:

1. To facilitate intergovernmental consultations on questions relating to international trade;

2. To sponsor international trade negotiations;

3. To study questions of international trade and commercial policy and, where appropriate, make recommendations thereon; and

4. To collect, analyze, and publish information and statistical data relating to international trade and commercial policy.

This support on our part was in large measure influenced by our understanding that the proposed OTC shall have no authority to amend the provisions of the General Agreement, and that no decision or other action of the Assembly or other subsidiary body of the organization shall have the effect of imposing on a member any new obligation which the member has not specifically agreed to undertake.

I hope that your study of the proposed OTC will result in your influential support of it.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. EVERS,
President, the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.

"American Secretaries Are Bringing to Their Positions Today a Wider Knowledge of Business and World Affairs Than Considered Necessary in the Past"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year, Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks declared April 23–30 as National Secretaries Week. All over the country that week our great band of girl Fridays took bows for their very real contribution to our American way of life. Moreover, the 300 chapters of the National Secretaries Association—International—observed the week by highlighting the educational projects for which it has gained national recognition and which have been of tremendous benefit to secretaries and management.

I was proud, indeed, Mr. Speaker, when my own secretary on Capitol Hill, Miss Marjorie Clough, of Cleveland, Ohio, who has been associated with me for almost 10 years, was invited to speak at an all-day workshop meeting of the chapters of the National Secretaries Association of Greater Youngstown, Ohio.

When Miss Clough reported to the Congressman representing Youngstown—the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN—that she was going into his district, he presented her with a toy donkey which I feel sure she will cherish, especially as Mr. KIRWAN emphasized the nonpartisanship of the little mascot. And he further asked her to convey his greetings to the meeting.

Miss Ann C. Hudak and others of Youngstown had skillfully arranged a full day of activities at the beautiful Butler Art Institute. Included on the program was another good friend of mine from Cleveland, Mr. A. L. Bittikofer, supervisor of character education for the Cleveland public schools, who conducted a lively discussion on human relations in and out of business.

May I express my appreciation at this time to the United States Information Agency and to Mr. William Hamilton, of the public information staff, who generously arranged to have Miss Clough take with her a color movie which vividly portrays what our Government is doing to combat Soviet propaganda behind the Iron Curtain. The showing of this film added greatly to the program of the day.

Mr. Speaker, because I know Miss Clough was speaking for and about us all in this great body, I believe my colleagues will enjoy reading what she said that day in Youngstown. Under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith the tribute of Secretary Weeks to the American secretary and Miss Clough's statement:

THE SECRETARY SENSES THE NEED

(Remarks of Miss Marjorie Clough, executive assistant to Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON, Member of Congress, before a meeting of the Youngstown Chapters, National Secretaries' Association, April 30, 1955)

It is a privilege to be here today to join with this distinguished group in paying honor to secretaries everywhere.

When Miss Helmes, of the Women's Bureau in Washington, told me of this workshop you are holding today, I was gratified to know that I would be invited to take part in it.

Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks is to be commended for proclaiming National Secretaries' Week across the Nation.

Indeed, I think there is special significance for our great army of Girl Fridays in another announcement which came from Mr. Weeks' office this week: The announcement which told of the high state of the Nation's prosperity.

For I would say that without the secretary, equipped as she is with a sort of built-in radar system we call the sixth sense—I doubt if such a record could have been possible by the great and small enterprises which constitute the American way of life.

To be in Youngstown itself, is a privilege. I come from a family of men who have long dealt in steel and the products of steel, I understand what it means to the prosperity of our Nation when the night skies over Youngstown and Bethlehem and Pittsburgh and Cleveland are aglow from the white-hot furnaces and open hearths of the greatest steel industry in the world.

And may I take this moment to tell you what I am sure you already know: That the people of Youngstown are fortunate to be represented in Congress by Hon. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN. A high compliment was paid to him recently by a friend who said: "MIKE KIRWAN is MIKE KIRWAN 365 days of the year." It can certainly be said that he puts the welfare of the country and of his people above and beyond party politics.

You may wonder why I have been chosen to speak at your meeting today. They say I am a successful secretary. I don't know whether or not this is true.

What I do know is that from the first day on that first job—paying $60 a month, Monday through Saturday—I have been filled with faith in the role which an obscure girl could someday play in our society.

I hope I am not mistaken when I say that only in America are the men and women at Cabinet level, the men and women of the President's Cabinet who make foreign policy and defense policy and domestic policy—known as secretaries.

And today when my Congresswoman leaves the supervision of her congressional office to me when on some important mission in our country or abroad, I realize that the faith of the obscure girl at the Woodstock typewriter has been confirmed.

They say I am a successful secretary. I don't know whether this is true or not. I do know that I am associated with a wonderful woman in Washington.

In order to tell you about my work, I must tell you something about Congressman BOLTON.

FRANCES P. BOLTON

Public life was nothing new to Mrs. Bolton when the death of her husband, the late Hon. Chester C. Bolton, left a vacant seat in the House of Representatives in 1939. She had had 10 years as wife of a Congressman, and had gone through many campaign at his side, and made many speeches in his behalf.

But now she was faced an important decision of her own, whether or not to run for the seat left vacant in Congress. There were the inaudible suggestions that as a woman she was not sufficiently educated in the law or one of the professions. There were the fears and doubts which seem always to beset men and women when comes the call to higher service.

But having put her hand to the plow, and winning that first election hands down back in 1940—she hasn't looked back, but has pushed steadily forward into new and challenging experiences which have inspired men and women everywhere.

Mrs. Bolton is a highly respected member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Her thought reaches out to the problems of peoples and nations around the world as their affairs touch upon our own at the international level.

Her deep sense of humanity and understanding of the basic needs of mankind, make her the staunch ally of America's friends the world over.

Mrs. BOLTON enjoys the unqualified confidence not only of her colleagues in Congress, but of the leaders of the executive branch as well. This was borne out when President Eisenhower appointed her the first woman Member of Congress to serve as a delegate to the United Nations. Her services there involved the daily handling of strategic information of the highest classification.

Men grumble a bit sometimes, about women in positions of responsibility. Here's a personal observation to end all grumbling:

A staff member of the Foreign Affairs Committee told me one day that Mrs. BOLTON was one of the few legislators he had ever seen—man or woman—who could influence votes in a committee meeting through pure logic and persuasive ability. She tries to resolve conflict of opinion and bring about a workable and just compromise.

He went on to say that she was the person who had convinced him that women have a constructive place to fill in public life. "Frankly, until I saw her in operation, I thought women ought to stay home."

What a tribute to woman's place in American endeavor today.

A little more about Mrs. BOLTON.

Hard work and long hours on the Hill are what the job demands in Congress. Mrs. BOLTON gives freely of both. She is a perfectionist to the smallest detail, but asks

nothing from those around her which she does not first demand from herself. She finds no time in her active life for small talk about people or things.

Her wit and good humor save many a situation in our busy office. Some weeks ago I found a newspaper clipping propped under my nose—at a moment of when things were going "seven ways to Sunday" as Mrs. BOLTON often says.

The story told about a young woman applying for a secretarial position.

"What are your special qualifications," she was asked?

Her reply: "I can look like a woman and think like a man, act like a lady, and work like a dog."

The business of thinking and acting like a whole-souled woman is what is important to FRANCES BOLTON.

STAYING IN CONGRESS

Let nobody tell you that it is easy for a man or a woman to serve in Congress. It takes something special to get there, and something very special to stay.

That something special isn't just the ability to wage firey battle for some piece of legislation, to meet the needs of constituents, to make quick decisions or to write good letters. Some of all of this, to be sure, is fabricated into the warp and woof of what is called a leader of people.

In my humble judgment, what it takes mostly to stay on in Congress year after year, piling good record upon good record, is not so much the people's faith in the Congressman, as the Congressman's faith in the people. It is the deep conviction that there is far more goodness than badness in the simplest of us; that every human soul is striving for a happier, freer, more secure way of life, and has the right to. It is the deep assurance that one can trust most of these aspirations most of the time, and know that out of them all will come something better, not worse.

Could this not be what George Washington meant when he wrote: "The aggregate happiness of society is, or ought to be, the end of all government."

Our first President spoke not of the special needs of this or that group, but of the happiness of society as a whole. He urged that the energies of government at all levels—local, State, National—concern themselves with what is best for all, not some, in the serious business of making the laws of the land.

How much easier said than done, friends. I have seen our statesmen on the floors of Congress making decisions of grave import to the peace and security of these United States. I have felt the pressures they are under. It is far from easy to think objectively of the whole, when the voices of special interest raise hue and cry. For whether the issue be the always troublesome tariff question, or the number of refugees we bring into our country each year, a labor-management dispute, or the cost of butter, the issues are always debated in terms of the happiness and prosperity of some one, or some group.

The spirit which permeates the foregoing brief passage on the life of FRANCES BOLTON—and what it means to be a Congressman—is the spirit which has filled my life these past 9 years.

A SECRETARY LOOKS AT WASHINGTON

And now permit me to give you a fleeting glimpse of Washington itself—your Capital and mine—the city which is today writing history for millions of people in many lands. America has had to assume a position of leadership among the nations, not because of her material abundance—O wonder of providence that it is—but because of that spirit of freedom and liberty which cradled her birth a short 200 years ago.

Come, drive home from work with me on an evening in April. The rush hour is past. The sun has sunk. The soft evening air is fragrant with springtime's wonders.

Let's stop for a moment and climb the steps of that glorious temple we know as Lincoln Memorial. From the summit, one has an unobstructed view of the Capitol dome to the east. Below our feet lies the long reflecting pool, and framed within it the eternal shadow of the lofty Washington Monument. At one end of an imaginary bar which crosses this sweeping view of the Capitol lies the White House. On the other, the marble rotunda of the Jefferson Memorial. Just behind us, and across the Potomac, the stately mansion of Robert E. Lee looks down from its natural pedestal on his own beloved Virginia hills.

The white crosses and tombstones of Arlington Cemetery lie folded within those hills just across the river. In the quiet of evening one can almost hear the measured step of the sentry pacing his perpetual watch before the tomb of the soldier "Known but to God."

But morning brings other glimpses of life in our beauteous Capital City.

There are the miles of wide boulevards spoking out from the Capitol Grounds and the miles of Government buildings, with their miles of corridors.

There are the storied shelves and the row after row of books in famed Library of Congress, and the seemingly endless queues of wide-eyed visitors around our historic sights. The glistening white marble dazzles the eye in the hot summer sun.

And everywhere in Washington there is the reminder of more gentle yesterdays which our Capital City has known. Red brick houses close to the road, flanked by shaded walks and alleys, cobbled streets and narrow, walled-in gardens to the rear, all whisper of genial colonial life in the early days of our Republic. Fashionable Georgetown society is preserving these lovely relics for modern living.

Elsewhere there is noisy evidence of new buildings springing up in answer to the incessant demand for modern offices and up-to-the-minute dwellings.

There is still another aspect of life in Washington, friends. A shocking picture it is to those who visit our Capital for the first time; slums within the shadow of the Capitol dome.

What a spectacle all this makes: the stately side by side with the sordid; the traditional vying with the modern, growth, change, displacement.

As you know, Washington has a large Negro population. There was a time when these citizens were not an integral part of life as a whole in Washington. Today they are slowly taking their rightful place among us.

Construction of the beautiful Supreme Court Building—that highest Court of the land which so recently handed down the decision on segregation—displaced hundreds of Negro families. The splendrous marble building which is soon to house the Teamsters Union; and the New Senate Office Building, now in process of building, likewise displaced their hundreds.

Where have these families gone? They are already becoming integrated in all areas of our Capital City. We are indeed setting an example to the Nation.

THE SECRETARY AT WORK ON CAPITOL HILL

Now where is the secretary in all of this—the young woman whom we are honoring today?

Picture her on Capitol Hill, representing the 48 stars in our flag, coming from every walk of life, laboring for every field of endeavor.

In a word, she is all of us.

Can she remain apart from all I have just discussed? I think not. As she emerges in the evening from buildings on the Hill you might think her day's work was over. But like you who have achieved success the hard way, she too must fill some portion of her evening hours with study and more work.

She stops at the beautiful Library of Congress—Congress' own Library—the largest in the world, to gather statistics. Passing through the portals and down the ornate corridors to the comfortable Reading Room, she ponders the timeless words of Francis Bacon:

"Reading maketh a full man; conference a ready man; and writing an exact man."

Going home that evening to retire before another long day of work, is her mind quite free of the issues argued that day in the Halls of Congress? Not entirely. Not if she is the secretary who senses the need. You may be sure that, like her own Member of Congress, the problems and decisions of the day—for constituent and the Nation—weigh upon her thought.

There was the problem of sudden death in the family of a boy serving in our Armed Forces. Had they done everything possible to bring him home?

There was the pitiful letter from the aging widow of a Spanish-American war veteran. What help was there for her?

There was the group of farmers eager to have the Congressman understand the responsibilities they bear in feeding the American people.

There were conflicting engagements on the calendar. Had the most important ones been given preference?

The mail that day had brought more than the usual requests for assistance in the knotty cases of immigrants and refugees seeking asylum in our country.

A constituent dropped in unexpectedly from back home. The constituent is indeed the most important person on Capitol Hill. He must be given time to tell his story to the Congressman before leaving Washington. But when? Can the secretary do the impossible and arrange a meeting when the Member must be closeted all day in executive hearings, keeping one eye on the floor, where rollcalls are expected, and the other on his office?

When will the Congressman write the speech which must be delivered that weekend in his district.

True, there is aid from the experienced staff to deal with all these problems. In some congressional offices there is the legal expert who carefully scans the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each morning, keeps track of the issues, their meaning, and the status of bills on the legislative calendars.

There is the experienced researcher and writer, constructing speeches for the Member out of scraps he has written on the backs of envelopes, preparing statements for the press.

There are the countless tasks which no machine yet conceived can do: the gracious notes of thanks, preparing tickets for travel, keeping harmony between overworked staff members, parceling out the work from an incoming mail basket filled six times each day by mail handlers within the building. The eternal jangling of the phones causes continuous interruptions, but telephone voices must show no irritation.

Time and again it is proven that the secretary, or the person in the executive position, must rely on that something which we like to call the sixth sense to make everything click like a precision instrument.

Even Sally Brown must rely on this sixth sense.

Who is Sally Brown?

Sally is gay and pretty and young. She had 2 years of junior college and 3 months at business school. Her grades were good. She hurried through business school because of general aptitudes and her eagerness to be earning.

Sally is willing to learn, if someone is willing to teach her. She tries to keep personal telephone calls to a minimum, to come

to work on time, and to work fairly constantly between breaks for coffee, lunch, coffee, and going home. She's even willing to cut her lunch period short if she must fly home at 5 for an early date.

But, friends, this young woman, except for some miracle of circumstance, is not long for our profession. She is on her way to a more exciting job, a long vacation, or whatever else will give relief from humdrum routine and the business of getting ahead—way ahead.

Her job is primarily for the purpose of earning a livelihood. She is perhaps filling a gap between young womanhood and marriage.

Now, I will not argue as to whether Sally and Joe will make a happy union, since this most wonderful institution of matrimony itself takes talent and imagination, sacrifice, and, above all, devotion to ideals.

Fortunately for Sally, American enterprise furnishes thousands of opportunities to keep her gainfully employed during this interim state of existence. But it is sad to realize that this young woman will miss the opportunities everywhere prevalent—in every business endeavor—to apply her talents in a way to pay rich rewards to herself and her employer.

Friends, I have not come to Youngstown today to speak about Sally Brown, because she is not representative of the secretary who has won laurels for our profession over the decades.

There is an extraordinary shortage of expert secretaries today. Despite the Sally Browns, and despite the fact that employers are paying higher salaries than ever before, there just aren't enough of them to care for the Nation's business.

AMERICA'S MECHANICAL SERVANTS

The wonders of the 20th century have brought to offices the marvelous machines and timesavers of which we are all familiar. They have literally taken labor off the backs and out from under the fingers of stenographers, typists, bookkeepers, and many others.

Now I, at this point, pay tribute to these wonderful machines, and to the creative genius of the manufacturers who gave them to us.

Like many a GI stationed all over the world, I have seen the look of tragedy and suffering in the faces of our brothers and sisters in the Far East, staggering under backbreaking labor all their lives for want of the automatic servants which we in America take so much for granted.

I have seen the look of childlike wonder come into the eyes of an Indian bearer running his finger over the sharply honed edge of an American razor blade. I have seen a woman's finger caress a safety pin. I have found such booty as a sewing needle, a tube of tooth paste, a broken fountain pen, a can of milk, rolled up in a bit of dirty cloth and tucked away in a secret hiding place.

Friends, I repeat here something I have said many times before, that in the treasury of the Queen of Sheba, with its rare and priceless gems, its ivory, tapestries and cloth of gold, were not such riches as can be found today on a single counter of an American 5- and 10-cent store.

Let us think often of the genius behind the tools which have brought into practical being our American way of life. From the indispensible zipper to the powerful hydraulic presses which stamp out automobile bodies at a single blow, these are the servants of Americans. And we are fast introducing them to people all over the world for their comfort and their wellbeing, just as fast as they can be absorbed into their economies.

GOOD SECRETARIES ALWAYS IN DEMAND

Figures show that only about 15 percent of the offices in our country have accepted these mechanical timesavers.

But I submit, friends, that if and when every business establishment in our Nation has the means to buy every modern machine invented, they will not have engaged the heart and soul of the secretary, or that sixth sense by which she has grown into a citizen with specific and definite responsibilities.

The bell tolls today for secretaries everywhere. They no longer dare to look upon their profession as a source of livelihood only—necessary as that is to us all. The secretary can and must create the power to serve her fellowman and her country with more skill than ever before, and with more dedication of purpose.

Her services are demanded even beyond the boundaries of our country. I was told just this week how many women are needed today in our foreign service. They must of course have adequate education, and meet other standards, but first and foremost they must have an appreciation for the high significance of serving their country abroad. Many women in our foreign service have risen to posts of great importance due to the faithful application of the talents which they took to their posts.

The age is past when the secretary's share in our common heritage was insignificant. Ours is no more a society which excludes certain professions from full participation in duties and privileges.

AMERICA THE BASTION OF FREEDOM

America has accepted world leadership with all its costs and dangers. We have become the most prosperous and dynamic unit of production the human race has ever known.

We are a vast empire with an enormous reach into all the oceans, and with obligations and responsibilities on every continent.

But all around these continents of the Americas there is dreadful evidence of man's inhumanity to man. There are countries where oppression represents a threat to our own borders. In these countries men are not free but are deprived of those inalienable rights upon which our own way of life is based and which we take so much for granted.

Here in Youngstown you make steel. In many countries behind the Iron Curtain citizens peer out from behind prison cells of steel.

Recently Secretary of State John Foster Dulles said in Washington: "Today a third of the world's population—800 million people—like in a nightmare world which has no counterpart in the world of reality."

And wasn't it Abraham Lincoln was expressed the conviction that the ideals of freedom contained in the Declaration of Independence should "give hope to all the world for all future time."

Not only have those words of Lincoln not yet materialized, but our country is in a position today of having to defend its own freedoms.

Why are these freedoms in danger?

Because totalitarianism, which today enslaves 800 million people is trying to persuade these people that life in America under our constitutional process of government is worse than life in concentration camps.

If these 800 million people are persuaded to believe these pernicious lies, it may be very difficult to keep totalitarianism away from our borders.

VOICE OF AMERICA

America, therefore, is faced with the important problem of trying to get in touch with these people, to tell them the true story about our country and our way of life. We are not telling them that we are going to liberate them—let's be clear about that—nor are we trying to force our way of life upon them. But we are trying to explain that we truly mean it when we say that we want to live at peace with the entire world.

The Secretary then, like every citizen who loves his freedom, should solemnly consider the meaning of the activities of that agency of Government which we call the Voice of America. Its vast network of powerful transmitters is carrying America's message in 38 languages to the oppressed of the world.

Through this agency, as Mr. Dulles said, 800 million people of the world are receiving the only "gleam of truth, and perhaps the hope and courage to keep them alive."

It is possibly too early to tell what the true effectiveness of this costly program is. What we do know is that the best experts of Soviet Russia have put millions of dollars into the most modern jamming apparatus that can be contrived in an attempt to prevent the beams coming from America from reaching the ears of millions behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

In a few minutes you will see a short film descriptive of the operation of this dynamic program.

May I say at this point that the United States Information Agency is today recruiting people—both men and women—for its staffs at home and abroad.

This Agency is not alone in needing able secretaries to fill the many vacant posts through Government. The point to remember is that special requirements are needed for each of them, and proper application should be made to the respective agencies. Congressional offices don't get you these jobs, but are happy to supply information as to how applications can be made.

THE CHALLENGE TO AMERICANS ALL

In conclusion, may I say that a more somber word of warning was never written in any age than that which we find inscribed on the beautiful Archives Building in Washington: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

The challenges of the 20th century and the atomic age call for dedicated men and women to carry the burdens of high office.

One thing is sure. What the most insignificant citizen feels unable to do, his Congressman—perhaps even his President—may not be able to do. Because, ladies and gentlemen, the President, your Senators, and your Representatives in this free country of ours, are the people.

My appeal to secretaries then, is:

Be not just skilled and alert in carrying out the functions of our profession, but ready and eager to offer a higher service by understanding both our domestic and foreign policies.

Remember that no individual or no smallest private industry can exist today apart from those interests and responsibilities which are the lot of our Government to carry. And because we stand closer than ever to the bastions where a life-and-death struggle may be going on in defense of our freedom, it is indeed a moment of grave importance to us all.

When foreboding clouds threatened the beloved country of Abraham Lincoln in 1861, as he took leave of his friends in Springfield, he spoke certain words which have deep meaning, I believe, for America today.

I could not do better than to leave these immortal words with you:

"Without the assistance of that Divine Being, I cannot succeed. With that assistance, I cannot fail. Trusting in Him, who can go with me, and remain with you, and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well."

A TRIBUTE TO THE AMERICAN SECRETARY, NATIONAL SECRETARIES' WEEK, APRIL 23–30, AND NATIONAL SECRETARIES' DAY, APRIL 27

In keeping with the best traditions of their profession, secretaries throughout the United States are shouldering vital responsibilities. They are performing important roles in commerce, industry, and government, and are bringing to their positions a wider knowledge of world affairs and of the affairs of business than was considered a necessary part of their sphere in the past.

The American secretary is an integral part of the economy which has brought to the world the American way of life—free enterprise, freedom of choice, and the highest standards of living existing in today's troubled world.

To honor the secretaries already performing their duties with diligence; to pay tribute to those constantly striving to improve their skills and abilities better to equip themselves as a part of the management team; and to encourage others to enter this worthy profession, it is essential that rightful recognition be given.

Therefore, during this special week we should fully honor the first lady of business—the American secretary.

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.
LILYAN MILLER,
President, National Secretary Association.
SHELDON F. HALL,
President, Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute.

Political Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, during the past two decades we have heard much about taking the Post Office Department out of politics and during that time we have seen the postmasterships in three major class post offices placed under civil service.

Suddenly we find a revival of politics in postal legislation in the form of the postal pay bill that is packed with inequities and which I am confident will be vetoed by the President.

I am for a pay increase for our postal employees, and I was for a pay increase for this fine group of workers when the proposal was before us last year. I am sure all Members of the House are for a pay increase for these people. But in both instances the chances of a pay raise have been jeopardized by political involvements.

Appearing in the May 10 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald was an editorial on this pay legislation which pretty clearly sets forth the reasons why this particular bill should not be passed and why a clean-cut, equitable raise should be made available to the postal workers without further delay.

The editorial follows:

POLITICAL PAY BILL

Postmaster General Summerfield is justified in his vehement opposition to the postal pay bill which the House approved yesterday. The size of the pay increase is not the governing consideration. The fact that the bill is political in origin and discriminatory in effect is what makes it unacceptable.

President Eisenhower asked for a pay increase for postal workers of approximately 7.6 percent. Congress boosted the increase to 8.8 percent. If there were no other consideration this would not be a significant difference—certainly not enough to justify a veto even though postal workers have been given a larger increase than classified employees. But the bill as passed would remove some of the incentive for better work because of discriminations against the most responsible officials. It would seriously distort the pay patterns for the different grades that every organization finds necessary for employee morale. As Mr. Summerfield said, it would be "utterly impossible to administer with fairness" and would "invite widespread dissatisfaction and serious morale problems."

It is a vicious thing to play partisan politics with Federal pay bills. If such practices continue a great many Federal employees will suffer in the long run. Only those with the strongest political organizations will benefit in the short run. By organizing politically they put Federal employees directly into the partisan squabbles they are supposed to avoid. These are the evils of the bill the House passed yesterday and which the Senate is apparently determined to pass on Wednesday.

The President, therefore, has no reasonable alternative but to veto it in the hope that Congress will come to its senses and pass another bill without the partisan flavor. The postal workers were denied an increase last year because of the same kind of politics. They ought not to be made to suffer another delay because of congressional jockeying for political favors.

The States Stage a Comeback

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address given by our courageous Secretary of Labor, James P. Mitchell, at the 21st Conference on State Labor Legislation, held in Washington on May 11, 1955. This speech is particularly germane within the President's efforts to remove the Federal Government from various areas of State responsibility.

THE STATES STAGE A COMEBACK

(Address by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell to the 21st Conference on State Labor Legislation, Washington, D. C., May 11, 1955)

It is my privilege and pleasure to welcome you to the Nation's Capital and to the 21st Conference on State Labor Legislation.

Because many of you are here for the first time, let me say that this conference is a voluntary assembly. It commits nobody to anything. We want to promote free discussion on the various aspects of State labor legislation and administration. We believe the voluntary character of this meeting is its strength. Ideas grow best on free soil.

As the Nation's Capital, Washington is the symbol, not the source, of the Nation's strength. Our strength is in our people. It is in the country at large that we see in operation the real fiber and backbone of our democracy. It is in the thousands of cities and villages from coast to coast that the people of this country live out their daily lives, raise the food we eat, manufacture the products we use, and develop the culture and standard of living which are significant American contributions to civilization.

You are here as the representatives of those people. Consequently, you are more important in the order of things than we.

There is occurring in the United States today a fundamental change in the course of Government. I hope that this change will be apparent at this conference.

Since the founding of our country, the States have been the great social innovators which first developed new social and economic legislation and originated programs to improve the welfare of working people. In the course of the past 20 years, we have tended to forget that the first minimum-wage laws and general maximum-hours laws were State statutes, that workmen's compensation was developed by the States, that the first child-labor laws were State statutes.

In these and other areas, the States have traditionally led the way. And, thanks to President Eisenhower, they are leading the way once again.

This does not mean that the Federal Government does not have its responsibilities. Quite to the contrary, there are numerous areas where it is incumbent upon the Federal Government to promote the welfare of wage earners. Last year, President Eisenhower recommended and the Congress enacted legislation to provide extension of coverage and an increase in benefits under the Social Security Act and the first Federal extension of coverage of the unemployment-insurance system since it was created in 1935. This year, the President has recommended a 20-percent increase in the Federal minimum wage and a substantial extension of coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the enactment of a general hours law, and temporary disability insurance for workers in the District of Columbia. These are all evidences of the Federal Government's determination to assume its proper role and exercise its responsibilities in the social and economic fields.

The country's workers are vitally interested in a comeback now being staged by the State governments. The States are once again demonstrating to the delight of their friends and the surprise of their critics that they can meet the social and economic needs of their own citizens. They are showing that they can in many ways do more for working people than it is possible or practicable for the Federal Government to do. In addition they can adapt their legislation to the special needs of their State and thus help their people make more progress in certain areas than they sometimes can under a more general Federal law which has to be broad enough to apply to all 48 States.

When the sovereign States of 1787 banded together in a Federal Government under a Constitution, they gave up some of their sovereignty. They were careful, however, to declare in 1791 in the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Shortly after President Eisenhower took office, he stated that "The present division of activities between Federal and State Governments, including their local subdivisions, is the product of more than a century and a half of piecemeal and often haphazard growth. This growth in recent decades has proceeded at a speed defying order and efficiency. One program after another has been launched to meet emergencies and expanding public needs. Time has rarely been taken for thoughtful attention to the effects of these actions on the basic structure of our Federal-State system of government.

"Now there is need to review and assess, with prudence and foresight, the proper roles of the Federal, State, and local governments. In many cases, especially within the past 20 years, the Federal Government has entered fields which, under our Constitution, are the primary responsibilities of State and local governments. This has tended to blur the responsibilities of local government. It has led to duplication and waste."

The Eisenhower administration has made a determined effort to encourage social and

economic progress by the free action of labor and management. We have also encouraged the State governments to develop their own labor standards for their own citizens and thereby improve the social and economic welfare of all the workers in all the States.

We have felt certain that progress could be achieved and that people's needs and hopes would be met and satisfied more easily, fully, and economically if they took action to help themselves or if their State Governments took action to help them than if sole or even primary reliance were placed on the Federal Government.

The President in his state of the Union message and economic reports has recognized the appropriate role of the States and has urged them to act to promote social and economic progress. In addition, I have followed up the President's request by writing to the State governors and calling upon them to improve their labor legislation. In meetings with State governors and in speeches to groups around the country I have consistently advocated improved labor legislation by the States.

One of our basic needs is the development of more effective labor standards legislation in the United States. For the past 20 years or so the supporters of this type of legislation have hammered away at the Congress, trying to improve labor standards largely through Federal legislation. It has been shown that, although there are some broad areas where Federal laws are very necessary and effective, such as the Social Security Act and Fair Labor Standards Act, for example, there are others where, as President Eisenhower said, Federal centralization breeds duplication between Federal and State efforts and waste of the taxpayers' money.

The philosophy of President Eisenhower and his administration is that, as far as possible, greater responsibility for labor standards legislation should be exercised by the States, since they are in a peculiarly good position to know their own needs.

Admittedly this approach usually takes more time and requires both more effort and more patience than Federal action would. It builds a sounder structure, however, and one that is likely to last longer. It is easier to enact one Federal law than 48 State laws. On the other hand, it is also easier to repeal one Federal law than 48 State laws. In addition, of course, State legislatures can make those variations and special provisions required to accommodate the law to the local situation and the needs of the people affected.

This campaign is paying off. The 1955 State legislative sessions are not over, but we already have had more State activity on behalf of workers than has been achieved at any time since 1939. The record to date demonstrates that an effective Federal-State partnership in the labor field can be developed and that significant and lasting progress in social and economic legislation can be made by encouraging State action.

I should like to summarize the action taken by the States so far this year. The legislatures of 45 States (all except Kentucky, Mississippi, and Virginia) and the 2 Territories have met in regular session in 1955. They have been active in every aspect of labor standards legislation.

Workmen's compensation laws exist in every State. Amendments to strengthen workmen's compensation laws were introduced in almost every legislature, and most of these included one or more types of increased benefits for workers. In 20 States,[1] Alaska, and Hawaii, workmen's compensation amendments have been approved; and in all but 2 of these, benefits of one or more types were raised. In some States all types of benefits were raised. Two States increased the maximum weekly benefits for temporary total disability to $40 or more, making a total of 13 jurisdictions now providing weekly benefits of $40 or more.

Bills amending unemployment insurance laws were introduced in practically all State legislatures. Maximum weekly benefits have been increased in 18 States,[2] Alaska and Hawaii. Eight States, Alaska and Hawaii now have a basic maximum weekly benefit above $30, and six others have increased theirs to $30, bringing the total of such States to 19. The 29 States which have a maximum of $30 or better account for over 68 percent of all the workers in the country covered by unemployment insurance laws.

Pennsylvania has changed its 26-week variable duration period to a 30-week uniform duration period. Vermont increased its 20-week uniform duration period to 26 weeks. Five States now have a 26-week uniform duration period.

Rhode Island extended coverage to employers of one or more, and New York extended coverage to employers of 3 or more as of January 1, 1956, and to 2 or more on January 1, 1957. Rhode Island also extended coverage to State employees, with elective coverage for employees of political subdivisions.

There appears to be no more activity in the direction of restrictive disqualification legislation than in previous sessions.

Minimum-wage bills were introduced in 33 States and two Territories, including 11 States without minimum wage laws. In 3 of these 11 States (Idaho, New Mexico, and Wyoming) laws have been enacted. All three apply to both men and women. All three set a 75-cent basic minimum-wage rate. These three laws have broad coverage, including retail and wholesale trade. In Nevada and Alaska existing laws were amended. In Nevada the statutory rate of 75 cents an hour for women was raised to 87½ cents. The Alaska law, as amended, applies to both men and women, and sets a $1.25 minimum hourly rate, with overtime required at time and one-half for hours in excess of a 8 a day or 40 a week.

Many bills relating to temporary disability insurance have been introduced in State legislatures. Most of these are proposed amendments to the four existing laws (California, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island). In eight other States, the bills would create new temporary disability insurance programs, most frequently coordinated with the State unemployment insurance program. In his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower called for the enactment of a temporary disability insurance law in the District of Columbia.

Migratory farmworkers would be affected by bills introduced in 20 State legislatures this year relating to labor standards for agricultural workers. Most of the bills would provide for coverage of hired farmworkers under workmen's compensation, minimum-wage, and child-labor laws and for the regulation of labor contractors and labor camps.

The State of Washington has enacted a law providing for regulation of labor contractors, and New York continued its joint legislative committee on migrant labor.

Bills still pending in the State legislatures would bring agricultural workers under coverage of workmen's compensation laws, regulate labor camps in which migrants are housed, or set up commissions to study migrant labor problems. In two States (Connecticut and Pennsylvania) agricultural workers would be brought under minimum-wage laws.

Equal-pay bills were introduced in 8 States not formerly having such laws, and amendments were proposed to 4 existing laws. Arkansas, Colorado, and Oregon have passed equal-pay laws this year for the first time, bringing to 17 the number of States and Territories with such acts. Eighteen States introduced amendments to other labor laws for women, such as regulation of hours of work and provision for meal and rest periods. In general these amendments would add flexibility to existing laws.

Maryland, Nevada, and Hawaii have adopted new industrial safety laws which would strengthen the States' accident prevention programs. The Maryland law transfers the safety activities, formerly spread among several departments, to a safety division in the department of labor and industry. Nevada created a new industrial safety department in the industrial commission; the act provides for safety inspectors and tightens the provisions relating to safety orders. The Hawaii amendment generally strengthens the act and provides for additional safety engineers and inspectors.

A New York law has been approved that makes provision for special counseling and placement service by the labor department to persons over 45 years of age.

This action by the States does not in all cases meet President Eisenhower's and my recommendations. It does, nevertheless, indicate substantial efforts on the part of the States to exercise their responsibility for improving State labor legislation and carrying out their obligation to promote the welfare of their people.

This is a trend which I am sure the Founding Fathers would applaud. In the 10th amendment to the Constitution they carefully associated the States and the people as the reservoirs of governmental power. By placing primary emphasis on the discharge of their responsibilities the State governments are showing that they were correct when they insisted they could and would use this power wisely.

The Eisenhower administration is devoted to progress for working people. We believe that the Federal Government is not the sole source of the facilities and know-how for promoting the welfare of workers. Labor, management, and State and local governments are also willing and able to help improve the well-being of working men and women. With the encouragement of President Eisenhower and his administration, labor, management, and the State and local governments are assuming their responsibilities in this area and are doing a good job.

[1] Arizona, Colorado, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Wyoming.

[2] Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington.

A Statement on American Abundance and World Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement which was recently issued by 88 American religious leaders throughout the country:

A STATEMENT ON AMERICAN ABUNDANCE AND WORLD NEED

God has blessed the United States of America with abundance. A vast endow-

ment of natural resources, brilliant achievements in science and technology, a free society, and a dynamic economy have united to bring us to heights of material productivity never before known to mankind. Both our natural resources and our human skills of hand and brain are the gifts of God. We are His creatures and stewards in His vineyard.

The abundance which is ours and the potential productivity within our grasp are at once blessings to be enjoyed and a trust to be administered in the name of God and in the service of mankind.

It is contrary to the will of God that islands of prosperity should persist amid oceans of poverty, hunger, and distress. Bread for myself is a material concern; bread for my brother is a spiritual concern.

In a moral universe the continued prosperity of one nation can only be justified by its faithful and courageous efforts to make comparable abundance available to all nations.

These basic ethical considerations point toward certain goals which should be firm guides to national policies and programs. In the domestic sphere the appropriate goals are an expanding peacetime economy and equitable distribution of the national product. These goals are fundamental because as a nation we cannot share what we do not possess.

In the international sphere, America's goal should be greatly expanded sharing of our material abundance, our technical skills and the dynamic spirit of a free society. This goal must be pursued in a genuine spirit of international friendship and good will. Although our efforts should always be dedicated to the advancement of free institutions and opposed to any form of totalitarianism, we must avoid making our participation contingent upon political conformity or subservience on the part of other nations.

We pledge ourselves, and we call upon our national leaders, both in the social sciences and in the practical realms of business, labor, agriculture, and politics, to work together for the following specific policies and programs:

1. National economic policies designed to achieve and maintain full employment with full and efficient production both in industry and agriculture. With growing population, increasing labor force and mounting productivity this means not a level, but an annually rising gross national product.

2. Industrial wage and agricultural price policies which will produce a just and equitable distribution of consumer purchasing power throughout the economy.

3. Food and nutrition programs which will assure adequate and healthful diets for all Americans and for as many as can be reached and served abroad.

4. Expanded programs of technical assistance in the fundamental work of world economic and social development.

5. International trade and monetary policies designed to facilitate and expand the international flow of goods and services. Appropriate public aid should be provided to agricultural and industrial enterprises facing adjustments as trade barriers are progressively removed.

6. Foreign economic aid programs geared to meet situations of emergency and long-time human need. For this purpose both the offices of Government and of the voluntary and religious agencies should be used.

In order to minimize suspicions of nationalistic or imperialistic motivation on the part of the United States, to reduce international tension, and to promote world peace, we believe the following three principles should be observed in all programs of foreign trade, aid, and technical assistance:

(a) Complete separation of United States economic and technical aid from programs of military aid.

(b) Full utilization of private and nongovernmental agencies in trade, aid, and technical-assistance programs.

(c) Maximum utilization of the United Nations and the specialized agencies associated with it.

In the last analysis, American policies and programs are determined by the will of the people. This is the glory of our free and democratic society. Therefore, our ultimate appeal is to the people of America. We call upon all Americans of moral idealism and righteous conviction to join us and their neighbors in an all-out crusade to employ the God-given abundance of America in an expanded program of world development, human progress, and international peace.

"And they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruninghooks; nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more; but they shall sit, every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid"—Micah 4: 3–4.

This statement is endorsed and supported by the following persons:

From the Catholic community:

Most. Rev. William T. Mulloy, D. D., Bishop of Covington, Ky.; Most Rev. Edwin V. O'Hara, D. D., Archbishop of Kansas City, Mo.; Most Rev. John P. Treacy, D. D., Bishop of LaCrosse, Wis.; Most Rev. Albert R. Zuroweste, D. D., Bishop of Belleville, Ill.; Rev. A. J. Adams, S. J., St. Marys, Kans.; Very Rev. Urban Baer, Eastman, Wis.; the Rev. Paul J. Brinker, Mayslick, Ky.; the Rev. Francis A. Candon, Fairfield, Vt.; the Rev. Michael P. Dineen, Des Moines, Iowa; Rt. Rev. Msgr. J. F. Frommherz, Ottoville, Ohio; the Rev. J. B. Gremillion, Shreveport, La.; Very Rev. Msgr. George G. Higgins, Washington, D. C.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. George J. Hildner, V. F., Villa Ridge, Mo.; Mr. Emerson Hynes, Collegeville, Minn.; the Rev. Joseph Hylden, Edgeley, N. Dak.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Luigi G. Ligutti, Des Moines, Iowa; the Rev. Benjamin L. Masse, S. J., New York, N. Y.; the Rev. Frederick McGuire, C. M., Washington, D. C.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. E. G. Murray, Roslindale, Mass.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady, Washington, D. C.; the Rev. Edward W. O'Rourke, Champaign, Ill.; Miss Betsy Phelan, Kansas City, Mo.; Miss Pauline Reynolds, Fargo, N. Dak.; Dr. Paul Sacco, Davenport, Iowa; Mr. Martin Salm, Chilton, Wis.; Dr. Elmer L. Sauer, Champaign, Ill.; the Rev. Wilfred J. Schuster, Brodhead, Wis.; the Rev. Alexander O. Sigur, Lafayette, La.; Dr. Paul O. Taff, Ames, Iowa; Mr. Edward C. Trainer, West Trenton, N. J.; the Rev. James L. Vizzard, S. J., Santa Clara, Calif.; the Rev. J. A. Wagner, West Point, Iowa; the Rev. Irvin R. Will, Sigel, Ill.

From the Jewish community:

Mr. Maxwell Abbell, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. Samuel Belkin, New York, N. Y.; Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, Rochester, N. Y., Saul Bernstein; Rabbi Morris Dembowitz, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, New York, N. Y.; Judge Solomon Elsner, Hartford, Conn.; Irving M. Engel; Moses Feuerstein; Mr. Julian Freeman, Indianapolis, Ind.; Rabbi Israel Goldstein, New York, N. Y.; Mr. I. Cyrus Gordon, Rockville Center, N. Y.; Adolph Held, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Morris Iushewitz, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Irving Kane, Cleveland, Ohio; Rabbi Israel Klavan; Rabbi Eugene Lipman, 838 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Hon. Abraham Multer, Washington, D. C.; Mr. Charles Rosengarten, Waterbury, Conn.; Dr. Norman Salit, New York, N. Y.; Rabbi Bernard Segal, New York, N. Y.; Bernard H. Trager, Bridgeport, Conn.

From the Protestant community:

Dr. John C. Bennett, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. Harold A. Bosley, Evanston, Ill.; Dr. Allan Knight Chalmers, Boston, Mass.; Dr. Albert Buckner Coe, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Clifford Earle, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Shirley E. Greene, Denver, Colo.; Dr. Luther A. Gotwald, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Ernest A. Gross, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Cameron P. Hall, New York, N. Y.; Mr. M. Glenn Harding, Baltimore, Md.; Mr. Paul Hutchinson, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. F. Ernest Johnson, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Benson Y. Landis, New York, N. Y.; Bishop William C. Martin, Dallas, Tex; Rev L. B. Moseley, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Dr. Reuben E. Nelson, New York, N. Y.; Bishop D. Ward Nichols, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Victor Obenhaus, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. C. Arild Olsen, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Washington, D. C.; Rev. Albert J. Penner, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Clarence Pickett, Philadelphia, Pa.; Very Rev. James A. Pike, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Clyde Rogers, Columbus, Ohio; Very Rev. Francis B. Sayre, Jr., Washington, D. C.; Rt. Rev. Henry Knox Sherrill, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Ralph Sockman, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Harry B. Taylor, Cleveland, Ohio; Rev. Norris L. Tibbetts, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Walter W. Van Kirk, New York, N. Y.; Dr. James E. Wagner, Philadelphia, Pa.; Bishop Lloyd C. Wicke, Pittsburgh, Pa.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

Appendix

The Nation Needs an Adequate Reserve

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, conditions which confront the free world today make it mandatory that the United States and its Allies look to all aspects of their security.

The nature of the Communist threat has remained basically unchanged.

World War II saw the Soviet Union emerge as the greatest single power on earth next to the United States.

But when the United States and the remainder of the Allies who had fought against the Axis Powers disarmed after that war, the Soviet Union remained fully mobilized, and began a feverish buildup of those areas of its military might which the war had depleted.

From this fact has sprung the basic misery of the present time—which is a world threatened by the possibility that unrestrained military destruction will be unleashed upon mankind.

From their position of power, it was an easy thing for the Reds to ignore promises and honorable commitments previously made and to further advance world communism.

In close cooperation with the Soviet forces stand the armed millions of Communist China, whose leaders continue to be dependent upon the Kremlin for the industrial sinews which their war machine requires.

Here it is pertinent to note that about 3 months ago the Peiping government announced a vast overhaul of its Armed Forces, and a compulsory program of active and reserve military service for every man from the age of 18 until he reaches his 40th birthday.

It requires little imagination to surmise the total numbers of trained men any such program as this will provide the Chinese Communist military planners.

Thus the Communist powers of the world stand today—armed to the teeth and determined to grow even stronger in every military capacity.

From their position of massive armed might they support their worldwide program of infiltration and subversion, espionage, intimidation, and outright challenge of democratic processes in country after country.

At the present time, most of the tension forthcoming as a result of these facts centers around the area of the Formosa Straits, and in the region of the China coast.

In the past, however, and in much the same fashion, the deadly influence of massive Communist military power has caused upheaval, conflict, and even open war in areas like Czechoslovakia, Greece, Berlin, Iran, Korea, Indochina, first one and then the other.

So what we face today in the creeping expansion of communism backed by hundreds of divisions, guns, bombs, and a manpower supply running into the millions, is a long-term challenge to the free nations of the world, and to every individual living in them.

The United States today is making response to this fundamental threat in a variety of ways.

The bonds with our allies are being strengthened—in NATO, in the London and Paris accords, in the Manila and Rio pacts, and in our mutual-defense treaties.

More than 40 free nations, including the United States, have allied themselves in regional defense arrangements.

Collectively our allies are stronger today than ever.

The philosophy of our Government within this framework of alliances is to confront the world at all times with a willingness to deal in good faith, but to do so from a realistic position of strength, rather than weakness.

The best hope this Nation has for peace, along with its allies, is to maintain such a position of strength from which it can work to reduce world tensions.

For this we require a stable and predictable military-defense program free of the feast-and-famine expediency of other years, and providing a solid foundation for balance in all our service branches.

The alternative is to court fatal weaknesses which might some day mean another, and far worse, Pearl Harbor right at our own front doorstep.

We must look at America's defense program today with a realistic and sensible eye to our world commitments, the nature of the times, and the uncertainties of the future.

The President has recommended the maintenance of an active-forces strength of approximately 2,850,000 at an annual budget cost of around $34 billion.

Within this framework, he has put emphasis on the existence of those forces and facilities for which the United States, uniquely among free nations, is best suited.

The proposed strength levels are based on world conditions at present.

They are based on the improved military preparedness of our allies, the end of fighting in Korea and Indochina, improved weapons, better use of our manpower, expected improvements in the future, the continuing Communist threat and a host of other factors.

With all these factors in mind, our preparedness picture will be incomplete without a revitalized and stimulated Reserve program which will serve as a ready backstop to our active forces, providing us with a swiftly mobilizable strength for either emergency situations or the long haul of a protracted cold war.

The reason why a national Reserve plan is being offered to Congress today is that the present situation of our reserves requires corrective action in accordance with the valid military requirements of this Nation.

Generally speaking, this involves the correction of six broad problems which currently prevent our reserve program from being all that it could be.

I should like to discuss these problems, and indicate how the national reserve plan will afford constructive action.

The first problem in need of correction lies in the area of the reserve structure.

The Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 established two principal reserve categories, the Ready Reserve and the Standby Reserve, designating liability for service during emergencies.

As conceived, the Ready Reserve, within a 1.5 million strength ceiling, was to contain the units and individuals to be employed in an emergency proclaimed by the President, and to be mobilized first in a general emergency.

The Standby Reserve was to contain units and individuals which, together with those of the Ready Reserve, would constitute the reserve mobilization base for a general emergency or war.

But this Reserve structure has not not functioned in practice in the way it was intended.

In practice as opposed to theory, the strength of the Ready Reserve has increased far in excess of its statutory limit, yet it does not contain those organized forces which it is supposed to have for its mobilization duties.

The Standby Reserve, on the other hand, has experienced a shortage of personnel, so that it has not been feasible to organize units in it.

It is interesting to note the reasons why this particular situation has developed.

Transfer from the Ready Reserve to the Standby Reserve is accomplished at the request of the individual.

Members serving in the Reserve under a statutory obligation are eligible for transfer only as a result of satisfactory participation in a Reserve training program.

But the great bulk of individuals who have moved into the Ready Reserve upon release from active duty to complete

their obligation, have simply chosen to sit it out rather than join a training program.

The Ready Reserve has become in large part a Reserve pool increasing in size, but becoming relatively less ready from the standpoint of containing organized and trained forces.

Recent strength figures show that the Ready Reserve contains 2,546,000, including 330,000 on active duty, while the Standby Reserve contains only about 200,000 members, of whom 140,000, or 67 percent, are on the inactive status list.

In the event of mobilization, the task of determining which of these millions of reservists should be ordered to service, and which would be essential in civilian pursuits, would fall on the military, and would constitute dangerous delay in event of mobilization.

The national Reserve plan would see the Ready Reserve become an organized force of trained units and individuals.

It would be of size and composition to constitute the reserve base for initial phases of a general mobilization, and would meet Presidentially proclaimed emergencies as well.

The Standby Reserve would become a nonorganized reserve pool from which experienced personnel would be selected for those forces to be developed in the secondary phases of a general mobilization.

On the basis of current planned strengths of 2.88 million for the active forces, Ready Reserve requirements have been determined to be 2.9 million men.

The goal for meeting these requirements is the end of fiscal year 1959.

It is expected that the Standby Reserve will reach a strength of 2 million by that time, but since they will be subject to selective recall, not all of this 2 million will be utilized in a mobilization.

To assure that the Ready Reserve will in fact be available in the event of mobilization, and to make certain of the least impact on the civilian economy as well, members of the Ready Reserve will be subject to a continuous screening process.

Under this process, men with civilian skills excess to military requirements, men with jobs in essential civilian activities or government, and those with excess military requirements will be transferred from Ready Reserve to Standby Reserve.

First consideration for such transfer will go to combat veterans.

Under the terms of this bill, the President may summon up to 1 million of the Ready Reservists in an emergency which he proclaims.

Any larger number will require congressional action.

The Standby Reserve will be called on a selective basis only in an emergency declared by the Congress.

With these changes, it is plain that the overall Reserve structure will be vastly improved, and placed upon a more functional and ready-to-go basis.

Problem No. 2 involves the fact that under present law there is no effective and practicable means to assure participation in Reserve training programs, and the incentives to participate have not alone achieved the desired result.

Of the 2.2 million members of the Ready Reserve not on active duty, only 700,000, or, roughly, 1 out of 3, are participating in paid training.

And within the approximately 700,000 in training, there is an imbalance in grade structure and a disproportionate ratio of officers to enlisted men.

Much discussion has attended this question of compliance with the proposed Reserve program, but in the last analysis the question is one of achieving an adequate and worthwhile Reserve program, or none at all.

The national Reserve plan provides reasonable compliance measures, involving one basic change by the committee.

This was the rejection of discharge under conditions other than honorable for noncomplying trainees, and the substitution of a required training period in its place.

Thus, those individuals who fail to attend required minimum drills and training may be involuntarily ordered to active training for as much as 45 days annually.

Experience has shown that a purely voluntary Reserve program will prove inadequate to our needs today.

What the national Reserve plan provides is a means whereby men who have a statutory obligation to serve a period of training in the Reserves will actually do so, rather than ignore that obligation entirely.

A third problem area centers around the requirement for a supply of initially trained young men to the Reserves or the National Guard.

The national Reserve plan proposes a limited 6-months' active duty program, followed by 7½ years of Ready Reserve or National Guard service.

The program will be carefully regulated by Presidential quota to avoid any adverse effect on Active Forces volunteer programs.

H. R. 5297 provides that this quota shall have a net minimum goal of 100,000 annually and a maximum of 250,000 net annually.

Under present law, men below the age of 18½ may voluntarily enter the National Guard and be deferred from induction for active service—so long as their service is satisfactory.

But the problem centers around the fact that these men come into the guard with no prior training whatsoever; consequently, their entry into National Guard units means giving them such training.

One result is a general lowering of the unit training level, as officers and experienced men concentrate on providing them with basic training.

A high percentage of National Guard enlisted personnel have not had the benefit of basic training.

Add to this a well-nigh prohibitive turnover rate among such personnel and the constant problem of combat officers drilling green recruits becomes even clearer.

H. R. 5297 includes a statutory requirement that National Guard strength must be maintained.

This leads to the fourth major problem area which is the fact that the National Guard does not presently have an assured supply of trained men.

The bill departs somewhat from previous practices, and the exclusively volunteer character of the guard, to meet this requirement.

It is desirable to keep this volunteer character to the greatest possible extent, but if strength levels are to be maintained, some kind of insurance must be provided to accomplish this purpose.

There is provision in the bill, as the President recommended last January, to assure a supply of trained personnel to the guard either by transfer of obligated reservists or by voluntary participation under the 6-month program.

H. R. 5297 would, therefore, make it possible to transfer men with Ready Reserve obligations to the National Guard, for the duration of their service period.

Such transfer, however, can be accomplished only upon request or approval of the governor.

In addition to this provision, young men before age 18 may enlist directly into the National Guard, take 6 months training with the active forces, and serve the remainder of a 7½-year obligation in the National Guard.

H. R. 5297 will provide the National Guard with two things: First, a supply of initially trained young men able to join units and proceed at once with advanced training, and second, insurance that if volunteer methods fail to provide adequate numbers to meet required strength levels, men leaving the active services may be transferred to guard units for the remainder of their Ready Reserve obligation.

Provisions of this kind are in the all-round interest of the National Guard and the general defense structure.

They will, in my opinion, provide us with a greatly strengthened and more appropriately trained guard organization.

The fifth problem with which H. R. 5297 deals, relates to the possibility of an attack against the United States coming at a time when National Guard units are required for duty away from their States.

Under present law States may not maintain troops in peacetime in addition to the National Guard.

Thus there is a period between the ordering of the National Guard into Federal service and the organizing of State militia, or home guard, when the State would have no troops available for internal security missions or support of civil defense.

The bill, accordingly, provides for the establishment of State defense forces in peacetime, in addition to the National Guard.

Here the bill clearly states that such State defense forces will be authorized in conformity with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, and as provided by the laws of the State.

Their numbers will be determined under defense regulations.

H. R. 5297 provides further that in peacetime such forces will be on an adequate basis for planning and organization, capable of rapid expansion in the event the Army or Air National Guard are ordered to Federal duty, or in emergencies declared by the Congress or the President.

These forces, composed principally of men ineligible for other service, could render great community service in the event of an attack, and in the absence of the guard.

The last problem considered under the new reserve program is that of the ROTC in the schools and colleges where it applies.

Basically, this involves providing an answer to the fact that current production of the ROTC program for mobilization requirements is greater than our active force requirements.

Equity considerations rule out deferment of ROTC graduates from military service when other draft-liable persons have been and must continue to be inducted for 24 months of active service.

Under H. R. 5297, all qualified ROTC graduates will receive their commissions.

The Department of Defense proposed to handle this administratively.

The committee did not accept this view and instead wrote into the bill a guaranty to commission all qualified Army and Air Force ROTC graduates.

On graduation, those excess to requirements of the active forces will be given 6 months of active training duty, after which they will be in the Reserves for the remainder of their service obligation.

As the committee has noted in the report, "excess to requirements" refers to numbers, and not to quality.

Provision of this kind with respect to the ROTC program, in the opinion of the committee, will greatly stimulate interest in this program, and improve its value to the overall defense effort.

These, then, are the 6 broad problems which are corrected by the program legislation offered in H. R. 5297.

There are, of course, many other aspects of this legislation which are not covered in my remarks, but I have wanted to talk about these problems in particular as a means of showing the positive features of the national Reserve plan.

It is a corrective plan, not something wild-eyed and new, and not something totally at variance with past experience.

It seeks to make certain needed improvements within the general framework of existing legislation, with the ultimate single objective of providing this country with a real Reserve, instead of one which merely exists on paper.

I believe the new Reserve program is going to deal fairly and competently with the manpower needs of all component services, including the National Guard in its State and Federal status.

I believe it will greatly strengthen our country and place the Reserves in each State across the Nation in a strong position—well equipped and trained in extensive facilities.

A realistic Reserve program to back up our active forces has become a simple commonsense necessity in this day of danger and tension.

The national Reserve plan has been evolved after better than 1 year of hard work and consultation on all levels of Government and after 3 months additional study and revision in the Armed Services Committee.

I believe we shall be taking one of the most shortsighted views in the history of this body if we do not give our full support to this measure.

It will provide our Nation with a very sizable increase in necessary strength, and what is more it will serve notice on potential enemies that we are determined to maintain all areas of our military readiness on an up-to-date and strengthened basis.

It will reinforce our basic philosophy of going forward to reduce world tensions from a position of strength.

Immigration and Naturalization Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, over the week-end, May 6 to 8, the executive board of the American Jewish Committee, a very fine and reputable organization, of which I am privileged to be an officer, held a meeting in Washington, D. C.

On the evening of May 7, the executive board sponsored a dinner at which Mr. Irving Engel, president of the American Jewish Committee, made a report on the current status of various public issues, and at which I, too, made a few remarks. A major portion of Mr. Engel's report dealt with our immigration and naturalization policies, which was also the subject of my remarks on that occasion.

I ask unanimous consent that the portion of Mr. Engel's address dealing with immigration be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, along with the remarks I made on the same subject.

There being no objection, the address and the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY IRVING M. ENGEL

America's immigration policies—as reflected in the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act and the operation of the Refugee Relief Act—cannot escape indictment as hurtful to the security of the free world. A 2-year review of their impact demonstrates that both have had the net effect of crippling our cold-war effort against communism.

The most hopeful sight in this dark picture is the fact that the Corsi affair has aroused nationwide concern that is shared by the administration and both political parties. Corsi's ouster should be understood as a final dramatic warning lest our so-called immigration and refugee relief acts be woven into a redtape curtain around the United States. Among the very people we should be welcoming to our side in the cold war are thousands of anti-Communists who have risked their lives to escape. Communist minefields could not stop them but the heartlessness of some American bureaucrats and lawmakers is preventing those would-be allies of the free world from joining us. Our own policies may thus prove the greatest boon to communism by setting up conditions that are practically impossible for refugees and escapees to meet. Communists are exploiting this opportunity militantly. With alarming success, they are propagandizing the thousands of people who fled from their rule but have been languishing in limbo for months and even years because we are denying them entry. The magnitude of this defeat cannot be underestimated because it will deter countless others behind the Iron Curtain from seeking asylum.

For its services in alerting America to these facts, the New York Times is to be commended. Its special reports from Munich on the plight of tens of thousands of refugees from the Soviet Union and its satellites should be studied by the Congress.

When Corsi sought to cut down the redtape curtain he not only encountered resistance, but was ousted as a reward for his efforts to bring about a long overdue liberalization of the law's operation.

Equally harmful is the McCarran-Walter Act which continues to deny us the benefits of a desirable flow of immigrants from the free world. Its racist and other repressive features are denying America fresh opportunities to attract people who will continue the process of enrichment just as has been done by immigrants in decades past. Apart from humanitarian reasons which urge us to admit these people, we should do so because it will be to our national interest. History proves how much of our well-being this Nation owes to immigrants and their descendants for their contributions to our economic and cultural progress and to our scientific preeminence in the fields of medicine, atomic research, electronics, etc.

Despite the fact that the President and members of both political parties have repeatedly emphasized the need to revise these harsh and unreasoning statutes and their administration, they remain unchanged. The American Jewish Committee believes that when the Senate Judiciary Committee opens hearings on measures to improve our immigration policies, it will have the opportunity to emphasize the grave threats to American security that have resulted from these policies.

REMARKS OF HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, OF NEW YORK, AT DINNER MEETING OF AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE EXECUTIVE BOARD, SHOREHAM HOTEL, MAY 7, 1955

I am glad to be able to be here tonight with you, Irving, and with so many old and true friends.

I had not expected to have this pleasure, but events arranged themselves so that I could.

There are many subjects I would like to discuss with you tonight, but unscheduled as I am, I am only going to discuss briefly one matter close to my heart, in which I know the AJC has a deep interest, too.

It is now 3 years since the passage of the McCarran-Walter Act, a bill which was passed over President Truman's veto in the summer of 1952.

Our experience with this dreadful law has fully justified the opposition which the American Jewish Committee and which I, and other Members of the Senate, expressed at the time of passage.

I will always remember one of the last appearances in the Senate of the late beloved Senator Brian McMahon, of Connecticut—perhaps it was the last one before his untimely death—when he spoke out and voted against the McCarran-Walter Act. How true was his vision and that of your own organization which fought valiantly against that law.

Under the McCarran-Walter Act, the name of the United States has been besmirched abroad. And here at home, we have seen numberless cases of injustice and heartbreak.

Distinguished visitors, scholars, scientists, and even plain tourists from abroad, have been treated like potential spies, criminals, and saboteurs.

I hardly need to refer to the manner in which aliens who want to come and settle here are treated. It is harder for them to be admitted into the United States than for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle—that is, unless they are Basque sheepherders.

Meanwhile, hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of illegal immigrants have streamed across the Mexican and Canadian borders, unchecked and unscreened—without arousing major protest from the supporters of the McCarran-Walter Act.

It is unnecessary for me to prove my point, although I wish I had time to tell you about some of the heartbreaking cases which come to my attention almost every day as a result of the operations of the McCarran-Walter Act—cases not only of aliens, but of American citizens—and not only of naturalized American citizens, but of native-born American citizens.

The victims of the McCarran-Walter Act are legion. But grant as the injury to individuals has been, the injury to the United States has been greater. That damage has been incalculable. We have given the Communists a club to beat us with.

We passed the Refugee Relief Act in 1953. We had to pass that act because the national origins quota system of the McCarran-Walter Act was obstructing the foreign policy of the United States. We were encouraging people to flee from behind the Iron Curtain, but could not admit any of them into the United States after they had escaped from tyranny.

When the Refugee Relief Act was signed, we told the world that we were going to do our part in providing asylum for the escapees from Soviet slavery. I need not tell you what happened after that. If a Nation could blush we should blush with shame, although there were some few of us who predicted what was going to happen under the Refugee Relief Act. It was a bad law, badly administered.

After the refugee relief program was shown to be a fiasco, the administration tried to cover up by hiring Mr. Edward Corsi, who was a known friend of immigration. Mr. Corsi didn't last very long. He lasted long enough to be disillusioned.

The refugee relief program has been a fiasco as far as bringing in refugees and escapees is concerned. In about two years, approximately 1,000 refugees and escapees have been actually admitted. Some relatives have been admitted, but they could have been admitted even under the McCarran-Walter Act if they waited long enough.

It is a scandal—a scandal at home and a scandal abroad. We should all be ashamed for our country.

But to be ashamed is not enough. We must act. There is still some time to salvage the refugee relief program by the enactment of appropriate amendments.

We can, and should intensify our efforts to overhaul the McCarran-Walter Act and to cut out the cancerous national origins quota system and to abolish the incredible encroachments upon the status of American citizenship.

I hope the American-Jewish Committee and all organizations will join with me in insisting on appropriate hearings on this legislation, and on congressional action. We can and should insist that the administration make good its pledges on this front. Noble sentiments by the President are no substitute for effective leadership on his part to get Congress to act—and to act now.

But I have no illusions. We have some chance of getting some minor amendments to both the Refugee Relief Act and the McCarran-Walter Act approved during this Congress.

We have very little chance—practically none—of getting to the heart of the matter during this Congress. And when I say the heart of the matter, I mean the national origins quota system and the second-class citizenship status for naturalized citizens.

Before we succeed in getting legislation which will remedy these defects in present law, we will need a long and intensive period of public education.

Members of the Congress will need to hear from the people back home; and the people back home—in the West, the Midwest, the South, and the Southwest—will need to know the facts.

I am sure that the American Jewish Committee will continue to do its part in this process of nationwide education and will join other organizations in furthering this vital cause.

This is imperative for us, not as Jews, but as Americans—Americans concerned above all for the principles of justice, equity, and humanitarianism at home and abroad.

Address Delivered by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, Before the Cleveland Engineering Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address I delivered last evening before the Cleveland Engineering Society, at Cleveland, Ohio.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND BEFORE THE CLEVELAND ENGINEERING SOCIETY, CLEVELAND, OHIO, MAY 16, 1955

Mr. Chairman, members of the Cleveland Engineering Society, and fellow Americans, Secretary of State Dulles has returned from Europe with a report of substantial progress of the free world as a result of recent conferences he attended. There have also been active and continuing Communist countermoves.

During the 2 years this administration has been in power much has been accomplished toward building an effective collective security system in Asia and in strengthening the defense of Europe.

On January 26, 1954, the Korean Mutual Defense Pact was added to the already existing Philippine, Japanese, and Anzus (Australia-New Zealand-United States) Pacts which were ratified in 1952. This year the gap was filled by ratification of the Southeast Asian Pact at Manila and by the Mutual Defense Pact with the Republic of China.

The effort of the Soviet Union will be the neutralization of Austria (already accomplished) and the same status for Yugoslavia, Germany, Norway, and Denmark.

The Soviet Union, in order to gain the neutralization of Austria, was willing to pay the price of having Soviet forces removed from that country simultaneously with the removal of United States, British, and French forces. The people of Austria are pleased to be free of Soviet occupation, even though they recognize their proximity to Communist satellite territory.

It appears that the Soviet Union intends to avoid the treaty requirement to get their "line of communication" forces out of Rumania and Hungary once the Austrian treaty has been signed by the simple expedient of having incorporated those countries into an eastern alliance as an offset to NATO.

Late this month Khrushchev and Bulganin will go to Belgrade. Their effort will be directed, I believe, toward the full neutralization of Yugoslavia. That country has never been a member of NATO but it has had a Balkan defense pact with Greece and Turkey which are members of the North Atlantic Alliance. If the Soviet Union could pull Yugoslavia away from this pact it would free Communist divisions from duty opposite the Yugoslavian frontier and make them available for other missions.

These two moves are only in preparation for the grand design of keeping Germany out of the western defense grouping. This would be considered a major Soviet victory, if accomplished. They are in a position to offer the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Eastern Germany if United States forces will move back to the United States. The Austrian example was and is expected to encourage Western Germany to follow the same example.

Soon we may expect a major Soviet diplomatic move to make a completely neutralized Scandinavian bloc. Sweden and Finland are not members of NATO while Norway and Denmark are allied with the West. If they could be induced to pull out it would weaken NATO (from a morale, if not a military viewpoint) and be considered a diplomatic coup to the credit of the Soviet Union.

These moves by the Communist world and our counterefforts will occupy much public attention during the balance of 1955 which may turn out to be one of the most decisive dates in world history.

Last Wednesday the Soviet Union proposed three United Nations resolutions as part of their effort to retain the initiative in carrying out their long-term policies.

When the veneer of propaganda is removed and the customary Communist technique of using words to confuse and obstruct rather than to clarify and expedite is taken into consideration, the Soviet proposal is a fraud.

Their so-called disarmament proposal would:

1. Destroy freedom of the press, radio, speech, and public discussion in the free nations of the world relating to warning the public against the homicidal mania of communism against human freedom. It would gag the opponents of communism in the free world as they have been gagged behind the Iron Curtain. Since the Communist totalitarian governments already have complete control over such media of public information they have nothing to lose.

2. It claims a success for the Korean and Geneva armistice agreements both of which have been flagrantly violated by the Chinese Communists. In Korea there is still a divided country despite pledges of 10 years ago, in which the Soviet Union joined, that it would be united and free. In Vietnam the Geneva Conference turned over half of the country and 15 million people to the Communists. This is their standard of a successful conference.

3. The proposals provide for the immediate withdrawal of United States forces in Germany back across the Atlantic to the United States (approximately 3,600 miles), whereas if the Soviet Union lived up to their agreement (it would be the first time in a quarter of a century that they would have), their forces would only be approximately 600 miles from the Elbe.

Such a withdrawal would also contemplate two Germanys (like divided Korea and Viet Nam) each with its own police force. It would also require the withdrawal of the Republic of Germany from the western NATO defense alliance.

4. Under the proposal our overseas bases would have to be dismantled as a "requisite

for discontinuing the arms race." We would trade a bird in hand for several in flight.

5. It contemplates that our industrial and scientific atomic know-how will be made available on an extensive basis to all Communist countries.

6. The proposal would result in yielding to Chinese Communist demands for Quemoy, Matsu, Formosa, the Pescadores, Chinese Communist membership in the United Nations, and removal of the provocative Seventh Fleet from the Far East, all of which contribute in Communist eyes to the existing tense situation in certain areas of the Far East.

7. It would eliminate all trade restrictions with the Soviet Union, Communist China, and their satellites, including trade in strategic materials.

8. All the above steps are to be carried out prior to getting down to the problems of an effective disarmament with adequate safeguards against Soviet deception.

During 1956, according to the Security Council resolution, the nations agree not to increase their armed forces and conventional armaments above the level of armaments and armed forces on December 31, 1954.

Since the free world forces as of that date are known and the Communist forces are not it sets as the starting point for future moves a top-heavy Communist base.

In free countries the limitations on forces and appropriations is subject to debate and vote in parliament and Congress and can be readily checked now.

In the Communist world this is not the case and we would have to rely on their "official figures" 1 month after the convention enters into force.

Unless and until Communist China becomes a "permanent member of the security council" the proposal is not meant to be effective.

Since without the balancing factor of the atomic weapon Communist power could already have overrun all of Europe and Asia, any limitation upon our development of this weapon and the testing of the same works to Communist advantage.

This is covered by the Soviet language in paragraph 5 wherein it states "simultaneously with the commencement of measures for reduction of armaments and armed forces * * * the States * * * assume a solemn obligation not to use nuclear weapons."

In the first phase of 1956, we are to abandon and dismantle all our air and naval bases abroad, and return 3,600 miles across the Atlantic and 5,000 or more miles across the Pacific whereas the Soviet Union pulls back 600 miles at the most.

The production of all atomic weapons to cease in 1957. Since the location of our atomic plants and facilities are known and the Soviet locations are not known and there is no adequate inspection system provided, this proposal is all to the advantage of Soviet military supremacy.

The second assembly resolution makes clear that the effective inspection proposals of the United States in the atomic and conventional weapon field is still not acceptable to the Soviet Union.

With apparently no embarrassment, the Soviet proposal then sets up a limited type of inspection and control similar to that established by the terms of the Korean armistice. Since this system has prevented any real inspection in North Korea, it is understandable why the Soviet Union now advises it in the highly sensitive field of atomic and armament inspection.

For the past quarter of a century the Soviet Union has violated 50 out of 52 international agreements it has entered into.

The $64 question is, "Has the Communist leopard changed its spots and carnivorous appetite and now becomes a milk-fed pussycat?"

I believe not. They now zag instead of zig, but their long-term strategic concept of the destruction of human freedom remains the same.

One of the most forthright statements of Soviet policy was made in 1930 by Dmitry Z. Manuilski in a speech to the international students of the Lenin School of Political Warfare, Moscow:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

By coincidence or otherwise, their present activities fit into this doctrinaire teaching of 25 years ago.

Just recently I had a letter from an Air Force pilot in Formosa. In his letter to me of February 12, this pilot wrote, and I want to share it with you:

"As an Air Force jet pilot assigned to this island for the next 2 years, I am sure my interest in lasting world peace is as acute as any American.

"The presence here of my wife and children tends to intensify my natural desire that no one toss any atom or hydrogen bombs this way.

"I am quite convinced that my best chances, as well as those of my country and the entire free world, rest with the firm 'stop the Communist march' movement which you so forcibly represent. I have flown 400 combat missions and would rather fly 400 more than to see my kind of a world go down the drain 1 island or 1 small country at a time.

"America must wake up to the real intentions of communism and take real and purposeful steps to frustrate those intentions."

We must not let our guard down. Our survival and that of the entire free world may depend upon how alert we remain to the fundamental strategy of world communism.

Early Returns in Registered Voters' Poll of Ohio Sentiment Concerning Formosa and the Coastal Islands of Quemoy and Matsu

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD results of a poll which I am conducting concerning the sentiment of Ohio registered voters with reference to defending Formosa and the coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENDER POLL SHOWS OVERWHELMING VOTE TO DEFEND COASTAL ISLANDS OF FORMOSA

Early returns in my 55,000 registered voters' poll of Ohio sentiment records an overwhelming majority in favor of defending both Formosa and the coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

My purpose in taking this poll is to ascertain the viewpoint of the people of Ohio on the three questions which are uppermost in everyone's mind today. First, should the United States defend the island of Formosa itself? Second, should we use American forces to defend the coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu? Third, should we employ atomic weapons if necessary to repel any Communist attack on these islands?

To date, I have received responses from the first group to whom my questionnaire has been sent. This group includes approximately 19,000 Republican precinct committeemen, women and workers from all over Ohio. Their answers show that by a margine of approximately 10 to 1 they believe that our Government should defend Formosa. By only a slightly smaller margin, the same overwhelming opinion prevails with respect to the defense of the coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

There is a substantial decline in the numbers of those who believe that we should use atomic weapons, if necessary, in defending these areas of the Pacific. Nevertheless, even here the opinion is over 4 to 1 in favor of using such weapons if we find it necessary to defend Formosa and the coastal islands.

The questions asked in the poll and responses received:

	Yes	*No*
Question No. 1: The United States should defend Formosa	13,723	1,282
Question No. 2: The United States should defend Matsu and Quemoy if Red China attacks these islands	11,425	2,829
Question No. 3: We should use atomic weapons, if necessary in repelling any Red Chinese attack upon Matsu and Quemoy	12,121	2,670

Here are some observations made by persons replying to poll:

"I cannot answer these questions as I feel that no ordinary person is in a position to do so correctly. I am perfectly willing to leave these decisions to our great President. If you and BRICKER will back Ike to the hilt, you won't go wrong."

Nos. 1 and 2: "Yes, if we have promised to do so."

"Please do all in your power to pass the Bricker amendment."

No. 3: "Tell them we will and if they continue, then do it. For once, let them know we mean what we say."

"We must make a stand—strike at military installations and save as much of population as possible."

"Give them the works."

"Supply Nationalist China with every weapon possible to defend themselves. We should use jets, atomic artillery—not atomic bombs."

No. 1: "Reason—Yes, for security and national honor."

"On Formosa, give all we got."

No. 2: "If necessary, for the safety of Formosa, use what is needed to do the job."

"I do not feel we should confer with Chinese Communists."

No. 2: "If necessary to defend Formosa."

No. 3: "We should use whatever necessary to save the lives of American soldiers."

No. 2: "Yes, if their loss would make Formosa indefensible."

No. 3: "Yes, if we are to defend them at all."

"We need the Bricker amendment. Please work for it."

"Thanks for listening to the public opinions."

"We have backed up so much now that no one is afraid of the United States any longer."

"We have given the Nationalists the cold shoulder too long now. Russia will use atomic weapons, if they have it, to help Commies."

"Kick h—— out of them."

"We've got to draw a definite line someplace."

"We must protect our interests. Protecting is not making war."

No. 2: "If deemed necessary for Formosa."

"Leave this up to Ike. He has access to important information which the layman does not."

"Unless a very good trade can be made"—No. 2.

"Only as a last desperate means"—No. 3.

"I don't know. I think I will trust our President and his advisers."

No. 2: "Might be sacrificed for cease-fire agreement."

No. 3: "Use for Formosa defense—not for Matsu or Quemoy."

"We should honorably avoid war if possible."

"No, we should never be first to use atomic weapons. Atomic warfare should be outlawed by all nations as barbarous."

"The real troubles of the world are economic and ideological."

"We appreciate your efforts to get the opinions of the public."

No. 2: "Think, depends on developments—leave it to Ike—with military intelligence."

No. 3: "Not unless they use them."

Nos. 1 and 2: "If it is part of our defense for the United States of America."

No. 3: "By all means, and with full force and effect."

"Whichever our President decides. He has the safety of United States in mind."

"Why wait until they use them on us first?"

No. 2: "It depends—did we agree to?"

No. 3: "If we're going to fight, let's use atomic weapons."

No. 1: "Yes, and the Pescadores."

No. 2: "But a negotiated transfer O. K. Not strategically located or important to defense."

No. 3: "Bad for propaganda in Asia."

"President's judgment should prevail."

"I will let the President decide."

"Sooner or later it will have to be done."

"Absolutely—we are committed."

"To destroy military positions."

"Let's go along with the President's decisions. I trust him, don't you?"

"Whatever the administration decides is necessary for the defense of Formosa. If we take part in defending the islands, we should use all weapons at our disposal."

"I do not think the necessity will arise, if we stop quibbling and let them know we mean business."

"Let's stop pussy-footing."

"Let's have more backbone in the administration."

"Yes, if it endangers protection of Formosa. Yes, if necessary."

"Atomic weapons—and use quickly."

"Defend islands if it endangers protection of Formosa."

"If not, they will soon take over the United States. I talk and meet a lot of people and they all think the Reds must be stopped."

"By all means, at all cost."

"Can't afford to back down again."

"I have complete faith in President Eisenhower and his administration to take action as they see fit in dealing with the Formosa situation. They have so many more facts and information at their disposal than I do that I frankly would be inadequate in expressing an opinion on these matters."

"Can't afford to back down now."

"It is about time we keep some promises we make. I think we should get out of the United Nations and get them out of here."

"I always sign my name. If I were ashamed to sign, I would not send it anonymously."

"Too big a question for a layman."

"Yes, if we must defend it."

"Atomic weapons only to protect our country."

"Atomic weapons if attack on Formosa or United States."

"The only thing I wish the United States to give the Reds is the atomic bomb by plane."

"Atomic weapons, but only if the military thinks this necessary, only on military targets."

"There is greater risk in doing nothing than in taking a firm stand."

"Referring to your communication, I certainly feel that Formosa should be our first line of defense in the Far East."

"Should pass Bricker amendment with 'which' clause."

"Use atomic weapons on Red bases, wherever they are. Fight the enemy wherever you find them."

"Pray to God that it won't be."

"Let's not ask our boys to fight with one or both hands tied behind their backs as Truman did. Sometimes I think Hoover's original plan might prove to have been the best for America."

"Thank you for this opportunity to express our opinions."

No. 2: "If they are of great value for protection of Formosa."

No. 3: "If it takes atomic power to stop them, yes."

"To let them win here only means they will have confidence to go further. God gave us the atomic weapons to use; let's use them before they destroy the whole civilization."

"Let's let Ike alone. Certainly believe in democratic expression, but we elected a capable man as President."

No. 1: "Yes."

No. 2: "Whatever President Eisenhower decided."

No. 3: "I believe we not only should use A-weapons, but H-weapons if we defend these islands."

"Why debate about it? Haven't we become convinced by now that leopard doesn't change his spots?"

"Our first defeat was when we supported Russia instead of Finland."

"You have the information, I don't. Use your own judgment."

No. 3: "Yes, if we defend Matsu and Quemoy."

No. 3: "Not unless the Reds start to use it first. I hope that atomic power bombs are never again used."

"God gave us atomic weapons. Let's use them with much forethought."

"Leave this to military leaders."

"I don't feel competent to answer these questions."

"Glad you are doing this."

"I feel a firm stand for our policy will prevent allout war. Communists cannot understand kindly consideration or gentlemanly conduct."

"Ike knows best. Only he knows about these people and what to do. If we go into this, let's win with bombs, not boys alone."

No. 2: "With reservations."

No. 3: "If the best military strategy says yes, then do it."

"How much longer do we have to put up with this treatment?"

"Communism must be stopped somewhere."

"We should be through playing."

"We have done too much appeasing, including that of our so-called allies."

"I voted for Ike believing him to be the man we as Americans need most for President and up to this day I still feel and I know I was right. So I have complete confidence in the decisions of Ike and Mr. Dulles. I thank God that they are in their respective positions. Success to you and Ike's administration."

"There is no possible compromise with Communism, be it Russian or Chinese."

"We must draw a line somewhere and the loss of these islands could have a very serious effect on our allies. Atomic weapons as a last resort only and then only if it can be done without too many civilian casualties."

"Let's let them know who is boss, and quit fooling."

"They dictated first, second, and Korean wars; when are we going to say 'No' to them and dictate a little ourselves?"

"It is time United States does what she says she will do or else get out and stay out."

"Whatever the President thinks best—I agree with him."

"Are we committed to defend these islands? If so, yes."

"I have the confidence in you to make the decisions as the facts present themselves."

"Not qualified to answer."

"I am not a military expert—so do not know the problems involved. I hate war and do not know whether we could save Asia even if we did defend Formosa and the other islands. Let the President decide."

"If we do not intend to do this we had better withdraw from the Orient."

"Let us not lose any more of our world prestige, and we have done this the last 20 years."

"If we would all work for peace through prayer as much as war wouldn't that solve the problem?"

"Leave it as it now stands—in the hands of the President."

"Atomic weapons—yes, it would be a better proving ground than Nevada, and Ike should run for reelection. Show the world we mean what we say. Use some Teddy Roosevelt diplomacy."

"I certainly do not believe in wars to settle things, because wars never have, and our only son is now in the Navy, but what else is left to do?"

"As long as we did not have sense enough to stay out of this Asian territory we should keep what we already have."

"I do not feel as if I have enough information to decide such an important issue."

"Atomic weapons and anything else we can use."

"If we don't, we better quite and keep our mouth shut."

"Defend islands if it's necessary for the defense of Formosa. Atomic weapons upon military installations only."

"Atomic weapons—yes, if it is necessary. Especially V 4, I think we promised."

"Not with United States soldiers. Give them arms and ammunition. We had one nephew killed in service—we don't want any more."

"Would not trust Chou En-lai. Defend islands to have Formosa saved. Atomic weapons after opinion of Chief Radford and Secretary Robertson are given."

Let's Sing America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial on Let's Sing America appeared in the May 14, 1955 issue of the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror and is a timely suggestion:

LET'S SING AMERICA

One of our Hollidaysburg readers, R. C. Stevens, came up with an idea that struck us so forcefully that we are passing it along to the readers of this column today in the hope that it may inspire some careful thinking on the subject.

Our Hollidaysburg friend thinks that it would be a good thing for our Nation if "America" was to be adopted as the national hymn and sung at all public gatherings. He pointed out that this beloved hymn is in many respects a prayer, that it lacks the militancy of The Star-Spangled Banner and that it is easier for groups to sing.

Now we know that it would take an act of Congress to change the national anthem. We also are aware of the fact that there are many folks who prefer "The Star-Spangled Banner" as the national anthem and that there are, perhaps, even more people who would not be too interested one way or another. We also believe that there are many who would be in favor of such a change.

One point on which we believe there would be almost unanimous opinion is that we do not sing "America" often encugh and when we do sing it we do not, perhaps, think enough about its real meaning to us as a Nation and as individuals.

Rev. Samuel Francis Smith, author of America, gave the song to a friend, Lowell Mason, and it was first used publicly at a Sabbath school celebration of independence in Park Street Church, Boston, on July 4, 1832.

Since that time this great hymn has been a real favorite with many generations of Americans. Perhaps if we of the present generation would follow the opening line of the third stanza, "Let music swell the breeze," more often, this song of patriotism, love of country and eternal belief in God and country would help all of us to realize more fully the great blessings that are ours.

There are many great songs and hymns in our national history and, perhaps, if "America" was to be established as the national hymn by an act of Congress it would not compete with The Star-Spangled Banner as the national anthem, but would be sung more frequently at public gatherings. Certainly it should be a familiar song at Sunday school and church gatherings as it is, in effect, a prayer set to music.

This great land of ours has been in troubled waters many times since Rev. Smith first wrote "America," but the love of liberty it portrays, the faith in God which it acknowledges, the prayer for protection with which it ends have always brought the great ship of state safely to port.

Ours is a great Nation, bound together by a singleness of purpose that has been hard for other nations to understand. We are not a Nation of one race or nationality; rather we have been formed by an alliance of the peoples of the earth brought together by a mutual desire for human freedom. Here the dignity of the individual has been raised to a new height and every man and woman has had the opportunity to live in a land where individual effort can be rewarded.

We have, from time to time, attempted to help other nations of the world achieve this great heritage of liberty and freedom for all, with but scant success. Nations that could have profited most by the example of "a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created free and equal" have failed to grasp the full meaning of liberty and equality that our Founding Fathers wrote into our Constitution.

No other nation has ever been able to bring its ideology to these shores by force of arms and if Americans as a whole retain their love of liberty, their belief in the faith of the Founding Fathers, it is not likely that any nation ever shall be able to successfully drive out American idealism with some phony ideology that makes man the slave of fate rather than the master of his own destiny.

We must, however, as a Nation, become more alert to the danger that comes from abroad in the form of men and women who come here to prey upon our credulity. They must not be allowed to bring into action the seeds of hate which some harbor in their hearts and minds against this great American institution of free enterprise.

Being free people, we will not, of course, always be in agreement on all topics. Among free men there are, and must be, differences of opinion. We should be careful to see to it that those who seek to lead opposing camps in these issues are Americans at heart, that they are not merely seeking personal advantages at the expense of others, that their minds and hearts are in tune with this great hymn "America" and that their actions are those of men and women who have the best interests of our great Nation foremost in their hearts and minds.

We should, in every instance, insist upon a free expression of men's true opinions at the secret ballot box where men and women can express their true thought without fear of harm or hope of favor. Let's sing "America" more frequently, let us think America always.

The Rights We Seek To Save

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention of the Members of this House to the receipt by one of our colleagues—the Honorable JOHN V. BEAMER, of Indiana—of a Freedom Foundation award. The award was granted for an article, The Rights We Seek To Save, which I am sure will prove worthwhile reading for all of us. I might mention, also, that Congressman BEAMER, in winning the 1955 Freedom Foundation award, finds himself in very distinguished company. Among other winners were General Ridgway, former President Hoover, Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr.; Secretary of Agriculture Benson, and Secretary of Interior McKay. The award-winning article follows:

THE RIGHTS WE SEEK TO SAVE

(By Hon. JOHN V. BEAMER, of Fifth District of Indiana)

Recently I spoke at a meeting honoring the Korean war veterans and it was a natural impulse to praise the valiant deeds of the soldiers of that conflict. At the same time, there was a realization of the honor that was due the more than one and one-half million battle casualties that have been spent by Americans since this Nation began defending its free way of life some 178 years ago. Many words have been spoken and many eulogies have been paid to these heroic sacrifices.

The impelling question thus posed is one that undoubtedly has been asked by each generation in each age of history. Why fight? And the answers have varied in different ages and in different countries. In some instances and, in fact, in far too many cases wars have been instigated by rulers with uncontrolled ambition to extend their authority, to enlarge their empire, and eventually to become world rulers

The causes of conflict are varied even in our own history but, underlying the motives that appear only on the surface, there is one motive of a determination to fight for the rights we seek to save. Then, we wonder how we fight for these rights and which means of combat is the most important.

The struggle on the battlefield is the one method to which most and perhaps even first consideration is given. Those who serve in the legislative halls of the State general assemblies and in the Federal Congress are deeply conscious of the fact that we wage a continuous fight to retain the freedoms that have been our inheritance. The efforts of the soldier and the statesman are vitally important but the most important fight is in the minds of the people for the American state of mind.

Armed Forces, perforce must always be on guard. Men and women must be trained and be alert in their respective branches of the Armed Services to be ready to defend our land. The people who serve in the three constituted branches of our Government must be equally prepared to carry on a cold war against an enemy philosophy. This kind of preparedness requires planning, nerve and loyalty.

It has been stated very appropriately that the present time is not one to be devoted to a contemplation of the past nor an attempt to fathom the future. Today more properly is an occasion upon which we should repledge and rededicate ourselves to those enduring principles upon which our society is founded. It should be a time for a search of knowledge and free exchange of ideas in a spirit of mutual trust and confidence.

This planning concept of legislation should be surveyed briefly. The original concept of law-making and, especially of Federal legislation in the United States was that there should be a minimum of laws; all laws should be fair, rigidly and impartially enforced, and that they should apply equally to all citizens. The concept that laws should be made for the benefit of any minority group—rich or poor; business groups or labor unions; white, black or yellow race; for any religious creed—has been resisted since the beginning of the history of lawmaking. When laws are made for individuals with an understanding that all have an equal responsibility under the law to look after themselves and their own property and family, and to respect the same right of others, then the signed concept will be retained to the improvement and the benefit of all.

The struggle for freedom thus is fairly definitely defined on the battlefield and in the legislative halls. But can we be assured of the same degree of certainty in the minds of people? Freedom has been classified in 5 phases: (1) a free mind; (2) free schools; (3) a free economy; (4) a free value system; and (5) free elections.

The earlier school systems developed and maintained a free mind when the schools were primarily concerned with the important proposition of teaching the elements of educating and developing the mind instead of attempting to build a new society. The free schools remain free only when they are public schools instead of being government schools designed to promote a special political philosophy that may be planned and plotted to perpetuate some particular group in power. Free schools are more nearly possible if conducted on a local level than on a national scale. Freedom of worship likewise is an important phase of this same freedom of education.

A free economy and a free value system in the current age are the complete antithesis

of a totalitarian or authoritarian form of government. A controlled economy, especially in peacetime, conceivably is a determined and calculated step toward the abolition of man's freedom in production, conversion, and trade of commodities. It is apparent that national socialism and communism has as its first objective, the abolition of a free economy and free value system.

A realization of this condition and of the continuing fight for freedom raises the question—how can our Nation best defend itself? Armies and legislators may do valiant work but they cannot carry the entire load. The minds of the people well may be the strongest defense. After all, can our Nation afford to pauperize itself by maintaining enormously expensive armies and keeping the youth of our Nation constantly poised to enter conflicts against the forces of socialism and communism abroad while permitting the Socialistic practices to be legislated into our economy. Of what value is the bravest and strongest American army on a foreign battlefield fighting against Communist aggression, if we continue to not only permit, but require, the Federal Government to interfere and force Socialistic doctrines and practices on the economic and social lives of our people.

The conscience, the good sense, the minds of people must be awakened to the encroachments of these planners who would trade our freedoms for glamorous words, gaudy promises, and the ultimate slavery of complete Government controls.

A Contract Dishonored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for May 12, 1955:

A CONTRACT DISHONORED

In declaring that rural electric cooperatives served by the Southwestern Power Administration have been thrown to the wolves, Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, of the House Appropriations Committee, spoke with moderation.

The treatment which the Interior Department has accorded these coops cynically violates the sanctity of contract and flagrantly defies the law and the Federal courts. Unless these conditions are corrected, and promptly, the five Missouri generating and transmission cooperatives associated with the plan face bankruptcy, according to SPA Administrator Douglas G. Wright.

The contracts between SPA and the five generating and transmission cooperatives were executed before the Eisenhower administration came into office. They called for the co-ops to build steam generating plants and transmission lines and sell the output to SPA, which would resell the power to the co-ops it serves. In order to make the payments for this power, SPA was dependent upon appropriations from Congress.

Subsequently a Senate-House conference committee forbade the Interior Department to use any part of an appropriation to carry out the SPA contracts. In United States District Court for the District of Columbia Judge Edward M. Curran ruled that the committee had no authority to prevent use of the funds to carry out the contracts. Of the official conduct of Interior Secretary McKay, Judge Curran spoke in the strongest terms. He said it was illegal, in violation of the law, and beyond the scope of his authority.

A story of broken faith is never a pretty one, and as yet no more attractive ending is in sight. But while the damage that has been done cannot be undone, further damage can be averted. It can be averted by recognition at Washington that a change in political ideology at the National Capital does not abrogate binding legal contracts. Hundreds of citizens in Missouri and the Southwest depend on the faithful execution of these contracts for the protection of the substantial investments they have made.

College Scholarship Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert the following address delivered on Saturday, May 7, 1955, by one of my constituents, 16½-year-old Carol Snyder, of 2188 Creston Avenue, Bronx, N. Y., as her contribution to the Junior Town Meeting broadcast over WATV. Carol is a senior student at the High School of Music and Art of New York City. Her address was judged the best of the six finalists and she was awarded a college scholarship of $1,000 which is quite an achievement for a youngster of her age. Her address follows:

THE NEXT 10 YEARS—A COLD WAR PREDICTION

The future can only be predicated on the basis of present realities, and in a world so filled with uncertainty, to attempt to predict the course of the cold war during the next decade, is to rush in where angels fear to tread.

As a basic premise we must assume that the cold war will not become a general, hot war, that somehow humanity will learn to bring human relations to the level of scientific achievement.

We can assume a shift in the world balance of power from concentration primarily in Russia and the United States, to greater dispersal among other nations, who will consequently be less prone to follow the bidding of either Moscow or Washington, unless it is on the basis of mutual respect and understanding.

During the next decade, western European countries will struggle to achieve internal stability and will draw closer together politically. Communist strength in the satellite countries will wane as the Russians concentrate on the underdeveloped areas and China. The peoples of Asia and Africa will rise more clearly to the fore. Underlying their nationalism and revolt is the universal desire to be free and to be fed. The Soviets will attempt to exploit it. Our response to that challenge will be tested in the next 10 years, for the issue of Soviet-American relations, and of United States foreign policy, is in essence a test of the overall worth of America as a nation among nations.

The most important influence we can exert on internal developments in Europe and Asia will continue to be the influence of example: of what we are, not only to others, but to ourselves. If this is sufficiently impressive it will compel the respect and confidence of a world which is still more ready to recognize spiritual distinction than material opulence; to accept our aid only if we respect the dignity and worth of those who accept it. We must be prepared to tender that assistance to countries whose economic and political philosophies will differ from ours, but whose goal of peace and abundance is our goal.

During the next 10 years there will be many opportunities for negotiation with the Communist world. There is no assurance that the Communists will negotiate in good faith, but if we proceed with honesty and reason, if we are willing to compromise, there is a good chance that the world will be on our side. We may even have to fight limited wars in remote places, but the only alternative to some peace, is total destruction.

I do believe, however, that although the area of choice and control has been considerably narrowed, we may still effect a more hopeful resolution of the conflicts that threaten to destroy us all. There is always the possibility that humanity will catch itself in time, before that last precipitous step into nowhere. We may succeed. A world in which we fail, will not be worth winning.

President Honored for Religious Aim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of May 2, 1955:

PRESIDENT HONORED FOR RELIGIOUS AIM

WASHINGTON.—President Eisenhower is the lay-churchman of the year.

The fifth Pilgrimage of American Church Leaders and Laymen awarded this title to Mr. Eisenhower for his outstanding service to the Nation in his leadership for peace, spiritual devotion, and inspiring example of steadfast attention to religious values as President of the United States.

The President's pastor, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson of the National Presbyterian Church here, read the citation at the annual awards dinner of the Pilgrimage, which met here over the April 29 weekend to encourage men and women everywhere who believe that faith is the foundation of freedom.

Dr. Elson told the Pilgrimage: "There is no such thing as a parade of piety along the Potomac. The spirit of faith and prayer simply permeates our official life so that Washington has become a symbol of the current spiritual awakening."

MOBILIZER OF RESOURCES

"Every layman exerts an influence over other laymen. The more exalted the position, the greater is the potential influence. Thus the President of the United States, by his perennial influence upon spiritual values, in a very real way is giving expression to our common spiritual aspirations; * * * He is a mobilizer of our spiritual resources."

Howard L. Pyle, administrative assistant to the President, read a letter, accepting the award, from Mr. Eisenhower, who was unable to attend the dinner. The President said that despite a deep feeling I have not earned

it—I shall highly prize the honor * * * conferred on me."

Dr. D. Elton Trueblood, chief of religious policy of the United States Information Agency, giving the main address at the dinner, said: "Do not believe President Eisenhower is a mere attender. He is a devout attender. But he also knows something about the relationship between our religion and our total life."

RELIGIOUS REVIVAL

There is concrete evidence of a religious revival in the United States. Dr. Trueblood said. Religious books are selling at an all-time high, and gatherings of church laymen are so great that the biggest problem is taking care of the crowds.

The doctrine of separation of church and state is not a belief in separation of religion and state, Dr. Trueblood stated. "We will not permit any one denomination to monopolize the religious life of the people or give one church a favorite position. But we are not a secular people * * * we open Congress in prayer. We have religious counselors in the Armed Forces."

Dr. Trueblood then gave his "own best thinking on the direction in which we are going."

He said the world is seeing the emergence of something like a new movement—call it a "society of penetrators," embracing clergy and laity of all denominations, and both men and women—"a task force penetrating the paganism of our world, each one where he is."

DEVOUT MEN EVERYWHERE

This society includes men and women in Government, business, and colleges—all those "convinced that our religious faith is that without which this world cannot stand, something without which our civil liberties are not possible and cannot be maintained," he said, adding:

"In this order, you find devout men teaching physics, devout men teaching chemistry, and devout men teaching English.

"I am grateful for the great crowds, but I put my hope in the hard core which can change the world."

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, majority leader of the Senate, speaking at a pilgrimage session in the old Supreme Court chamber of the Capitol, said: "We must as a Nation make the decisions which will determine the future of all mankind. Those decisions will be right only if we place our trust in immortal wisdom."

PRAYER ROOM HELPFUL

Representative BROOKS HAYS, Democrat, of Arkansas, responsible in large part for the establishment of the Prayer Room in the Capitol, said about 75 Members of Congress used it the first week it was open, and as many as 13 in a single day since then.

Under the burden of leadership and legislative duties, harassed Congressmen welcome a place to retreat and pray, he said. The room "is primarily to meet this human need of men and women like yourselves, who feel the need * * * for strength that comes from outside themselves."

At an afternoon service in front of the Lincoln Memorial, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson gave a prayer for the Nation.

Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, Republican, of Ohio, received the churchwoman of the year award for her service as a spiritual interpreter in Congress, in international affairs, in nursing and public health matters, and in advancement of educational institutions and values.

The pilgrimage named the Reverend Ralph W. Sockman, minister of Christ Church, New York City, the clergy-churchman of the year.

The Question of Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, there is much talk about the security of the United States, the methods used by investigating committees and agencies, and the practice of using informants. Can anyone tell me of a suitable substitute for informants? It is my belief that they cannot.

I have read with interest the column of George E. Sokolsky which appeared in the May 16, 1955, edition of the New York Journal-American.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Sokolsky's column and commend it to my colleagues:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

THE QUESTION OF SECURITY

In time of war, security becomes a routine matter; spies, saboteurs, and traitors are dealt with summarily if known and caught. In time of peace, definitions become blurred. It is not so easy to prove that a tourist or a merchant is a spy; sabotage is generally not practised; and it is extremely difficult to prove treason. A difference of opinion is not treason; membership in the Communist Part or support of its cause is not treason per se.

Usually, when a war is ended, these problems fade from the view of our people and even our officials charged with such matters turn to other work. The Communists and the pro-Rusisans have, however, presented altogether another problem, one to which we are not accustomed and which is, on the whole, distasteful to most Americans.

Inquire into subversion

Two agencies of government exist which are charged by law to inquire into this subject constantly. One, of course, is the FBI which supplies the Department of Justice and other Government departments with unevaluated data gathered by its agents. The other investigator into this subject is the Congress through its various committees. In addition, in recent years, the various departments of Government charged with the employment of men and women in Government are required by law to investigate their character and their relations to subversive movements.

How far all these investigations are to go and what methods are to be used has been a bone of contention for several years. The main differences of opinion can be stated in these terms:

1. Some say that any method is justifiable to bring out the facts of subversion because the security of the country must come first;

2. Others take the position that no matter what the suspicions of subversion are, no methods should be employed which may imperil the constitutional guaranties of civil liberties;

3. Still others take the position that the FBI is fully equipped to protect the security of the country and that other agencies should not engage in this work;

4. And finally, there are those who do not believe that the security of the country is endangered at all and who hold that the whole matter had better be dropped.

This discussion continues in various forums to a greater extent than is generally realized because while some politicians feel that they have pushed it out of the way, the public interest in the two separate subjects of security and civil liberties continues.

One manifestation of this interest is the increasing criticism of the use of informants by the FBI and the refusal of that agency always to provide names. The Matusow case dramatized the use of the informant, as Matusow's pro-Communist associates anticipated. A liar is always an ugly creature, but a compulsive pride in being a liar is monstrous.

Few have gone sour

Of the hundreds of informants used by the FBI in its various activities from kidnaping to subversion, instances of informants gone sour have been trifling. Others may turn up to be wrong ones, but that is the chance that an investigative agency must take if it is to work at all. The FBI undoubtedly takes steps to guard against errors of personality and errors of data, but it cannot operate without informants or it will get no information.

Furthermore, such an organization must protect the anonymity of its informants. Stepping aside from the question of whether the Communist Party should be treated as an American political party or an arm of an alien conspiracy with which we are in conflict universally, if the latter view is accepted, it is necessary for the FBI to infiltrate the Communist Party. Those who do this work must be protected in their anonymity or the entire operation must fail. The decision then is not whether their names should be withheld, but whether this work should be done at all.

The responsibility of those who must make that decision is great because who can guarantee that there is no espionage, no sabotage, no treason in what we presently call peace?

If all is well, why do we spend so much on the preparation for war? Admittedly it is possible to go too far in the matter of defense of security, but what risks dare we take when we know that infiltration into another country's affairs has become a weapon of war?

This is the problem and it will not be shunted away by ignoring it.

Norway's Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, today is the "Fourth of July" in Norway. Minnesota is noted for its high proportion of descendents of Nordic people. Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to call your attention to the significance of this Independence Day celebrated by citizens of Norway in the Norwegian Embassy and around the world.

There is no national holiday in the world that is celebrated and honored more enthusiastically and sincerely than May 17, Norway's Constitution Day. And so it is this year, too. The day is

marked by Americans of Norwegian descent at rallies in Brooklyn, Chicago, Minneapolis, and other United States cities as it is elsewhere in the world.

On this morning, every schoolboy and girl in Norway hops out of bed at the crack of dawn to look at the sky, hoping for a sunny day. But even if the winds are chill and the rain falls, they will march all morning in the school parade, to tunes played by the boys' brass bands, to celebrate Norway's greatest national holiday—the day in 1814 on which its Constitution was signed.

The largest school parade is in Oslo, the capital city of Norway. Every year, at the end of their long 3-hour march, Oslo schoolboys and girls, pass under the balcony of the Royal Palace. Among the paraders are also students about to graduate from the secondary gymnasium school to enter the university. As the students march by, they cheer and spin their red and blue tasseled caps up in the air on the traditional bamboo canes.

Every May 17 from early morning on, the Palace grounds and the parade streets are packed with people. By 7 a. m. the churches open and crowds gather to listen to the choirs. Children from hospitals sit in special places in front of the Palace. Everyone brings a package lunch, and grownups and children alike are excited and happy. Freedom and independence, celebrated this day, mean as much to Norwegians as they do to Americans.

In the afternoon, each neighborhood has a celebration of its own so that the children who are too little to join in the school parades may march near their homes. Everyone joins in the fun—waving the red, white, and blue Norwegian flag, leading dogs, pushing baby carriages—all heading for the place where they will listen to patriotic speeches and play games.

The Eidsvol mansion near Oslo, where the Constitution was signed, is now a national shrine. This neat, gray house with its rust-colored trim still stands as it was on that memorable day in 1814. Even the furniture is the same.

Freedom, independence, and self-government have long traditions in Norway. An ancient Norse statute proclaims:

> No one shall lay hands on another in his home, neither the King nor anyone else. If, nevertheless, the King does so, the summons shall pass through all the land and men shall advance against him and strike him. If he eludes them, he shall never be allowed to return to the land.

This and many other ancient rights were reaffirmed at Eidsvold. Four hundred years under foreign kings has not quenched the love of freedom. It was expressed in the nationwide call for a return to the law and to self-government.

The constitution of 1814 is one of the few charters of freedom of that era still remaining in force. Twenty years after its enactment, at a time when the tide of reaction was sweeping away all liberal constitutions on the European continent, a contemporary British writer and politician explained its lasting success in these words:

> All the essential parts of liberty were already in the country. The property was in the hands of the whole people. The ancient laws and institutions affecting property were in full operation, and they were conceived and administered in the very spirit of liberty. There was nothing in the condition of the people, the state of property, the civil or religious establishments which did not fit in with a free constitution. The new constitution was but a superstructure of a building of which the foundations had been laid and the lower walls constructed, 8 centuries before, by the ancestors of the present generation.

The Norwegian Constitution of 1814 provides for clearly separated legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government. Inspired by the ideals of the American War of Independence and the French Revolution, the Norwegian constitution lays down the following important rules: First, no person can be imprisoned without trial; second, freedom of speech, publication and assembly must be protected; and third, no law may be given retroactive effect. Norway is a free, independent, indivisible, and inalienable kingdom. Its form of government is a limited and hereditary monarchy.

Research in the Development and Utilization of Saline Waters

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2126) to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, if I were to choose the two problems in the United States, of greatest importance to the people, in which the Government could interest itself I think they would be water and the conservation of land; that is, the conservation of water, the development of new sources of water, the use of water to its fullest capacity, just as we have now before us the problem of the conservation of land which has been washing away. In that way there is a certain similarity between the subjects, because we are wasting these two essential, and perhaps greatest assets that any nation could have.

As the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], said, I have been interested in this, and the RECORD will show I was one of the first to put in a bill to try to do something about it. I am still interested, and I know this bill will pass because of its importance.

I think the RECORD should show that it is a broad subject, that it is not entirely a question of taking sea water out of the ocean and getting the salt out of that, and then either putting it upon land or using it domestically. There is the question of the transportation of water. Some islands have been compelled to use sea water, in dual lines, so they may conserve the fresh water and use the salt water for fire protection. The amount of fresh water that we put into the great cities of this country daily in the sewage disposal plants is unbelievable.

All of this is involved in the question of the use of sea water which has been rendered either pure or practically free from salt. It is only a beginning. I look for great advances, under the terms of this bill.

I am very much in favor of the bill. I know it will pass.

Foreign Aid—Where Does the Little Man Come Out on This?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a timely editorial that appeared in the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette on May 7. This editorial points out that if the men in Washington decide to spend a billion dollars more for foreign aid or other purposes that it will all come out of Mr. Taxpayer's pay check and it will be just that much less for him to take home and spend on himself. The editorial follows:

WHERE DOES THE LITTLE MAN COME OUT ON THIS?

The man who works 40 hours a week at a good job and earns $100 a week actually sees only a fraction of that amount written on his paycheck. The balance is taken out before he even sees the check, for "security" of one kind or another—insurance, social security, contributions, withholding taxes, etc. The amount he does not see depends upon the number of his dependents.

If the men in Washington decide to spend a billion dollars more for foreign aid or financial banks or rivers and harbors or big dams or superhighways or higher salaries all around, Mr. Taxpayer's paycheck will be just another fraction less. His "take home pay" is what we are talking about. The additional Government spending comes directly out of his pocket.

That is why this newspaper is apprehensive about the President's proposal for spending three to four billions on southeast Asia, where we already have sunk billions with no return. It is another rathole. Spending billions for direct aid is no answer. It is only a sop. The only help so far that means something is a type of point 4 plan, giving those countries our know-how.

The International Bank has served a highly useful purpose and President Eisenhower's suggested participation in a new international finance corporation to increase flow of private investment funds from this country to others may be sound. It requires a minimum of commitments with a maximum of good in return.

Mr. Taxpayer faces higher Rock County taxes, perhaps higher Janesville city taxes, much higher State taxes, higher gasoline taxes, and the certainty of continuing high

Federal taxes to feed the conglomerate mass of Federal payrollers and spenders and their pet projects.

If he doesn't like it, at least he can write to Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH and others in the Senate and House Office Buildings in Washington, D. C.

Addresses Incident to Opening of Second Century of Washington University in St. Louis, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, if we were to choose one word which epitomizes our American tradition and the American way of life better than any other—one which sets it apart from all others—I think it would be liberty. Washington University in St. Louis, Mo., held a 4-day celebration last month to mark the opening of its second hundred years of existence. The university, as many of my colleagues know, has a distinguished record of public and educational service to the community and Nation. The phrase "The blessings of liberty," taken from the preamble of our Constitution, was adopted as the theme of its second century celebration. In the course of the 4-day celebration, during which it was my honor and privilege to be awarded a citation by the university, outstanding citizens participated in a series of programs, speaking on their interpretation of this phrase.

Among the noteworthy contributions were the addresses on the opening day by the Reverend Paul C. Reinert, S. J., president of St. Louis University, and President Abram L. Sachar of Brandeis University.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Father Reinert's invocation and ex-President Abram L. Sachar, of Brandeis be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the invocation and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVOCATION DELIVERED AT KEYNOTE ASSEMBLY, 2D CENTURY CONVOCATION, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, FEBRUARY 19, 1955, BY PAUL C. REINERT, S. J., PRESIDENT OF ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY

Almighty and Eternal God, Father of all men, we begin these days of rededication with a pledge of faith in your benevolent care for us as your individual children and for the venerable institutions which share the noble task of bringing young minds and hearts to full intellectual, social, and spiritual maturity.

As we take time from busy distracted lives to ponder the blessings of human liberty, in your august Presence we solemnly affirm with all the sincerity of our innermost convictions that, like our Founding Fathers nearly two centuries ago, we too hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by You their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Grant that from these exercises this morning and in the coming days all of us may see more clearly that our right to liberty cannot be separated from the other self-evident truths, namely, that You are still the Creator and Master that our rights in 1955 still have their origin in You, that each of us enjoys a personal dignity because he is Your handiwork, that Your law, written in the hearts and nature of men must be followed if the blessings of liberty are to be preserved, and that liberty without an abiding sense of obligation to You degenerates into lawless license or a fleeting fancy.

Impregnate our minds, inflame our hearts with the realization that the eternal vigilance which is the price of liberty must extend not merely to military preparedness against a ruthless enemy who would take our freedom by force. Eternal vigilance must also be exercised over our own minds and hearts, lest the insidious enemy of earthly materialism and indifferentism rob us of our faith and our positive convictions, leaving us empty and devoid of a sense of personal responsibility.

Bless and prosper this university and all the members of her family as they rededicate themselves to even greater service; bless our speaker and all others charged with the administration of justice, the guardian of liberty; bless all of us who long for that precious possession promised by your Son—the liberty of the children of God. Amen.

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY ABRAM L. SACHAR, PRESIDENT, BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY, WALTHAM, MASS.

The chief hazards in wholesome community life do not come exclusively from the malicious or the evil or the predatory elements. Protective safeguards have been devised to cope with these, and the community is relatively vigilant. Equally dangerous are the righteous citizens who are cynical about community service, indifferent, slothful, anxious to escape responsibility, tired liberals whole ideals have not been quickly realized. All such categories represent a new kind of Trojan horse, boring from within to wear out the patience, the dedication, the courage, and the vision of those who do not swoon into defeatism at the first touch of adversity. Some day a good thesis should be written about these burnt out irresponsibles, and perhaps it may be helpful to list them in categories.

First there are the sophisticates of the ivory tower. The world is too much for them and they want to resign from the human race. They are suspicious of crusades, of reforms, of all causes. All social effort is meaningless since we are all trapped anyway by vast impersonal military and economic forces. In Emerson's phrase, "things ride people," so why not, they say, cooperate with the inevitable. They just want to be let alone. This group includes many famous literary personalities who turn their backs on a world which is not worth salvaging.

Then there is the group that has no faith in the decent motivations of men, that look upon the world as a "dog-eat-dog" sort of jungle, where the golden rule should be "Do unto others as others would do unto you—but do it first." They have inevitable examples in the history of the past two decades, and the lesson burnt in upon them is that self interest is the only safe guide for survival.

Prominent also are the refugees from responsibility. Peace of mind is their be-all, and nothing must be undertaken which affects the blood pressure or agitates the colon. The best sellers which offer prescriptions on how to relax, how to avoid aggravation, how to reach the Shangri-la of ease and serenity, appeal especially to these community escapists.

Increasingly numerous is the category of wholesome dedicated people whose sensitiveness drives them out of service because they do not link idealism with stamina. Public service inevitably brings criticism or misunderstanding; it requires involvement in the hurly burly of conviction and battle. The greedy, the selfish, the primitives, the men with axes to grind, hang on for dear life. They do not turn tail and run when the going gets tough. But so many of the decent elements who honestly want to serve don't have the staying power, and they resign to save their dignity, often leaving the field to the elephantines and the Neanderthal men. So we get the survival of the unfittest.

Finally, there is the great crowd of belittlers. Unwilling to make sacrifices themselves, they have no good word for anyone else. Public servants are rascals, they insist, out always for their own good; everyone has an angle and only the naive are taken in. They sit in the seats of the scorner and when their neighbors have exhausted themselves in service for the common good, their reaction is expressed in criticism or Monday morning quarterbacking.

These are the self-righteous good people who offer the largest challenge to good citizenship. They are deep in the heart of every community and they are chiefly responsible for the attrition which ultimately destroys the will to progress. As voices are again raised to follow a dangerous neo-isolationism, look for the cynics who form the vanguard. As respect for democratic processes lessens, look for the bankrupted idealists, the exhausted volcanos and all the flashy verbalizers whose impatience with the tedious techniques of fulfillment leads to futility and impotence. As doubts are thrown over the heroic efforts of teachers and public administrators to use education for the release of capacity look for the escapists and the defeatists who can smell out failure even before an effort is made.

Fortunately, the field is not abandoned to these. There are enough men and women of real moral stamina who, though often blocked and hampered and even discouraged by these types, once brilliantly stigmatized by Walt Whitman as having hearts of rags and souls of chalk, continue to hold to the line. They are our best hope for international peace, for good government, for the fulfillment of social justice, and, of course, for the kind of schools and teaching which are the sinews of a vital democracy. For they are anchored to the conviction that the most honorable objective for a going society is not ease; it is fulfillment. It is not serenity; it is adequacy.

This Is No Time To Be Pennywise—Let's Save the Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am privileged to include a most interesting editorial from the pen of T. C. Harris, executive editor, St. Petersburg Times, St. Petersburg, Fla. The editorial brings out some important aspects of the student exchange program:

THIS IS NO TIME TO BE PENNYWISE—LET'S SAVE THE EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Billions voted willingly for guns and planes, bombs, and ships, and other tools of war—but a modest appropriation for a potent weapon for peace is cut almost in half.

The State Department asked $22 million for its educational exchange program. The House cut it to $12 million.

Vice President NIXON, asking for a restoration, said the $10 million cut was "pennywise and pound-foolish" and added if any program was "indispensable" this was it.

What is this program and what is its purpose?

Congress authorized it—under the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt acts—to promote and increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries. Due to this Nation's role in world affairs and the existence today of grave international tensions, the Government seeks through this program to bring about greater worldwide confidence in and cooperation with the United States. We can do this by furthering the realization among other peoples that the motives, objectives, and policies of the United States and its citizens are in harmony with and will, in fact, advance their own real aspirations for peace, progress, and freedom.

WORKS TWO WAYS

The program works two ways. We bring students from other nations to the United States for face-to-face contacts, and we send American students to other countries for the same purpose. This, again, has a twofold purpose: We give the world—through these representatives—a chance to see our way of life and our democracy at work and we also help to further the desires and ambitions of the individual students.

These students are students only in the sense that they are abroad—here or in other countries—for the purpose of learning. They are already key young people of outstanding character and of great potentiality for future leadership in their own countries. Three-fourths of them are young professional persons in the 25–35 age groups—teachers, journalists, government officials, lawyers, representatives of labor and of management.

And those we send abroad are selected after rigorous competition and are restricted to those doing postgraduate work. As unofficial ambassadors, the American students demonstrate to their foreign friends and contacts the high qualities of edfucation and personal excellence found in the young people of our country.

In other words the exchange program is the most effective and most economical way of building essential friendships in other parts of the world.

Here are some examples:

1. Some of our most active supporters in postwar Germany were a large number of Germans who had traveled in the United States. This same group had been anti-Nazi in the era when Hitler was causing us so much trouble.

2. In Indonesia the people most sympathetic with the Western ways generally and with the United States specifically are the men and women who have been here on State Department and FOA exchange programs.

3. French business activity has been improved by French "students" who have enjoyed the exchange program in the United States. They profited from what they learned or were taught here in good business principles and administration. This is the best possible way to help free enterprise in a nation where communism is an ever-present threat.

We can't bring all the citizens of other countries here to study our ways, but representative students and groups will take their impressions home and spread them among the other citizens. An observer in both Europe and the Far East said the impact of these programs and the business community, on public officials and on important citizen groups has been tremendous and most favorable for us.

* * * * *

Another aspect of the case is that if this cut is not restored, many students who go to Europe or other countries on personal or scholarship funds matched by Federal funds will be deprived of that opportunity and we will have fewer ambassadors of goodwill abroad.

And still another aspect is that at the very time the Soviet Government is stepping up its propaganda program, we are talking about cutting down. We can't afford to do it.

We hope that Congressmen will reconsider and vote to restore this $10 million. The cost is small compared to the tremendous benefits.

The goodwill and understanding this $22 million program gencrates may help make unnecessary the war for which we are spending the billions.

Shallow Logic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, legislation has been introduced in the House this session to grant the rank of General of the Armies to Douglas MacArthur. The Committee on Armed Services advises me that an unfavorable report was received, therefore it is anticipated that no action will be taken by the committee.

In my opinion, a majority of the citizens of the United States would wholeheartedly favor such recognition of the services to this Nation by General MacArthur, and it is my hope that the committee will see fit to report this legislation to the House.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the May 16, 1955, New York Journal-American:

SHALLOW LOGIC

Representative MARTIN of Massachusetts is the minority floor leader in the lower House of Congress, but on the subject of granting the rank of General of the Armies to Douglas MacArthur he speaks for an overwhelming majority in Congress and in the country.

Speaking in behalf of the five Members of Congress who are sponsoring legislative measures granting the title to General MacArthur, which only the late Gen. John Pershing has held before him, Mr. MARTIN says he is not impressed by the objections offered to the plan by the military authorities in the Pentagon.

Evidently the objections which seem pretty shallow rest on the argument that the rank which General MacArthur now holds is also held by four other officers, and that a promotion of one requires the promotion of all.

We do not believe that General MacArthur's present peers would accept the specious plea.

General MacArthur is respected among military men everywhere as a brilliant combat veteran of three wars. As Chief of Staff he reconstructed our American organization on the basis of World War I experience, and employed the interval of peace to teach a new generation the precepts of preparedness. Later, he founded a defense system in the Philippines; in World War II his Pacific campaign was resplendent; and with victory, he as a military governor reconstructed Japan. Now it is conceded that he should have been permitted to win the Korean war.

His administrative and military records are both unrivaled.

This great soldier and honored citizen once stood as the lonely symbol of our refusal to accept defeat at our time of greatest humiliation and despair, and he came home to receive the greatest outpouring of affection and respect ever accorded any American.

It is to be hoped Representative MARTIN and his colleagues persist in their determination to give proper national expression to the honor in which General MacArthur is held.

The obstructions they have encountered in pursuing that purpose are the little delusions of some very little people.

American Industry Takes a Beating From U. N.'s Socialistic Researchers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, an interesting article appeared in the Saturday Evening Post, and under leave to extend my remarks, I am including it at this point:

AMERICAN INDUSTRY TAKES A BEATING FROM U. N.'S SOCIALISTIC RESEARCHERS

The eager beavers who talk about revising the United Nations Charter to give U. N. more authority, without damaging this country's right to order its own internal affairs, might well take a look at recent reports issued by two inconspicuous United Nations agencies. One of these is a study, with some vague recommendations, of the practices of the foreign operations of the American oil industry as interpreted by the staff of the secretariat of the economic commission for Europe, if you follow us. The charge is that American oil companies overcharge their European customers for Middle Eastern oil, and it is hinted that some sort of international price control is the indicated remedy.

At about the same time, another U. N. bureau, the department of economic and social affairs, came up with a long report on foreign capital in Latin America. Although the report itself was in the main benign, it was presented in the newspapers as a charge that "United States investors yearly take more money out of Latin America than they put into it, and the disparity is growing." This news was solemnly displayed in our newspapers, and undoubtedly in newspapers all over the world, suggesting that American investors were in some way swindling Latin America and making fabulous profits at her expense.

Actually, as the U. N. survey concedes, American capital is hampered in several Latin-American countries by so many restrictions and virtual prohibitions that new investment is effectively discouraged. But the newspaper releases of the U. N. report suggest that the supposedly low rate of new investment is all our fault.

The oil report by the staff of the economic commission for Europe was prepared under the direction of Gunnar Myrdal, a Swedish Socialist, who, as Sweden's Minister of Commerce, engineered a trade treaty with Russia which produced so little trade that it was not renewed. Myrdal is also the author of a report on the race problem in the United States, the result of a $250,000 grant made by the Carnegie Foundation. In the course of this "monumental work" Myrdal describes the adoption of the United States Constitution as "nearly a plot against the common people." Is Myrdal the best authority a U. N. agency could rely on for a complicated study of the oil industry?

Officials of American oil companies deny that the price of Middle Eastern oil is linked to the price of American oil. According to them, oil from the Middle East sells at a competitive price and has virtually driven Western Hemisphere oil from Europe's market for that reason. Nevertheless, in Europe, American industry has been taking a severe journalistic drubbing on account of this misleading report.

Curiously enough, neither the American delegation to the United Nations nor even the U. N. Secretariat itself appears to know what these subsidiary and socialistically inclined bodies like the economic commission for Europe are up to. It seems to us that, before the next United Nations Day, the American delegation might put in a little spade work to find out how much U. N. activity is concerned with the undermining and discrediting of the free-enterprise system and the promotion of socialism.

Work of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, the Sertoma Club of Washington at its luncheon meeting on May 3 heard an address by Wendel B. Barnes, Administrator of Small Business Administration, and because of the informative nature of his presentation, I would like to include his comments in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks:

BASIC PROGRAMS OF SBA

An outstanding fact about the Small Business Administration is that it is a service organization—100 percent. The Agency is dedicated to service to the small-business concern. It operates on the principle that on-the-spot assistance, through its field offices, is more valuable than remote analysis.

The Small Business Administration does not operate in an ivory tower. We take a realistic approach to all of the problems of small business and we operate on the community level insofar as that is possible. We like to meet the businessman on his own ground. Today I want to bring you a few examples of how the Small Business Administration operates its various programs. I want to give you concrete examples of the service to small business provided every day.

In our approach to the problems of small business, the Small Business Administration always tries to be humane, considerate, and sympathetic. This, of course, is the decent way. It is a pattern of conduct that was established by President Eisenhower himself. In an address in Denver a year ago, the President, speaking of the program of his administration, had this to say:

"Now, this program at home can be defined best, I think, by saying this: That it has been a liberal program in all of those things that bring the Federal Government in contact with the individual; when it deals with the individual and his problems; in this field, the Government tries to be humane, considerate, and sympathetic—and that is true liberalism."

That is what the President said, and the Small Business Administration, I can assure you, is striving hard to live up to this high concept of public service.

In creating the Small Business Administration about 2 years ago, Congress and President Eisenhower recognized that in these changing times small firms have special problems, and it is desirable to have an independent agency in the Government where these problems can be taken up and where solutions can be worked out on a cooperative basis.

To carry out this assignment, the Small Business Administration has developed programs of giving financial counseling and assistance to small firms, of helping small firms get Government contracts and subcontracts, of providing them with managerial and technical assistance, and providing products assistance—including product development and improvement.

Let me explain these basic programs in more detail.

The agency's financial specialists have counseled with thousands of proprietors of small firms, and have helped many of them arrange loans from private lending sources, or have shown them how, by making some changes in their methods of operation, they could continue to operate satisfactorily without the necessity of a loan from either Government or private sources.

In the loans made the emphasis is always on helping the small firm develop a line of credit at his home bank. Let me cite briefly a couple of examples:

A little more than a year ago, the proprietor of a small firm in Coral Gables, Fla., came to our field office in Miami seeking financial help. His firm was engaged in manufacturing rattan and other types of furniture, and was a pioneer in the field of offering employment to physically handicapped persons. It had received recognition from the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. It had been written up in the local newspapers and in a national magazine.

Well, the proprietor of this firm came to the Small Business Administration and asked us to share in a $20,000 bank-participation loan to help him increase his production. The firm was then employing 23 persons, most of them physically handicapped, and the proprietor wanted to expand—to provide employment for 17 more physically handicapped persons.

He had already been to see his bank. We require applicants to seek the loan from their banks first, since we do not wish to compete with private banks. The banker wanted to make the loan, but it was against the bank's policy to make loans for such a long term—in this case 4 years. However, the bank would take half of the loan, if the Small Business Administration would take half.

Our investigation was favorable, and a short while later the funds were disbursed to help this firm remodel and expand, and provide more jobs for physically handicapped persons. In this type of loan the bank advanced all of the funds, and we agreed to purchase our share later, if called upon. No funds were withdrawn from the United States Treasury.

That is the story of one of our bank-participation loans—the story of a service we were able to provide.

Let us take another case. The operator of a popcorn-processing plant in a small Maryland town wanted to build a similar plant in a nearby Delaware community to meet the needs of farmers growing popcorn on restricted acreage—land that could not be used for growing Government-supported crops.

This enterprising small-business man located an abandoned building. But he needed drying crips to store the corn, conveyor belts to move it, machinery to shell, clean, and package it. That would take $150,000 that he didn't have.

The man went to his bank, and the loan looked good to the banker, except for one thing. It was a small bank, and its legal maximum for a loan was $15,000. The bank's big-city correspondent wasn't interested in a term loan. They specialized in commercial loans that could be paid back in 90 or 120 days.

So the local banker sent the businessman to see us. We found that he was eligible—he had a sound business proposition. The result was a $150,000 loan—our limit—at 6 percent for 10 years. The local bank took 10 percent, or $15,000, of the loan.

As a result, nearly 500 farmers in the area served by this new business now save $5 a ton in costs they formerly had to pay to get their popcorn to market. A new business has been established in a community, providing employment where it was badly needed. Through this loan we helped the entire community, another example of service.

The Small Business Administration also has a disaster-loan program—a purely humanitarian function. We provide financial assistance to individuals and to businesses that need help because of losses suffered in natural catastrophes, such as hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, or other disasters.

So you can see that the Small Business Administration is a service agency. All of our programs are to provide service to the business community.

Let us now consider our program to help small firms get Government contracts and subcontracts. Again I want to cite actual examples.

The Small Business Administration has representatives stationed in the principal procurement centers of the military department across the country. Here, all individual proposed procurements valued at $10,000 or more (except those classified as confidential or higher) are screened jointly by the Small Business Administration representatives and military procurement officers.

Those found suitable for performance by small business, if jointly agreed to by the Small Business Administration and the military, are earmarked and reserved exclusively for competitive award to small firms.

Here is an example of the help we gave to one small firm. I quote from a letter we received from the firm. It says: "You will be pleased to know that as a result of the excellent cooperation you have given us in the past, this company has been awarded * * * United States Navy contract for $188,076. Please extend to your entire organization our heartfelt thanks." Another example of service.

Our assistance in helping firms get Government contracts also extends to subcontracts let by prime contractors performing work for the Government. Here is an example of this type of service. Officials of a small firm visited the Small Business Administration regional office at Kansas City seeking work because their tool department was operating at only 10 percent of capacity. The regional office studied the firm's capabilities, recommended it to a large manufacturer, and arranged a meeting between the two. The small firm later reported that as a result of this assistance it expected to receive sufficient work to keep its tool shop operating at full capacity.

Another program we have is that of providing small firms with managerial and technical assistance. We publish three series of practical, helpful, leaflets called Management, Technical, and Marketers Aids for Small Business. These leaflets cover a wide range of management and production problems, telling how to recognize and deal with them. They are available free at all of our field offices. They have been in great demand.

Regarding these publications, a manufacturer's supply company in Indiana said: "The Management and Technical Aids are excellent. The ideas obtained from one aid alone enabled our company to make a saving of more than $1,000."

Regarding these same publications, a trust company in New York State said: "We use your aids as a part of a business reference library for the use of small business con-

ccrns in this area. The commercial banks of the area recently held a 10-week course for owners of small firms, and among the text and reference material used by each of the 100 participants were all of your Aids published to date."

One of our newest programs is that of products assistance. It is designed to meet the problem faced by many small business concerns, of keeping abreast of product and marketing developments.

This program has a twofold goal: To assist in strengthening the independent small firms of the Nation, and to help in developing the actual and potential capacities of small business—thus increasing the contribution of small firms to the national economy and to themselves.

Perhaps the best way to tell about this new program is to mention some problems that are common to many owners or operators of small firms: How to make something; how to eliminate a costly process; where to find a substitute; where to sell a byproduct or waste product; how to determine the market for a product. You will note these are all types of services that we offer to small businesses.

The owner of a small business is usually occupied with many varied duties in operating his plant or business. We therefore seek to help small firms find answers to their specific problems. We bring to their attention the availability of information on new or improved products, processes, and inventive ideas—which may ultimately mean greater sales, business expansion, more profits, and more jobs.

It has long been recognized that one of the most urgent needs for small businesses is to keep up to date on production and marketing techniques. They need to do this so they can diversify their lines and keep pace with the changes which occur in our ever-expanding economy. We get information of this type to pass on to small firms, from other Government agencies, large private concerns, and from inventors and developers of commercial ideas.

There is a tremendous wealth of this information available on product research, utilization and development, marketing techniques, and related subjects. The problem in the past has been to channel this information into one spot where business firms can obtain it easily and without cost.

That is why the Small Business Administration is making the information available through its field offices. We are now distributing a products list circular, which will be issued periodically. It lists and gives a brief description of the product, invention, technique, or commercial idea; along with the name and address of the owner.

It should be emphasized, however, that the Small Business Administration does not endorse or guarantee success of items or ideas listed. The Agency, as a service organization, operates as a clearinghouse. We are always willing to help small firms gain access to technical and research data, and to aid them in applying this type of information or knowledge to a particular problem.

How successful is this program? On a national basis, the Small Business Administration has already received more than 2,000 individual requests for products assistance, and interest in the program is growing by leaps and bounds.

These, very briefly, are the basic services we have developed to help small business. I have tried to show that the Small Business Administration is an Agency with a conscience. We make every effort to offer services that are needed by small firms to help them increase their employment and grow and prosper in these changing times.

We try never to lose sight of the injunction President Eisenhower has laid down for us, to be humane, considerate and sympathetic in dealing with the indivdual and his problem.

Signs of Real Accord Missing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of May 16, 1955]

SIGNS OF REAL ACCORD MISSING—A LOOK BEHIND SURFACE DEVELOPMENTS TELLS SOME THE SOVIET HASN'T CHANGED

(By Constantine Brown)

There is only a thin veneer of optimism in Washington official circles concerning the chances for real improvement in the international situation.

Responsible officials in the executive and legislative branches do not see any genuine signs that spring may be coming soon. Here is a sketchy survey of views expressed in off-the-record talks:

The treaty which makes Austria free again is only a modest accomplishment which basically cannot affect the cold war. The Russians held it up until the so-called eastern NATO became an accomplished fact. This new Soviet gimmick will permit the Russians—who are always punctilious about protocols and formalities—to transfer their occupation forces from Austria to Hungary and Czechoslovakia on the borders of newly freed Austria.

Official crystal gazers see an uncertain future for Austria. That country, which less than 40 years ago was the heart of a large and powerful European empire, has shrunk to a small state of some 6 million people, with one-third centered in the capital of Vienna. The little republic's boundaries adjoin two satellite states, Czechoslovakia and Hungary, and the unsympathetic Communist republic of Yugoslavia.

Austria's non-Communist neighbors are Switzerland and Bavaria, neither of which could lift a finger if something happened to Austria. And that something could well be a Communist movement from within. Supported by the cells the Russians are leaving behind, it would be aimed at establishing a government like the bordering Soviet satellites.

The guarantees contained in the Big Four Treaty apply only to protection from outside aggression and do not concern any political moves within the newly liberated State. There were such occurrences a few years ago in Hungary and Czechoslovakia after they had regained their independence from the Nazi empire which we had destroyed. And as in the case of those satellites, the Western World could do nothing more than protest the gobbling up of another free State by the Communists.

These may be unpleasant and pessimistic thoughts before the ink of the new treaty has dried. But they exist in the minds of Washington officialdom. Continued freedom of the Austrians depends entirely on the sincerity of the men in the Kremlin. And they have done nothing so far by actual deeds to lead us to believe the leopard is changing its spots.

The entrance of West Germany into the NATO is less important presently than has been advertised. Germany will need until the end of 1959 to muster a new military force which might make the Russians pause. That is the earliest date, provided there are no new diplomatic developments.

The free Germans are more concerned with union with East Germany than with speeding up rearmament. Admittedly the West, by itself, cannot reunite Germany, but Moscow can perform this feat as easily as it concluded the Austrian Treaty after so many years of delay.

The Russians are definitely courting the West German Republic and are worried about a genuine consolidation of the Western defenses with German military forces at the disposal of NATO. This, indeed, would challenge Moscow's aims in Europe. The Soviet general staff is reported unwilling to launch its forces in an adventure in Europe, except as a last resort. As in all dictatorships, there is complete coordination between the political and military leaders in Russia. Hence, Soviet diplomacy is now intent on tempting the Germans with the carrot of reuniting the two separated portions by some means which may be revealed at the forthcoming Big Four meeting.

President Eisenhower reluctantly yielded to the demands of our European allies to meet with the heads of the other three powers, not only to help the British Conservatives in their election campaign, but also to strengthen the position of Chancellor Adenauer. The aged German leader, dedicated to the idea of a European confederation, needs help desperately. He achieved the sovereignty and NATO pacts but has lost ground politically with his own people in free Germany.

According to responsible observers, the Germans are far more interested in unity than in rearmament. Unless Adenauer can hold out prospects for German unity, he may be replaced by the Socialists who are on record that unity is the prime German objective.

Russia is expected to exploit these natural sentiments of the Germans and will lose no chance to tell them that the Kremlin alone holds the solution to the problem. They cannot ask the Bonn government to renege on its commitments to the West as the price of unity. But they are expected to exploit the situation at this summer's conference. This can be done in two ways: (1) A demand that all powers involved withdraw their forces as is being done in the case of Austria. This has been indicated already in the disarmament proposals issued last week by Moscow. (2) An easing of the present tensions by a worldwide settlement which must include all claims of the Chinese Communists against territory held by the Nationalists. Our refusal to comply with this later demand would be deeply resented, not only by the French and British, but also by the German people who have no stakes whatever in the Far East.

The idea of a Big Four parley was born from the necessity of strengthening the present Governments of Britain and Germany. But it is the Russians who will take the ball from now on.

That Raise for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Oregon Journal of Wednesday, May 11, 1955:

THAT RAISE FOR POSTAL WORKERS

What one individual or group of individuals is qualified to decide exactly the percentage pay increase the Nation's 500,000 postal workers should receive?

President Eisenhower early indicated an increase higher than 7.5 percent would be unacceptable.

Subsequently the House voted an 8.2-percent and the Senate a 10-percent boost. House and Senate conferees compromised on an 8.8-percent increase, which now has passed the House by an overwhelming 328-to-66 vote and seems assured clear sailing in the Senate.

Meanwhile, opponents of the compromise point to the implied threat of a veto.

The President's concern is not merely the impact of the postal raise itself, but also the relationship of postal workers' pay to that of other Federal civilian workers.

Nevertheless, we do not see how the President could justify a veto on a percentage-point difference of 1.3, particularly at a time when he is trying to sell, quite properly, a $3,500,000,000 foreign-aid program. The 8.8-percent raise would add $178 million to the post-office payroll, about $28 million more than a 7.5-percent boost.

Legislation increasing by 50 percent the pay of Congressmen was found acceptable because it was generally conceded their salaries were too low. Postal workers have not had a pay increase since 1951. We believe their salaries are too low. We hope disagreement over a few percentage points does not deny them a justified raise.

Citizen of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening, May 15, the Kansas City chapter of Unico National held its annual I Am an American Day dinner. On this fine occasion one of Kansas City's most distinguished citizens was proclaimed "the citizen of the year." Mr. Henry J. Massman, Sr., the recipient of this award, is one of the country's ablest construction contractors and one of Kansas City's outstanding civic leaders.

On receiving the award Mr. Massman made the following moving acceptance speech:

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH OF MR. HENRY J. MASSMAN, SR., UPON RECEIPT OF CITIZEN OF THE YEAR AWARD BY UNICO NATIONAL OF KANSAS CITY, MAY 15, 1955

I wish I could tell you how deeply grateful I am for this honor. I accept this beautiful plaque with humility. I know what this honor means, and I hesitate to think that I could possibly deserve it.

We are told that he who honors another also does great honor to himself. St. Paul had a special way of making friends. He gave his life in the service of others, yet whenever a favor was done for him he was not happy. He saw honor only in serving others.

I think St. Paul would have loved to belong to Unico, that is, if you would let him serve in some humble capacity. Unico, too, believes in service above self.

Tonight I honestly think I may say that I now have a new understanding of the worth and value of Unico. One does not have to scratch much below its surface to discover that Unico is American in concept, American in philosoph, and American in practice.

Tonight you honor me as an American. Next to that of Christian, there is no greater title. I hope I am worthy of it. To be a true American is a difficult thing, and while we may all be proud to be called Americans, the test is in our daily lives.

A good American is many things. He believes in the dignity of the individual, and that makes him a Christian.

He respects the rights of others, and that makes him a human being. He believes that a living wage means decency and the luxuries of life, and that makes him a philosopher.

He believes that the strength of our country is in our young people, and that makes him almost godlike.

But a good American will not demand too much of our young people while they are young. He is tender toward the bashful, gentle toward the distant, and merciful toward the foolish.

All these things, I know, are the aims of Unico. Throughout this land you demonstrate every day the finest instincts of the American ideal.

As far east as Massachusetts, south to Florida, and straight across the country to California, the banner of Unico can be seen. Your charter is a kind of bill of rights, the bright hope of every immigrant to step on American shores. Your daily program spreads the gospel of the American way of life to young and old alike.

Your spirit of world brotherhood is a lash against the forces of hate and tyranny. It is hard to keep our values clear today. The temptations to be cynical are many. We live in difficult times, when prayer and trust in God are the occupations of wise and prudent men.

With Unico, I join in thanks for the blessing of life in a free country—for the greatest of the eternal gifts, the strength one day to achieve lasting peace and good will among all men.

A National Essay Contest Winner From New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I include in my remarks an essay written by Miss Nancy Mann, of Santa Fe, N. Mex., which placed second in the national essay contest conducted by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. I commend this essay to the careful attention of every Member of Congress and of the American people because it provides food for thought on a subject about which I am forced to confess, there is far too little understanding. Miss Mann displays breadth of human quality that is extraordinary and most exceptional for one of her age. Would that more of us in our adult years could display such understanding of a program which has contributed so vitally to our Nation's betterment spiritually and economically—a program which has inspired in the hearts and minds of the many thousands of our physically handicapped fellow citizens new hope and restored confidence. I am sure all of us join in congratulations to Miss Mann for her brilliant contribution which so vividly portrays that characteristic of American youth which assures all of us that the future of our Nation is indeed in good hands.

Miss Mann's essay follows:

A DECADE OF PROGRESS IN EMPLOYING THE HANDICAPPED

Eight o'clock. Another busy work day is beginning all over America. People from Maine to California yawn, gulp down a second cup of coffee, and then rush to their jobs. In Detroit, a World War II veteran with two artificial legs catches a bus to a General Motors factory, where he operates a giant die cutting machine. A young typist, on her way to an office building in a middle-sized town in Texas, walks slowly because she is sightless. In New York City a little bald man prepares his classroom where he trains children suffering from cerebral palsy, an illness from which he himself suffers.

Ten years ago, these individuals might have been unemployed. They would have been burdens to their families and to the public. They would have been objects for pity. But now they need no pity; they are self-sufficient citizens in their communities.

What has happened in the last decade to allow these people, and many thousands more like them, to have a chance to support themselves? Many different conditions and events in this period of time have brought about advancement in the employment of the physically handicapped.

The occurrence of World War II and the Korean war was an important factor in this progress. War always is a drain on the country's manpower. During the war years, employers were required to find ways to meet the shortage of laborers; and they realized the potential manpower of the handicapped. Then, too, with the huge number of battle casualties, the public was forced to come to grips with the problem of rehabilitating the disabled veterans. The Armed Forces set up many convalescent centers to train these battle-scarred men. The Detroit veteran with the two artificial legs probably was taught the new skill of operating a die cutting machine in one of these centers.

In the last 10 years new medical knowledge has provided help not even dreamed of 25 years ago. Wonder drugs, liver extract, insulin, and cortisone are a few of the scientific discoveries that have aided many disabled persons to become better fit for life and work. Improved surgery, better hospital facilities, public health preventive measures, and new X-ray techniques are some other advancements.

An increased interest in the welfare of the handicapped by the State and Federal Governments has appeared in recent years. Since 1945, Congress has designated a week of the year for National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. October 3–9, 1954, was the 10th observance of this week. Many persons have been helped under the State-Federal program of vocational rehabilitation. During the fiscal year of 1950–51 alone, 66,000 persons were rehabilitated at a cost of $4 million. All over the country agencies are currently carrying on important work for the disabled. State governments operate many convalescent centers.

Through efforts of the National Government, surveys, pamphlets and meetings like the Exposition and Parade of Progress in Washington April 28–30, 1954, the facts have been made known to the public. Education has played a very important part in the employment of the handicapped; if people realize that their prejudices against the handicapped are unfounded, they will employ them readily. Employers are learning that disabed workers are adaptable, productive, careful, regular, reliable, and capable.

New mechanical devices have enabled the handicapped to do more on their own. Aids to writing and reading, special power tools, and scores of other ingenious gadgets help them to do constructive work. The young typist from Texas uses a special dictaphone for the blind.

Progress has been made also in the increased number of schools and rehabilitation centers. For instance, in 1944 there were

only 13 approved schools for occupational therapy. Now, however, there are about 30 in the country. The Institute for the Crippled and Disabled in New York City, the Kabat-Kaiser Institutes in California, the Cleveland Rehabilitation Center, and the Curative Workshop of Louisville are some of the many convalescent centers in the country. The little bald man trains his pupils in such a center in New York City.

Through the efforts of nonprofit organizations like the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, the Goodwill Industries, the National Tuberculosis, and the American Heart Association, much has been done toward the advancement of employment of the handicapped. The Goodwill Industries, for example, collect discarded things. The Industries train the handicapped to make these things over and then sell them.

The accomplishments of the Government, the rehabilitation centers and all other agencies are evidenced by this fact: from October 1945 to April 1954, public employment services report 1,938,000 job placements of the disabled.

In spite of the great strides the physically handicapped have taken in the last 10 years, much remains to be done. Not all are as fortunate as the World War II amputee, the blind typist, and the little bald man. There are at least 2 million disabled persons in this country who have not yet been rehabilitated. Trained personnel, more physicians, an improved hospital program, and a better education of the public are needed. The progress the United States has made is little compared to what must be done throughout the world. The International Labor Office of the United Nations has realized the great need for a worldwide vocational program for the disabled. The world must look to the future. The rehabilitated people at work add to our source of manpower, purchasing power, and the general welfare.

Five o'clock. The workday is over. In Detroit the veteran punches the time clock in the General Motors factory and waves goodbye to a fellow worker. The young typist in Texas clears off her desk and combs her hair before leaving. In New York City, the little bald man, thinking about the roast he will have for dinner, quickens his pace. Handicapped employees all over America are on their way home from their jobs. Handicapped? No. Because of the progress in the last decade, these people have overcome their handicaps.

Michigan Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged today to draw to the attention of my colleagues and the entire Nation an important civic celebration now in progress this week in my home State of Michigan.

As proclaimed in a concurrent resolution of the Michigan Legislature, Michigan Week is designed to focus the attention of Michigan citizens on past achievements and to instill a greater civic pride in our State and its people.

Michigan is proud of its achievements both in war and peace as America's industrial center. But Michigan Week affords an opportunity to outline some of our other activities equally important in providing a richer, fuller life for our people and the Nation as a whole.

The Nation's first regularly scheduled air service was started in 1926 between Detroit and Grand Rapids by the Stout Air Services.

In addition to automobiles Michigan ranks first in boatbuilding, auto trailers, gray iron, cutting tools, woodworking machinery, breakfast foods, and refrigerators. Eighty-one percent of all types of industry are found in Michigan.

The town of Colon is the "magic capital of the world," and Kalamazoo is known for its large paper mills. Midland and Wyandotte are leaders in the production of chemicals and at Fremont is located the Gerber Food Products Co., the Nation's largest maker of baby foods.

The only wooden shoe factory in the United States is located at Holland, Mich., which is also famous as a center of furnace production. Grayling houses the world's largest producer of quality archery equipment, and the largest packer of live bait is located in Port Huron.

Michigan ranks 10th or higher in the production of the Nation's 20 leading crops.

Michigan ranks first in the production of tart cherries, navy beans, cantaloups, celery, cucumber pickles, strawberries, and gladiolus for bulbs.

Michigan farmers have won the International Wheat King title in 2 of the last 4 years.

Cash sales of Michigan farmers topped $700 million in recent years, making agriculture one of the State's leading activities.

Michigan is proud of its record in education. Michigan State University at East Lansing is now celebrating its centennial year. MSU was the first land-grant college established under an act of Congress.

Michigan was the first State in the Union to provide for public libraries in its constitution. Michigan State Normal College in Ypsilanti was the first teachers' training school west of the Alleghenies. It was set up in 1849.

This enumeration is far from complete but it gives you a number of reasons why we in Michigan find satisfaction in marking Michigan Week.

But we are not living in the past. We look forward to the future with confidence. Our goal is to provide an ever-increasing abundance for more and more people so that our State may go forward with the Nation.

Following is the concurrent resolution of the Michigan Legislature proclaiming Michigan Week:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION URGING THE PEOPLE OF MICHIGAN TO TAKE PART IN THE OBSERVANCE OF MICHIGAN WEEK FROM MAY 15 TO MAY 21, 1955, PASSED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN ON APRIL 28, 1955

Whereas Michigan Week is a period set aside annually for citizens of this State to turn their attention to the social and economic resources of their State and examine thoughtfully the things that make it a good place in which to live and work; and

Whereas Michigan is abundant in the things which develop a great pride and loyalty in our State; and

Whereas Michigan workers have put Michigan at the top in skills and productivity, and Michigan has 365 of the 451 different kinds of manufacturing in the United States and the diversity of Michigan's manufacturing makes the State a leader in the production of gray-iron, cutting tools, jigs and fixtures, products of machine shops operating on a job or order basis, plating and polishing, automobile trailers, woodworking machinery, paper coating and glazing, sporting and athletic goods, cereal preparations, and salt; and

Whereas many of Michigan's cities are nationally and internationally known because of the products they make: Detroit, Pontiac, Flint, and Lansing—autos and parts; Battle Creek—cereals; Holland—furnaces; Grand Rapids— furniture; Kalamazoo—paper products and drugs; Midland and Wyandotte—chemicals; and

Whereas Michigan has in its Upper Peninsula one of the world's greatest iron ore producing regions and leads the Nation in the production of calcium-magnesium chlorides, gypsum and salt, ranks high in the production of numerous other important minerals and has the world's largest supply of fresh water for industry; and

Whereas Michigan's farmers have made our State the most self-sufficient food producer in the Nation, placing Michigan in the top 15 States in production of the 46 of the country's 50 major crops, giving Michigan an amazing diversification of quality agricultural products and an annual farm income of three-quarters of a billion dollars; and

Whereas Michigan produces the greatest amount of lumber of any major industrial State and consequently boasts of such great wood-dependent industries as the paper and the furniture industries; and

Whereas Michigan, bordered by 4 of the 5 Great Lakes, has the country's longest shoreline, contains more than 11,000 inland lakes, and more than 36,000 miles of streams, enjoys forests of unspoiled beauty, possesses an unparalleled number of State parks and excellent resort facilities, and offers visitors from other States and countries an ideal place for recreation and vacations; and

Whereas Michigan is the only State in the East North Central census district predicted by the United States Census Bureau to have a greater share of the country's population in 1960 and 1965 than today; and

Whereas Michigan residents are blessed with unusual opportunities to enjoy a vigorous cultural, intellectual, and religious life, with thousands of fine churches, schools, colleges, and libraries located within the State; and

Whereas Michigan possesses a long and illustrious history which began only 14 years after the landing of the Pilgrims; a history during which both war and peace Michigan's agricultural and industrial might and the industriousness and ingenuity of its people have stood in the ready service of our country; a history marked by a strong tradition of courage, freedom of spirit, and firm endeavor displayed by Michigan people; and

Whereas Michigan's residents should know and appreciate their State's unlimited advantages and opportunities in industry, natural resources, agriculture, recreation, and culture, and their State's fine historical background: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the members of the Michigan Legislature urge all people of Michigan to take part in the observance of Michigan Week, May 15 to May 21, 1955, a period in which residents of our State may become better acquainted with the boundless opportunities present in Michigan, as well as all sides of Michigan's past and present greatness which may help bring about a deeper pride in our State's many accomplishments and an increased feeling of unity among its peoples.

A Death Sentence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, independent business in the United States is gravely concerned by the importations of foreign commodities that are already being dumped on this country and the increases that may well take place under the proposed lowering of tariff rates.

The following article by a well-known official of one of the largest independent business organizations focuses attention on the dangerous situation that is developing to the American economy:

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of May 9, 1955]

LOWER TARIFF WALLS THREATEN UNITED STATES LIVING STANDARDS

(By Ed Wimmer, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, Inc.)

The death sentence of thousands of businesses, and a possible loss of countless jobs, is written into the new tariff legislation if the President exercises the powers granted him by Congress. He will be able to cut all tariffs 50 percent of the value of imported goods, and reduce the rates another 15 percent in the next 3 years.

Such powers should not have been granted in view of the present situation in international politics, in that trade concessions have become a weapon to be used against communism, but which can be too easily turned against us.

Last year our markets were hit with 900,000 imported bicycles at prices $6 below American cost of production. Chemical imports were up 500 percent over 1948. German shovels were laid down at $6 a dozen below domestic price.

Pottery imports jumped 138 percent since 1948, leaving the industry in a state of paralysis. Three prominent companies over 50 years old, liquidated last year, a spokesman saying: "Our industry is being sacrificed on the altar of appeasement."

Glass imports are running away with our market—American production down 60 percent. Japanese wages 28 cents an hour in glass industry. American wage $1.72 an hour.

Pork imports from Europe in 1954 was equal to 5,500,000 hogs; 19 million pounds from Communist Poland. Beef imports reached new records. Oil importers are becoming millionaires at expense of United States coal and oil industries.

Frozen ground fish fillets up from 9 percent of domestic market to 81 percent in 10 years. Congressman JOE BATES asked for tariff increases in 1952; was refused and imports jumped another 136 million pounds in 1953.

Optical instruments from foreign manufacturers up from 1 percent in 1947 to 44 percent of domestic market in 1954. Textile industry in New England States down from 439,000 workers in 1919 to 172,000 in 1954. Increases in United States population those years, 45 million.

Skilled watchmakers in United States down from 10,000 to 4,000 since 1948. Last year 86 percent of chinaware sold in United States was "foreign made." In 1949 American fishermen supplied 91 percent of canned tuna, but in 5 years dropped to 55 percent of market.

San Diego, Calif., fourth largest tuna port, down $10 million in production. Boats tied up, vessel permits down from 110 to 67. Japanese tuna sales to United States up from 3 to 98 million pounds. Coastal fishermen on all coasts facing disaster. These are only a few of hundreds of equally startling examples.

Consider, for instance, that on January 1, American shipyards had on order a total of only 14 vessels of the 1,000 gross tons or over, which was 1.7 percent of the total vessel tonnage on order for nations of the free world.

United States companies and their affiliates, on the other hand, were having built in foreign shipyards a total of 57 vessels, all or most of which would carry a foreign flag and be operated by a foreign crew. In 1954 only 29 percent of our foreign trade was carried in our own ships.

American interests have ordered $1,800,000,000 worth of ships from foreign builders at a savings of $600 million, but how about the loss of jobs, taxes, etc., to the United States? American shipyards have dropped to 12th place, and their future becomes more bleak every day. The Maritime Administration reported 7,550 fewer merchant seamen on jobs than a year ago, and 1 union reports less than a third of its members at sea.

Despite this America-last tendency in foreign trade (and other relations) the tariff walls against United States products are higher than our own in many cases. For example, United States tariff rates on cotton goods 10 to 25 percent; Pakistan rate is 60 percent; India, 100; South America, 60 to 300. Wage rates in American factories, $1.78 per hour. Belgium, 48; France, 46; Germany, 44; Italy, 37; Japan, 19; United Kingdom, average factory wage 47 cents per hour. There is no possibility that United States can buy enough goods to up living standards of Europe and Asia to any appreciable degree.

In 2 years, American-financed factories in Europe and Asia could wreck any United States market. Foreign nations must raise their own living standards, just as we raised ours.

Your Government spent $50 billion across the water since World War II. We bought billions of dollars' worth of goods, making Venezuela, West Germany, and other spots more prosperous than ourselves. We spent billions in private relief and private investments. We built airports, factories, schools, libraries, and supplied the know-how that is shoving us out of foreign markets, and then we allow tax concessions on American earnings if invested in foreign industry.

With all this and more, we did not bring foreign wages near our own, and we never will help in this direction by knocking out our own workers and our own businesses with low-wage products from abroad.

Before free trade is possible there must be a more common currency, reasonably close wage levels, and no restrictions on raw materials caused by friction between nations. Our public and private debt is $879 billion. Our tax bite is about 32 cents on the dollar. Taxes took 49 percent of profits in 1954. All goods and services produced between 1947 and 1954 increased by 50 percent, but total profits before taxes increased only 17 percent. Can we afford new floods of cheap foreign goods?

Samuel Waugh, Assistant Secretary of State, warned: "The United States cannot maintain friendship and alliances if we use our great financial power to dump surplus products on the world market and thus disrupt world prices and economics of friendly countries."

Ezra Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, asserted, that "cut-rate sale of farm surpluses to foreign nations would demoralize world markets and means the loss of export business through legitimate channels." Yet it is all right for the foreign nations to demoralize our markets.

Tariff walls are no more than needed protection against unstabilizing competition from other countries. Therefore, foreign trade should mean fair trade, whether it is going or coming. Congressman H. R. GROSS, Iowa, asked the question, "Where will America get its relief when our standard of living goes down to the level of the rest of the world?"

Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, when President Eisenhower spoke the other day of an easing of international tensions, it was, of course, good news to everyone to have the President's encouraging analysis of the situation.

But there is nothing in the President's words to lead anyone to think that the danger of war is now over. While there is room for optimism, there is no room for complacency.

Responsible officials of the Government—in the military services, in the intelligence agencies, in the State Department, and in the various mobilization bureaus—are proceeding on the assumption that war is an ever-present danger. It is their job to act accordingly, and to base their decisions on policies which will assure maximum safety for our country under any circumstances.

This sense of preparedness, however, does not seem to carry over into the field of civilian defense. We are not prepared. We seem to have a phobia about civilian defense—a reluctance even to think about it.

Somehow this attitude reminds me of some folks we know who refuse to consider the purchase of insurance. They feel that if they buy life insurance, this will in some way cause their death—that the purchase of fire insurance will likely lead to a fire, and so on. Do you not know some people who seem to feel the same way about writing a will?

But I think most of us recognize that sensible preparation is still the best policy—that the Boy Scout slogan "Be prepared" is about as good as any we can devise as individuals or as a Nation.

But in the realm of civilian defense, our slogan seems to be "Be unprepared and maybe the danger will go away."

In our own West Virginia, we have learned through experience the value of disaster training. The coal companies and the Mine Workers Union have cooperated over the years on mine safety and mine disaster training which have been of invaluable help to the local communities not only in case of mine disasters but of any type of local emergency. It has meant saving hundreds of lives.

The Red Cross has also done magnificent work over the years in rescue and first-aid training.

The national civilian defense program, instead of concentrating on the development and expansion of this kind of work, however—training work which would help to prepare a community for any

kind of emergency—seems to have been more concerned about developing some magic formula. First it was mass air-raid shelters; then it was mass evacuation of cities. Neither scheme seems to be practical.

In case of danger from attack, most of us would have to know how to assure our own survival. Our communities would have to know how to keep on functioning.

This kind of training has a big plus in its favor. It is this: No matter what happens internationally—whether there is war or enduring peace—it is information and skill which is always helpful to the local community—training for peace as well as for war. In other words, it is training for a better community no matter what happens.

World Trade and Monroe County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the League of Women Voters of Monroe County, N. Y., has recently conducted a survey of the impact of foreign trade on that county, which includes the city of Rochester. Its survey covered a major portion of the locality's large industries, and constituted a significant and profitable undertaking at the grassroots to study the ramifications of this important problem.

Meanwhile, the Library of Congress, with the cooperation of the Industrial Management Council and the Chamber of Commerce of Rochester has, at my request, conducted a broad survey on this problem within the city of Rochester. I anticipate that its findings and conclusions will be available at an early date. Together, these studies should throw valuable light on the city's stake in foreign trade.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an article from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle of May 15 summarizing the league's findings:

WORLD TRADE EXPANSION, TARIFF SLASHES FAVORED

Among Rochester and Monroe County industrialists expansion of world trade is viewed with favor.

They go along, too, with lower tariffs, according to a survey announced by the League of Women Voters of Monroe County.

The survey polled 165 Rochester industries to test the industrial community's feelings on world trade. Analyzing questionnaires returned by 165 out of 188 industries, the league survey disclosed:

Exporting activities are carried on by 70 industries here, 78 use imported material to produce their goods.

Of 51 companies reporting, they compete with goods from overseas, only 18 reported feeling adverse effects from the competition.

On trade and tariffs, 97 were in favor of expanding world trade; 63 had no comment because they said they were not well enough informed; and 5 favored reducing United States trade with other nations. Twenty-four companies came out for raised tariffs against 58 for lowering them; 4 want tariffs retained at present levels; and 78 had no comment.

MANY FAVOR TRADE BILL

The league committee, headed by Mrs. Richard Alden, noted that Rochester's industries generally favor the reciprocal trade bill recently passed by Congress, which extends the President's tariff-cutting powers until June 30, 1958. Part of President Eisenhower's program, the legislation permits cuts without prior approval of Congress in return for trade concessions from other nations.

According to the Rochester survey, exports are important in most local industries. They affect about 90 percent of the labor supply in the metals, machinery, and heavy equipment field. Eastman Kodak Co., which because of its large number of employees, occupied a separate classification in the survey, reported about 10 percent of labor force was occupied in export trade.

While the survey was unable to obtain dollar values of either production or exports from the industries, the league noted that one official said "a sudden and complete loss of foreign markets would mean either no jobs for 3,000 or a shutdown of the entire local plant for 6 weeks of a year." The company, continued the survey report, "is not, and should not be, considered typically an exporting business.

"At least 13 Rochester companies," the survey added, "find the export end of their business so important that they employ full-time export managers. Several of these same companies, as well as others with smaller amounts of exports, indicated that they found themselves limited in the amount they could export by lack of dollars in the countries which wished to buy their products."

In every category of industry there were imports needed for manufacture of the finished product. "These imports were often in very small amounts, but wherever any of them were essential, or fairly so, to some product, the importance to the overall economy should not be underestimated," the report said.

"One major (unidentified) company, employing 8.8 percent of the labor force in its category in work demanding a high degree of skill and paying proportionately well, is trying to eliminate the necessity for any imports whatsoever.

"FEAR SUPPLY STOPPAGE

"The officers of this company feel that in the event of war or calamity they should be able to manufacture their products, many of which would be essential to national security, from materials available within the continental limits of the United States of America. The exports of this company have steadily decreased in volume during the past decade. They are in competition abroad with similar products made in Germany and Japan.

"Whether this decrease in exports has any bearing on their admitted and public protectionist policy is hard to say. The company officials seem honestly concerned lest loss of skills necessary to their type of manufacture should endanger the country."

Turning to import competition, the survey discovered many Rochester industries consider competition a "stimulant." Only one company thought competition from other nations could be curbed by tariff policies.

"However," declared the survey, "there was concern expressed many times about the competition between United States labor and cheap foreign labor. No reply indicated direct contact with any labor group adversely affected by such competition, but many felt such groups must exist if all they had heard was true."

Address by Hon. Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, Before Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, an excellent and stirring address on the subject of the free enterprise system of business, delivered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], on May 12, 1955, before the Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce, prompts me to ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM ARIZONA, BEFORE THE BALTIMORE JUNIOR ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE, BALTIMORE, MD., MAY 12, 1955.

Your invitation to address the Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce this evening honors me deeply, for in doing so I am once again able to come to this State which figured so prominently in the establishment of the freedoms of our Republic.

While it is an impossibility ever to convey to you, to whom the State of Maryland is home, the immensity of the debt that we of the other States feel toward the valiant and successful efforts of your forefathers in the cause of liberty, the theme of my remarks tonight is such that they can be most appropriately delivered in this citadel of man's freedom.

I am honored, also, to have the opportunity to pay tribute, publicly and before their friends and neighbors, to your two outstanding Senators, JOHN BUTLER and GLENN BEALL. Last year, it was my pleasure to have worked with Senator BUTLER during his successful efforts to establish legislation which would give labor unions the mechanism with which to rid themselves of communist domination, and I have long admired, as well, his tireless efforts on behalf of his State of Maryland.

The fact that Senator BEALL and I both belong to the same college fraternity—we are Sigma Chis—establishes an immediate bond, but my observation of his sincere work on the Banking and Currency Committee has nurtured the added element of respect for a job well done.

As I have already indicated, my remarks tonight will be directed towards an important aspect of our basic freedom: the freedom of enterprise—our economic system. My choice of that subject has been prompted by several years of concern over the attitude of the American businessman toward that system which has made this Nation prosper, and which has provided our citizens with the highest standards of living ever known by any people.

In fact, it was primarily because of this concern that I ventured on to the rough sea of politics; and the more I travel that sea, the more I am convinced that the bland and careless acceptance of this system as something that will go on and on, without due diligence on the part of the business community, is the one thing that might ultimately destroy it.

It has been said that eternal vigilance is the price of freedom. That not only applies to our everyday freedoms, but also to the freedom under which our business system

operates. This is not to say that either one segment or one or two groups can maintain this vigilance in the protection of these economic freedoms; rather it means that you young businessmen gathered here in Baltimore tonight, and the millions like you across this land, must be constantly standing guard lest the soldiers of socialism overcome our fortress.

You might well ask at this point just why the Senator is so disturbed this fair evening. Is not the economy running at its highest rate in history? Are not the ranks of the unemployed extremely small? Is not the national income and the gross national production at a new all-time high? Why, then, should the Senator be disturbed to the point of berating you concerning your attitude toward the system which has produced this situation?

If that question exists, I can answer it by telling you that I am concerned because we, as a people, always seem to be relaxed in our vigilance when the going is the easiest. It is easy now to feel safe, to be complacent, but I assure you that those forces who would replace this free system of ours with the system of socialism are not relaxed or complacent. Theirs is a constant and persistent effort to lull the business minds into the acceptance of Government domination and regulation of our method of doing business.

Perhaps you have already so much accepted the extent to which Government has crept into your daily business lives that you now feel that nothing can be done about it. Perhaps you have forgotten the regulations, the edicts, the forms, and the reports of Government that now affect your daily business activities. If you have, then I suggest that you have been slightly brain-washed either by complacency or, worse yet, by an idea that we can be half socialistic and half free enterprise.

Still, I cannot bring myself to believe that you businessmen, living in this State which is part of the bedrock of freedom, actually feel that way. I know that businessmen from across the length and breadth of this land share your concern—and mine—and for that reason I feel that you and I should take the time to discuss our freedom of business tonight, and to discuss, also, the alternative to it.

Of course, businessmen across this Nation share your concern. As we in the Senate sit, day after day, through committee hearings, we listen to this concern and to the anxious queries of these brothers of yours from elsewhere in America. Listening to a series of witnesses appearing before the Labor Committee last week testifying as to their concern over various changes proposed in a law, I couldn't help but note the oneness with which they spoke. There was the crisp and clean accent of the New Englander; the slow and broad accent of our friends from the South; and, then, from across the mountains and the plains, came the voices of westerners. They all spoke of one concern: What would these proposed changes do to them and to the daily conduct of their businesses?

The law on which they were testifying was one of the many that, while originally intended to serve a good and laudable purpose, offers subtle inroads to the very vitals of our system. Almost inevitably, laws that have been enacted with lofty purposes, directed at correcting known evils of the moment, have to be changed time and again in order to justify their continuation, and, in so doing, in so trying to make corrections to corrections that are no longer needed, the laws become confusing and their effects on the business of this country become sharply evident.

One witness that appeared expressed this confusion and concern so well that I want to read now what he said. Mind you, this was a businessman of this country, speaking before a committee of the United States Senate. He said:

"However, where do I stand under this act? Where do these contractors stand under it? I asked my lawyer. He doesn't know. I could conceivably be the employer of the contractors and their employees. If I am, I'd at least like to get their names, because I'd like to know who's working for me. But, I may not need their names either, because maybe I am an employee of the paper mill. But, in that case, I'd like to know which mill, because I want to know where to look for my check. If it weren't so serious, it might be amusing to be an employee, who is also an employer of individuals who would be my employees."

That, remember, was an individual American businessman, who came to the Congress because he didn't know where he stood under the law, and because his lawyer was unable to tell him. It was never intended, under our system of government, that government should so inject itself into the daily lives of its business and professional people that such confusion and question would arise. It was never intended that government should inject itself into our business structure at all, except as outlined by the Constitution.

Yet, it has, and this example is only one of hundreds that I could recite. You, as business and professional men, know that Washington must enter into many of your economic decisions. You know that a safari to Washington is not an unknown activity, either by you personally, or by a lawyer representing you. We in the Congress know that a great amount of your time is spent trying to solve the puzzles that are bound to occur when the Federal Government oversteps its bounds, regardless of the purpose, and gets into the daily lives of the States and their business activities.

This is only a sample of the dependence the business of this country would have on the Federal Government if our free enterprise system were to be replaced by that system we know as socialism.

You may ask why worry about it. You may say that it can't happen here; that things are better than ever; that we will take care of socialism when the time comes. But let me tell you, the time has come; for there will never be a time when it isn't imperative that we defend and extoll this economic system of ours.

I suggest to you that Fabianism, which later became socialism, took a long time to take over in England; but when it did, it all but wrecked that once great force in the world's markets. It took from the 1870's to the 1940's, and all the time English businessmen said there was nothing to fear from those crackpots. What they didn't realize, of course, was that those crackpots were dedicated to one cause, that of replacing England's free system of business with socialism, and, being dedicated to that, they never let up in their efforts.

Why must it be that people who have, as we have, the greatest personal freedoms in the world, and the most productive free business system in all history, are so bland in our acceptance of these precious possessions?

These highly prosperous times in which we live today have come about because of our economic freedom, and it was the loosening of the shackles which bound this freedom that stimulated investment and confidence in our business structure. "What shackles?" you might ask. I would answer: the shackles of wage and price controls, and the overburdening load of taxation which was lightened somewhat a year ago, but which still needs more of its bulk pared off. These are but two of the shackles. There are others which, though less tangible, are in their own right, productive of profound effects on the economy.

One of the important things that has happened in the years since Korea is that American capital has been put to work, and American labor has responded with increased output, to the end that we are growing economically at a proper and safe rate today. Another—and, to my mind, this is equally as important—has been the realization that we are not dependent on a beneficent government which, by taxing away our potential future, has been trying to suggest that it, and only it, is the source of our economic muscles. We must never lose sight of this proven fact: the normal and free operation of our enterprise system has produced and will produce an increasingly higher standard of living for all of our people.

Now, let us compare the nebulous suggestions of those who would replace our business system with one that they suggest might be new, but which, to me, has all the old earmarks of socialism, with that proven fact which I have just mentioned. Mind you, I am called a reactionary for wanting to cling to our proven methods of government and business; but let's see who the real reactionaries are in this country of ours today.

I hold that they are those who profess to be liberals. They are the ones who want to go back to the days of bureaucratic government and a big central government with full control over our lives. These are the reactionaries. They want to return to what was discarded when your glorious pioneering grandfathers came to these shores seeking relief from the tyranny of big government.

No, I am not a reactionary; but I am a conservative, because I recognize that, after over 5,000 years of man's efforts to govern himself and to run his business, there have developed some fundamental truths. These are that the dignity of man and his freedom, which comes from God, are the ultimate ideals of any government, and that this dignity and freedom can best be expressed in the economy of the country when that economy runs as free from Government edict and regulations as it can. Being of that mind, therefore, all of us who would prefer progress under our proven system are conservatives; and I reiterate that the true reactionaries are the eggheads and the socialists who want to go back to the dark ages.

Remember that these people who advocate Government intervention in our business either wittingly or unwittingly go along with a large bureaucracy, because it is not possible to inject Federal monies into our business life without corresponding Federal regulation and control. In fact, it is not improper to emphasize here that whenever the Federal Government gives money to people in the form of subsidies, it is only giving back to them, at a greatly reduced proportion, money which it took from them in the first place in the form of taxes; and with that same money goes the inevitable regulation and control by the Government.

Now who are these people who advocate a radical change in our economic system, and what, specifically, do they suggest as a substitute? We can best identify them as those who have gathered together under the banner of the Americans for Democratic Action, the ADA, although I will be the first to admit that there are others of their kind to be found in each of the two major political parties, and among a few of the national leaders of organized labor.

Business Week, in 1952, said of this clique: "ADA is too well organized to be called merely a group, too loose to be called a real organization. It is not a political party, but has backed men in political elections. It is left-wing but anti-Communist."

Now, ignoring their political manifestos, directed toward the social or the international scenes, I want to call your attention to that phase of their philosophy which applies directly to your business—to our economic system. One of the leaders of the movement, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., said in the ADA World, in 1948: "When ADA came upon the scene a year ago, it struck the American liberals with the impact of a new idea. The idea was simply this: That a

liberal movement should properly devote itself to the maintenance of individual liberties and to the democratic control of economic life."

To further develop the philosophy contained in this suggestion of the "democratic control of economic life," let's turn to a statement in this organization's program as adopted by its second annual convention in April of 1949, and I quote: "Government action is also required to eliminate bottlenecks of increased production. Government subsidies and financing and, if necessary, Government plants must be used to provide more steel, more power, and other vital necessary raw materials."

In short, what is proposed by the ADA is socialism, on the one hand, with the pious suggestion, at the same time, that they have some as yet undisclosed formula whereby this socialism can "devote itself to the maintenance of individual liberties."

The failure of socialism has been not only in the fields of economy but, by the very nature of its requirement of Government controls, it has also denied to the individual the freedom that our system guarantees as the dominant feature of both our Government and our economic life.

Certainly these facts are not news, as any student of history well knows. We have all read of the controls imposed by the nations of history on their economies and the resultant collapse of those governments. Babylon, Egypt, and the Roman Empire, of the days long gone, are glaring examples of the dangers involved in following the siren call of the Socialist, who promises everything to everybody. Modern England, who, thank God, saw her mistake in time, is graphic proof, at close hand, of the catastrophic impact of socialism on the economy of a country.

Despite these urgent pleas of mine, however, you may still be inclined to say tonight, as we gather here in this festive mood: "It can't happen here." If I were sure of that, and if I were not certain that great inroads have already been made into the thinking of not only our business fraternity but, more importantly, into that of our children, I would not be addressing you on this subject, nor would I be so personally alarmed.

I have seen enough, though, of the dependence of businessmen on the bureaus in Washington, and I have read the writings of too many businessmen who would accept part or all of these doctrines, not to be concerned.

Recently, I read a report of Opinion Research of Princeton, N. J., which gives me the greatest reason to pause and ponder. It is a report that I want to pass on to you at this time. Opinion Research Corp. conducted a poll of high school seniors in 86 communities throughout the country. When asked the question, "Is the theory, from each according to his ability to each according to need a valid basis for an economic system?" 55 percent replied, "Yes." Thus, over half of the high school seniors, the citizens of tomorrow, accepted the very theory that is the basis of Marxism.

Sixty-one percent said the profit motive is unnecessary to the survival of our system. Sixty percent said that the owners get too much of the profits. Eighty-two percent of the pupils said we do not have competition in business. Seventy-six percent believe that owners get most of the gains from machinery. Sixty percent said that a worker should not produce all he can.

This, gentlemen, will give you some indication of what we are up against, of how fertile the soil is for the Reuther-Keyserling propaganda.

How, then, shall we counterattack? Let's steal a page from the enemy's book. Let's live our convictions in everyday life. The enemies of freedom seize every opportunity to discredit our system. Let us seize every opportunity to lambast theirs. Indeed, not only to lambast theirs, but—and this is more important—to extol ours. It is far better to be for something than merely to be against something without offering a positive alternative; and by ardently advocating our own proven and successful system, we can drown out the lilting song of the sirens of socialism who would wreck our good ship on the dark rocks of their philosophy.

We must tell our employees and the public how our system operates—how they fit into the scheme, and how they benefit when capital benefits—how investment is the lifeblood of the system, and how investment creates purchasing power.

We must insist upon private capital developing the resources of the Nation, without reliance upon the Federal Government to accomplish this.

We must, as businessmen, become concerned with the problems of our communities, and with their politics, and with the politics of the National Government.

We must continue to demonstrate that free enterprise, when operating in its full and proper sense, contributes the most to the workingman, to the investor, to the public, and to management, and that all four are a team, each dependent upon the other for the success of all.

Profit is a necessary element in this operation; not only profit in terms of money, but the profit of advancement, and the profit of the maintenance of man's dignity through his ability to achieve for himself those things which need to be accomplished.

Deny Americans this reward, try to place all Americans on a basis of "from each according to his ability to each according to his need," and I suggest to you that the dignity of man will vanish from the American dream; and those noble aspirations of liberty, for which the famous men of Maryland's history gave their blood, will become another page in the history books of tomorrow—a page reminding men again, as they have been reminded in the past, that time and experience have given us the things on which we should hang our faith—that man does have freedom and dignity, and that these come to him because he is a child of God, and not through the directives of a bureau of the Federal Government in Washington.

Appropriations for Airmail Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which recently appeared in the Akron (N. Y.) News, based on a statement by the Citizens Public Expenditure Survey of the State of New York. The article, commenting on the appropriations for airmail subsidies, points out the saving to the people of my State and to the people of the Nation from a House action taken initially at the urging of my distinguished colleague from New York, Representative JOHN ROONEY.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SLASH IN AIRLINE SUBSIDIES SAVES NEW YORKERS $3.5 MILLION

ALBANY.—A $3.5 million saving for taxpayers of New York State has resulted from the recent action by the Federal Government in slashing a request by the Civil Aeronautics Board for a supplemental appropriation of $31 million in airline subsidies, according to the Citizens Public Expenditure Survey.

Thirty-three million dollars from a proposed $73 million appropriated in air mail subsidies. Last September the CAB attempted, through the Budget Bureau, to get White House approval to send to Congress a request for a supplemental appropriation of $31 million for fiscal 1955. In other words, CAB was still trying to get back nearly all the money that was cut.

After a review of the request by both the Budget Bureau and the White House, the appropriation was trimmed to $15.2 million by the time it was actually transmitted to Congress in February.

Last week, the House Appropriations Committee, at the urging of Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, cut the supplemental request still further, from the $15.2 million recommended to $5 million.

Therefore, of the original cut of $33 million made last year, only $5 million is being restored by the House Committee, for a net savings to the taxpayers of $28 million.

The Citizens Public Expenditure Survey, a statewide private taxpayers organization, points out that with New York State taxpayers paying approximately 12.5 percent of all Federal taxes, the cut in the airline subsidies appropriation means a saving of some $3.5 million in taxes to people of this State.

A Just Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Arizona Republic, Phoenix, Ariz., April 26, 1955:

A JUST LAW

An interesting debate is currently being conducted as to the economic effects of right-to-work laws. Naturally, labor is trying to show an adverse effect while management is trying to demonstrate benefits both for labor and industry.

The CIO has produced a survey which shows that of 17 States which have right-to-work laws, in 16 the average income was below the national average and above in only 1. The CIO neglected to point out that in 3 of these States the right-to-work law was not enacted until 1954 and also failed to point out that the average income was below the national average in 18 other States which do not have right-to-work laws.

The National Association of Manufacturers and the National Right-To-Work Committee have produced surveys which are almost identical as to results. Using the years 1947–53 as a base, they show nonagricultural employment up 21 percent in right-to-work States as against an average United States increase of 14 percent. They show the number of business establishments increased 24 percent in right-to-work States as against a 15 percent national average. Wages and salaries, the reports show, are up 69 percent in right-to-work States as against a national average of 59 percent and that 33 percent less

man-days were lost due to work stoppages in right-to-work States as against 18 percent for the national average.

It seems the CIO survey proves nothing since average earnings already were below the national average in the States named. Actual facts show those State incomes have more nearly approached the national average since they enacted right-to-work laws than in other below-average-income States that do not have such laws.

It is evident from almost every other viewpoint that right-to-work laws are an economic benefit to both worker and business. In addition, such laws maintain the right of man to freedom of choice. They protect the Nation from labor dictatorship. They protect the right of every man or woman to earn a living without let or hindrance by any group. Such a law is a just law.

The Administration's Wise Tax and Fiscal Policies Spell Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an article from the New York Times of May 16 reporting on the peak prosperity which our country is now enjoying under this administration's wise tax and fiscal policies, and also a letter from a citizen of Rochester, N. Y., concerning these policies. The letter appeared in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle of May 10, 1955.

NATIONAL OUTPUT EQUALS 1953 PEAK—HOME BUILDING, HEAVY BUYING BY CONSUMERS BIG FACTORS IN FIRST-QUARTER GAIN—INVENTORY RISE HELPS—GROSS PRODUCT ADVANCES TO $370 BILLION ON AN ANNUAL BASIS, UP $8 BILLION

WASHINGTON, May 15.—Home building and heavy consumer buying, particularly of such durable goods as automobiles, refrigerators and television sets, proved major factors in restoring national output to top levels in the first 3 months of the year.

This was the conclusion voiced by specialists of the Office of Business Economics of the United States Department of Commerce in announcing that the gross national product in the first quarter of this year advanced to $370 billion at an annual rate that matches the previous peak recorded in the second quarter of 1953.

The figure for the first quarter of this year compares with the annual rate of $362 billion in the closing months of 1954 and with the $356 billion registered in the first quarter of 1954.

The gross national product, in the parlance of economists, is the sum of all goods and services produced by the Nation. The figure for each quarter is adjusted for seasonal variations.

Also important in the upturn since the third quarter of last year, the report said, was the swing in business inventory investment, from a substantial rate of liquidation to a small rate of accumulation in evidence by the end of March in this year.

DISPOSABLE INCOME RISES

Disposable personal income, the amount remaining for personal expenditures after the payment of taxes, stood at $260,600,000,000 at an annual rate at the end of the quarter. It represented a steady advance in each of the months since the fall upturn in business. The large increase in wages and salaries in March reflected the continuation of the business recovery.

Personal consumption expenditures reached an annual rate of $242 billion, a new peak for the quarter. This spending was $4 billion higher than in the last quarter of 1954 and $11,500,000,000 more than in the corresponding quarter last year. Purchases of nondurable goods were more than 10 percent larger than in the closing 3 months of last year.

Wages and salaries regained the peak they had reached in the autumn of 1955. The recent advance was the sharpest in the durable goods manufacturing industries, where the earlier payroll decline had been mainly concentrated. Increases also appeared in nondurable goods manufacturing, trade, mining, services, and finance.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR—IKE HAS COURAGE ON TAXES

In every issue of every newspaper these days one reads such headlines as Bond Plans Expansion, Kodak To Spend Millions on Additional Facilities, Stromberg Merges, Expansion Planned, Sears Opening New Stores, Kodak Increases Wages 5 Percent, Rise in Employment Sets Record, Peak Business Year Seen for State, etc. In other words, new jobs for out-of-work individuals, and more pay for those who have jobs.

Last year President Eisenhower rejected a high-pressure effort in Congress to cut individual income taxes by $20 per person per year. Instead the President favored a reduction of corporation taxes. Immediately, shortsighted people set up a howl that Ike was favoring big business instead of the little fellow. (Of course, big business these days, is, to a large extent, owned by small-stock holders.)

Now the wisdom of the President is paying off. The $20 income-tax reduction would have been a mere drop in the bucket to the individual taxpayer. On the other hand the reduction in the tax burden borne by business has given corporations additional financial elbow room for expansion, with the results noted in the headlines. I wonder, for example, how many Kodak workers would have preferred the $20 tax cut to their current pay increase?

If, with examples such as these before them, there are still those who believe that President Eisenhower favors big business instead of the little fellow, then one can only conclude that there is truth beyond dispute in the old adage that there are none so blind as those who will not see.

Actually, of course, this calm, straight-thinking man of courage and immense vision favors neither big business nor the little fellow as such, but America. Many are luckier than they deserve that he sits in the White House.

HOWARD SEVERE.

Distortion in a Surprising Place

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Phoenix Gazette, Phoenix, Ariz., May 3, 1955:

DISTORTION IN A SURPRISING PLACE

Arizonans who have read the article Dollars Into Dust in the May issue of Reader's Digest may well wonder how a reputable international magazine can afford to pass into print such distorted material. The article is an attack on reclamation in the United States, and several paragraphs deal with the Central Arizona project in terms that sound dictated by California special-interest groups.

The authors are Leslie A. Miller and Holman Harvey. Miller, a former governor of Wyoming, is chairman of the Hoover Commission task force on reclamation and water supply, but it was Harvey who came to Arizona to gather material for the article. He was given ample information by the Central Arizona Project Association and specific questions concerning the State's water needs were answered for him, especially those dealing with the Colorado River controversy.

None of this material found its way into the article. Instead, it presents a biased and wholly unsupported view of reclamation in general and the Central Arizona and Upper Colorado River Basin projects in particular. This appears to result from Harvey's failure or refusal to use the material he gathered here. But because Miller's name appears as co-author, and due to the Digest's multimillion circulation, the article, despite its disregard of facts, will be accepted by many readers as an accurate picture of western reclamation.

The Central Arizona Project Association has asked the Digest to remedy the damage by presenting the other side of the story. In view of its reputation for accuracy and fairness, the magazine's editorial board should take this action immediately. Even so, many readers may never hear the other side, which is probably exactly what California intended when the distorted material was planted in the guise of factual data.

Farm Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Falls City Journal of Falls City, Nebr. I believe it effectively expresses the viewpoint of many middle western farmers:

Congressman PHIL WEAVER, of Falls City, as you may have noted, was one of the Republican Congressmen who voted with the Democrats to restore high, rigid price supports for wheat, corn, and other basic agricultural products. It is interesting to note that, while other Nebraska Republicans in the House voted against the high supports, all of the Republican Kansas delegation voted as WEAVER did, except for one Congressman from highly industrialized Kansas City, Kans. And, as far as we are concerned, the high rigid support program is necessary as a temporary measure until the smart boys can do something more than make nice-sounding speeches about the farmer's independence. Today, the farmer can be independent only so long as he has the income to meet the high fixed expenses which are imposed upon him. Does anyone for a moment think he is independent of those fixed expenses? It would be ideal, of course, if some day someone would find a way out for the farmer without such unpleasant

features as acreage controls, marketing cards, sealing corn and Federal inspections. Until such a program is worked out, in our opinion, the majority of general farmers want price protection. And that undoubtedly explains Congressman WEAVER'S vote.

A Brief Survey of Some Early Roots of the Agricultural Extension Service in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

I. THE FARMERS' SOCIETIES, FAIRS, CLUBS, ETC.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the beginning of agricultural extension work, broadly defined as the popular education of farming people, has been set as early as 1785, with the organization of the Philadelphia Society.[1] As might be expected, these early attempts to reach dirt farmers included discussions, exhibits, and fairs. They were more or less indigenous and local in keeping with the facilities of the period. Some attained more than local status, becoming in name at least a State society, board, and so forth. Several such groups existed before 1800. By the eve of the Civil War, some 900 local and county agricultural societies, and so forth, were more or less active.

In our State of Iowa, the Iowa State Agricultural Society was organized in December 1853 at Fairfield, Iowa, and held its first annual State fair at that place in October 1854.[2] The State fair was permanently located at Des Moines in 1879. It represents, according to Morgan, a step leading to the development of the present Extension Service:

> The education of the adult farmer and his wife was organized on a Statewide basis and received tax money for its support.

In addition to the direct education which may have been derived by the participating members and others in attendance at the several types of events sponsored, there were still other results, expressed by Dr. True:

> * * * brought a considerable and growing body of the most intelligent and progressive farmers into active relations with a nationwide movement for the advancement of agriculture. Through meetings, fairs, correspondence, publications, and articles in the agricultural and other papers they sought to make the public feel that the interests of agriculture and farming population were entitled to more consideration by Congress and the State legislatures. They were increasingly active and influential in the efforts to establish State boards of agriculture, a national Department of Agriculture, the teaching of agriculture in schools and colleges, the carrying on of experiments and scientific investigations for the improvement of agriculture, and the building up of agricultural journals and books.[3]

It is not perhaps surprising to find that public funds in modest amount were in some places appropriated for these groups, or that they sometimes were allowed part of the proceeds from the fairs and proceeds of sales of escheated lands.

II. THE STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES AND THE OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Other developments which contributed greatly to the later emergence of the Extension Service were the State colleges and the associated experiment stations. Early education was not always wilthout its agricultural aspects, even a strong agricultural core, witness the Gardiner Lyceum established in Maine in 1821 and the Agricultural School of Josiah Holbrook in 1824 at Derby, Conn. Private colleges, such as Rensselaer Institute at Troy, N. Y., and Washington College—now Trinity—at Hartford, Conn., were in part agricultural establishments as early as 1824. These and other such developments were not highly successful. The movement toward public support for agricultural colleges continued to develop slowly. Ideas involving an integrated agricultural college and experimental farm are credited to Elkanah Watson as early as 1819.[4]

It is not the purpose of this paper to cover the history of the developments which preceded—the Iowa State Agricultural College and Farm was established by law on March 22, 1858, and followed the establishment of the land-grant colleges under the Morrill Land Grant Act of July 2, 1862. That is in itself a long and interesting story. What we are interested in here is that these colleges strongly nurtured the experiment stations as well as agricultural education.

Agricultural experiment stations had been established at several or most of the land-grant colleges prior to the Hatch Act of 1837. Professor Hilgard organized such a station as soon as he went to the University of California; in 1875 he equipped a laboratory for research in agricultural chemistry and began field experiments on deep and shallow plowing for cereals. It was the staff of such colleges with their associated experiment stations, together with a portion of their trainees who were in due course to carry education by extension to the dirt farmer.

The Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations was formally organized in October 1887. Departments of agricultural extension work were organized in some of the State agricultural colleges in the early nineties. Extension leaders in the State agricultural colleges who had been appointed to assist in farmers' institutes and other early forms of extension work attended the meetings of the college section—organized in 1890—but as their numbers and influence increased in the early 1900's, it became necessary to give them recognition by appointing a special extension committee in 1905 and by creating a separate extension division in 1908. By 1907 State agricultural colleges in 39 States were carrying on some form of agricultural extension work.[5]

The Smith-Lever Extension Act of May 8, 1914, which we will not discuss here, has an interesting history beginning at least as early as 1908, when a rising demand was indicated for Federal appropriations for extension work, partly to stimulate increased State appropriations for the same. An early voice in the discussion was that of the committee on extension work of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Sations which made such recommendations in November 1908. However, only the recommendation: "That each institution represented in this association organize as soon as possible a definite scheme of extension work in agriculture" was approved.[6] Much debate and delay followed before the Smith-Lever Act itself came into existence.

III. THE COUNTY AGENT AND DEMONSTRATION FARMS

In one fashion or another experiment station farms no doubt served as early demonstration farms. Even secondary schools sometimes had major farm enterprises. Secretary of Agriculture Wilson in his 1903 report mentions that the Mount Hermon School, near Northfield, Mass., founded by the late D. L. Moody, had decided to establish an agricultural department and to offer courses of instruction in agriculture. It already had a farm of about 1,000 acres, a dairy of 200 cows, fruit orchards and a cannery for putting up vegetables.[7]

It remained for a transplanted upstate New Yorker to inaugruate what came to be recognized as a new and significant departure in agricultural education. Dr. Seaman A. Knapp, who after wide public agricultural experience in the East and Midwest had turned to a private agricultural venture in the South in 1886, used demonstration farms, about one per township in southwestern Louisiana to show not only that the area was suited to general farming but how it could be done.

Later, in Federal service working with the Bureau of Plant Industry, he set up several demonstration farms in the Gulf States to show that diversified agriculture could be feasible. All of this experience, both public and private, was basic to his new efforts, beginning perhaps about 1901 but clearly underway in 1903, to rehabilitate cotton areas which had been devastated by the boll weevil. Burritt says of Knapp's educational system:

> To aid in securing local cooperation from the farmers themselves, Dr. Knapp established districts with local agents in charge, the district agents being lieutenants for the State agents. These local agents were preferably and usually local farmers in good repute with the people who had been practically successful with the control methods (for the cotton boll weevil) advocated by the Department and who had local knowledge of the problems and the methods of the people with whom they worked. They traveled from farm to farm and gave personal instruction to farmers who by actual demonstrations showed that cotton could be profitably grown in spite of the weevil.[8]

Another statement, by Dr. True, on this development is:

> Professor Knapp established headquarters at Houston, Tex., in January 1904 and took counsel with farmers, bankers, merchants, railroad presidents, and other businessmen.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Contributions of money, railroad trains, passes, and other aids were received. On February 19, 1904, W. D. Bentley was appointed as agent and served on an agricultural train of the Fort Worth & Denver Railroad for 2 weeks. Meetings were held in towns along the route, and lectures were delivered on cotton, corn, fruit, and forage, and other crops. At first farmers were unwilling to agree to undertake demonstrations, but after Mr. Bentley joined the farmers' union he had better success and gave demonstrations in about 10 counties in the northwest part of the cotton section in Texas. W. F. Procter and James A. Evans were appointed February 12, 1904. The latter has remained in the Government service in prominent positions in connection with demonstration and extension work and at present is assistant chief of the Office of Cooperative Extension Work. Over 20 agents were employed in Texas in 1904, 3 in Louisiana, and 1 in Arkansas. That year over 1,000 meetings were held, and 7,000 farmers agreed to demonstrate. In the fall a meeting of agents and more than 200 representatives of farmers was held at Houston. Profits from the demonstrations were reported, and the benefits of pure seed, deep plowing, frequent shallow cultivation, and the growing of home supplies were the chief topics discussed. In general, getting ahead of the weevil with early planting, early-maturing varieties, and treatment of the soil to promote rapid growth was the secret of success.

In 1905 the work was expanded to include Oklahoma and Mississippi.

In the early days agents worked in districts of 10 to 20 counties, and the demonstrations were carried on largely along the lines of railroads. The agents visited representative farmers, obtained their cooperation as demonstrators, furnished them with working plans, and instructed them in keeping records and making weekly reports. Each demonstrator was expected to grow from 5 to 20 acres of cotton under direction of the agent, who visited him at least once a month. Farmers met to see the demonstrations, and many of those present agreed to manage a part or the whole of their land under directions sent out by the department. Such farmers were called "cooperators," to distinguish them from the 'demonstrators." A "demonstration" was the growing of a single crop under direction of the agent on a portion of the farm. The term "demonstration farm" was at first used to designate a farm on which there was a demonstration, but later was applied to a farm wholly worked according to the department's instructions.[9]

Secretary of Agriculture Wilson in his 1904 report called atention to this cooperation with farmers:

With a view to bringing directly home to farmers of Texas and Louisiana, especially those in the boll-weevil districts, the advantages of better methods of cultivation, the value of early maturing seed, etc., the Bureau organized an extensive line of propaganda work. The farmers in the various counties were organized and were brought into cooperation in such a way that large plantings were made under the direct supervision of the Department. Tracts of 5, 10, 15, and 20 acres were handled by individual farmers, under working plans furnished by the Bureau, the object being in all cases to demonstrate the practicability of growing cotton despite the presence of the weevil.

More than 5,000 farmers were engaged in this work, and the results have been highly satisfactory. At a recent meeting held in Houston, where more than 200 representative farmers from all parts of the State were present, records were presented showing the yields of cotton under the plans of the Department compared with old methods. The increased yields, ranging all the way from 25 percent to 100 percent in districts badly infested by the weevil, show that by proper methods of culture, the use of early maturing varieties of seed, and the application of proper fertilizers, excellent results may be obtained. A complete record of the yields from the various farms conducted under the direction of the Bureau has been kept, and a report embodying these data will soon be published.

As another feature of the work in the South, plans were made and put into operation establishing diversification farms at various places. The object of these farms was to show the value and importance of diversified agriculture. It was found unnecessary for the Bureau to expend any funds in the development of these farms, except in minor ways for the purchase of certain special seeds, and sometimes for special fertilizers where such were to be used. In all cases the business interests of the respective communities gladly cooperated with the Bureau to the end not only of securing a desirable farm for the purpose, but assuming all responsibility for its support. In every instance efforts have been made in organizing these farms to make them not only self-supporting but profitable. The main object of the work is to show that by diversified agriculture the lands may not only be improved, but more money can be made than in farming with a single crop.

Thirty-two of these farms have been or are about to be established, of which 16 are in Texas, 5 in Louisiana, 3 in Georgia, 2 in Alabama, 3 in Mississippi, 2 in South Carolina, and 1 in Florida. The general method employed in locating, organizing, and conducting these farms is to first determine in what section of the State the various farms are to be located. An effort is then made to find a progressive farmer who is desirous of encouraging diversified farming in his section, and who is willing to permit the Department to aid him in doing it. When a suitable arrangement has been made, a representative of the Department and the State experiment station make a thorough study of local conditions with reference to cropping possibilities, markets, advantages, etc. A system of records is instituted, which enables the Department to secure detailed information regarding every phase of the management of the farm and the results secured. After the farms are established, other farmers are encouraged to visit them, this being done largely through the cooperation of the State experiment station.[10]

A somewhat coordinated but not wholly distinct branch of the work was inaugurated under W. J. Spillman. The Secretary in his report for 1902 said:

As the work of reorganizing this Bureau developed, the need was felt for properly coordinating all the varied lines of plant work in such a way that they could be brought directly home to the practical farmer and fruitgrower in all parts of the country. To this end, I have approved the establishment within the Bureau of an office of Farm Management, which shall have for its object the bringing together in concrete form of all the facts developed in the Bureau as a whole, sifting the results, and applying them in a practical way where they will do the most good. To enhance the value of this work general studies have been inaugurated in the matter of securing facts regarding the way in which the best paying farms in the country are being managed, and what are the relationships of surrounding conditions, such as proximity to markets, ways of leasing or controlling the lands, soils, and climate, and the methods of farming followed. With the knowledge thus secured it will be practicable to lay out a working plan for a particular farm in a particular region, the object being in all cases to have such plans serve as object lessons for type regions rather than for individuals. In line with this plan there is now being undertaken in different parts of the South demonstration experiments for the purpose of showing the possibilities of more diversified farming.

With the cooperation of farmers, working plans are being devised whereby the present system of growing only one crop will be changed so as to secure more diversification, thus insuring greater profits and the building up of the fertility of the land. There are many thousands of acres in the South where the same system of farming has been carried on for years and where it would be a great advantage to inaugurate changes which would lead to the building up of the fertility of the soil and give broader opportunities to those handling the same. As a specific example of this work there is now being developed in the South, as object lessons, a system of what will be called "one-man" farms. These are small areas of land in the pine woods region upon which a system of farming is being developed of such a nature as to appear directly to the class of farmers who must necessarily handle such land. Instead of a single crop, simple systems of rotation are being put into operation, and the question of the proper stock to keep is being considered, all being of such a nature that the work can be handled by one individual. In other regions, where the conditions are different, more elaborate plans are underway whereby considerable tracts of land which have for years been cropped to cotton are being arranged for a regular rotation, introducing stock as an element for the purpose of showing the possibilities of such diversification and its bearing on the welfare of the different communities.[11]

The county agent in any form approximating the present was long missing. Nevertheless, his future place and function in the education of farmers was slowly but certainly evolving.

Burritt[12] states that the first county agent in the South was W. C. Stallings in Smith County, Tex. True dates this as of November 12, 1906, and indicates that the appointment resulted from a local demand for more demonstrations and more information than could be given by agents whose territory included several counties.[13] Burritt further states:

It was in Broome County, at Binghamton, N. Y., on March 1, 1911, that the first county agent in the northern and western States was permanently established; and this was by the chamber of commerce.[14]

The man was John H. Barron.

IV. THE FARMERS' INSTITUTES AND SIMILAR ACTIVITIES

Farmers' institutes were a major root from which the Extension Service eventually developed. They appear to have evolved at an early date. The duties of the secretary of the Massachusetts State Board of Agriculture, established in 1852, included visiting the various agricultural districts of the State and delivering lectures on the practice and science of agriculture. The idea was to have meetings rather similar to teachers' institutes, but upon agricultural subjects. The purpose of such early group meeting appears to have included at least the following:

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

First. To discuss agricultural matters among themselves.

Second. Establish a series of lectures on agriculture, agricultural chemistry, and geology.

Third. Conduct classes, especially for young farmers and women.

Fourth. Purchase agricultural books, to be read and commented on at meetings.

This early period may perhaps be best characterized as one of modest beginnings but one fecund with ideas foreshadowing much which was to come later. Consider the suggestions of George Boutwell in 1857 that six professors be appointed, representing different branches of agriculture, and assigned on rotation to districts, to visit farms, institute experiments, advise farmers, give lectures, and hold institute meetings. Some farm papers drew special attention to information regarding the institutes, among them the Farmers Institute, published at Mason City, Iowa.

Some statements by Dr. True perhaps provide a general summary.

The extension work of the agricultural colleges was an outgrowth of the addresses delivered at meetings of agricultural societies, at fairs, and at other gatherings of farmers during all the 19th century. From the beginning these addresses included some on the more technical phases of agriculture and its relations to the sciences, delivered by college teachers or persons having special knowledge of the subjects they treated. In 1861 the Michigan Legislature passed an act which contained a provision that "the professors of the college may give lectures to farmers away from the college."

About 1870 meetings called farmers' institutes began to be held in Iowa and Kansas, and these were gradually developed into a regular system of meetings under public control, organized and managed by the agricultural colleges or State boards or departments of agriculture, and supported by public funds. Whatever authority controlled the institutes, the officers of the agricultural colleges quite generally participated in them in the several States. The experiment stations made large use of the institutes for the dissemination of the practical results of their investigations. The Office of Experiment Stations therefore promoted the institutes and in 1903 under a special appropriation by Congress established a division for its work relating to them.

Following the decline of the lyceum movement, partly as a result of the Civil War, there began in 1874 the more systematic Chautauqua movement. This was not connected with educational institutions but consisted largely of literary and scientific circles, which were to a certain extent assisted by summer schools and correspondence courses managed by university professors. * * *

In 1896 the extension work was expanded in the State of New York to include (1) itinerant or local experiments as a means of teaching, (2) readable expository bulletins, (3) itinerant horticultural schools, (4) elementary instruction in nature study in rural schools, and (5) instruction by means of correspondence and reading courses. This plan was so successful that the legislature in 1897 broadened the scope of the work to include the whole State and agriculture in general. The appropriation was increased to $25,000, to be spent under the supervision of the director of the New York College of Agriculture.

That year, besides the horticultural investigations, 200 local experiments with various crops were conducted, 10,000 teachers were reached through visits to schools, lectures at teachers' institutes, and distribution of nature-study leaflets, 15,000 pupils were enrolled for nature study, and 1,600 young farmers took correspondence courses.[15]

By the end of the century institutes were held in all of the then existing States. Financial contribution from public funds were substantial, about $150,000 in 1899. In 19 States, mostly in the South and West, the institutes were directly under the auspices of the agricultural colleges or experiment stations, but in 16 States were connected with the State Department of Agriculture; and in 3, including Iowa, with county organizations.

Farmers' institutes were not initiated in Iowa until relatively late—1870—and then by the State Agricultural College as a more practicable method of meeting an urgent demand from outside the institution for a winter session. Thus the policy of disseminating information by means of lectures and demonstrations was early established. Farmers' institutes at Cedar Falls, Council Bluffs, Muscatine, and Washington were conducted during the winter of 1870–71. However, at a later period the sponsoring organization was the Iowa Association of Agriculture and Industrial Instruction.[16]

The Secretary in his 1903 report summarized the situation and the support which the Federal Government had been able to provide.

In my last annual report I recommended that an appropriation of $5,000 be given to enable the Office of Experiment Stations to undertake work connected with the promotion of the farmers' institute system in this country. The appropriation was to be used in employing an officer who would devote his time and energy to this work, visit institute workers and advise them regarding the ways in which the Department might help the institutes, study the problems of institute management at home and abroad, and seek to shape the Department's work for the institutes so that it might be most helpful to this enterprise. As the matter was finally fixed in the appropriation act, only about $2,000 of the income of the Office of Experiment Stations for the current fiscal year can be used for this purpose. This is entirely inadequate for the work planned, but will be used in gathering statistics of the institute movement and in employing, during a part of the year, an officer who will be retained as farmers' institute specialist, if Congress shall provide sufficient means for continuing the work.

Farmers' institutes are now held in 44 States and Territories, including Hawaii. Nearly complete returns from 40 States and Territories show that in the areas reported about 2,300 institutes are held annually; that the funds expended by the different States and Territories in support of these institutes (not including expenses incurred by local authorities) amounted to about $196,000 per annum, and that about 709,000 people attended the institutes. The number of students taking the agricultural course at the agricultural colleges in the same States and Territories during the year ended June 30, 1901, was 9,623, including those who are recorded as attending courses in household economy, dairying, and veterinary science.

The total number of persons reached by the farmers' institutes and the agricultural colleges (about 720,000) is, however, only a small percentage (7.2 percent) of those actually engaged in agricultural pursuits (about 10 million). The publications of the experiment stations are sent to about 500,000 farmers. A great need of our educational system is, therefore, wider dissemination of the results of agricultural study and research among those now actually engaged in farming.

I recommend that an appropriation of $6,000 be made by Congress to enable the Office of Experiment Stations to aid the farmers' institutes during the fiscal year 1904.[17]

Early in 1903 occurred an event which has been called the beginning of the county farm demonstration work. It is of interest to all those dealing with agricultural education but of very special and peculiar interest to Iowans. But before we plunge into it we must lay some groundwork. Iowa in 1902 had the great fortune to acquire Perry G. Holden from the neighboring State of Illinois.

Of him, Russell Lord has said:

That a man of science, a promoter, a politician, and a stimulating teacher can dwell and labor within one mind and body is illustrated by the extension career of Perry G. Holden, whom "Uncle Henry" Wallace attracted to Iowa from Illinois in 1902. Iowa State College had no adequate appropriation for a professor of agronomy. Wallace's Farmer put up part of the money for Holden's salary for the first 2 years. At the end of that time Holden had 5 counties cooperating in the growing of corn, oats, and alfalfa and in the eradication of quack grass, and he had launched his famous "seed corn Gospel Trains." By 1906 his demonstrations, made on the farms of county poorhouses, were put on in 10 counties; and his corn-gospel trains touched every county in Iowa.[18]

But to return to 1903 and the origin of county farm demonstration work in our fair State. The Sioux County Farmers' Institute met in Hull, Iowa, on February 16, 17, and 18, 1903. On the final day, its assembly passed the following resolution urging the county board of supervisors to establish an experimental—demonstration—farm.

The resolution adopted reads as follows:

Whereas it has been proposed (proposal made by Professor Holden of Iowa State College who was present and participated during 2 of the 3-day sessions) to the members of the Sioux County Farmers' Institute now in session at Hull this 18th day of February 1903 to establish an experimental farm in Sioux County; and

Whereas it is believed that the board of supervisors upon request will set aside a portion of the poor farm for such experimental farm and appropriate money to purchase seed and to pay the extra expense incurred in carrying on such experiments as may be deemed best to be made; and

Whereas Mr. Harry McKee, the present superintendent of the poor farm, has kindly offered his services as far as possible without any extra compensation; and

Whereas it is believed that such experimental farm will be of great value to the farmers of Sioux County: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we favor such an experimental farm provided that:

1. The poor farm or a portion of it can be secured for the purpose.

2. That the money necessary for carrying on experiments can be secured.

3. That the experiments for the first year be limited to the growing of cereals, grasses, and vegetables.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

4. That the amount of money to be expended be limited to $250; and

Resolved further, That upon the adoption of this resolution, a committee of two be appointed to present this matter with a copy of these resolutions to the board of supervisors together with a plan of action.

The Board of Supervisors of Sioux County did comply with the request of the Farmers' Institute as recorded in the county auditor's office, as follows:

April 8, 1903: On motion the board made an appropriation of $150 to be used for an experiment station at the County Poor Farm. The committee appointed to superintend this work is: J. C. Emery, H. J. Vander Waa, and H. H. McKee, county farm superintendent. John Boeyink, auditor; William Dealy, chairman of the board; Charles Harmelink, member of the board; William Shimp, member of the Board; J. H. Blatherwick, member of the board; John Smith, member of the board.

In the conduct of county demonstration farms the county furnished the land, labor, storage space, travel necessary in getting samples of corn and living expenses of college people while in the county and in addition the cash fund for incidentals.

We should perhaps note that Barton Morgan in his history of the extension service of Iowa State College, discussing the official creation of the extension service and its early development under Holden, says:

In 1903 Holden started the county farm demonstration work near Orange City in Sioux County. In 1904, 5 counties cooperated; and in 1906, 10 counties cooperated. The projects were with oats, alfalfa, corn, and quack-grass eradication. This county farm demonstration work, according to Holden, was the beginning of county agricultural agent work.[19]

But perhaps we should supply the story of that major event as Morgan was able to reconstruct it:

The county farm demonstration plots, or experiment stations as they were sometimes called, seem to have grown out of a discussion at a farmers' institute in Sioux County, at Hull, in the winter of 1903. The farmers were in the midst of a sharp argument when Holden entered the meeting. A Mr. Hawkins called upon Holden to give his opinion on the question of whether or not Ames was too far away and conditions too different for the experiments of the college to be of value in Sioux County.

Holden replied (Morgan, Barton, Notes on a Personal Interview with P. G. Holden. Ames, Iowa, May 23, 1932.), "Mr. Hawkins, you are discussing one of the biggest things in the world." Holden took the view that every county should put on demonstrations and have someone in the County to direct the demonstration projects. He would have this man advise the farmers as to the best solution of their problems and also to work with the boys and girls.

As a result of this discussion, county farm demonstration work was started on the county farm in Sioux County in the spring of 1903. County farms were chosen because they belonged to all the people and were centrally located. Field demonstrations and simple experiments were conducted with oats, alfalfa, corn, and the eradication of quack grass. Corn, however, received the chief emphasis. Holden was often called the Corn Man because he stressed corn so much.

In the fall of the year, large gatherings, or picnics, were held at each of the county farms to view the results of the work. From 400 to 3,500 people usually attended these gatherings. The plan followed was for those interested to visit the plots in the forenoon and listen to an explanation of the work by some member of the extension department. At noon the people gathered for a picnic dinner, in family or neighborhood groups. After the dinner, programs of general interest were held in which some local people and 1 or 2 from the college took part. (Data Regarding the Organization of the Agricultural Extension Department, op. cit., pp. 37–38.) Data from these plots were published in circular form up to 1915.

From a beginning in Sioux County in 1903, the work grew rapidly for a number of years. In 1904, there were 5 counties; in 1906, there were 10 counties; in 1908 there were 14 counties; and in 1910 there were 16 counties. (Iowa State College. Annual Reports, Superintendent and Specialists of the Extension Department, 1911. Unpublished, Ames, Iowa.)

While section 2 of the first extension act in Iowa made provision for experimental work, the college trustees decided against experimentation in the extension department as it was otherwise provided for in the experiment station setup. The county farm demonstrations had in them an element of the experimental, but this work was finally discontinued in 1915. The county demonstration farms were however, a forerunner of the county agent plan of extension work which a little later came to occupy such an important place in Iowa.[20]

Thus, not only Professor Holden but J. C. Emery, president; G. A. Sheldon, secretary; B. F. Hawkins, N. E. Williams, and E. S. Boomer, of the program committee, and others, including substantial attendance from the Dutch population of that area, initiated a much larger "wave of the future" than they could have realized.

For it appears that Sioux County in cooperation with Iowa State College established more than 50 years ago the fundamental basis of support that is now being carried out in cooperative extension work throughout the United States. The Sioux County demonstration in 1903 was a significant event in the development of extension work.

The Sioux County Demonstration Farm of 1903 qualifies for the high national honor of beginning county farm demonstration work because it was:

First. Organized at the request and on the initiative of a group of farmers—Sioux County Farmers' Institute.

Second. Supported by county appropriations and land at the request of farmers.

Third. Conducted in full cooperation with Iowa State College and this cooperation also included support from the United States Department of Agriculture.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Alfred Charles True, A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States, 1785–1923, USDA miscellaneous publication No. 15, October 1928. He also mentions that a group of South Carolina planters interested in indigo began to hold meetings about 1740. Agricultural fairs were held as early as 1644 in New Haven, Conn.

[2] Barton Morgan, A History of the Extension Service of Iowa State College, Ames, 1934, p. 3.

[3] Alfred Charles True, A History of Agricultural Education in the United States, 1785–1925, USDA miscellaneous publication No. 36, July 1929, p. 24.

[4] True, op. cit., p. 47.

[5] See Gladys Baker, The County Agent, the University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1939, p. 4.

[6] See True, A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States, 1785–1923, op. cit., pp. 100–101.

[7] Report of the Secretary of Agriculture, 1903, USDA Rept. No. 76, Washington, 1903, p. 72.

[8] M. C. Burritt, The County Agent and the Farm Bureau, Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1922, pp. 154–155.

[9] True, A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States, 1785–1923, op. cit., pp. 60–61.

[10] Report of the Secretary of Agriculture, 1904, USDA Rept. No. 79, Washington, 1904, pp. 27, 28.

[11] Report of the Secretary of Agriculture, 1902, USDA Report No. 73, Washington, 1902, pp. 8–9.

[12] M. C. Burritt, The County Agent and the Farm Bureau, op. cit., p. 154.

[13] True, A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States, 1785–1923, op. cit., p. 63.

[14] Burritt, op. cit., p. 160.

[15] True, A History of Agricultural Education in the United States, 1785–1925, op. cit., pp. 276, 277.

[16] True, A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States, 1785–1923, op. cit., p. 14.

In his other work, A History of Agricultural Education in the United States, 1785–1925, p. 119, he indicates 1871–72 as the beginning date but p. 158 says 1870–71.

[17] Report of the Secretary of Agriculture, 1902, USDA Report No. 73, op. cit., pp. 78–79.

[18] Russell Lord, The Agrarian Revival, American Association for Adult Education, New York, 1939, p. 49.

[19] Barton Morgan, A History of the Extension Service of Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, June 1934, p. 24. Inasmuch as Morgan says "according to Holden," rather than taking a stand on the matter himself, we should note that the reference he gives is: Data Regarding the Organization of the Agricultural Extension Department, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa. Unpublished notes, Extension Service files, 54 pp., no date.

[20] Morgan, ibid., pp. 32–33.

Transportation Tax on Travel to Mexico, Canada, Central America, and the Caribbean Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues 2 newspaper editorials, 1 from the Habana Post and 1 from the San Antonio News, which deal with the question of removing the transportation tax on travel to Mexico, Canada, and the Central American and Caribbean Sea areas—which are the only areas in the world which are still subject to this discriminatory tax.

I have introduced a bill to accomplish this purpose, as have several other Members of Congress. The revenue produced by this tax is not significant, but its existence is an absolute act of discrimination to those countries which are our

closest friends and whose continued good will is necessary to our western solidarity.

The editorials follow:

[From the Havana Post, Havana, Cuba, of May 6, 1955]

END OF AMERICAN TRAVEL TAX IS URGED BY CUBAN AIR GROUP—AIM AT ABOLISHING STATES' LEVY OF 10 PERCENT, PASSAGE SOUGHT FOR BILL PENDING IN CONGRESS

The elimination by the United States Congress of the tax discrimination now existing on travel to Mexico, the Caribbean, Central America, and Canada would be an effective contribution toward the development of Cuba's second industry—tourism—it was emphasized here yesterday by the Cuban Air Transport Association.

The Cuban association has joined the Air Transport Association of America in a campaign aimed at abolishing the existing 10 percent travel tax to this area.

The 1947 amendment to the transport tax law left travel to Mexico, Central America, the Caribbean area and Canada completely taxable, the Cuban ATA said, adding that the tax to Europe and South America was abolished or what was alleged to be the convenience of helping the economic reconstruction of those nations.

"Aviation companies believe," the ATA said, "that there is no longer any validity to that argument and no reason whatever to maintain this discrimination against the trips of Americans to countries like Cuba."

Under the current threats to Cuba of selling less sugar to the United States market, the ATA feels that removal of the discriminatory United States travel tax is more than justified.

The ATA said that with the backing of the American Chamber of Commerce of Cuba it has sent a letter to the United States State Department asking for cooperation in the efforts being made by airlines to have Congress abolish the tax.

Under a bill now pending in the United States Congress, introduced by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS (Republican, Missouri), travel between the United States and Mexico, Central America and the Carribbean would be exempt from the tax on transportation of persons.

Both the Air Transport Association of America and the Cuban Air Transport Association endorse Representative CURTIS' bill and advocate for its early passage. CURTIS' bill makes no other change in the present law.

The reasons given by the ATA for passage of CURTIS' bill are:

(1) It removes the discrimination which now exists against travel to Mexico, Central America, the Caribbean and Canada and in favor of other international travel—"which cannot be justified on any logical grounds."

(2) Legislation of this kind has been endorsed by substantially all of the foreign countries involved, by the State Department, the Department of Commerce, the Bureau of the Budget, the Randall Commission and by national and international private organizations.

(3) It will be as successful in strengthening the economies of the Central American countries as the 1947 amendment was successful of strengthening the economies of European and South American countries.

(4) The revenue loss to the United States will be very small, if there is any loss at all. Estimates made by the Treasury Department, which assumed that no increase in travel to the countries concerned would result, are that the annual revenue loss would be approximately $10 million. "Obviously, however, by increasing travel to Mexico, Central America, the Caribbean and Canada, the bill would produce increased tax revenues from the domestic portion of the travel, an increase which can be expected to substantially offset or even exceed the estimated revenue loss."

[From the San Antonio News of May 6, 1955]

DEMAND REPEAL OF UNFAIR TAX ON TRAVEL TO NEIGHBOR LANDS

Within the month the House Ways and Means Committee in Washington is expected to act, favorably or unfavorably, on an amendment to the 1941 transportation tax that is of considerable importance to San Antonio and all Texas. Congress should hear from this area an emphatic demand that the amendment be approved.

The wartime transportation excise originally was levied primarily to discourage civilian travel, domestic and foreign. In 1947, in response to foreign appeals for a stimulant to American tourist travel to aid economic recovery, an amendment was passed to exempt from the 10-percent tax United States-purchased transportation in European and South American countries.

But transportation abroad, purchased in the United States, is still taxed from the point of origin to the limits of the northern portion of the Western Hemisphere, that is, in Mexico, Central America, the Caribbean area, and Canada. The effect, of course, is tax discrimination that discourages travel to those neighboring lands in favor of travel to other foreign countries.

Anything that discourages tourist trade with Mexico and Central America hurts San Antonio and Texas, which enjoys passing-through and stop-over trade from that source and substantial indirect benefits. But from any viewpoint, the discrimination is unfair and senseless.

Removing that discrimination is favored by the Eisenhower administration, the foreign countries involved, the Randall Commission, and various trade organizations. The amendment is endorsed by the San Antonio Chamber of Commerce Aviation Committee.

Both in self-interest and as good neighbors, Texans should urge their congressional delegation to push that amendment through.

Confusing and Discouraging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if there is one policy of the Eisenhower administration which has received the united support of Republicans, as well as substantial support of Democrats, it is the effort to get the Government out of businesses which can be carried on by individuals or private organizations.

This because thinking individuals know that, inasmuch as Government depends upon tax dollars for its existence, every time the Government eliminates a business which pays taxes it lessens its ability to operate—or must replace the lost tax by additional levies.

In the 83d Congress, without opposition, the House passed a bill introduced by me, the purpose of which was to get the Government out of taxpaying businesses. It was late in the session, hence, the bill did not reach the floor of the Senate.

The administration, by Executive action, has been trying to get the Government out of civilian activities, but legislation is needed.

May 12, last, when the bill making appropriations of $31,488,206,000 for the Department of Defense came before the House, it carried a section which made it difficult for the administration to curtail Government operations. An amendment designed to further the administration's purpose to get the Government out of activities usually performed by taxpayers was first adopted by the House when in committee by a vote of 160 to 134, but, then on rollcall, was defeated by a vote of 102 to 184. Some Members for no apparent reason reversed their position.

INCONSISTENCY

When the amendment came on for a vote in committee, those who had supported a similar principle in the 83d Congress again consistently voted for it; but on the rollcall vote, many switched positions and voted against it.

Naturally, no Member attempts to tell another how he should vote but it certainly is surprising to see Members of Congress within an hour on as simple and sound a proposition as was this do an about face.

Perhaps one reason for a switch from a position designed to protect the taxpayers to one permitting the Government to engage in commercial activities was in part due to the fact that the Member had a Government enterprise in his District.

The vote not only found the leaders on the Republican side in opposite camps but it also found top-ranking members of the Committee on Appropriations on opposite sides.

DISCOURAGING

Here is the discouraging feature of that action. Everyone knows that, if the Federal Government is to transact the business normally carried on by taxpayers, whether it be production, transportation, merchandizing, or storage of any item, crowding the taxpayer out, ultimately it will destroy itself. Republicans missed the boat on this one. Reason—lack of vigilance, party organization, personal interest.

Research in the Development and Utilization of Saline Waters

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2126) to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself with those who have spoken in support of this bill. I represent a rather unique district in the State of California. We have 400 miles of coastline. Directly in from that coastline we have 400 miles of territory which desperately and urgently needs water. Anything that can be done along this line experimentally certainly will be most useful and beneficial not only to the State of California, but to the country as a whole.

Why the United States Supports Our Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it is particularly encouraging to note that people residing in other than seaport areas are acquiring an awareness of the problems of the American merchant marine. Indeed, this should be a matter of universal and vital concern.

With these thoughts in mind, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why the United States Backs Our Merchant Marine," which was printed in one of Maryland's fine weekly newspapers, the Pilot, of Union Bridge, Md., on May 5, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE UNITED STATES BACKS OUR MERCHANT MARINE

Just about everyone is in favor of a strong American merchant marine. But a great many people are not familiar with the problems involved in maintaining it. So an explanation is in order of why congressional approval of President Eisenhower's request for $115 million in ship operating subsidies for the 1956 fiscal year is needed.

That explanation has been offered, in simple yet comprehensive form, by the Committee of American Steamship Lines.

To begin with, these subsidies are actually "differential payments." They are designed to help offset the enormous advantage that foreign merchant marines, with which our ship operators must compete, have in the all-important matter of operating costs. United States Maritime Administration figures show that in a recent year, it cost $20,800 a month to operate a typical cargo ship under our standards. By contrast, the same ship could be operated for $4,700 a month under British standards, and $4,400 under Asian standards. Thus, American costs are nearly five times as great. One of the principal reasons for this difference, incidentally, is found in our seamen's wages, working conditions, and other benefits.

The $115 million requested for 1956 is lower than the 1955 figure, which was $125 million. Even so, both years represent a substantial increase over appropriations made before and since the end of World War II. The reasons for this increase are twofold. First of all, there is a backlog of unpaid subsidy obligations to the steamship companies totaling about $120 million, some of them going back 7 years. The plan is to gradually catch up on these, so a part of the requested appropriation would go for prior year commitments. Second, ship operating costs have tremendously increased since the end of World War II. As an example, monthly base wages for a C–2 cargo ship operation are up 77 percent since 1947, overtime wages are up 18/ percent, and food supply, maintenance, and repair costs have jumped 124 percent. Other factors resulting in higher operating payments are an increased number of voyages by American ships engaged in world trade, a governmental approved increase in the number of trade route operators, and an increase in the number and size of our passenger fleet.

As for the need for United States merchant ships, endless facts could be cited. To take but one, of 38 critical industrial metals and materials, we are self-sufficient in only 9—we must import all or part of the others, including two-fifths of our copper and nearly a third of our lead and zinc. And we export vast quantities of foods and manufactured goods across the oceans—exports which account for an important share of our employment and national income. In the light of world conditions, it would be an invitation to disaster to depend on foreign-flag merchant marines to do the job for us. Through no fault of theirs or ours, we could lose their services almost overnight.

Last January, President Eisenhower said that the United States requires "a foreign economic program that will stimulate economic growth in the free world through enlarging opportunities for free enterprise and competitive markets." The American merchant marine is an indispensable element in that.

The 75th Anniversary of Marquette University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 75th anniversary in the life of Marquette University, that distinguished institution of higher learning located in the district which I represent in Congress.

For three-quarters of a century, Marquette University has been dedicated to the pursuit of truth and to the service of its community. The university has fulfilled these tasks with rare distinction. Under the guidance of the dedicated men of the Society of Jesus, the university has grown in prominence in the field of education, and has made a tremendous impression upon our community and upon our Nation.

It is with a deep sense of pride that I join with the students, alumni, and friends of Marquette University in extending my sincere congratulations to my alma mater upon this memorable occasion.

In the belief that it will prove of considerable interest to the membership of this body, I should like to include in the RECORD a brief history of Marquette University in which the university's aims and achievements are succinctly restated and appraised. The résumé stresses the philosophy of the university: "The pursuit of truth to make men free":

The academic year, 1955–56, marks the 75th year in the life of Marquette University. This anniversary affords Marquette an appropriate occasion for restating its basic aims and for appraising its achievements during the past 75 years in the hope of deepening the mutual understanding that exists between the university and those it serves.

To understand fully the aims and achievements of Marquette University it is necessary to grasp the distinctive spirit which has motivated Marquette's growth and development for the past three-quarters of a century.

It was this spirit which brought a group of pioneering Jesuit priests to the western shores of Lake Michigan in 1881 to teach the truths they knew of religion, science, and the humanities. Here in Milwaukee they established a small Catholic men's college, which later became Marquette University, and dedicated it to the pursuit of truth and to the service of its community.

Behind the efforts of these pioneering educators was the inspiration of two great men, St. Ignatius of Loyola, the founder of the Society of Jesus, and Pere Marquette, the French Jesuit missionary and explorer. Today, this same spirit continues to inspire the teachers and students of Marquette University and to give the university its unique character and quality.

In 1534, St. Ignatius of Loyola dedicated himself, together with six of his friends, to the "greater honor and glory of God" and founded the Society of Jesus. One of the works with which he charged his followers was the education of youth and in his constitutions he set down the basic principles which have continued to this day to be the foundation of all Jesuit education.

St. Ignatius directed his followers to develop the intellects of their students in knowledge and wisdom so that they would go forth an leaven society with the spirit of Christ. They were to teach the whole truth, drawing both from the discoveries of human reason and from divine revelation in order to develop the whole man, intellectually, morally and socially.

In 1673, the young Jesuit missionary and explorer, Pere Marquette, ventured into the uncharted wilderness of the American Middle West. He came as a disciple of St. Ignatius to teach the Indians of this area the truths of Christianity; he came, also, to learn the truths of this mysterious country, to discover the mighty Mississippi River and other natural resources of this new land.

From the scholarly St. Ignatius, Marquette University has drawn the ideas and spirit which form the basic aims of its instruction. From the courageous Pere Marquette, the university has inherited its pioneering spirit and its special dedication to the people of Milwaukee and the Middle West.

During its 75th anniversary year, Marquette University plans to demonstrate more fully how this spirit has motivated its own development as a center of higher learning. Because the principles of knowledge and truth are being subjected to violent attacks on all fronts today, any attempt to appraise the position of a single university in the field of learning also involves the broader question of the role of learning itself in our society today.

As a consequence Marquette proposes to devote some of its efforts during the 75th anniversary year to developing its celebration theme, "Learning," which it describes as "The pursuit of truth to make men free." To this project it has invited the participation of scholars and educators from throughout the world, along with its alumni, students, benefactors, and other friends.

THE AIMS OF MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY

From its earliest beginnings, Marquette University has sought to serve the common good by a pursuit of truth by all its members. The university has committed itself to the formation of its students in truth according to their abilities, especially that truth which will enable them to understand the full purpose of living. Marquette seeks as well to enlarge truth as possessed by its own teachers and students, thus enlarging truth itself in the community it serves. Through its teaching and its research it seeks to help men grow in truth.

This growth in truth it believes is vital to the proper development of man. For while man has been created with freedom of choice, his own ignorance of what is true and good prevents him from properly exercising his freedom and reaching the fullness of his nature. By assisting man to learn what is really true and good, so that he can attain the fullness of his freedom, the university serves the cause of the greatest common good, human liberty. By its pursuit of truth, therefore, the university serves to make men truly free.

THE GROWTH OF MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY

These basic aims of Marquette University spring solidly out of tradition, but the changing, growing times in America through which Marquette has grown have called for adjustments and adaptations. The 75 years of Marquette University's life have witnessed the industrialization and urbanization of American society. This era saw also the realization of the American hope that college education would be brought within the reach of all qualified young men and women, regardless of wealth or class.

In keeping with the instructions of St. Ignatius to adapt educational procedures to the varying circumstances of times, places, and persons, Marquette University has met these changes and differences in a unique, pioneering fashion.

What began as a single building, a handful of students, and four Jesuit fathers soon grew into an expanded college of liberal arts culminating in a graduate school. And these were supplemented by business and professional schools which included business administration, engineering, journalism, nursing, speech, medicine, dentistry, and law.

What originated as a men's college became the first Catholic coeducational university in America. Marquette also was the first Catholic university to offer summer-school classes, designed originally to meet the needs of Catholic teachers. An evening division, with cultural and professional classes, was also instituted to meet the special needs of an expanding industrial and urban community.

These and many other innovations were accomplished, however, without any abandonment of Marquette's primary dedication to the pursuit of the truth which is unchanging. Only the ways of discovering and teaching the truth have changed.

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY TODAY

Today, more than 9,000 students fill the classrooms of Marquette University from early morning until late evening, seeking the knowledge and learning offered by its 77 departments. These students come from all the States in the Union and from many foreign lands. The largest percentage, of course, are natives of the city of Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin.

The subjects they study range from French literature to the theories of choice; from jurisprudence to orthopedic nursing; from electronics to exodontics; and from the history of the theater to banking and finance. And for the young man seeking a career in the armed service, there are courses offered by the Navy ROTC and the Army ROTC units on the campus.

These classes are conducted by 860 full or part-time professors and instructors, 45 of whom are priest members of the Society of Jesus. As university teachers, these faculty members are also engaged in research and scholarly activities. These activities include both basic and applied research, ranging from scientific studies seeking a cure for the disease of cancer to philosophical studies seeking a clearer understanding of the act of judgment. Some of the projects offer direct assistance to the local business and industrial communities.

To accommodate all this teaching and research, the Marquette campus includes more than 30 main buildings, the newest of which are the memorial library, the Brooks Memorial Union, the College of Business Administration, O'Donnell residence hall, and the medical-dental library addition.

This year more than 1,000 graduates will leave Marquette University and return to their communities to become active, participating members of society. Besides educating this group of young men and women, which is Marquette's major contribution to the good of society, the university will conduct 44 professional institutes for the professional and business leaders of its area. Hundreds of men and women will return to the campus to learn of the latest developments in their fields and to improve their understanding of their work through these annual short term postgraduate courses.

The special clinics and services of the university, such as the speech correction clinic, the dental clinic, and the bureau of business and economic research, will also be used by thousands of people during the year, thus adding to Marquette's contribution to its community and its members.

From modest beginnings 75 years ago, Marquette has grown into a dynamic university community. Thousands of teachers and students are today earnestly engaged in the pursuit of truth, strengthening their grasp of the liberal arts and improving their skills in the various professions.

SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION PLANS

In preparation for the 75th anniversary celebration, Marquette has sponsored the publication of two scholarly books written by members of its faculty which give a deeper understanding of the university.

One, the Story of Marquette University, by Father Raphael Hamilton, S. J., details the historical growth of the university in Milwaukee. The other, St. Ignatius' Idea of a Jesuit University, by Father George Ganss, S. J., analyzes the basic principles of education which the founder of the Society of Jesus set forth in his constitutions. Both were published by the Marquette University Press.

During the past year more than 100 members of the faculty have been engaged in an intensive self-analysis study of the university. At the direction of the president, these faculty members have compiled a report of the present status of the university in all its departments and activities. Within the coming months, these faculty members will evaluate present practices and personnel and will make recommendations for the future planning and development of the university. Out of this will come the Blue print for the Marquette of Tomorrow.

For the celebration year itself the faculties of the university, aided by a special 75th anniversary celebration committee composed of civic, religious and industrial leaders, have planned a series of special events aimed at demonstrating the aims and achievements of the university.

The exact details and character of these events will be disclosed as they are developed. Some of the major activities that are planned, however, include the following:

More than 30 learned societies and professional groups are scheduled to hold their annual conventions on the campus during the celebration year. These will bring to the community many of the Nation's more brilliant scholars and leaders for lectures and discussions.

The university will sponsor a series of scholarly discussions of pertinent problems under the general title of "Learning and American Life." Speakers will include university faculty members, other famous scholars, and national and local leaders.

The university plans to award honorary degrees to several world leaders who have distinguished themselves by their service to the welfare of society.

Marquette will present the Pere Marquette award to religious, civic and educational leaders who exemplify the ideals and teachings that the university upholds.

A series of special religious observances has been planned, featuring religious leaders of the Nation and the State.

An arts festival will be held, to exhibit the creative and dramatic talents of the community.

In addition to these special events, the 75th anniversary will be emphasized at all the regularly scheduled campus events during the year—such as lectures, dramatic and cultural presentations, homecoming and the student social activities.

Through this series of academic, cultural, religious and social events during its 75th anniversary year, Marquette University expects to emphasize its heritage of educational principles from St. Ignatius and its pioneering spirit from Pere Marquette and to demonstrate its own capabilities as a center of learning. Marquette hopes that in this way men and women will come to recognize more fully their need for the university in their struggle for truth and freedom.

Politics and the Gospel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, at best any discussion of politics and religion in the same breath is a delicate one, reflecting age-old beliefs and convictions. Courageously, and with rare insight, Rev. Iain Wilson, of the Franklin Street Presbyterian Church, of Baltimore, Md., has treated this subject. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD his sermon of May 1, 1955, entitled "Politics and the Gospel."

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS AND THE GOSPEL

Text: Ephesians 1: 22: "God * * * hath put all things under His feet."

High up on the rocky face of a mountain that overlooks the ancient caravan route from Persia to Babylon, there can still be seen in sculptured relief a trio of heroic figures, confronting a row of cringing suppliants begging for mercy.

That splendid relief was carved there some 2,500 years ago on the orders of one of the great Persian warrior-kings, Darius the First. It commemorates his victory over a confederation of rebels who had sought at the outset of his reign to dislodge him from his throne.

If you look more closely, you can see that Darius himself, standing head and shoulders

above the others, has his left foot firmly planted on the body of the prostrate rebel leader. And that is how Darius regarded himself, and wished to be known throughout history, as a conqueror who had placed all things under his feet.

It is quite possible that it was just such a gesture of triumph, common enough in that ancient world, that Paul had in mind as he dictated the words of our text. These words are not original to Paul; they are in fact a quotation from the eighth psalm. But whereas the psalmist speaks of God having put all things under the feet of man, Paul—with greater realism and with an insight denied to the psalmist—proclaims that this is what God has done in Jesus Christ.

And the whole passage from which the text is taken is a brilliant cry of triumph. For in it the risen Christ is portrayed as reigning in Heaven, ruler of all rulers, the name above every name, master of time and eternity, under whose feet God has placed all things.

We should notice the energy of the picture. This Christ is no languid or withdrawn recluse. He is a warrior, resplendent in His hard-bought victory. And we should observe, too, the comprehensiveness of that victory; for all things are under His feet; He is the undisputed victor, and the field is His.

That is how Paul saw Jesus Christ, and that is how you and I must see Him, if we are authentically His disciples. That is, in fact, our gospel. The word "gospel" means good news, a message that is completely satisfying: and one way of stating this message is simply to affirm that all things are under the feet of Jesus Christ—that is what the early Christians meant by their terse confession of faith: "Jesus Christ is Lord." He is the Master, and nothing at all is withheld from Him. There are no autonomous areas of human life, dispensed from allegiance to Him. There are no activities of the human spirit that have the right to proceed as if they were independent of Him, as if He were not in fact their legitimate ruler.

Now this morning I have given the sermon a title, and called it "Politics and the Gospel."

I have done so, because I want us to face what the Lordship of Jesus Christ means for our political life.

And let me say immediately that I am well aware that there are many who cannot see that the Gospel means anything at all for political life. For many within the church as well as outside, there is something unfamiliar or unnatural or even offensive, in the juxtaposition of the two words, "politics and Gospel."

There are some who think of the Gospel as too sacred, too holy and ethereal, to be involved in what is simultaneously held to be the thoroughly worldly and disreputable business of politics. Others think that politics is too serious and practical a matter to be complicated by what they regard as the abstract theories of religion. So we have the maxims: "Keep religion out of politics"; "Let ministers attend to their own business of preaching, and leave the politicians to get on with their own job." There are many variations on the theme, but the theme itself is the same: the Gospel is one thing, politics is another, and it is best to leave it that way.

The trouble with such generalizations is that they are childish and superficial. They have a certain appeal to us, because they sound like simple commonsense. But they do not stand any examination. At best they are no more than half-truths, and far too sweeping and too facile to correspond to the subtleties and complexities of our actual human society.

For example: While it is surely true enough to say that a preacher should not use his pulpit as a platform for political propaganda, what is he to do when a situation of blatant political corruption exists? Is he to avert his eyes and be silent? If he does, he will not be true to his calling or true to the Bible. Did Elijah remain silent when Ahab used his political power to liquidate Naboth? Was Amos silent when he saw the bribery, and the exploitation of the helpless and poor, and the licentiousness of the rulers of Israel? One of the great insights of the Old Testament is that wherever moral considerations enter into a situation, our faith has an interest at stake. Politics is involved through and through with moral and ethical considerations. Politics is the art, not of governing machines or robots, but of governing men. Men are beings who live in moral terms, and wherever moral and spiritual issues arise, there our faith has a word to say. We talk glibly of keeping politics out of religion, but a preacher of the Gospel who fails to challenge an abuse of political power is in fact giving an endorsement of that abuse. A preacher of the Gospel who fails to name and commend humane and honest political ideals stands convicted of a timidity unworthy of the Christian man.

Or again: While all of us here would subscribe to the constitutional provision for the separation of church and state; and we all hold that this is a sound provision, in theory and in practice; it is sheer foolishness to conclude from that that religion and politics as such can neatly be severed one from the other. It is one thing to preserve the integrity of institutions created by religious or political thinking—it is one thing to preserve religion as organized into churches, or politics as organized into a national state—and it is wise to maintain a distance between the two types of institution; but that does not mean that religious aims and political aims can simply be separated from one another, for in that deep realm of ideas and aspirations far below the surface of external institutions, there is no such fissure between that which is religion and that which is politics. In the deepest places of our human spirit, and its yearnings and hopes, there is a oneness which must not be forgotten. The Bible is the best testimony to that fact.

How can any authentic Christian sever his faith from his actions at any point? How can any man who believes that God has put all things under the feet of Christ, then go on to make political judgments and decisions apart from Christ?

In any event, however difficult or hazardous may be the consequences of relating the Gospel to politics, you and I as Christians really have no choice in the matter. We are under orders. We have a Master. We are serving One on whose behalf we are told to claim the whole of human life, including that area of it which we call political. Our task is to serve notice on the world that it is our fixed intention to work without ceasing until, as the Book of Revelation says, "the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and He shall reign forever and ever."

Now, let us think in the broadest and simplest way of that which happens when the Gospel of Jesus Christ is brought to bear upon politics.

The very first thing that happens is that we see politics as an activity which is going to be redeemed.

Politics is defined in my dictionary as "the art of government," and so it is. It is a noble art, but it is an art which has fallen. Like every other activity of man, it stands in need of redemption.

This is obvious enough in our existing political situation. The intrinsic nobility of politics is scarcely discernible because of the vulgarity of its trappings. One of the most sublime exercises of the human spirit has become so degraded that the very word "politics" has acquired an unsavory quality. For many, the concept of politics as a high and solemn art is completely obscured by its secondary accompaniments: The word immediately suggests the corruptions of political administrations, bribery, bosses, fixing, and favors; the word is associated with smoke-filled rooms, dingy with cigar butts, and the dismal stench of stale liquor, the uproar and ballyhoo of party conventions, the spurious friendliness and effusive backslapping that contrast so strangely with the stridency and mudslinging of political campaigns, so that the very idea of politics has come to stink in the nostrils of many morally sensitive people, and they decline anything more than the most perfunctory interest in politics, and the minimal responsibility in political action.

But for the Christian citizen the very fact of the repulsive context in which political life is so often lived, is the strongest reason for him to engage in political activity. Our religion is not one that counsels us to withdraw from the graceless squalor of this world. On the contrary, it is exactly because it was this world which God entered in Jesus Christ, exactly because Jesus took our frail flesh upon Him and bore the cross and redeemed us by the power of the resurrection—it is because of this that we are under the obligation to help redeem the diseased body politic. A Christian who turns his back upon this obligation is guilty of disastrous irresponsibility. He is irresponsible toward his fellow citizens because politics is a necessity of organized life; and he is irresponsible toward God, who has given him the privilege of sharing in Christ's redemptive purpose.

But, how are you and I as Christians to perform a responsible task, to bring the gospel of Jesus Christ to bear upon the actualities of political life?

We can do so in ways that are perfectly concrete, thoroughly prosaic. First, there is the discipline of gaining the knowledge of political facts: of knowing what is taking place in the political arena, and of evaluating that in as scrupulously unprejudiced and careful a manner as is possible. Instead of satisfying ourselves with half-examined and half-digested clichés, we should take the trouble to study the Bible and to subject our own political judgments to that which meets us there, and is manifest, about the right relation between man and man. We do not have to seek far—the 19th chapter of Leviticus could be the starting point for the social doctrine of the Bible. And we should thank God for the freedom of speech and the freedom of the press, that we have received, and that we can use in the patient search for political understanding.

We shall vote—thoughtfully and carefully. It is not beneath the dignity of the Christian man to speak about voting in the presence of God, and in the context of an act of worship. Apathy in the matter of voting is a cardinal sin. It is a sin because it is a callous insult to those men and women who have paid with toil and blood and agony for the preservation of that political system whereby it is possible for you and me freely to register a political decision. By what right do we ignore the mute testimony of those scores of thousands of graves in France, Germany, Italy, North Africa, Korea, the Philippines, and the islands of the Pacific? By what right do we ignore that which was made possible for us only by that high and terrible cost?

Let us be clear. The Communist traitor is neither the only nor the worst enemy of our freedom. The man who noisily professes his patriotism, but then neglects to exercise the very privilege bought for him at that high cost is—no doubt unwittingly, but no less

certainly—the most deadly accomplice of those whose deliberate intention it is to destroy the freedom in which we stand.

It seems just as well to bring this home by specific reference to the situation in this city. There is in the city of Baltimore a potential voting list of about 600,000 citizens. Yet over 30 percent of that potential—or more than 200,000—are not even registered. One-third of those who could vote do not even have that degree of interest.

And even among those who are registered, there is a monumental apathy. We speak of this as "the monumental city." Perhaps one aspect of that monumentality is to be found in this kind of apathy. In the gubernatorial election last fall, only about 250,000 of the 400,000 registered voters actually cast a vote: and when the supremely important $20 million school loan came up to be voted on, only 22 percent of those who might have voted did so.

The statistical picture is even more thought-provoking, however, when we examine its religious aspect. Here is a city whose population is 60 percent Protestant: yet only three members of the present City Council are Protestant, while 18 are of the Roman Catholic or Jewish faiths. The combined Roman Catholic and Jewish populations of Baltimore total no more than 40 some percent of the entire population; yet 6 out of every 7 members of the city council are drawn from that 40 percent.

What conclusions can be drawn from these figures?

Let me be quite explicit. Most certainly I will not draw a conclusion that would be disparaging to those of our fellow-citizens who are Roman Catholic or Jewish. On the contrary, they should be congratulated on their readiness to take poltical responsibility. The conclusion that can be drawn—and it is glaring—is that we Protestants are much less active either in offering our services in civic leadership, or in exercising responsibility as citizens of a great and ancient town. The only conclusion that we can draw is that we Protestants are guilty of an indifference to our civic responsibility that is deplorable. It is an indifference, furthermore, that is a denial of the very traditions which made us what we are. It was not an accident that democratic government flourished and grew in those countries where Protestantism was the faith of the majority—in Switzerland and Holland, in England and Scotland, and eventually in this New World. And it is nothing less than tragic to witness in our days the evidences of so widespread a refusal on the part of Protestants to measure up to their political tasks.

Much more could be said, and much more should be said, but there is no time.

Let us try to draw the threads together.

You and I are the servants of One, under whose feet God has willed to place all things.

That is the Gospel. The Gospel means more than that you and I, as individuals, are saved. It means that in and through that salvation, we are committed to the task of opening every door that is barred against Jesus Christ.

And that, in its turn, means that we have a specifically Christian task to perform in the great and fateful theater of political action.

We may not see all the way ahead. But at least we can see the immediate steps ahead, and there are certain quite definite things that we can do.

We can listen to what the Bible has to say about God's will for our human relationships; we can hold ourselves ready to take political responsibility, should God call us to do so; we can acquire political knowledge; we can pray for our political leaders; and we can vote.

Very well, then. Let us go to it.

Arbitration Provisions Offered by Southern Bell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, today I received a letter from the President of Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co., Mr. Fred J. Turner, stating that in the company's latest proposed arbitration clause are provisions for arbitrating disputes arising out of suspensions, demotions and discharges which arise out of the proposed no-strike clause.

While this letter does not give any detailed information about the latest proposal, it seems hopeful to me that the company and the union are very close to an agreement and I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I believe that we can be optimistic about an early settlement, as long as negotiation is continued in good faith. The parties, I am informed, are now meeting—and have been having negotiation sessions since last Friday.

It is always most desirable to settle such matters as this by negotiation, if at all possible, and that is what they are trying to do. If the negotiations again break off, then arbitration seems to me to be the answer.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHERN BELL TELEPHONE
& TELEGRAPH CO.,
Atlanta, Ga., May 14, 1955.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: I have been furnished a transcript of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 13, which carried your statements to the Senate regarding the telephone strike.

In the course of your remarks you are quoted as saying: "What the union wants, I understand, in view of the fact that they will agree to a no-strike clause, is the right to have arbitrated by neutral parties the disciplinary action taken with regard to arguments arising, as a result of the no-strike provision, over such things as suspensions, demotions, and discharges."

I want to clear up any misunderstanding that may exist regarding how completely arbitration is available under the latest company offer. Under the company's proposal, each of the matters you mentioned in the quoted paragraph, that is, all disciplinary action taken under the no-strike clause, all suspensions, discharges of employees with more than 6 months' service, and demotions of employees who have been on the new job more than 3 months is subject to arbitration.

The very few matters that are not subject to arbitration under the proposal made by this company are management functions which, in the interest of the sound and effective operation of this business, should not be delegated or surrendered to an arbitrator. To do so would be contrary to the welfare of the public and the employees, as well as the company.

The offer now before the union incorporates many of their demands and many proposals made by the company. It is the result of true collective bargaining and would increase the company's costs by more than $7 million annually. I feel sincerely that it provides a fair basis for settlement.

Let me thank you again for your continued interest and express my desire to provide you with any additional information you may wish to have.

Sincerely,

F. J. TURNER, *President.*

Turbine Power and Air Transport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have read a very interesting article on turboprop development written by Mr. C. R. Smith, president of American Airlines, which appeared in the May issue of Flying, and I wish to include it as part of my remarks:

The warning has been sounded often and over a substantially long period of time. But hear it once again.

Unless the American aircraft industry reasserts and implements its belief in the privileges and advantages of private enterprise, and unless it shows willingness to undertake reasonable business risks to make available air transport equipment of obvious need, the initiative in commercial aviation development will vanish from these shores. Currently there are substantial indications that it is about to embark.

We are ready for major advances in domestic air transportation in every respect * * * except the availability of proven turboprop powerplants of modern type and proper sizes. Other than for technological details of development, we know exactly how these major advances can be accomplished.

First requirement is an adequate assignment of turboprop development in the overall aviation development program of the United States. Then should follow a devoted application of the technical abilities and capacities of the aircraft industry to coordinate and produce the desired result in a dated program.

It is regrettable that the American aviation manufacturing industry in all its categories * * * including airplanes, engines, propellers, and all things which go together to make the desired objective obtainable * * * has not exercised the initiative so admirably displayed in the first 40 years of powered flight. Rather, the industry apparently now have come to be dependent almost wholly on guaranteed Federal underwriting before it will undertake any so-called commercial ventures, regardless of how obvious the need or how bright the ultimate business prospects.

In almost startling contrast to this loss of initiative is the current aggressive and imaginative program of British aviation in the civil field. And I repeat, unless the former initiative of our industry is recaptured, the leadership in commercial aviation development will be lost to the United States.

Let us review analytically, if somewhat briefly, the train of events which preceded this situation. Speed * * * the ability to

shrink distance in terms of time and thus facilitate human objectives * * * is the unique contribution of aviation to society. Many years ago aviation ceased to be competitive with ground transportation in the field of speed.

From the inception of flight in 1903, up to the introduction of the turbine engine into operational use after the Second World War, the top speed of military aviation had advanced at an almost steady annual rate of 14 miles per hour. Maximum speeds of air transport had advanced equally steadily at about half that pace. Had it not been for the introduction of the turbine engine, and the radical increase and the direct nature of applied power which resulted, the ratio between military and civil advance in speed would probably have continued constant.

However, the impetus of war urgency in Germany, and not long afterward in Britain, brought the long-established principles of gas turbine power and jet thrust to the attention of aviation. Needless to say, the rapid and practical application of this form of power to aircraft propulsion was the result of previous technological progress in many areas outside of aviation. Once the turbine had been proved practical for flight, the rate of progress was astounding, and the United States has played a part of ever-increasing importance * * * particularly in turbo jets.

In military aviation the race for speed is competitive with one's enemies, real or potential. As it appears today, there seem no limits, technical problems being assumed, to prevent top speeds from soaring far into the supersonic realm. For such competitive military uses, exclusive of certain logistic and other specialist requirements, emphasis will continue to fall on turbo jets, with increasing attention to ram jets and supplementary rockets. Nuclear power may be the ultimate. Stress on attendant factors, such as size, weight, extreme ruggedness, and kindred qualifications is certain.

This, then, is the reason and the logic of military emphasis on jet propulsion.

Along with this military competitive effort go many problems and penalties. Among them is aerodynamic control and flutter which beset the transition from the sonic into the supersonic range. Ahead at some point also interposes the "thermal barrier." Nor does supersonic flight escape its drag penalties and resultant high fuel consumption. Moreover, the military can be content in some instances with limited range and other considerations which would be intolerable to commercial utility.

We must note, too, that all these ultra-high-speed devices are inherently noise generating—a factor which can be tolerated in war, but which is hardly consistent with the specifications of peaceful commerce.

It seems obvious, then, that for commercial use, where comfort, quietness, and economy are basic, we must compromise for a long time with speed below that of sound.

In the upper reaches of the subsonic area it seems inevitable that commercial aviation will have a big stake. The great emphasis of the military on turbojet power for this area has advanced the potential of commercial application. Of course, we still must find the answer to the noise problem even here, but the high speed and over-the-weather cruising and the possibility of long range make the simple turbojet appear commercially attractive for cross-continental or transoceanic utility. Still to be determined are the true economics of the turbojet in commerce. Such factors as slow ground acceleration, low angle of initial climb, restricted ground maneuverability, higher approach speeds, fuel limitations for holding in traffic, and ground deceleration are matters to be considered. But let us say that all such matters will be solved in time and that the turbojets will be adapted by air commerce for long-range flights of high speed between important cities with adequate airports and all essential aids to traffic control.

This still leaves air commerce without progress in solution of the greater part of its required services, especially in the domestic sphere. Recognizing the suitability, and ultimate availability of turbojet transports in the long range field (1,000 to 4,000 miles), we must also see the need of a small economical turboprop plane for domestic runs up to 750 miles and a larger turboprop with reasonably increased speed and heavy emphasis on economy for domestic runs up to 2,500 miles.

In the realm of these last two airplanes most of the domestic air transport is done * * * with economic factors adverse. Economy in the operation of these types is the all important requirement. And here it is that advanced turboprops seem to hold the answer to progress in performance combined with economy. Costs are continually rising and air transport charges must inevitably increase unless we can hold basic operating costs, and secure equipment of higher performance at reasonable advance in price.

Basic characteristics of the conventionally powered transports continue to serve restricted airports of our community network. Yet in the essential search for greater comfort and higher power to handle modest increase in plant size, it is inevitable that the turbine be considered. War brought the piston engine to a size and complexity beyond which it seemed illogical to go. Then came the breakthrough in the form of the turbine engine with its greater power and basic simplicity.

At that point a national aviation policy, such as was adopted by the British, undoubtedly would have stressed necessity for gas turbine and propeller combinations to fill requirements in which super speed was not the critical ingredient. But no such program was conceived or adopted and military emphasis was, and is, concentrated on the turbojet. As a result, with almost no sponsorship, turboprop development was unhappily neglected in the United States. A couple of projects were undertaken with questionable enthusiasm, partly with military encouragement and partly under private enterprise, but they have no consistent backing.

In contrast, the well-coordinated British aviation program has produced, or has in the making, a substantial number of turboprop types and sizes. Some are of designs and sizes to meet the critical needs of civil transport, and as past emergencies have shown, civil transport can become the backbone of military logistics.

Almost the same observations could be applied to development of the bypass or ducted fan types of turbine engine—intermediate in purpose and general characteristics between the turbojet and the turboprop. In some respects the ducted fan type of turbine promises to be more suitable to air transport in the high subsonic range than does the straight turbojet. Additionally, the principles may be advantageously extended to the natural field for the turboprop—the shorter range, not-so-fast, low-altitude transports. Here again the British are out in front with a soundly established and well-advanced program.

It is estimated that the turboprop in modern application will give a speed increment of 25 to 35 percent over the best comparable reciprocating engine. It likewise will increase traveler comfort and service. And basic to economy, it will give civil air commerce a chance to hold the cost line.

But what has happened to the American industrial initiative which formerly made progressive steps possible to air transport, not only of the United States but of the world? This, I judge, is a more pressing consideration than can be measured in technical terms.

The Precarious Status of Our Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Struggle for Survival," pertaining to the precarious status of our merchant marine, which I prepared for the May 1955 issue of Marine News magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRUGGLE FOR SURVIVAL

(By Hon. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

That the privately owned American merchant fleet is engaged in a fight-to-the-death struggle for continued participation in the transportation of the world's ocean cargoes is a fact too clearly discernible to admit of any question.

Even the most cursory consideration of the possible outcome of that struggle immediately brings to mind a number of questions, the answers to which would shed a great deal of light upon the matter.

In somewhat logical order, these are some of the more urgent questions:

Why, basically, is it that United States-flag vessels, particularly in the so-called "tramp" trades, are at such a competitive disadvantage in their ceaseless quest for ocean tonnage?

Why are the coastal and intercoastal shipping lines, which do not have to face foreign competition, unable to achieve the prosperity they enjoyed in prewar days?

Are wage and overtime rates on United States-flag vessels the prime reason that our merchant fleet is being priced out of business, as has been alleged?

If wages are a factor in the difficulties of our shipping, is it the only differential, or are there other contributing reasons of importance to explain why United States flag vessels are unable to operate, much less operate profitably, without Government aid?

Once these salient points are brought into focus, other queries naturally follow. For instance—

If American shipping cannot make its own way unaided, is there justification for Federal financial participation, when there is an abundance of foreign bottoms available to serve our Nation's needs?

Will Government be willing continuingly to spend millions of dollars each year for shipbuilding and shipping, to equalize costs of constructing and operating vessels of the American merchant fleet?

Will these Government aids diminish in amount, or are they likely to increase over the years ahead?

Or—is the American fleet of such importance to the Nation's interests, in peace and war, that it must be maintained on an adequate basis, cost what it may?

Exploring this matter of costs further, it might reasonably be inquired at this point—

Just how much has shipping cost the Government in the period since the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 enunciated the broad policy of Government participation to assure, in the national interests, development and maintenance of a privately-owned merchant fleet adequate to transport "a substantial portion of its waterborne * * * foreign commerce * * * and capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency"?

Is Government itself guilty of helping to depress the shipping industry by competing, through its Military Sea Transportation Service, for the commercial cargoes which the privately-owned vessels should be carrying?

What return have the Nation, and the Federal Treasury, received from the contributions made to the maintenance of the shipping fleet?

If you are somewhat groggy by now, as a result of all these questions, it is perfectly understandable. Maritime operations are most complicated. The problems are so varied, and their implications run so deep into every phase of American life, that one can readily rationalize the lack of appreciation of those problems on the part of the Congress and citizens alike.

Make no mistake about it, however, all the questions listed above and many others will have to be considered, and answered, if our privately-owned merchant marine is to survive.

If each of the foregoing problems could be resolved satisfactorily, one huge obstacle to survival would still project itself into the shipping picture. It is simply this—

Four-fifths of the merchant ships presently operating under American registry will have to be replaced within the next 10- to 12-year period.

At today's inflated prices, such replacement will cost 5, 6, or possibly even 8 billions of dollars, of which the Federal Government, under the provisions of the 1936 act, will normally subscribe between 2 and 4 billions.

A considerable sum of money indeed for the Government to pay. However, it is no more than Government spent to build a fleet of useless ships in World War I. And it is far, far less than the fantastic $13 billion expended for ship construction in World War II.

Orderly replacement of the present fleet, likewise, would prevent another recurrence of the obsolescence problem that plagued our Nation after World War I, and that hangs like an oppressive storm cloud even today.

There, as briefly as I could summarize, are the urgent questions that must be considered in any discussion of the American Merchant Marine and its chances for survival.

Now let's review some of these points more fully.

First, why are American ships at such a competitive disadvantage with respect to foreign vessels? The reason is simple. Because of higher wages and greater benefits to our seamen, and because of higher costs of supplies of all kinds and types used in shipping; and because, too, in great measure, of loading and unloading costs at American ports. Even in the case of American tankers, where stevedoring is not a factor, I am told that operating costs average approximately $1,000 per day higher than foreign costs on similar tankers.

A comparison of wage costs on American and foreign ships is most revealing. Data compiled for the year 1953 shows all too clearly the disadvantage under which United States-flag ships were operating in the world transportation field.

The monthly cost for wages on an American-flag ship, with a crew of 48, the report shows, averaged $29,426 during 1953. This was almost 6 times the cost on a British ship with a mixed crew of 80 men; it was almost 5 times the cost on a British ship with a white crew, or on a Japanese ship carrying 56 men; it was about 4 times the costs on similar ships of Norwegian, Netherlands, Italian or Danish registry, with crews of 41 to 55 men; and it was almost 3 times the costs on a French vessel, with a crew of 47.

On no foreign vessels were monthly costs for wages anything like the costs on American ships.

The coastal and intercoastal lines, while not faced with foreign shipping competition, run into bitter competition from all types of surface transportation, and are particularly burdened with high port costs, because of their many calling points. A promising development in this field is the roll-on-roll-off type of vessel, capable of transporting loaded tractor trucks and freight cars. The lessened labor costs, and greater security of such shipments, help to accelerate turnover and reduce port charges. But, of course, the initial cost of vessels and of the necessary adjustments in terminal facilities are factors that may prevent rapid adoption of this concept.

Recent conferences on coastal shipping problems, staged by the Maritime Administration, may help to bring this segment of this industry "out of the doldrums" of recent years. Certainly these conferences illuminated the basic problems in this field. That is the initial step in any effort towards improvement—knowing the nature and extent of the problems.

Coming to Government aids and attitudes toward shipping, I would express several firm personal convictions which, if more widely held, would definitely clear the atmosphere. These are, first, that the majority of those who refuse to give reasonable support to shipping, or who do so reluctantly, are simply not conversant with the true facts in the matter.

Secondly, many of these persons, while champions of shipping or any other phase of our economy that is useful in war or emergency, promptly forget such service once the emergency ends. In the case of shipping, particularly, they will applaud the building of 5,000 vessels to win a war, but refuse to consider the harm they've done to the shipping industry by completely upsetting the normal supply and demand, and normal replacement procedures.

Our shipbuilding plants, so vital in war, have been reduced to an irreducible minimum since 1945. Their irreplaceable skilled workers have been scattered to the four winds. Ship construction expenses have "sky-rocketed," because, in the pressure of wartime, we were forced to build, and build, and build, regardless of cost. Now, with all those ships on hand, many of them anything but modern, we have been unable to carry on a gradual modernization of the merchant fleet, and the other maritime nations have far outstripped us. Our ships, the great bulk of them, are slow of speed, costly to load, costly to maintain—all of which adds to the competitive burden of wages, and so on, already cited.

In justice to the maritime industry, and for the information of our taxpayers whose tax payments are involved, the Government should revamp its fiscal accounting so that it could be determined precisely the extent of maritime operating differential payments.

As it is, there is much clamor each year over budget appropriations of funds to cover the operating differential payments due to the various subsidized lines. The House cut these funds last year, and the Senate restored the cuts. Now the House has cut them again. It has chopped $25 million from the $60 million requested in the supplemental budget to put these accounts on a current basis.

The basic reason for this reduction—which merely defers the payment of the $25 million debt to the lines—is that it holds the total payments for the year to exactly $100 million. Some of the committee members apparently felt that $100 million was enough to pay in 1 year.

Not a very businesslike or even fair manner for the Government to transact business, it seems to me. And it must seem so to the ship operators who must carry that $25 million of accounts receivable for an additional period, paying interest to the banks all the while.

One reason why so many people, in and out of Congress, question and sometimes vigorously oppose such payments to the ship operators is that they simply do not understand the complete procedure. A man who makes watches, perhaps, or bicycles, or any one of many other items affected by competing imports, will think it perfectly reasonable to request imposition of a tax on similar foreign items, to protect his company or his industry. Members of Congress oftimes will join in such efforts, to serve their constituents.

Farm groups demand, and secure, parity payments to equalize their net incomes with those of other groups. Operating differential payments to ship operators are in exactly the same veing as parity payments to farmers, or protective tariffs. They make it possible for American shipping lines to compete with foreign shipping whose costs are vastly lower than those of American vessels.

There has been a most regrettable lack of understanding among our people, and even in the Congress, as to the actual operation of the so-called subsidies by which the Federal Government has sought to equalize costs of ship construction as between this country and other maritime nations.

I am sure it was news to many, many people when I made public in the Senate recently the results of an audit by one major shipping line showing the favorable results to Government of this particular subsidized operation. Over the 1936 to 1953 period, from the very initiation of the subsidy program, this shipping line actually has paid back to Government $31 million more than it received in subsidies. This profit to Government was in the form of subsidy recapture, charter hire for use of Government-owned vessels, and corporation income taxes.

In addition to this direct return of the Government's "investment" in that line, there was a huge indirect return stemming from the continued operations of the line—the millions of dollars paid to its officials and employees, the millions of dollars paid to other firms for supplies, ship repairs, and so on, and the many subsidiary businesses wholly or partially supported by these payments.

While on the subject of subsidies, it would be an omission of importance if I were to pass over the question of ship construction differential payments. Over the 20-year period, such payments have totaled $105 million to shipyards in the United States, to equalize construction costs here with those abroad.

The Government has profited from these payments also, but no one has ever been told about it. Of the 107 vessels for which construction subsidies were authorized, more than two-thirds—74 to be exact—were taken over by the Government for use in World War II. Some were requisitioned during construction; others were purchased under the terms of the subsidy contract.

The actual savings in money, I venture to say, resulting from such requisitioning and purchase, would equal or far surpass the net cost of the subsidies, for wartime costs on such vessel were vastly higher. Even more important was the fact that the Government made use of these vessels many months earlier in the war than they could have, had it been necessary to build them.

Always overlooked also is the fact that the owners from whom these ships were taken must replace these vessels at premium costs and values.

One significant difference between so-called ship "subsidies" and subsidies paid directly to agriculture or, indirectly by tariffs, to many businesses, is little known or completely unrealized generally. The payments made by Government to the shipping lines are subject to recapture and actually are recaptured in large measure.

A little known fact unfortunately, for while all operating differential payments

must be budgeted, and appropriated—usually after much discussion and occasional loud howls—the amounts recaptured are never publicized. They simply revert to the Federal Treasury as "miscellaneous" receipts.

Take the example as cited above; of $50 million paid to shipping for operating purposes from the inception of this procedure in 1937, through 1942, a total of $31 million was paid back into the Treasury by the shipping lines, through the "recapture" provision of the law.

From the time when such payments were resumed, following the war shipping boom through 1951, a total of $96 million additionaly has been recaptured, but again, without pubicity. Few Members of the Congress, I am confident, and almost no one outside the Congress, realize this state of affairs. And that is partly why there is so much resistance to these payments which have helped so tremendously to keep our American ships operating.

Nor is there any general awareness, in the Congress or among our citizenry, of another vast recovery of funds through the operations of American shipping. Because of previous neglect of shipping, our Government found it necessary to expend more than $13 billion for new ship construction during World War II. More than 5,000 vessels were launched, of which approximately 40 percent later were sold to citizens and to foreign nationals. The remaining 3,000 vessels went into the National Defense Reserve Fleet.

In the years since World War II, more than $500 million have been paid into the Federal Treasury by American shipping companies for charter hire of vessels from this fleet—whose only purpose, otherwise, is to serve in case of war or emergency. Again, most of these payments went into the Federal Treasury unpublicized. Only the payments to the ship operators were given prominence.

Which returns us to the thought expressed earlier, that our people should be furnished the full information on the net cost of Government participation in the financing of ship operations. Now they hear only half the story—the bad side, as far as America's shipping is concerned.

The basic shipping law, the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, authorizes a reasonable method of providing this information, and at the same time providing a continuingly replenished fund for Government's participation in the financing of new vessel construction. It is the ship construction revolving fund, which has been inoperative in recent years, but which should be reactivated as one positive step to aid in the tremendous vessel replacement program now confronting all shipowners. This revolving fund, once again in operation, would remove one great obstacle now hindering new construction: It would make it unnecessary to include construction subsidy funds in the budget.

Legislation which is proposed to reestablish this revolving fund would provide for deposits to be made therein of (1) appropriations for ship construction, (2) receipts from sale of ship mortgages (now totaling several hundred million dollars), (3) interest and principal payments on ship mortgages, and (4) charter receipts. Thus, as mortgages on new ships are repaid, the funds would go back into the revolving fund, instead of into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, and there would be a continually available source of funds for new construction, with full information always available as to the net cost of Government aid to the industry.

Is the answer to all our martime problems, as has been suggested, even by some leaders who should have known better, to rely on foreign vessels to carry our commerce? I say, "No," on many counts. First, the allegiance of their owners and crews would always be elsewhere—as past experience has shown only too clearly. Once they had the field to themselves, they could, and would, charge us whatever the traffic would bear.

Remember when ocean freight rates were increased as much as 2,000 percent, and American docks everywhere were piled with rotting cargoes? And in war, these vessels would go dashing back to serve their own countries—possibly to be used against us.

Many a husband, father, son, and brother would be alive and with their families today, I am sure, if the United States had been reasonably well prepared with ships to supply our military forces throughout the world in the early months of World War II. We not only did not have the ships but we did not have the shipyards or skilled workers with which to build the ships so vital to our security.

No; it would be tragic to make that mistake a third time. Even though the total of operating and construction differential payments to shipping should continue to increase—as I suppose they will. Everything else has. And a point to bear in mind is that if we take all the alleged subsidies that have been paid to shipping since 1936—say $400 million in all, net—and if we were to add an equal sum annually for construction and operation aids each year during the next 10-year ship replacement period, it would not equal the amount we wasted through hasty, inefficient vessel design and construction in World War II alone.

Again, I am confident that the benefits to our peacetime economy during this next 10-year period—in jobs for shipyard, steel, and countless other workers, as well as the taxes that would be paid by the plants and their employees—would equal or come close to matching the funds paid out.

And we could look forward with confidence to any shipping needs the future might bring—competition to our foreign commerce in peacetime, logistic demands of our Military Establishment in war or emergency.

The struggle for survival will not be lost by the American maritime industry if our people can be given the full truth about the need for, and the needs of, the American privately owned merchant fleet.

And if management and labor in the industry, appreciative of their separate and joint responsibilities, will work hand in hand with Government in a planned program based on efficient operation and honest devotion to the interests of all.

High Price of Egg Sandwich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper article, which was published in the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune of April 14, 1955, stating that a consumer went to a restaurant and was charged 75 cents for a fried-egg sandwich. On that very day eggs were selling for 29 cents a dozen. I shall refer to it later this afternoon.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMER FUMES AT 75-CENT EGG SANDWICH

ROCHESTER, MINN.—A puzzled farmer Friday displayed a restaurant check showing he paid 75 cents for a fried-egg sandwich on a day when farmers in this area were selling eggs for 29 cents a dozen.

His protests to no avail, Paul Hemp paid for the sandwich and a 15-cent cup of coffee at an airport restaurant at Dayton, Ohio, Thursday.

Then he announced he was going to let Senator THYE, Republican, of Minnesota, and Representative AUGUST ANDRESEN, Republican, of Minnesota, know about it.

"Farmers are in the wrong business," raged Hemp. "They should open their own restaurants in Dayton."

He said he questioned whether the price was correct and the waitress told him it was. So he talked to the restaurant cashier, and then to the manager.

When the manager insisted 75 cents was right, Hemp asked for a copy of the bill so he could frame it for display at his farm.

The manager complied, and wrote "Thank you" on the slip.

Fewer Farmers Instead of Higher Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Fewer Farmers Instead of Higher Prices," which was published in Business Week of May 14, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEWER FARMERS INSTEAD OF HIGHER PRICES

From a hilltop overlooking some of the most scenic acreage in Orange County, N. Y., far from the overheated atmosphere of Washington, the American Assembly last week took a long, hard look at the farm situation. The conclusion was that the Eisenhower administrator's agricultural policies are basically on the right track.

The assembly is a national nonpartisan group established by Republican Dwight D. Eisenhower when he was president of Columbia University. It met at Arden House, the estate given to Columbia by Democrat Averell Harriman, now Governor of New York State.

The group, made up of leaders of big farm organizations, operators of big and little farms, government and university agricultural experts, and businessmen decided that—

The importance of price supports and production controls for solving agriculture's long-range problems has been exaggerated.

Price supports have overstimulated production of some commodities.

Production controls—a necessary part of high price-support policies—reduce efficiency and add to production costs.

In the future, price supports should play a smaller role, net income a greater role, in directing agricultural production.

General welfare: For the most part, the delegates seemed to be thinking and talking just as the organizers of the meeting hoped they would—primarily as citizens concerned with the general welfare rather than as representatives of special interests.

They recognized that the decline in farm income and agriculture's share of the American economy is part of a long-running trend—one that began in fact when the United States began. They saw the major task of farm policy as helping to adjust

agriculture to its diminishing importance in the American scene.

The participants all agreed that this adjustment can be handled in a relatively painless way if the general economy is kept stable and expanding. This would give less prosperous farmers an opportunity to move to better paying occupations outside agriculture.

Flexible supports: Agriculture's chief claim for public support, according to Prof. William H. Nicholls, of Vanderbilt University, technical director of the seventh assembly, is the extreme instability of farm prices and farm income.

This instability, Nicholls says, is the main justification for flexible supports rather than no supports at all. Nicholls feels that the case usually made for high price supports—that they help the small farmer—is fallacious. Poor farmers don't produce enough to benefit much from high price supports; it's the big producers who gain.

Vanishing American: Many people still cling to the time-worn image of the United States farmer, his hand on a sickle, a straw in his mouth, a pot-bellied stove under his boots. But today that image exists mostly in the mind. The farm picture is changing right along with the rest of the American scene. Today, the top 2 percent of farm operators produce 25 percent of total farm sales; the top 9 percent produce over half of all farm sales.

At the other end of the farm income scale, the figures look exaggeratedly low, because many small-income farmers actually get a substantial part of their income outside farming. Nearly 30 percent of United States farmers are part-time or residential farmers.

First-aid program: The solution to the low-income farmer's problem, the assembly feels, is to get him off the farm. Price supports have done him little good, might even have a negative effect if they encourage him to hold on. The way to help him, Nicholls stresses, is not by farm legislation as such, but by general measures that would encourage mobility to industrial jobs. Some such measures: extending and improving United States Employment Service in rural areas, starting more vocational training programs, revising unemployment compensation statutes to eliminate factors that discourage mobility, locating defense plants in areas of rural underdevelopment as well as in areas of urban employment, increasing power supply in rural areas, and possibly introducing regional differentials if the minimum wage is raised.

No drag: The notion that lagging farm income is a drag on the American economy as a whole got short shrift from the assembly's technical experts. Farm income, they pointed out, amounts now to only 5 or 6 percent of total United States income—so even a 20-percent drop in farm income would produce only a 1-percent drop in total national income. Such a slight drop, Nicholls said, could easily be offset by other factors, and he pooh-poohed as a myth the idea that there is something peculiarly crucial about movements in farm income compared to that of other industries.

Farm Bill's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of May 7, 1955. It is an excellent editorial, and I commend it to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM BILL'S FUTURE

Something really seems to have been managed by the Democratic-controlled House in voting the junk the Benson flexible farm-price-support system before it has gone into effect.

But this result is not an end to that system, nor any clear promise to farmers of early return to higher and more rigid Federal farm price supports. Those can be stopped either by the Senate or by a Presidential veto.

Really achieved is a rather skillful maneuver of the farm-price-support issue toward the end of the 1956 political campaign. The maneuver is unfinished. And it will remain in such a suspended state until the Senate gets around to act on the Democrats' bill.

But, from the Democratic Party's political point of view, that seems to be quite all right. For the essence of political tactics is timing. And clever timing calls for completion of the maneuver, not this year, but in 1956, a presidential year.

That, however, can be managed, too, by delaying Senate action until next spring. Then, whether the Eisenhower-Benson administration (with some important Democratic help) defeats the bill there, or the President has to veto it, the farm-price-support issue will be plumped into the middle of the national presidential campaign, where the Democratic majority seems to think it belongs.

Certainly the merits of the issue of high-versus-flexible farm price supports have aroused widespread and real concern. But that such concerns lack present priority is indicated by the small probability of Senate action this year.

Finally, if this political interpretation ruffles or bruises the Senate's dignity, that august body can set it aside by acting quickly and finally now one way or the other, on the House bill. And that, from the standpoint of farmers and all others whose interest is in the merits, would be the right thing to do. For the Federal farm price program does seem to deserve something better than just to be made a political football for 1956.

Tribute to Val Peter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, one of the most respected citizens of my home city of Omaha, Nebr., was honored recently on the occasion of his 80th birthday, when he and his wife celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary. It was Mr. Val Peter who was thus singled out. He is a publisher, and has long interested himself in civic affairs. Recently, he was awarded the Officer's Cross of the Order of Merit by the Federal German Republic, the highest award which Germany can bestow on a civilian.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial appearing in the Omaha World-Herald on April 26, 1955, in regard to this occasion and this outstanding personality.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MEDAL FOR VAL PETER

Val J. Peter has been an outstanding American citizen for 59 of his 80 years and a valued resident of Omaha since 1910. His career has been as active as it has been long and we would guess that nothing in it, aside from raising a large family, has been more rewarding than his efforts to promote understanding between the people of the United States and his native Germany.

It was for these efforts that the Federal German Republic honored Mr. Peter, Sunday night with the Officer's Cross of the Order of Merit, the highest award that Germany can bestow on a civilian. As a publisher of German-language newspapers, Mr. Peter has helped several generations of German immigrants become good Americans. As an individual he worked hard on behalf of refugees during the Hitler regime and among Germans in Omaha in World War II. Mr. Peter is deserving not only of a medal from Germany, but of thanks from his fellow citizens.

Sweden's Muscular Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert in the RECORD an article from the May issue of the Reporter, by Blake Ehrlich, a staff writer, entitled "Sweden's Muscular Neutrality."

Today, after 10 years of cold war, the ice in Europe shows signs of breaking—for better or worse. It is timely and refreshing. It should be borne in mind that Sweden is one free nation in Europe that has never been overrun by any foreign foe.

The article follows:

SWEDEN'S MUSCULAR NEUTRALITY

(By Blake Ehrlich)

STOCKHOLM.—The visitor to this placid little nation of lakes and hills, this minor kingdom which has shunned war since 1814, expects to find Sweden snug between the parentheses of its historic neutrality, happily preoccupied with perfecting snow removal and improving the flavor of its temperance beer. The visitor gets the surprise of his life.

While there is little talk of war here in Stockholm, people are proud of their armed forces and excited about their defense program. Psychologically and physically, Sweden is the Western European nation most ready to go to war tomorrow.

The Swedes themselves, who take for granted the program and its overwhelmingly popular support, don't realize how strikingly they compare with other continental powers of the West, where even gravely deficient arms programs are matters for bitter squabbles, where civil defense is a joke if it exists at all, where the biggest barrier to defense is the wall of public indifference to the whole question of national security. For some reason, the Swedes like to picture themselves in the figure of a rather paunchy businessman

who avoids wars because he doesn't want to disturb business as usual. When I have suggested to several dozen leading Swedes here that theirs is actually a war-minded country, their reactions have ranged from hoots of laughter through dismay to downright horror. However, among foreigners stationed here, especially the military, naval, and air attachés, I've found unanimous agreement with my impression.

THE LITTLE RED PAMPHLET

The Swedes have the world's fourth largest air force, ranking right after the United States, the Soviet Union, and Britain. Every Swedish citizen over the age of 15 is registered, tagged, and ticketed for a wartime job, and even the dogs and horses have draft numbers. Hospitals, factories, Government offices, hangars, and naval installations have been put underground, sheltered deep in the native granite.

In every Swedish home you will find a small red-covered pamphlet 35 pages long, published by the Royal Civil Defense Board on the instruction of the King in Council. On the back cover, in a halo of black barbed wire with a white bayonet for an exclamation point, is the following message:

"Every attack against the freedom and independence of the realm will be met with force. Every report that resistance will cease is false. Sweden can and will defend herself."

The first thing in the booklet is a series of unpleasant truths: "Modern warfare is ruthless and total. The aggressor will seek to break down our resistance by any means in the shortest possible time." This statement is followed by a short, brutal sketch of the nature and scope of "any means"—bombs, bayonets, trickery, terror.

The Swedes are told they "must accept" such things as "shortages, rationing, evacuation, direction of labor, etc. A people at arms cannot maintain the ways of peace."

It is explained that plans have already been made for the evacuation of the national Government from Stockholm and of provincial governments from their normal seats. "Evacuation does not mean flight and desertion, it is a planned step to secure the direction of our total defense."

By the simple touch of an alarm button, setting off a continuous warbling siren note, Sweden can be placed immediately on a war footing. "This signal means that: * * * all personnel with a war appointment in the armed forces or in the civil defense will immediately report to their mobilization depots; all vehicles, dogs, and horses, requisitioned in peacetime for use in the armed forces or in civil defense, will be conveyed to the place indicated in the requisitioning order."

Evacuation of civilian populations from urban centers, an extraordinarily tricky subject, is treated in full. The Prime Minister, Tage Erlander, said not long ago in Parliament, "Naturally, not even the most well-concerted plan of evacuation provides any guaranty for the possibility of putting evacuation into effect."

But the Swedes do have a well-concerted plan, nevertheless. One hundred and thirty thousand men and women (there will be more) have already been intensively trained as members of a civil-defense Special Service Branch to supervise evacuation of 3 million persons from 100 communities. The rural areas to which the civilians will be evacuated are stocked to receive the evacuees. Special Service Branch overlays on the map of Stockholm are several inches thick. No matter what happens to airfields, railways, roads, assembly points, and shipping, they aim to get the civilians out of target areas without hampering the military. There have already been trial evacuations of portions of major cities, and in the picnicklike atmosphere of summer and peace they have gone off like smoothly run week-end excursions. In war things would be far different, but Sweden hopes for sufficient warning to move the civilians out of cities, off military supply lines, and away from likely combat areas before the shooting starts.

For those who are needed in the cities, vast rock shelters are being dug. In Stockholm, the present deep shelters (ceilings 90 feet thick) can hold 80,000 persons, and the finished program will provide shelter for 400,000. If the ventilators should be knocked out, chemicals will keep the air breathable for 10 hours, a longer time than the longest air raid ever staged. Being the businessmen they pride themselves on being, Stockholmers are going to use the biggest of the downtown shelters as a peacetime underground garage, relieving some of the traffic commissioner's headaches, and paying off some of the construction costs.

All this costs money—$28 million last year, a rate per person ($4) more than 13 times that levied for civilian defense in the United States (29½ cents). Industry pays its own civil-defense bill for equipment and air-raid shelters, its employees making up civil-defense staffs within plants as well as special Government-trained antisabotage squads. Industry is also a heavy contributor to the Nation and Defense Association, made up of some 41 voluntary organizations.

"Nation and Defense," since it includes the labor unions, the manufacturers' associations, the huge cooperatives, the Farmers' Union, and various white-collar unions, permeates every aspect of Swedish life. It has a constant captive audience, since the Swedes have voted themselves into total civil-defense conscription. Every citizen over 15 is obliged by law to take 60 hours a year of civil-defense training and is obligated to sign up for active duties if he is not slated for first signal mobilization.

"LET'S SEE THE FILES"

Sweden goes even further to get everybody into the act. The Defense Staff College admits civilians to the hush-hush courses it runs for selected officers of the three forces. These civilians, who come from Government departments as well as from industry and commerce, make up about half the sudent body.

The thinking behind this procedure was explained by the Prime Minister while he was talking about atomic research, and what he said about atoms applies to all security matters: "To allow the picture to become distorted by undue secretiveness and unwarranted illusions would mean very bad preparation. It would mean that we were lulled into a false security, or became ready victims to rumor mongering. Democracy draws its life from the knowledge, insight, and trust of each individual citizen and from his being able openly to discuss the questions that matter, after having had free access to the relevant facts."

Every Swedish citizen is free to march into any Government office and demand to see the files. His citizenship is his guaranty that he may see them. That's the law. Bureaucrats are thus leery about slapping restricted and secret labels on their dossiers. The Armed Forces, although they have the right to the services of all males between 19 and 48, need even more men. The women's auxiliaries need more women. Thus civil defense often has to content itself with half a man or woman. That is, when the essential worker is through with his day's desk duty at the Economic Defense Board he is expected to take over a shift as firewatcher or special policeman. Home Guard and its seagoing equivalent, the Naval Defense Corps, are also looking for recruits—as are the voluntary corps for motor cars, motorcycles, and hamradios; the Red Cross; and the service dogs' club. Women are sought as Red Cross medical aids, as blue star veterinary aids, as drivers for military and civilian transport. "Women with previous experience," the pamphlet says, "or who for other reasons consider themselves suitable for work in essential industries should report to the provisional labor boards now. Many women may be able to take over the work of their husbands." A less gentle note, further on under direction of labor, points out to women that if they don't volunteer for some full-time war activity, they may be drafted into industry.

The authorities also have planned guerrilla units and underground resistance: "Obey instructions through radio or other channels."

THE ARMED FORCES

Reorganized on the basis of the brigade rather than the bigger and lese flexible division, the regular Armed Forces employ every possible means to stretch their limited manpower. A draftee trains for 10 months, and during his remaining years on call he gets 3 month-long refresher courses. Specialists and noncommissioned officers take 40 days. There is no "army in being" here, only a cadre of career officers, NCOs, and specialists whose peacetime job is largely a training mission. For the refresher courses the General Staff tries to counteract the shortness of time by calling up mean as members of a fighting unit rather than as draftees of a certain age group.

The Swedes look to new weapons to give enormous firepower to a small ground force. They have rockets and have lately produced a guided missile. Their researchers are working frantically, handicapped by lack of consultation with NATO nations, to devise a tactical atomic warhead for it. Sweden's interest in atomic energy predates the Second World War, and Gordon Dean, ex-Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, said in his Report on the Atom, "One might reasonably assert that Sweden has the most completely equipped nuclear science laboratories in western Europe, next to England."

The Swedes have another powerful weapon: their own terrain. Mechanized military operations would be almost impossible in the upper two-thirds of the country, the Norrland. "Beyond the valley of the Dal we have no oaks, no lobsters, and no nobles," is the old saying. The forests, lakes, mountains, and bogs of the dark and frozen north would be brutal terrain for an attacker. "I'd hate to be commanding invasion troops in that country up there," one of the Western attachés told me. "You'd find yourself trying to stiffen your lines of communication only to find out that you had no lines of communication."

Just short of one-quarter of Sweden's annual budget is given to the armed forces, a sum amounting to 4.7 percent of the national income. The civil-defense expenditure is listed as part of the Ministry of Interior's appropriation, and stockpiling goes on the Commerce Department's appropriation. The total bill comes to around half a billion dollars.

The government is now considering a proposal from the armed forces to make their allotment a standard 4.7 percent of the national income during the next 10 years. The military reckons that as the national income rises, the military appropriation will thus automatically increase too, and if nothing else is gained, they will at least be able to keep pace with rising costs and eventually devote a larger amount to weapons research.

PSYCHOLOGICAL DEFENSE

Another contender for a cut of the defense budget has just come into existence to take its place with the National Defense Research Board, the Medical Defense Board, the Economic Defense Board, and others. It is the Psychological Defense Planning Board. The Board's peacetime mission is to study propaganda (especially that of potential enemies), finding out where it comes from, how

it is disseminated, what its purpose is, and how well or badly it works on Swedes.

What they're after in the end is an effective system of control of Sweden's wartime psychology: to keep morale high while discouraging lynch-mob superpatriotism, to prick the balloon of overconfidence without encouraging defeatism, to strengthen discipline without curbing initiative. It must keep the public informed, yet controlled; they want to tell the truth, yet not give the show away.

Board members made it clear to me that their peacetime activities do not include putting out propaganda. They agreed that Sweden is sufficiently steamed up not to need it.

One evening at the movies I saw some of Sweden's new SAAB J–29 fighters, their underground hangars, their radar installations, and their night-landing techniques. The underground hangars hug the perimeters of operating air bases. They accommodate planes, repair shops, ammunition, spare parts, and fuel. Their smooth-rolling but ponderously armored doors protect against skip-bombing and strafing, and the 40-foot-thick granite roofs are considered bombproof. Against the double cost of underground construction and special machinery to ensure 30-second scrambles in case of alert, the bookkeeping Swedes equate the savings in imported fuel required by drafty ordinary hangars during the long winters. The entrances to the hangars bulge near the runways like prehistoric sod-covered barrows; the granite bedrock is but a few feet beneath the surface.

The privilege of seeing this I purchase for 75 cents, and got also for my money a new Swedish feature film displaying at least one unclad female, at present a standard fixture in most locally made movies. The short subject that preceded the feature was an air force release telling the story of a jet fighter on night exercise. The plane's radio goes dead, but, tracked on radar, the ship is brought back to the field through a storm by another jet from the same squadron. It was told with much skill, and the result was as exciting as a good war film, with the audience applauding wildly.

It was, I was told, a typically good example of the armed forces' running account of its progress. Although the official aim of the motion-picture units may be an informed citizenry, the result is still propaganda no matter what its producers call it.

Viewed dimly through the distorting mirror of 141 years of peace, war seems a bizarre but rather thrilling game to many Swedes. The Swedes in charge, however, know what the score is. The current report of the commander in chief of the armed forces, General Swedlund, states flatly that a Scandinavian campaign is an essential part of any Russian thrust at Europe, and Sweden cannot hope to stay out of the battle for very long. He also says what he and other responsible national leaders, even the extreme isolationists, have been saying since 1947: The final basis of Swedish defense is help from the west. The commander in chief talks about only one possible invasion, a Russian invasion; only one defensive scheme, a defense against the Soviet bloc; and only one source of aid, the West. Sweden is only superficially neutral.

There is no trade in armaments with Communist nations, but weapons are both bought and sold to the West. The recent expulsion of Communist diplomats dramatizes the situation; there have been no such incidents involving non-Communists. As the Swedes themselves frequently remark, with only the trace of a smile, "The Americans observe. The Russians spy."

SWEDEN NEEDS ALLIES

The commander in chief makes no bones about the military situation, as pertinent extracts from his report show:

"If a small nation is not in possession of atomic weapons and is not allied with powers having such weapons at their disposal, this fact in itself may entice the aggressor into attacking * * * our freedom from alliance can in certain respects make it an advantage for an aggressor to begin hostilities—at least in the Scandinavian operational thea- for an aggressor to begin hostilities—at

"Our resources are not sufficiently ample to permit us to withstand an attack by a great power for any length of time without economic and military support from the outside. Seen from this viewpoint, our strategy must be directed toward the creation of conditions enabling us to receive aid in war from powers finding it compatible with their interests to assist us."

Under Army regulations, that's as far as the Commander in Chief dares go. As a soldier debarred from discussion of political questions, he is muzzled on such questions as Sweden's foreign policy of nonalliance, which is political dynamite.

But even though his sentences may be fitted with baffle plates, there is no mistaking his meaning. Militarily, Sweden needs allies. He says aid must be arranged for, as indeed, if it is to come in time, it must. In modern warfare a simple cry for help does not bring help just like that. Logistics are a matter for electronic brains to compute, a matter for long planning of the sharing of supplies, a matter of standardization of weapons and materiel, of coordination of strategy, of agreement on objectives and methods. Such a subject as convoys takes weeks of detailed hammering out. Whose escort vessels take over the convoy where, in what pattern, using what signals? Where are the refueling points? Who supplies air cover for what sectors? Those are a few of the thousands of questions to be answered on one small subject. When it comes to air support for ground troops, the matter can become even more complicated.

"NATO planning," I was told in Paris, "would certainly be unrealistic if we did not make plans that include Swedish participation in a war." But NATO cannot earmark in advance a guessed-at number of troops, planes, ships, an estimated number of tons of supplies to be dispatched under war conditions to an invaded Sweden. Without detailed talks in advance, a last-minute ally can render only one kind of help to an invaded Sweden: Liberate it.

INFORMAL TALKS

Hamstrung though they are by Sweden's policy, the Armed Forces' chiefs have taken several steps that should make it possible to have talks without officially having talks. There are, for instance, many more airfields in Sweden than there are aircraft to use them. They are capable of handling any planes the Swedes have now (they have no large bombers); and during the long winter, runways can be extended with packed snow to receive any planes used by NATO. The radar at these fields is all foreign-made. The Swedes are armored with British Centurion tanks and have recently added a French howitzer, that, with a slight revision of fire-control tables, will take United States ammunition.

These are all ideal subjects on which to pump NATO nations for technical information. A workaday encounter between technicians would be so minor and ordinary it wouldn't even be worth a public announcement. Once the technicians got together, there'd be nothing to prevent them from straying to larger subjects than millimeter calibrations and coefficients of expansion.

What prevents these conversations? Sweden's defense effort is as big a one as the nation can make, and it is admittedly not big enough to save the country without outside aid. There must be talks in advance if assistance is to be at all effective, so why not, for the cause of saving Sweden, have the talks?

Herbert Tingsten, editor of Dagens Nyheter, the country's largest newspaper, has fought virtually alone for Swedish membership in NATO. Although he is greatly respected and finds some private support for his opinions, he receives few public endorsements of his views. He says, "The Government wants to enjoy the advantages of cooperation with the West without shouldering its responsibilities; it wants to be regarded as a semi-ally in Washington and as strictly neutral in Moscow. This game can scarcely go on any longer."

The Parliament here, like the pre-Pearl Harbor Congress, believes in a policy of "no entangling alliances." Its members patriotically vote huge defense appropriations, knowing full well that Sweden's biggest effort cannot be quite big enough, that morale alone is not enough to stop guided missiles. Having abandoned total head-in-the-sand neutrality, they cannot move further into the stream of things than the dry rock of "nonalliance," even though they have seen Denmark and Norway, with whom they are closely linked and from whom they are strategically indivisible, go the whole way into the Western defense bloc. One hundred and forty-one years of peace can drug the mind pretty effectively.

There stands Sweden on the Scandinavian ridge, tough, trained, clad in full armor. It knows where its friends are and where its enemies are. Sweden would make a valuable NATO ally on a vulnerable flank; and without Western backing, brave Sweden is doomed. Yet Sweden stands alone.

In many ways, the visitor finds, the Swedes are surprising.

Alternative Choices by Republican Women of Presidential Candidates

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, Gould Lincoln, dean of Washington political columnists and widely recognized as one of America's foremost political analysts, has written a column which I feel is of considerable value in its realism.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of May 12, 1955]

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

MRS. SMITH STRIKES A CHILLY NOTE

Republican women from all parts of the country received special treatment this week—and why shouldn't they? The huge margin of victory rolled up by President Eisenhower in 1952 was due in considerable part to the support he had from the women—not all of them Republicans, either.

So President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON, Cabinet officers, Republican Members of Congress, and Republican State chairmen, all have come to welcome and address the Republican women's national conference, which brought to Washington more than 1,700 party leaders and workers—women—from every State in the Union except 3.

The women wanted Eisenhower for President in 1952. They still want him in the White House and will do all they can to help keep him there. Therefore, it was a chilly note struck by Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, who cautioned the women against putting all their eggs in the Eisenhower basket—since she has an "impression" the President will retire after 1956. Senator SMITH added an emphatic and heartfelt wish the President still will run again. But she urged the women to give consideration to the selection of another candidate for President should Mr. Eisenhower finally bow out. The Maine Senator suggested the women take a lead in sponsoring a poll to learn who stands next to Ike for the presidential nomination.

ALL WANT EISENHOWER

Up to the present time, the vast majority of Republicans, women and men alike, have had no second choice for the presidential nomination. They want Ike. A recent poll of the members of the Republican National Committee and all Republican State chairmen, taken by the Star, to which a large response was made, showed a unanimous desire that the President run again. It also showed a small percentage only who were willing, or ready, to suggest a presidential candidate in the event Mr. Eisenhower decides not to run. A widespread poll of party workers on this subject—"If not Ike, who?"—as suggested by Senator SMITH would set them all thinking, at least. Obviously, a withdrawal by the President without some preliminary spade work would leave the GOP in a chaotic situation. Presumably, there would be plenty of candidates. But there would be no single, outstanding candidate. California's alliterative three—Nixon, Knowland, and Knight—might lead the list, but it would not end there. Senator Dirksen, of Illinois, and Governor Stratton, of the same State, Governor Herter, of Massachusetts, and Governor Craig, of Indiana, New Jersey's Senator Clifford P. Case, and Senator Bricker, of Ohio, would have their followers. New York's big delegation at the GOP National Convention might again line up for Thomas E. Dewey, the State's three-time Governor. Mrs. SMITH's suggested poll, if carried out, might prove very interesting.

WOMEN ARE UNANIMOUS

The women up to date, however, have no one in mind but Mr. Eisenhower. They look on him as the man who brought the fighting in Korea to an end, and as the chief world leader for peace. They don't want even to think about anyone else for the Presidency. They have shown, during their 3-day conference, they are ready to work hard for his reelection next year. These Republican women party workers came here from every State in the Union except Arkansas, Mississippi, and South Carolina. Five women came from Alaska, 3 from Hawaii, and 1 from the Virgin Islands. California's delegation numbered 124. Ohio had the largest—234. States whose delegations numbered more than 100 included New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Illinois. Virginia sent between 50 and 60 women, and Massachusetts had a large delegation.

Senator SMITH, of course, was not predicting the President will not run. All she was saying was that she had an impression that he prefers to retire. The President said, with a twinkle in his eye, he had no slightest idea where she got that impression. The Maine Senator is not alone in having that idea, however. Nor is it likely to down until the President himself declares his willingness to become a candidate. Should the international situation improve materially in the next year, and should the country remain prosperous, the President might reasonably say he'd done a job and that he wished to retire. If the cold war still persists, it is unlikely he could or would decline to run.

The School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from Mr. M. F. Peterson, superintendent of the Department of Public Instruction of the State of North Dakota, dated March 24, 1955, on the subject of the school-lunch program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Bismarck, N. Dak., March 24, 1955.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The purpose of this letter is to give you information relative to the school-lunch program as we see it from the State level. We hope that you will find this information helpful in considering school-lunch legislation in this session.

The school-lunch program in North Dakota served 24 percent of the school children in the 1946–47 school year. In 1954–55 we are serving 48 percent of the school children. Participation has doubled and Federal aid has remained the same. We are still serving less than one-half of the school children in the State. We are able to pay 6 cents per meal reimbursement this year instead of the maximum 9 cents provided by the National School Lunch Act. We also must consider that 6 cents has less purchasing power than it had in 1946. With the steady growth in school-lunch participation, each year brings a threat of further reduction in reimbursement rate unless a larger Federal appropriation is granted.

One of the most pressing problems facing Congress and the country is the use of agricultural surpluses. The school-lunch program has always been recognized as a real help in using these surpluses. The following table indicates how much of some foods, declared in abundance in March, would be used if the food were served only once to the 1.9 million children participating in the school-lunch program (A and B meals) in the 11 Midwest States (Minnesota, Wisconsin, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Missouri, Ohio, Iowa, Michigan, Illinois, and Indiana) in January of 1954.

Food	Size serving	Pounds	Carloads
Pork	2 ounces	380,000	18
Eggs	1 egg	1 5,278	11
Beef	2 ounces	380,000	18
Raisins	½ cup	237,500	14
Frozen fish	2 ounces	380,000	13
Turkeys	2 ounces	893,000	30

1 Cases.

North Dakota raises many potatoes. A one-half cup serving for 1 meal for the children participating in the school-lunch program in the 11 Midwest States would require 16 carloads of potatoes.

If the school-lunch appropriation were large enough to permit an active selling campaign to all schools, the potential utilization of agricultural commodities would become much greater.

The Department of Agriculture has informed school people that they will have ample supplies of such foods as butter, cheese, nonfat dried milk solids, shortening, and cottonseed oil, but the fact remains that schools have been able to get all they can use of these commodities. If you are already receiving all you can use, what help is it to be able to get a greater quantity of the same commodity?

The Department of Agriculture states that the special milk program will be a big help to school-lunch programs and that the appropriation for the special milk program was increased from $50 million a year to $75 million a year. We wonder how many States are having the same experience North Dakota is having. This money may only be used to pay for increased consumption of milk. North Dakota's public schools received an allocation of $251,438. In spite of a campaign to induce schools to make use of the program, we will be able to use only about $80,000 of this money. An extra $125,000 will do no good if we cannot use the original $251,000. If this extra $25 million was added to the school-lunch appropriation, it would enable sponsors to serve many millions of additional meals, each including one-half pint of milk. Each additional dollar of school-lunch appropriation would not only produce an increase in fluid-milk consumption but would also result in expenditure of at least $4 more for other agricultural products through normal market channels.

If the school-lunch appropriation cannot be raised to $110 million, I believe an alternate plan is to be presented. The Department of Agriculture receives 30 percent of the total customs receipts each year to be used to promote the domestic consumption of agricultural products. In recent years the Department has been using only part of these funds and turning the balance of $70–80 million a year back to the Treasury. If $25 million of these unused funds could be transferred to school lunches, it would aid the school-lunch program and step up tremendously the use of agricultural surpluses. It would, therefore, accomplish the intended purpose of section 32 funds—that of promoting domestic consumption of farm products.

We will appreciate anything you may do to help the school-lunch appropriation.

Yours sincerely,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
M. F. PETERSON, *Superintendent.*

Ninety-Percent Support Prices for Basic Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram which I received today from M. W. Thatcher, general manager, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, favoring 90-percent support prices for basic commodities.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *May 16, 1955.*

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We have received the news of your determination to fight for 90-percent support prices for the basic commodities as the most

important domestic news of the day. We are in the midst of a very costly advertising program in addition to our radio to explain to the farmers the calamitous situation that may confront this country if our support programs fall apart in 1956 and 1957. We are very proud of our Senators from these Central Northwest States. Our continuing farm survey audit discloses the same general character of economic deterioration on the farms as those which we gave you in our preliminary statement last March. Your position of today will be one for which you will later on be very proud. I firmly believe that if our Senators do their utmost that we can prevail in the committee and in the Senate. If this action should not be completed before the wheat referendum of June 25, the combination of an unfavorable wheat vote followed by an unfavorable action of the Senate would, in my judgment, cause irreparable damage to the entire price-support program. The House has approved this legislation, and I now believe that if the Senate approves it, President Eisenhower would not veto it. Deep appreciation and best regards.

M. W. THATCHER,
General Manager, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association.

For Whom the Constitution?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD an outstanding treatise on our Federal Constitution written by the very learned jurist, Leon R. Yankwich, chief United States district judge, southern district of California:

FOR WHOM IS THE CONSTITUTION?

(By Leon R. Yankwich, J. D., LL. D., chief judge, United States District Court, Southern District of California)

The Constitution of the United States is the oldest written fundamental charter governing any nation. Its long existence in its original form with but few amendments, would seem to denote qualities which should make an inquiry as to whom it is for supererogatory. The following tribute to it in a recent book expresses the hopes of the makers and the exultation over their triumph.

"We are told by James Madison that on the last day of the Constitutional Convention, as the members were signing the product of their debates, Benjamin Franklin looked toward the President's chair, at the back of which a rising sun happened to be painted. Then he observed to a few members near him that painters had found it difficult to distinguish in their art a rising from a setting sun. 'I have,' said Franklin, 'often and often in the course of the session, and the vicissitudes of my hopes and fears as to its issue, looked at that behind the President without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting. But now at length I have the happiness to know that it is a rising and not a setting sun.' No chance remark by any man has won so stupendous a confirmation at the hands of history."

Yet there are those who insist upon a type of literalism and selectivity in its application which would rob it of the very qualities which have made it endure.

So the object of this discussion is to consider the Constitution, and the norms of interpretation which are responsible for its long existence without radical change and its adaptation to the exigencies of our national life for over a century and a half.

Some assume that the Constitution has a definite meaning. If it did, its scope would be limited to the meaning on the day of its birth and the expanding needs of a growing country could never have been met.

Because it is flexible and adaptable it has withstood the impact of time and is capable of serving the United States today as it was in its infancy. And this because of the manner in which the Constitution is worded, and the way in which the courts have interpreted its fundamental provisions.

FREEDOM AND EQUALITY

Jefferson on June 24, 1826, wrote to the mayor of New York on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of American independence:

"May it (the anniversary) be to the world what I believe it will be (to some parts sooner, to others later, but finally to all), the signal of arousing men to burst the chains under which monkish ignorance and superstition had persuaded them to bind themselves, and to assume the blessing and security of self-government, the form which we have substituted restores the free right to the unbounded exercise of reason and freedom of opinion, all eyes are opened, or opening to the rights of man, the general spread of the light of science has already laid open to every view the palpable truth that the mass of mankind has not been born, with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few booted and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately, by the grace of God. These are grounds of hope for others. For (our) selves let the annual return of this day, forever refresh our recollections of these rights and an undiminished devotion to them."

This letter sees in freedom and equality the basic ideals in our national life. Edmund Burke in his famous speech on conciliation with America, delivered in 1775, traced what he called the "fierce spirit of liberty" of the colonists to certain antecedent sources. This, he argued, became a part of the temper and character of the Americans. Along with this goes the spirit of egalitarianism which, stemming from the Judeo-Christian philosophy of life, considers—to use the phrase of an American philosopher—"the individual as the seat of value."

The same thought is expressed by Albert D. Schweizer in the phrase "reverence for life." The idea of equality as a political principle stems from the ethical-religions ideal of the sacredness of all human life, and the oneness of the children of God.

THE WORTH OF EVERY MAN

Whatever form our political life has taken, the aim has always been to achieve the greatest well-being for the common man. At times, this ideal has been obscured. But it may be safely said that, at no period in our history, has it entirely disappeared. To it are traceable two basic principles which the Constitution embodies—the doctrine of limited sovereignty (the limited state) and the doctrine of the supremacy of the law.

The doctrine of limited sovereignty or the limited state means that the Government is bound by the law of the land and is not above it, and that each citizen has certain rights of which he cannot be deprived by the Government, either State or Federal, or by a majority. Of necessity, if the well-being of the ordinary individual is to be safeguarded, his trust cannot be in the benevolence of a ruler, be such an individual or a majority. He must rely on limitations on the will of the sovereign, by establishing a domain in which the sovereign cannot enter. So the coercive power of the Government is delimited.

THE IDEAS BEHIND THE CONSTITUTION

The American Constitution and the Bill of Rights sought to embody these dominant principles. A proper understanding of our constitutional development requires, therefore a brief summary of the manner in which these ideas were carried over into the Constitution.

The chief ideas embodied in the Constitution (outside the first 10 amendments) are:

1. A compromise between the sovereignty of the States and the Federal Government, expressed in the structure of the Congress;

2. The fear of a strong executive power expressed in:

(a) The separation of powers between the executive, legislative, and judicial functions;

(b) The doctrine of checks and balances between the various arms of the Government and the two Chambers.

In the first 10 amendments are contained the doctrine of limited sovereignty, which finds the only safeguard for freedom to lie in conferring definite rights upon the citizen, and the doctrine of the supremacy of the law.

Both are traceable to Magna Carta. They mean, in a general way, that the State or sovereign is governed by the law of the land and is not above it; that the citizen has certain rights of which he cannot be deprived by the State or by a temporary majority.

They also mean:

1. That all are equal before the law;

2. That no one can be deprived of his life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, i. e., without a law applicable to all similarly situated, or the judgment of a court or administrative tribunal of competent jurisdiction, after a hearing; and

3. That the citizen is protected against executive, judicial, and administrative arbitrariness. By constitutional development in the United States this principle has been extended to include protection against legislative arbitrariness as well, through the power of courts to declare laws unconstitutional.

This, then our constitutional heritage has meant in the past.

What of the future?

Everywhere, except in the English-speaking world, the tendency is toward the state of unlimited power. Bills of rights either do not exist, or are disregarded in the modern authoritarian states. The present economic tendencies in this country and elsewhere will result in continued participation of the Federal Government in economic life.

The success of such governmental intervention depends upon its impact on the constitutional limitations just expressed. So we consider the adaptability of the Constitution to new and unforeseen exercise of Federal power.

A FLEXIBLE CONSTITUTION

Sir Thomas More, although himself a lawyer, excluded interpreters of the law from his Utopia. He envisaged in it laws so simple that each citizen could easily present his legal claims to judges. He wrote:

"They have but few laws. For to people so instruct and institute very few do suffice. Yea this thing they chiefly reprove among other nations, that innumerable books of laws and expositions upon the same be not sufficient. But they think it against all right and justice that men should be bound to those laws, which either be in number more than be able to be read, or else blinder and darker, than that any man can well understand them. Furthermore, they utterly exclude and banish all proctors, and sergeants at the law; which craftily handle matters, and subtly dispute of the laws. For they think it most meet, that every man should plead his own matter, and tell the same tale before the judge that he would tell to his man of law. So shall there be less circumstance of words, and the truth shall sooner

come to light, whiles the judge with a discreet judgment doth weight the words of him whom no lawyer hath instruct with deceit, and whiles he helpeth and bareth out simple wits against the false and malicious circumventions of crafty children. This is hard to be observed in other countries, in so infinite a number of blind and intricate laws. But in Utopia every man is a cunning lawyer. For (as I said) they have very few laws; and the plainer and grosser that any interpretation is, that they allow as most just. For all laws (say they) be made and published only to the intent that by them every man should be put in remembrance of his duty. But the crafty and subtle interpretation of them can put very few in that remembrance (for they be but few that do perceive them), whereas the simple, the plain and gross meaning of the laws is open to every man."

Unfortunately, we do not live in Utopia. And the American world in which we do live, from the very beginning of its existence, has needed skilled and discerning interpreters for its fundamental law to help mold a cohesive Federal Government for the young Nation through the exercise of the powers of sovereignty, given or implied. The process has been successful only when the interpreters of the Constitution have seen it as an instrument capable of easy adaptation to the changing and expanding needs of a growing, cohesive nation.

The pragmatic character of our law, constitutional and other, calls for reliance on the wisdom of its interpreters. It requires the living spirit of the interpreters to give it being by applying it to the problems of the community and, to use the words of the Book of Common Prayer, "the various exigencies of the times and occasions."

The Constitution has proved adaptable because its chief clauses are couched in general language capable of adjustment to the expanding needs of the Nation. The outstanding exponents of the Constitution have all approached it in this manner.

In 1816 Mr. Justice Story wrote in a famous decision:

"The instrument was not intended to provide merely for the exigencies of a few years, but was to endure through a long lapse of ages, the events of which were locked up in the inscrutable purposes of Providence."

Over a century later, in 1920, Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., expressed this same thought:

"When we are dealing with words that also are a constituent act like the Constitution of the United States, we must realize that they have called into life a being the development of which could not have been foreseen completely by the most gifted of its begetters. It was enough for them to realize or to hope that they have created an organism; it has taken a century and has cost their successors much sweat and blood to prove that they created a nation. The case before us must be considered in the light of our whole experience, and not merely in that of what was said a hundred years ago."

The Supreme Court has refused with more or less consistency to concede that the meaning of the Constitution was fixed at the time of its adoption. On the contrary, at its best, it has asserted the changing nature of constitutional concepts. This principle was well expressed in 1926 in an opinion written by one of the most conservative members of the Court, Mr. Justice George Sutherland. In dealing with a zoning ordinance, he stated:

"Regulations, the wisdom, necessity, and validity of which, as applied to existing conditions, are so apparent that they are now uniformly sustained, a century ago or even a half a century ago, probably would have been rejected as arbitrary and oppressive. Such regulations are sustained under the complex conditions of our day, for reasons analogous to those which justify traffic regulations, which, before the advent of automobiles and rapid transit street railways, would have been condemned as fatally arbitrary and unreasonable. And in this there is no inconsistency, for while the meaning of constitutional guaranties never varies, the scope of their application must expand or contract to meet the new and different conditions which are constantly coming within the field of their operations. In a changing world it is impossible that it should be otherwise."

The reason why a legislative enactment deemed invalid at one time should be considered constitutional a few decades later lies in the fact that while the Constitution is unchanged, the needs of those whom it was made to serve are not. And so the courts, in interpreting the Constitution and in applying it as a touchstone to legislation, must take into consideration new needs as they arise.

In the Minnesota Moratorium case, in 1934, Mr. Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes wrote:

"It is no answer to say that this public need was not apprehended a century ago, or to insist that what the provision of the Constitution meant to the vision of that day it must mean to the vision of our time. If by the statement that what the Constitution meant at the time of its adoption, it means today, it is intended to say that the great clauses of the Constitution must be confined to the interpretation which the framers, with the conditions and outlook of their time, would have placed upon them, the statment carries its own refutation. It was to guard against such a narrow conception that Chief Justice Marshall uttered the memorable warning: 'We must never forget that it is a Constitution we are expounding.' *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316) 'a Constitution intended to endure for ages to come, and, consequently to be adapted to the various crises of human affairs.' (Id., p. 415.)"

So we find consistency and continuity in this approach.

THE FAULT OF THE INTERPRETERS

When our courts are imbued with this spirit in assaying the validity of challenged State and Federal statutes, social progress is made. When they lack it, and fail to give constitutional sanction to the attempts of the legislative branches of the States and Nation to remedy social injustices, or improve social conditions, reaction reigns. This happened early this century. The rapid industrial development of our Nation which followed the War Between the States, culminated, at the beginning of this century, in the change from a rural to an urban civilization. Legislative attempts to maintain our tradition of egalitarianism by remedying some of the inequalities in industrial and business life or abuses in the relationships arising from them clashed with the laissez-faire economic philosophy of the judges, and they were denied validity. The cycle lasted about 30 years. Some of its outstanding expressions may be referred to. In 1905, the Supreme Court struck down a New York law which limited the hours in bakeries and confectionary establishments to 60 hours in any 1 week or not more than 10 hours in any 1 day. The ground expressed by the majority was, that the statute "has no such direct relation to and no such substantial effect upon the health of the employee, as to justify us in regarding the section as really a health law."

The majority thus denied to the States the right to regulate the hours of labor of employees in a private business which, in their opinion, was not dangerous to the morals or health of the employees. There were two dissents in the case. One was joined in by Justices Harlan, White, and Day, the other was the famous dissent of Mr. Justice Holmes in which he accused his colleagues of deciding the case upon "an economic theory which a large part of the country does not entertain." Ineffectively, for the time, he warned them: "The 14th amendment does not enact Mr. Herbert Spencer's Social Statics."

In 1918 came the decision invalidating the first Federal child labor law which attempted to regulate child labor by prohibiting the shipment of goods manufactured by such labor. From this opinion Justices Holmes, McKenna, Brandies, and Clarke dissented.

The baneful influence of these two decisions continued for years. In 1923, the Minimum Wage Act of the District of Columbia which created a board empowered to establish standards of minimum wages for women and children was invalidated. Here again there were dissents. Even the conservative Mr. Chief Justice Taft could not agree with the majority. He was joined in his dissent by Mr. Justice Sanford and Mr. Justice Holmes wrote a separate dissent.

It was not until 1937 that this decision was reversed and a minimum wage law for women enacted in 1913 by the State of Washington was upheld in an opinion written by Mr. Chief Justice Hughes. The dissenters were Justices Sutherland, Van Devanter, McReynolds and Butler.

In the meantime, the pernicious influence of the verbalist and narrow approach continued. In 1928 the Supreme Court invalidated a New Jersey law enacted in 1918 regulating employment agencies.

It was not until 1941 that the Supreme Court repudiated directly *Hammer* v. *Dagenhart*. In upholding the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, the Court reasserted the power of the Congress to control commerce between the States even if such control resulted in regulating local activities. This was followed, in succession, by the decision upholding the constitutionality of the provisions of the Public Utility Act of August 26, 1935, relating to the registration of holding companies, the regulations under the same act ordering the integration of certain holding companies, and many others, which are known to all. So the change in the attitude of the Supreme Court, through the reassertion of the unlimited power of the Congress over commerce, and the use of its taxing power, not only brought on desirable control of abuses in our Nation's business, financial and economic life, but helped revitalize reforms adopted at State levels.

ATTAINING FORBIDDEN OBJECTIVES

The same result was achieved when the Supreme Court sustained other incursions of Federal power into forbidden domains in instances in which they deemed them socially desirable. The pattern is not new.

Historically, every government confronted with conditions not envisaged by its begetters or its fundamental law, has sought to achieve indirectly what it was forbidden to do directly. And if the object was one which the community approved, there was no great outcry against the assumption of a nonexistent power. When the Federal antikidnapping law had been approved by the Supreme Court, a witty Attorney General who had seen the same Court strike down other attempts to use the power to regulate commerce between the States to relieve the effects of depression, stated that "it was fortunate that no one had an interest in supporting kidnapping." The United States has used its power to control commerce between States, for the purpose of regulating the greatest variety of activities ranging from transporting stolen automobiles or securities from one State to another, to regulating the wages and hours of labor of persons engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods for such commerce. The control of the Federal Government over the postal establishment has resulted in denying mailing privileges to and making an offense the mailing of obscene matter which,

as defined, covers many matters, including material teaching birth control by describing means for preventing conception or abortion. Control over transportation has been used to cover transporting women in interstate commerce for immoral purposes, the famous Mann Act. This law denominated by its author as the White Slave Act, and which he declared solemnly before the Supreme Court, was intended to punish only transportation of women for immoral purposes of a commercial type, has been extended by the Supreme Court to cover all kinds of transportation of women unconnected with commercialized vice, which the Court considered illicit, including the movement from one State to another of plural wives of Mormons of the old type. Lottery tickets, prison made goods, and birds and wild animals are excluded from the mails and forbidden transportation or importation in interstate commerce or both. There are even penalties for taxiing passengers between shore and gambling ships outside American waters, whether it is done for hire or otherwise.

The Federal taxing power has been used to regulate many local activities, the latest being the tax on a presumably illicit enterprise—gambling. And judges, including myself, have had no difficulty in sustaining the exercise of the power.

THE PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

The Federal courts are the ultimate guardians of the rights of the individual. Indeed, this guardianship is, perhaps, the most important function which they perform. For many of our rights are personified in those who come in conflict with the law. If the Federal courts do not insure to them the full measure of constitutional rights, these rights cease to exist for all. Courts must protect the individual in the assertion of his rights, not only against other individuals, but against the community itself. This is of the essence of the democratic process. Totalitarian regimes do not concede to the individual the possession of any right which he may assert against the community as a whole.

The most complex difficulties stem from the efforts to insure the guarantee of due process of the 14th amendment against violation at State level. In striving for the goal, the courts have changed the meaning of that amendment in many respects. What was originally intended as a guaranty of rights to the newly emancipated slaves has been interpreted as a shield against denial of due process to individuals and corporations.

Along with this there has also been a latitudianarian attitude which has read into the 14th amendment some of the provisions of the 1st amendment. So courts have held that the due-process clause of the 14th amendment "may make it unlawful for a State to abridge by its statutes the freedom of speech which the 1st amendment safeguards against encroachment by the Congress; * * * or the like freedom of the press; * * * or the free exercise of religion; * * * or the right of peaceable assembly, without which speech would be unduly trammeled; * * * or the right of one accused of crime to the benefit of counsel."

Confessions or incriminating evidence obtained by force by State officers are also held to violate due process.

Another extension of meaning came from the departure from the decision allowing "separate but equal" public facilities on a racial basis. The Supreme Court has finally concluded that it is impossible to grant equal educational facilities under a system of segregation, and has compelled the opening of State-supported schools to Negroes. The total abandonment of the doctrine in other fields is still a desideratum.

A step against private, social segregation was made when the courts invalidated private restrictive covenants through which persons were forbidden to sell or allow property to be occupied by racial groups in certain districts.

Under the Civil Rights Statutes the court has sustained conviction of State officials who had deprived citizens of federally guaranteed rights. But in order to achieve any result under these statutes, it is necessary that such deprivation be the result of State action. For, the statutes do not give redress against persons acting in their individual capacity, and not as agents of the State.

So the outlook in this field is still not too reassuring. In the last analysis respect for and protection of individual rights depends not so much upon enlightened legislation or even courts with vision to interpret such legislation, as upon the desire of the whole community to achieve the great promises of American life, freedom and equality.

We must all aim to make the Constitution and its provisions an instrument for all and not practice a type of selectivity that would deny the benefit of its provisions to those whom we may, in a spirit of pride and prejudice, consider racially inferior or objectionable, or those who came in conflict with the law or with current ideas. For if the Constitution and the Bill of Rights are not a shield for all, they protect none. And the test of our rule of law lies in the measure in which we respect and apply it to those who, for whatever reason, come in conflict with the law, Our judges cannot, without doing violence to our heritage of freedom, become, like totalitarian judges, mere instruments of current political or social policy.

THE SPIRIT OF OUR LAWS

In carrying the ideas of freedom and equality into the Constitution, its makers built upon the past. The Constitution which they gave us did not spring full-grown from their heads, as Minerva emerged full-armed from the head of Jupiter Tonans. The Constitution is the product of the wisdom and experience of the framers, derived from colonial and English history. It sought to apply to new situations certain accepted principles which were the outgrowth of constitutional life as actually practiced in England and in the Colonies, and which had been formulated by theoreticians on constitutional government both English and other. Because of this, the new country from the very beginning, was able to achieve a unity which many had not thought possible. This was the true political genius of the framers of the Constitution. In giving expression to it, they couched the important clauses in the Constitution in terms broad enough to cover changes in our national life which could not be anticipated.

It is, therefore, presumptuous to assume that constitutional theory is an arcanum of definite meaning handed down by the makers of the Constitution to future generations with an injunction against any deviation from its mystical meaning. Such attitude does disservice to the men who framed the Constitution. For their greatness lay in giving us a document which could withstand time and, through adaptation to change, serve, for over a century and a half, what is now a large and powerful nation of over 150 million people, occupying a huge continent between 2 great oceans with the most complex industrial organization in the world, as well as the emergent and weak nation of a few million colonists, with a rural economy, confined to the Atlantic coast. Our task is to exhibit and apply the same spirit to our modern problems.

THE FUNCTION OF THE JUDICIARY

In achieving this result, the function of the American judicial is unique. All law is merely a form of social control. And the process of its interpretation and application to concrete cases involves an act of creation. Law cannot be dissociated from society or from the personality of the judge who interprets and applies it. This is especially true in the United States where, through the power to stay arbitrary power and to declare laws unconstitutional, judges may, in a sense, become final arbiters of society's polity. Because their attitude may determine the validity of social legislation, their views, at times, clash with legislative desires. And if they are carried over into their interpretation of the Constitution, they became the real lawmakers. It was Mr. Chief Justice Hughes who wrote: "We are under the Constitution, but the Constitution is what the judges say it is." Edouard Lambert, a great French jurist, has entitled a book about the United States Supreme Court, Le Gouvernement des Juges (A Government of Judges). Such, in a sense, is our Government.

For, as appears from the preceding discussion, courts can stay social experimentation or promote it. Even the application of inert law to a specific controversy requires an understanding of societal needs.

And ultimately, if the judge, in interpreting and applying the law, does not exhibit social-mindedness because he does not possess it, social harm may ensue.

Realism and not abstractions should dominate the judgments of courts in matters of social legislation, as it should that of legislators. Ways must always be found of meeting problems of national scope in the future, as in the immediate past, in the only effective manner—namely, through legislation of a national scope. To speak of return to States' rights in the domain of labor relations is to subject the antagonists in such disputes to the whims of inefficient local bodies—in an era when the industrial factors from which the relationship arises are national in scope.

So to conclude:

To preserve our heritage of freedom, we must interpret the Constitution and the laws enacted under it in the spirit which sees in it not a Draconic edict, but a means to achieve greater well-being for the greatest number in our society.

There is always need for statesmanship in our legislators. But idealism, social understanding and wisdom on the part of judges is the most essential need. For if they understand the spirit of the times and the needs of the day, they will, like the reed in La Fontaine's fable "The oak and the reed," bend our laws and adjust them to the demands of stormy days—and a better-ordered, fuller social life will be the result.

If, on the contrary, like the mighty oak in the same fable, they do not bend, the whole system may be torn up by its roots by a hurricane, and the precious heritage of freedom and civilization may be entirely lost.

A modern philosopher, Alfred North Whitehead, has written:

"The art of free society consists first in the maintenance of the symbolic code; and secondly, in fearlessness of revision, to secure that the code serves those purposes which satisfy an enlightened reason. Those societies which cannot combine reverence to their symbols with freedom of revision, must ultimately decay either from anarchy, or from the slow atrophy of a life stifled by useless shadows."

Law, through its suppleness and adaptability, requires, perhaps more than any other of the social sciences, the spirit of which Whitehead speaks. For by its very nature, it can anticipate only the usual situations. The unusual, the unexpected, when it appears, requires the creative thought of the judge.

His creative spirit must achieve a synthesis between the old and the new and turn inert law into a living, dynamic entity, aimed to satisfy human needs, in a changing society. Only judges who realize their great function as creators through interpretation, application, and adaptation of law cease to be mere craftsmen and become true judges of a modern progressive society.

Lack of Adequate Detention Facilities for Juvenile Delinquents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in my work as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, I am in an advantageous position to view the accomplishments of civic groups all across the country in their fight to control the growth of juvenile delinquency.

During the subcommittee's hearings last year, we found that one of the worst situations was lack of adequate detention facilities for juvenile delinquents. Recognizing the situation, the May 1955 issue of Woman's Home Companion has named Mrs. Nellie Maze Broderson, of Palo Alto, Calif., as clubwoman of the year for her work in leading a fight for better facilities in Santa Clara County, Calif.

Through her work with the women's clubs, she has been able to complete a program which would stagger the imagination of most people. Mrs. Broderson discovered a situation at the Santa Clara Juvenile Detention Home that needed correcting. There, she found delinquent children herded like animals, crowded together with criminals and perverts. Some officials shrugged off her complaints about the conditions, branding her as another "do-gooder."

But Mrs. Broderson would not tolerate this complacency. Instead, she went forth and rallied the people of Palo Alto. A minor miracle was wrought through the help and cooperation of the women's clubs, and of worthy citizens like Mrs. Albert Bonnell, Mrs. Frank Johnson, and Mrs. Jack Tuomy, presidents of the Palo Alto Women's Club; Mrs. Harry Larmour and Mrs. Harry Cox, presidents of the Santa Clara County Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. Harold Kay, secretary of the federation; Mrs. James Corcoran and Mrs. Charles Burr, the Rev. Joyce Farr and the Rev. R. Marvin Stuart, Attorney Norman Stoner, Novelist Kathleen Norris and Manufacturer John Crummey.

Santa Clara officials recently set aside $750,000 for the construction of new facilities. It was a victory for Mrs. Broderson and a victory for all the women's clubs of Santa Clara County who coordinated their efforts to insure better facilities for wayward youngsters, in trouble with the law.

Mrs. Broderson has shown what an aroused citizenry can do to help solve the very complex and serious problem of juvenile delinquency. She has shown the way to thousands of other Americans who face similar situations in their own community.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD part of the article published in the Woman's Home Companion.

There being no objection, the portion of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"KIDS ARE BETTER THAN PIGS"

(By Albert Q. Maisel)

Nellie Maze Broderson, unanimously elected the Companion's clubwoman of the year, is a gray-haired grandmother of 65. But don't let her age, nor her gentle—almost fragile—appearance fool you.

Complacent officials in California's Santa Clara County made that mistake 3 years ago—when she began to ask questions about the overcrowded juvenile detention home, the dungeon that passes for a county jail and the tax millions being siphoned off into the county fair—they dismissed her as "just another do-gooder." Today, sadder men but wiser, they know that—for energy, judgment, insight, and sheer bulldog perseverance—Nellie Broderson can outmatch most men and women half her age.

When she asks for the floor at a meeting she may seem merely a small unostentatious, shy woman with a trim, 5-foot-3 figure that belies her years. But as she puts on her spectacles and backs up her words with facts and figures, the room becomes hushed. Everyone in the region knows that her quiet, measured, persuasive voice echoes the consciences of thousands of aroused Santa Clara mothers.

Her persistence has proved catching. Dozens of women, hesitant and timid at first, have followed her example and emerged as leaders in a struggle to put the welfare of troubled teen-agers ahead of providing luxurious county-fair pens for prize hogs. Tens of thousands more, who joined the battle last fall forced through a $750,000 appropriation to replace the worst jail in California with a modern structure.

By a 2-to-1 vote they scotched an almost accomplished plan to install pari-mutuel racing at the local fair and thus prevented big-time gambling from capturing Santa Clara County.

* * * * *

Nellie Broderson is the first to insist that despite last November's victories, the women of Santa Clara County still have a long way to go. "The project for a new jail seems to be moving ahead," she told me. "The county has actually hired an architect. If we keep after it, we may yet see plans for a new building. And after that, if we maintain the pressure, the structure itself may actually materialize.

"But that," she continued, "will still be only a first step. We've got to win an appropriation for the new juvenile detention home. To retain or remodel the obsolete home is unthinkable. As we put it in a letter to the board of supervisors: as many as 10 boys must share 1 small room, sleeping in tier bunks. If a child has a cold there is no possible way in which he can be segregated for observation. Boys from 9 to 18 are kept in the juvenile home. Should a teenager be brought in under the influence of liquor there is no room where he can be isolated.

"The only play space available for 25 to 50 boys is a tiny yard. On rainy days these boys must remain in a small room 14 by 16, which also doubles for a dining room. Boys of this age have a superabundance of energy. Can you imagine the problem of supervising 50 boys in such a small area through 7 days of inclement weather—as has happened?

"We've got to move those neglected children out of their crowded warren, out into the country where they will have space to play and classrooms and all the other things that make for reformation, instead of hardening any delinquent tendencies.

"We women have got to recognize that our real problem, here and everywhere else, is the kind of complacency that locks kids up for months in iron-barred prison cells and converts neglected youngsters into permanent enemies of society.

"The greatest joy I've gotten out of this whole campaign has been that, here at least, thousands of men and women have learned that we adults are really responsible for our juvenile delinquency problems."

Russia Starts To Destroy Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of Cleveland have long been acquainted with the column of Mr. Spencer D. Irwin, associate editor and specialist on foreign affairs of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. Mr. Irwin has shown a unique understanding of the great ideological conflict which now grips the entire world. On Sunday, May 15, the title of Mr. Irwin's column was "Russia Starts to Destroy Rumania." In this column Mr. Irwin makes a remarkable analysis of the latest maneuver of the Russian Communists to deport large segments of the Rumanian population to desolate and barren areas of the Communist empire. While these deportations sail under the camouflage of volunteer settlements, it is clear that this is a maneuver to destroy the patriotic elements of the Bessarabian population. I feel this column brings a message of real interest to the American people, and under unanimous consent, I insert it in the RECORD:

RUSSIA STARTS TO DESTROY RUMANIA

(By Spencer D. Irwin)

Systematically and relentlessly on what the Russians call a volunteer basis, the Rumanian Nation is being disintegrated.

This is the disheartening news that reached Rumanians in the West, the only ones able to observe their national independence day which occurred last Tuesday. The day celebrates the deliverance of the country from the Turks in 1878. Freedom was gained then in the Russo-Turkish War, but it was lost in World War II.

VOLUNTEER PLAN HIDES MASS EXILE

Now the population of Bessarabia, a Rumanian province which was annexed to Russia in 1944 and became the Moldavian Socialist Soviet Republic, is being transplanted to the steppes of central Asia.

The background of this step to de-Romanize Rumania (for Rumanians still rightly think of Bessarabia as part of their country) was related in Cleveland last week by Anton Crihan, a native Bessarabian and the only member of the permanent council of the Rumanian National Peasant Party to escape to the West.

Until 1924 Crihan was a Russian citizen. Russia had grabbed Bessarabia from the Sultan in 1812 and it remained the Czar's domain until 1918 when it was a republic until 1924, when it rejoined Rumania. The Sultan, of course, had no business giving it to Russia, but that was a detail.

Crihan organized the Moldavian militia which fought for the independence of the province in 1917–18. He was a deputy of the republican legislature and a minister of agriculture. Then he promoted union with Rumania. He became one of the closest col-

laborators of Dr. Julius Maniu, the great peasant leader, and served five terms in the Parliament at Bucharest as well as undersecretary of agriculture in Maniu's cabinet.

During the 106 years of Russian rule Bessarabia was subjected, as were other non-Russian parts of the czar's empire, to a constant program of Russification. It didn't work. The Bessarabians always were staunch Rumanians. There are 2 million of them.

On April 30 there went into effect a law published in Sovietskaia Moldavia, the official Communist newspaper printed at Kishinev, capital of Bessarabia, for the voluntary but planned resettlement of Bessarabian peasants on the collective farms in Astrakan and Rostov in the Russian Soviet republic and in the Pavlodar region of the Kazakhstan Soviet republic in central Asia.

Publication of the law is a blind to cover forced deportation. Resettlement has been going on for months as a voluntary proposition. It is part of the Soviet propaganda to open up new agricultural regions for the population of Russia is growing at twice the rate of food production. Many Bessarabians took the voluntary step. They simply cannot live in central Asia where the climate is akin to the Sahara and the possibility of turning the area to productive agriculture still extremely dubious. None of those who went earlier, according to Crihan, survived more than 2 years.

High inducements are included in the new law, the text of which was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN who, at the same time, asked President Eisenhower to protest publicly this organized destruction of a people.

Here are three pertinent paragraphs:

"Citizens who will enlist voluntarily for this transfer will enjoy free traveling facilities to the locality of residence, including all personal belongings up to 2 tons for each family.

"The state will grant, at the same time, a bonus of 500 to 800 rubles to the head of the family and 150 to 300 rubles to other members of the family. On their new residences, the settlers will enjoy exemption of agricultural taxation as well as of state deliveries of farm products for a period of 2 years. They will receive foodstuffs as additional relief.

"The settlers are offered long-term credits for the construction of dwellings (with a 10-year amortization) and for the purchase of livestock (with a 3-year amortization) as well as other facilities."

Then follows a list of 20 districts of Bassarabia where, as the law states, "the transfer is in force," which betrays the nonvoluntary character of the move.

Mass deportations, according to Crihan, are already under way. But Bessarabia is not being depopulated. Peoples of Mongolian origin from central Asia and the Urals are now being moved in. Many of them were brought in before.

MONGOLS TO TAKE PLACE OF UPROOTED

This program is not so much to expand Soviet agriculture as to destroy the Rumanians. If expansion were the aim the populations in central Asia could undertake it to better advantage. They are accustomed to the climate and the methods long prevalent in the area.

The resistance of the Bessarabians has obviously been too stiff for the Russians and this is one way of breaking it. At the same time it puts in the heart of Europe a docile population that can be maneuvered in any emergency by the Russians. It prevents the rebirth of Rumania at some future time.

On this point Congressman FEIGHAN said in a speech on the floor of the House:

"While Khrushchev may call for pioneers to settle and develop vast regions of the U. S. S. R., the fact remains that this is nothing but a cover for the brutal transfer of an entire population to geographical areas of the Russian Empire where it is impossible for them to eke out an existence and where the likelihood remains that they will perish in the course of several years."

With this program under way the peace professions of the Kremlin seem hypocritical indeed. It might even offer, now that the Austrian treaty is signed, to withdraw its troops from Rumania in return for some western concessions, but it would be an empty gesture with Asiatics controlled by Moscow in the heart of Europe.

Marketing of Midwestern Fluid Milk in Eastern Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I noted an article in the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune for May 11, on the editorial page, in a column headed "Minnesota Editors Say" which quotes from an article by Mr. W. F. Schilling of the Northfield (Minn.) Independent.

Bill Schilling, as he is known to all of us in the Midwest, is one of the pioneers in the dairy cooperative movement, and in the development of the splendid processing plants these farm cooperatives have.

Bill Schilling was attending meetings throughout all of the Midwest and oftentimes speaking to dairy producers' groups in the New England area when I was a very young man. I always admired his ability to present to any audience, in an understandable manner, the problems with which the farmer was confronted. He strove to improve the farmers' produce marketing. He was a great influence in the development of the Twin City Milk Producers Association, which is one of the largest cooperatives in the Midwest, supplying approximately 90 percent of all the fluid milk consumed in the Twin Cities.

W. F. Schilling's article has referred to the question of breaking into the eastern markets by Minnesota dairymen, and I commend attention to this article because Mr. Schilling has spent many, many years observing the question herein involved, "Can midwestern fluid milk be marketed in these eastern markets?"

This is a question requiring most careful study. The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should make a very careful study of this very involved question.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

But W. F. Schilling, of the Northfield Independent, is confident the best display of unthinking legislators in Minnesota was their vote of $30,000 for attorney hire to break into eastern markets with Minnesota dairy products. After paying $1.20 in transportation costs to New York, this veteran in building Minnesota's dairy industry says our farmers would have lost 77 cents on all their milk.

Although this proposal was simply political "bunk" Schilling heard no legislator raise his voice against it, although it would disturb the market and pit one group of farmers against the other and that spells disaster. If the country would spend a few millions making farmers get together instead of trying to keep them apart we would not hear so much about parity and farm relief, Schilling concludes.

H. R. 5297

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have received many favorable telegrams and letters from outstanding organizations throughout the United States favoring the passage of H. R. 5297, called the National Reserve Plan bill. I will not seek to analyze these telegrams here, but I present for the information of the House a telegram recently received from the Coast Guard Washington Chapter of ROA by Walter K. Handy, president. The telegram is as follows:

Representative OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building:

Coast Guard Washington Chapter ROA meeting May 4 unanimously urges passage H. R. 5297 to strengthen Reserve adequacy. This legislation appears only hope for early strengthening Coast Guard Reserve, which lags badly in strength, now training only 16 percent mobilization requirements. Budget Bureau limitations previously preventing adequate funds, and other limitations on adequate strength, could be overcome by adoption H. R. 5297.

WALTER K. HANDY,
President.

I have also received a telegram of May 4, 1955, from National Commander Seaborn P. Collins, of the American Legion, approving H. R. 5297, and urging the Congress adopt it as defense legislation on behalf of this country. The telegram is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your personal support H. R. 5297 as reported out by Armed Services Committee. We believe approval of this measure is absolutely necessary to correct present inequities in military manpower program and to provide all-important start toward achieving strong Reserve force. Earnestly hope you will vote in favor of H. R. 5297.

SEABORN P. COLLINS,
National Commander, the American Legion.

One of the communications which appeals to me very strongly and supports wholeheartedly H. R. 5297 is a letter from the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America. In a letter of May 3 the position of the Jewish War Veterans is disclosed and I present for helpful consideration of the House a letter

signed by the national legislative director, Bernard Weitzer:

JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1955.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROOKS: As you know, I have repeatedly appeared before your committee on behalf of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, on bills affecting the Department of Defense and the security of our Nation. On such occasions, I have often read to your committee the resolutions regularly passed at our national conventions urging a program which would create a strong ready-trained Reserve force made up of nonveterans of our wars. On behalf of our organization, I can and do say that H. R. 5297, favorably reported by your committee, will accomplish the objectives which our membership has sought. With the passage of this bill, we will do away with the injustice of calling on war veterans to serve again in the ranks of our Armed Forces as they were forced to do in the Korean emergency. However, the major advantage of enacting H. R. 5297 into law is not to do away with injustice, important though this is. Such a law will give our country a military readiness in a relatively short time through the Ready Reserve feature which will deter aggression and enable us to repel aggression if it occurs. Furthermore, over a period of years, it will cut the disbursements which are essential for our Defense Department without reducing our defense potential.

I hope you will find it feasible to read this message into the RECORD during the course of the debate on the bill so that the Members of the House may know your bill, H. R. 5297, has the firm support of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

With all good wishes,
Cordially yours,

BERNARD WEITZER,
National Legislative Director.

I have also received a second telegram from the American Legion, dated May 16, which telegram I include as a part of the RECORD, indicating the very active position of the Legion in reference to this bill. It is:

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

American Legion again urges your approval of H. R. 5297 scheduled for debate May 17. Bill, if enacted, would mark turning point in Nation's present costly, inequitable manpower program by providing military service obligation not borne by veterans alone and by insuring strong trained Reserve force at least possible cost. Urge defeat of any delaying or crippling amendments.

SEABORN P. COLLINS,
National Commander, American Legion.

Mr. Speaker, there is a telegram received from Mrs. Percy Lainson, the national president of the American Legion Auxiliary, Indianapolis, Ind., dated May 16. I know the membership of the House would like to know the strong views which she entertains and which are entertained by the Legion Auxiliary in reference to H. R. 5297. The telegram is:

OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As national president of the American Legion Auxiliary, I am happy to place the full support of our nearly 1 million members firmly behind H. R. 5297, a measure which we deem vital to the long-range security needs of our Nation. I respectfully urge that you lend your vital support to the passage of this legislation.

Mrs. PERCY LAINSON.

Mr. Speaker, there is a telegram from Comdr. R. G. Singleton, United States Naval Reserve, president of the United States Naval Reserve for the Department of Louisiana, and I present his telegram for the information of the House:

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you support H. R. 5297 with ROA amendment to be proposed by BROOKS and request you vote against all crippling amendments and Barden substitute amendment.

Comdr. R. G. SINGLETON,
United States Naval Reserve President.

Likewise I present the telegram received from the Carney Chapter ROA, Monroe, La., urging the House favorably consider this measure. The telegram is as follows:

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We strongly support and urge your favorable consideration of and action upon H. R. 5297, national reserve plan, without amendment.

CARNEY CHAPTER ROA.

Also I have a telegram from the national secretary of the American Legion Auxiliary, Indianapolis, Ind., dated May 16, which is:

OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As a former member of the Armed Forces and present national secretary of the American Legion Auxiliary, I endorse H. R. 5297 and urge favorable House action for this needed youth training measure.

Mrs. JANE RISHWORTH.

I have received many more telegrams and letters but time and space will not permit me to present them to the House in this extension of remarks. I think every one of these indicates the strong position taken by the patriotic organizations throughout the United States, and I wholeheartedly commend the careful study of these telegrams to all of our Members.

National Security and Individual Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on Thursday evening April 28, 1955, in New York City, Mr. Louis B. Nichols, Assistant to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, delivered an address entitled "The Role of a Security Agency," before the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. I ask unanimous consent that this address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF A SECURITY AGENCY

To participate in the freedom forum of the Anti-Defamation League is indeed a pleasure. Over the years we of the FBI have welcomed the assistance and cooperation of both the Anti-Defamation League and its parent organization, B'nai B'rith. There has never been a time when we have sought your aid that it has not been forthcoming. That is why Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, who heads our organization, so deeply regrets his inability to be with you personally. It is my privilege to bring you his greetings and best wishes for a most successful conference.

There are few subjects as important as National Security and Individual Freedom, the theme of our discussion tonight. It is unfortunate but true that freedom and liberty too frequently are taken for granted and accepted as a heritage without the eternal vigilance, intelligent dedication, and the vigorous action necessary for their preservation.

There are few subjects which have been so confused and misrepresented as the topic of security and freedom. Some of this results from design cleverly and diabolically conceived to weaken security and rob us of our freedom; some of it results from plain ignorance and a failure to face reality; and much of the current confusion on security and freedom is a direct result of complacency and muddled thinking.

Security and freedom, to have real meaning, must buttress each other. A nation without freedom is a nation dead and soulless; a nation without security cannot long exist. Security and freedom are compatible; they are the essential ingredients interwoven in the ever-growing process which created our democracy.

Security and freedom, just like law and order, are not ends in themselves. They are but conditions under which we can enjoy our individual rights. The mission of the FBI, therefore, is the attainment of these conditions within the sphere of its responsibility. To that end its energies have been dedicated over the years—that is the real purpose to which Mr. J. Edgar Hoover has devoted his waking hours in the past 31 years he has headed the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He has never wavered from the principles which he early inculcated into our organization.

In our generation we have witnessed more than once the rise of forces which threatened our security and our freedom. In 1938 Mr. Hoover called attention to a rising menace in addressing the American Legion convention when he said: "Both communism and fascism are the antitheses of American belief in liberty and democracy. There can be no room in this country for these destructive, anarchic, or despotic cults. Fascism has always grown in the slimy wastes of communism."

These menaces today threaten our security and freedom. Fascism is not dead; hateism is on the rise; racism rears its head with increasing frequency; and the world knows only too well the terror, sorrow, and bloodshed which have followed the worldwide rise of communism.

Mr. Hoover only recently observed that "subversive activities today overshadow those which we experienced during the peak of World War II, when we were dealing largely with Nazi and Fascist elements."

There is no difference between the objectives of a domestic Communist and a Chinese, North Korean, or Russian Communist. Each is dedicated to world revolution, each is dedicated to furthering the Soviet Union, and each employs stealth and deceit, and is a swindler of our freedoms; they would destroy the God of the Jew, the Gentile, the Catholic, and the Protestant. The Communist Party is now down to a hard core of dedicated, fanatic revolutionaries. Its dan-

ger increases in proportion to the number of its sympathizers and muddle-headed persons.

Since 1945, when the Communist Party reconstituted itself, it has had time to develop a new cadre with no open record of Communist Party activity. The FBI has observed their efforts in concentrating in vital areas. We have seen them set up fronts and manipulate innocent dupes; we have seen them meet under the cover of darkness with their Soviet masters and we have observed them launch campaigns designed to undermine faith and confidence in the American way.

It is true that the formal strength of the Communist Party has declined in numbers. It is also true that a persistent effort has been made over the years to falsely evaluate this menace in terms of numbers. This was true in 1946 when Mr. Hoover pointed out: "The fact that the Communist Party in the United States claims some 100,000 members has lulled many Americans into a feeling of false complacency." And it was still true a few weeks ago when Mr. Hoover pointed out, "Even though there are only 22,663 members today with their tentacles stretched out into the front organizations and the various educational and economic fields." The strength of communism must be evaluated in terms of its influence and not on the basis of numbers. And its influence is still potent.

The Communists for a hundred years have been advertising to the world their ultimate program of proletarian dictatorship. Yet the cold fact remains that Communist tyranny rules one-fourth of the world's surface and one-third of the earth's population. Nations have lost their freedom overnight because they paid no attention to either the Nazi or Communist fifth column which constituted only a small minority when they seized power.

It would seem that the lessons of history would not be so widely disregarded. Less than 25 years ago Hitler advertised to the world what he would do, but was dismissed by most people not as discerning as the Anti-Defamation League as a "crazy little paperhanger."

In his book, "Outline Political History of the Americas," which is widely used in Communist training schools, the head of the Communist Party in the United States pointed out, "Communist strength in this hemisphere, or elsewhere, cannot be measured even approximately by statistics * * * the Communist Party's strength runs far beyond all formal measurements." This is illustrated by one of our investigations. One who had served the Communist cause was awarded The Order of the Red Star with the advice that his work had equalled that of two divisions of Red soldiers.

The dimensions of the menace to security can never be measured in numbers. One person, whether or not he occupies a sensitive position, can do irreparable harm. And the sensitive nature of any position is merely a matter of degree. Let me illustrate by another of our own cases. Even before we were involved in World War II, we identified an important Nazi espionage ring. Then we became baffled by frequent references to one known only as "Robert." We knew from the guarded references made to him that he was important. But we met defeat at every hand in seeking to identify him. And then one day we were rewarded. There was a loyal American employed in what would be considered as a non-sensitive job in a boiler room whose cooperation we enlisted. Officials of the German Consulate in New York brought their papers to the boiler room where they were burned in a condemned furnace. The boiler room employee would personally take them out of their burlap bags and light a match to the top of the heap. Once the fire was started the Consugar officials would leave. The boilerroom employee, however, had rigged the draft to stop the fire. One day he retrieved a cablegram from the German Foreign Office which instructed that Paul T. Borchardt should burn a letter from "Robert." Investigation very quickly identified the mysterious "Robert."

"Robert" had arrived in the United States in early 1940 posing as a refugee. He lived a quite life in a private home where he could view the New York harbor. His background was even more revealing. He was an associate and disciple of Professor Karl Haushofer who blueprinted the Nazi plans for conquest. He was a Professor of Military Science at the Polytechnical University in Munich, reportedly secretly run by the German Army, and had carried out such assignments as mapping the African desert where Rommel once ran wild. "Robert" turned out to be Maj. Paul T. Borchardt, who, after his arrest by the FBI, stated he would rather die than reveal any secrets of the German Army. He received a 20-year penitentiary sentence in Federal Court in 1942 as the technical advisor for one of the most important Nazi espionage rings in the United States, and largely through the efforts of one in a nonsensitive job whose cooperation we had enlisted. Let us not underestimate the intelligence of our adversaries, until at least we can acquire the wisdom of a Solomon and propery determine what is sensitive and nonsensitive.

But you might now ask what this has to do with the present menace. Simply this: Human nature does not change. Espionage techniques follow a pattern. This case can be used as an illustration, while pending or contemporary cases may not be disclosed. Even in espionage there must be a beginning. The person or persons who condition a youthful mind and make possible the later recruitment to commit Communist espionage or sabotage eventually must assume the responsibility and must account certainly to the natural laws upon which our Judaic-Christian society rests, if not the manmade laws.

One of the tragedies of our era is the fact that it has become necessary to have a security program. An even greater tragedy is found in the tactics employed by those who do not wish to face the facts. We are constantly impressed by the fervor, for example, on the part of some to learn the source of information on subversion rather than to learn the truth of subversion.

The investigative process is the first step in any security program. As it relates to the FBI, it is the simple one of securing facts. Yet even that has been obscured too frequently by diversionary tactics. In early 1940 the hue and cry was raised that the FBI was a menace to civil rights; that it was thought control; that it invaded privacy; that it inhibited freedom. In fact, some of those same old harangues are heard today. But we went through World War II without any enemy-directed acts of sabotage, and enemy espionage within the United States was kept under control. History records the fact that even in time of war there was no abridgment of civil rights by the FBI. On the other hand, civil rights were maintained because the investigative process identified our real enemies and laid the groundwork for action in the American way.

The FBI is the same institution today, only it is better, as it has learned from experience, and it is proud of the role it has played in helping preserve American freedom. Compared with other Federal agencies, we are a youthful organization. The FBI was founded in 1908. It moved through an era of mediocrity and political abuse until 1924, when Mr. J. Edgar Hoover was appointed its Director. Since 1924 the responsibilities of the FBI have continuously grown. At present we have jurisdiction over some 140 Federal investigative matters.

Since 1939 the FBI has been charged with investigating espionage, sabotage, subversive activities, and related matters within the United States. Additionally, it is our responsibility to correlate information concerning the internal security of the United States and to disseminate that information to appropriate Government agencies. To give you some idea of the magnitude of these responsibilities, during the 1954 fiscal year the FBI received some 73,872 security matters for investigation. We handled more than 1 million requests from other Government agencies for subversive-type data to use in the interests of their own security. Additionally, more than 30,000 investigations of applicants, appointees, and employees of agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government were conducted by our special agents in the past fiscal year.

The FBI is strictly a fact-gathering and fact-reporting branch of the Department of Justice. We do not clear persons for Federal employment; we do not prosecute violators of the law; we do not render opinions as to the guilt or innocence of persons whom we investigate, nor do we tell other Federal agencies how to manage their affairs by suggesting that employees be discharged or retained in office. The FBI gathers facts; it locates witnesses and evidence. Our role ends there. We are not—nor have we ever been—an accuser, prosecutor, judge or jury in any case. Nor is the FBI an exposure agency since its files are confidential.

Internal security investigations raise special problems. Take, for example, the matter of informants. One would think from the reams of material which has been written in recent weeks that the use of informants is peculiarly related to the FBI. The use of informants by the FBI has increased since the late thirties but so have our menaces. For the first time in our national existence our generation has come face to face with underground organizations. If their clandestine meetings and activities are to be penetrated, clandestine methods are necessary. The most effective method of penetrating a conspiracy is to enlist the cooperation of the conspirators. Thus, informants have become a necessity in the protection of internal security.

Many good people are glad to furnish information if their confidence can be protected. This has been particularly true in security investigations of Government employees. Our regulations require our agents to secure signed statements from persons furnishing derogatory information. But some people simply will not furnish information under those conditions. The question then arises: is the Government to be deprived of such information? Mr. Hoover at the very start of the Loyalty Program in 1947 put this up to the Civil Service Loyalty Review Board, which set the policies, and we received an emphatic answer: take the information under the bond of confidence if need be. And maintain the confidence.

The use of informants is as old as man. Informants as a means of acquiring information are recounted in ancient history and in the Bible. Our credit system is based in part upon confidential information. Our free press would not long survive if news-gathering agencies could not have their confidential sources of information. The Anti-Defamation League, like other fact-gathering bodies, for example, must depend upon confidential informants and sources if it is to continue to discharge its assignments. Of course, some informants are found to be unreliable. In the FBI we constantly check and double check information secured from informants—and make no mistake—if there is the slightest suspicion as to the veracity of the informant, this is set forth in our reports since the FBI does not evaluate the results of its investigations.

The Communist Party has made a most vigorous campaign against informants, seeking to discredit the former Communist whose testimony is necessary to expose the Comunist conspiracy. They also have another reason: They want to discourage informants and other former Communists from telling the truth.

The former Communist who has seen the error of his ways and seeks to undo the harm he has done, is deserving of every consideration. Those who seek to discredit the truly reformed, former Communist, just because he once was a Communist, do a real disservice. The former Communist renders a real public service and makes a positive contribution to enhancing our security every time he makes a full disclosure. And if it has to be in confidence, he can come to the FBI and the FBI has never broken its bond.

To date, 134 Communist Party leaders have been indicted for violation of the Smith Act. In each case where convictions have resulted—and in securing 83 convictions, there have only been 3 acquittals—former Communists and one-time confidential informants have supplied the evidence which led juries to conclude the persons were guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. If they are to survive, the Communists know that the FBI and its sources of information must either retreat or be destroyed. And you may be assured the FBI will not retreat.

Considerable misinformation has been circulated on the use of wire taps by the FBI. We always have frankly admitted their use. They were prohibited until 1931. Then in 1940 they were discontinued by former Attorney General Jackson on Mr. Hoover's recommendation, only to be reinstituted by the late President Roosevelt, who on May 21, 1940, by confidential memorandum to the Attorney General directed and authorized the use of wire taps. Mr. Hoover has said time and again that the use of wire taps is justified only when the life of the Nation is in jeopardy, as in security investigations, or when the life of a human being is in jeopardy, as in a kidnaping case.

Six Attorneys General and three Presidents have ruled on and approved the practices of the FBI on wire tapping. In 1940, when President Roosevelt reinstituted the practice, Mr. Hoover insisted that the authority not be delegated to him, but, on the other hand, he submits the facts in each case to the Attorney General for his authorization.

There are less than 150 wire tape, by the FBI, in existence throughout the United States and territorial possessions, each authorized by the Attorney General and each in a case involving security.

Mr. Hoover has never looked with favor upon extending the jurisdiction of the FBI because an organization such as ours functions best when it is tightly knit and highly mobile. We are constantly converned over how extended we are. This becomes obvious when you realize that there is approximately 1 special agent to each 27,000 inhabitants in the United States, or only about 2 special agents for each county in the United States.

While it has been expanded since World War II, its work has increased 13 times while its personnel has increased only 8 times. We have made up the difference by increased efficiency and burning the midnight oil. Last year alone the voluntary overtime for which Bureau Agents were not compensated was valued at more than $9,900,000. And, speaking of values, in the past 18 years it has cost the taxpayers $748,180,514 to maintain the FBI, while fines, savings, recoveries and claims adjusted in favor of the Government have totaled $1,052,808,902 in FBI cases. In other words, the monetary value of our work exceeded our cost of operations by $304,628,388.

We have always taken special pride in the FBI's contributions to protecting civil rights. Mr. Hoover early established in the FBI the basic principle that we fulfill our responsibility only when we secure all the facts, fairly, impartially, and in a manner consistent with the judicial process. Thus, the fundamental objective in any investigation is to secure the facts. Once the facts are secured, the innocence of the innocent and the guilt of the guilty inevitably follow. Last year convictions resulted in 95.8 percent of the cases investigated by the FBI which were taken to court. Of these, 91.3 percent resulted from pleas of guilty. This hardly could be possible unless there was a conscientious effort to protect the rights of those involved.

It is a real source of satisfaction that in the past 3 years not a single lynching has been recorded in the United States, although in the past 10 years a total of 16 lynchings have occurred. The effectiveness of our investigations and the growing conscience of the country are best illustrated by pointing out that in the preceding 10 years, 65 lynchings occurred.

Since the investigative process in the first step in enforcing the criminal laws, as well as in maintaining security, it is logical to expect attacks upon the investigative process by those who are affected by strict law enforcement and by those who are interested in weakening security. In the FBI we have been blessed with an operation which steadfastly favors no one and impartially discharges its duties to all. Only the facts and the truth are important.

The effectiveness of any organization such as the FBI is governed in the final analysis by the character of its personnel and its leadership. The special agents of the FBI are the product of 750 colleges and universities. They are appointed solely on the basis of merit and character. They remain and advance in the FBI solely on the basis of merit. Leadership has been given to the FBI by its Director through periods of great strain, and his accomplishments are a matter of proven record. There is no one who has made a more significant contribution to civil rights, law and order, and the security of this country than Mr. Hoover.

In the final analysis the key to security must lie within the collective will and actions of all our people. We are freemen, capable of making decisions and able to choose, with reason and intelligence, the path we will follow.

A healthy, virile Republic, drawing upon the creative genius and energies of all its people, is irresistible. The enemies of the American way can succeed in this Nation only in direct proportion to our own weaknesses. Our task as a people is to eliminate these obstacles to security—security which means in the broadest sense the protection of our freedom—security which insures a strong nation, materially and spiritually.

True security goes hand in hand with freedom. They are inseparable. Without security there can be no freedom. Freedom withers to extinction when real security ceases to exist.

Effect of Red War Entry on Japan Quitting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Red War Entry Had Little Bearing on Japan Quitting, Beightler Says," published in the Dayton (Ohio) Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED WAR ENTRY HAD LITTLE BEARING ON JAPAN QUITTING, BEIGHTLER SAYS

(By Dick Cull, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, April 13.—The man who led Ohio's own National Guard Division to victory in the Pacific in World War II thinks Russia's entry into the war in 1945 had "little bearing" on Japan's request for an armistice in August of that year.

Retired Maj. Gen. Robert S. Beightler, now executive director of the Ohio Turnpike Commission, expresses that opinion in a letter received today.

General Beightler headed Ohio's 37th (Buckeye) Division throughout World War II.

General Beightler says today that high military leaders in the Pacific in mid-1945 were of the mind that the end of the war was in sight before Russia agreed to enter.

He thinks the dropping of two atom bombs by the United States did more to speed Japan's surrender than anything else.

Here is the text of General Beightler's letter:

"Your letter of April 9, 1955, has just reached my desk, and I am making prompt reply even though what I have to tell you may not be too newsworthy.

"In 1945, Ohio's 37th Division was fighting in the Philippines. During the drive down the central plains of Luzon and the actual campaign in Manila, I saw a great deal of General MacArthur. At the conclusion of the Manila fight, which, incidentally, was the most severe and costly to us in casualties of any during our very active several years in the Pacific island-jumping, we moved north and made the drive on Baguio, the summer capital of the Philippines, and then to the northeast in the so-called Cagayen Valley campaign.

"After leaving Manila, I saw General MacArthur only once or twice, as I recall it. During those one or two meetings, I do not remember having heard him comment about Russia's entry into the war against Japan.

"As a matter of fact, I do not now recall just where I may have seen him during those two latter campaigns which were some distance from Manila, where he had established his headquarters, and it is possible that I may not have talked with him at all after Russia entered the war.

"Actually, as it turned out, I think Russia's active participation in the war had little bearing upon Japan's asking for an armistice in August 1945. It was generally believed by those of high military rank in the Philippines that the end of the war was definitely imminent before Russia announced her participation.

"Our bombers operating from Okinawa and airplane carriers were pulverizing Japan's cities, vital industries, and installations, and I personally regretted at the time that Russia got into the picture at all. Of course, the dropping of the two atom bombs did far more to hasten Japan's capitulation than anything else.

"Answering your specific question as to whether Russia's entering the war helped to save any lives in any of our Ohio troops, my answer is that I don't think it did.

"If it had been necessary for the American forces to make landings on the islands of Honshu and Kyushu, there is no doubt but that our losses would have been very heavy.

"These landings were scheduled for the latter part of 1945 and early in 1946, and, incidentally, it might interest you to know that the 37th division had been tentatively earmarked as one of those units to make the entry directly into Tokyo Bay.

"I firmly believe that the war ended as a result of our own damaging operations rather than Russia's belated help."

Statehood Vote Explained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by my colleague, the Honorable JAMES J. DELANEY, which appeared on the editorial page of the New York Times on Tuesday, May 17, 1955. I believe it to be a very satisfactory and comprehensive explanation of the vote on the Alaska-Hawaii Statehood bill:

STATEHOOD VOTE EXPLAINED—HAWAII AND ALASKA'S ENTRY OPPOSED BECAUSE OF THEIR NONCONTIGUITY

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your editorial of May 12, Statehood Will Come, seems to infer that I voted against statehood for Hawaii and Alaska on the grounds of opposition to civil rights legislation. Certainly my record in support of civil rights is clear enough, and I cannot believe that this inference was intended.

Among the many reasons for my opposition to statehood for these 2 territories at this time is that of their noncontiguity.

On July 15, 1947, the New York Times published a letter from the late Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler in which he said: "It is my judgment that to admit one or more of these distant territories to statehood would be the beginning of the end of our historic United States of America. We should soon be pressed to admit the Philippine Islands, Cuba and possibly even Australia. We now have a solid, compact territorial Nation."

On March 17, 1954, Walter Lippmann wrote in the New York Herald Tribune: "* * * the admission of outlying territories to statehood would mean a radical change in the structure of the Union and of our external relations."

PART OF LAND MASS

The argument is often made, as in your editorial, that in the past various States were admitted to the Union which, at the time of admission, were not contiguous with the other States. However, no Territory was ever admitted as a State which was not part of the land mass which is now the United States, thus making possible the compact and contiguous aspect of our country as it now exists. No present State is noncontiguous.

To an appreciable extent our economic strength has resulted from contiguity. While air transportation is an important modern development, our highways, railroad systems and inland waterways carry the load of most of our commerce. Being noncontiguous even with itself, Hawaii will never have the advantages of these means of transportation, and Alaska not for many years to come.

As Dr. Butler pointed out, the admission of noncontiguous territory might well give rise to certain future problems. If the classic pattern of our country is violated, there is no reason why other noncontiguous commonwealths and possessions should not petition for statehood. To be sure there is the precedent that only incorporated Territories have heretofore been admitted as States.

FUTURE PETITIONS

However, that is not a constitutional provision and if the precedent of contiguity is broken in favor of Hawaii and Alaska, then Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and Samoa could well maintain that they would be discriminated against if denied statehood. Indeed, if the principle of contiguity is abandoned, it is not at all certain that future petitions for statehood would be confined to areas now under the United States flag.

Statehood is irrevocable—once granted it cannot be rescinded. Considering the present state of the world I do not believe that this is a propitious time to experiment with the basic structure of our country.

JAMES J. DELANEY, M. C.

WASHINGTON, *May 12, 1955.*

The Future: Sound as a Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Future—Sound as a Dollar," written by Hon. George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasurer, and published in Fortune magazine for April 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUTURE: SOUND AS A DOLLAR

(By George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury)

It is easy to be too conservative when we think about the kind of world we will be living in 25 years from now. If we project recent trends, we are likely to picture 1980 merely as a "souped-up" version of 1955. This can be misleading. For the really significant features of 1980 are likely to be the unpredictable contrasts with the present rather than the similarities. If we picture ourselves back in 1930 trying to form an idea of the world of 1955, we can readily see how a conservative approach would have led us astray. Who, 25 years ago, could possibly have predicated the vast changes that have taken place in the world's political and economic structures; who could have foreseen the fantastic developments in electronics, antibiotics, or atomic energy?

I have always been skeptical about flat economic predictions; our economy is a sensitive and complex mechanism and any one of a thousand factors can affect its behavior. So I would like to base this look at the coming quarter-century on certain assumptions. There are, after all, some factors in the outlook that seem reasonably predictable even though they can't be projected exactly—the growth of population, the quickening rate of technological development, the rise in productivity and employment, the stead improvement in living standards. Assuming these basic trends, we should give them every encouragement in the years ahead. We must aim not just to maintain but to accelerate the favorable trends of the present. We can't possibly control all the factors bearing of the future, but we can work toward helping the world of 1980 become the kind of world we would like to see.

CHECKLIST FOR CONFIDENCE

A goal that may overshadow all others in importance to our Nation is the maintenance of confidence—living, enthusiastic confidence both for today and for the future. It must be shared by everyone—businessmen, workers, investors, and consumers alike. It must be contagious confidence and it must also be practical and justifiable. With such confidence, our Nation can move to new heights of production and services, create new and better jobs, and constantly push ahead on a sound basis to an ever finer future.

The confidence displayed last year by American citizens was a main reason the economic readjustment was not more serious. Consumers ignored the gloomy predictions of some economic forecasters and went on to spend more money than ever before. Investors kept making risk capital available. Businessmen went boldly ahead with development and expansion plans. They put large sums in plant, equipment, and research with the firm objective of improving their competitive positions in future years.

All of this helped to create new jobs, to raise incomes, and to advance the Nation's productive capacity. It enabled the economy to meet the needs of our growing population and was an eloquent demonstration of the life-giving role confidence can play in a free-enterprise economy.

How can this essential confidence be maintained and strengthened during the next 25 years? We shall have to keep working at it all the time. What is required most of all, I believe, is that people develop assurance on the following five major points. They must be convinced:

1. That their Government is working fervently—and successfully—for the blessings of lasting peace.

2. That the management of Government is in the hands of men of integrity and high moral purpose.

3. That the value of the dollar, with which all transactions are made, will be preserved.

4. That the dynamics of a free competitive economy will be stimulated by Government encouragement of private enterprise.

5. That future business declines can and will be held within moderate limits.

I would like to discuss the prospects for the coming quarter century largely in terms of these basic objectives.

A LESSON TO LEARN

The present high degree of national confidence derives in large part, of course, from the belief that business readjustments now can be kept within tolerably narrow limits, and that, in the future, serious recessions can be avoided. Certainly, events of the past 6 months have given people new faith in the ability of the Government to help moderate economic fluctuations. The fear of a reserve recession that was prevalent a year ago has disappeared, and for this the Government's monetary and fiscal policies can take partial credit. Will the next 25 years justify the belief that economic adjustments can be kept within reasonable bounds? I happen to believe that if we continue to pursue flexible and sensible financial policies the current optimism may prove to be warranted.

One major lesson concerning recessions is still too little understood, however. We have learned that when business begins to slacken—as a result of excessive inventory accumulation, overbuying by consumers, or for any other reason—an easy credit policy is helpful. The lesson that still needs learning is that credit restraint is equally necessary during periods of expansion, when the seeds of future troubles are sown.

If we are to reach 1980 with our confidence undiminished, and with the economy continuing to operate at highest efficiency, restraints on credit may be needed just as often as easings of credit. This is something to be expected, to live with, and to take into account in making business plans. In this way the Government can help diminish the maladjustments and excesses responsible for serious recessions.

A major factor in the maintenance of national confidence is people's confidence in what the dollar is worth. During the decade

prior to 1953, the severe decline in the purchasing power of the dollar robbed people of nearly half the value of their savings. This inflation has been brought to a virtual halt, and during the past 2 years consumers' prices have remained practically unchanged.

We must make sure that the inflationary trends do not reappear. We must work to insure that the dollar of 1980 will buy at least as much food and clothing as the dollar will buy today—preferably and properly more. If that is done, all will share the benefits of increased productivity, and the saver who puts away a dollar for his retirement, to buy a house, to educate his children, for an emergency, or for any other purpose, will still have a dollar that is worth a dollar when he needs it.

THE STAKE IN STABILITY

This goal of a sound dollar has gained tremendously in importance during the past half-century. This Nation, since 1900, has gone through an economic transformation that far exceeds any other in the long history of man's efforts to achieve a better life. The United States today is a nation made up, overwhelmingly, of small-to-medium savers and investors. It is a nation of "haves" rather than a nation of "have-nots."

Since the turn of the century real income per man, woman, and child in the United States has tripled. And the lower and middle income groups have received the greatest share of this increased income. Early in the century, only 10 out of every 100 American families earned as much as $4,000 a year in terms of today's prices; now 55 do. Most families now have enough money not only to live adequately, but to save besides. That is the basic economic development that has enabled this country to reach fantastic heights of material prosperity as compared with the rest of the world.

The flow of small savings into an ever broadening investment stream during the past 50 years has been truly remarkable. Ownership by individuals in life-insurance policies has increased from under $2 billion in 1900 to more than $80 billion today. Small investors' holdings of United States savings bonds now total nearly $50 billion. More than 10 percent of all families today own stock in American corporations. Whereas in 1900 individuals had liquid savings amounting to less than $10 billion, now such savings total more than $225 billion.

You can see from these few examples what has been happening to the individual and the family in our wonderland economy. The "average" man in America has acquired a financial stake in the future such as no other "average" citizen anywhere ever had before. We need a completely new set of standards in thinking about ourselves and in defining the "general interest." This Nation's economy has grown right over, and left in the dust, both socialism and communism.

FROM THE BOTTOM UP

We all want the great beneficial development of the past half century continued in the next quarter century, and in many quarter centuries beyond that. But the progress won't be continued unless we follow national policies that allow the healthy advance of the day-to-day process of "betterment from the bottom up." By this I mean not only policies that will safeguard individual savings against the corroding effect of inflation but also policies that will encourage investment in job-creating plant and equipment and insure rising production and employment, and so prosperity for our ever-growing population.

Confidence that the value of the dollar will be maintained in the next quarter century will encourage the investment necessary to finance the power and tools for the economic development of the next 25 years. The total of the small sums deposited in savings banks, insurance companies, investment trusts, savings and loan associations, pension funds, and other financial institutions will become the large investment to build America.

UNDER NEW MANAGEMENT

To maintain a sound dollar in the years ahead we must continue the sound and flexible monetary and fiscal policies the Eisenhower administration has been following during the past 2 years. Our methods of strengthening confidence in the dollar have been simple. We are steadily curtailing unessential Federal spending. And we are increasing the efficiency of Government operations.

Cuts in Federal expenditures enabled us to travel two-thirds of the way toward a balanced budget in fiscal 1954. And in the coming 1956 fiscal year, net budget expenditures will be an estimated $11.9 billion below the postwar peak spending of 1953.

We have cooperated with the Federal Reserve Board to assure a smooth meshing of the Government's debt-management and monetary policies. While the Federal Reserve Board has used flexible credit and monetary actions to see that the Nation's supply of money and credit was kept in line with the needs of the economy, the Treasury has worked toward making the $278 billion Federal debt less inflationary and less of a threat to the soundness of the currency.

The Eisenhower administration inherited a public debt heavily weighted in short-term obligations (the average maturity of the debt in January 1953 was less than 4 years). Since short-term debt can add substantially to inflationary pressures (even at times approaching the liquidity of printed money), we have taken action at every appropriate time during the last 2 years to extend the maturity of the debt by issuing intermediate and long-term securities.

Last February the Treasury offered a 40-year 3-percent bond, the longest-term security offered by the Treasury since 1911. The 1995 maturity date was chosen to give the bond wide appeal to such long-term investors as pension trusts and insurance companies. It was designed to supply a real need for a Treasury issue in an area beyond the primary demand for mortgage funds. Long-term investment money was available, and the economic situation permitted long-term refunding of this essentially neutral type without danger of unsettling the economy.

If in the next 25 years we use proper opportunities to lengthen the average maturity of the Federal debt when we can do so without disrupting the money markets unduly, we can hope that 1980 will find us with a Federal debt better balanced than at present as between short, intermediate, and long-term issues, and widely distributed among various classes of investors. We can devoutly hope also that the total amount of the Federal debt will be somewhat smaller than at present.

A SMALLER TAX BITE

What about Federal tax policy? Within the next 25 years it is possible that the threat of Communist imperialism will be reduced to such an extent that we can substantially reduce national security spending. This would give us a long-sought opportunity to lighten substantially the Federal tax burden that today consumes nearly a quarter of the total national income. This objective is continually before us. For a cut in the tax share of each income dollar—the maximum cut consistent with the requirements of national defense—would do much to encourage individual initiative and economic growth.

In spite of heavy defense spending, we have already been able to reduce taxes. Sizable cuts in Government expenditures made possible a tax reduction last year of $7.4 billion, the largest dollar cut in our history. Moreover, the broad revision of the Internal Revenue Code last year brought long-needed improvements in the Federal tax structure. Much remains to be done, but the 1954 Revenue Act removed many of the inequities and hardships for individuals that had crept into the tax laws over the years, and reduced some of the worst tax hindrances to business incentive. Thus our tax program to date has not only smoothed the 1954 transition from a high to a lower level of Government spending but has helped provide a more favorable climate for economic growth over the long run.

In the next quarter-century we must continue working in the direction of reduced taxation. And we must do so in ways that will not only take a smaller percentage of our total national income but in ways that will most encourage the initiative and enterprise which are the very foundation of our economic progress.

GLOBAL GOALS

Another important goal for the next quarter century should be the strengthening of our economic relationships with other free countries, that we may all prosper together and together build increasingly strong barriers against Communist imperialism.

Efforts to improve economic output here and in other free countries have particular significance in view of the prospect for a rapid increase in world population. By 1980 the United States population of 164 million may be increased to well over 200 million; the population of the world, now about 2.5 billion, will exceed 3 billion at the present rate of increase. The United States population growth will affect our entire economic life. It will require more plants and homes and stores and may change the whole face of urban and rural America.

A 20-percent rise in world population will press increasingly upon the world's land resources and food supplies, and will influence many foreign economic and political problems. It will undoubtedly bring increasing demands for more efficient methods of providing food and other necessities for the people of the world and will provide exceptional opportunities for the application of modern technical knowledge and methods to the production of food, clothing, and other consumer goods.

WHOSE ALLY IS TIME?

Contrary to the popular view, I believe time is working in our favor in the cold war against communism. As we build up the strength of free people throughout the world, we are erecting barriers to the spread of Communist doctrine. As the free nations are able progressively to improve the welfare of their people, to promote individual freedom and initiative, to raise living standards, improve transportation and communication, encourage international trade, the Communist countries will find themselves operating under increasingly severe handicaps.

The present and future of free-world people in this year of 1955 look good. An America of confidence, prudence, and imagination will mean that free men of 1980 will see a present—and a future—finer than our minds of today can even dream.

Address by George C. Pardee at the Municipal University of Omaha

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Municipal University of Omaha recently

celebrated the laying of a cornerstone for its new library building. This university is one of about 20 institutions of higher education, municipal in character, and occupies a very high standing among institutions of learning.

On the occasion of the cornerstone laying, Mr. George C. Pardee, president of the board of regents, delivered an oration. Mr. Pardee is completing his term as regent of the university, where, as his fellow member on that board, I have seen him officiate with great distinction. His remarks on that occasion are typical of the fashion in which he has consistently expressed himself on behalf of this university and the cause of education generally.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of his oration.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Ball, fellow regents, honored guests, faculty, students, and friends; we are met today to commemorate another important achievement in the life of this young and vigorous Municipal University of Omaha. This community has just concluded, during 1954, a year-long celebration marking the centennial of the Territory of Nebraska.

The University of Omaha will celebrate the 50th anniversary of its founding in September of 1959. Its growth and expansion, since its beginning in September 1909, has faithfully exemplified the hearty pioneering spirit and courage of our forefathers.

Lest we forget the sacrifices of those farseeing citizens of this community which made possible this university, a brief résumé of its history seems to be appropriate.

Dr. Daniel E. Jenkins was its first president when its doors opened in September 1909 with an enrollment of 26 students and a faculty of 5 persons. The campus, or plant, at that time, was the Redick home, located at 24th and Pratt Streets, together with the ciy block of ground upon which the residence was located. The first president kept body and soul together and raised a family from his earnings as a professor at the Presbyterian Theological Seminary then occupying a site within a few minutes walk of 24th and Pratt Streets.

Ten years later there was a successful drive for a $500,000 endowment fund. This, for the first time, afforded some financial stability to this growing institution. Its enrollment had reached a total of 300 students and the Redick home was replaced by a brick building to be known as Joslyn Hall, and a smaller building had been erected known as the John Jacobs Memorial Gymnasium. These buildings at the 24th and Pratt Street location constituted the plant of this growing university until it moved to its present site at 60th and Dodge Streets. The first building erected on this campus was completed in 1938.

The location of the university on this site—contiguous to Elmwood Park—was a major change in the life of this institution. Friends of the university secured the enactment of legislation in 1929 affording the people of Omaha an opportunity to decide by an election whether to have a municipal university. In 1930 the electorate said "yes" and this beautiful 51-acre campus was acquired. It was in the summer of 1930 that the Omaha Board of Education appointed the first Board of Regents of the University of Omaha as a municipal corporation and in January 1931 this board of regents formally took over the existing University of Omaha and its properties.

Since the University of Omaha became a municipal institution its presidents have been W. E. Sealock, who occupied that post from 1931 to 1935; his successor, Roland Haynes, during the years 1935 to 1948; and our esteemed president, Dr. Philip Milo Ball, who assumed those duties in 1948. The university presently consists of eight colleges and divisions, a graduate division, and a correspondence department.

In 1949 the second major structure on this campus, a fieldhouse, was erected. It was a $750,000 structure paid for from funds accumulated in anticipation of the need.

Singularly significant of the changes during the short life of this university and the pace and complexity of life today as contrasted with 1909 is the existence of our Air Force ROTC unit established in 1951. This unit has received national recognition as a leader in this field of activity.

Your university, its regents, and administration are ever alert to the challenges posed by the area it serves. Not only are the educational needs of the city of Omaha, both on the undergraduate and adult level, being served, but so are such needs in the nearby territory. This record of accomplishment is certainly worthy of the spirit of its founders.

The University of Omaha is fully accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and other significant agencies. It is included on the list issued by the Association of American Universities for such purposes. Thus, course credits of the university are accepted by other colleges and universities, throughout the country, which are members of comparable accrediting agencies. At the close of this academic year the University of Omaha will have conferred some 5,000 degrees.

The important achievement in the life of the University of Omaha which we celebrate today is the laying of the cornerstone of the third principal building erected on this campus. Ground was broken for this building in June of 1954. It is the library building located as planned in the long-range plan for buildings or physical facilities as needed.

Libraries as an adjunct to a university in the United States did not assume real stature until but comparatively recent date. True it is that as nothing more than a "museum for books" connected with a college, they have been recognized for approximately 100 years in this country. But as a true working tool of the university and a significant part of the educational process, a college library has had its development since the turn of the century, parallel to the span of life of the University of Omaha.

The trustees of Columbia University early in 1850 appointed a committee to inquire into the conduct of the institution. This committee found that the library more than fulfilled its duty since it was kept open from 1:30 to 3 p. m. on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, in compliance with an 1844 regulation. The then librarian expressed the opinion that to "double the number of hours, or from noon to 3 o'clock, on the same days, would be ample." A study made in 1849 by the librarian of the Smithsonian Institution reveals that Harvard College Library then had a total of 68,000 volumes exclusive of the libraries maintained in the professional schools. Similarly, Yale's library consisted of 47,700 volumes and was available to juniors and seniors only.

Our present library, although inadequately housed, contains over 100,000 carefully selected volumes to meet the reading needs of students in all curricular fields. A broad general collection is available to encourage independent reading. In addition, documents, film strips, recordings and other educational material, even to the extent of material on microfilm is maintained. The library is a document depository for the major publications of the United States Government.

This new library building is to be such in the fullest modern meaning of the term. It will consist of a basement, first and second floors, providing a general reading room, a reference library, a department of library science, a department of audio-visual education, a curriculum laboratory, and seminar rooms. It will include an educational unit occupying space equivalent to one-half of one full floor, providing conference rooms, lounge and small auditorium to serve the needs of the adult-education program. The building is presently scheduled for completion and occupation during the first semester of the 1955–56 academic year.

It is designed in accordance with principles of modern, functional, library planning. The books will be on open shelves with adjacent reading areas providing study facilities for each field of investigation served. The first floor, in addition to the main circulation desk, will provide a general reading room and the reference room. The Bureau of Teaching Aids, together with a complete inventory of the most modern audio-visual material, will be housed on this floor to provide effective coordination between the books and such other materials of learning. The second floor, in addition to the space for general reading and bookstacks, will provide space for the seminar rooms, the curriculum laboratory and the library science department. The adult education unit will be housed in the wing on the south of the building. The auditorium there provided will have a seating capacity of 350 persons. The lounge and four conference rooms adjacent thereto will provide efficient facilities for groups to meet and study in close proximity to the educational tools in the building.

This library building, when equipped, will represent an investment of approximately $1 million. This building, like the field house, is financed from revenues without borrowing.

These modern methods of communication typified by this library unit should not obscure the vision of the students or the faculty members to what may be thought to be the outmoded, old-fashioned dusty tome. The recent developments in the field of nuclear physics and electronics are but the fruits of the labors of many unsung heroes utilizing and extending many principles long established. The microwave transmission of voice and television pictures has been in use only 5 years. This system and a full explanation of it, together with diagrams of wooden towers, is found in a volume published in 1795 by a French scientist. The scientists participating in the modern counterpart known as the microwave, are happy to acknowledge the work of the French scientists published 160 years ago.

We cannot afford mediocrity nor its handmaidens smugness and complacency, if we are to preserve this great Republic. Everyone associated with the educational process must constantly guard against such indulgence and extravagance.

Those directing the destinies of the University of Omaha are fully aware of this challenge. Quality, and not quantity, is their objective. That objective is being pursued with devotion and may it ever be so. The ever-increasing demands made on the library attests the effectiveness of the teachers' efforts to stimulate intellectual curiosity. Those using the facilities to be made available in this library building will include the undergraduate, the graduate, and those using the adult education program. To such persons, the words of Francis Bacon are commended—"Read not to contradict and confute; nor to believe and take for granted; nor to find talk and discourse; but to weigh and consider."

Opinion of Ralph Keller, Manager, Minnesota Editorial Association, Concerning Senate Bill 1618

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, some time ago I addressed a letter to Mr. Ralph Keller, manager, Minnesota Editorial Association, of Minneapolis, Minn., asking him, as manager of that association, to give me his opinion of Senate bill 1618, a bill to permit weekly newspapers to suspend publication for not more than 2 issues in any one calendar year without loss of second-class mail privileges.

I have his reply, and I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 11, 1955.
Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR AND FRIEND: Thank you very much for writing about the Mansfield bill to permit weekly newspaper vacation lapse without loss of second class entry. And thank you most especially for graciously asking MEA comment on the proposal.

I cannot speak for our members, individually or collectively. No one can. That's the mighty power of the grassroots press, that every editor, every community, speaks for himself; we are not conformists or yes men but a mighty coaxial cable bearing not one message but hundreds, agreed on only one thing in all the vast complex of today's world: preserving individual freedom and the American way of life.

Which peroration is not to impress you but to make a point. Who is to say when and on what occasion this voice is to be stilled, this diapason muted? If it is essential that the public be constantly and continually informed, which 2 weeks can we go without this information? If we can dispense with certain newspapers for 2 weeks, why not certain others? If 2 weeks why not 20?

Frankly, I am confused by the many facets to this question. I am somewhat dismayed that it should become an issue at all. Do we close the pumping plant for the engineer to take a vacation? Do we discontinue telephone service for the rural operator (often on call 24 hours a day 7 days a week) to take a vacation? Does REA suspend service while hard-working supervisors and maintenance men get a rest?

I'm speaking personally, ED, but I believe a majority of right-thinking newspaper people, really dedicated to their calling, will go along with this reasoning. If our weekly newspapers are as essential as we represent them to be when bidding for more advertising, and greater freedom of information, and stricter laws requiring governmental accounting by publication, then they are too necessary to dispense with for 2 weeks, or 1 week, any time under any consideration. Moreover, if they are that essential to our way of life, they are certainly worthy of financial support in their respective fields to an extent that will warrant the employment of vacation help to insure continued publication while editor and publisher and staff get the required rest and change.

Finally, and this it seems to me clinches the argument against legal suspension, if the law can tell us what newspapers can suspend when, soon it will tell us what newspapers can't start when and where, what newspapers will have to suspend for one good reason or another (first economic, then social, finally political). And soon we will be as thoroughly regulated as the radio stations and even more impotent, because the air is freer than newsprint.

No sir, I appreciate the humane thoughts back of Senator MANSFIELD'S proposition, but I fear the implications far outweigh the potential benefits.

Mine is a lone voice—that, I am almost persuaded to say, of a chronic dissenter. I may be dumb and impolitic as all get out, but I stubbornly maintain a certain consistency in my leave us alone attitude.

Thanks for listening, and all good wishes to you and Mrs. Thye.

RALPH.

Colorado Project Involves More Than West—It's a Sound Investment in America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, every great public project from the Panama Canal through Grand Coulee Dam has been subjected to criticism from those who failed to recognize that this Nation's wealth depends upon adequate development of all of our natural resources.

Currently, attacks based on half-truths are being leveled against the upper Colorado River storage project which has the support of President Dwight D. Eisenhower and which has been approved overwhelmingly by the Senate.

As the facts are known, however, more and more influential journals are coming out in support of this development. For the information of the Members, I submit the following editorial from the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette:

COLORADO PROJECT INVOLVES MORE THAN WEST—IT'S A SOUND INVESTMENT IN AMERICA'S FUTURE

The Senate's action in approving the Colorado River storage project by a resounding 58-23 margin was significant from a number of points of view. It showed the Senate's firm decision to invest in the future of the underdeveloped areas of the Nation, and it demonstrated the Senate's analytical ability to sift through a mountain of propaganda chaff and get down to the hard kernel of fact.

Few issues in modern times have been the subject of so much heated controversy or have produced such a volume of propaganda as the Colorado project. It could not possibly be said that our Senators lacked information on any phase of the subject. Their vote, therefore, represented their fully considered opinion.

Senator NEUBERGER'S amendment, which would have eliminated the furiously debated Echo Park unit from the project, was decisively defeated on the way to the final vote. This may indicate—and it is to be hoped it does—that the myth of invasion of our national park system by Echo Dam has been laid to rest.

Evidence recently assembled and presented by Senator WATKINS, of Utah, clearly shows that the river channels which would be affected by Echo Park were reserved for power and water development long before Dinosaur Monument was enlarged to its present boundaries, and that these reservations were specifically recognized in the Presidential proclamation enlarging the monument.

In the light of these facts, sincere conservationists would be well advised to support the integrity of the power and water reservations as a matter of protecting their own interests. If they should succeed in invalidating a Federal guaranty of protection in one field, it would indeed set a precedent which could some day lead to the invalidation of other Federal guaranties which they so much prize—those protecting our national parks and monuments.

The Colorado project is an ideal test of national policy on the sound development of resources because it is free from arguments over public power which becloud the basic issues in discussions of many similar projects. Hydroelectric power will be produced by the Colorado project, it is true, but it is not power for power's sake. Power production is subservient to the primary development of water, just as it is in West Virginia, and privately owned utility companies in the area concerned are solidly backing the project.

The Senate has clearly labeled the Colorado project a sound investment in the future of the West and of the Nation as a whole—one which will return to the national economy far more than it costs. It is to be hoped that the House will see the issues of this case in the same clear light of fact.

United States Lists Power Rules as Lobby Drafted Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I called the attention of my colleagues to the changes being made in the historic partnership of the people and our Federal Government working together for multipurpose development of our water resources.

The change away from partnership with the people and toward partnership with the commercial utilities is discussed in the following article by Edward F. Woods, a Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

UNITED STATES LISTS POWER RULES AS LOBBY DRAFTED THEM—REGULATIONS AFFECT GOVERNMENT PROGRAM ADVERSELY—AGENCIES NOT CONSULTED

(By Edward F. Woods)

WASHINGTON, May 13.—Ten changes in Department of Interior regulations adversely affecting the operation of the Federal low-cost power program were adopted under the Eisenhower Administration verbatim as suggested by the private power lobby in the

Western States, the Post-Dispatch learned today.

The changes, the Post-Dispatch was told, were made without consultation by the Interior Department with the Rural Electrical Administration or other low-cost power agencies which they affected.

Documents in possession of the House Government Operations Commitee show that James D. Geisinger, former special assistant solicitor of the Department, submitted to Solicitor Clarence E. Davis on April 9, 1954, a list of changes which the private power companies sought in the regulations. There were 13 changes suggested, complete with text.

Ten of these were issued as regulations on August 11, 1954, exactly as the power lobby had submitted them, over the signature of Ralph Tudor, then Under Secretary of Interior. Tudor no longr is in the Department.

The new regulations were issued without publicity and became generally known only Wednesday when the House Government Operations Committee opened an investigation of this and other activities of the Department under Secretary Douglas McKay, an Eisenhower appointee.

Geisinger, now regional solicitor for the Department at Denver, informed committee investigators that the text of the proposed changes was sent to him on behalf of the private power companies by their Washington representatives.

Chiefly under fire by Democrats on the operations committee was the deletion from the regulations of a provision requiring private power companies seeking permits to build their own transmission lines over public lands to agree to permit the Federal power marketing agencies to use transmission capacity in excess of the private companies' needs for carrying power to low-cost power marketing agencies such as REA, municipalities and other public bodies.

TO AVOID DUPLICATION

The purpose of this regulation was to eliminate the need for the Government to build transmission lines duplicating those of the private power companies in order to get power from federally operated generators to the preferred market for low cost power.

In recommending that the Government's right-of-way protective clause be abandoned, Geisinger said in his memorandum to Solicitor Davis that "it would appear that the regulation is not in harmony with the present power policy." He did not amplify this statement but committee members are interpting it as a reference to the Eisenhower administration's power policy.

Among the changes in regulations adopted was one limiting the Government's charge for transmission rights-of-way to $5 a mile per year. Under the old regulations, if valuable timber land, for example, were destroyed in the course of operating the private transmission lines so that $5 rental meant financial loss to the Government, the Government could increase the fee to meet its losses.

Seriously revised was a clause requiring private companies leasing rights-of-way to comply not only with present regulations but future regulations as well. The requirement applying to future regulations was eliminated.

In another change, the private companies were relieved of having to keep the commission informed as to the locations and capacity of substations, lines, and other facilities. This information had been essential to the department in planning interlocking connections with the private lines in order to get low-cost power to the preferred customers.

Geisinger told Davis in his memorandum that "for some time, the department has been considering the possibility of amending or eliminating some of the present right-of-way regulations governing electrical transmission lines."

"Informal requests have been made of the various utilities in the Western States to make suggestions concerning such changes," Geisinger continued. The utilities, he went on, had suggested several changes and modifications "to negate possible arbitrary action, and to remove language which has become obsolete."

SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS

"Specific suggestions have been made by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. attorneys and I am advised these suggestions have the approval of attorneys representing other of the Western States utilities," Geisinger wrote.

"The suggested changes have been considered in the order and manner presented. The company quotes the regulations, crosses out objectionable language and underlines new language. This is followed by comment of the utility counsel.

"For each reference I will first set forth each section. This will be followed by the company's comment and finally by my comments."

In general, Geisinger's comments consisted of a recommendation that the private utilities' position be upheld.

Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is one of the western utilities with which the Department under the Truman administration had great difficulty over the right-of-way regulation. It had applied several times for permission to place transmission lines on Government property, but was turned down because of the regulation. The company has exercised its right to appeal directly to the Secretary for reversal of the earlier rejections.

WOULD MAKE CASES ACADEMIC

Apparently referring to this situation, Geisinger said in his memorandum to Davis:

"If the changes are made, then the legal questions raised in the pending cases would become academic and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. would undoubtedly withdraw its present appeals and make new applications for rights-of-way in accordance with the new regulations."

Geisinger and Davis are expected to appear before the committee next week.

Only one witness was heard by the committee yesterday. He was Masten G. White, who served as solicitor in the Interior Department in the Truman administration and was one of the framers of the rights-of-way regulation.

Noting that Davis had at one time questioned the legality of the regulation, White said he apparently had overlooked two very important court decisions in 1952, which had upheld the authority of the Government to require reciprocity from private power companies wishing to utilize public lands.

Idaho Power Co., which now is fighting the efforts of public power proponents to have a Government dam built on the Snake River to provide low-cost power for several Western States, figured in both cases, White said.

In one of the cases Idaho Power challenged the authority of the Federal Power Commission to impose such a condition. The United States Supreme Court ruled against the company. The other suit was against the Interior Department. In that instance the United States district court in the District of Columbia decided against the utility.

A Decade of Progress in Employing the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, in recent years great progress has been made in employing the physically handicapped in positions suited to their capacities, which has proved advantageous both to the employer and the disabled worker. Following is the prize-winning essay on this subject written by Miss Barbara Ward, of Boise, Idaho, who placed fifth in the national essay contest sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped:

A DECADE OF PROGRESS IN EMPLOYING THE HANDICAPPED

Dusk fell hot and sultry on that August evening in 1949. People sat on their porches with cool drinks in their hands, watching the sun set in myriad colors. Across the street a group of teen-agers played tag around the school building, their shouts of laughter ringing against the stone walls. One perky, red-headed girl dashed around a corner, scampered across the street, and fell on the cool grass with a sigh. Beads of perspiration glistened on her brow as she exclaimed between pants, "Boy, it's hot." Then, without waiting for a reply, she jumped up and ran back across the street to resume her play.

Perhaps you wonder what significance this incident can possibly have. For one person, it was the end of a way of living, a last glimpse of what was to be no more. It was the last time this frisky redhead would ever play tag—or run, or jump, or walk, because the next day she was stricken with polio. It could have been your daughter, or your niece, or your friend, but it wasn't. No; it was my sister.

Each year thousands of people are disabled in numerous ways: Countless diseases that come without warning, twisting and destroying the body, automobile accidents that strike as swiftly and venomously as a snake, falls that break and maim, enemy bullets that tear and sever. What happens to these people? Not so very long ago they would have been condemned to the life of an invalid. Not today. Now they take their guide dogs and canes, their wheelchairs and artificial limbs, their braces and crutches, and go out into the world, confident and assured because they know they are needed.

One might wonder what miracle lies behind this change. Only the miracle of America. Ten years ago the observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week was enacted into law. Since that time, these objectives have snowballed to greater and greater magnitude, becoming not just a week's project but a year-round job. Communities began working together toward a common goal—to see that the physically handicapped were employed. And it was not an easy task. First of all, they had to promote public understanding of the problems faced by handicapped workers. Then the employers had to be made to see that such people were able and productive workers.

Jobs had to be found for them. Employers had to be encouraged to list job openings at employment agencies. Disabled persons had to be encouraged to take advantage of rehabilitation services.

These efforts were rewarded. Soon the slogans began to hit home, and employers realized that ability counts, not disability. The handicapped employees themselves helped their cause by being able workers. To the amazement of many employers, these workers were frequently outstanding in their jobs. They had a lower accident rate, were rarely absent, quit less often, and were quick to recognize opportunity. The outstanding thing about these individuals was their desire to please. They were extremely appreciative of the opportunities given them and showed it in increased production.

Many handicapped workers were better suited to their jobs than other workers. For instance, a deaf person worked better because the noise of a factory didn't disturb him, and a blind person sorted parts faster because a light touch was all that was needed to identify each object. Yes, employers were hiring the handicapped, not out of pity, but because they realized that these individuals were an asset to their businesses.

Not only were these disabled workers doing more and better work, they were also saving the taxpayers money. Since they were no longer dependent upon the Government, the money that once was used to support them could be channeled into other Government projects, or used to rehabilitate even more handicapped persons.

Approximately 60,000 disabled persons are rehabilitated annually, and it has been proposed that this figure be increased to 200,000 by 1959. Can it be done? I am confident that it can. If so much has been done in one decade, there is no limit to what can be accomplished in the next few years. The hardest part is over. Public acceptance of the importance of handicapped workers in industry has been accomplished. And most people realize that there is always the chance of disability ahead for them. Unforeseen calamity could strike you or me as swiftly as it struck my sister, and, just as she did, we would bless the people who worked so hard to give us a chance in life. To advocate employment of the physically handicapped is a good way to insure our own future.

President Should Disregard Postmaster General Summerfield's Recommendation for a Veto on Postal Pay Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, Congress has voted overwhelmingly in favor of a pay raise for postal employees. I personally feel that most Members of Congress sincerely believe that the increase in pay for postal employees should have been at least 10 percent.

I am hopeful that the President will disregard the recommendation of Postmaster General Summerfield to veto the legislation approved by both the House and the Senate. A veto, in my opinion, does not seem justified, and would be a disservice to these faithful workers.

I herewith include an editorial which appeared on May 12 in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "Postal Workers Deserve an Increase":

POSTAL WORKERS DESERVE AN INCREASE

Senator CARLSON, of Kansas, one of the strong Eisenhower supporters in the upper branch of Congress ,predicts that the prospective veto of the postal workers' pay increase bill will be sustained.

This amounts to a forecast that President Eisenhower will veto the bill although as yet he has said no more than that he will study it. Presumably a veto would be based on the fact that the bill provides an 8.8-percent increase whereas the White House agreed to an increase of but 7.6 percent. The original administration proposal was for only 6.5 percent.

Until the President makes his present position known, it will be impossible to look very far ahead in this matter. The postal workers deserve an increase in pay—a fair and generous one and there can be no question about that. Many Member of Congress believe that the increase should average 10 percent.

But the main concern now should be not to lose an increase in a wrangle between the White House and Congress. The vote in the Senate for the 8.8-percent increase was 66 to 11 and that in the House was 328 to 66. If there are not too many defections these would suggest the possibility that a veto might well be overridden.

The President will make no mistake if he thinks twice before he follows Postmaster General Summerfield's recommendation for a veto.

Reducing Cuban Sugar Quota Would Jeopardize Our Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a letter sent to me by Mr. H. T. Jensen, of the Inland Paper Board Division, Federal Paper Board Co., Inc., of Versailles, Conn. In this letter, further support is presented for the maintenance of the present Cuban sugar quota. Mr. Jensen joins the many other American businessmen who have written me to point out that reduction of the Cuban sugar quota would seriously affect the substantial Cuban market for American goods. I commend this letter to the attention of my colleagues:

FEDERAL PAPER BOARD CO., INC.,
INLAND PAPER BOARD DIVISION,
Versailles, Conn., May 2, 1955.

Hon. ALBERT P. MORANO,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We understand that domestic sugar producers are campaigning now to reduce Cuba's United States sugar quota to below the formula fixed by Congress for 1953 through 1956. These same producers are now receiving, we understand, over $60 million a year in direct Federal subsidies.

The Cuban market indirectly affects the sale of our product, which is paper boxboard, inasmuch as cartons made from our product are used to package sugar imported from Cuba by one of the leading sugar companies of the United States, which concern is one of our largest customers. Cuba has, for many years, supplied about 50 percent of the sugar needs of our country; however, under present quotas, Cuba's share of the United States market has been reduced to about 32 percent—yet the domestic industry is demanding for itself increasing subsidized quotas at the expense of Cuba, the American taxpayer, our industry, and other American producers who sell in the Cuban market.

The Cuban people cannot buy products from the United States if they do not have the dollars with which to buy, and the exporting of sugar is their main source of income. Legislation detrimental to Cuban markets will further damage their already strained economy.

We definitely feel that the Cuban market for our products is now in jeopardy.

We respectfully urge you to oppose legislation prejudicial to Cuban sugar and to support legislation maintaining Cuba's quota under the Sugar Act, thus conserving the Cuban market for our products.

Respectfully yours,

H. T. JENSEN.

Accomplishments of Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an address delivered by the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York, before the national commission of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

I know it is not necessary for me to make any especially lauditory remarks about Bob Wagner. In emulating his late father, Senator Robert F. Wagner, he is proving to be one of the greatest mayors that the city of New York has ever had. As my friend and fellow Democrat, I am proud of the record that he is establishing as a great liberal and a great American.

His remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, DELIVERED BEFORE THE NATIONAL COMMISSION OF THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to address the leadership of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. My familiarity with its accomplishments goes back many years. I have watched with great interest its sustained efforts toward civic betterment. Those efforts have helped advance the welfare of all Americans and have been a strong educational and community asset. Organizations such as yours must not relax their efforts. There is a greater need today for expanded activities in the area of your special interest than at any time in the past.

Life has grown vastly more complex and so has the administration of municipalities like New York, whose problems have kept constant pace with the rapid increase in its population. We are forced to deal with these problems on a much more imaginative plane. New times call for new methods, and new skills on the part of municipal authorities.

We have accordingly given a high priority to an area that has been your particular concern, what you call human relations. Reduced to explicit terms, this involves the ability of the diverse elements in our population to live and work together in harmony, mutual tolerance, and esteem. As you well know, this is not a simple matter, especially in our own community where so many different religious and racial stocks live side by side.

The people of the city of New York have shown a heartening ability to live together peaceably. And much has been contributed toward this end by numerous voluntary organizations. But the official authorities cannot shirk their own responsibilities. The consequences are too costly.

And so I am happy to announce that, commencing next month, we are making a fresh start in a major area of city administration to develop the special skills and knowledge required in the proper handling of intergroup relations. The police department is setting up an in-service training program that will last through June. The pilot project is a first step in the permanent establishment of special training in the field of human relations and the handling of juvenile delinquency for all members of the force. Over 3,000 patrolmen will be involved in this initial training program.

The modern police officer must be equipped with more than his gun and manual. We hope that this new training program will provide him with a knowledgable approach to people and situations which breed tension and trouble. I hope this program will ultimately lead to a greater consciousness and awareness of human relations factors throughout every police precinct from the captain down.

At first glance, this may sound like the encouragement of an anomalous role for the policeman, that of the social worker. But virtually all trouble, stemming from various social, psychological, and other background factors, starts at the policeman's level.

Police work can be routine, or even fall short of that. It can also reflect intelligence, knowledge, and vision. The police precinct can be a powerful force for good in the local area. It has often proven particularly effective in its impact on one of our most resistant problems, juvenile delinquency.

We hope to bring to our training program much thought and expertness. It will be built up on the most advanced methods of instruction developed in this special area. In this we welcome the cooperation of the Anti-Defamation League and other voluntary agencies.

Such organizations have already proven their value in the assistance they have rendered to the city school system, and municipal housing authorities. Education and housing, of course, are two fields where the factors of human relations loom as large as they do in law enforcement.

I take particular pride in the increasing emphasis the city's educational leadership has given to these factors. This is something to be most thankful for. Here, after all, is where the molding of the good citizen starts, the good American who likes his fellows, regardless of race, creed, or national origin.

Deserving of special tribute are the effective audiovisual institutes dealing with human relations materials and techniques that have been conducted for all our public schools by the Anti-Defamation League under the auspices of the Board of Education. These workshops have been most instructive to the teachers of our vast school system. They have also benefited officials of the parents' associations and leaders of our community.

These workshops have expanded our knowledge and use of the important science of human relations.

Housing is another highly crucial area where this science can function most effectively. The city of New York has devoted itself to a constantly expanding program of public housing, where accommodations are available on the basis of need, without regard to race or creed. The city's numerous housing projects are tenanted by people of all faiths and colors, living side by side in harmony.

The problems of slum clearance and tenant relocation, however, are very complex. They have led to some occasional discomfort and misunderstandings. But those responsible for administering this program are in constant contact with various voluntary organizations. This exchange has brought about a pooling of the most expert experience in the handling of the program, with due regard to the human relations factors.

There was a time, not too long ago, when an official preoccupation with the purely human element, or its corollary social factor, would have been looked upon with some contempt, as a frill, or even worse, an aberration. Human beings were considered less important in a municipality than transportation or the securing of franchises, sanitation, street lighting, or law enforcement on the most elementary plane. Important as some of these are, we have come a long way in officially recognizing all the elements in the whole local picture.

Towering above all is the people of the community. Mussolini may have drained Italy's marshes, but his people were led to destruction. Hitler built an impressive autobahn. He also erected some glittering municipal structures that finally buried the German people under their debris. The Moscow subway has been described as architecturally beautiful, and the trains are said to run on time. But the Muscovites live in an atmosphere of stifling suspicion and jump with fear at the sound of a stranger's voice.

This may sound trite, but it is worth repeating, the climate of a community is only as healthy as the people living there. The people give the city its soul and personality. New York's skyscrapers are impressive indeed, but more so is the city's fine cosmopolitan spirit.

On behalf of our city I welcome you and trust that your deliberations will continue to be as fruitful as your noble heritage warrants.

Reluctance to Govern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following very fine editorial which appeared in the May 15, 1955, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald:

RELUCTANCE TO GOVERN

Polio immunization is about to start again. We hope that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has learned something from its unhappy experience. For it has certainly emerged from the first stage of the immunization program with its prestige very badly impaired. The Department seems to have suffered from at least a partial paralysis of leadership at a time when a positive program was critically needed.

There have been two problems in connection with the Salk vaccine. One has involved control of the product. The other has involved control of the product's distribution. Control of the product itself is clearly a statutory responsibility of the Public Health Service. It is easy to say from the vantagepoint of hindsight that the PHS control should have been more firm and stringent than it was. If there is any single overriding criticism of the immunization program, it is that the whole affair has come too fast. But it ought to be equally easy to recognize that with announcement that the Salk vaccine had been proved safe and effective for the prevention of polio, the PHS was under formidable pressure to let the vaccine get to the public as speedily as possible. It relaxed the testing requirements—with tragic results.

The results have been tragic not only for the families whose children contracted polio following vaccination, but tragic for the immunization program as a whole; the program will henceforth be subject to doubts and challenges which should never have been permitted to arise. The PHS needs to be absolutely sure that every reasonable safeguard has been observed respecting the vaccine to be released from now on. In this connection, it is perhaps worth noting that planned mass injections against polio have been canceled in Sweden, where it has been disclosed that one-third of the Swedish vaccine did not stand the final test. Disturbing reports from the United States had something to do with the decision of the Swedish Board of Health.

The kind of triple checking now in order will probably slow up vaccine production. A question arises, therefore, in regard to an uncertainty suggested by President Eisenhower himself—that the onset of the polio season might make it desirable to delay further vaccination until the fall. This is a question to which the Surgeon General ought to give an authoritative and unequivocal answer.

Assuming a decision to go ahead immediately with the immunization program, the distribution problem looms anew. We do not know at this point when supply of vaccine will catch up with demand. His newspaper initially shared the Surgeon General's confidence in the workability of what he called voluntary controls; but that confidence is now somewhat clouded. It is high time, at any rate, for Dr. Scheele and Secretary Hobby to make perfectly clear what controls they want the public, the medical profession, and the pharmaceutical laboratories to observe voluntarily. A voluntary program, as we have said before, can work only if there is a program.

Public Service: A Rewarding Trust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Public Service: A Rewarding Trust," delivered by George C. McConnaughey, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, before the Ohio Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters' convention at Cincinnati, Ohio, on March 17, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC SERVICE—A REWARDING TRUST

(An address by George C. McConnaughey, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, before the Ohio Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters Convention, Cincinnati, Ohio, Thursday, March 17, 1955)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members of the Ohio Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters and friends, your invitation to be here is just like asking me to come home, and equally appreciated. It emphasizes the truth of an old saying, "You can take the boy out of the country, but you can't take the country out of the boy." No one will ever be able to take the love for Ohio out of me. Particularly, my love for this part of Ohio.

I was born at Hillsboro. We have always contemplated the annexation of Cincinnati—we are just waiting for it to develop a little more. The name "Hillsboro" does not mean that we are not on the level.

We all realize that one of the purposes of this meeting is to make it possible for radio and television broadcasters to exchange ideas for the mutual good of all of us. Since most of you work with a company or person who holds a license from the Federal Communications Commission, I believe it is appropriate for me as Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission to speak to you on this subject.

My duty as Chairman of the FCC and one of 7 commissioners appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, is to administer the Federal Communications Act as passed by Congress. And I didn't want to pass over lightly, the part about Senate confirmation—should I say more? But seriously, I consider it a singular honor to be confirmed by the United States Senate.

The Federal Communications Commission is an arm of the legislative branch of the United States Government and as such, it is my philosophy that we should work harmoniously with the Legislative Branch of the Government. That was my philosophy at the State level when I was chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio and it remains the same at the Federal level. Congress is vitally interested in the subjects over which the Commission has jurisdiction, as quite properly they should be, since ours is a sensitive regulatory process and almost our every act affects the public welfare of the people of this country.

May I also emphasize, that one of the outstanding honors that was bestowed upon me, was my appointment to be Chairman of FCC by our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower. Since he represents all of the people of the greatest Nation in the world, I wish that all of you could have the opportunity of meeting him. I am certain that you would be inspired as I was, to render the greatest possible patriotic public service for your country. It is a great privilege for me to be associated with such an inspirational leader as our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Speaking of public service, I am sure that all broadcasters, realize that every license granted by the FCC is a public trust to be used in the public interest. This cannot be over emphasized. Broadcasters in their efforts to solve their financial and technical problems tend to forget that their license to operate is like a determinal grant—"to be used so long as it is used in the public interest and no longer." So you can see that a licensee does not have an absolute property right but holds his privilege to broadcast so long as his enterprise is conducted in the public interest and no longer. In other words his license should terminate when he ceases to operate in the public interest.

This is not a sermon on public service but is a statement of the criteria which will enable us all to see how well we measure up to the ideal standards. There is no one who appreciates more the fine work that the broadcasters have done in the past than myself. This is evidenced by the fact that the people of the United States are the recipients of the finest programs in all the world. Indeed, I want to salute and congratulate you on an outstanding job admirably done. The reason you are entitled to congratulations and also the purpose of this meeting is to devise means and methods for increasing your ability to furnish public service. This tends to promote refinement and progress in your art.

I have been with the FCC since October and the longer I stay there the gerater appreciation I have of our problems. I, too, have many times strived and even reached for a magic wand and Utopian solution to many of these problems. But I find as you probably find that I am plodding along laboriously trying to do a good job day to day. We must, however, anticipate tomorrow with all its unknowns in our efforts to solve today's problems.

This reminds me of an experience that a friend of mine had several years ago in our western mountains. Some Indians had told him about the beauty of the Turkey Lakes on the other side of the Continental Divide. After he had journeyed some distance in the mountains he ran across a sheepherder and asked him about the way to the Turkey Lakes. He told him to follow the small stream up the canyon. He said, "When you come to the end of the stream it will look like you are walled in on all sides." He continued, and told him to go up even though the stone walls on all sides looked like there was no way out. He said that my friend would find a crevice which leads to the top a way out of this walled canyon. My friend reported to me that he found his way to the rim of the canyon and from there he could see the beautiful Turkey Lakes in the distance. His appreciation of the grandeur of this scene was magnified because of the difficulty he experienced in finding his way out of the canyon.

Many of the difficult problems confronting the FCC such as the UHF–VHF problem; subscription TV; network questions; daytime sky wave; clear channels, boosters, satellites, seem to be walled in and fraught with such difficulties that the solution is not immediately apparent. However, that does not mean that there is not a crevice or a way leading to their accomplishment. Certainly the hazards encountered will make their solution appear no less atractive than the Turkey Lakes. And it is with the same undaunted purpose that we approach these problems confident of ultimate satisfactory solutions. Now at least you cannot say that I did not talk turkey to you.

I was about to mention to you that at the present time our Nation is served by more than 700,000 radio transmitters, 51,000,000 telephones and 3,500,000 channel miles of telegraph. The broadcast authorizations now exceed 6,100; 2,800 being commercial AM stations, 580 commercial TV stations, 35 educational TV stations, 550 commercial FM stations, 125 educational FM, 39 international and 2,000 pickup, studio transmitter links, and other auxiliary stations. The Commission operates on approximately a $7 million a year budget.

As I recite these statistics, it occurs to me that you might be more interested in a specific qualitative analysis of a specific subject than in a quantitative analysis of the amount of work that the Commission handles during the period of a year.

This reminds me of a story about a local preacher who had a church up in the mountains near Casper, Wyo. He was going to have a big revival and thought it would be a great event if he could have his good friend, Bishop Smith, from New York City, to preach the opening sermon. He invited the bishop and the bishop consented to be there on January 15. When the bishop got to Wyoming he found that they were having a severe snowstorm and blizzard. In fact the snow was about 5 feet deep and drifting. By chartering a small airplane and riding horseback for many miles he arrived at the church on time. But to his surprise there was no one there except a long-lean westerner who said he was the janitor. The church was warm and after he and the janitor sat there a while they decided that no one else was coming on account of the terrible storm. The bishop said to the tall westerner that he had prepared a 2-hour sermon and that it was his duty to carry the message of God and he would just like to know since he had come all this way, if the janitor would like to hear his sermon. The westerner was somewhat taken off guard and before he could answer, the bishop started to preach. More than 2 hours later, when the bishop concluded he asked his western friend how he like the sermon. He drawled out that he thought that perhaps it was a bit long. Then the bishop said, "If you were going across the prairie and had a truckload of corn in search of your herd of cattle and found one starving steer greatly in need of food, wouldn't you stop and feed the animal?" The westerner said, "I reckon I would but I wouldn't dump the whole truckload of corn on him at once."

I thought that most of you would be interested in hearings because your first contact with the Commission might be by the hearing process before a hearing examiner.

In conformity with its efforts to simplify and expedite the general broadcast hearing procedure, the Commission on July 15, 1954, announced substantial revisions of its covering rules. These modifications were adopted in the light of clarifying experience with expediting procedures previously adopted, and again after full consultation with representatives of the outside bar.

In brief, the Commission further changed its cutoff rules to require all competing applications for the same broadcast facility to be on file at least 60 days (in lieu of the previous 30) prior to the scheduled hearing, and that in broadcast cases the Commission will endeavor to give applicants 60 days advance notice of a hearing.

Each applicant now provides all parties to the hearing with a full set of exhibits to be offered as part of its direct case. Unless otherwise directed by the examiner, this exchange of exhibits takes place at least 20 days in advance of the hearing date. These exhibits contain all data which the applicants desire to submit concerning their qualifications and proposals. Oral testimony by an applicant or his witnesses, with respect to his direct case, is limited to appropriate qualifications and explanations of his exhibits, if necessary, and to such testimony in connection with the applicant's direct case in substitution of exhibits or portions thereof which may have been rejected by the examiner on grounds solely of competency or form.

In all hearings involving applications for authority to construct new broadcast stations, except for good cause found in advance by the presiding officer, prehearing conferences are held both prior to and after the exchange of exhibits, with a view to eliminating, by agreement, the necessity of proving some facts, the possibility of agreement disposing of evidentiary issues raised by the exhibits exchanged, the limitation on cumulative evidence, and numerous other matters which may effectively shorten the hearing. The second prehearing conference, in most instances, is held at least 10 days prior to the date for commencing the hearing.

There is also a provision which enables any party to obtain, upon written request, from any other party to the proceeding, such detailed information revelant to its proposals as may reasonably and timely be requested, including any material falling within eight specified categories; e. g., background and

experience, integration of ownership and management, and other matters bearing upon the criteria previously employed by the Commission in selecting between competing applicants for the same facilities.

Under these modifications broadcast hearings no longer commence, as was previously the case, with hearing conferences, but instead with the actual presentation of proof. It is no longer required that the applicants make a preliminary submission of detailed information supplemental to their applications in six different categories specified in an attachment to the Commission's letter sent to applicants prior to the designation of their applications for hearing. Also eliminated is the previous requirement that the parties state the matters upon which they propose to rely in conferences at which time the hearings were deemed to have started, but prior to the actual presentation of proof.

Findings are still made upon the basic qualifications of the applicants (legal, financial, technical, etc.) before designating their applications for hearing on a comparative basis. Thus, lengthy testimony on which no actual controversy exists continues to be eliminated.

Related expediting actions taken during the year included a February 10, 1954, rule amendment which limits the number of pleadings that may be filed in a proceeding. This was done because numerous and repetitious pleadings tended to delay and complicate Commission consideration of the cases involved, and indications were that many of these pleadings were unnecessary to disposition of the cases involved.

On August 20, 1953, the procedural rules were amended to provide that when any party fails to file exceptions within the specified time to an initial decision which proposes to deny its application, such party shall be deemed to have no interest in further prosecuting its application and the latter may be dismissed for failure to prosecute.

Recently I appointed James D. Cunningham, a career hearing examiner with more than 20 years' service, to the Office of Chief Hearing Examiner. I have appointed a committee from the Commission to work with a committee of the Federal Communications Bar Association to draft a manual for hearing examiners. This hearig examiner's manual, we believe, will accomplish a uniformity of rulings on basic evidentiary matters arising in hearings before the Commission. The statements that I have just made pertaining to hearings are exemplary of the steps that have been taken in other departments of the FCC. We feel that these are worthwhile improvements and will inure to the benefit of the public.

A condition precedent to the successful operation of any broadcasting or telecasting station is that it be a successful economic operation. In other words, you have to make a profit. It is basically fundamental that if a station does not make money it will not stay in business. After a station goes on the air one of the most important factors contributing to its financial success is appropriate programing. I have always felt that the smaller the community the more personalized the programing must be.

To appreciate what constitutes personalized, interesting, and attractive programing that fits a particular community, it is necessary for the licensee to have the feel of the community. To obtain this feel, it is necessary that the licensee become an integral part of the community by actively participating in public religious, civic, and local activities. By so doing, he would be able to know instinctively what the people of his particular locality are interested in seeing and hearing and what will contribute to the general welfare and public service of his home community. Everyone in a particular community greatly appreciates recognition whether it is on a personal, group, or organizational basis. It gives one the feeling of belonging, contributing, and self-interest. In other words, a particular broadcasting interest may partially take on the atmosphere of a cooperative community enterprise.

When this spirit of public service is obtained, it tends to go hand in hand with a proportionate amount of financial success. So we can safely conclude public service is not something that the FCC saddles a licensee with for technical and mysterious reasons. But it is a basic mandatory criteria which may be turned into a most valuable asset.

It gives me a great amount of pleasure to compliment the broadcasters and telecasters because in many respects they have accomplished profitable public service even though they may not have used my method of reasoning to realize this admirable characteristic.

As you know, certain standards with respect to the production of children's programs have been adopted by the National Association of Radio & Television Broadcasters, and are included in its standards of practice for radio programing. It may also be of interest to note that a number of bills have been introduced in Congress dealing with television and radio programing practices. For example, one bill introduced by Senators BRICKER, HUNT, and SALTONSTALL, called for the creation of a National Citibens Advisory Board on radio and television, to study among other things, programing practices. There has been a considerable amount of interest on the advisability of such legislation.

I heard a story of a man that was very hard of hearing and his friend asked him, by writing questions on his pad of paper, how he became so deaf. He told him that the doctor said that his deafness was caused by excessive drinking. For a short time he stopped drinking and found that he could hear very well. After several months, he saw his friend again, and was as deaf as in the beginning. His friend said, "Why have you started drinking again?" To which the man answered that when he could hear the things he heard were worse for him than the stuff he had been drinking.

Let's hope this talk of mine does not drive you all to drink.

You folks who are in the business of radio and television have a glorious future and it must be a delight to be in such a fascinating and rapidly expanding line of endeavor. Your opportunity to render a public service to the people of your area and at the same time receive proper remuneration for your efforts are fabulous. I have been delighted to be privileged to say a few words to you, my fellow Ohioans, today.

Albert Woolson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay certain hospital and medical expenses incurred by Albert Woolson, of Duluth, Minn., the last surviving member of the Union Army, resulting from his recent illness, and future expenses for his care and treatment. The committee report accompanying this bill points out that no precedent whatever will be set inasmuch as Mr. Woolson is the last survivor of the Union Army and the passage of this legislation is necessary and should be expedited.

Mr. Speaker, the beneficiary of this bill is a grand old man. I have always admired him. He is the last survivor of the Grand Army of the Republic. Today, at the age of 108 years, he lives with his daughter and son-in-law in Duluth, Minn. The closest VA hospital is in Minneapolis, 165 miles away. It is a long trip for an old man in an ambulance. Mr. Woolson's recent illness was a lung congestion, a dangerous condition in a man his age. When it became evident that his condition warranted hospitalization there was no time to go through the usual VA channels to enter the hospital at Minneapolis plus making the long trip by ambulance, about a 3½-hour drive. Considering Mr. Woolson's age and the gravity of his condition, the only thing to do was admit him to a non-VA hospital in Duluth. There is serious doubt that he would have survived the trip to Minneapolis, and it seems unreasonable to say of a man of Mr. Woolson's age and condition that he should have taken that long trip to Minneapolis thereby endangering his very life so he could take advantage of VA hospital care.

Under these circumstances special provision should be made to take care of the hospitalization and medical expenses incurred by Mr. Woolson during his recent illness and subsequent illness he may suffer. For instance, because of his age and condition, special nurses, oxygen, and other extraordinary hospital and medical expenses were incurred. The hospital bill for his last two illnesses is estimated not to exceed $1,200. Mr. Woolson will have to pay this large amount out of his own resources, or will have to rely upon friends, neighbors, and relatives, unless special provision is made under this bill. Inasmuch as VA services were unavailable to Mr. Woolson because of his great age and the distance involved, such special provision should be forthcoming in his case.

I think it appropriate to call to the attention of the Congress, Mr. Speaker, the fact that Mr. Woolson is the last survivor of the Grand Army of the Republic. He is the last of an era—of an Army, and if for no other reason that that he alone represents a whole era of American history, we should make some special consideration in his case. He should not be forced into the position of forfeiting his veteran's privileges merely because he is too old and sick to travel all the way to Minneapolis—nor should he be taken away from his home and friends in the sunset years of his life.

Mr. Speaker, we always honor Albert Woolson on Memorial Day and on his birthday with speeches and words of acclaim. He asks for nothing more. But this is our opportunity to provide more than words, but rather a real helping hand in time of need to this grand old gentleman, the last representative of a grand old army.

Appendix

Reemployment Rights for the Disabled Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have reprinted herein an article appearing in the April 1955 issue of Performance, a monthly publication distributed by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, the Chairman of which is my very good friend Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Mass, USMCR, retired.

The Committee is a voluntary citizens' committee which seeks to create a proper climate in which physically handicapped men and women workers can seek and find gainful employment suited to their skills and abilities. Under the able leadership of Chairman Mass, a native of my home State of Minnesota, the Committee is making an invaluable contribution in the field of the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped. We are all deeply grateful to Mel Mass for his many contributions to the betterment of his fellow man.

I also want to call my colleagues' attention to the article below, inasmuch as it tells the very heartwarming story of how the people of Cloquet and Carlton, Minn., both situated in my district, are helping a blind Korean war hero and his blind wife toward a normal and self-sufficient life.

Jack Thornton, of Carlton, Minn., who became a hero when he tried to save his foxhole buddies from an exploding hand grenade, and was blinded permanently, married Joyce Ann Campbell, who is also blind, last year and the community built a home for them. Today Jack Thornton is learning a new job at the Wood Conversion Co. plant in Cloquet, Minn., thanks to the work of Mr. Mass' committee and the farsightedness of the management of the Wood Conversion Co. Jack has memorized the specially built control panel which enables him to operate a shredder at the plant. Signals from other parts of the production,, normally relayed by flashing lights, will reach him via horn system.

The article is as follows:

REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS FOR THE DISABLED VETERAN

(By Adelbert C. Long, liaison officer, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights, U. S. Department of Labor)

History will look back on section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act as a significant milepost in the long history of veterans' benefits and rehabilitation of the physically handicapped.

It took the medical profession hundreds of years to progress from the pegleg of Long John Silver and the iron claw of Captain Hook to the ingenious prosthetic appliance of my fellow worker who, unknown to most of his close friends, lost a leg in northern Africa. And it took society equally as long to accept any real change in its concept of veterans' benefits from the land-grant reward that Rome gave Horatius:

"They gave him of the cornland,
That was of public right,
As much as two strong oxen
Could plow from morn till night."

to the right that Napoleon gave his old veterans to live out the rest of their lives at the Hotel Des Invalides. For it was not until Congress passed the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 that there developed a brandnew philosophy that a government which could constitutionally compel a person to leave his employment to enter military service could also require his employer to reemploy him upon his release from service, "since the life and property of the employer as well as the lives and property of everyone in the United States are defended by such service."

It took Congress only 8 short years to take the next epoch-making step and add these important words to the reemployment rights section of the Universal Military Training and Service Act: "If not qualified to perform the duties of such position by reason of disability sustained during such service but qualified to perform the duties of any other position in the employ of the employer, be restored to such other position the duties of which he is qualified to perform as will provide him like seniority, status, and pay, or the nearest approximation thereof consistent with the circumstances in his case."

But it is not enough to just pass a law to fulfill the intent of Congress and really assist the thousands of ex-servicemen who come under the protection of the reemployment rights statutes. The Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights in the United States Department of Labor is faced with the difficult task of the day-by-day administration of this important law.

The significance of this bread-and-butter veterans' benefit to the entire field of industrial relations was recognized when Congress in 1947 placed the responsibility for administration of the program with the Secretary of Labor through the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights.

Reemployment rights encompass much in the field of industrial relations, involving the management practices of business and the professions, wage and salary structures, and the collective bargaining agreements between management and labor; also, they are defined, clarified, and sometimes muddled by several hundred court decisions. Thus, the task of assisting a nonhandicapped veteran often ranges from simple compliance actions, such as providing correct and applicable information, to roundtable conciliatory negotiations or referral of the cases to the Department of Justice for court action. But this is relatively simple and easy compared to the efforts often expended on restoring a disabled veteran to "such other position the duties of which he is qualified to perform as will provide him like seniority, status and pay, or the nearest approximation thereof consistent with the circumstances in his case."

Such situations often require a review of his Veterans' Administration medical history (with the veteran's permission, of course), consultation with other medical authorities, a study of jobs in the plant, conferences with vocational and rehabilitation specialists and job analysts, and the utilization of many other community facilities to try and find a suitable job for such handicapped ex-servicemen. But while this section of the law taxes the ingenuity and experience of the Bureau's staff, they are repaid many times in their personal satisfaction of finally placing a handicapped veteran in a job which will put him once more in the labor market as a full-fledged, self-supporting member of his home community.

Vincent McCoy, the Bureau's area representative in Minneapolis, simply glows with Minnesota pride when he tells how a veteran's hometown, his employer, the Veterans' Administration, two veterans' service officers, the newspaper and, in fact, everybody, all worked together to welcome a totally blind Korean veteran home with a wife, a job, and a new house. Jack Thornton was fighting with the Thunderbird Division (the 45th Infantry) in Korean when he seized a hand grenade thrown by the Reds and attempted to hurl it back to save himself and three other soldiers in his foxhole. It exploded and Jack Thornton won the Distinguished Service Cross but lost his sight.

When Jack got back home there was no reluctance on the part of G. F. Allen, personnel director of the Wood Conversion Co., to give him his full reemployment rights. It was only a question of finding the right job, converting a machine so he could handle it, clarifying his seniority rights to a different job classification, and other little details of a similar nature.

Mr. K. S. Rondesvedt, Veterans' Administration Rehabilitation training officer, surveyed all the jobs in the plant and suggested necessary technical changes and a machine conversion so that Jack could operate it. Mr. Allen had some of his engineers get busy on this. Meanwhile, Carlton County Veterans' Service officer, Charles Buehre, and Veterans of Foreign War Post Service officer, Howard Melde, kept a close eye on all the efforts to put Jack back on the job. "Vince" McCoy, the Bureau's area representative, clarified the industrial relations problems of seniority and job classification.

While this was all going on, Harry Lawrence of the Carlton County News Graphic and the Pine Knot, local weekly newspapers, sparkplugged a community drive to provide a new house. Because Jack Thornton wasn't just loafing around all this time, he was busy courting and finally marrying pretty Joyce Campbell. To top it all off, Pope Pius XII sent a scroll with his personal blessings.

Of course, all reemployment rights cases don't have the glamorous trimmings of a blind hero, a romantic wedding, a good boss, and a charming new home in a wonderful town like Cloquet, Minn.

Harvey Driscoll, the Bureau's regional representative in Atlanta, spent a lot of time and effort in reinstating a veteran who had lost his left hand and couldn't perform the heavy duties of his former job. With the employer's cooperation, however, the veteran

is once again employed and with the protection of his full seniority.

V. J. Meyl, the Bureau's regional representative in the Washington, D. C., office, became quite familiar with workmen's compensation laws and second injury claims before he got a veteran with defective vision back to work in a steel mill.

Jack Warshaw, in the Cleveland office, had lengthy negotiations with company officials and two different unions before he was able to restore a veteran who had lost the use of his left hand.

And sometimes employers don't cooperate. Jim Higgins, regional representative in Kansas City, insisted upon the reemployment of a diabetic veteran whose employer was most reluctant to reemploy him. The veteran thanked him for his efforts, and wrote, "They (the employer) said they would have to put me back to work or face a court fight, so the next day, November 18, I was called back to work. I again wish to thank you for all your help."

And so it goes in all 17 offices of the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights every day throughout the country. A good law on the books and the earnest, sincere efforts of these specialists in reemployment rights spell self-respect and gainful employment for hundreds of returning handicapped veterans.

Big Four Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, in regard to the proposed Big Four conference, I should like to insert in the RECORD the following interview with Dr. Joseph A. Mikus:

The Catholic Universe Bulletin, Cleveland, Ohio, published in its issue of April 29, 1955, the following interview with Dr. Joseph A. Mikus, director of the Slovak League Press Bureau in Washington, D. C.:

"EX-SLOVAK DIPLOMAT SAYS: 'BIG FOUR CONFERENCE? SURE, IF RUSSIA—'

"A former Slovak diplomat here this week urged the west to demand that Russia first establish basic human rights in Red-ruled nations before agreeing to any Big Four conference.

"He is Joseph Mikus, doctor of political science and director of the Slovak League Press Bureau, Washington. His remarks were made in an interview and in a talk at a fourth-degree Knights of Columbus banquet honoring Abbot Theodore Kojis, of St. Andrew Abbey.

"Mikus was in the diplomatic service of Slovakia before the Communists took the country. He escaped in 1948 and has been in the United States 3 years.

"He said the captive peoples of Europe will look upon any East-West conference as a sellout—unless the West takes a firm and united moral stand for individual freedom. He said the free world should demand that the Kremlin guarantee certain minimum conditions before any meeting. He added:

" 'Those conditions must apply to Russia and its satellites and include:

" 'Freedom of religion—no government can rule with justice if it attempts to separate the people from God.

" 'Right of habeas corpus—no state can imprison a man without making a charge and bringing him to a speedy trial before an impartial court. I was in prison three times, for months at a time, and was never charged with any crime.

" 'Free elections—the government must receive its power from the people.

" 'Those are the minimum conditions. Suppression of those basic rights by the Kremlin is the heart of the East-West problem. There can be no solutions, no agreements, until Russia restores those freedoms—or the United States surrenders them.'

"Mikus said the West must demand that Russia respect its obligations to the U. N. or get out.

"He doesn't expect the Communists to accept those demands. But he thinks that their rejection will give the West a chance to take the propaganda ball away from the Kremlin.

"He said the United States should pursue a propaganda appeal to the nationalism of 128 millions living in the captive nations—the Ukraine, White Russia, Poland, Slovakia, Bohemia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and the Baltic countries. Mikus pointed out that the Communists have had great success in appealing to the nationalism of colonial peoples. He said that we can turn that weapon against the Reds. He added:

" 'Such a series of actions would create an entirely new world situation. It would produce instability in the Kremlin orbit. It would begin the disintegration of communism from within.

" 'But first the West must stiffen its attitude toward Moscow. When these captive peoples rise up, we must be ready to help; ready to supply them with guns—just as the Communists do in stirring up trouble in the free world.' "

A Joint Committee on the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the power of the purse is the constitutional birthright of Congress. But the efforts of Congress to control expenditures have been repeatedly frustrated in recent years. Recurring Treasury deficits, huge Federal outlays for defense and civilian purposes, and the rising burden of the public debt, are fundamental factors in inflation and jeopardize the fiscal solvency of the Nation.

There is growing recognition that Congress is poorly organized and equipped to perform its fiscal control function, that is, the function of reviewing and passing on the Federal budget and determining the fiscal policies of the Government. No substantial change has been made in the process of congressional review of the budget since the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 was adopted. Legislative procedures which may have been adequate 35 years ago in reviewing annual budgets of less than $4 billion seem ill-designed to cope with the $65 billion budgets of today.

In the simpler days of earlier decades members of the appropriations subcommittees could intelligently review the smaller budget requests of executive agencies. But today the activities of the Federal Government have become so vast in scope and size, extending not only throughout this country but throughout the world, and the Federal budget has become so big and complex that Congress is no longer able to cope with it effectively.

There is an insistent and growing demand both in Congress and among the taxpayers that we develop a more efficient and effective system of handling the annual appropriation bills. Critics say that the existing fiscal machinery and procedures of Congress are fragmented and dispersive, affording little or no coordination in the consideration of revenue and spending measures. The appropriation process is piecemeal in nature, each supply bill being separately considered by different subcommittees in each chamber, but without consideration of their interrelationships or of the overall aspects of expenditure and revenue programs.

The recurring logjam of appropriation bills at the end of recent sessions of Congress has required the passage of a series of continuing resolutions in order to keep the Government going. This has handicapped the planning of public programs and delayed the adjournment of Congress. The public business cannot be operated successfully or economically when its policies and programs are held in suspense for several weeks or months of the new fiscal year.

For many years congressional review of the President's budget estimates has failed to achieve a balanced budget or substantial economies. Reductions voted by the House of Representatives have been largely restored by the Senate. In many cases the cuts ordered by Congress have merely postponed the necessary appropriations which were subsequently made up by deficiency measures. Sometimes reductions voted by Congress have been arbitrary, such as flat-percentage cuts or rigid limitations on personnel or other items. Arbitrary or meat-ax reductions, flat-percentage cuts, and rule-of-thumb restrictions raise a question concerning the ability of Congress intelligently to review the President's budget.

Congressional control of public spending is affected by the stake which various organized interest and sectional groups have acquired in particular appropriations such as subsidies to farmers and shippers and appropriations for public improvements. Responsibility for Federal finances is diffused in Congress between various legislative committees which authorize expenditure programs and the Committees on Appropriations which appropriate funds to carry on these programs. The budget submitted by the President is broken into bits and pieces and considered piecemeal by 10 subcommittees in each House, each acting independently of the others.

A true budget includes income as well as expenditures, but for almost a century separate committees in Congress have passed on tax legislation and expenditure programs. The revenue program is not regarded as a part o fthe budget and hence over-all consideration of fiscal policy is never achieved. As a result of these conditions there is a growing belief in Congress and among students of public finance that basic reforms need to be made in our Federal budget system.

Numerous proposals for improving the budgetary procedures of Congress have been made in recent years. The most promising among them, I believe, is that for the creation of a Joint Committee on the Budget. A Joint Budget Committee was created by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—section 138—but it has failed to function since 1949. There is strong sentiment in Congress, however, for its revival. Bills to recreate a Joint Committee on the Budget have been introduced in both Houses in the last three Congresses. And the McClellan bill has twice passed the Senate, first on April 8, 1952, by a vote of 55 to 8, and second on May 23, 1953, under unanimous consent. Senator McClellan has again introduced his bill, S. 1805, in the current Congress.

CASE FOR A JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE

First. A Joint Committee on the Budget would give Congress that overall, coordinated view of Federal revenues and expenditures which the existing fiscal machinery of Congress fails to furnish. The revenue committees are tax-minded; the appropriating committees are expenditure-minded; what is now needed is a budget-minded committee that will look at both the income and outgo sides of the fiscal picture in their interrelationships.

Second. The Joint Budget Committee would inform and advise, but not supersede or trespass upon the jurisdiction of, the separate standing Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate. It would have functions on the spending side similar to those performed on the revenue side since 1926 by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. The latter committee with a competent staff has rendered invaluable assistance to the taxing committees of Congress for a quarter of a century. Similar results may well be expected from a joint budget committee.

Third. Under the existing system of separate appropriating committees, the whole complex problem of considering the expenditure needs of the Government is considered twice by two bodies acting independently. Apart from the additional work thereby entailed, this system provokes differences of opinion that often threaten to deadlock the two Houses and cause long delays in conference. At best, these differences can only be adjusted through resort to conference committees, whose action is rarely satisfactory to either House. The proposed joint budget committee would facilitate agreement between the two Houses in the formulative stages of the appropriation process, and thus tend to minimize later differences and avoid the disadvantages and delays of the conference committee system.

Fourth. The Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 set up a procedure for the orderly formulation by the Executive of fiscal proposals and for their submission to the Congress as a unified budget. No comparable procedure has been set up in Congress for considering revenues and expenditures together as two interrelated aspects of a single problem. Some such innovation would improve the efficiency of the Government and allow better coordination between the executive and legislative branches in the fiscal field. Broadly conceived, the proposed Joint Committee on the Budget would in effect be a lens through which all appropriation and revenue measures could be viewed in relationship both to what the Nation needs and to what the Nation can afford.

Fifth. With the great growth of the Federal Government and its functions, some method of reducing the burdens of bicameralism in the appropriation process seems advisable. A joint committee to coordinate the action of both chambers is obviously better suited to the survival of soundly conceived executive budget programs or to the substitution of legislative plans than are separate committees in each chamber acting entirely independently of each other.

Sixth. The joint committee would concern itself largely with major categories of both sides of the budget program, would endeavor to correlate all fiscal and economic implications, and would, with its avowed interest in the balancing problem, express its views on maximum limits for revenues and expenditures.

Seventh. It is contemplated that the joint committee would deal chiefly with the broad aspects of the budget and would not supplant the other fiscal committees of Congress. A budget reviewed on the basis of conferences between the members and staff of the joint committee on the one side, and Budget Bureau officials on the other, would be presented to Congress with added prestige, since it would represent not only the opinion of the President, but also, to a greater or lesser extent, that of key Members of Congress.

Eighth. Such a joint committee would be a definite, permanent, and continuously available agency to which Congress would look for the development and maintenance of a systematic fiscal program, and which would be in a position to indicate limits on both revenues and expenditures.

Ninth. The desirability of increased expert staff aids for the Appropriations Committees has been long felt and frequently advocated by their own members. With annual budgets now running around $65 billion, a larger and more expert appropriation staff is obviously needed to make a much more intensive scrutiny and screening of the President's budget requests than the present small staffs of those committees are able to make. Economy can be gained only by detailed knowledge of every request for funds and the actual need for them.

How Great Is Our Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have inserted in the Record some timely observations by Fred W. Slater, one of the outstanding newspapermen of the Midland Empire, which appeared in the St. Joseph News-Press, St. Joseph, Mo., on Tuesday, May 3, 1955. This article is a timely reminder to the people of America of the vital role of the great valley in our economy and national defense:

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

The frontier a century ago, the Mississippi Valley today is not only the geographic but also the economic heart of the Nation. That conviction grows on one after reading How Great Is Our Valley, a publication of the Mississippi Valley Association. Today, where trappers and hunters were the only businessmen, vast agricultural and industrial developments have taken place. Despite the rapid strides made in a century, the full potential of industry, commerce and transportation in the valley cannot be estimated.

Few persons realize that the Mississippi Valley, composed of major parts or all of 23 States, is rapidly becoming the world's greatest manufacturing, commercial, agricultural, and mining center. The goal of the association, as outlined in their pamphlet, is to safeguard and advance the economic security and prosperity of the entire area. It is particularly interested in the development of industry in the midcontinent area where it is close to the sources of raw material, and the center of population as well as being remote from future foreign aggression.

As many realize, the Mississippi Valley Association is primarily interested in water problems, such as improvement of rivers for navigation, adequate flood control, and conservation of water resources. At the same time, the association is also interested in the practical development of a coordinated system, not only of waterways, but also of railways, highways, airways, and pipelines. Such a system, the group believes, should be developed to give the area a competitive parity with other parts of the Nation. It is also promoting an expanded export trade with the area and the gulf area and the formulation of a sound permanent agricultural program.

The pamphlet describes this part of the Nation as "A country that gives substance to a man's dreams, that gives him room to achieve his ambition. A country whose fat black soil gives food in minerals and timber, water and power, and transportation provide the raw stuff of which our American way of life is formed." Maximum benefits can be obtained, the association believes, by furtherance of flood control, navigation, irrigation, power development, soil conservation, upstream flood prevention, wildlife conservation, reforestation, recreation, and conservation of underground waters. The program is ambitious and farreaching and it must be if the area is to achieve its rightful destiny.

Of particular interest to the Midland Empire area are the sections of its platform dealing with this section of the valley. One goal is the completion of authorized agricultural levees to protect 1,500,000 acres of Missouri River bottom land and public and private installations worth in excess of $2 billion. Another is a 9-foot channel from Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth of the Missouri as well as appropriations for channel and bank stabilization work on the same stretch. The levees, the association notes, would prevent recurring, staggering losses from floods and other basin work would insure sufficient water during drought periods to provide water for municipalities as well as carry sewage discharges in a safe fashion.

Take a look at a map the next time you have a chance and see just how large this Mississippi Valley is. It stretches from the Appalachians to the Rockies and from the

Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico. The Mississippi and Missouri Rivers and their web-like tributary are the moist filaments which hold the area together. Look at it again and think of the crops it grows, the products it manufactures, and you will realize it is truly the workshop, the foodshop, and the natural resources storehouse of America.—F. W. S.

New Press Credo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 18, 1955, setting forth a new press credo by Ogden Reid, the able, dynamic, and progressive young president and publisher of one of America's great newspapers, the New York Herald Tribune. This is well worth reading:

OGDEN REID OFFERS NEW PRESS CREDO—FIRST ESTATE, NOT FOURTH, HE SAYS

Ogden R. Reid, president and publisher of the New York Herald Tribune, offered last night a new credo for the American free press which, he said, faces a major change today in a world contrasting in both time and space.

He called on the press to assert aggressively its support of the traditional American liberties with new sense of responsibility and with vigorous adherence to its own traditional principles of fearlessness of action, integrity of news reporting, and editorial candor.

SIGMA DELTA CHI DINNER

Addressing the 23d annual journalism awards dinner of Sigma Delta Chi, honorary journalism fraternity, at the Waldorf-Astoria, Mr. Reid said the fourth estate has now become the first estate, because without the free press there can be neither freedom nor free government. The press, he said, today must help to make history, not just write it.

Basic to a credo for the free press in this period of history, he asserted, should be the reaffirmation of certain inalienable truths by which this Nation has guided itself to greatness. Freedom, civil liberties, staunch partnership with other free nations, freedom of enterprise, responsible management-labor relations, a strong 2-party system and willingness to provide haven for the oppressed are among those he cited.

Prefacing his credo with words uttered by great editors of the past on fundamentals of a free press, Mr. Reid turned to the changes which have overtaken the press today through such new media of communication as radio, television, and motion pictures and the development of news magazines. These, he said, will help to give healthy stimulation to the press and all will be able to live with each in mutual prosperity.

CREDO FOR THE FREE PRESS

Mr. Reid outlined the credo for the free press as follows:

"I. Today, we are the first estate and not the fourth, for without the free press, there can be neither freedom nor free government.

"II. We must help make history—not just write it. A passive press that only records, will write itself and freedom into oblivion.

"With objectivity in the news: candor and firmness on the editorial page—we must thoughtfully and resolutely direct the searchlight of truth on the great problems and opportunities of our time.

"We must continue to win the respect of all readers in the absolute integrity of the news columns. The right of the reader to all the facts is paramount. A reporter should not allow emotion or personal opinion to distort the news he writes.

"III. Our actions must be characterized by independence and courage. The conscience of America and the free world must be our guide. No government or party must sway us from what we believe to be right and just.

"IV. We must hold aloft our ideals and calmly seek practical solutions to them. The cynic and the special pleader should hold no high place in our counsels. We must always have the courage to hope and to believe.

"V. We must reaffirm certain inalienable truths, namely:

"(a) Our freedom is inseparable from the freedom of others. We cannot give our sanction to slavery wherever it may exist.

"(b) Individual rights, due process and the maintenance of our civil liberties are basic to all other freedoms, including that of the free press.

"(c) Godless communism cannot win against an aroused, God-fearing, and spiritually minded nation and world.

"(d) The United States should stand as a strong, steady partner with its allies and member nations of the free world—dedicated to peace, but never at any price.

"(e) Governments are created to humanely serve mankind, not to enslave it. Equally, government office is a public trust to be given not lightly and entrusted only to the worthy.

"(f) The economy of our country and that of the free world must rest on freer trade and greater monetary convertibility. Free enterprise, that has the initiative to discharge its social responsibilities, is basic to our economic way of life. The dream of individual opportunity and liberty must not be lost sight of in the quest for security. Collective bargaining—on the part of management and labor—must be both responsible and flexible, if economic statesmanship is to prevail over economic politics.

"(g) A strong two-party system is basic to our form of government. The constitutional balance between the Federal Government and the States, along with a proper separation of powers between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, must be vigorously maintained. The active participation of our citizens in local, municipal, and State government is necessary if our political system is to stay dynamic and representative of all.

"(h) The United States must stand, always, as the haven for the oppressed and dispirited—the land that welcomes the courageous and the hard working.

"A free press will remain free only so long as its practitioners are free from fear, from politics, from yielding to pressure groups, from cowardice—free, at all times, to print whatever is believed to be right for our people and our country. To all these freedoms we are dedicated."

Articles by George D. Dean Give Clear Analysis of Trinity River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George D. Dean, the associate editor of the Sacramento Bee, in Sacramento, Calif., has written some excellent articles which appeared in the Sacramento Bee, the Fresno Bee, and the Modesto Bee in regard to the Trinity River project with particular reference to the proposal made by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s so-called partnership proposal to build the powerhouses. Because these articles give an excellent general outline of the project, as well as a clear analysis of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s proposal, I include their insertion in the RECORD at this point for the information of the Members of the House:

[From the Sacramento Bee of May 10, 1955]

STORY OF TRINITY DAM STEMS FROM GRIM FIGHT TO HOLD BACK DESERT

(By George D. Dean)

The story of the Trinity Dam and controversial powerhouses does not begin on the Trinity River. It properly has its origin in the semiarid plains on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley, reaching from a point near Los Banos south to western Kings County. This is the largest agricultural area in California for which a surface water supply has not been provided.

In the wells from which the irrigation water is being pumped, the water table is dropping at an alarming rate.

It is a grim race as to whether the water will run out first or the pumping costs become so exorbitant as to make farming economically unfeasible.

In either case these fertile acres would revert inexorably to a desert.

ENGINEERING PROBLEM

The Bureau of Reclamation long has had plans to bring this productive area into the Central Valley project .

To do so represents a highly complex engineering problem.

It would involve the construction of a reservoir on San Luis Creek in the Coast Range Mountains west of Patterson.

But except on rare occasions San Luis Creek flows at little more than a trickle and its canyon is a dry gulch most of the year. To fill San Luis Reservoir it would be necessary to utilize surplus water from the Sacramento River.

This water would be pumped from the CVP's Delta-Mendota Canal into the reservoir, whence it would flow by gravity to irrigate the west side San Joaquin Valley acres.

Hoisting the water from the canal into the reservoir would require an enormous amount of power.

PGE GETS THE POWER

For this electric energy the Bureau of Reclamation looked first to the Kings River in the Sierra Nevada east of Fresno. There the Bureau proposed to construct a multiple purpose project to supply additional irrigation water for the San Joaquin Valley and generate the power to operate the San Luis pumps.

But the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. also sought a permit to build a powerplant on the Kings.

Hearings were conducted by the Federal Power Commission. The examiner recommended that the permit be granted to the Bureau of Reclamation on the ground it would serve more beneficial uses.

But the FPC itself arbitrarily overruled its own examiner and awarded the permit to the PGE.

PROTECTED BY MC KAY

Oscar Chapman, then Secretary of the Interior, appealed the decision to the Federal courts. But in the meantime there was a change of administration in Washington, D. C. Chapman was succeeded by Douglas McKay and one of McKay's first acts was to order the Bureau to drop the suit.

That, temporarily at least, killed the San Luis project.

NEW DEVELOPMENT

In the meantime another situation had developed, this one in the Sacramento Valley.

When Shasta Dam was put into operation, a certain amount of water was set aside for use by landowners along the Sacramento River.

As the stream began to develop a sustained summer flow due to releases from Shasta, the use of the river water was increased. The allocation set aside for the Sacramento Valley was being overdrawn. The Bureau faced the possibility of being unable to meet its contractual commitments in the San Joaquin Valley.

The Bureau had two alternatives: (1) It could order the Sacramento Valley farmers to cease drawing upon the stored water being released from Shasta and thereby risk a deluge of lawsuits, lawsuits it might lose; or (2) construct a new project for additional water supplies to satisfy the needs of the users in both valleys.

TURN TO TRINITY

The Trinity River, long regarded as the most feasible site for a multiple-purpose dam in California, assumed new importance.

The Bureau engineers envisioned this project as, in effect, enabling them to kill two birds with one stone. The storage on the Trinity would give the Sacramento Valley farmers additional water and supply the Sacramento Valley Canals now under construction. It also would generate the power needed to make the San Luis project at long last a reality.

Bills to authorize the Trinity-San Luis projects were introduced in Congress.

PGE AGAIN

Then the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., which had thwarted the Bureau on the Kings, stepped into the Trinity picture.

The company belatedly proposed that the Government build the $154 million Trinity main dam, diversion dam, and tunnels, and the utility build the power houses and sell the power, paying the Government a fee for the use of the falling water.

The proposal, and the company's well-financed propaganda campaign in its favor, has upset completely the Government's long-range planning.

Sixty percent of all the power generated at Trinity by the Government would be set aside to operate the San Luis pumps.

If the Trinity power houses were to be operated by the PGE, the project cost would be increased enormously. San Luis would be put into a shadow world as to feasibility.

Congressman CLAIR ENGLE, of the Second California District, has said flatly that if the power generating facilities at Trinity were turned over to the PGE it would kill both the Trinity and San Luis projects deader than a doornail.

The San Joaquin Valley farmers, figuratively and literally, would be dry gulched.

[From the Sacramento Bee of May 11, 1955]

UNITED STATES WOULD PAY BUT PGE WOULD REAP PROFIT FROM TRINITY DAM PARTNERSHIP

(By George D. Dean)

Paid propagandists for the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. have been beating trails throughout northern California in support of the so-called but misnamed partnership on the Trinity River. Under this scheme the Federal Government would build the dams, including the main dam and diversion dam, and the tunnels at a cost of $154 million.

The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. would construct the hydroplants, generating and selling the power and paying the Government an annual fee for the use of the falling water.

One argument repeatedly set forth by these paid propagandists is: "Look, all we propose to do is let the water run through our generators. The Government still would have all the water. It is not tainted nor is it any the less wet. For that we propose to hand the Government a check each year for $3,500,000."

Never was there a case of more specious oversimplification.

DOUBLE PROFITS

The fact of the case is the PGE stands to profit enormously by the so-called partnership, directly and indirectly.

The direct profits can be measured on a cash register.

The indirect effect would be to cramp or even destroy competitive public power in the area. And if that came about the housewife would pay every time her electric refrigerator went on, the merchant every time he turned the light switch, the industrialist every time he started the machinery in his factory.

Here is how the direct profit would go to the PGE under the "partnership" proposal:

In every multiple purpose project built by the Government, a certain amount of the cost is allocated to irrigation, a certain amount to power generation, flood control, recreation, fish and wildlife development, etc.

Of the estimated $154 million cost of the Trinity dams and tunnels, $105 million would be allocated to power.

This money would have to be repaid to the Federal Treasury out of power earnings, plus 2½ percent interest.

LOW INTEREST

In effect then, the Federal Government would be putting up $105 million at low interest rates to store water to enable the PGE to operate its powerhouses.

The price which the bureau proposes to charge the company would be based upon repayment of the $105 million at 2½ percent interest.

The company would have the advantage of the low interest rate Government money.

And in all such large scale undertakings, the interest rate is of utmost significance. A differential of just 1 percent on $105 million amounts to more than $1 million a year.

If the PGE were to build the Trinity project on its own solely for power generation, the cost, according to Bureau engineers, probably would exceed $105 million. Certain works would have to be constructed, whether it was a single-purpose power dam or a multiple-purpose structure.

OTHER BENEFITS

Thus, in addition to the low interest, the PGE would benefit from the allocations to irrigation, etc., which would be made against a Government-built dam.

Further, the Government-built dams and tunnels would be tax free—another big advantage which would accrue to the PGE if the falling-water partnership plan were adopted.

SHORT OF COSTS

The Bureau of Reclamation contends that, even at 2½ percent money, the PGE offer of $3,500,000 falls considerably short of meeting repayment and interest costs.

Bureau experts figure the sum ought to be at least $3,956,000. If interest during construction is included, it should be $4,100,000. There are also other gimmicks proposed by the PGE which would run the cost of the project up materially.

Thus, the PGE's offer is anything but a philanthropic gesture.

THIRTY-MILLION-DOLLAR LOSS

The payoff period on the project would be 50 years. The $456,000 difference between the PGE offer and the Government's minimum estimate over the 50 years would be $22,800,000. If interest during construction were charged, this would run to $30 million.

This would be a dead loss to the taxpayers of the United States. If the Government built the plant and generated and sold the power the price by congressional law would have to be computed to pay off the investment, plus interest and plus maintenance and operating costs.

EVEN BIGGER STAKES

But even bigger than these millions are the indirect stakes which are involved.

If the Government builds the powerhouses, as authorized in a bill in Congress sponsored by Senators THOMAS H. KUCHEL and WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, public agencies will have first call on the power over and above what is needed for the San Luis pumps. This is provided by long-standing Federal law.

But if the power is gobbled up by the PGE there will be none for sale to public districts. There will be none for the Sacramento Municipal Utility District, none for Redding, Gridley, Roseville, Lodi, Alameda, Palo Alto, and the other cities which operate their own electric distributing systems. There will be none, in fact, for Mare Island, Mather Field, and numerous other military installations buying their power from the Bureau.

Thus, the company would succeed, through what amounts to a Government subsidy, in shackling competitive power and destroying the yardstick of publicly generated electricity.

How much this would cost the housewife, the merchant, the farmer, and the industrialist is anyone's guess.

But it is no guess that the farther one gets away from the public-power areas, such as the Tennessee Valley, and the Columbia River, the higher are the rates of the privately owned utilities, even where the rates are regulated by State commissions.

[From the Sacramento Bee of May 12, 1955]

PGE PLAN FOR OVERSIZE TUNNELS AT TRINITY DAM THREATENS CVP BALANCE

(By George D. Dean)

One of the most serious considerations connected with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s proposal to build the powerhouses at the Trinity River project, utilizing falling water from the Government-built dams and tunnels, is the effect its adoption would have upon the overall operation of the Central Valley project.

The company has claimed that if it is allowed to construct the electric facilities it will generate a much larger quantity of electricity than will be produced if the Government builds and operates the powerhouses.

That is true. But it does not mean the PGE has any peculiar magic nor does it reflect upon the ability of the Bureau of Reclamation engineers.

BIGGER TUNNELS

It is not to be done with mirrors but with the simple expedient of bigger tunnels—and therein is a threat to snafu the orderly operation of CVP.

Operating the CVP is not unlike a musician putting together the parts of a composition on a pipe organ.

Releases of water from Shasta must be timed to irrigation needs, power development, flood control, salinity control, and navigation.

The Shasta project consists of two dams, the main Shasta Dam and Keswick Dam.

The reservoir behind Keswick Dam is used as a regulatory unit to bring the various CVP operations phases into coordination.

The Government generates power when the water drops from the main Shasta Reservoir into Keswick. It generates more power in the drop from Keswick into the Sacramento River.

PLANNED COORDINATION

In designing the Trinity project, the Federal engineers proposed to release Trinity water into Keswick at a rate such that it could be coordinated with the overall CVP operation. That is why the tunnels were designed of a specific size.

Now comes the PGE to claim it can develop a greater quantity of power than the Government proposed, and so it can. But what will be the effect?

Bureau of Reclamation engineers claim that if water should be discharged into Keswick at the capacity of the larger tunnels, the delicate balance between Shasta and Keswick would be upset.

The water dumped from the Trinity powerhouses would be about all the Keswick generators could handle a good part of the year.

Releases from the main Shasta Dam would have to be curtailed with the result the generators would be shut down a large part of the time and the Government would lose a huge block of power. Or if the releases were continued, the water would waste to the sea.

The power which would be lost at Shasta would be public power. The power gained at Trinity would be PGE power, thus removing another quantity of public power from the market.

There is one more point.

TAXPAYERS WOULD PAY

If the larger tunnels were built on the Trinity, the extra cost would be footed by the Government. The PGE claims the large quantity of falling water in the bigger tunnels would return $36 million more to the Government over the project payoff period than if the smaller tunnels were used. But the additional cost to the Government for the larger tunnels would be $43 million.

So, the Bureau calculates, the Government would acquire a deficit as well as lose considerable Shasta power and thereby reduce the amount of public power available to the market, including the Sacramento Municipal Utility District.

NOTHING FOR SAN LUIS

Now, the Trinity-San Luis project is designed so Government power generated at Trinity would operate the pumps to hoist the water into the San Luis Reservoir, whence it would flow by gravity to irrigate the west side of the San Joaquin Valley.

Plainly if the PGE were permitted to build and operate the Trinity powerplant, there would be no Government electricity to run the San Luis pumps.

Therefore, after giving up the powerhouses on the Trinity to the PGE, the Government would have to buy power from the PGE for the San Luis operation.

At what price and under what conditions?

NOT SETTLED

In this regard, the PGE has made no firm offer. It has talked in generalities of supplying offpeak power at no more than it would cost the Government to transmit its own electricity from Trinity.

Offpeak hours are those times of day, mostly late at night and in the early morning, when the use of electricity in the homes, stores, and factories, and on the farms, is at a low ebb.

But water flowing down the Sacramento River will not stand still in the delta waiting for those offpeak hours when it can be pumped into the San Luis Reservoir. It will run to the Pacific Ocean—unless the Government builds a storage basin where it can be held.

The Government would foot the bill for this basin, or forebay, of course. The engineers have not calculated its cost because they regard it as little short of preposterous that the Government would be placed in the position of having to build it.

But if it comes to that, they are sure, the cost will run into millions of dollars, of which the PGE would put up nothing, but would realize all the profits which would accrue therefrom.

RATE QUESTION

And what would be the price at which the PGE would offer to sell offpeak power to the Bureau?

That question has not been answered. But this much is certain:

The Government has calculated the price of Trinity-San Luis water in the San Joaquin Valley at around $7.50 per acre-foot on the basis of Government-generated power operating the San Luis pumps.

The amount of power required is so enormous that an increase of just 1 mill per kilowatt in its cost—one-tenth of 1 cent—would add $740,000 a year to the San Joaquin Valley farmers' water bill.

But that, in the belief of Congressman CLAIR ENGLE, of the Second California District, can be regarded as academic. If the partnership arrangement is made, he says, there will not be any San Luis project, and therefore no water for the farmers at any price.

[From the Sacramento Bee of May 13, 1955]

ENGLE DECLARES FEAR OF RATE YARDSTICK PROMPTS PGE'S PITCH AT TRINITY

(By George D. Dean)

Congressman CLAIR ENGLE, of the Second California District has stated that if all of the Trinity River project power were to be used to operate the San Luis project pumps, the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. never would have proposed the so-called partnership deal on the Trinity.

As it is, 60 percent of the Trinity power under Government operation would be used for pumping. The remaining 40 percent would be available for sale to public districts and Government installations.

It is, said ENGLE, to keep this block of public power represented by 40 percent of the Trinity output from becoming available in northern California that the PGE has made a pitch for the so-called partnership deal.

Under this scheme the Government would build the necessary dams and tunnels. The PGE would build the hydroplants and generate and sell the power, paying the Government a fee for the use of the water stored in the Government-built reservoirs.

NO PREFERENCE

Naturally, if the PGE generated and sold the Trinity electricity, the Federal preference law giving the public districts first call on the Government power would not be operative. The utility would own the hydro output lock, stock, and barrel.

So far as Trinity is concerned there then would be no competitive power. There would be no public power yardstick with which to measure private power rates, either at the wholesale or retail level.

SMUD TELLS THE STORY

One such yardstick is the Sacramento Municipal Utility District.

For several years SMUD purchased its power from the PGE. Within the past year it has been getting its energy from the Central Valleys project.

The amount SMUD is paying the Bureau of Reclamation for CVP power is nearly $1 million a year less than a comparable quantity would have cost under the PGE contract.

But more significantly, the aggregate bill of the SMUD power users is $4 million a year less than it would be under PGE rates in effect in other northern California cities. SMUD rates in most categories are the lowest in the State.

This is money which stays at home in Sacramento. It is $4 million in added purchasing power to be spent here.

DIRECT EFFECT

But how does the proposed Trinity partnership affect Sacramento and other cities which have their own electric distributing systems? It does so very directly.

The contract which SMUD has with the Bureau of Reclamation calls for power deliveries up to 290,000 kilowatts. The district expects to reach this maximum by 1960, possibly in 1959.

And so here is the crux of the whole power situation.

If the PGE gets the Trinity power facilities on the basis it desires, the total hydro output from Shasta, Keswick, and Folsom available for public sale would dwindle, according to Bureau engineers, to 270,000 kilowatts after 1967.

The PGE claims that by coordinating the power output it would be 310,000 kilowatts.

But whether 270,000 or 310,000 kilowatts, it is obvious the door would be closed to additional CVP power purchases by SMUD.

WHAT ABOUT DEFENSE?

Also, what about the defense installations which are CVP customers—the Mare Island Naval Shipyard, the Ames Laboratory, Moffett Feld, the Stockton Naval Supply Annex, the Sharpe General Depot in Lathrop, Castle Air Force Base, Camp Beale, the Benicia Arsenal, etc.?

If the power runs out, say Reclamation Bureau officials, these installations will be dropped. And at present comparable rates, if they were forced to buy power from the PGE the bill to the Government would be $400,000 a year more, during the 50-year payoff period of Trinity, $20 million.

The PGE is selling to several California cities which in turn have their own retail distributing systems. These include Redding, Gridley, Roseville, Lodi, Alameda, Palo Alto.

They have enjoyed very favorable wholesale rates, and these rates have been justified to the public utilities commission on the ground they were competitive with CVP power. In other words, these communities could turn to CVP for power.

These contracts are expiring this year. What would be the tenor of the negotiations if it appeared definitely there no longer was any competition from CVP because the Government had no more power to sell to these agencies?

These matters are of vital concern to all of these communities which are building their economy on an abundance of water and low-priced public power.

YARDSTICK IS VITAL

And as Congressman ENGLE has stated, if the yardstick of public-power rates is lost or restricted it will be a matter of vital concern to everyone every time he switches on an electric light.

The so-called partnership deal whereby the Government would build the Trinity dams and tunnels and the PGE would build the powerhouses and sell the electricity has been compared to two farmers negotiating for a cow.

One farmer would buy the cow. The other would furnish the bucket, milk the cow and sell the milk.

But the implications are even broader. ENGLE has stated the partnership, if approved, would kill off the Trinity and San Luis projects completely, which would mean there would be no water or power for anybody.

Anyway there would not be, in the Congressman's words, a block of public power bouncing around in the area.

LEGISLATIVE BACKING

California's two Republican Senators THOMAS H. KUCHEL and WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, are supporting the Trinity-San Luis project with Government development of

the power facilities. So are the Congressmen from the area.

In his campaign speeches, his inaugural address and in subsequent statements, Gov. Goodwin J. Knight has favored the Federal Government construction of Trinity and San Luis, to gether with all of the power facilities.

They see that in this manner the welfare of northern California best can be served.

Economic Growth Comparison of Western Powers and Soviet Bloc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over WORL, Boston, Mass., on Sunday, May 15, 1955, the first program in the rotation series "Your Congressman Reports":

Which system is more productive—that of free enterprise or that of Communist regimentation?

The facts on our side are available for all to see. It is difficult, however, to penetrate the censorship, secrecy, and the isolation of the Communist world to get at the economic truth as to the progress or failures of the Reds.

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, in cooperation with the staff of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report of the United States Congress, has made a thoroughgoing study of trends in economic growth—a comparison of the Western Powers and the Soviet bloc.

In the struggle between communism and freedom the factor of relative economic strength is fundamental.

Neither morale, nor political stability, nor a firm military posture can long be sustained in its absence.

That is why we enacted the Marshall plan and other measures to rebuild the war-shattered economies of our friends, particularly those in Europe.

These efforts have cost the American people many billions of dollars and have aroused resentment among some taxpayers, but the fact is that this help from us has sparked an economic revival in most of independent Europe and in a number of other areas.

Without this aid they would have been tempted in desperation to try the Communist way.

The Soviet Union is making an intense effort to spur production within its own borders and within those of the captive countries of Europe.

Recovery by the free world is not enough. It must have dynamic growth to keep ahead of the Communist bloc.

Underdeveloped countries in Asia, Latin America, and Africa are watching and comparing the two systems.

As medical advances have increased the rate of population growth in these backward countries, they must have greater output from farm and factory. It is not surprising that some of these nations are fascinated by the rapid industrialization of the Soviet Union, even though this is paid for at a frightful cost of human lives and human freedoms. To show that economic progress can be achieved without recourse to slavery is a moral and practical obligation of the West.

The well-being of the United States, apart from the conflict with communism, is tied up with the rest of the world. Only an expanding world economy can provide the raw materials and the markets which we will need, with greater population and less balanced resources, in future years.

Bearing in mind the difficulty of getting all the facts of the Soviet economy, and the Communist custom of juggling figures to serve propaganda purposes, the committee came to the following conclusions:

Although the population of the Soviet bloc may gain on us in the years ahead, the output per worker in the United States and Western Europe will probably retain its lead.

The Communists are having real troubles with their agriculture because, under the collective system, the farmers have no incentive to produce.

Although the Soviet Union has increased its steel capacity, its tonnage of steel produced is growing at a rate that prevailed in the United States 40 years ago.

Western Europe may be faced with a power shortage as generating capacity lags behind increasing demand. Atomic power, if it were developed at low cost by either area, could shift the economic balance quickly.

In transportation, the Soviet bloc is far behind. Due to the great distances separating resources, factories, and markets it has little chance of catching up with the West.

The Soviet Union during World War II suffered far heavier losses in terms of human life and capital resources than the West. Between 7 and 10 million persons were killed, or died, in the armed forces alone. The metal industry was hit with special severity, with 60 percent of the prewar steel and aluminum capacities destroyed or damaged. In agriculture, nearly half the horses and one-seventh of the cattle were lost.

Counterbalancing these losses, to a varying degree, was the territorial expansion of the Soviet Union. It increased its labor input by lengthening the workweek from a prewar 40 hours, to a postwar 48 hours by employing more women, by the conscription of 14-to-17-year olds, and by the slave labor of political prisoners whose number run in the millions.

The Soviets gained through the free access of thousands of engineers to American industrial know-how. It has enjoyed large capital and raw material transfers through lend-lease, and through booty or tribute taken from its captive states.

An examination of the various factors of production (growth of labor input, agriculture, housing, etc.) in the United States and in the Soviet Union today, gives strong grounds for expecting that the absolute gap in the size of the 2 economies will widen over the next 2 decades. Even though the rate of growth in the Soviet Union might be somewhat higher than in the United States.

As to Western Europe, if its rate of growth is not to fall further behind that of the Soviet Union, certain bottlenecks must be eliminated. Western Europe is a deficit area with regard to many raw materials. For this reason, its industries must be centered upon imports, fabrication, and reexports. It is greatly dependent, therefore, upon international trade. Lacking economic union, the separate countries of Western Europe, suffer from inefficient use of labor, capital, and natural resources. Some countries have a shortage of labor; others have a surplus. Where labor is abundant, there is a shortage of capital, and vice versa.

The captive countries have made very little progress because of the tremendous confiscation of their resources by the Russian Communists. The economic future of the captive countries will be influenced by the extent of continuing Soviet exactions, the character and pace of industrial expansion required by Russia, the degree to which economic cooperation between the captive states may be permitted, the morale of the labor force, and even the existence of, say, Poland, in its present boundaries.

All in all, the captive countries, in the long run, may prove to be an economic drag on the Soviet Union.

Per capita personal consumption in the United States is more than 40 percent higher than it was before the war, while in independent Europe it has risen, on an average, by 11 percent. In contrast, per capita personal consumption in the Soviet Union and Poland is barely above the prewar level; in other captive countries, especially East Germany, it is still below that level. Thus, differences in living standards between the East and the West have widened over the past 15 years.

Before the war, Eastern Europe was more dependent, tradewise, upon Western Europe, than Western Europe was dependent upon it. Since the war, trade between these two regions has contracted greatly.

This shrinkage in trade has been caused, in large measure, by distortions in economic relationships caused by the Iron Curtain which the Soviet has drawn around its empire.

The West has retaliated by refusing to export the strategic goods that the Soviet bloc needs and wants.

The contraction of East-West trade means that the Reds are cut off from access to capital goods and iron ore, while free Europe is deprived of some foodstuffs, timber, and coal.

Meanwhile, free Europe has been making substantial progress in the lowering of many of its trade barriers.

Careful consideration should be given, on the one hand, to the restraints on East-West trade that are important for direct military reasons, and, on the other, to the desirability of cultivating friendship with the people in Communist countries via trade in nonstrategic goods.

At one extreme is the possibility of cutting off all trade between the free world and the Communist bloc. At the other is the possibility of encouraging the importation of needed raw materials from Communist countries in exchange for consumer, as opposed to producer, goods.

The West has tremendous economic power whereas the Soviet bloc, through propaganda and false promises, has been hiding its lesser economic growth. It is in the interest of the United States that these facts be made known throughout the world, particularly in underdeveloped areas.

The leaders of the Soviet Union are trying to sell the idea that the economies of the West are in decay. In pursuit of this goal, they circulate the most fantastic lies.

Careful cross-checking is always needed before accepting their statistics.

The Communist bloc will continue intense efforts to increase its output, especially heavy industry, with little regard for human costs. In view of this fact, appreciation of the substantial successes of the United States and independent Europe, acting in close cooperation, in achieving both industrial expansion and better living, is essential. Such cooperation, continued in the future, can serve as a basic weapon in the East-West struggle.

Utilization of United States foreign trade policy as a positive means for strengthening the free world versus the Communist bloc, should be considered.

In Europe, the main task of aiding economic recovery has been accomplished.

It is important that the Western countries intensify their efforts in the field of education. The more immediate need is to train adequate numbers of scientists, engineers, and technicians. In the longer run, it is essential to keep raising the general level of education.

Superiority in economic strength and economic growth are desirable ends in themselves, but they do not assure political and military security. In fact, an economy that is already mobilized for war, can operate with greater effectiveness, and for sometime, against a considerably stronger economy that is not so mobilized.

The quality of economic goods in the Soviet Union varies greatly, being at its best in military and war-supporting goods, and at its poorest in consumer goods. However, under a regimented economy, like that of the Soviet Union, poorer grade goods can be kept in use much longer than they would be under a competitive economy.

Such a state, by virtue of the fact that it is a dictatorship, can act quickly, without having to engage in extended internal debate and discussion. For a time, at least, this power to utilize surprise tactics, might counterbalance relative economic weakness.

Although the deciding factor in a long war usually is economic superiority, a strong economy can be held at bay for sometime, by a country whose economy is less strong, but is mobilized for military action, especially where new types of military weapons are available. Peacetime economic strength, in and of itself, therefore, is not a measure of military posture.

I have brought you the summary and conclusions of the committee's report.

In the hope and belief that only a well-informed public, able to grasp all the economic, political, military, and psychological factors involved, can decide the best policy for the free world to follow in winning the cold war against communism.

Portrait of the Late Senator Bob Taft Unveiled at Taft School, Watertown, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on Friday evening, May 13, 1955, a portrait to a great American was unveiled at Taft School, Watertown, Conn. The painting is of the late Senator Bob Taft, who is a graduate of the school bearing his name, and established by his ancestors.

During the ceremonies the school chaplain, Channing Jesche, gave the following closing prayer, which is most fitting to such a solemn occasion and one which should become a permanent part of Bob's record at Taft:

Let us pray. Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, may the words spoken here, the emotions expressed, those who acted and those who witnessed, find favor in Thy sight this night. Fill us with the mind and spirit of Christ; "make us instruments of Thy peace; where there is hatred, let us so love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is discord, union; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; and where there is sadness, joy.

"O Lord, our Christ, grant that we may not so much seek to be consoled as to console; to be understood, as to understand; to be loved, as to love; for it is in giving that we receive; it is in pardoning that we are pardoned; and it is in dying that we are born to eternal life" (St. Francis).

And now, may the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all, now and forever more, world without end. Amen.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch Commends Representative Henry Reuss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, many well-informed observers have taken note that we are privileged to have in this House an extraordinary group of very able freshman Members. It was a remarkable event, I think, when these first-term Members took the floor for a series of speeches on foreign policy and made a truly effective contribution to public thinking on the great issues of war and peace.

We need all the fresh, creative thinking we can get on the problems of the could war. It is a great credit to the first-term Members that they had something important to say about the proper approach of America to these problems and had the courage to speak up on their ideas.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch paid tribute to these first-term Congressmen, and their contribution, in an editorial entitled "Fresh Wind on the Hill." The initiative of these Members deserves and has received national recognition. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial:

FRESH WIND ON THE HILL

Congress has been asked to express the will of the American people to abolish war, to revise the Charter of the United Nations, and to have the President establish a special mission for peace to plan for better understanding among nations.

The three resolutions go to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and probably they will go no further. But they are significant quite aside from their merits and demerits. They were introduced by Representative VICTOR L. ANFUSO, a young Democrat who has been combating delinquency and other social evils in Brooklyn, and who sent 250,000 anti-Communist letters to Italy in the 1948 electoral campaign. He may be a youngster on the Hill, but at home he is known and respected.

This puts him roughly in the category of some 30 Democratic freshmen in the House, supported by a number of second termers, who have been speaking recently with an unaccustomed frankness on foreign affairs. There are no pacifists, appeasers, or young Turks in this group. Knowing that first-term Representatives are expected to be seen but not heard, they consulted with Speaker RAYBURN before taking the floor. But they did take the floor, and then had their hands pumped and their backs slapped by scores of oldtimers.

Representative HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin, probably attracted more attention than any of the others. He urged a sweeping settlement abroad. Let Russia withdraw from the satellites, so that they may choose their own governments. Let the West promote a united Germany in a central European community without power to make war. Let the United Nations guarantee its security.

Thus Russia and France, he said, would be delivered of their fears of a rearmed Germany, the satellites would have a chance to deliver themselves from Communist bondage, Germany would be reunited, and Russian security would be assured. In Asia, Reuss would have a U. N. trusteeship over Formosa, and he would have us reverse our refusal to cooperate in the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development.

Neither Secretary Dulles nor any other diplomat has been half so bold. Perhaps international understanding can be achieved only 1 or 2 steps at a time. There are obvious weak spots in the proposals of the young representatives. The big point, however, is that they are not speaking as diplomats. They are speaking for their constituents, everyday people, who do not want to live in peril of the big bombs. These people want accord in the world so that they may feel that their lives are meaningful.

The names of some of these young Congressmen deserve listing: QUIGLEY of Pennsylvania, ASHLEY of Ohio, UDALL, of Arizona, EDITH GREEN of Oregon, LANKFORD of Maryland, BOYLE of Illinois, THOMPSON of New Jersey, MCDOWELL of Delaware.

Their specific proposals are of relatively slight consequence. Their appeal is all important. They are saying that the people are well aware of the dangers of the times, but that the people do not believe that the dangers can be mitigated by my-father-can-beat-your father talk or by chip-on-shoulder assertions of devotion to peace. Maybe the Russians and the Chinese cannot be brought to use any other language, these people say; but let us find out.

The young representatives have not dispersed the clouds, but they have let Washington feel the wind that blows across the country. It is fresh.

Customs Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, although many of us are aware of the great strides in implementing the President's program of increasing and facilitating foreign trade accomplished through the Customs Simplifications Acts of 1953 and 1954, I doubt whether we realize the tremendous progress which has been made since the Eisenhower administration took office in furthering the President's program in this direction through increased efficiency and other administrative improvements made by the Treasury Department and the Customs Bureau.

The following editorial from the May 4, 1955, issue of the New York Times calls attention to some very significant results achieved in this area which were outlined in a recent speech by the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, H. Chapman Rose, before the National Council of American Importers:

CUSTOMS PROGRESS

As a result of the Customs Simplification Acts of 1953 and 1954, the Customs Adminis-

tration has been freed from many archaic procedural requirements. In the Customs Simplification Act of 1954 Congress recognized the need for modernizing and simplifying the Tariff Act descriptions and authorized the Tariff Commission to undertake a 2-year study and revision of these which "should go far to eliminate the problems arising from obsolescence."

Meanwhile, it is interesting to note, the Customs Department has not just stood around waiting for the law to be reformed. It started immediately, in 1953, to do what it could under the existing laws by the simple process of increased efficiency. Reform of the customs laws would not help much unless and until the customs officials had caught up on their work so they could apply them. That has been no easy task. When this administration came into office, according to Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Rose, the backlog of customs entries awaiting liquidation was about 700,000. It had been rising steadily ever since the war from a low point of 275,000 in 1947; and it continued to rise until September of 1953, when it reached the alltime high of 900,000. That was a backlog of 1 year's work at the then rate of liquidation. This meant that many an importer waited a year or more after paying his estimated duties before he could be sure that his customs liability was finally fixed. The latest figures reveal that this backlog had been reduced by nearly one-third, to 655,000. While the number of entries filed continues at peak levels, the quarterly rate of liquidation has been raised from 225,000 (where it stood in September of 1953) to 322,000 in the first quarter of this year and is continuing its rapid rate of rise.

Mr. Rose's address before the Council of American Importers is interesting as a clear exposition of the customs problems and the state of progress in that area; it is equally interesting as a reminder of the consistency with which the administration has sought to make its basic ideas on foreign trade effective on every front.

The Norwegians on Their Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, across the Atlantic in Norway today there is a spirit of general celebration and festivity. Norwegians are looking back across the pages of their country's history to a spring day in 1814. In April of that year a constituent assembly met at Eidsvold to draw up a new constitution. Representatives had been elected by the people for the purpose of drafting and adopting a constitution. The observation has since been made by historians that it is doubtful if there has been an assembly of men more sincerely and wholeheartedly devoted to the welfare of their country. They were in unanimous agreement that Norway must have a government based upon the sovereign will of the people. Within 6 weeks of their first meeting the assembly had adopted the new constitution and elected their new king.

This Constitution of Norway is in many ways similar to our own, in its provisions for personal and individual liberty and in the clauses which have to do with justice and equality. If these similarities are traced back to their origin, we can see that the ideas and traditions of these two nations, Norway and the United States, have much in common. The people of both countries have the same devotion for the rights of man and his personal dignity, and both believe in government founded on a proper balance between freedom and law.

Since May 17, 1814, the day when the Constitution of Norway was finally signed and became the law of the land, the going has not always been easy for Norway, by any means. Within our own generation we have seen Norway conquered and occupied by the ruthless Nazis. Norwegian forces at first struggled against overwhelming odds. Finally they were forced to surrender, but during the remainder of the war years the exploits of the Norwegian underground were daring and heroic, and in this way they were able to make a great contribution to the war effort.

Since the war Norway has been mainly concerned with reconstruction, recovery, and new economic gains for her people. The task at first seemed staggering. The demand for new housing was a particularly perplexing problem. But with new development in industry, with aid from our own country, with new vistas opening up for cooperation with other countries, Norway today finds herself on a sound economic footing and in a position to compete with other nations in selling her goods to the world.

On the international scene, Norway has shown remarkable interest in participating in many international organizations. Norway is a member of the United Nations, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the Council of Europe and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Together with the leaders of other Western democracies Norway's leaders have given unstintingly of their time and energy to work for world peace and for improved cultural and economic relations between nations.

This day of celebration in Norway gives us in America an opportunity to send across the sea our own hearty greetings and congratulations. May the spirit of brotherhood which already binds us together continue to grow not only in our international life but also in a more personal way, in our own hearts.

New Partnership Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I have here an editorial from the Oregonian, an independent newspaper published at Portland, Oreg. This editorial concerns H. R. 5789, legislation providing for the immediate construction of the John Day Dam on the Columbia River. This editorial gives a very good explanation of the vital need of H. R. 5789, and I would like for all of my colleagues to have the benefit of reading it. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD:

NEW PARTNERSHIP PLAN

The John Day Dam "partnership" bill introduced by Representative SAM COON and the offer of three private utilities to put up $273 million of the total cost estimated at $310 million provide the first major test in the Pacific Northwest of the Eisenhower partnership plan involving private utilities.

The bill will be fought bitterly by Democrats committed to public power and an all-Federal Columbia power system. But southern Democrats and Republicans who voted to deauthorize the Coosa River project and permit a private utility to build it may welcome the John Day plan. Those who voted for the Priest Rapids Dam partnership of Grant County PUD with the Government may find it inconsistent to oppose a similar deal with private utilities.

Local partnership is not limited to the three private utilities, Portland General Electric, Pacific Power & Light, and Washington Water Power. Others, including PUD's, REA's and municipal systems who want to lay some money on the barrelhead may become partners if they act not later than 6 months after passage of the bill. But there is no rush of public-power groups to join. Their future power supply, unlike that of private utilities, is protected by the "preference and priority" clause of the Bonneville Act applying to Federal dams under construction.

Partnership is, indeed, the private utilities' answer to the preference clause. The installed capacity of 1,105,000 kilowatts of the John Day project is about equal to a 2-year average increase in the power needs of the region. But unless the Federal Government resumes its earlier policy of dam building, and at a much higher rate, the supply of Federal power available to private utilities will be relatively small in the early 1960's

Portland General Electric now is dependent upon the Federal Bonneville system for about 75 percent of its power supply, and Pacific Power & Light about 50 percent. The constant and tremendous increase in demand makes it imperative that these companies assure themselves of large blocks of power in the 1960's. Hence their applications for dams in the Snake River and for partnership in John Day.

The chief attraction of John Day partnership to electric customers in the State of Oregon is that about two-thirds of John Day's output would flow into the PGE and Pacific systems in return for their investments in a project which the Government would build and own. This power supply would be available for at least 50 years—and the local partners would have first opportunity to finance and obtain power from additional generators which, depending on upstream storage, might increase John Day's installed capacity to 1,700,000 kilowatts.

The applicant utilities believe the power produced at John Day under private financing will be competitive in cost with that from other projects. This is challenged by most public power leaders who see a big saving in power rates from Treasury financing.

This newspaper has not been and is not now enthusiastic for the partnership approach to regional development as enunciated by Secretary of Interior McKay. But we recognize fully the need of private utilities to protect their companies and their customers by obtaining power supplies for the future. Federal or regional development with elimination of the preference for public power agencies would provide a better approach, in our opinion. But as long as the

public power enthusiasts cling to priority contracts, we cannot view too harshly the efforts of the private utilities to get their share of power.

Modern Material Handling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include herein a communication from Mr. J. W. Hall, national secretary of the American Material Handling Society, together with comments and an article by Mr. James R. Bright, of Harvard University, on the subject of material handling:

AMERICAN MATERIAL HANDLING SOCIETY, INC.,
Toledo, Ohio, May 9, 1955.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RODINO: I would like to enter into the record, as a part of the program in support of your resolution, H. J. 231, A National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week, the following letter and articles from Prof. James R. Bright, Harvard University.

Formerly chief editor of Modern Material Handling magazine, Professor Bright served from 1940–45 in the United States Army, second lieutenant to lieutenant colonel. He served as island ammunition officer at New Caledonia and at Guadalcanal (for the 1st Marine division), as division maintenance officer at Bougainville and as assistant division maintenance officer, Philippine campaign. He served 1 school year as instructor, academic department of ordnance engineers, United States Military Academy, West Point.

The attached article is lengthy but contained in it is a message of vital importance to the military forces of the United States. Professor Bright's background qualifies him to point out weaknesses which may some day prove to be, the Achille's heel of this, the most productive Nation the world has yet seen.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. HALL,
National secretary, AMHS, Westinghouse Electric Corp., meter division, Newark, N. J.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Boston, Mass., April 29, 1955.

Mr. J. W. HALL,
National Secretary, American Material Handling Society, Inc., in care of Westinghouse Electric Corp., Meter Division, Newark, N. J.

DEAR MR. HALL: Your concept of a National Material Handling Week is a very interesting one. However, I seem to detect a great deal of satisfaction with the state of affairs. We seem to be congratulating ourselves on a job well done. While it is true that many splendid things have been done, this week you propose should be the springboard to make some real progress in an area where we are tremendously backward—the handling of military supplies.

A few months ago an officer from the Transportation Corps presented a paper before the Society of Automotive Engineers in which he pointed out that back in 1775, when Ticonderoga was captured, a requisition was sent from Boston to have these captured British cannon forwarded to assist in the seige of the British at Boston. Proceeding by oxcart and sledge took several months for these cannon to reach Boston. I believe the speed averaged out at about 1½ miles an hour.

The paper went on to point out that when front-line troops in Korea requisitioned supplies, it took something like 3 months for the supplies to reach them from the States. My recollection is that the author pointed out that this is an average speed of about 3 miles an hour. Thus in 175 years we have raised the speed of forwarding military supplies by about 1½ miles an hour. This is a pretty sorry record.

We pride ourselves on being the most mechanized and mechanically progressive nation. Is this the best we can do in the military field? The facts are that we as yet have no unified system for moving a pallet load of ammunition or rations from the manufacturer's packaging line to the ammunition or ration dump supporting the combat regiment. There is no unified material handling program between the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Merchant Marine. There are some individually excellent material handling programs in branches of our services, but integrated effort—from packaging line to the using troops—has not been developed. We still supply our military forces by an antiquated and highly inefficient system of manhandling millions of small boxes thousands of times on their way to the front. This need not be.

If the National Material Handling Week can help to provide a servicewide, nationwide mechanized system for forwarding supplies, it will be a real contribution to our economy. Not only would supplies get there faster and in better condition, but we would need smaller inventories, far fewer cargo trucks, and it would save at least 25 percent or more of the supply troops who now manhandle these supplies. The attached article, Expediting Supply From Beachhead to Battlefront Through Mechanized Handling, suggests the basic nature of the problem and points out some possible solutions which should be tried.

Since this paper was presented before the American Society of Mechanical Engineers in 1953 experiments along some of these lines have been conducted by different branches of the armed services, but it is still true that we have no nationwide, servicewide, or even armywide concept for mechanized handling of a standard package from homefront to battlefront.

I hope the National Materials Handling Week can do something about this.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES R. BRIGHT,
Lecturer on Industrial Management.

FROM BEACHHEAD TO BATTLEFRONT THROUGH MECHANIZED HANDLING

Modern handling methods could increase our Army's mobility enormously and release at least 25 percent of present supply troops for combat duty. Here are seven suggested techniques.

Our combat line—the battlefront—is highly mechanized with automatic weapons and the finest of armored vehicles. The home front—our production lines—are certainly the most mechanized in the world. Yet, in between, we Americans tolerate an archaic and wasteful procedure—the handling of supplies from beachhead to frontline is literally a hundred years behind the rest of our armed efforts. With exception that we now employ a motortruck instead of a team of horses and a wagon, we are back in Civil War days in moving supplies up to the front.

Our Army's principal activity, other than combat, is to move men and supplies to the desired spot at a rate fast enough to satisfy military situations. It follows that we ought to employ every possible means of speeding such movement. It is no exaggeration to say that hundreds of small operations and numerous big ones, such as Patton's drive across Germany, were delayed or stalled because supplies could not keep up with the combat troops. Not only do our ancient handling techniques delay military movement; they also absorb an enormous number of troops for sheer "coolie labor." Furthermore, an excessive number of conventional cargo trucks are required because such a large percentage of their operational time is spent in loading and unloading rather than in moving.

Fundamentally, the movement of supplies is a materials-handling problem and it can be enormously improved by approaching it as such.

At present military supplies are handled as single man-sized packages. Probably better than 90 percent of them weigh in the vicinity of 100 pounds or less. Piece by piece they are moved to the shore from landing craft, and here they are segregated by classes, such as ammunition, rations, and clothing. Usually, after temporary storage on the beach, motortrucks will be drawn up to each stack and cartons or crates will be loaded onto the trucks for delivery to base depots. Supplies are stored in these base depots by classes and they eventually move through a sequence of depots, still segregated by class.

As the battlefront advances, these depots are leapfrogged forward and occasionally sideward and backward. It is conservative to say that the average carton probably is handled a minimum of 20 times before reaching the combat troops. It is no exaggeration to say that 50 handlings and even a hundred handlings often occur.

At the supply point, the issue to users (the combat troops) begins. Up to this point supplies have been moved in bulk, and usually in terms of at least one and often many truckloads of a single item. However, from the supply point to the man on the frontline breakdown begins. The problem from here on is not one of moving large quantities of a single item, but rather of handling many smaller quantities of mixed items and of sending them to scattered destinations.

Obviously, from ship to supply point, the job is susceptible to a high degree of mechanization, since such large volumes of single kinds of items are going to a limited number of destinations.

Under the present system using conventional motortrucks and loading and unloading by hand, the results have to be seen to be believed. An active beachhead or dock can only be described as chaos. The roads leading into beachheads and many depots are literally clogged with trucks waiting to be loaded or unloaded. The number of men that have to be pulled away from other work to do the handling is enormous. At one time during the Guadalcanal campaign, it was necessary to march 800 marines from frontline to beachhead each day to handle supplies that were pouring ashore. At one time the harbor of Noumea had 107 ships waiting to be unloaded. As a local wag quipped, "Henry Kaiser may think he's building Liberty ships, but he really is just making floating warehouses."

This scene was repeated in hundreds of combat situations throughout the world. It is potentially existent today because of one basic oversight. Failure to use and develop modern materials handling methods. The supply activity has not been mechanized consistent with the battlefront and the pro-

duction line. In terms of materials handling principles, what is wrong? These things stand out:

1. It is a mistake to handle things in small pieces. The unit load should be adopted and pushed from production line as far forward as possible, before breaking it down for issue.

2. The whole concept of manual handling must be abandoned. We must handle things with machines to avoid the waste of manpower and the enormous delays now tolerated.

3. There are too many pickups and putdowns. Some of these transfer operations can be eliminated.

4. The use of general cargo trucks for the mass movement of supplies is wrong. The conventional motortruck is not the right vehicle because it has to be loaded by an outside agency. We must adopt a self-loading vehicle for major supply movements.

5. There is no Army-wide attack on the handling problem. Furthermore, it is not enough to mechanize the Army's handling alone. This job must be coordinated with the Air Force, with the Navy, as well as with the manufacturers of military supplies. The above should not be misinterpreted as a statement that no research is being done by the Armed Forces. It is; however, there is no overall coordinated materials-handling program.

Let us consider what could be done to improve or eliminate these basic trouble spots:

POSSIBILITY I—INTRODUCE UNIT LOADS AND FORK TRUCKS

Since the average unit load of military supplies might contain 30 cartons approximately 13 by 18 by 14 inches on a 40-by-18-inch pallet, the fork-truck technique would provide enormous improvement. One man—the fork-truck operator—would move 30 times the weight and volume that he could move manually. He would be able to move it faster than he could walk with a single carton. Furthermore, he could lift this load and stack it much higher than he could reach.

Using conventional motortrucks, this fork-truck unit-load technique would enable one man to load a vehicle in less than 5 minutes.

If fork trucks were stationed at the beach and at each depot, up to and including the supply point, we would see fantastic improvement in the speed of loading and in the reduction of the number of men required. Furthermore, it might be practical to use a fork truck in the regimental supply dumps to reduce the number of their men pulled away from combat duty.

The system reduces manpower requirements on beach and in depots by at least 90 percent. It cuts the time required to load or unload a motortruck to between a half and a tenth that now required. It reduces damage to material, because boxes, cases, and shells would not be thrown to the ground from the truck. The unit load would be swiftly and properly placed, with much less damage to individual items.

Two of the basic problems are not solved. There are still just as many transfers as there were previously, and the carrier vehicles still stand idle while they are loaded. However, there is a way to improve this:

POSSIBILITY II—FORK TRUCKS, UNIT LOADS, AND STRADDLE CARRIERS

The modern straddle carrier, which has evolved from the lumber carrier, is barely coming into its own in industry. Its fundamental advantage is this: It is a truck that loads itself. Once this concept is grasped, the possibilities of speeding the handling of supplies is self-evident. Straddle carriers, under normal industrial operating conditions, will pick up and discharge loads ranging from 5 tons to 22½ tons in 15 seconds. It should be emphasized that just one man does the job—the vehicle driver. No additional help of any kind whatsoever is required.

This technique is being employed on an every-day operating basis by many firms. Some are operating in open fields and over relatively rough terrain. In the steel mill, for instance, one man picks up, moves, and unloads as much as 125 tons an hour between rolling mill and a storage yard a half mile away. This is perhaps the most exciting and fantastic improvement that could be applied to military operations, and it is a clear demonstration of the superiority of mechanical muscles over manpower. Here's how it would work in action:

Fork trucks on the beaches would go into the landing craft, pick up a unit load, and deposit it on a master pallet somewhere on the beach. When 6, 8, or 10 unit loads were assembled on the master pallet (whatever proved to be optimum for the straddle carrier designed for military requirements), the straddle carrier could be directed to pick up this load, transport it to the depot, and deposit it wherever desired.

In less than 30 seconds, a single man, the vehicle operator, would pick up the load. Similarly, he would unload it in less than 30 seconds. Contrast this handling technique with the present piece-by-piece manual handling into a motor truck and out of it, and it is so startling as to be almost unbelievable. It will be a military crime if we do not explore this possibility.

When supplies have to be forwarded from the base depots to intermediate depots and supply plants, they will be handled in the identical manner. However, it will not be necessary for the fork truck to be present, since the load is already assembled on the master pallet Thus, the straddle carrier saves even more time, and suggests other advantages.

Because loads can be preassembled, and because the transporting vehicle is not idle during the loading operation, far fewer vehicles are required. In civilian practice, straddle carriers are used to distribute lumber, building supplies, and similar items. It has been demonstrated repeatedly that 1 straddle carrier can transport material between given locations about as rapidly as 5 to 7 conventional motor trucks. Suppose that under military conditions it would do the job of just three motor trucks. This still would be a tremendous saving in reducing congestion, equipment requirements, road-building requirements, and the need for drivers and maintenance personnel.

Measured against the 3 basic objectives, we see that the straddle carrier has accomplished 2 of them.

We are now:

1. Handling machine-sized loads.

2. Applying a self-loading vehicle.

3. Transfers, however, have not been eliminated since there are just as many pickups and putdowns as before. However, since the times to perform these functions are so negligible, we might almost consider the transfers eliminated.

POSSIBILITY III—THE TRAVELOADER

Closely allied to the straddle carrier is another self-loading vehicle. It has several distinct advantages over the straddle carrier:

1. Since it has forks, it can make up its own master load, and be completely selective about the discharge of part of its load.

2. It can stack one load on top of another.

3. It can pick up all kinds of odd-shaped objects, such as a load of lumber, a compressor, a portable generator, etc.; whereas the present straddle carrier often requires the assistance of a fork-truck to place an object on a master pallet before movement.

4. It can lift things out of trucks and railroad cars.

Obviously the traveloader is more expensive than the straddle carrier, but its versatility appears to give it an advantage for certain operations.

POSSIBILITY IV—FORK TRUCKS, UNIT LOADS, AND AERIAL ROPEWAYS

Few Americans are acquainted with the aerial ropeways and their possibilities. Many of their applications are not appreciated by us. During the Italian war in Ethiopia, it was reported that the Italian Army was supplied at the rate of 700 tons a day over an 80-mile ropeway in miserable, rugged terrain. The longest ropeway in operation now is in Sweden. It is about 60 miles long, and it appears there is no reason why much longer ropeways could not be successfully operated.

The ropeway can negotiate literally any gradient, so terrain is no problem. Its operation is practically unaffected by wind, snow, rain, or heat. It does not require a great deal of bulky material to construct. Preassembled towers could be quickly erected by a small crew. Capacities of 100 to 200 tons per hour would be practicable for military operations, in light portable structures. Unit loads of 1 to 3 tons would be easy to handle.

Speeds of 40 to 2,000 feet per minute would be possible. Passengers could be carried if desired. It could be erected much faster than a road can be built. It is not very vulnerable to enemy fire. Far less material, equipment, and men are required than with roads. Moreover, it has one great advantage over vehicular techniques:

It forwards loads continuously without personnel accompanying each load.

In practice, ropeways would be located on the beach and would lead to each of the major base depots. Fork trucks would take unit loads out of the landing craft, put them on trays, or cars of the ropeway for conveyance to depots. At the depots, fork trucks would remove the unit loads and stack them. The ropeways could be made to be self-loading and discharging. Ropeways could be established from base to intermediate and advanced depots. They could also supply isolated and relatively stationary combat groups.

Referring to the three basic handling problems, it will be seen that this system accomplishes:

1. Handling mechanized loads.

2. Substantial elimination of vehicles.

3. One transfer is eliminated because the fork truck often will put the unit load directly on the ropeway from the landing craft.

There is a further possibility that some sort of stationary island offshore could be created on which to mount a ropeway and supplies could be conveyed directly to the base depot. If this could be achieved, fantastic gains would be made in relieving the beachhead of congestion. The transfers of material from ship to landing craft and from landing craft to beachhead stack, and from beachhead to vehicle would all be eliminated.

POSSIBILITY V—UNIT LOADS, FORK TRUCKS, AND BELT CONVEYORS

In 1950, Mr. Harold Von Thaaden, of the Hewitt-Robins Co., Inc., presented before the ASME a paper on Conveyors and the Problem of Military Supply. He recommended cross-country conveyors to forward military supplies. These would be portable conveyors, each about 200 feet long. Complete with belt truss sections, drive and idlers, they would weigh about 7,000 pounds and take up approximately the same shipping space as standard 2½-ton truck. In continuous operation, one 30-inch belt conveyor would do the job of 400 Army trucks. Thirty-five men could lay a quarter of a mile of such conveyor in 2 hours. About 100 soldiers would be required to maintain and operate a 30-mile conveyor system. The belt would run night and day at 5 miles an hour. Because of straight-line advantages, 10 miles of overland conveyor would do the job of 15 miles of road. These are a staggering set of advantages, and

there is no doubt that the belt conveyor industry could make it so.

The author would suggest, however, that the 30-inch belt conveyor is not the answer. The belt should be broader and heavier so that the unit load principle could be adopted. Therefore, a conveyor capable of moving unit loads on the same general basis and at the same speeds, is a more proper goal. If a 1-ton unit load were spaced every 10 feet on the conveyor, and the conveyor moved at 5 miles an hour, supplies would be forwarded at better than 2,500 tons per hour.

Again if it were possible to support this conveyor on floating pontoons leading to a ship offshore, we would eliminate 2 to 3 transfer operations and greatly relieve beachhead and road congestion. Such a system would not have the flexibility of the aerial ropeway, nor its ability to negotiate gradients as steep as 2:1, nor its speed of erection. However, it would be ideal for the high-volume operation from beach or dock to base depot.

POSSIBILITY VI—AMPHIBIOUS CARGO VEHICLE, UNIT LOADS, AND FORK TRUCKS

Last May the Army Transportation Corps announced a new type of ampbibious vehicle. The BARC is rated at 60 tons and has a drop front ramp to facilitate cargo discharge.

Since a cargo ship using ship's gear would discharge unit loads into the BARC lying beside it in the water, and the BARC could travel on its own power to shore, then cross the beach on wheels and follow the road to intermediate base depot for discharge, a considerable saving would be made. The BARC's principal advantage is that it eliminates transfers at two very troublesome points: (a) from the landing craft to the beach, and (b) from the beach to vehicle destined for depot.

Also, it looks like an especially valuable vehicle for handling odd loads that do not readily fit into other mechanized handling devices. For instance, large bulldozers, tanks, trucks, artillery pieces, mobile radar stations, etc., could be moved ashore much more efficiently by this technique.

It does not appear to be a good technique for general land operations.

POSSIBILITY VII—THE CARGO CARRYING HELICOPTER

The Transportation Corps has already conducted some successful experiments with helicopters for emergency shipments. Here the helicopter hovers over a portion of the ship's deck and lowers a rope with hook. This hook is attached to a load fastened in a sling or container. The helicopter then winches the cargo up secures it, and flies directly to the desired spot.

If the giant straddle-type cargo handling helicopter can be made practical, enormous savings could be made. Master pallets or containers with 10 to 20 tons could be flown from large cargo ships having special landing decks, or from beach or depot to whatever point was desired.

Such a technique would give the Army undreamed of speed in moving supplies. Neither terrain, road conditions, or intervening enemy strong points would be a problem. Enormous numbers of trucks, men, and maintenance facilities and road-building facilities would be eliminated. Such aircraft would save so much money and shipping space, as well as driver manpower, that this flying freight car idea may not be so expensive after all. Certainly the idea should be carefully explored.

Results of such a program

Through these techniques, combinations of them, or others not mentioned here, it would be possible to greatly speed the movement of supplies. As a minimum result, we could expect the following:

1. The numbers of supply troops required could be cut at least 20 to 25 percent, perhaps even more. These troops would be available for combat duty.

2. The need for civilian labor to vast quantities at rear depots could be cut 75 to 90 percent by introducing the fork truck system.

3. Substantial numbers of cargo trucks could be eliminated because delays in loading and unloading would be reduced. This in turn would effect a saving in shipping space, gasoline requirements, the reduction of road congestion, the reduction of road building requirements, and the requirements for drivers with all their supporting supplies and facilities.

4. By going to the unit load technique, the elaborate packaging now given each individual case or carton could be reduced. Collectively, 30 cartons, let us say, could be made into a unit load that would be strong enough for all handling purposes, yet would reduce packaging costs.

Putting such a program in action

Nothing significant will be accomplished until, on the highest level, the Army recognizes that the mass movement of supplies is its single biggest job other than combat. Once this is done, and a unified overall handling program is initiated under someone with imagination and vigor, tremendous results can be expected.

One supply branch—perhaps the Transportation Corps—should be charged with the movement and handling technique for all supplies from beachhead to frontline, or at least to supply points.

The Department of Defense should recognize that this supply job is an interservice problem. It requires coordination from the end of production line through the continental warehouses to the cargo ships and so on into the hands of the combat troops. It must be attacked as such by some interservice materials handling group, which should create a uniform handling procedure, with each link integrated with the others.

Conclusion

In brief, mechanized handling offers us an immediate and practical method of releasing large numbers of troops for combat duty, for reducing the number of cargo trucks now used, and for greatly speeding the movement of supply. These gains will far outweigh the costs.

No claim is made that all of these things will work in all of the places and ways suggested. The author does maintain, however, that vast improvements are possible through mechanized handling.

Organized Labor Takes Initiative To Make Certain Welfare Funds Are Administered With Complete Honesty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned before the manner in which our great labor organizations are taking steps to see that union-welfare funds are administered with complete honesty, even with a somewhat higher standard of ethics than that prevailing in ordinary business.

This is as it should be. When a union negotiates a hospitalization, welfare, or pension system for its members, every penny possible above actual legitimate costs should go exclusively for the benefit of the members. There should be full disclosure of the facts about the fund to the public and to members of the union. There should be an accounting, to the public and to the members, for every dime.

Both the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the American Federation of Labor have adopted principles to guide the operation of welfare funds by their affiliated unions. Both of these big labor federations are acutely conscious of the responsibility they bear to make sure that the funds are administered according to the highest standards of ethics.

The weekly organ of the International Association of Machinists carries a pertinent editorial on the AFL statement of principles on welfare funds. The editorial, entitled, "We Can't Afford Moral Backsliders," admirably declares the high idealism that motivates all worthwhile union leaders and shows that union spokesmen themselves are insistent on integrity in the handling of welfare funds. I offer the text of the editorial for the RECORD:

WE CAN'T AFFORD MORAL BACKSLIDERS

Policing health and welfare plans is one of the most painful problems facing the union movement. We can say, with complete truth, that the difficulties in the administration of health and welfare plans, the kickbacks from insurance companies, the missing funds have occurred in only a tiny fraction of 1 percent of the thousands of plans in existence.

We can be proud that in the administration of thousands of health and welfare plans negotiated by IAM lodges, not a single bad apple has turned up.

But saying this is not enough. There have been some scandals in connection with a few health and welfare plans. These scandals have given aid and comfort to labor's enemies; they have provided ammunition that labor enemies have been using not against the guilty but principally against all labor.

It is because the union movement is founded on the highest ideals, because it has no other purpose but to serve its members and the country, that the slightest slip of an individual gives our enemies a springboard from which to attack not only our weaknesses, but our entire existence.

As union members, we must be on our guard to make sure that slips are prevented, not only in our own organization but in every labor organization. The labor movement cannot afford moral backsliders, no matter how small their number.

FOR LABOR'S PROTECTION

To help with this problem, the A. F. of L. executive council has just adopted a code of principles to guide all affiliated unions in setting up and administering health and welfare plans.

Our own IAM executive council already has adopted a similar code of ethics governing our health and welfare plans, as have some other unions. All others are expected to follow suit.

The AFL executive council also pointed out that this job of protecting our health and welfare funds is also going to require some additional legislation, both Federal and State.

The AFL has recommended that full reports on the financial operation of every negotiated health and welfare plan be required annually by the Bureau of Internal Revenue and that such reports always be available to union

members and employers directly concerned, to State insurance officials, and authorized Government agencies.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE STATE

Also, the AFL recommends that State insurance commissions and departments should assume and exercise a greater responsibility for the integrity, competence, and character of agents and brokers who are licensed by the State. At present, such a license is virtually meaningless.

Records and accounts of agents and brokers should be subject to regular and thorough inspections, and they should be required to file regular reports with State insurance commissions disclosing and identifying every fee and commission received in connection with group policies issued as a part of health and welfare plans, and the nature and purpose of expenditures made in the course of their business.

The charging of excessive fees, commissions, or expenses, and the making of unethical or improper payments to secure or to hold an account should result in the prompt revocation of the license to operate.

The American labor movement is moving to safeguard its good name. We can only hope and trust that the insurance companies—at least those that do not have to pay kickbacks to sell their policies—will do likewise.

The Cabinet Committee on National Transportation Problems Recommends That the Nation's Railroads Be Given the Right To Compete With Other Forms of Passenger Haulage and Freight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the May 5, 1955, issue of Weekly Newsletter of the Independent Editorial Services, Ltd., Washington, D. C., included the following editorial concerning the recent recommendations of the President's Special Transportation Commission. The editorial is entitled "The Right To Compete" and warrants the attention of all Members of Congress:

THE RIGHT TO COMPETE

The Cabinet Committee on National Transportation Problems has issued its study of the subject, and naturally attention has been focused on the railroads. It is now up to Congress to straighten out the tangle which has been caused not by economics but by Congress itself.

Most of the laws governing the operation of the railroads are more than 30 years old, and in effect have been strangling railroad operation since the rise of truck, airplane, and pipeline transportation. If Congress does not get busy, it can raise hell with this country's defenses in case of war, and can cause too high prices in time of peace.

The railroads—as they did in the last struggle—will have to carry 90 percent of the goods for war. To kill off the railroads so that they can't function in case of war is just plain suicide, and that is what the present laws, as necessarily administered by the Interstate Commerce Commission, are doing.

Nothing can carry heavy war materials and large bodies of men as efficiently or as cheaply as the railroads. Trucks are convenient for short hauls and restricted weights, but we must come back to the railroads if we want to get huge armaments transported over long distances. To insure a supply of cars in case of emergency, we should stockpile them now, instead of being required to junk them for the purpose of avoiding taxes.

To keep railroad transportation alive, preserving industrial communities and helping free travel for the population, the railroads should be permitted to compete equally with all other forms of movement. It is just stupid to extripate the cheapest, most reliable, and safest mode of travel by sheer inertia of Congress.

The railroad case should be under constant and vigilant surveillance, and not left to archaic legislation which was designed for the preautomobile age, or the period when the automobile was a pleasure vehicle.

The situation of the railroads today would be pathetic were it not so tragic. On a foggy day when the airlines are grounded, hordes of passengers descend upon the railroads, expecting full services, despite the fact that this is only an occasional event.

The airlines enjoy the facilities built at public expense and in some instances receive subsidies. By the same token, and in justice, it would seem that trains should be canceled, just as airlines cancel a flight, if it means a dead loss in revenue to operate.

If the railroads should cancel a train because of too few passengers, a holy howl would go up from the public. Some of the trains between Washington and New York should run only in bad weather, when the airlines can't run.

The management of the roads, the labor unions of the roads, and the public should take a good look at the transportation report.

Congress would do well to adjust the laws, major or minor, so that the railroads can compete in justice with the other forms of passenger haulage and freight. It is only prudent and long overdue.

Like a Breath of Fresh Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an article written by Barrett L. Crandall, chairman of the executive committee of the Washington Rowing Association. This article was set forth in the official program of the 10th annual Potomac Sprint Rowing Championship Regatta held at Hains Point, Washington, D. C., on May 14, 1955, of which Mr. Crandall was chairman:

LIKE A BREATH OF FRESH AIR

For the third time, something new is being added to the Washington scene today. It is a group of more than 400 young oarsmen who have come here to compete on our Potomac for sprint rowing honors. Both young and old say "Welcome" to them because their appearance is like a breath of fresh air—bringing the spirit of amateurism into the midst of an area where so many concentrate on professional activities.

Two years ago Washington was honored by the Eastern Association of Rowing Colleges. It was selected for the first time as the site for an intercollegiate rowing event. This regatta revealed that Washington has the potentialities to become the rowing capital of the world.

Right away, we can hear loud-voiced expressions of surprise: "What's all this talk about rowing grabbing the limelight? This is just some new fad." Well, brother, get set for a surprise. The 10 or more contests to be seen today are just some more of a string of competitions which have been going on for over a century.

Way back when Millard Fillmore was President of the United States—yes, way back when folks were talking about what that 32d Congress was doing, the predecessors of two of today's competitors started intercollegiate rowing.

Just 103 years ago, back in 1852, Yale and Harvard crews began to compete with one another. Down through the years the sport has spread to other schools and now, each year there are two great regattas in which they compete for top honors.

Here, in the Potomac Regatta, with more crews and colleges participating than in any other, sprint rowing honors are decided over an official Olympic distance course of 2,000 meters. At Syracuse, N. Y., the once-called Poughkeepsie regatta is held to determine who the distance rowing (3-mile) champions are.

Today we salute the young men participating in the oldest form of organized sport in America. They occupy a unique and enviable place in the world of athletics. They are all simon-pure amateurs, competing in contests the like of which do not attract professionals. In an age when the tendency is so strong, and properly so, for young men to capitalize on their athletic skills, it is indeed different to find one sport untouched by the dollar sign. A breath of fresh air.

But there is more about these young men that is important. There are some who have been known to remark: "What's the matter with their heads? Why do they pull and tug on those heavy oars with no chance to shine as individuals—with no prospect of seeing their names in headlines as winners of this or that event?"

Well—there's nothing wrong with the heads of these lads. Just ask the deans of their respective universities. As a group of students, these sweepswingers usually rank among the highest scholastically to be found at any school. More than that, they are precision artisans, working with split-second teamwork in a sport which quickly reveals and develops real men.

All Washington hopes that the events today will prove the forerunner for a long series of similar regattas. The example they provide of clean amateurism and sportsmanship is good for this city. Those responsible for bringing it to the Nation's Capital are to be congratulated for having done so.

But this sport of rowing has deeper, more far-reaching significance to Washington, to this Nation—yes, to the entire world. As today's contests are being presented, we have in our midst those who are looking beyond. In the examples of teamwork being seen on the Potomac today, they see prospects of greater teamwork within our own country and between nations—something that could mean a breath of really fresh air, air untainted by the trials and strifes that are too prevalent.

Those looking ahead, have their eyes on the trials at which oarsmen will be selected to represent the United States in the Olympic Games in Melbourne, Australia. They feel that the logical place for holding such trials is our own Nation's Capital.

The young men who will represent our Nation will be ambassadors of good will. They will be a living demonstration of how young men of varying circumstances from all parts of a free country, can and do work together successfully.

Out on the river there are undoubtedly several young men who will win places in the rowing squad which will go to Australia and seek to maintain American supremacy. The

teamwork they demonstrate Down Under can be an impressive lesson to the entire world. In their strong hands may lie important answers to our destiny.

High Dam Bill Odd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following article entitled "High Dam Bill Odd," published in the Post-Register newspaper at Idaho Falls. The article refers to testimony given by W. S. Holden, an attorney for a number of canal companies and irrigation companies in Idaho.

HIGH DAM BILL ODD

"The bill pending in the Senate to authorize a high Federal dam at Hells Canyon invokes the constitutional authority in Congress to control the Snake River, a departure from the established practice by the Federal Government to construct Federal projects on the upper Snake River under the national Reclamation Act."

W. S. Holden, Idaho Falls attorney, made this statement Monday after returning Sunday from testifying in hearings of the Hells Canyon bill in Washington, D. C.

"All of the Federal projects in Idaho above Milner Dam, the last point of major diversion for irrigation in Idaho, were authorized under the national Reclamation Act. Any projects authorized under this act are operated in conformity with State water law. Our basic objection to the Hells Canyon bill is that the Federal Government is attempting to authorize this legislation by invoking its constitutional authority under the commerce clause of the Constitution, not under the Reclamation Act," Holden told the Post-Register Monday after filing a written objection in Washington, D. C., and after testifying orally for 2 hours and 25 minutes.

PRODUCED BILL

After Senators ANDERSON, JACKSON, and NEUBERGER originally challenged such a legal departure, Holden said he produced the bill authorizing the Palisades Dam.

"Conceding the marked difference in language in the two bills, the Senators then answered that the Hells Canyon bill sought to vest the operation of the Federal high dam at Hells Canyon under the Bureau of Reclamation in compliance with the Federal Reclamation Act. I seriously question whether this can be done because the authorization clause of high-dam bill is in no way based on the National Reclamation Act and water users of Idaho do not want to be put to the expense of testing this matter in courts," Holden, counsel for the Upper Snake River Water Users Protective Union, reported.

Holden said he also questions the constitutionality of that section of the act wherein it attempts to preserve existing and future rights to the water users of Idaho. A Supreme Court decision might be necessary to test the constitutionality of this provision of the bill.

LICENSE POWER

He also emphasized that a Federal license for a non-Federal power project is not "an original grant of authority but merely permission to use a State's grant of authority."

"After a Federal license is issued, then the non-Federal operator, such as the Idaho Power Co., must comply and conform to State water law. The Federal dam does not.

"If Congress insists on the exercise of this power—the constitutional power invested under the commerce clause rather than the Reclamation Act—then I earnestly urge that Congress commences with development of the Snake River in the upper watershed region in Idaho and Wyoming where multiple-purpose projects can be developed which would result in effective benefits upstream before going down the Snake River to Hells Canyon.

"The irrigation, flood control, and power benefits at the upper reaches of the river certainly would have unusual benefits where they can be effectively applied.

URGES NEW DAM

"I urge the authorization of the reregulating dam below Palisades Dam under the Reclamation Act. I also urge the construction of a reservoir above Palisades at the Alpine site. This reservoir would impound in excess of 1 million acre-feet of water for multiple-purpose use.

"The regulating dam itself, which would cost from ten to twelve million dollars, could have a power head of 100 feet and according to engineers' report would develop 45,000 kilowatts of power."

Holden stated that Senator WATKINS, of Utah, joined him in urging that the Columbia interstate compact be approved before enactment of the pending Hells Canyon Act.

Pride of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the city of Lakewood, Ohio, has just observed one of the most unique celebrations in modern American history—the observance of a "pride of progress."

These peerless American citizens of Lakewood are justifiably elated over their accomplishments during this past decade, for without State or Federal assistance this city, with a population of approximately 70,000, has spent $50 million in civic improvements.

This decade of advancement has marked the construction of a new municipal swimming pool, the expenditures of millions for the development of Lakewood Hospital, thousands for the development of off-street parking, $5,215,000 in new apartment construction, and more millions for parochial schools and new churches. Millions have been spent in the last 10 years improving and adding to Lakewood's public schools, and thousands more have been spent in general revitalization of a community which many people said reached its peak 25 or 30 years ago.

Uppermost in this sense of pride is the completion of the $1,200,000 Lakewood Civic Auditorium, the last word in modern amphitheaters with accoustical design employing the best features known to audio-engineering. Its one floor design with seating for 2,000 people provides an atmosphere of informality and a feeling of belonging.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Lakewood are rightly proud of their accomplishments. It is indeed unique for a community of this size without both hands in Uncle Sam's pockets to embark upon such a tremendous building program. I am proud to represent these true Americans in the Congress. Their spirit and energy could well serve as an example for all America. "Pride of progress" would be a fitting motto and guide for us all. We in Washington point with the utmost pride to Lakewood, Ohio.

The Reserve Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, much has been said on the so-called Reserve bill during the last 2 days.

Much more could have been said. Much less probably should have been said, because the subject matter is one which is certainly not new to the great majority of the Members of this Congress. Especially those of us who serve on the Committee on Armed Services have wrestled with the problem for years.

There is one specific phase of the problem, however, which cannot be explored too much and which should be the subject of exploration and study until properly resolved.

An old newspaper contemporary friend of mine, who has seen service with the Marine Corps and is now one of the fine editorial writers of the New Orleans States, has said in an editorial what so many of us would like to say on this floor.

Through me, I am taking this opportunity of this Marine Reserve giving expression on this floor today by repeating the words of a most thought-provoking editorial which he has written:

RESERVE PROBLEM

The Defense Department's policy on the Armed Forces Reserves is becoming as incomprehensible as the State Department's policy on Formosa. Publicly it plugs for a strong Organized Reserve, while privately it is erasing from its Organized Reserve rolls its most valuable asset—the battle-tested, field grade officers.

What members of Reserve forces of several branches have been mumbling about for some months finally was brought to public attention by an Associated Press newsfeature of a typical Reserve officer in Maryland who is about to be "promoted" out of the Reserves. Of this officer the AP said:

"(He) has a feeling that the Government thinks it was nice to have him when he was needed, but since he isn't needed now the Government would like to save money by encouraging him to quit."

The encouragement consists of promoting a man to a rank above that allowed for billets in his Reserve unit. He is replaced

eventually by someone less experienced. And eventually he resigns his commission for while he is encouraged to continue participating in drills without pay he finally decides it is unfair to himself and to his family to remain in the Reserves without compensation while sacrificing civilian opportunities.

Some employers don't want to train him for a better job because he might leave again to defend his country. Also he begins to think that this time he gives to an ungrateful Government might be spent better doing chores about the house or giving his family some recreation.

The problem is one of financing, apparently with the Defense Department anxious to show Congress that it is getting the greatest number of men for the dollars allotted to Reserves. The sacrifice of quality for quantity is senseless, however, for the raw enlisted men could be trained to the same skills they now possess in a matter of weeks if a war occurred.

To train replacements for these still comparatively young officers would take years. These are men whose military knowledge is not confined to knowing which end of the rifle is the business end. These are men who could command battalions, air squadrons, and technical units.

The Defense Department apparently is timid about explaining such matters to Congress which has been critical of Defense Department shenanigans. But this is false economy and Congress ought to ask the Department to explain it.

Strength and Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Addressing the members of the Parent-Teachers Association at St. Joseph's Hall, Fitchburg, Sunday night, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN of Clinton stated that, "despite present gigantic world problems, there has been a distinct improvement recently in the entire international situation and that the prospects for something more than a nervous peace could be regarded as brighter than at any time since the end of the Korean conflict."

Pointing to the admission of Germany into NATO, the Austrian peace treaty and the happenings of the recent Bandung conference as most encouraging signs of the vitality of the free world, the Clinton Congressman declared that "while it is too early to predict complete success with current negotiations, that all these developments indicate that we can take a more optimistic view of international problems pending the outcome of the Big Four conference.

"I would not venture to predict at this time," said the Congressman, "that we can or that we will be able to forge in the near future the just peace which all the peoples of the world so ardently yearn for. But it is becoming increasingly clear that the attitude of the Soviet toward peace proposals is more conciliatory and more rational. If this Nation continues to make it clear to the Kremlin leaders that we will not compromise our basic principles and ideals and that we will not tolerate international banditry designed to permit communism to destroy free institutions, I sincerely believe that great progress can be made, by proposals for disarmament and control of atomic and hydrogen energy, toward the goals of peace and freedom which we seek and which must underlie any lasting settlement of world problems."

"It is the time for us, not only to sympathize with, but stanchly to support the intensified efforts which this Government is making to try to avert the unspeakable calamity of a third world war, and every true American must be and will be prepared, I am sure, to cooperate toward these great ends.

"In the meantime," he said, "it behooves us to keep our own house in order—to build our defenses and to establish our striking forces on a firm and invincible basis—to develop our economic resources—promote the national prosperity—so as to insure that our great economic machine is kept healthy and dynamic and so that employment opportunities are furnished to all our fellow citizens.

"Economic strength is the basis of our military power as the Soviet well knows. But there is another kind of strength most essential, and that is the kind represented here tonight—our spiritual strength, our spiritual devotion to the principles of freedom and an unyielding determination to uphold them. That is the real strength of America. If properly preserved and nourished that strength will enable us, not only to build a greater America, but in time to secure a peaceful world."

The Congressman declared that organizations like PTA were making invaluable contributions to the solution of our educational problems and the well-being of our youth who will be the future leaders of our national life.

Override the Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1955

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Boston Post, in its issue of May 13, 1955, editorially asked the Congress to override a veto of the postal pay bill if the President does veto the important measure. The newspaper, a strong supporter of President Eisenhower during his 1952 campaign for election, presents the following logical arguments on the question:

OVERRIDE THE VETO

It is the duty of the Congress, if the postal pay increase of 8.8 percent is vetoed by the President, to override the veto and grant the 500,000 underpaid postal workers an adjustment long needed in their living standards.

Congress is conscious, of course, that the 50-percent pay increase that the Members voted for themselves imposes upon them a duty to adjust the pay of the postal workers, who have been neglected in the inflationary rise of living costs, and who never were paid what they deserve.

Postmaster General Summerfield has declared he will recommend a veto of the $178-million-postal-pay bill. For a professional politician he is peculiarly blind to the needs of these important public servants.

The Senate vote appears to defy the wishes of the President, but there is some question whether the threat of a veto is being used by some Senators to get themselves off the hook with the intention of supporting Senator CARLSON'S move to introduce a postal-pay-raise bill which meets the President's approval.

Veterans' Administration Hospital, East Orange, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to spend Hospital Day, May 15, at the splendid Veterans' Administration hospital at East Orange, N. J., and I was deeply impressed with the fine care that is being provided for our hospitalized veterans by the able manager, Dr. A. P. Upshur and his fine staff. They are aided by faithful regular volunteers who were honored at the ceremonies on Sunday. Awards were presented to 200 volunteers, 6 of whom have served well over 1,000 hours; 1, Mrs. Helen Seidenberg, has served 2,902 hours. She travels almost 2 hours each way to perform her duties at the hospital. This spirit of devotion and sacrifice animates these good citizens who give so generously of their time.

The following organizations compose the Veterans' Administration voluntary services hospital advisory committee: American Gold Star Mothers; American Legion; American Legion Auxiliary; American National Red Cross; American Veterans Committee; American Veterans of World War II; American Veterans of World War II Auxiliary; American War Dads; American War Mothers; American Women's Voluntary Services, Inc.; Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States; B'nai B'rith; B'nai B'rith Women's Supreme Council; Catholic War Veterans; Catholic War Veterans, Ladies Auxiliary, Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War; Disabled American Veterans; Disabled American Veterans Auxiliary; Eastern Paralyzed Veterans Association; 52 Association; Garden Club of New Jersey; Jewish War Veterans of the United States; Jewish War Veterans, Ladies Auxiliary; Marine Corps League; Marine Corps League Auxiliary; Masonic Service Association of the United States; Military Order of the Cootie, Military Order of the Purple Heart; Military Order of the Purple Heart, Ladies Auxiliary; National Catholic Community Service; National Jewish Welfare Board; National Jewish Welfare Board, Women's Organization Division; National Woman's Relief Corps; Navy Mothers Clubs of America, Inc.; New Jersey Federation of Women's Clubs; New Jersey Tuberculosis League, Inc.; Order of the Eastern Star of New Jersey; Supreme Cootiette Club of the United States; United Spanish War Veterans; United Spanish War Veterans Auxiliary; Veterans of Foreign Wars; Veterans of Foreign Wars, Auxiliary; Women's Overseas Service League; Young Women's Christian Association.

They render splendid cooperation to the competent chief of social services, Mr. Joseph V. McLoone.

My remarks at the ceremonies follow:

It is a privilege to celebrate National Hospital Day in this great veterans' facility and

your kindness in inviting me to participate is deeply appreciated. It is fitting that we proclaim the importance of hospitals in the American community and their tradition of devoted service to the American people. It is especially fitting that we observe the magnificent work being carried on in our veterans hospitals to provide the highest quality care to the valiant defenders of our beloved Nation.

On this peaceful May day in 1955, even in this spot where the ravages of war are close by, V–J Day of September 2, 1945, seems a long way off. That memorable day signaled the end of the most terrible war in all history, which had involved almost every nation in the world.

No prepared summary of statistics can properly tell the story of our loss. Of no moment is the financial cost when compared to the cost in suffering and sorrow, in disabled men and heartbroken women, orphaned children and broken homes.

Many of you here remember very well the tremendous tide of emotional jubilation that ran throughout our country on V–J Day. Think how the relatives of our prisoners of war felt, for now their men would be released from prison camps; inhabitants of the horrible concentration camps holding the civilian survivors of these years of hatred would be able to walk again with the God-given dignity of free men; the medical profession relieved of the tremendous demands of military medicine could now devote their time to repairing the physical and mental ravages of war; soldiers, sailors, marines, and coast guardsmen would recuperate from the rigors of combat and attempt to pick up the threads of a disturbed life. I recall the great surge of relief and joy which V–J Day brought to me and my comrades serving in the European theater. Like so many others, probably some of whom are here today, I had gone through the war from the landings in North Africa to the surrender in Germany and was preparing to go to the Far East when the thrilling news of the final surrender of the Japanese came.

At that time the American people were deeply aware of their debt of honor to their countrymen who had endured so much and of their duty to the disabled, to those who had given their health and strength in battle. Congress acted with great wisdom in carrying out the will of the American people. It was recognized that, no matter how beautiful or elaborate, a monument fashioned out of masonry would still be a lifeless, useless momento to the men and women in World War II. In its place was erected something much better, much more fitting—the GI bill. Congress also passed legislation which provided for the construction of these beautiful modern Veterans' Administration hospitals. These indeed are living memorials, dedicated in great part to the dead but of service to the living. The American people were fortunate that men of the caliber of Dr. Upshur were available to assume the exacting, veering, and demanding job of managing these great hospitals and that highly trained personnel were eager to devote their talents and skills to this public service.

In 1945 and 1946 there was started another memorial founded not on legislation but on the great love of the veteran that exists in the hearts of so many wonderful Americans. While volunteers had been serving in service and veterans hospitals for many years prior to World War II, it was after this war that they were organized into one group under the Special Services of the Veterans' Administration. Forty national organizations have joined together to coordinate their services, eliminate duplication, and deliver to the hospitalized veteran the full support of the people in the community.

While maintaining their own organizational individuality they work in close cooperation with each other and the result is of tremendous service to the Administrator for Veterans' Affairs and the Chief Medical Director on the national level and the hospital manager in the local community. These organizations may be veteran, service, religious, or fraternal but they all have one common goal—service to the veteran.

The proof that they are doing their job well sits right here before us today. You 200 volunteers are to receive certificates honoring you for the faithful performance of your duties. Your service has been so outstanding that in some cases there is no certificate yet authorized to equal the number of hours that you have served.

I understand that you serve in virtually every service of the hospital bringing with you the true spirit of service. It is particularly appropriate that we should honor you on the same day in which we honor the nursing profession for your service so closely resembles and, in many cases, becomes a part of theirs. You are here to give comfort and solace to people who are sick and disabled. You do it willingly, unselfishly, and, for the most part, anonymously. It is on rare occasions such as this one that the other people in your community are afforded the privilege of viewing you in public and receiving from you the same inspiration which comes to me now.

You may ask how I know so much about the volunteers. I hear about you in letters from my constituents. In their praise of the care which they receive in this fine institution they invariably make mention of the smiling face, cheerful hello, or helping hand of the volunteers.

Be proud of your certificates. They are your remembrance of the part you play in building and maintaining this living monument to the men and women who served their country in time of war. This is an example of America at its greatest for it shows that we can mix the power and strength required to win a war with the sincerity and gratitude required to maintain a just peace.

Like the professional staff, yours is a service to America that cannot be measured. It is my privilege to salute you and it gives me great comfort to know that you serve the men and women hospitalized in this institution. Between your efforts and those of the professional staff I know they are in good hands. I shall go back to Washington heartened by that knowledge and I pledge you my best efforts to insure that the Congress, just as it did in 1945, will stand by our Nation's obligations to the VA hospital program.

Markers for Graves of Deceased Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following resolution, as passed by the Carson-Wilson Post, No. 1, the American Legion, Tulsa, Okla., on April 26, 1955, with which I concur:

Whereas grave markers are now furnished by the Government for graves of deceased veterans and former members of the Armed Forces; and

Whereas certain cemeteries do not approve the markers furnished by the Government; and

Whereas H. R. 4695 has been introduced to the United States Congress and S. 1121 has been introduced in the United States Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, Carson-Wilson Post, No. 1, Tulsa, Okla., in regular meeting convened this 26th day of April 1955, go on record favoring the passage of House bill 4695 and Senate bill 1121, which will give the next of kin of a deceased veteran or former member of the Armed Forces who becomes deceased the right to choose between the acceptance of a Government veterans' grave marker or a cash allowance, as provided in the bills, to be applied toward the purchase and erection of a memorial chosen by the next of kin; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the first district convention for favorable action and from there to the department convention in September 1955, at Tulsa, Okla., and further that a copy of this resolution be submitted to each member of the Oklahoma congressional delegation and each member of the senatorial delegation.

This resolution passed favorably in regular meeting of Carson-Wilson Post, No. 1, Tulsa, Okla., April 26, 1955.

GEORGE L. HUNT,
Commander.
A. E. WILSON,
Adjutant.

Colorado River Fiasco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the upper Colorado River projects present a challenge to the imagination as well as a serious threat to the water supply to more than 7 million people in southern California as shown in the following editorials, one from the Los Angeles Herald-Express, and one from the Los Angeles Times.

All Members of Congress should give long and careful thought before even giving any consideration to these projects.

The editorials follow:

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Express of May 5, 1955]

COLORADO RIVER FIASCO

The more one probes into the fantastic upper Colorado River Basin reclamation project, the more the impression grows that this may turn out to be one of the worst hunks of boondoggling this Nation ever has been forced to shoulder.

In the first place, it will be robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Taking water out of the Colorado River in its upper reaches will mean that southern California will have to be shorted on its supply in the not-too-distant future and our domestic and agricultural water supplies will be threatened.

Official estimates place the cost of the projected upper Colorado Basin project and reclamation projects at more than $1½ billion.

The result is going to be power at fantastically high rates, irrigation at a cost many times the conceivable value of the land, and the scarring of one of our most beautiful national-park-system areas.

Even Senator NEUBERGER, stanch advocate of public power, has admitted that upper Colorado power will be produced at so high a rate that it "precludes extensive use for competitive manufacturing."

It is rather amazing that the Eisenhower administration, which prides itself on sound

business policies, should have fallen into such an economic trap.

It may be gaining votes in the Colorado River Basin States, but it is a cinch it will be losing votes in California.

And what does it all mean as far as agriculture is concerned nationally? That we will thereby raise more corn and wheat to rot in storage bins?

Shouldn't we try to conserve some of this virgin soil for the future when we may need it, instead of ravishing it for crops that might as well be burned on the spot?

[From the Los Angeles Times of May 10, 1955]

POWER FROM HOOVER DAM TO BE REDUCED BY 30 PERCENT

BOULDER CITY, NEV., May 9—A 30-percent reduction in power commitments from generating facilities at Lake Mead is expected to be announced here tomorrow by the Bureau of Reclamation because of the falling level of the lake.

Wade Taylor, acting regional director, said the Bureau's action would be based on a semiofficial survey of water storage behind Hoover Dam. Letters will be sent to power-company customers in Nevada, Arizona, and California notifying them that only 70 percent of the normal power load will be available after June 1, Taylor said.

Power contracts for the new fiscal year will be signed June 1. Last year contracts called for a 15-percent cutback in power commitments.

Southern California Edison Co. and the Los Angeles Water & Power Department buy power from Federal generating facilities, but both have other generating facilities.

The lake level has reached its lowest point since the dam was built more than 20 years ago.

Putting the Blame Where It Belongs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the many requests I have had for transcripts of what I said before the House Banking and Currency Committee on May 13, 1955, on the subject of who has bungled the Salk vaccine distribution problem, I am inserting that statement in the RECORD. It is as follows:

Mr. MULTER. Dr. Scheele, there isn't any confusion in my mind as Mr. Widnall indicated there may be in his mind. I can see a clear division here of the overall problem into two different problems. One problem is to make sure that we have a safe vaccine that can be used for the purpose intended. The other problem is one of distribution of the vaccine. I wish you would correct me as I go along, if I am wrong in anything I say.

I have taken the trouble to send for the United States Government Organization Manual, the current manual, which sets forth the purposes and duties of the various departments in the executive branch of our Government, including all of the Cabinet officers, and under Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we have the Office of the Secretary, a member of the Cabinet, Mrs. Hobby, and she is charged with the overall management of that Department, and the purpose of that Department is, and I quote "to improve the administration of those agencies of Government, the major responsibilities of which are to promote the general welfare in the fields of health, education, and social security." That Department breaks down into various subdivisions, one of which is the Office of the Surgeon General, which you so ably and competently head, as the Surgeon General.

Your office, under your jurisdiction, is charged with the duty of making sure that whatever new is developed involving the health of the public can be safely used. I haven't any doubt that as long as you are the Surgeon General and you are given the right to perform your duties as required of you by law, you will make sure, within the realm of possibility, and within that degree of certainty that a human being can have, that only safe vaccines will be used, as well as serums and everything else that come within the jurisdiction of your department, and that the minute you discover something is wrong, either in a plant or a laboratory or with a product, you will stop its use until you are sure it is safe. I think you have been doing that.

But there is another problem involved here, and that problem was pointed up by the introduction of bills in this Congress as early as April 18. That was 6 days after the vaccine was released for use throughout the country, and I think, in accordance with the requirements of the law, there has been consultation back and forth between our health officials, headed by yourself, and others, in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and the Canadian Health Department, because simultaneously on the same day, April 12, both the Canadian Government and our Government released this vaccine for public use.

With this difference, however—and I won't pull any punches—I join with every last one of my colleagues in this Congress in laying the fault right in the lap of Mrs. Hobby. If she has been preoccupied with other things, including Cabinet meetings, I don't think any of them were so important as giving her attention to this problem. It was certainly more important that she attended to this problem rather than to making so many speeches, whether to political organizations or otherwise. She is your superior, so I don't ask you to comment on that, but I join my colleagues in saying that she is primarily responsible for this situation.

The Canadians love their children no more and no less than we Americans, and I am sure the Canadian Government has no more and no less interest in the health of their children and their people than our American Government has. They were able, the day they released it as we did on April 12, at the same time to put into effect governmental regulations as to the distribution of the product. They made sure that they wouldn't have to wait for the head of the Government to say that "if and when"—and the statement doesn't impress me one bit—"he hears that some child can't get this vaccine because they haven't the money with which to pay for the inoculation, he will make people listen."

The time for this Congress to make people listen is in advance of that. And as long as I am a Member of this Congress I am going to fight for the enactment of laws in advance of the happening of the contingency, and that is what should have been done here.

Mrs. Hobby, I charge, was derelict in her duty in 1 of 2 respects: Either she has the power under the law to act, in which event she was derelict in not acting, or she doesn't have the power under the law to act, in which event she was derelict in her duty in not coming before this Congress and saying, "Members of the Congress, we need a law so that we can regulate this thing."

That is where all the confusion and confounding of the public has come in.

As early as April 18 Mr. RAINS, of this committee, and other Members since, have introduced bills, not trying to tell you, Dr. Scheele, or your Department, how to operate to determine whether this vaccine is safe, or who should make it, but to make sure that there be no black market at any time, to make sure that this went into the channels of distribution properly, in accordance with the way the medical men, the scientific men, think it should go, and there should be no ifs, ands, or buts about that.

We have been trying, our chairman has three times invited Mrs. Hobby to come here, and she has found it impossible to be here.

Yesterday this committee adopted a resolution requesting her to come here, but the vote was declared out of order because it was taken while the House was having a quorum call. I am sure she knows about that. She still has not been able to find the time to come in and tell this committee whether she has the authority to act, and will act, or she needs a law under which to act.

Now, I think you have made it very clear, Dr. Scheele, that within your jurisdiction you are doing everything you and the men under you can do to make sure the public will be protected.

But we, as Members of the Congress, have a duty to perform, too, and I say the first duty of this Congress is to hear the responsible official of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby, the Secretary, to have her come in here and tell us why she wasn't ready with some plan, on the day this was released, on April 12, just as the Canadian authorities were, and to tell us why she is not ready with some plan now.

No one can blame the National Foundation. They have done a good job, and they will continue to do a good job. But I think you indicated to us when Congressman DAVIDSON last week read to you a section of the law which he thought gave you the authority to control the distribution, and you very properly pointed out that that law does not apply. Now, whether the law does or does not apply, somebody—and that somebody is Mrs. Hobby—should be in here to tell this Congress, in no uncertain terms—let us forget about why she didn't do it up to April 12—she should come in here now and tell us, "This is the way we are going to distribute this and make sure there is proper and equal distribution throughout the country to those who should get the vaccine in accordance with the best scientific and medical thinking and direction." It is time she had such a plan. If she doesn't have one, then this Congress should work one out for her.

With reference to that very matter—and I hope, Dr. Scheele, that you won't think that I am taking this out on you. I have the highest respect for you. I don't mean any of this as being critical of you. I can't say too frequently or in too many places how good a job you have done in the years that you have given yourself to this service. But this matter needs attention, and needs attention now.

Delegating it on a voluntary basis to the 48 States, in my opinion, cannot possibly solve the problem. We have already been told that there are State governments which do not have any funds. We know they can get the vaccine for nothing. They don't have the funds with which to employ the technicians, the doctors, or the nurses to do the innoculating. You, yourself, told us that your Department does not have the funds with which to do that kind of work. It is not supposed to be your job. But somebody has to do it. And if my State has the funds with which to do it I am not going to be very proud, if an adjoining State, or a State a thousand miles away, hasn't the funds to do it. It is my duty as a Congressman to see that the children of every State get these inoculations as fast as it is available.

With your releasing the product in the manner you indicate it is going to be released, it necessarily is going to be in short supply. I can see how you must decide that the vaccine is going to be released in small quantities as each batch is found safe. But somebody must decide who is going to get it. Is it going to go into New York State because we have the money, and another State that doesn't have the funds must wait? That is not my idea of how to treat our children. I think it is Mrs. Hobb's duty to come here and tell us how she is going to handle that. You have enough to do. You are doing a good job to make sure that this vaccine is going to be safe, and that is a full-time job in itself.

As I say, I have tried to take you off the hot spot that you are sitting upon, Dr. Scheele. You can or cannot comment as you please on what I have said, and if you wish to correct any statement that I have made that you think is wrong, I will be happy to have you do it.

That is all, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Members of Congress Engage in a Forum Discussion With United States Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge at United Nations Headquarters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the recent congressional tour to New York City one of the highlights was a visit to the United Nations where the party was greeted by United States Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge and his staff.

After inspecting the United Nations Building, Ambassador Lodge conducted a forum at which time he answered questions from Members of Congress. Following is a transcript of the question-and-answer period:

UNITED STATES MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS—CONGRESSIONAL VISIT TO THE UNITED NATIONS, MAY 7, 1955

Congressman VAN ZANDT. The purpose of this gathering is to permit Ambassador Lodge to make a brief opening statement and to answer questions. If there should be a question that he feels should be answered in executive session, he reserves that right. Each Member of Congress, as he puts his question, should rise and state his name and State for the benefit of the record. Ambassador Lodge will now make a brief opening statement.

Ambassador LODGE. Let me first say that it is quite inspiring to see that the competition of the gift shop wasn't very heavy.

In response to a question that I could not answer upstairs, the auditorium seats a little more than 2,000 people.

Now, the United Nations has not worked out in the way that the founders thought it would 10 years ago. You know this year the United Nations is celebrating its 10th anniversary with a week's celebration in San Francisco.

Here is how it has worked out:

The Soviet Union, as I said upstairs, has paralyzed the Security Council by its abuse of the veto. But, it has not destroyed the power of collective international action. We now have a system whereby we can go to the General Assembly in cases of aggression and thereby bypass the veto. Also, under the United Nations Charter we can set up regional organizations. We have done this in the case of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which has a good deal of force back of it. The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization is just beginning. We also have the Organization of American States which goes back to the Monroe Doctrine and, of course, is much older than the United Nations. And the Organization of American States I think is a model of what an international organization can be. We follow the policy here of not having disputes come to the United Nations unless the Organization of American States has proved that it cannot deal with them; and since I have been here that has never happened.

So there is some power of collective security in the United Nations although not through the Security Council.

Secondly, the United Nations has developed into a remarkable center of information. When a very difficult question is about to come up for a vote, a day or two before that, it is just surprising how much you can find out about what the real attitudes of these governments are. There is nothing like having to vote on a thing, as you gentlemen well know, to make you come to grips with the realities of the subject.

We learn a great deal here about the thinking of other nations. And the file that I send every night to Washington on that, I am told, is of great interest in Washington.

The United Nations is a center for harmonizing disputes. That, of course, is one of its original purposes and it has lived up to it. That often is not very spectacular. If you harmonize disputes you do not attract as much attention as when you have a dispute. For example, the Berlin blockade was brought to an end as a result of a meeting in the delegates' lounge between a United States representative and a Soviet representative.

These contacts can be made without loss of prestige, loss of face, or anything like that.

Then the United Nations has developed into the only truly world forum. It is the most powerful single engine that there is for influencing world opinion. And I believe that only by influencing world opinion will you develop a world sense of justice, and only on the basis of justice can you have dependable peace. You can have periods of peace such as we are having now. But if you are going to organize peace dependably, there has got to be a world sense of justice. And, of course, there isn't any such world sense of justice today with communism thinking the way it does. Communism is a disease which is afflicting the world, and this is one place where we are trying to cure the world of the propensity to go to war.

When you have a forum you have to use it. It is like a man in a boat on a river in front of a boathouse. He doesn't stay still. He goes either forward or backward. When you have a forum you have to have the material, the aggressiveness and skill to use it in debate, and you have to be prepared to use it.

We use it all the time and I think we have gotten a great deal of advantage out of it. I have a rule here, which I never deviate from, always to speak on the day that the Communists speak, so that something about the viewpoint of the United States of America goes out to the world in the news dispatches.

Finally, the United Nations is a place where countries can learn about each other. At the recent Bandung Conference, which I know you have all followed with interest, it was interesting that many of the most prominent figures there were men who had served here at the United Nations for many years. They had come here to New York to live. They brought their wives and children. They put their children into schools and colleges here. They had traveled around the country and gone to our colleges and service clubs. They know this country. So when somebody gets up and says that we are nothing but a bunch of Wall Street plotters with icewater in our veins, these fellows just know it isn't true. That came out, I think, very markedly at the Bandung Conference.

When you think that that conference adopted a resolution which condemned Communist colonialism in the very same breath with the old-fashioned colonialism, which is what most of these countries had actually known, you realize what a great center of learning the United Nations is—and what intelligent and fair-minded men many of these leaders are. I think this is a recent interesting example of what that United Nations can accomplish.

Now, since it has been founded, the United Nations has played a decisive part in the following situations any one of which could have led to war:

The removal of Soviet troops from Iran in 1946.

Ending the Communist encroachment of Greece in 1947.

Bringing about the independence of Israel and ending a bloody war in Palestine, although the situation, of course, is still delicate.

Bringing about the independence of Indonesia, a country of more than 70 million people in which there was a great deal of unrest at that time.

Ending the fighting between Pakistan and India over the Valley of Kashmir.

And, of course, finally in repelling the aggression in Korea.

Now, of course, the United States played the overwhelming part in Korea. I think on a typical day at the front, out of every 100 troops, 38 were United States, 52 were Republic of Korea, and 10 were of other United Nations members. In other words, the United Nations members other than the United States put up the equivalent of two divisions. It would have been obviously better if they had put up 4 or 6 divisions, but 2 divisions at World War II costs is $600 million, which does not compare so badly with the $13 million which we pay here to the U. N. And, of course, measured by the graver arithmetic of human life, there were many less casualties—3,000 deaths, I believe—which otherwise might have been borne by the United States.

Let me also say that if we ever have another Korea, which God forbid, we would get a still better performance because I do not think the United States would adhere to the policy which we had at that time of requiring countries to put up their own logistic support, their own shipping, their own dollars and their own supplies. We would take troops that were militarily effective even if they could not supply that logistic support.

So in Korea we had for the first time in history an aggression repelled by collective security under the auspices of an international organization. It is like the first time that the Wright brothers were able to make an airplane fly 31 miles an hour for 17 seconds—but it flew—and they did not go out and destroy it, but they proceeded to try to make it better. That, I think, is what we should try to do with the United Nations.

That is a brief summary of what the United Nations has done and what it has evolved into in the last 10 years.

Let me say, as I conclude, that I think it is a wonderful thing for you Members of Congress who are the elected lawmakers and policymakers of the United States Government to come here and see the United Nations with your own eyes, to take time out from what after all is a personal vacation for all of you, and to do this rather serious errand. The United States belongs to many

international organizations but this is the one that has the most comprehensive character; and I think it is a fine public service for you to come here and give it your precious time and get a firsthand picture of the United Nations.

Thank you.

Congressman JAMES I. DOLLIVER (Iowa). Last fall, a committee, of which I am a member on interstate and foreign commerce, made a trip to Africa, and we did not quite get into the Gold Coast but we heard a good deal about it. I would like to hear any elaboration of what you said upstairs about independence for the Gold Coast and any racial tensions that may or may not exist there.

Ambassador LODGE. Well, that is a matter that is in the Trusteeship Council, where our representative is Mr. Sears, and I could only answer it in a general way. As I understand it, they are moving toward self-government and making real progress. But just when they expect to achieve it, I can't say. The actual date of independence has not been established. I know that our United States representative has been there and I only wish he was here today. That is all I can give you of a general nature. However, I will get Mason Sears to write you a letter about it.

Congressman CLYDE DOYLE (California). The form of my question does not necessarily reveal my thinking. I have heard on the floor of the House, within the last 3 months, at least 1 or 2 or 3 Members of the House say it is time for the United States to withdraw from the United Nations. Shouldn't we do that, Mr. Ambassador? If not, why not?

Ambassador LODGE. No. I don't think we should. In fact, I think it would be about the most imprudent thing we could do. If we withdrew, of course, the Soviet Union would not, and then the Soviet Union would do everything in its power to turn this organization into something directed at us. I think that even if the United Nations were not doing a good job, we could not afford to withdraw and leave the Soviet Union in. I do not think we can afford to withdraw from any of the international organizations that we belong to and leave the Soviet Union in. The United Nations is doing a good job; it has accomplished something on the plus side all the time in the quest for peace. So there are two reasons why we should not get out: First, it would end the constructive work the United Nations is doing, and second, it would leave the Soviet Union in control and turn this against us. Of course, thirdly, I think it would probably mean world war III.

Congressman RUSSELL V. MACK (Washington). Is there any feasible way in which the veto could be abolished and, in your opinion, should it be abolished?

Ambassador LODGE. I think the veto should be abolished on the admission of new members. I do not think the veto should be abolished on questions which might involve the use of American troops. I think that all questions of that kind I should always refer back to Washington. I do not think we can ever give up that right. But I do favor abolishing the veto on the admission of new members. At the present time there are 14 countries, including such large countries as Japan and Italy, and, of course, the Federal Republic of Germany, which joined NATO yesterday, and Spain when and if they apply. Then a host of small countries, democratic, peace-loving countries among whom are Finland, Ireland, Portugal, and Austria in the Western World. Then you have Ceylon, Korea, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Nepal, Libya, Jordan, and Japan. Those are the countries that ought to be in that are being kept out by the Soviet veto. I believe that we ought to eliminate the veto on the admission of new members, but we should not eliminate the veto on matters that might involve the use of American troops.

Congressman ED EDMONDSON (Oklahoma). Mr. Ambassador, can you tell us anything new about the prospects for release of our imprisoned airman in China?

Ambassador LODGE. Well, I can just say that I am optimistic, that I have faith that it is going to come about. The reaction here, I think, has been about as good as you can want. As soon as this became known last November and December, I introduced a resolution condemning their imprisonment and instructing the Secretary General to use every means within his power to seek their release. That resolution passed by a vote of 47 to 5. The only people against it were the Communist bloc. The Secretary General, Mr. Hammarskjold, went to Peking. He has just been to Stockholm recently where he conferred with the Chinese Communist ambassador. I have had frequent talks with him. He is leaving no stone unturned. I just have faith that it is going to happen. I can't say much more than that. It is not the kind of thing you can spell out all the details in public, but I have faith it is going to happen.

Congressman PORTER HARDY, JR. (Virginia). Mr. Ambassador, I understood a while ago that you felt that if we had another situation like Korea we would have more help from the United Nations than we did in Korea.

Ambassador LODGE. Yes.

Congressman HARDY. Would you apply that or would you expect we would have more help from the United Nations if we become involved in trouble in the Formosa Straits, including Matsu and Quemoy?

Ambassador LODGE. I will take that question off the record later on.

Congressman SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL (Maryland). Mr. Ambassador, I heard on the news report that Red China is manufacturing a lot of narcotics and shipping great quantities to the United States. What are we doing about it?

Ambassador LODGE. Well, that is a matter that comes up quite often. Mr. Anslinger, the United States Commissioner of Narcotics, has had a good deal to say about that here before the International Narcotics Commission, and I know they have it under advisement. But I am not aware that they have come out with any specific recommendation. However, I will have that looked into and write you about it. I will give you a detailed answer in writing.

Congressman EDITH GREEN (Oregon). Ambassador Lodge, do you think it would be advisable to put Formosa under United Nations trusteeship, and what would be the advantages and disadvantages?

Ambassador LODGE. That question also I will take off the record.

Congressman W. PAT JENNINGS (Virginia). I believe the original United Nations Charter provided for the revision of the charter at the end of a 10-year period. What is being done at present toward that end?

Ambassador LODGE. There will be a resolution on the agenda this fall of the General Assembly for the calling of a charter review conference. The United States has not yet developed an official position. As a matter of fact, the executive branch is waiting for the advice of the Senate. The Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee has been taking testimony all over the country on the subject. My own view as an individual official is that there should be a charter review conference but not before we have developed an American position and had time to develop an interallied position.

My view is, as I told this gentleman, that one thing we ought to be for is the elimination of the veto on the admission of new members.

That is where we stand now. It will be on the agenda again this autumn and it is a question first whether you have a charter review conference and second, when.

Congressman PAUL C. JONES (Missouri). Mr. Ambassador, relative to the operation of the financial affairs of the United Nations, who makes the determination or sets the allocation of contributions from the various members?

Ambassador LODGE. There is a contributions committee that works that out in accordance with statistics of national productivity, wealth, and so forth. Their recommendations, of course, are subject to appraisal by the General Assembly.

Congressman JONES. Pardon me, one other question. Have you had any incidents where some nation has had an assessment made and felt that that was too much and declined to make that payment?

Ambassador LODGE. No, I don't think that has ever happened. We have had some nations object but not refuse to pay. We have some nations in arrears, but they haven't been in arrears long enough to lose their General Assembly vote. You have to be in arrears for 2 years to lose your vote. When we started in here, it was proposed that we pay about 50 percent. Now we have got it down to 33⅓.

Congressman JONES. When you first started we paid much more than that even.

Ambassador LODGE. Originally it was suggested we pay 50 percent. But we never paid even that 50 percent; now we pay a third.

Congressman JONES. That was on the floor of the House and it was indicated that we had paid much more, and for the building——

Ambassador LODGE. The building is a separate proposition. I am talking about the operating expenses. The operating expenses we now pay 33⅓, which I think is about right. I don't think it ought to go any lower.

Congressman JONES. The Soviet Union, how much do they pay?

Ambassador LODGE. They are up from 14 to 17.

Congressman LESTER R. JOHNSON (Wisconsin). My question is in line somewhat with EDITH GREEN'S of Oregon. We hear much about trusteeship for Formosa. By what rights is Chiang Kai-shek governing Formosa at the present time?

Ambassador LODGE. I am going to take all the Formosa questions off the record.

Congressman STEWART UDALL (Arizona). Mr. Ambassador, one area where our work impinges directly on the work of your organization here is in the field of appropriating money that is requested, and we had a vote 6 weeks or so ago with regard to the appropriation for the technical assistance program of the United Nations. I believe that $8 million was requested and we voted in the House $4 million. I don't know whether the Senate has passed on it as yet. I want to know if you feel that that work is important, and you might educate us a little bit on that if you would.

Ambassador LODGE. I think that work is very important, and I think it is very advantageous to us. It is another way for us to do something that we want to do anyway.

We have bilateral technical assistance in which we make an agreement with one country and go in and help it. When you do it through the United Nations you have certain advantages over that.

The fact that you do it under the auspices of the United Nations means that the charge of American imperialism, which while it is completely specious, is nevertheless made, falls absolutely flat at an activity which is made under the auspices of the United Nations. That is one advantage.

Another advantage is that you get a great many more countries in on the act, so that increases the percentage of participation by countries other than the United States. It

is a good will builder for the United States. It is a thing that does a lot of good in eliminating disease, and improving basic living standards, in countries that are today in a very primitive state.

A man here once said to me that a hungry man is more interested in 4 sandwiches than he is in 4 freedoms. And until people have a certain minimum to live on, you can't expect them to get very much excited about ideals and ideas, whereas once they do have that minimum standard then you can expect them to stand up and fight for themselves in case they have to.

So I think the United Nations technical assistance is a good thing and it is something we should support.

Congressman UDALL. Is our contribution in that field somewhat similar—in a similar ratio—to our contribution to the operation fund of the organization?

Ambassador LODGE. No, it is bigger. We contribute 33⅓ to running this United Nations organization. The contribution to the United Nations technical-assistance program is more than that; it is over 50 percent.

Senator THOMAS E. MARTIN (Iowa). I have been following the activities of the United Nations in the field of trade, in commodity agreements, in the Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices, and I have been very pleased with the statements of Mr. Hotchkis in stating our position in refusing to go along with some of those world-wide movements in the direction of what you might call governmental cartel. I wonder whether Mr. Hotchkis' statements in those two fields have resulted in United Nations backing away from further dealings in that direction? Are they still determined to go along without us in this matter of Ad Hoc Committee of Restrictive Business Practices?

Ambassador LODGE. Well, I can't answer that question specifically, although I will get the answer for you. Our position is still the same, and the question of restrictive business practices is coming up in the Economic and Social Council next week.

Senator MARTIN. Our position has been very well stated by Mr. Hotchkis and very well done. I am just wondering about the rest of the United Nations.

Ambassador LODGE. It is coming up in the Economic and Social Council next week. Our position has not changed.

Congressman WILLIAM S. HILL (Colorado). Mr. Ambassador, 2 years ago I was a member of the delegation to the FAO. My question is along the line that someone asked a while ago regarding our assistance, technical assistance. Now, the question is this: I couldn't help but feel the lack of technical staff that our leadership lacked in that great conference of 71 nations—older than the United Nations, according to their testimony. Now, what sort of a staff do you have, and how do you come about your staff? In other words, is the United States Congress and the executive department furnishing you with the assistance to do the right kind of a job you should do in an organization like this? That is my question.

Ambassador LODGE. Well, the Congress treats me all right. I have no complaints.

I have a miniature State Department, you might say, here in New York. I have to have it, because when I come over here every day I have to deal with 60 different countries and I have to have advisers who keep me posted. I have quarters in a commercial office building over at 2 Park Avenue, 2 floors. I have 103 people. They involve communications personnel, because I have cryptographic equipment and telegraphic equipment to Washington and tie lines and telephone lines. You can always get me direct from Washington on the State Department tie line. And I have stenographers and research people, and then I have about a dozen political officers. It is adequate for what I have to do. The quarters are not satisfactory to me, from a security standpoint. Frankly, I am trying to do something about that. But as far as personnel is concerned, I have enough to do the job I need to do.

Congressman LEROY JOHNSON (California). I would like to find out what the State Department thinks of the efforts of the military-assistance groups. I have visited pretty nearly everyone in the whole world, and I have a high regard for what they are doing. Are they helping develop peace plans along the lines of building up strength in that direction with the State Department?

Ambassador LODGE. I think, in general, yes. In general, it is an extremely sound policy and I think they contribute to the security of the world and to the chances of peace.

Congressman VAN ZANDT. Thank you, Ambassador Lodge. The Members of Congress will proceed to conference room 8 for a short off-the-record conference with the Ambassador, and the remainder of the group should remain here, and you will be guided from this auditorium.

The Matusow Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, occasionally in this great country of ours something special happens which dramatically catches the attention of the people and gives them renewed faith, hope, and courage; something happens which adds luster to the American tradition and gives people a new surge of confidence in each other and in our country.

Our former colleague, Hon. R. Ewing Thomason, now Federal judge in El Paso, Tex., precipitated such a moment in our history a few weeks ago when he rendered his decision in the now famous Matusow case. To Ewing Thomason it was simply a case of doing his official duty as he has done through his long years of public service. But to his fellow Americans it was vastly more than that.

Judge Thomason served in Congress from 1931 until he resigned to accept appointment as judge of the western district of Texas in 1947. He did a grand job here, and I am pleased that Congress has joined with the executive branch of the Government in taking note of the most recent major contribution to good government by our friend and former colleague.

Judge Thomason's decision was heralded by every major newspaper in the Nation, and there was much editorial comment which was universally favorable. Having received unanimous consent to do so, I am inserting three of the most representative editorials in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Evening Dispatch of March 18, 1955]

ONE JUDGE HANDLES MATUSOW

A United States district judge in El Paso, Tex., has cut through the maze of uncertainty, inertia, double-talk, and confusion surrounding the antics of that eccentric expert of the triple-cross, Harvey Matusow.

While everybody else was just talking about what to do about the self-revealed catspaw of the Communists, Judge R. E. Thomason simply ordered him into court, decreed him guilty of criminal contempt, and sentenced him to 3 years in prison.

Before the amazed defendant could recite the opening paragraph of the Communist manifesto, he was behind bars in lieu of $10,000 bond which, at this writing, he seems unlikely to secure.

It was a businesslike handling of an unusual situation and one that should go far to halt the further cynical use of the modern Ananias by our domestic Reds for propaganda purposes.

Prison terms of substantial length for contempt of court are not commmon in American jurisprudence, but here was a case in which one was justified and a judge with the courage and initiative to impose it.

The jurist was ruling on an appeal, which he rejected, from the conviction of a union leader for falsifying a non-Communist affidavit. Matusow's testimony had been a factor in the trial, although not a decisive one. Nevertheless, the judge held that his testimony, which Matusow now claims was false, was an attempt to obstruct justice and punishable as such.

Matusow already has been exposed beyond any doubt as a pawn of the Communists. His projected book is to be published by a house operated by two men with long Red-front records and who have invoked the fifth amendment. It was initially financed by a union expelled by the CIO as Communist-dominated. The Communist Daily Worker has been hailing him for days past as a hero-martyr.

Nevertheless, so long as the Government took no decisive steps to end the shabby charade, Matusow and his Communist pals could continue to make propaganda hay by using his record to discredit all anti-Communist witnesses, including scores of sincere and reputable men and women.

Judge Thomason put a stop to it and put Matusow where he belongs. For this he merits a vote of thanks from the entire country.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 17, 1955]

THEIR HERO

Communist hopes of making a hero out of Harvey Matusow have been rudely jolted by a Texas Federal court.

The turnabout informer and onetime Red has been sentenced to 3 years in jail, and no monkey business about it. Moreover, he actually was clamped in a cell in El Paso and there he'll stay unless some angel ups with $10,000 bond pending appeal.

Somehow, this restores a lot of faith in American courts on the workaday level. While the Justice Department and congressional committees hemmed and hawed and sat around listening to Matusow obstructing justice and showing his contempt of American courts, United States District Judge R. E. Thomason did something about it, real quick, too.

Let the Communists now try to make a martyr out of this guy, if they can. In jail or out, we predict he'll get no more audiences and sounding boards for his spiels. It couldn't have happened in a better State.

[From the Los Angeles Herald Express of March 16, 1955]

CLEANCUT TEXAS JUSTICE

The eyes of Texas, and the eyes of the Nation, were on United States District Judge R. E. Thomason, of El Paso, the other day when he upheld the conviction of Clinton Jencks, union leader, on charges of lying in a non-Communist affidavit.

At the same time, the judge, no pussyfooting jurist, charged witness Harvey Matusow with criminal contempt of court.

The judge also barred a top attorney for Local 890 of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers at Bayard, N. Mex., from his court.

Said Judge Thomason anent Lawyer Witt, who had been called to the witness stand and declined to answer questions about possible Communist affiliation:

"No lawyer who takes the witness stand and invokes the fifth amendment on grounds of self-incrimination will be allowed to practice in this court."

Judge Thomason should be applauded for so forthrightly tearing the veil from Harvey Matusow's brazen attempt to save Communists by gaining new trials for them through repudiating his own testimony which helped to convict them.

The judge also deserves the Nation's commendation for the action he took concerning Lawyer Witt.

In California, the State bar association is struggling with the same difficult problem of lawyers and Reds.

A committee of the bar association has proposed discipline, up and to the point of disbarment, for attorneys who refuse to answer questions on subversion, who show disrespect for legislative committees or who invoke the fifth amendment when examined by bar disciplinary committees.

A Program of Great Promise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday this House passed H. R. 2126, which would expand and extend our wise program of research in the development and utilization of saline waters. I note with great pleasuer that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs yesterday reported favorably S. 516, a bill which is intended to accomplish the same purpose of continuing and enlarging this program.

This is highly encouraging news, not only to our citizens living in coastal areas, but also to those residing in inland areas and suffering from drought and water shortages. Research along the lines provided for in this program could well make available billions of gallons of potable water to noncoastal areas suffering a critical shortage, since there are tremendous quantities of water within States located all over the United States which are not now usable because of high saline content. Development of a successful process of purification could aid these States immeasurably, as well as those bordering on the seacoasts.

The potentialities of this research are almost limitless. It can be of tremendous importance to the entire world, and could be one of the most fruitful developments of all times, virtually revolutionary in scope. Discovery of a cheap and easy way of converting saline water into a form which would be palatable to mankind, to domesticated animals, and to the plant life which provides so much of our food and other necessities of life, could transform countless regions of the world. It could be the most effective and inexpensive economic-aid program ever conceived. It might be a point 4 program without a peer in the annals of history.

Too, in the event of an atomic war, and the bombing of municipal water supplies, development of this process might save countless lives.

As one who is deeply concerned at the terrible impact of the drought upon the face of the Nation, it is highly encouraging to me to see the Congress well on its way toward taking another step which may eventually do much to bring some relief to so many citizens and so many wasting millions of acres of our land.

Let us hope that this bill speedily becomes law, and that the prospects held out by this farseeing research come to an early and triumphant conclusion.

Gen. Charles Pelot Summerall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce to the House that a grand old soldier who reached the top of his profession in another era of infantry warfare has now passed on. Gen. Charles Pelot Summerall, former Army Chief of Staff, and oldest ranking soldier, died May 14 at the Walter Reed Hospital. I am very proud of the fact that this great general was born in my congressional district, the Eighth District of Florida. Charles P. Summerall was born on March 4, 1867, near the beautiful little city of Lake City in Columbia County, Fla., the son of Elhanan Bryant Summerall and Margaret Cornelia Pelot Summerall. He received his early education in Florida schools and went on to become one of the most distinguished sons of my beloved native State. The whole State mourns his passing and I am sure that all thoughtful citizens of the United States share our bereavement at the departure of such an outstanding soldier-citizen. I should like to insert herewith an article from the May 15, 1955, edition of the Washington Star which summarized the brilliant career of General Summerall. As stated by Secretary of the Army Robert T. Stevens:

The general was truly a great American who shall be missed by all who knew him.

The article follows:

GENERAL SUMMERALL IS DEAD; FORMER CHIEF OF STAFF, 88

Funeral services for Gen. Charles P. Summerall, former Army Chief of Staff and oldest ranking soldier, who died yesterday at Walter Reed Hospital, will be held at 2:30 p. m. Tuesday at the Fort Myer Chapel.

The 88-year-old officer will be buried in Arlington Cemetery with full military honors. He died at 11:50 a. m. yesterday.

General Summerall, who was Army Chief of Staff from 1926 to 1930, entered Walter Reed last August and had been in failing health for months.

His son, Col. Charles P. Summerall, Jr., retired, and his daughter-in-law, were at his bedside when he died.

The general had been the oldest ranking soldier since the death of Gen. Peyton C. March, 90, last April 13. General March was Chief of Staff during the First World War.

EULOGIZED BY STEVENS

Secretary of the Army Stevens was among top officials and friends who eulogized the veteran officer.

"During his 38 years of active service," Mr. Stevens said, "General Summerall was a devoted and distinguished soldier. A veteran of the Philippine Insurrection, he was selected by General Pershing to command various Army corps in Germany during World War I.

"He was cited five times for gallantry by the President. A brilliant leader, as Chief of Staff, he contributed immeasurably to the Army's progress. The general was truly a great American who shall be missed by all who knew him."

Gen. Matthew Ridgway, present Army Chief of Staff, hailed General Summerall for a "personal life and brilliant military career that exemplified the true patriot and great leader. Both the Army and the Nation benefited immeasurably from his tireless energy and unstinting devotion to duty during his career of almost four decades," General Ridgway said.

PRAISED BY MARK CLARK

Gen. Mark Clark, who succeeded General Summerall as president of The Citadel, saw General Summerall yesterday morning before his death.

"He not only was a great soldier, but was a great educator. He will be missed by everyone who felt his influence. It is a great loss and I will have a job trying to fill his shoes and carry on," General Clark added.

At an age when he could have retired on a full and distinguished 40-year military career, General Summerall went on to carve out an equally meritorious career as educator.

DOZENS OF DECORATIONS

The general was 64 in 1931 when he left the Army after a 4-year term as its Chief of Staff. Behind him were the glories of the Chinese Boxer Rebellion campaign, leadership of the famed Rainbow Division in World War I, and dozens of decorations for soldiering in the grandest tradition.

During the next 22 years, until the age of 86, he was president of the Citadel, South Carolina's State military academy at Charleston.

When he retired, in June 1953, General Summerall left behind a record of high achievement. From a depression enrollment of 600, he built up the "West Point of the South" to more than 1,800 cadets.

TOUGH BUT LOVED

"I have loved the Citadel as I have loved no other institution," he said. Despite his blistering lectures and strict demands, the cadets loved him, too. They showed it once when the general, peeved because his budget was questioned, threatened to resign. The entire corps signed a petition persuading him to stay.

Always the vigilant soldier, General Summerall tried to rouse the people to preparedness 16 months before the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor. The summer before the blow fell he said in a speech: "Because of our weakness and indifference, we must wait like fat oxen for the butcher with the carving knife."

General Summerall's term as Chief of Staff began in 1926 by appointment of President Calvin Coolidge. He spent the next 4 years improving the General Staff and building up housing facilities in posts throughout the country.

General Summerall began winning citations for bravery as a first lieutenant of artillery in the Philippines in 1899 and 1900. He was mentioned for gallantry six times during the campaigns against the insurrectionists.

In August 1900 he took a prominent part in a battle upon which the eyes of the civilized world were focused. It was the storming of Peking by the China Relief Expedition during the Boxer Rebellion.

COMMANDS FIGHTING FIRST

Summerall sent his platoon of field guns with the forces attacking the Imperial City. His guns blew open the gates of the four outer walls surrounding the so-called Forbidden City, and then blasted open the gates of the Forbidden City itself. He was twice again cited for gallantry in action.

After America entered World War I General Summerall was assigned to command the artillery brigade of the 42d (Rainbow) Division and went to France with that division, but later was transferred to the First Division as commanding general of artillery.

His brigade went through the Cantigny fighting in May 1918, the first important battle for the American forces, and it was credited with producing artillery results without precedent in United States history.

The next month he was promoted to major general and given command of the division, later known throughout the Army as the Fighting First. He led it in the Aisne-Marne, Second Marne, and Meuse-Argonne offensives.

MANY DECORATIONS

A month before the armistice General Summerall took command of the 5th Corps, which as usual with his commands, reached all objectives. After the armistice he commanded the 9th Corps and later the 4th Corps.

His leadership and ability in France won for him the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Honor of France, Belgium's Grand Officer of the Crown, and Italy's Commander of the Order of the Crown.

General Summerall was born near Lake City, Fla., March 4, 1867, the son of Elhanan Bryant Summerall and Margaret Cornelia Pelot Summerall, both natives of South Carolina.

He received his early education in the schools of Florida, then attended Porter Military Academy at Charleston, an Episcopalian preparatory school, for 3 years. After graduating from Porter he taught school for 2 years.

He was graduated from West Point in 1892. His first Army assignment was with the Infantry, but after a few months he transferred to the Field Artillery. He married Laura Mordecai in 1901. Their son, Charles P., Jr., served in World War II. As a lieutenant colonel commanding a field artillery battalion he was awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action. General Summerall was an Episcopalian and a 33d degree Mason.

Mrs. Summerall, the daughter of Brig. Gen. Alfred Mordecai, died in Charleston, S. C., in April 1948. She was buried in Arlington Cemetery.

Too Little and Too Late

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 17, 1955, is deserving of our attention:

TOO LITTLE AND TOO LATE

If Mrs. Hobby's proposals for distribution of the Salk vaccine had been issued on April 12—simultaneously with the expected favorable report of Dr. Francis—or at least when the Public Health Service cleared vaccine supplies shortly thereafter, they might have made sense. Coming now, more than a month later, with the emergency situation created by short serum supply intensified, they fall lamentably short of what the problem requires.

Only one of Mrs. Hobby's 11 recommendations shows any imagination, any grasp of the emotional factors involved in the antipolio program. That is the suggestion for Government grants-in-aid to States for the purchase of vaccine beyond the limits of the free distribution offered by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. And there are indications that this plan was injected into the report at the last minute.

Among the rest of the proposals is nothing new, nothing but the most obvious arrangements for voluntary allocation which should have been put in effect before distribution of the vaccine began. There is no provision for any improvement in the present inadequate and confusing service of information to the public, no enlisting of the country's administrative talents to insure efficiency and public confidence. It is a routine approach to an unprecedented challenge.

A sizable section of the report is devoted to proving how easy it is to make the voluntary system work. Yet it has taken more than a month to draw up this oversimplified system—a month in which plans for a vigorous and effective method of distribution have been held in abeyance. One might almost assume that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was trying to demonstrate how slowly a government agency can work and thereby discredit any truly national plan.

The country will hardly want to accept this report as the last word. It can get better guidance from Washington than that. In this critically urgent matter, it will continue to look for firm national policy.

Huge Cost of Federal Government Paperwork Should Be Curtailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Hoover Commission has done a tremendous job for the people of the United States in investigating every phase of Government expenditure to ferret out the waste, extravagance, and duplication which has cost the American taxpayer billions of dollars each year, and which can now be saved thereby increasing the efficiency of the Government without loss of services to the public.

I do not place a blanket endorsement on all of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission because each such recommendation must receive a thorough study and review by the Government Operations Committee of which I am a member, and only after such study can a final decision be reached on the merits of the recommendation.

However, there is no question that previous recommendations of the Hoover Commission which have been put into operation have already resulted in a tremendous reduction in the cost of Government.

One of the latest reports of the Hoover Commission covers the problem of internal paperwork management in the 14 Government agencies which employ about 95 percent of all Federal employees.

The total cost of paperwork in the Government for 1 year, according to the report, has reached the staggering figure of $4 billion, a figure that shows the cost of paperwork alone in the Government approximating the entire budget for total operating costs of the Government prior to 1933.

As an example of some of the savings that can be made in paperwork management, the Hoover Commission has estimated that $255 million can be saved by more efficient operation of Government correspondence, reports, recordkeeping and mail handling.

In the fieldt of reports, it cost the Government as much as $700 million a year simply to prepare and collect information contained in reports, and the cost for a single report has reached $1 million. The Hoover Commission has further found that some reports have been issued long after they could serve any useful purpose, and that better than $50 million could be saved annually through careful management of Government reports.

More than $1 billion of the total paperwork cost in Government is charged to letterwriting alone, and a considerable reduction can also be achieved in this field.

The following is a comprehensive review which recently appeared in the Tax Digest of the Hoover Commission report on Federal Government paperwork with some of the recommendations for specific action to cut down this enormous expense which is consuming the taxpayers' dollars at an alarming rate:

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PAPERWORK $4 BILLION COST A YEAR

(A digest by research department, Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report)

The Federal Government creates and handles some 25 billion pieces of paper each year (exclusive of the tons used in printing technical manuals, pamphlets, periodicals, etc.).

To do this, it employs 750,000 full-time employees.

The total cost of this paperwork is $4 billion a year. This figure aproximates the entire Federal budget prior to 1933.

The annual output of paperwork includes: More than a billion individual letters; 127,000 reports for use by Federal agencies; the addition of 9 billion documents to the Government's permanent records.

The Federal budget includes: $180 million for office space for paperwork employees, plus $40 million for records' storage space; $36 million for the rental of tabulating machines; $1 billion for letterwriting.

This report covers the problems of internal paperwork management in the 14 agencies which employ about 95 percent of Federal employees. A second report will cover the

paperwork required of the general public by the Government.

The possibilities for more economical and efficient handling of the necessary paperwork are illustrated by the accomplishments with respect to records management, traceable to the recommendations of the first Hoover Commission, which were:

1. The creation of a records-management bureau in the Office of General Services;

2. The enactment of a Federal records-management law;

3. The establishment of an adequate records-management program in each department or agency.

In June 1949 the Congress established the General Services Administration (GSA). In 1950 it passed the Federal Records Act, giving GSA responsibility for the promotion of a program to improve the management of Government records. This act also required each agency head to establish a program for economical and efficient management of his agency's records.

The GSA has been responsible for important accomplishment in this field. It has reported these savings for the fiscal year 1953:

Records disposal	$11,500,000
Lower cost storage	8,227,000
Filing and paperwork	14,443,000
Total	34,170,000

The first Hoover Commission estimate of savings possible in this area for the fiscal year 1953 was $32 million.

The task force of the Hoover Commission covered a wider segment of the paperwork problem—taking up where the first Hoover Commission left off.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of the Commission led to three major recommendations. These are described in brief below:

Recommendation 1

That the President establish a government-wide paperwork-management program by executive order and direct his top officials to give it their support.

That the General Services Administration be given the responsibility for general supervision of paperwork management in the executive branch, with a view to simplifying and improving the quality of documents, eliminating nonessential copies, reducing the volume and cost of paperwork, and standardizing procedures and practices.

That paperwork management staff functions now existing in the National Archives and Records Service be consolidated into the organization established in the GSA to implement this recommendation.

Bases for recommendation 1 are:

First. "The enormous volume of paperwork imposed upon top Federal executives interferes with their basic responsibilities * * * makes these positions far more difficult than those of the top officers of large corporations." The Commission thought the handling of the personnel side of paperwork could, at best, be "characterized as haphazard and shortsighted." Encouraging results were found to be an exception. "On the whole, agency heads and their principal subordinates have not given proper attention to potential economies in this $4-billion activity."

Second. While the General Services Administration has developed successful methods for improving the management of records, other phases of paperwork management leave much to be desired.

Many of the billion letters written each year (at a cost of $1 billion) "deserve their reputation for long words, long sentences, and long paragraphs, further obscured by legal terms, abstract nouns, passive verbs, and dangling clauses * * *."

The task force suggested that 1 style manual (instead of the 55 it found) would result in monetary savings and produce a letter of higher quality, which would be more acceptable to the public.

The Government spends about $700 million to collect information and prepare 127,000 different reports. The Commission found that "agency management is often uninformed of the kind, quantity, purpose, and cost of the information collected. Many reports do not appear to be well conceived as tools for management control, nor is the data properly integrated and maintained for this purpose. Some agencies could not supply relative elemental information about their activities.

Directives and instructions cost in excess of $100 million a year. The Commission found that few systems are effectively coordinated. There are 2- to 3-year lapses between revisions and unwarranted delays in clearing and promulgating instructions. In some agencies, subordinate echelons rewrite and expand instructions received from above. Not only is this practice costly, but confusion as to the original meaning is increased each time the original is paraphrased and interpreted. Thus, the energy, time, and money spent on the establishment and maintenance of the system is wasted, and those who attempt to adhere to it are frustrated and confused.

The Federal Government was a pioneer in the development of large-scale, high-speed computers, but it "has taken a back seat in their use * * *." Budgetary procedures are the most important reason for this—a machine must be bought from a single year's budget. "It would pay some agencies, which have been processing data separately, to buy and operate a machine jointly." Personnel poses a similar problem, as highly skilled technicians are costly if each agency hires its own. Coordinated effort is advantageous.

Quality control accounts for at least 10 percent of the total paperwork cost ($400 million). In one unit of a military agency the review of finished letters takes 15 percent of the unit's total appropriation. "Even 100-percent inspection does not insure 100-percent accuracy because the drudgery * * * causes inspection errors."

Personnel policy provides another obstacle. Although it has attempted to develop standards for 3 years, the Civil Service Commission has tended to delay action until more agencies establish paperwork management programs. Agencies "* * * either scatter responsibilities for various segments * * * among relatively untrained, low-ranking employees as a part-time activity, or push the responsibility off on to some higher ranking employee too busy to give serious attention to it."

The Government keeps 26 percent of all records permanently. Records kept permanently by private industry average closer to 4 percent.

This all adds up to the cardinal fact that: While the Federal Government has made important strides, its records management program is still lacking in centralized direction and managerial drive.

Recommendation 2

The Commission suggests that some top official in each agency be assigned the responsibility of simplifying forms, eliminating nonessential copies, and determining the number and character of reports with a view to reducing and eliminating the nonessential reports. This official should cooperate with the General Services Administration in determining methods and systems.

Bases for recommendation 2 include:

The possibilities of intra-agency improvements are illustrated by some of the practices commended by the Hoover Commission:

The Internal Revenue Service, working with the General Services Administration, saved $157,200 in its Baltimore office in 1 year by streamlining its correspondence operation. Applied to all 64 district offices, this would result in a saving of $5,500,000 by the Internal Revenue Service alone.

On 1 project, covering 1 functional area, the Department of the Navy consolidated 3,161 forms into 752. Overall, it eliminated 21,000 forms in a year with identifiable savings of $3 million.

The Commodity Stabilization Service (Department of Agriculture) reduced its report requirements from 1,400 to 600. This made possible a 43-percent reduction in the number of employees working on reports in the field offices.

The Army Finance Corps audits only 10 percent of its pay cards and expects to cut its present low error rate in half. The overseas error rate dropped from 7 percent to 4½ percent in the last half of 1953.

These important, but as yet somewhat isolated, examples indicate what can be saved in time and money if this problem is given the emphasis is deserves.

Recommendation 3

Enactment of legislation authorizing necessary changes in forms 941 and 941A (Employers Quarterly Federal Tax Return), as recommended by the Internal Revenue Service and the Social Security Administration.

Basis for recommendation 3 is that these forms now require 184 million lines of information from employers each year, and also they duplicate data sent to other Federal agencies. "The saving to the Federal Government would be considerable, and the saving to the business world is estimated at $22 million annually."

POSSIBLE SAVINGS

It is possible to do the necessary paperwork more economically and more efficiently. Improved records management alone saved more than $34 million in fiscal 1953. If the recommendations of this report are implemented a further annual saving of $255 million is possible. This means more than a 6-percent reduction in the cost to the taxpayer.

The Task Force on Paperwork Management has estimated the current cost and possible savings on the seven major categories of paperwork.

Paperwork activity	Task force estimates	
	Current cost	Possible saving
Correspondence	$1,000,000,000	$75,000,000
Forms	867,000,000	50,000,000
Reports	700,000,000	50,000,000
Directives and instructions	100,000,000	----------
Record keeping	650,000,000	50,000,000
Mail handling	104,000,000	30,000,000
Supervisory and miscellaneous	579,000,000	----------
Total	4,000,000,000	255,000,000

Sarnoff Submits Program for Political Offensive Against World Communism To Win Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, recently Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of

America, announced a plan to keep our country on the offensive in the cold war against communism.

General Sarnoff's recommendations are similar to those of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression on which I served during the 83d Congress. In order that the Members of the House may be apprised of the Sarnoff plan, I wish to place in the RECORD a press release which outlines the program.

The press release follows:

A firm and open decision to win the cold war, as the surest way to prevent a hot war, was urged upon our Government by Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America, in a memorandum presented to the White House on April 5, 1955, and made public today.

Pointing out that the Kremlin's fixed goal is world dominion by means short of an all-out war—propaganda, fifth-column subversion, civil strife, terror, and treacherous diplomacy—General Sarnoff declared:

"Logically we have no alternative but to acknowledge the reality of the cold war and proceed to turn Moscow's favorite weapons against world communism. Our political counterstrategy has to be as massive, as intensive, as flexible as the enemy's.

"The question, in truth, is no longer whether we should engage in the cold war. The Soviet drive is forcing us to take countermeasures in any case. The question, rather, is whether we should undertake it with a clear-headed determination to use all means deemed essential, by governments and by private groups, to win the contest."

General Sarnoff's memorandum, entitled "Program for a Political Offensive Against World Communism," grew out of his discussion of the subject with President Eisenhower in Washington on the morning of March 15, and announced at the time by James Hagerty, White House Press Secretary.

The same afternoon, at the President's request, General Sarnoff conferred with Nelson Rockefeller, Special Assistant to the President on psychological warfare, and officials from the United States Information Service and the Central Intelligence Agency. At the end of the meeting he undertook to submit his views on the subject and a suggested program of action.

The result was this memorandum, in which he emphasized that "we must go from defense to attack in meeting the political, ideological, subversive challenge. The problem," he said, "is one of attaining the requisite magnitude, financing, coordination and continuity of action. The expanded offensive with nonmilitary means must be imbued with a new awareness of the great goal and a robust will to reach it."

People everywhere, and especially behind the Iron Curtain, General Sarnoff recommended, should be told that "America has decided, irrevocably, to win the cold war; that its ultimate aim is, in concert with all peoples, to cancel out the destructive power of Soviet-based communism."

General Sarnoff declared that his proposals "should not be construed as a substitute for adequate military vitality," both in the newest weapons and balanced conventional forces.

"But short of a blunder that ignites the third world war which nobody wants," he added, "the immediate danger is the debilitating, costly, tense war of nerves that is part of the cold war. The primary threat today is political and psychological."

If we allow ourselves to be defeated in the cold struggle, he warned, "we will have bypassed a nuclear war—but at the price of our freedom and independence. We can freeze to death as well as burn to death."

Existing organization for fighting and winning the cold war must be "adjusted and strengthened in line with the expanded scale and intensity of operations," General Sarnoff said. He proposed a "strategy board for political defense, the cold war equivalent of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the military side," functioning "directly under the President, with Cabinet status for its head."

The conflict on the political front, he said, "is not a preliminary bout but the decisive contest, in which the loser may not have a second chance. It must therefore, be carried on with the same focused effort, the same resolute spirit, the same willingness to accept costs and casualties, that a hot war would involve."

The specific activities cited as examples in the memorandum would be carried out not only by official agencies but by private groups such as labor unions, veterans' organizations, churches, youth and women's groups. The Soviet-controlled countries, it showed, are extremely vulnerable to precisely the kind of psychological pressures the Communists are using against free nations.

In outlining a vastly enlarged propaganda effort, General Sarnoff drew attention to opportunities opened up by new technical developments in communications. For instance, mobile big-screen television units in black-and-white and in color would be effective in non-Communist regions where their very novelty will guarantee large and attentive audiences.

"Vast regions in Asia and elsewhere, where illiteracy bars the written word and lack of radios bars the spoken word," General Sarnoff explained, "could thus be reached."

His plan also included mass distribution of cheap and lightweight receivers tuned to pick up American signals. In addition, a simple, hand-operated phonograph device costing no more than a loaf of bread and records made of cardboard and costing less than a bottle of Coca-Cola could be made available by the million in critical areas.

"Propaganda, for maximum effect, must not be an end in itself—it is a preparation for action," the memorandum stated. "Words that are not backed up by deeds, that do not generate deeds, lose their impact."

The arena of action is the whole globe, General Sarnoff believes. "We must aim," he said, "to achieve dramatic victories as swiftly as possible, as token of the changed state of affairs." He saw great possibilities for encouraging and guiding passive resistance by individuals, with a minimum of risk, in the Soviet empire.

At the same time he took note of the fact that pockets of guerrilla forces remain in Poland, Hungary, the Baltic States, China, Albania, and other areas. These must be kept supplied with information, slogans, and new leadership where needed and prudent.

"We must seek out the weakest links in the Kremlin's chain of power," General Sarnoff declared. "The country adjudged ripe for a breakaway should receive concentrated study and planning. A successful uprising in Albania, for instance, would be a body blow to Soviet prestige and a fateful stimulus to resistance elsewhere."

Among the specific activities discussed in the memorandum were intensive collaboration with emigres and escapees from Communist countries and special schools to train personnel for political-psychological warfare.

Address of Albert M. Cole, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, to the Construction and Civic Department Luncheon at the Annual Meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D. C., May 3, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address before the annual meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce by a former colleague in the House and now Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Honorable Albert M. Cole:

ADDRESS BY ALBERT M. COLE, ADMINISTRATOR, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, TO THE CONSTRUCTION AND CIVIC DEPARTMENT LUNCHEON AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1955

I like the title, "The New City," that Stuart Fitzpatrick of the United States Chamber of Commerce has asked me to talk about here today. It has the ring of real change in it. And it is change we want in our urban patterns.

But just to keep things entirely clear, I'd like to enlarge on that title a bit. Let's make it "The New and Better City."

We have a habit of thinking that anything new—or different—is also better. When we buy anything new we assume it's better. Well, maybe it is.

But let me ask you this. "When your wife gets a new hat—and note I said your wife, not mine—can you honestly tell me it is always a better hat?"

No; just new things aren't necessarily better things. A new home isn't always a better home, nor a new neighborhood a better neighborhood a better neighborhood—just because it's new.

What we want in the new city is a really better city—better suited to our needs and times, better planned for our future growth, better designed for the way our people want to live.

We don't want change in order to have something different but in order to get something better. We're not out just to destroy everything we've built in the past.

On the contrary, we are seeking to preserve and revitalize the good we have built into our cities at the same time that we replace what we have outgrown and worn out. This is what we mean by the renewed city, and by "urban renewal" as it is conceived in President Eisenhower's new program and the Housing Act of 1954 which so many of those here in this room helped formulate.

As a result we can honestly say that we are approaching the new and better city we've talked and dreamed about for a good many years. In a way, it still seems to be something we hope for in the distant future, a kind of castle in the air.

But I have news for you. This new city is no longer a distant dream. It is materializ-

ing before our eyes—it is developing from coast to coast under the driving force of private enterprise with local, State, and Federal help. It is what our public wants.

I doubt if you realize how great and rapid a change is being wrought today all across the Nation. I have been in numerous cities and towns. It is my job to go and see—and tell you what I have seen.

In more than 100 communities, ranging from small towns to our largest metropolitan areas, 185 clearance and redevelopment projects are either in work or soon to start. One way to grasp the scope of this activity is to assume for the moment that all this work is concentrated in one place.

Here is what it adds up to:

The removal of substandard housing in these areas is the equivalent to clearing all the slum housing in the cities of Detroit and Boston combined or, if you prefer, of Baltimore and Atlanta.

It is equal to eliminating all the slum units in the cities of Buffalo, Denver, and San Francisco.

Or, to spread it out more, it amounts to getting rid of the slum housing in all of the following six cities: Dallas, Tex.; Toledo, Ohio; Omaha, Nebr.; San Diego, Calif.; Providence, R. I. and Little Rock, Ark.

And that's not all.

These projects involve the clearance, replanning, and redevelopment of more than 7,000 acres—or 11 square miles.

This means clearing and rebuilding an area the size of Raleigh, N. C., or Schenectady, N. Y., or Atlantic City, N. J.

What about people? These undertakings will mean decent housing in place of slum and blighted homes for more than a quarter of a million people—nearly 80,000 families. This amounts to rehousing the total population of such cities as Miami, Fla.—or Oklahoma City—or Long Beach, Calif.

In addition, another 100 such projects, more than half again as many, are in earlier planning stages.

Of even more far-reaching importance, however, are 100 communities that are developing, or have completed, community-wide workable programs, not only to clear slums, but also to undertake full-scale rehabilitation, preventive, and conservation measures to eradicate the effects of blight. Many of these will have broad-scale action under way this year to upgrade neighborhoods, revamp obsolete street patterns, open up deficit areas to greatly increased and productive use, and to expand the clearance and reuse of wornout high-tax-low-revenue sections.

This is the box score 9 months since the broad urban renewal program became law in the Housing Act of 1954. Slum clearance work, of course, has been going on for several years, but there has been a tremendous intensification of the activity under the stimulus of the new program. It is now reaching out all over the Nation. A revitalized private industry in communities everywhere is now giving vigorous support to planning programs and social responsibilities, once thought to be the bailiwick of long-haired dreamers. Today the businessman presses the President's program on to practical solutions.

Already this is potentially a billion-dollar business in redevelopment and reconstruction, the great bulk of it by private investment. This represents, in fact, a national ground swell of major proportions in our economic and in our urban life.

The new city, the better city, is no longer a myth and a dream. It has come into being throughout the Nation.

You here today, as spokesmen and leaders for American business, can take real satisfaction in what is being done in urban renewal. In no small part it represents the force of progress that motivates American private enterprise. Without business support in the community, working through your chambers of commerce and other professional, trade, and civic groups, it wouldn't be happening.

This new city will be your city. It will be of your design and construction. We are handing down no blueprints from Washington.

We are offering you Federal assistance to carry out your plans. All we ask is that the new city shall be a better city—that it shall serve the needs and interests of the whole community, not just special or privileged segments.

The urban renewal program is off to a successful and gratifying start. But there are dangers in early success—many of them hidden dangers.

I see some rough times ahead as we begin to feel the impact of the changes wrought on our own particular fields of interest. And there is always danger in losing sight of the fact that we owe our progress to common agreement and common purpose among many groups and interests and to the coordinated use of all our resources.

Either of these dangers could derail the urban renewal program and wreck our hopes for the new and better city. Business enterprise will need to exert strong moral and civic leadership for cohesive action if these dangers are to be avoided.

Officials in many of our cities today are trying to bring about effective enforcement of local codes. But most of them are having a tough time.

The slums die hard because slum proprietors hate to see them go. Few of them really care how the people in the slum live, and fewer still, apparently, really care if you and I as taxpayers have to pay a subsidy to the municipal services to keep their rent collections level. I am no "do-gooder" in the satirical sense of the name, but I get sore seeing so much tax money supporting the contempt of the slum owners. They employ every available device of noncompliance and legal obstruction to thwart the efforts of the city and the citizens.

Enforcement is the city's job. But compliance with the law and improvement of the property is the owner's responsibility. We can't piously demand that the city enforce its codes and clean up the town, and then add in the next breath, "But you'll have to catch us first."

Strong business support of the city's efforts to compel correction of unfit dwellings and the moral force of business to bring about willing compliance by individual property interests is essential. And businessmen see this. Few of America's slums are owned by businessmen who are worthy of the name. This is not a matter of equity or just treatment—to which the Republican Party believes every citizen is entitled. It is a question of whether any private interest can assert and maintain a vested right to profit from the degradation and financial loss of the community as a whole.

The business community is relied upon to meet the private development requirements in these renewal areas that are now coming on the market. We recognize that this is a new field of investment, with a number of imponderables to be worked out. For that reason, the new Housing Act provides for special Government mortgage insurance through the FHA for new and rehabilitated housing in renewal projects.

This is also a field of new investment opportunity in prime properties with built-in security and protection.

Now, frankly, I am not seriously concerned about how business enterprise will measure up to these responsibilities. As a matter of good conscience and good sense, I am confident it will assume its full role of leadership.

A more subtle danger, as the program moves ahead, is whether we will maintain the high degree of coordinated and cooperative interest we have been able to achieve. More important than the projects we have under way is the mutual understanding and common effort that has been developed among all interests concerned.

A few years ago, housing was in danger of becoming a Tower of Babel. The men responsible for its progress were shouting at each other in foreign and hostile tongues. Today you will find these same interests sitting about a common conference table, in the community, and in the Nation. They talk the same language, and basically they seek the same things. They have learned that no one of them has the whole answer, but each has a contribution to make, and there is much they can do by working together.

This concert of effort has ben matched and fostered by better coordination and consistency in the Federal Government's housing activities and policies. That coordination is effectuated, on behalf of the President, through the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Most responsible people in the housing and community field have strong feelings that coordinated Agency effort is essential in the administration of the Federal program in housing and its financing. Those who have studied the matter, including the Congress, the first Hoover Commission, and the President's Advisory Committee on Housing Policies and Programs, have all concluded that such coordination is necessary, and some have even recommended that it be strengthened more than it is. There are also, sadly, a few who would like to profit from the chaos caused by the very disunity we all fought so hard to overcome.

Under the President's new program for community renewal, consistency of policy and coordinated action is now more important than ever. It has been carefully provided for in the law—and as long as I can fight, it will stay there. Five of the HHFA's seven major divisions, for example, are directly involved in most intricately related operations to help the community carry out its local urban renewal program. The functions of the other two, though somewhat more indirect, are also important to the whole. Failure to integrate these aids at the Federal level could lead only to discouragement and complete frustration of the communities throughout the country, to which you gentlemen owe so grave a responsibility.

But there are still some partisans who don't like it that way. Even guerrilla warfare goes on in some quarters. Sharpshooting is heard in the bushes and potshots are taken at coordination in the Federal Government. I have traced some of these down and found nothing but muddy tracks leading nowhere. Confusion of direction seems as common among them as their confusion about the ideals and the responsibilities of this administration to best serve the Nation with heart—and with efficiency.

These dissenters have redoubled their efforts to drive a wedge into the housing agency, break it into fragments, and insulate their particular sector against governmental coordination or responsibility. They would rather go it alone for they believe that their partisan interests would be better served by a return to the philosophy of every man for himself.

With this I do not—nor will I ever—concur.

Some of this kind of thinking was insinuated into early reports prepared for, not by, the new Hoover Commission as part of its study of Government-lending functions. But the Hoover Commission, as usual, took it out. I do not know what they did with it.

The Commission, however, did not adopt these proposals—nor did it recommend that the housing agency be broken up into free-wheeling components. The Commission's own review was thorough and responsible. With most of the Commission's recommendations we would not argue, since they largely

represent policies that the Agency and the administration has already adopted.

A few we question. On one in particular, after full study, we have some dissent. This one—although I don't think the Commission so intended it—would, if applied to its full extent, remove a keystone from the very structure of Federal housing policy itself, and render inoperative a vital part of the President's program.

This was the Commission's recommendation that the FHA be reorganized so that it would not have to call on the Government for funds, possibly along the lines of the Home Loan Bank Board.

What does this mean? And what effect would it have?

The FHA has always operated without calling on the Government for funds. Its costs and reserves are provided from mutually owned funds obtained through premiums and fees. If the proposal means—as I think it probably does—that study should be given to further perfecting this mutualized system, consistent with FHA's public responsibilities, I would agree, for we are doing that.

But if it means—as some would like to interpret it—that the FhA should be reconstituted as a separate privately owned corporation, with or without authority to borrow from the Government, and that it should operate on its own corporate resources and under its own policies, subject only to distant Federal regulation, then I strongly disagree.

If this were to be done, it would mean much more than just changing its organizational structure, and removing the Government as its financial godfather. It would mean a basic change in the character and purpose of the FHA as it now exists—a strong bulwark in our economy. Furthermore, it would, in effect, accomplish the fragmentation of the Agency and destroy the basis for the coordinated use of Federal programs in the housing and community development field.

The real question here is whether the FHA should continue to serve a public purpose, as it has done in the past, or whether it should become simply a Government-regulated instrument to provide greater security for private mortgage investments on their own terms.

To be sure, the FHA mortgage insurance program has provided valuable security to private lenders. This has been important to the economy—but it has also been a means to a much larger end. The FHA has done a great deal more to further economic progress and serve the public need.

Because of the Government credit behind its debentures and reserves, the FHA has been able to provide a mortgage instrument to private lenders that has enabled them to make low-cost home loans on a secure basis to a great mass market of homebuyers who could not have been financed on the basis of normal private credit alone. It has enabled millions of our American families to obtain homes—millions of new homes to be built—and many special and emergency requirements to be met in the national and public interest. It has accomplished this through the belief of our Government in the integrity—and thus the insurability—of our people and our businessmen.

The FHA, in fact, has provided a great example of how the Government—without using its own funds and without injecting itself into the private market—can accomplish a public purpose through the established channels of private enterprise.

But if the FHA were to be converted to a privately owned corporation, without Government credit behind its debentures, then it could no longer serve a truly public purpose. The FHA mortgage would become quite a different credit instrument, that could not match the scope of its present function, either in the general mass market or for special needs.

Today, however, the need for its present service is even greater, particularly to further local redevelopment or rehabilitation. Under the new section 220, special FHA mortgage insurance is extended for housing redevelopment and rehabilitation in renewal areas on the basis of the values to be generated by the area's redevelopment. Under section 221, special FHA mortgage insurance is extended for low-cost housing for lower income families displaced from slums, as a means of bringing more private capital into this field and reducing passing needs for straight, subsidized public housing.

I have asked various partisans, but I have received no affirmative answer, who would, or could, provide this and other needed types of home financing if the FHA were converted to private corporate ownership.

But we cannot expect to continue the great advances we are making toward the building of the new city without these measures. We cannot expect private enterprise to assume the full burden of public improvement if the Government fails to back up its efforts to renew and redevelop these areas and to rehouse these families.

Coordination, within Government or between Government and business, is not just an empty word. It is a word of action, of concerted, common action with all our resources along the whole front.

To clear and replan a blighted area is not enough. The real test comes in our capacity to redevelop and rehabilitate these areas for the kind of use, the kind of living, and the kind of business growth on which the future of the new city depends.

That is the job the FHA can and should help to get done. That is the job for the coordinated efforts of all the housing agencies in the field and in Washington. It provides the means by which Government makes its possible for private enterprise, without sacrifice of sound business principles, to undertake this rebuilding responsibility.

If we are to realize our dream of the new city, the FHA must continue to serve that purpose. To change its basic character could only result in unmet public problems and needs to be provided for in some other, and probably more direct way. To paraphrase the philosopher, Voltaire: "If there were no FHA, it would be necessary to invent it." For the FHA is an indispensable part of the magnetic core which holds together and vitalizes—gives meaning to—each of the great constituents in Government housing operations today.

Fragmentation of this core is not, as I see it, a proposal to achieve the laudable purpose of getting the Government out of private business.

It is a proposal to get the Government out of government.

Eliminating the public purpose underlying the housing program would have a destructive effect on the whole Government housing structure. It would make any question of comprehensive or coordinated activity toward the new city purely academic.

Most of the industry and, I feel sure, most of the country don't want it that way. We have gone too far, we are moving ahead too fast, to turn back now, or to allow our program to be splintered into useless bits.

We have too great a future ahead, too real a prospect in that great new city we are building.

And you, as business leaders, are among the builders.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Civil Air Patrol's Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at a recent meeting of the Texas wing of the Civil Air Patrol, Col. D. Harold Byrd delivered an address which is worthy the attention of all Americans.

Colonel Byrd—a leading figure in my State—addressed himself to one of the most important problems before our Nation. His timely discussion was stimulating, and I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL AIR PATROL'S CHALLENGE

(Address by Col. D. Harold Byrd, vice chairman, National Executive Board, Civil Air Patrol, statewide meeting, Texas Wing, Civil Air Patrol, April 16, 1955, Mineral Wells, Tex.)

Colonel Brewer, distinguished guests, fellow members of Civil Air Patrol, I am most grateful for this opportunity to address a group whose importance to Texas and to the Nation itself may not be understood by you yourselves, much less the public.

I have a serious and disturbing message for you tonight. It is serious in that our very national security is involved, and disturbing because we in Civil Air Patrol have a possible solution to the problem right in our grasp, but have not done the best we could with the solution.

In my position as vice chairman of our National Executive Board, I represent the highest echelon of nonmilitary leadership of our organization, since both our National Executive Board chairman, Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, and our national commander, Maj. Gen. Lucas V. Beau, have had long and distinguished military careers.

Please forgive me for injecting personal experience and the first person into my talk—I won't be able to get my message across unless I do.

In my travels around the country and in foreign lands, and in talking to people from all walks of life—high Government and military officials, and patriotic Civil Air Patrol members like yourselves, I have had the opportunity of learning things which perhaps you do not fully appreciate. So what I'm going to tell you tonight is in the form of a message from the vice chairman of our National Executive Board and from a fiercely patriotic Texan and American.

First, let me give you some background. When I was in Germany in 1933, visiting my friend, Ernst Udet, who was one of the world's greatest pilots, who was destined to become the major general of Germany's Air Force under Goering, I was aroused and alarmed at the far-reaching preparations they were making in providing airpower through their air youth of Germany movement. Udet was typical of the air fraternity—warm-hearted, friendly—just a good allround chap. Through him, I got a good look at the Hitler air youth movement, which was destined to become the forerunner of the dreaded Luftwaffe of Nazi Germany, the Luftwaffe which almost brought world domination to Hitler's evil grasp. Udet himself couldn't stand Hitler's madman tactics and when ordered to attack Russia and being browbeaten and villified by the Nazi regime, committed suicide in his apartment over the korsher restaurant where he had entertained both Charles Lindbergh and me. Nazi Germany's bid to world domination depended on her air force which in turn was built out of the hundreds of youth flying clubs which were permitted under the Versailles Treaty, when German military airpower was forbidden.

About the same time that Germany was building her airpower through her air youth program, Mussolini's Italy and Tojo's Japan were doing the same thing. The Japanese pilots who wrought destruction on Pearl Harbor were a scant few years before flying kites in Japan and studying basic aerodynamics.

Let's look around the world today and see what's happening. I have it on good authority that in France, any teen-aged boy who is physically qualified and wants to learn how to fly can practically do so at government expense, with no strings attached.

When General Spaatz, General Beau and I were in France arranging the first exchange of 5 French youths for 5 of our CAP youths and the original international cadet exchange setup, we were only able to get 3 boys from France who were taking flying and 2 who were mechanics, as France did not even have a cadet program. Since then, and I believe because of our showing them by example what we were doing in the United States, they modeled one after ours.

In little Switzerland, smaller population-wise than New York City, there are more gliders and more soaring clubs than in this entire United States.

In Brazil natives who saw their first white man when a small aircraft landed in a cleared area are hacking hundreds of landing strips out of the deepest and most impenetrable jungle areas, opening vast possibilities of development of national wealth. Brazil encourages her young men to get into aviation as the key to the nation's development.

In Canada the Air Cadet League, whose annual meeting I was privileged recently to attend, works hand-in-glove with the Royal Canadian Air Force to provide the caliber of men needed by Canada's first line of defense and the Canadian aviation industry. They have an outstanding partnership there.

What our Nation's friends are doing in the field of air youth movements is most encouraging to us.

Of sinister implication is what is going on behind the Iron Curtain, that invisible barrier so well coined by Winston Churchill. Did you ever stop to think that the Iron Curtain doesn't go up very high? It certainly isn't high enough to prevent Communist bombers from devastating strategic targets in our country.

I can't give you exact figures, of course, but I can tell you that for every teen-age American boy and girl preparing themselves for a career in aviation, whether it be civilian or military, the Communists have more than a hundred. Do you know that twice as many young Communist men and women are being graduated from engineering schools and universities this year than in the United States?

Sovict leaders have long ago realized that as the twig is bent, so shall it grow. By appealing to the imagination and unbounding energy of her youth, the Soviets have organized thousands of youth aviation groups, with a compulsory membership of hundreds of thousands of boys and girls. They spend their time studying aerodynamics, navigation, communications, electronics, and meteorology. They rig parachutes, make frequent parachute descents with free and tower-controlled chutes. They learn basic aerodynamics through widespread use of model aircraft, from the simplest design to radio-controlled models. Soaring is a popular sport in the vast areas behind the Soviet borders, something which their young people would like to do even if it weren't compulsory. There can be no shortage of pilots, mechanics, navigators, electronics specialists, nor of engineers in many fields upon which airpower depends, because the Communist leaders can forestall such shortage by a compulsory youth program. Can you picture the Soviet Minister of Defenze saying what Secretary of the Air Force Harold E. Talbott told the Air Force Association last summer, when he said, "The safety of our country depends largely on the quality of our Air Force, not alone its size. More than anything, it depends on the skill and endurance of the men who handle the new equipment of the jet-atomic age." No, indeed. the Soviet Defense Minister would say something more like this: "Our glorious air force and our massive aviation industry need 400,000 pretrained young Soviet citizens 2 years from now to make us the strongest airpower in the world. You commissars have exactly 18 months to deliver the goods." He wouldn't have to add "or else." That's taken for granted.

Now, let's get back to this country. We don't operate like the Soviets. We are a free and proud people, and when we are faced by danger, no one has to stand over us with a whip and make us do anything. Now here is where the danger lies: Much has been written and said about the critical shortage of engineers and scientists. In a recent pamphlet, published by the Institute of the Aeronautical Sciences, one reads that our most serious present national problem is a "helluva shortage of engineers." The booklet points out that the shortage of engineers, far from easing, is growing worse. And it goes on to say that if the long-range view is critical, the short-range view in terms of national defense is appalling. For the next few years, it goes on, there will be twice as many jobs available for new engineers as there will be engineering graduates to fill them.

I don't believe I have to impress you with the fact that we are in the midst of a design revolution. Today's production bombers fly twice as fast as the bombers of World War II. Modern production fighters fly over 300 miles an hour faster and at twice the altitude of those used against Germany and Japan. At the same time, today's aircraft, type for type, are 3 to 4 times as

heavy as those of 10 years ago, and the complications involved are endless, as anyone knows who has looked under the skin of a modern jet fighter. Every cubic inch of space in such aircraft is crammed full of electronic, electrical, and hydraulic devices needed to assist the pilot in navigating and in maneuvering his airplane—an airplane and pilot being trained in uses of the atomic bomb, guided missiles, and modern methods for offensive and defensive action in case of a shooting war.

Just a few years ago, engineers were concerned with building a powerplant which would drive an aircraft through the sound barrier. Today, the problem is no longer the sound barrier, but finding a metal which will not melt when an aircraft goes through the thermal barrier—metals subjected to intense heat.

You've often heard it said that it takes 4 years to build a fighter aircraft, from design phase to production phase.

By this time, you are probably saying to yourself, what in the heck has this got to do with me, a little ol' volunteer member Civil Air Patrol.

Let me repeat what I just said—it takes 4 years to build an airplane from the design phase to production phase. Now let us take this pregnant question—How long does it take to build a man?

We, in Civil Air Patrol, have as one of our major missions the building of men. We have entered into a contract with the Congress of the United States to maintain a continuing pool of 100,000 carefully selected teen-age boys and girls who will have a small understanding of the air age and its effect on them, the Nation, and the world.

I wish in no way to belittle, by not going into more detail tonight, about Civil Air Patrol's superb record as a search and rescue organization, upon whom the Air Force must depend for 78 percent of searches in the Continental United States and Territories. Nor will I ever personally forget the heroes who gave their lives flying on anti-submarine patrol missions during World War II. I am certain that all of us are ready to do whatever we are called upon to do to defend our shores from foreign aggression.

But I must stand before you tonight and tell you that as an organization, we have not kept our contract with Congress, and we have not given to our brother organization, the United States Air Force, the support it most of all wants from us. Again let me quote from Secretary Talbott's speech when he said, "The biggest headache (in USAF) was obviously the increasing turnover of our skilled men. During the last 4 years, the USAF reenlistment rate has fallen from 66 percent to about 30 percent. At some of our bases where the strain is greatest and the living conditions are the poorest, the rate has fallen as low as 6 percent. On top of this, many highly skilled and experienced officers have sent in their resignations. Now, every time a skilled man leaves the Air Force, it costs our country a little fraction of its security." At this point you are probably wondering how much the Air Force has helped us with our cadet program. I might state they have done a lot with personnel, equipment, facilities, airplanes, and the finest teaching manuals that have ever been devised. Article 5 of our Civil Air Patrol constitution under "Objects and purposes" provides:

"(A) To provide an organization to encourage and aid American citizens in the contribution of their efforts, services, and resources in the development of aviation and in the maintenance of air supremacy. To encourage and develop by example the voluntary contribution of private citizens to the public welfare.

"(B) To provide aviation education and training, especially to its senior and cadet members, to encourage and foster civil aviation in local communities, to provide an organization of private citizens with adequate facilities to assist in meeting local and national emergencies."

You are also probably asking yourselves how much they expect a workingman, executive or otherwise, to do with his limited free time, how much devotion is necessary for the program, and if it can be accomplished without more help from the Air Force.

I don't propose to stand here and go into who is at fault or why things are as they are. The important thing is to remember that the United States of America must depend on complete, unqualified, undeniable air supremacy for its very existence as a free nation. We, as volunteer members of the Civilian Auxiliary of the United States Air Force, must do everything we can to bring about a constant flow of the cream of our Nation's youth into all those things which go together to make up air supremacy. We are not doing it as well as we can or must.

I know for a fact that too many members of Civil Air Patrol are not particularly interested in the cadet program. Too many don't want to be bothered with the kids. Too many would rather fly with the back seat empty than be saddled with taking our eager cadets for an orientation flight. Too many will take cadets up only if they chip in for the fuel expended. Too many have no interest whatsoever in getting together with school officials on working out aviation education courses in our schools. Too many care only about the glamorous phases of our work, and will pitch in willingly in a search mission, or mercy flight, or disaster of any kind, but when it comes to organizing, working with, and helping a cadet squadron to become part of their community, they're just plain not interested.

I have heard it said time and time again, if the Air Force will give us thus and so, then we can do thus and so. Let me remind you that we, as volunteers, have pledged our assistance to the United States Air Force and the principles of airpower. We are the auxiliary of the United States Air Force, of our own free will. We exist to help the United States Air Force—the Air Force is not the auxiliary of the Civil Air Patrol.

We are needed, urgently needed, right now to help solve this critical problem upon which the future of the United States depends. Somehow, someway, we must find the way to light the spark of interest in a career in aviation in the hearts of the best boys and girls of Texas and the Nation, and then fan that spark until we are in position to say to Air Force, Navy and Army Air, the aviation industry, and the airlines, "Here, here they are, the cream of our young people who will fill your ranks in a better way because we have seen to it that they are pretrained." And to the young people, who will not join the ranks of the growing numbers of juvenile delinquents, we can say, "Here, we have led you on the path to a career in the Nation's biggest industry, the aviation industry, so that you can find a future for yourself and help your country remain free at the same time."

And to Congress, we can say, "Look what we did by the sweat of our own brows, with our own initiative, without one cent of subsidy from the United States Treasury. Now give us an appropriation so that we can give 10,000 flight scholarships per year, so that we can have suitable meeting places, so that we can buy and build gliders from kits, and teach our young people what airpower means through actual flight experience, so that we can offer a substantial number of aviation engineering and electronic engineering university scholarships to our most-deserving cadets, so that we can work hand-in-hand with our educators in helping them to provide the necessary courses in our primary and secondary school systems—so that we can build our program to a point that it will fill the needs of our country's power to survive in this dangerous world."

Right here in Texas, with military airfields all around us, the No. 2 State in the Nation in aviation industry, with the University of Texas, and Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College offering two of the best aeronautical engineering courses in the country, we can prove to all of Civil Air Patrol, and the Air Force, and the Nation, that we are No. 1 in leading the way. But we can't do it unless every senior member of the Texas wing will say to himself: "I have the will to do it, and no hardship will stop me." We are "doers" not "askers."

If any man or woman sitting in this room tonight is in Civil Air Patrol for what he can get out of it, and considers the cadet program a necessary evil toward getting more from the Air Force in the form or surplus or excess property, then let him get out—he is being true neither to himself nor to this land so richly endowed by the Almighty.

But if he resolves to meet this task, as our World War II CAP pilots met the submarine threats to our shores, then we will not fail, and we will lead the way for others to follow. I pray to God that it may be so.

Thank you.

Opposition by Mayors' Committee to Proposed Legislation to Destroy Federal Regulatory Power Over Interstate Gas Sales

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, although they have not received much attention in the competition with the well-financed publicity drive of the natural gas producing industry, the activities of the mayors' committee to oppose legislation which would destroy Federal regulatory power over interstate gas sales, deserve careful attention of all Members of Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement which I made for myself and for the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], in introducing the leaders of this mayors' committee to members of the press yesterday, May 18. I also ask unanimous consent that the original statement of the mayors' committee on the Harris bill and released on April 25, made by Mayor Joseph S. Clark, Jr., of Philadelphia, Pa., on behalf of the committee, rejecting recently reported, so-called compromises, and a list of the members of the mayors' committee, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS, IN BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND SENATORS HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, ESTES KEFAUVER, AND ALEXANDER WILEY, MAY 18, 1955

The 60 million gas users in America are greatly indebted to the city and State officials who have been leading the drive against

exemption legislation that would add hundreds of millions of dollars annually to America's gas bills.

I refer particularly to the mayors' committee to oppose H. R. 4560 and similar exemption bills, under the able leadership of Mayor Joseph S. Clark, Jr., of Philadelphia, Mayor David L. Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, Pa., and Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York, the Wisconsin and Michigan officials who carried through the successful battles in the Phillips case to compel the Federal Power Commission to do its regulatory duty, including the Honorable James R. Durfee, chairman of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, and Hon. James H. Lee, assistant corporation counsel of Detroit, Mich., and the leaders and members of the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers.

These officials have helped to bring the facts in the situation and the growing public concern over exemption proposals to the attention of Congress. They have also helped to inform the public of the big new raid that is being attempted on the consumers' pocketbook.

In the face of the well-financed propaganda drive of the oil and natural gas production industry, the people are fortunate to have such able defenders.

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF MAYORS' COMMITTEE ON NATURAL GAS, MAY 18, 1955

In fighting to protect the consumer interest on natural gas rates, we believe it is absolutely necessary to retain Federal jurisdiction over the rates charged in the field for the major sources of supply of our interstate pipelines. Otherwise, a continual rise in field prices, such as has already occurred over the past 10 years, and which will certainly be renewed in the absence of effective Federal regulation, will push the consumers' monthly gas bills ever higher and higher.

It is our position that no legislation is presently necessary to permit Federal regulation fair to both consumer and producer. We believe the Federal Power Commission should be given a reasonable opportunity to administer the powers of regulation over the nontransporting producers which the Supreme Court upheld last year.

While there is a great deal of talk on the part of gas and oil industry spokesmen that they want to find a reasonable compromise on the basic issues involved in this matter, we find that all of the so-called compromises put forward by the industry spokesmen would result in stripping the consumer of any effective Federal protection against steady and continuing increases in the field price of gas. All of the compromising would be in one direction—in favor of the producers and against the consumers, for all such compromise proposals call for elimination of direct regulation of producer sales. We reject such compromises.

STATEMENT OF MAYORS' COMMITTEE TO OPPOSE THE HARRIS BILL REMOVING POWER OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION TO REGULATE NATURAL GAS SALES BY PRODUCERS

On behalf of the committee, Mayor Joseph S. Clark, Jr., of Philadelphia, made the following statement at the close of an all-day conference held in the Jefferson Room of the Mayflower Hotel:

"This group here today represents most of the natural gas consumers of the United States.

"Representatives of mayors of more than 50 cities having a total population of over 30 million people have been meeting with the chief city attorneys and representatives of mayors of many other cities, large and small. Our purpose has been to organize presentation of the consumers' case against the Harris bill and similar legislation now pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The purpose of these bills is to remove the authority presently vested in the Federal Power Commission to regulate the price of sales of natural gas by producers and gatherers to pipeline companies which transmit gas to our city borders.

"Protests against this legislation are national in scope. Cities from Oregon to Alabama, from Louisiana to Massachusetts have joined our committee to oppose this legislation. The interests of all gas consumers require that it be defeated.

"Huge increases in the price of natural gas during the last few years are largely due to the fact that the Federal Power Commission has hertofore failed to exercise the powers given to it by the Natural Gas Act of 1938 as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Phillips case. If this legislation passes, the power of the Federal Power Commission to exercise its obvious duty in the consumer interest will be removed. Gas bills all over the country will inevitably increase in an aggregate of hundreds of millions of dollars.

"Experience has amply demonstrated that the unregulated operation of the law of supply and demand with respect to a national resource in as short supply as natural gas, whose ownership is monopolistic in character, results in one thing only: higher prices to consumers and unwarranted profits to the big oil companies of the country who control over a third of the supply of natural gas.

"It is clear that regulation of the profits of pipeline companies and retail distributors of natural gas is not enough. The weak link in the armor of consumer protection is failure to regulate the initial sale from producer or gatherer to pipeline company.

"A priceless national resources such as natural gas affected as it is with a public interest and in increasingly short supply must be subject to effective regulation from wellhead to the tip of the burner if the interest of the average American consumer is to be adequately protected.

"We are accordingly united in our opposition to legislation which would remove this key protection to the consumer which exists in the present law."

MEMBERS OF MAYORS' COMMITTEE TO OPPOSE H. R. 4560 AND SIMILAR EXEMPTION BILLS (CITIES WITH POPULATIONS OVER 100,000)

Philadelphia, Pa., Joseph S. Clark, Jr.
Pittsburgh, Pa., David L. Lawrence.
New York, N. Y., Robert F. Wagner.
Akron, Ohio, Leo Berg.
Baltimore, Md., Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr.
Birmingham, Ala., J. W. Morgan.
Boston, Mass., John B. Hynes.
Bridgeport, Conn., Jasper McLevy.
Buffalo, N. Y., Steven Pankow.
Cambridge, Mass., John J. Foley.
Camden, N. J., George E. Brunner.
Chicago, Ill., Richard J. Daley.
Cincinnati, Ohio, Carl W. Rich.
Cleveland, Ohio, Anthony J. Celebrezze.
Columbus, Ohio, Maynard E. Sensenbrenner.
Denver, Colo., Quigg Newton.
Detroit, Mich., Albert E. Cobo.
Duluth, Minn., George D. Johnson.
Elizabeth, N. J., Nicholas Sylvester LaCorte.
Erie, Pa., Arthur J. Gardner.
Fall River, Mass., John F. Kane.
Flint, Mich., George M. Algoe.
Gary, Ind., Peter Mandich.
Grand Rapids, Mich., George W. Welsh (city manager).
Jersey City, N. J., Bernard Berry.
Kansas City, Kans., Paul F. Mitchum.
Knoxville, Tenn., George R. Dempster.
Louisville, Ky., Andrew Broaddus.
Milwaukee, Wis., Frank P. Zeidler.
Minneapolis, Minn., Eric G. Hoyer.
Montgomery, Ala., W. A. Gayle.
Nashville, Tenn., Ben West.
Newark, N. J., Leo P. Carlin.
New Bedford, Mass., Arthur N. Harriman.
New Haven, Conn., Richard C. Lee.
New Orleans, La., deLesseps S. Morrison.
Paterson, N. J., Lester F. Titus.
Portland, Oreg., Fred L. Peterson.
Providence, R. I., Walter H. Reynolds.
Richmond, Va., Thomas P. Bryan.
Rockford, Ill., Milton Lundstrom.
Sacramento, Calif., H. H. Hendren.
Springfield, Mass., Daniel Brunton.
St. Louis, Mo., Raymond R. Tucker.
St. Paul, Minn., Joseph E. Dillon.
Syracuse, N. Y., Donald H. Mead.
Tampa, Fla., Curtis Hixon.
Toledo, Ohio, Ollie Czelusta.
Utica, N. Y., Boyd E. Golder.
Waterbury, Conn., Raymond E. Snyder.
Yonkers, N. Y., Kristen Kristensen.
Youngstown, Ohio, Frank X. Kryzan.

Winning the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Sunday evening, May 15, the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], delivered the main address at a dinner honoring Gen. David Sarnoff in New York.

The majority leader directed his remarks not only in tribute to a very distinguished American, General Sarnoff, but also to the great issue of foreign policy and national security. Taking appropriate note of General Sarnoff's recent document concerning a program for winning the cold war, the majority leader stated a philosophy and program which merit the immediate attention of the executive branch of our Government, as well as the attention of the Congress.

I consider the address by the Senator from Texas one of the most important public pronouncements in recent years. It calls for a new dimension in our efforts to check and roll back Communist imperialism, namely, a political offensive directed and guided by competent experts in the field of political strategy and psychology.

The Senator's speech is must reading. It is a priority policy document. It lays the basis for a reevaluation of our national security policy. I commend it to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINNING THE COLD WAR

(Address by Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, at dinner honoring Gen. David Sarnoff, Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York City, N. Y., May 15, 1955.)

General Sarnoff, Mr. Baruch, Mr. Swope, Dr. Bunche, honored guests, in a very real sense, we are here tonight to pay tribute to America.

The strength of a country lies in its people. A country that can list Gen. David Sarnoff among its leaders need not fear the future.

It is difficult for me to think of America without General Sarnoff. He is one man who has given as much to his country as he has received.

A DEBT REPAID

He may owe a part of his eminence to the opportunities which this land afforded. But whatever the debt, it has been repaid—unstintingly, ungrudgingly, and with compound interest.

No man feels a greater sense of obligation. And no man is more willing to serve; more eager to sacrifice; more anxious to set aside his personal affairs when duty calls, in war or in peace.

His industrial leadership has been vital in bringing electronics from the laboratory into our daily lives.

His company is almost as fully engaged in defense work as the Defense Department itself.

He has been the adviser of Presidents, and he has never withheld his talent because of partisan motives.

This is the record of a man who has risen to the top through his own unaided efforts. He asked only for opportunity. He supplied his own brains, his own efforts, his own muscles.

THE REAL TEST

I feel humble tonight that I have the privilege of paying tribute to such a man. I feel even more humble because I find myself in the company of some of our greatest Americans.

Here tonight is Herbert Bayard Swope, a towering figure of journalism, and one of the most forceful thinkers of our times; Bernard Baruch, America's financial genius, and adviser to Presidents; Dr. Ralph Bunche, who brought to diplomacy the very finest of the heart and soul of America.

It is the real test of General Sarnoff that such men are not only willing but eager to appear tonight to honor him.

COLD-WAR BLUEPRINT

Over the years, I have drawn freely upon General Sarnoff for ideas. He has never been lacking, never failed to be stimulating. But his greatest effort may be the cold-war blueprint published last Tuesday, a blueprint which has been endorsed in its basic elements by the President.

It points the way to a solution of the greatest problem before our people.

We are living in a great crisis period of freedom. The decisions of the next few years, possibly of the next few months, may decide our fate for centuries.

It is nothing new in history for freedom to be threatened. But the magnitude of the present threat has no precedent.

Never before has there been a time when so many people were mobilized and dedicated to one objective, the overthrow of liberty.

A PARTIAL RESPONSE

In part, we have responded to this threat capably and well. We have constructed a military machine to devastate an attacking enemy. We have built military alliances that, at least since the Paris accords, are strong and enduring.

But in other respects, we are still groping. We have prepared for hot war. But we have failed to grasp the essential nature of the cold war and to form the strategy to conduct it.

Our resources have been mobilized primarily against military aggression. We cannot, and should not, relax such efforts.

But the method of cold war is political aggression, and in this field atomic bombs and jet planes are scant protection.

DEADLY AND DECISIVE

A cold war is just as dealy, just as decisive, as hot war. But it is fought on different battlefields and with different weapons. Even when cold war turns hot, on a local scale, we find the terrifying weapons of modern science almost useless.

Atomic bombs did not shield the free Republic of Korea. Hydrogen warfare did not save Northern Vietnam, and may not save the balance of southeast Asia.

And all the powers of nuclear physics will not recover for freedom the vast territory of China.

THE SOURCE OF POWER

Somewhere along the line, we have forgotten a fundamental. It is that power ultimately rests with the people. Unless we win them to our side, we are lost.

In recent months, we have been preoccupied with the problem of Asia. We have awakened to the fact that this great continent—which many think was humanity's cradle—may also be humanity's grave.

We have argued the military problems of this huge land mass. We have discussed bases and soldiers as though the issue were a tactical exercise at a military war college.

But we did not awaken to the true key to Asiatic victory until the Bandung Conference. It was there that we learned that the ultimate decision will be made by the people themselves.

We discovered that freedom in Asia had friends—and able, forceful leaders. It is to our discredit that we did not know this earlier. It will be to our destruction if we fail to move on their side.

A SNARL OR A SMILE

In recent weeks, the Soviet Union has astounded the world by moving—at least in words—to ease some of the tensions building up to world war III.

We would be soft minded to accept those words at face value. They must be tested to the last degree to determine whether fair words will be backed by fair deeds.

It is possible that they are not in good faith—that they do not want to abandon the threat of military aggression.

But there is an even more subtle possibility. It is that the Communists have decided to ease world tensions so they can concentrate on the purely political struggle at which they are so adept.

Could it be that they have set aside the weapons of hot war—which must be hurled with a snarl—in favor of the weapons of cold war—which can be delivered with a smile?

Could it be that they have decided that nothing can emerge from hydrogen war except the total destruction of both capitalism and communism?

If that is the case, we must be prepared for a full-scale cold war—admittedly more desirable than hot war. We must be as fully armed for the ideological as for the thermonuclear struggle.

THE PRIZE OF VICTORY

We must launch the greatest political offensive in history. And we must mobilize all our people behind it.

The objectives of that offensive should be peace and the preservation of freedom. The only alternatives are hot war and the destruction of liberty.

The prize is the good will of the vast multitude of people not only in Asia but throughout the world who are still uncommitted. They are the great jury who will decide the fate of this planet.

A PLANNED OFFENSIVE

The offensive itself can take many forms.

We must get out in the marketplace of ideas and compete for the minds of men.

We must be ready to help those who will fight for freedom and build for freedom both inside and outside the Iron Curtain.

We must be as fearless in accepting the realities of peace as we should be in accepting the realities of war.

And at no time should we be afraid to explore any step which will bring us closer to peace and dignity.

It is not enough to say that Communists are treacherous. We must demonstrate their treachery by contrast—in deeds—to our own good faith.

It is not enough to say that Communists seek to enslave humanity. We must hold forth an alternative—freedom, not under our rule, but with our help.

It is not enough to say that Communists are driving the world to war. We must show that we are trying to lead the world to peace.

There is nothing new in these ideas. There would be something new if they were carried into action on the necessary scale.

THE FIRST STEP

The first step must be the formation of a general staff for the cold war—a general staff that would have the same role in our political offensive that the Joint Chiefs of Staff would play in a military offensive.

It should be more than just a collection of department heads meeting to discuss their individual problems.

This staff could direct and coordinate the weapons of cold war—diplomatic, economic, propaganda. It could advise the President directly on the many questions upon which he now receives a bewildering number of estimates and advice.

It could help him decide whether Matsu and Quemoy are worth the risk of losing our allies.

It could help him decide the extent to which our country should participate in such meetings as the Bandung Conference.

It could help him to decide when and where we should encourage resistance and how we can help captured people stave off the assault on their minds.

AN OVERBURDENED MAN

These issues are now discussed far too much in a vacuum. The burden of decision is loaded entirely on the shoulders of one man—the President—and he has little help in weighing the many factors against each other.

It may be that atomic and hydrogen war will never come to this earth. We would be foolish to assume that it will not happen. But we would be equally foolish to ignore the other possibility.

Our atomic and hydrogen muscles are strong and growing stronger. But they do not defend against infiltration and political aggression.

MUCH TO PRESERVE

We have much to save, much to preserve. It would be folly if we failed to save and failed to preserve because we had placed our faith in military strength alone.

If David Sarnoff has provided us with a clue to the answer—and I believe he has—he will have demonstrated once again that free men can always conquer tyranny.

From the brains of such men we can always draw vital ideas. This world, which is so precious, can and will be saved, and this Nation will enjoy a new lease on life.

Homestretch for H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

HOMESTRETCH FOR H. R. 1

When the confereees on the reciprocal trade extension bill meet today to consider the Senate and House versions of H. R. 1, their deliberations will be overshadowed by one all-important fact: The White House has given up the fight to keep its own bill intact as it passed the House and instead is accepting—save for one particularly dangerous amendment—the considerably weakened measure approved by the Senate.

Whether it was necessary for President Eisenhower to embrace the Millikin and other amendments of the Senate Finance Committee in order to get any respectable reciprocal-trade bill at all through the Senate is a question that might be argued until doomsday. Let us admit that the Senate bill might have been worse; it might have included a whole series of special-interest amendments each designed to favor a specific commodity; it might have taken away the final power of the President to pass upon the recommendations of the Tariff Commission. If it had done these things, it wouldn't have been worth the paper it was written on. Even as it is, it is much weaker than we would like.

The Senate bill includes tricky and vague phraseology that will unquestionably open still wider the already wide escape-clause provisions of existing law. It will increase the already great pressures on the President, who remains the final arbiter, to grant special exceptions to every branch of every industry touched by foreign competition. For example, the Senate version, which the President has accepted, says that the escape-clause mechanism shall come into play when the Tariff Commission finds that increased imports, "either actual or relative * * * have contributed materially to the serious injury or the threat of serious injury" to American industry. This terminology is so broad that it is difficult to see where its limits lie—which is doubtless just what its original proponents intended. And it is by no means the only weak point in the Senate bill.

We hope, as we have said before, that the House conferees will stick to the House bill, which is not only what the President asked for in the first place but is a reasonable, moderate gesture toward opening up the channels of international trade. But if the Senate version, as backed by the administration, should prevail, we will still have a measure that extends the principle of reciprocal trade for 3 years, that provides for distinct if limited tariff reduction, that leaves ultimate authority in the hands of the President where it belongs, and that will perform the historic feat of setting the broad direction of top-level Republican policy toward less rather than more restrictive trade practices. If on top of that the White House can get Congress to approve at this session a respectable customs simplification bill and the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation (GATT), it may yet have something to crow about in the field of international trade policy.

Chemical Progress Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that this week has been designated by the chemical industry as Chemical Progress Week, which is sponsored by the Manufacturing Chemists' Association in an endeavor to emphasize the importance of this industry to our national welfare.

This week has been emphasized in various parts of the country by the chemical industry and is the second annual observance.

The educational program is being carried out at the community level by people of the industry in plants, laboratories, and sales offices within the communities having chemical industries. This represents the largest single educational program ever attempted by the chemical industry.

I am particularly interested in the observance of this week due to the location within my district of a number of important chemical plants which serve the country by the production of many useful products. Virginia has a particularly eventful history in relation to the chemical industry. The industry is a part of Virginia's heritage. In 1608, the year following the founding of Jamestown, the first chemical plant went into operation in Virginia. This was a glass factory. Virginia's first exports that year included glass, pitch, tar, and potash—all products of the infant chemical industry.

Today the chemical industry in Virginia is one of the most important industrial developments in our State. In 1953 all chemical-industry employers in Virginia gave employment to 42,012 men and women and paid about $175 million in wages and salaries. The industry produced during 1953 chemical products valued at nearly $1 billion. Virginia is ranked ninth among chemical-producing States and gives evidence of continued progress along this line. In November of last year, according to a survey, Virginia during the preceding 12 months had completed $36,400,000 in new chemical construction and had another $38,500,000 worth of construction underway and $13 million more being planned. Today the chemical industry is the Nation's fourth largest in terms of assets; employs approximately 800,000 persons at over 11,000 plant locations; and averages approximately $21 billion in annual sales.

In connection with the observance of Chemical Progress Week, I wish to pay particular tribute to the splendid programs of development in the plants located at Hopewell, Va., which is in my congressional district. The production carried on by the Hercules Powder Co., Continental Can Co., Celanese Corporation of America, and the national aniline division of the Allied Chemical & Dye Corp. is of tremendous value to the economic stability of our State. In addition to the tremendous economic advantages brought about by the employment of more than 5,000 people in the Hopewell area, these plants and their leadership have rendered a commendable service in the way of community relationships in that section of the State. The men and women associated with these firms have not only contributed of their time and effort in the promotion of the industrial development of Virginia, but have also stepped into various other walks of life to make a valuable contribution to the welfare of our people. I feel that their efforts are typical of those put forth by the chemical industry as a whole.

Nineteenth Annual School Safety Patrol Rally and Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, statement, and citations:

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., May 13, 1955.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Your enthusiastic participation in and review of the 19th National School Safety Patrol parade last Saturday was a fine way of honoring the patrols from Pennsylvania and elsewhere, and was deeply appreciated by us. We have learned of your graciousness in having your picture taken with patrol marchers from your own area.

It was very kind of you to offer to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement concerning the school safety patrols. We have prepared the attached statement, and trust that it will meet with your approval. If there is anything further we can do in connection with this, you may be sure that we are eager to do it and will take care of it promptly.

Just in case you want them, we are sending a set of the citations for the Lifesaving Medal winners, together with a list of the judges who were responsible for their selection. As you will recall, 3 out of the 13 Lifesaving Medal winners this year were from Pennsylvania: Phyllis Boose, Lancaster, Pa.; Dorothy Koehler, Columbia, Pa.; and posthumously, John Minadeo, Pittsburgh, Pa.

By the way, your enthusiasm in this subject is so great that we wonder if perhaps you might care to make a brief television film for use in your own area. Facilities have been made available especially for Members of Congress to make such television films. These facilities exist in room 511 A of the Old House Office Building, and we understand that the person to contact is Mr. Robert Coar.

Indeed, my associate, Walter Morris, who is in charge of patrols, has already collaborated with Capt. Thomas V. Slominski, liaison officer of the Metropolitan Police Department and parade marshal for the past 8 years, and with Representative JAMES C. DAVIS in making such a film. If you like this idea and if we can be of any help, please call upon us.

Sincerely,

BURTON W. MARSH,
Director, Traffic Engineering and Safety Department.

THIRTY-TWO THOUSAND YOUTHFUL LIFESAVERS RECOGNIZED IN 19TH ANNUAL SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL RALLY AND PARADE

Why has the traffic death rate for youngsters aged 5 to 14 been nearly cut in half in the past 30 years while that for other age groups has practically doubled?

There are a number of reasons, highly important among which is the splendid work of devoted schoolteachers and police. One school program which has helped greatly in achieving this splendid record—the more remarkable in light of the fact that motor vehicle registrations have more than tripled in the past 30 years—is the school safety patrols.

In about half of our elementary schools, 600,000 carefully chosen older children are designated as members of the school safety

patrol. They are instructed and trained in how to help protect their schoolmates at heavy or dangerous street crossings between homes and schools. Most of them proudly wear the familiar white sam browne belt and a badge.

These school safety patrols constitute a gigantic youth "army for safety" and where well chosen, trained and supervised, they do a splendid life-saving job.

It is appropriate therefore that they be thanked and recognized for their fine work. The leading annual recognition program occurs here in the Nation's Capital—in an annual school safety patrol rally and parade.

The 19th annual school safety patrol assembly and parade was held here in Washington, D. C., May 6 and 7. Boys and girls who are currently serving in local units of the school safety patrol came to Washington from most of the States in the eastern half of the United States to participate in the event. In parts of the country too remote from the Capital to send representatives, local ceremonies were held to mark school safety patrol "day," which was often proclaimed by governors and mayors throughout America.

On May 5, the Vice President of the United States received 12 members of the school safety patrol in the Senate Office Building, where he presented them with the Nation's highest award for safety patrol heroism—the AAA gold lifesaver medal. A 13th presentation was made posthumously to John Minadeo, a Pittsburgh, Pa. schoolboy who lost his life while protecting his classmates. The AAA knows of no other case in the long history of the patrol that a serving member has been killed on duty.

On the evening of May 6, there was a patrol rally and entertainment in the armory and on May 7, almost 32,000 participated in a gigantic colorful patrol parade on Constitution Avenue. These events have focused much attention on the school safety patrol movement, and I feel that this is an appropriate time to make the accomplishments of the school safety patrol over the past 33 years as a matter of record.

Here are some key facts about this year's parade:

Nineteenth national school safety patrol assembly and parade, May 6–7, 1955.

A. Metropolitan Police Department data (count made at 9th and Constitution Avenue):

1. Number of participants in parade, 31,879.

	Visiting	District	Total
Number of marchers	25,424	6,136	31,560
Number of bands, and drum and bugle corps	80	22	102
Number of floats	6	11	17

Number of automobiles, 72; drivers and riders, 236; motorcycle riders, 20; horses, 16.

2. Time parade took to pass 9th and Constitution Avenue: 5 hours, 25 minutes.

AAA data

B. Parade features:

1. Nineteen States and the District of Columbia were represented.

2. Patrol coming from the greatest distance—Beresford, S. Dak., 1,285 miles.

3. International division—world spread of patrols was colorfully indicated by the parade-leading unit of Embassy children carrying flags of 33 countries.

4. Hopalong Cassidy—before the parade started Saturday, TV and Radio Star Hopalong Cassidy rode his famous white horse Topper through the formation area and then led the second division of the Parade. He later drove back through the formation area.

5. Awards—Thirty-one awards were presented after the Parade by AAA President Andrew J. Sordoni and chairman of the AAA traffic and safety committee, E. Ray Cory, to the best bands, drum and bugle corps, drum majors and majorettes, baton twirlers, safety slogans, safety floats, and for the best appearing unit and most unusual feature.

6. There was almost a one-third increase in the number of bands and drum and bugle corps.

7. Floats and slogans were in about the same numbers as last year.

8. Many prominent congressional, governmental (including police and educational) officials reviewed this year's colorful parade honoring the representatives of 600,000 patrol members throughout the country.

C. Gold AAA lifesaver medal awards:

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON presented medals and certificates to 10 boys and 2 girls (Mrs. Nixon pinning the medals on the girls). Also, a posthumous award was made by Vice President NIXON to John Minadeo of Pittsburgh, Pa., who was killed on patrol duty protecting a group of schoolmates. The ceremony was in the Senate Office Building on Thursday, May 5, 1955. Parents and chaperones heard Vice President NIXON read the citations and congratulate all School Safety Patrol members for their important lifesaving work. Medals went to: Richard Bailey, Washington, D. C.; Phyllis Boose, Lancaster, Pa.; Raymond Van Fitzgerald, Gainesville, Fla.; Paul Grobert, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Roger Held, Ecorse, Mich.; Richard Innocenzi, Trenton, N. J.; Dorothy Koehler, Columbia, Pa.; Walter R. Lee, III, Gainesville, Fla.; Gary Nelson, Royal Oak, Mich.; Hatcher William Piland, Jr., Hampton, Va.; Edward Priem, Saginaw, Mich.; Roy Williams, Jr., Atlanta, Ga.; and to John Minadeo.

D. Armory program—drills, Hopalong Cassidy, military district of Washington units:

Seven thousands boys and girls (top armory capacity) enjoyed the Friday evening entertainment. Twenty-nine teams from six States and the District of Columbia participated in annual drill competitions. There was a snappy "retreat parade" of the 1st battalion, 3d Infantry Regiment, Fort Myer, Va., commanded by Lt. Col. John M. Farnell, led by the United States Army Band. Hopalong Cassidy thrilled those present with his six-shooters and western attire and with a fine talk. A 2d battalion, 3d Infantry Regiment group then presented a thrilling "mock battle" demonstration.

School safety patrols began in a number of widely scattered places about 1920, when the death rate among children between 5 and 14 years old was appalling. A search for patrol pioneers by the American Automobile Association some years ago developed the fact that at about the same time, about a dozen school, police, and automobile club persons did important patrol pioneer work. These were honored by the AAA with a gold patrol pioneer key and certificate.

In each of these three fields, one individual stood out as the earliest or major pioneer. In the educational field, Eugene J. Sheridan, a school official in Newark, N. J., was the original pioneer. H. O. Rounds, of Detroit, Mich., was the first police officer to be responsible for starting a safety patrol. In the field of automobile clubs, it was Charles M. Hayes, president of the Chicago Motor Club, one of the largest affiliates of the AAA.

From the first, the patrol idea proved a success, but, nevertheless, it grew slowly during the early years. After the first 5 years, during which many more automobile club representatives, school officials, and police officers joined in the program, there were still less than 40,000 boys and girls on duty.

Then in 1928, the national headquarters of the AAA established a safety department, and the school safety-patrol movement was adopted as one of its projects. For the first time a large national organization undertook the job of giving widespread stimulation to the starting of patrols, and to having them equipped, trained, supervised, and organized.

One early aim of the AAA was to get suitable standard rules for the operation of safety patrols adopted that would be generally acceptable to school officials, police, and interested civic groups. Principally, these standard rules were intended to avoid unsound practices, thus increasing the effectiveness of the patrols.

The American Automobile Association has participated from the beginning with other national organizations in formulating and revising the standard rules for the patrols. The first joint effort was in 1928. Out of that meeting came the Standard Rules for the Operation of School Boy Patrols. Although these rules were revised in 1938 and 1948, they are still essentially the same. The committee which last revised the standard rules was composed of the AAA, International Association of Chiefs of Police, National Commission on Safety Education of the National Educational Association, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, National Safety Council, and United States Office of Education. This year, the rules are again being revised by a committee of school, police, and main interested private groups.

Another important outcome of the 1928 meeting was the determination of the function of the safety patrol. As stated at that time, the function was: "To instruct, direct, and control members of the student body in crossing the streets and highways at or near schools; and to assist teachers and parents in the instruction of school children in safe practices in the use of streets and highways at all times and places."

This function is also substantially unchanged, and the two rules that are most stressed in the training of new safety patrol members are: (1) Patrol members are to stay on the curb, and (2) they are not to attempt to direct traffic. Their duty is to remind schoolmates of the safety rules learned in classes and to see that schoolmates cross only when there is a sufficient lull in vehicular traffic so that they can cross safely.

Today the patrols are no longer an experiment, they are a national institution. This year nearly 600,000 boys and girls are actively serving in 14,000 communities in every State. And in most instances the three kinds of agencies work closely together to foster and maintain effective local patrol units.

There is ample proof of the success of the experiment in these two facts:

(a) Although there has been a tremendous increase in the number of motor vehicles using our streets and highways and a comparable increase in the number of school children, the death rate resulting from traffic accidents involving children in the 5 to 14-year-old group has been nearly cut in half during the past 20 years. This fact is even more remarkable when it is considered that the rate for all other age groups has nearly doubled during the same period.

(b) In hundreds of communities it has been recorded that not one child has been killed in a zone protected by the safety patrol since it was organized, and this means for periods up to a quarter century.

It is impossible to evaluate the patrol solely in terms of lives saved or injuries prevented. There are some instances where patrol members have saved lives very dramatically, as typified by the youngsters who were decorated by the Vice President last week. In fact, since the AAA began awarding gold lifesaver medals in 1949, 56 boys and girls have received the honor. In each of the cases a national board of judges carefully examined the facts and determined that each patrol member thus honored performed a lifesaving act and at the same time exposed himself to great personal danger. These, however, are exceptional dramatic cases in which the patrol member acted above and beyond the call of duty. The major day-

to-day lifesaving work of the patrols is done quietly and efficiently, without any fanfare whatsoever. It is done by thousands of boys and girls every day. They do their job on the sidewalk and are never called upon to rush into the street to pull a fallen child from the path of a speeding car. Yet by steadfastly doing their daily job the 600,000 patrol members in the aggregate save hundreds of lives per year.

Perhaps a better measure of the value of the patrol lies in the benefits that accrue to the school, other school children, and to the patrol members themselves.

The school benefits because the patrol furnishes a constructive outlet for the energies of growing boys and girls. Where the patrol is properly organized and operated it offers an incentive for better work and deportment, not only to those on the patrol but to those desiring to become patrol members. The privilege of serving is much sought after and generally only students exhibiting leadership, reliability, and interest are selected. Progressive educators regard the patrol movement as an excellent safety educational device as well as a means for developing character and positive usefulness for community living.

Other school children benefit from the patrols in more ways than simply getting protection from them at corners. In the classroom, rules for safe walking are learned. On the streets patrol members remind schoolmates to apply them. By constant repetition, good habits of traffic safety are formed and gradually become more or less automatic. Once firmly established, these sound habits govern at all street crossings—and hence the influence of the patrols extends far beyond the intersections at which they are on duty.

In one sense, the greatest beneficiaries are the patrol members themselves. Many educators feel that there is no better way to mold character in a child and to develop the so important sense of personal responsibility than to assign him a task where the need for punctuality and strict attention to duty are essential. Service on the patrols almost invariably develops a sense of civic responsibility and active concern for the welfare of others that scarcely can be imparted in any other way to elementary school children.

School safety patrols originated in America and they are an American institution. Now, however, they are spreading to many other lands—in fact, all around the world. There are active units in 21 other countries, and several more countries are engaged in organizing units. Most of these patrols are patterned on the American model, and the AAA is helping in their establishment by giving the benefit of their more than a quarter century of experience.

While the growth of the patrol movement in this country has been phenomenal in recent years, the AAA estimates that only about half of the elementary school children in the United States now have the protection of the patrols. About one million trained boys and girls are needed each year to give complete protection to America's 25 million school children under 14 years of age. To reach this goal, the AAA claims, greater recognition must be given for the present and past accomplishments of the patrols, thus building the official and public support which are needed.

CITATIONS ACCOMPANYING AAA GOLD LIFESAVER MEDALS PRESENTED TO SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL MEMBERS BY VICE PRESIDENT AND MRS. RICHARD NIXON, MAY 5, 1955, WASHINGTON, D. C.

(Names and addresses of parents included)

RICHARD BAILEY, 11, STANTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

On September 23, 1954, Richard Bailey was on safety patrol duty at the 25th Street entrance of the Stanton Elementary School. A vehicle was moving north on 25th Street at 30 to 35 miles per hour when Roy Keats, 7 years old, started to cross the street. He was about halfway across when he fell forward into the path of the oncoming car. Richard, disregarding his own safety, ran out, grabbed Roy, lifted him up and pulled him back to safety. Had it not been for Richard's action, Roy would have been struck by the car.

Richard is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Ralph J. Bailey, 3353 23d Street SE., Washington, D. C.

PHYLLIS BOOSE, 12, JACOB EICHHOLTZ SCHOOL, LANCASTER, PA.

While on safety patrol duty on May 21, 1954, Phyllis Boose saved several children from traffic injury or death. A collision of 2 cars at the intersection of Hazel and Beaver Streets threw 1 driver out of his car, causing it to swerve toward her and a group of children waiting to cross the street. Without thought of her own safety, Phyllis pushed the children behind a telephone pole for protection. Altough she and 2 of the 5 children she was protecting were severely injured by the driverless car, her action undoubtedly saved several lives.

Phyllis is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Paul W. Boose, 321 Beaver Street, Lancaster, Pa.

RAYMOND VAN FITZGERALD, 13, SIDNEY LANIER, ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, GAINESVILLE, FLA.

On January 5, 1955, Raymond Van Fitzgerald was on safety patrol duty at the intersection of U. S. Route 441 and 16th Avenue. Under the direction of a police officer, Raymond was escorting Gerald Foster, who was pushing his bicycle, across the street. An approaching truck with faulty brakes was unable to stop, though the traffic signal for it was red. The officer shouted a warning. Raymond saw the danger and grabbed the bicycle luggage carrier, giving it and Gerald a strong pull backward just as the truck went past. The truck hit a car in the intersection, and continued down the road about 200 feet before stopping. Raymond's action saved Gerald from serious injury or death.

Raymond is the son of Mr. and Mrs. R. V. Fitzgerald, 1124 Northwest 15th Avenue, Gainesville, Fla.

PAUL GROBERT, 13, PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 209, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

On September 24, 1954, Paul Grobert was on safety patrol duty at the intersection of East 7th Street and Avenue Z. A policeman was standing in the center of the intersection directing traffic. Paul was stationed on the curb holding back a group of about 20 children. An 8-year-old girl, who had been talking with schoolmates, suddenly started to cross the street directly into the path of a fast-moving truck. Disregarding the danger to himself, Paul dashed into the street and pulled the girl back to safety, as the truck passed only a few inches from them.

Paul is the son of Mr. and Mrs Sidney Grobert, 838 Avenue Z, Brooklyn, N. Y.

ROGER HELD, 11, NO. 1 SCHOOL, ECORSE, MICH.

While on safety patrol duty at the corner of Labadie and High Streets on January 12, 1955, Roger Held saved a 5-year-old child, Raymond Sablosky, from injury or death, when he darted into the street in front of a turning car. Patrol Capt. Kenneth Tackett, also serving at this intersection, saw the car begin to turn and shouted a warning to Roger. Believing there was a slim chance of saving the child from being struck by the car, Roger acted without thought of self and pulled Raymond back to safety just in time.

Roger is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Ludwig Held, 4428 High Street, Ecorse, Mich.

RICHARD INNOCENZI, 12, WASHINGTON SCHOOL, TRENTON, N. J.

On February 1, 1955, Richard Innocenzi was on safety patrol duty at the intersection of Chestnut and Emory Avenues. At approximately 8:15 a. m., when traffic was heavy along Chestnut Avenue, 8-year-old Anthony Bencivengo ducked under Richard's extended arm and ran into the street directly into the path of an approaching car. The younger boy did not see the car. Richard, disregarding his own safety, ran into the street and grabbed Anthony, pulling him back to safety. The driver of the car braked and swerved to the left, but was unable to stop until the car had traveled well beyond the boys.

Richard is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Dante Innocenzi, 48 Charles Street, Trenton, N. J.

DOROTHY KOEHLER, 13, WILLIAM G. TAYLOR SCHOOL, COLUMBIA, PA.

On May 12, 1954, while on safety patrol duty at Seventh and Walnut Streets, Dorothy Koehler saved a 2-year-old child, John Andes, from serious injury or death when he darted into the street directly into the path of an oncoming truck. John's mother was waiting for a bus across the street. When John saw her, he ran into the street. Dorothy saw the child and realized that the driver of an approaching truck could not see him because of a parked car. There was no time to signal the driver. Dashing into the path of the truck, she snatched the boy as the vehicle brushed her dress and came to a stop some 20 feet past the spot where the boy had been.

Dorothy is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John Koehler, 521 Walnut Street, Columbia, Pa.

WALTER R. LEE, III, 13, SIDNEY LANIER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, GAINESVILLE, FLA.

On January 5, 1955, Walter Lee was on safety patrol duty at the intersection of United States Route 441 and 16th Avenue. Under the direction of a police officer, he was escorting Allen Stinson, who was pushing his bicycle, across the street. An approaching truck with faulty brakes was unable to stop, though the traffic signal for it was red. The police officer shouted a warning. Walter, realizing that Allen was not aware of the danger, gave a hard shove on the rear fender of the bike, thus pushing Allen clear of the truck. Walter managed to jump clear as the truck swerved. The truck then struck a car in the intersection and continued down the road about 200 feet before stopping. Walter's action saved Allen from serious injury or death.

Walter is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Lee, Jr., 915 Northwest 17th Avenue, Gainesville, Fla.

GARY NELSON, 11, ABE LINCOLN SCHOOL, ROYAL OAK, MICH.

While on safety patrol duty at the corner of North Kenwood Street and East 11 Mile Road, November 5, 1954, Gary Nelson acted without thought of his own safety to prevent a driverless car with four child passengers from crashing into other automobiles. The driver, who had come to school to pick up her son, had forgotten to pull on the handbrake when she parked across the street from Gary's post of duty. Gary noticed the car rolling downhill away from the curb. He ran across the street, jumped in, and stopped the car by pulling on the handbrake, thus preventing what might have been a tragic accident.

Gary is the son of Mr. and Mrs. John Nelson, 1925 East 11 Mile Road, Royal Oak, Mich.

HATCHER WILLIAM PILAND, JR., 11, FRANCIS ASBURY SCHOOL, HAMPTON, VA.

While protecting school bus passengers as a safety patrol member on September 22, 1954, Hatcher William Piland, Jr., saved 6-year-old Thomas Bryant from being struck by a speeding car while the school bus was stopped to discharge passengers. Several children had already crossed the road when Thomas started to cross. Hatcher noticed a speeding car approaching, the driver showing no intention of stopping. The small boy was

unaware of the danger. Hatcher quickly stepped into the path of the speeding car and lifted and carried him back to safety. The car passed less than a foot away.

Hatcher is the son of Mr. and Mrs. H. W. Piland, Sr., 319 Atlantic Avenue, Buckroe Beach, Va.

EDWARD PRIEM, 12, PLAINFIELD SCHOOL, SAGINAW, MICH.

On September 30, 1954, Edward Priem was on safety patrol duty at the school crossing located at Bay and Shattuck Roads. Steven Anscomb, a kindergarden pupil, darted under Edward's outstretched arm directly into the path of a car traveling approximately 50 miles per hour. Edward, disregarding his own safety, ran after the child and just managed to pull him out of danger, as the car swerved, with brakes squealing and dirt flying. Edward's quick action saved Steven from death or serious injury.

Edward is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Priem, 3810 Shattuck Road, Saginaw, Mich.

ROY WILLIAMS, JR., 12, HAPEVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, ATLANTA, GA.

At the grade crossing of Ross Street SW., and Highway 41, Roy Williams, Jr., while on safety-patrol duty, on October 11, 1954, saved 6-year-old Quinette Gay from the path of an approaching train. The little girl, who was partially paralyzed, stumbled and fell between the rails in crossing the tracks on her way to school. Roy saw that because of her injury and fright she was unable to move. Disregarding his own safety he ran into the path of the fast-approaching train and carried the girl to safety.

Roy is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Roy Williams, 279 Mudd Row, SW., Atlanta, Ga.

JOHN MINADEO, 15, GLADSTONE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, PITTSBURGH, PA.

(Posthumous award to be accepted by Dr. Robert V. Cresswell, principal, Gladstone High School)

On October 7, 1954, at the intersection of Hazelwood and Second Avenues, John Minadeo, on safety patrol duty, saw a car, out of control, rushing downhill toward him and a large group of children waiting on the sidewalk. Disregarding his own safety, John pushed the children back. The driver of the car, which had had a brake failure, attempted to steer between a car waiting for a traffic light and the sidewalk on which the children were standing. The car jumped the curb and struck John and five other children. John and a girl were killed, and four children were injured. Yet the accident would have been far more tragic had it not been for John's heroic, sacrificial action.

John was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Antonio Manadeo, 242 Glenwood Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Board of Judges, 1955 School Safety Patrol Lifesaver Medal Award Board.

Inspector Arthur E. Miller, chairman; former director of public safety, Montgomery County, Md., 7804 Radnor Road, Bethesda, Md.

John J. Agnew, deputy chief of police in charge of traffic, Metropolitan Police Department, Washington, D. C.

John W. Bethea, Staff Director, President's Action Committee for Traffic Safety, General Services Building, Washington, D. C.

E. Ray Cory, chairman, AAA Traffic and Safety Committee, Post Office Box 463, Austin, Minn.

Dr. Carl F. Hansen, associate superintendent, District of Columbia Public Schools, Franklin Administration Building, 13th and K Streets, Washington, D. C.

Helen K. Mackintosh, Acting Chief, Elementary Schools Section, United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Third and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

Boys' Clubs of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley before the 49th annual convention dinner of the Boys' Clubs of America at the Hotel Schroeder, Milwaukee, Wis., on May 12, 1955:

I am most happy to have a part in this convention of the Boys' Clubs of America. It is a great cause. It is to provide for citizens of the future the essentials of a wholesome life, for men and boys do not live by bread alone; nor by books or schooling or philosophy. They must have wholesome recreation and association with their fellows.

For into the hands and on the shoulders of these boys we, who have passed through most of the years allotted to men on earth, pass the burdens we have carried and the problems we have not solved. Theirs is a profoundly important responsibility.

We, the elders, are likely to envy youth. It has so many things in abundance that we begin to miss—great energy, the spark of enthusiasm, and, above all, the wide field of opportunity.

Perhaps sometimes we even overestimate the significance of youth, for we see youth with eyes that have traversed many years of experience. We see what youth could do. But youth can only see within its own limited experience.

We feel that we could enjoy youth in a manner beyond description. Perhaps that was what was in the mind of George Bernard Shaw. He said, in effect, Isn't it a pity that youth should be wasted on the young?

The world that faces these boys—a world in which we shall not be living—has a wonderful prospect. In many ways, it will be a time of opportunity such as the world has never seen before. There is the unlimited horizon of invention, of human progress, of the discoveries of science, of the eradication of disease, of the lengthening of life. Truly a wonderful time to live.

But in another sense, is it so wonderful? Because with what that is new and wonderful and beautiful and helpful that will come there must inevitably come responsibilities, problems, and burdens beyond anything that we have known in the past. For providence makes us pay our way as we go through this world.

We know, at any rate we can guess at the possible good that lies ahead. But no one can guess what the tragic possibilities may be in the awesome future in which these boys will be citizens of the Nation and the world.

For we are leaving to them neglected problems, unpaid debts, and work undone, for we have left undone some things we should have done and we have done things we should not have done. And the harvest of pain and suffering is very great. A part of that harvest these boys must gather.

Because that world toward which these youngsters look is so full of grim possibilities, no doubt they will in a sense grow older earlier. For they will realize all too soon the dangers into which the course of events may carry them. In short, they will grow older earlier and they will stay alive longer.

The latter—that is, the lengthening of life—will be a gift of science to humanity, a gift that we are already enjoying in some measure. But the sobering, indeed the depressing realities which will bring these youngsters to mental manhood sooner are something that the world in which we are living has granted them. We have permitted this generation of ours altogether too carelessly to lose sight of the strong moral values and the imperative demands of former generations. For this we must bear a large responsibility.

Let us for a moment review a few of the factors which have contributed to this failure of our moral standards to keep pace with our material progress.

We have been fortunate, we Americans, to inherit the richest country on earth. For this we owe a great debt to those of our forefathers who came here and made it their own by their labor and their devotion to ideals of morality and democracy. But as one generation followed another, it has come to be almost accepted that this heritage is something for which we have no responsibility except to enjoy it to the utmost. As a people, we resemble some of the unworthy heirs of distinguished and rich men who scatter what others have gathered and who waste what others have saved.

In a sense, our moral standards have not been equal to our material opportunities. We have grown rich too fast and too carelessly and too thoughtlessly. Ultimately we have respected one ideal and have worshiped at one altar, and that is the ideal of riches and the altar of personal success.

Another factor is the lack of sufficiently high standards in the world of business in a past generation. When I was a boy, we heard a great deal in the newspapers and in political campaigns about the malefactors of great wealth. It was Theodore Roosevelt who coined that phrase. In a large sense he awakened the people of the country to the realization that there were in fact malefactors of great wealth and in some instances he awakened the malefactors themselves. At any rate, there began to be stock-taking of the methods and ideals of business and the reckoning was not favorable. Thereupon there set in a long period of agitation and reform, which fortunately has carried into business a vastly higher standard of conduct and much more wholesome ideals than were present before. But some of the neglect of that standard has survived in our own time. We see altogether too many people who are giving examples to the youth of the land that those who succeed are those who cut the corners; that those who are great are those who accasionally forget to obey the law; and that high profits go with low sense of responsibility.

These are factors for which our generation is responsible, and it is our duty to correct them insofar as is possible. For their effect upon the youth is unmistakable.

I have spent a good deal of my life in politics, and I think I have seen it in all of its glory and, I may say, in all of its grossness. I think that part of our moral failure has been the presence in politics of misguided ambitions and of irresponsible and reckless conduct.

It is a source of regret to me when I hear politicians making an appeal for votes in purely material terms. It is no way to build the moral fiber of the people to make them feel that all that the Government is intended to do is to supply their material wants and all that they are supposed to contribute to that Government is what the Government exacts in taxes.

In political parties, which I have had something to do with, I have enjoyed the life because a political party, while it is in conflict with another political party, enjoys within itself a great deal of clean and honest and wholesome companionship. It builds spirit when it is politics in the right sense. It builds, I may say, character in the best sense of the word.

But there are those in politics who have misconceived the essential purposes of political life and have made participation in the activities of the party purely a means of furthering selfish interests. We can help the generation to come by building in politics for higher ideals and for the noble purpose of service to all the people.

But among all the factors which have contributed to moral decline has been a neglect of religion and of responsibilities of participation in religious activities. There was a time when the vocation of a minister or rabbi or priest was regarded in a family as the highest to which a son could aspire. To belong to the ministry was regarded as the attainment of a proud place in the community. I wonder whether these standards have been maintained.

We have taken God out of our schools. Of course, I believe that there should be a sharp separation of the church from the state, but there surely must be a means by which people who, though in different churches are pursuing the same ultimate and eternal objectives to get together on a program to put religious teaching in some form back into educational systems of the land.

Another factor in the decline of religious responsibility is the presence of theories of law which are new and strange. The law of the land, which we must obey, is far more than what is written in the statute books. For there is a law above the law. That is what Jefferson referred to as the laws of nature and of nature's God. These are based upon the eternal principle of a guiding purpose in the universe. These laws or rules we must obey or suffer the consequences. We have neglected this at great cost to ourselves and to our generation.

Another factor has been the growth of amusements that have no moral purpose. I grant that it is not always exactly necessary that harmless amusements be overlaid by the stern lessons of morality. However, we have taken some of the fine moral development and education out of our sports, our theater, our television, our radio by neglecting what is wholesome in favor of what is merely sensational and exciting.

Another element in our past and our present society is the presence of materialistic concepts in the pursuit of scientific perfection. Science can be, as we have learned to our bitter regret, not only a great builder but a great destroyer. It is for us to determine which it is going to be in our time and in the future. For our attainments have been beyond the comprehension of even the most imaginative of people. We must come to realize that science should be the servant and not the master of man's destiny.

Finally, there has been the insidious teaching of marxism which in its most malignant form is represented in communism and in its more subtle but nevertheless destructive form is found in socialism. This has not only challenged us abroad but has challenged us within our own country. We have permitted too much of our thinking, of our teaching, and our standards of literature and the drama to become contaminated by Merxist doctrine in one form or another. This is a true destroyer of the ancient moral standards, for those standards involve self-reliance, the mastery of opportunity, the doing of a day's work honestly for an honest day's pay, the fulfillment of contracts, and the standards of fair dealing among men. But marxism teaches none of these things. Instead, it teaches men to be mere slaves of what the Marxists call dialectics. Dialectics can be explained in very high-toned language, but to me it is simply a Marxist expression which means making a poor case sound good.

Our children have not been immune to this influence and it has taken its poisonous course with many of them.

It goes without saying that the unfortunate decline in moral values, in respect for authority, in willingness to work hard, to be diligent, to save, and to help others is basically responsible for the problem of juvenile delinquency about which we are hearing so much these days. Surely the statistics of that social disorder cannot be wrong. They are ominous and challenging.

May I say at the outset that I offer no panaceas, but I should like to leave a thought or two with you on how I feel about the spread of juvenile delinquency. I think it is appropriate at this time to refer to this unfortunate phase that has arisen in our daily life.

May I say that I certainly have no desire to condemn the boys of our country. The great bulk come from decent homes, receive good religious training, and are taught to recognize and prepare for the responsibilities that they must assume when they become mature citizens. We must not hurl the dart of criticism at the boyhood of the Nation because of the malfeasance of a small segment who have been diverted or who have themselves strayed from the path of decency. Nevertheless this development is like the faint symptom of what may eventually spread into a contagious disease.

There must be exercised wisdom, tolerance, and restraint on the part of older people so that this problem may be resolved without harsh punitive measures, but with understanding and a desire to rebuild lives that have broken down.

It is my considered judgment that our attack on this juvenile delinquency menace must be three-pronged—the home, the church, and the school. The formative years are vital and decisive and parents must understand that it is their early influence and guidance that molds the character of the boy, that instills him with a proper conception of life and its responsibilities and encourages him to give to others a measure of respect and cooperation in whatever tasks and relations he may be called upon to follow as a member of society.

I need scarcely say that religious training is highly essential and that the church and synagogue have the very sacred and vital obligation to impart to the boy the true ethical values of life. It is for them to project and to interpret the true meaning of right and wrong, for once the boy knows how to distinguish this he should become a useful and honorable citizen.

The school makes its contribution in the cultural field so that these three forces, working together, in a spirit of harmonious understanding can create the man of the future. The handling of juvenile delinquents must be left to the experienced hands of national, State, city, and county agencies, religious leaders, social workers, and civic leaders so that, together, they can evolve an effective program that will ultimately erase this evil. They are entitled to the unstinted cooperation of parents, school administrators, and spiritual leaders.

And, finally, may I say that it is the mission of the Boys' Clubs of America to join the other agencies and activities by providing the thousands of boys, through the medium of clubs, an opportunity to develop many extracurricular interests to acquire strong bodies, to form wholesome habits, and foster respect for their faiths and, above all, to understand clearly the meaning of our American way of life.

There is a big job ahead for all of us in this country, but I am sure we will not fail for we are imbued with a spirit of brotherhood and helpfulness and the Boys' Clubs of America is one of the potent symbols of our philosophy of life and living.

The training and opportunities which we have been offering in the past are not sufficient to meet the challenges of the future. We need much more of those services that have proved their value in the past.

As a member of the national board of Boys' Clubs of America, I have been inspired by the tremendous development which has taken place in our movement, especially in the past few years. Assets of Boys' Clubs throughout the country now have a total value of over $100 million—this is big business and important business. I understand a new Boys' Club was opened every 10 days last year, and it seems like this pace will continue throughout this year. This is a definite indication of the growing recognition on the part of the American public of the fine effective service which is being rendered to our youth by Boys' Clubs.

I know all of you here tonight have a sincere interest in the Boys' Club movement. Most of you have given unselfishly time, money, and effort, often at some sacrifice to yourselves. You have done this because you believe in the Boys' Club philosophy and its methods.

As a member of the Boys' Club family, I know from personal observation that the Boys' Club movement is truly one of the most important services to youth in our country. I congratulate each one of you for helping to make it so.

Eisenhower Highway Program and Delaware Deepening

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has asked the Congress to approve his multibillion-dollar program for the Nation's highways, and he now appears to be displeased over the fact that the Congress does not act with alacrity to adopt his proposals. His desire for immediate action on this project, coupled with his refusal to allow the Government to participate in a project to deepen the Delaware River unless private industry contributes a share of the expenses, strikes the editor of one of the papers in my district as slightly incongruous. I must say that I agree with the editor's sentiments. For the edification of my colleagues, I include the editorial which appeared in the Trentonian on May 17, 1955:

BASICALLY THE SAME

President Eisenhower is irked with Congress because of its reluctance to sanction his $27-billion Federal highway program. The Nation's entire economy is geared to this proposal, the President insists, and he points out further that "it is tied in with steel production, transportation, and other industries, and, of course, employment in these industries."

It is not difficult for those of us here in the Delaware Valley to follow the President's logic. We in this vast industrial area are fully mindful that adequate transportation facilities, including water, are vital steppingstones to prosperity.

Therefore, we find it hard to reconcile the President's willingness to sponsor a nationwide highway program with his unwillingness to sponsor an internationally important waterway program such as the deepening of the Delaware River.

And, without presuming to be facetious in the matter, it might also be pointed out that Mr. Eisenhower has not yet taken the position (as he did on the proposal to deepen the Delaware) that private enterprise should foot part of his highway-program tab.

Conversion of the Delaware to an international waterway for oceangoing vessels undoubtedly would stimulate vehicular traffic on our public roads, which, apparently, is precisely what the President is striving to do. In the light of these conflicting viewpoints, it would seem to us that some White House explanations are in order.

No Occasion for Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Pittston Gazette, Saturday, May 14, 1955, which strongly advocates that President Eisenhower not veto the postal pay bill. I, too, would like to go on record again in complete support for a much-needed pay raise for the postal workers as incorporated in the bill recently sent to the President. It is long overdue and completely justified.

The editorial follows:

Mr. Eisenhower will have to dig very deep if he is to come up with a convincing reason for vetoing a postal-pay-increase bill because the House voted six-tenths of 1 percent more than he has indicated he would approve.

A year ago he denied the postal workers a raise for the legitimate reason that Congress provided no funds to pay it. But this year the responsibility rests with him to make sure that these faithful public servants get their proper share of the pay boosts that economic circumstances have persuaded him to recommend for other civilian employees. These circumstances have already compelled the Government to provide increases for its military personnel and, more conspicuously, for the Members of Congress themselves.

Where the conference committee will finally fix the percentage point remains to be revealed. It must stand somewhere between the House's 8.2-percent pay increase and the Senate's 10 percent. But obviously there is no reason to expect that either branch will drop back to Mr. Eisenhower's 7.6 maximum.

And considering that the administration in the next fiscal year plans to spend upwards of $60 billion, with at least 3.5 percent of total expenditures allotted to alien peoples, it can hardly afford to haggle over perhaps a dozen million extra dollars that Congress may decide to give the postal workers beyond the amount the President prefers to ratify.

In the circumstances, if the conference committe sticks to the House's 8.2 percent, Mr. Eisenhower should not compel the legislators to attempt to override a veto. Such presidential action would be politically unwise and economically dubious.

The postal workers deserve a raise in pay. The ratio of cost of living to their pay raises over the past years proves that. And the President in a measure invalidates his position of last year when he now implies that he will veto any raise over 7.6 percent.

Finally, the fact that the measure is not accompanied by a raise in postal rates is not a sound objection. As has been said before, postal rates and pay for postal employees are no more connected than the pay of sailors is to the price of battleships.

Grace Lutheran Church, Washington, D. C., Awards Honorary Loyalty Day Citation to Representative James E. Van Zandt, Member of Congress, 20th District of Pennsylvania, for Service to His Country During Two World Wars and for His Sponsorship of Legislation in the 84th Congress Designating May 1 as Loyalty Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, at the 11 o'clock service Sunday morning, May 1, 1955, in Grace Lutheran Church, Washington, D. C., Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress from the 20th District of Pennsylvania, was awarded an honorary Loyalty Day citation in appreciation for his outstanding service to his country during two world wars, and for the introduction of legislation approved by the 84th Congress designating May 1 as Loyalty Day.

The honorary citation was awarded by Pastor J. Victor Murtland, of Grace Lutheran Church, following the morning sermon titled "Loyalty and Freedom," delivered by Dr. Robert Van Duesen, of the National Lutheran Council.

The citation reads as follows:

LOYALTY DAY CITATION

GRACE LUTHERAN CHURCH,
Washington, D. C.

It is fitting and proper that Grace Lutheran Church should acknowledge its appreciation of the privilege this day enjoyed to observe the first Loyalty Day as fixed by act of Congress and proclamation by the President of the United States of America.

We thank God for the opportunity given us to note, as we do, the blessings of liberty and freedom bestowed upon all who live under the banner of the United States, including the precious liberty to worship as our faith directs.

We pledge our continued loyal allegiance to our country, its Constitution and laws, and the Christian purposes they proclaim and serve.

This congregation has double reason to rejoice in this Loyalty Day. In addition to the privilege of participation in this nationwide observance, we rejoice in the knowledge that the sponsor and author of Resolution 184, adopted by the Congress in establishment of Loyalty Day, is one of our congregation and a worshipper with us.

The pastor, church council, and members of Grace Lutheran Church, ardently sharing the purpose of Loyalty Day, wish to pay this open tribute to the fine American spirit and service of our fellow man:

"CITATION

"For outstanding and enduring American and Christian service as a citizen, as a distinguished veteran of two world wars, as a Member of the United States House of Representatives for 16 years from the 20th Congressional District of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, as a Christian, and as author of Loyalty Day, we commend our fellow man, the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

"You have not only deserved this commendation but have made us proud of your association as a fellow member of our congregation. That you may continue to find rich rewards, spiritually and otherwise, for your services is our wish. May the blessings of God attend you always."

Done this first day of May, 1955.

RICHARD H. WINKELMAN,
President of the Congregation.
J. VICTOR MURTLAND,
Pastor, Grace Evangelical Lutheran Congregation.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Southwestern Power Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the following Members of the Missouri congressional delegation the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, the Honorable LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, the Honorable FRANK M. KARSTEN, the Honorable RICHARD BOLLING, the Honorable PAUL C. JONES, the Honorable GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER, the Honorable MORGAN M. MOULDER, and the Honorable W. R. HULL, Jr., join me in asking unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Missouri House of Representatives on May 16, 1955, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

An adequate dependable source of power for local REA cooperatives in Missouri is a serious and urgent problem. Congress should immediately take appropriate action to meet this critical situation.

The resolution follows:

House Memorial 2

Resolution memorializing Congress to appropriate funds necessary to carry out the contracts between generating and transmission cooperatives financed by the Rural Electrification Administration and the Southwestern Power Administration and to do all in its power to encourage and further public power in the area served by Southwestern Power Administration

Whereas it has come to the attention of the House that there is growing pressure in Washington, D. C., seemingly emanating from the Interior Department, to discontinue the use of the Southwestern Power Association, by using economic pressures to force the generating and transmission cooperatives to deal with private utilities instead of the Southwestern Power Administration; and

Whereas the proposed new rate schedule of the Southwestern Power Administration is said to be undermining the very purpose of public power by making it impossible for the generating and transmission cooperatives

to negotiate economical contracts for peaking power; and

Whereas the original idea of the Southwestern Power Administration was to make available the maximum quantities of energy to cooperative and other preference customers and ultimately to make power available to the largest possible number of consumers at the lowest rate consistent with good business policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to appropriate money for the furtherance of the Southwestern Power Administration, and to enact any and all laws consistent with the public power policy of the United States to make power available to all who need and demand it; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this memorial be immediately transmitted by the Chief Clerk of the House to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member of the Congress from the State of Missouri, and to the chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of both the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

Adopted May 16, 1955.

AUSTIN HILL,
Chief Clerk.

A Eulogy to Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, it was with the deepest sense of sorrow and shock that I learned this morning of the death of our beloved Mary McLeod Bethune. We have truly lost one whose great and gentle influence has shaped our lives over many years. The people of America have lost the keen mind, the rich wisdom, and the infinite courage of a woman who has contributed so much to her country.

The life of Mary McLeod Bethune was so fruitful, so varied, and so beneficial to her people and to her country that one cannot even attempt to measure her loss. We know only that it is beyond calculation, beyond the power of words to express, and that her passing leaves an emptiness that can never be filled.

The life of Mary McLeod Bethune will forever serve the people of the United States as a profound source of inspiration. Had she succeeded in but one of her many fields of interest, she would have made a great contribution. But her successes were many because her interests were many and varied and because she worked and fought for them with determination, wisdom, and infinite courage.

To her family may I say that in this, your hour of grief, please accept my deepest and most sincere sympathy. Be assured that the Nation's heart goes out to you at this time. Be comforted in your sorrow by the knowledge that, although a great and noble person has passed away, the rich works of her hands and heart will endure forever, and she will be eternally cherished and loved by all upon whose life she touched.

Treaty Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, so many times the so-called Bricker amendment has been described as "the Bricker amendment, limiting the power of the Executive." That is distinctly not so and is the product of the leftwingers who would distort the facts. The Bricker amendment does not limit the power of the Executive—it simply limits the effect of treaties already made, and thereby confines the lawmaking responsibility to the Congress where it constitutionally belongs.

I insert as part of my remarks an able editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner of May 9, 1955:

TREATY LAW

President Eisenhower has said, and Secretary of State Dulles has testified, that they would accept section I of the Bricker amendment.

The section declares that no treaty or other international agreement conflicting with the Federal Constitution shall have any force or effect.

But section I is a lesser part of the amendment and is of little value in itself; for section I, standing alone, has already been nullified by Federal court decisions under which the executive branch may disregard the Constition without appearing to violate the Constitution.

Section II completes section I by stipulating that a treaty or other international agreement may be made domestic law for the United States only by valid legislation.

Every important foreign country except France, the Netherlands, and Mexico retains this self-protection against excessive executive action. As to executive action in foreign affairs, the Bricker amendment only asserts that such actions must be constitutional.

Legislation by treaty can be, and has been, imposed on the United States outside the Constitution both by formal treaties and by informal executive agreements.

The Constitution does not even mention executive agreements.

It provides that treaties "made under the authority of the United States" are "the supreme law of the land," along with the Constitution itself, and it empowers the President to negotiate treaties.

For 132 years the supremacy of the Constitution in treatymaking was hardly questioned.

Then came, in the following order, corrosive Court decisions which have shunted the Constitution aside:

1920—The migratory bird case: The Supreme Court held that treaties may authorize Congress to pass legislation which the Constitution forbids Congress to pass. Under this decision, the President and two-thirds of the Senate may nullify the Bill of Rights, including the 10th amendment (States rights).

1936—The Curtiss-Wright case: The Supreme Court ruled that the treatymaking power does not derive from the Constitution, but is "an inherent power vested in the Federal Government as an attribute of sovereignty." This decision is tantamount to the obsolete Bourbon doctrine of the divine right of kings. By its terms, the Federal Government is not restricted by the Constitution in making laws for the American people in the guise of treaties.

1942—The Pink case: This decision concerned an Executive agreement, not a formal treaty, with Soviet Russia. The Supreme Court noted that a treaty is a law of the land under the Constitution and asserted that such international compacts and agreements as the one then in litigation have a similar dignity.

This reasoning does violence to the Constitution.

According to the Constitution, a treaty becomes a law of the land only if approved by two-thirds of the Senate. But an Executive agreement is not required to go before the Senate for scrutiny.

The Supreme Court decision therefore permits the executive branch to evade Congress and the Constitution and to dictate laws to the Nation by merely substituting Executive agreements for treaties.

The danger to our institutions from treaty legislation is relatively recent, but it has become very great.

At a bar association meeting in Louisville in 1952 Mr. Dulles, speaking as a private citizen, warned that treaties can abrogate the rights given our people by the constitutional Bill of Rights.

Now, as Secretary of State Mr. Dulles opposes the Bricker amendment. He pleads that the Eisenhower administration would not make a bad Executive agreement or an unconstitutional treaty. But there will be other administrations after this one.

On this point the Hearst newspapers prefer the admonition of Thomas Jefferson, who said:

"In questions of power let no more be said of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

Chemical Progress Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, this week we observe Chemical Progress Week. I would like to congratulate the men and women of the chemical industry whose contributions to the increased standard of living enjoyed by their fellowmen cannot be overestimated. The growth of the manufacture of chemicals and allied products has been phenomenal. Since 1939 it has increased fourfold and is now our sixth largest industry. The development of products and research during the past 25 years has been inspiring.

The welfare of the people of the world is evidenced in many, many dramatic ways through the progress of the chemical industry. Chemicals have made possible the increased production of food at lower costs through the use of fertilizers and insecticides. Better ways of preserving foods through packaging and freezing have been found. The progress of the chemical industry in the field of wearing apparel has helped make the people in America the best dressed in the world. The man-made fibers are in greater and greater use. Its great contribution in the field of medicine is called to our attention through the successful use of antibiotics, drugs, and methods of

disease prevention. Modern means of transportation and communication are dependent upon the chemical industry for the parts that make up this technical equipment are made from chemical derivatives. And more and more each day the building materials used in housing America and the world benefit by the genius of the chemical world.

This industry plays a great part in the economy and welfare of my district. Wilmington, Del., often called the chemical capital of the world, is justly proud of such concerns as E. I. du Pont de Nemours, Hercules Powder Co., the Atlas Power Co., and others. The some 11,000 chemical producers throughout the broad expanse of our Nation are doing their part to make the chemical industry a most important part of our lives.

Anselm Forum, Inc., Gary, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Anselm Forum, Inc., a cosmopolitan organization at Gary, Ind., has accomplished great work back over the years through its educational program in clarifying misunderstandings and primitive prejudice which unfortunately has existed in certain localities concerning minority groups.

Recently, this organization has taken up the problem of aiding the American Indians in receiving fair treatment and justice from the hands of the Federal Government. Difficulties concerning their rights have arisen at times by misinterpreting Federal legislation. Legislation to improve their status is pending in the Congress and favorable consideration should be given same.

The following is a report from a subcommittee of this organization under the chairmanship of David Sheer, of Gary, Ind., which sets out valuable facts concerning the welfare of our American Indians:

ANSELM LOOKS AT INDIAN AFFAIRS

Gary's Anselm Forum, comprised of over 40 nationalities, all races and walks of life, has always been interested in the problems of America's minorities. Its social concerns have run the gamut from Europe's displaced persons, equity for Negroes, to the uprooting of Japanese-Americans during the war.

Now the forum has become interested in the oldest minority problem of all, the welfare of the First Americans who inhabited this land thousands of years before Columbus and the white man set foot upon these shores.

Its interest was quite accidental. An editorial in the Christian Century suggested that the legislative actions of the 83 Congress in terminating several Indian tribes might conceivably have opened the door for commercial exploitation of the tribes involved. A letter of grave concern and inquiry was sent to Glenn L. Emmons, Commissioner of Indian Affairs. His reply was released to the Associated Press. Soon, letters began coming in from Indian tribes from all over the country; tribes of whose existence we had no prior knowledge. Chiefs, simple Indian folk, tribal chairmen, applauded this concern and poured out their numerous grievances.

A review of the history of the American Indian and the treatment accorded him is certainly not pleasant reading. It is common knowledge that we have as a nation and as a people badly treated him. From the beginning to the present, Canada, whose treaty making with the Indians is similar to ours, has lived up to her commitments scrupulously. From 1780 through 1925, it would be difficult to find a single agreement that America has kept. Our attitude during this period is best stated by the Indian Affairs Commissioner in 1871: "When dealing with savage men as with savage beasts, no question of national honor can arise. Whether to fight, to employ a ruse, or to run away, is solely a matter of expediency."

What is not so well known is that we have returned to a policy of dishonor.

The Hoover administration received from the Brookings Institute its monumental study, The Problem of Indian Administration, by Lewis Meriam and others. This report, issued in 1928, began with its now famous statement: "An overwhelming majority of the Indians are poor, even extremely poor, and they are not adjusted to the economic and social system of the dominant white civilization." With the appointment of J. Henry Scattergood, as Assistant Commissioner, and Charles J. Rhodes as Commissioner, in 1929, came the first real turning point in Indian affairs. Both men were Quakers and understood the folly of coercion in dealing with Indian affairs.

A new day for Indians began in earnest when President Roosevelt, in 1933, appointed John Collier, Commissioner. The 3 major objectives of the new program were: economic rehabilitation of the Indian, principally but not exclusively, upon the land; organization of the Indian for managing his own affairs; and civic and cultural freedom for the Indian. What the essence of Collier's program was, is the simple truth that the Indians are capable of working out a completely satisfactory adjustment within the framework of American life.

Much good was accomplished under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934. Tribal landholdings increased. Farm production went up. Beef production increased 2,300 percent.

It seemed at long last, in their own way, the tribes were ready for the task of building a happy America.

On July 15, 1948, the Arizona Supreme Court ruled that Indians were not persons under guardianship and therefore eligible to vote. On August 3, a Federal court rule that Indians in New Mexico could likewise vote. Until this time the two States had refused to include Indians in their social-security appropriations. They had been made citizens of the United States in 1924.

In 1950, in the building of the Dalles Dam in Oregon, was evidenced another abrogation of the treaty of 1855. This to nature-loving Yakimas of Oregon was heart breaking. In the treaty were found these words: "This treaty will last as long as the snows on the great white mountain (Mount Adema), and as long as the river flows (Columbia), and as long as the sun shines, this is the word of the Great White Father." For the promised right to worship and fish the Yakimas yielded territory half the size of Washington; ground on which they lived for thousands of years.

During the 1952 campaign Dwight D. Eisenhower pledged himself "to consult with the Indian people and give them every opportunity for a full expression of their desires, hopes, and aspirations."

Much of the responsibility for the present crisis in Indian affairs rests with the policies introduced by former Commissioner Dillon S. Myer. He and his associates were strong "assimilationists" and understood the Indian in much the same way they understood the Japanese in wartime concentration camps. It was they who launched the present drive to have Congress annul the treaties with the various tribes and to free the Indians for assimilation.

President Eisenhower has replaced Myer with Glenn L. Emmons, but Myer's associate, H. Rex Lee, remains.

Passage by Congress of the Tongass Act, in 1947, has seriously undermined Indian holdings in Alaska.

A bill which authorized any State, at its own discretion, and with no regard for Indian consent, to substitute its own civil and criminal code and enforcement machinery for the tribal codes, customs, and systems of enforcement. President Eisenhower denounced this bill for its failure to require "full consultation in order to ascertain the wishes and desires of the Indians."

Our present policy was defined by House Concurrent Resolution 108, 83d Congress. It provides: "As rapidly as possible to make the Indians within the territorial limits of the United States, subject to the same laws, and entitled to the same privileges and responsibilities as are applicable to other citizens of the United States, and to end their status as wards." The 83d Congress terminated the special relationships existing between Government and six tribes. Two of these acts break up the tribes of Klamaths and Uintah-Ouray. This will force liquidation, at least in part, of tribal assets. It places tribal lands on tax rolls despite long time treaties. For the aged and the uneducated this creates a serious danger of loss of homes and livelihood.

This policy of enforced Americanization is a throwback to the early twenties. Not since Albert Fall and the Indian Bureau concocted the so-called omnibus bill has anything of this sort been attempted. That bill was killed in the Senate largely through the efforts of the elder LaFollette. Bills passed in the 83d Congress, of termination, is a piecemeal pursuit of the objectives of the omnibus bill.

It is the sense of Anselm Forum that none of the vital services of the Government in behalf of the tribes be diminished without the consent of the tribes affected; that we adhere to a policy of self-determination for the Indians who wish continuance of tribal culture and self-government. Quoting the Christian Century: "It is expedient and right that we should move now for justice and help for the American Indians. Nearly every day some refugee from Europe or Asia reminds us that America is the hope of the oppressed people of the world. Are we as just and compassionate and wise as we should be to bear the burden with fidelity? Have we achieved at home what we are asked to do abroad? It is right that the American people should do justly and love mercy. No question of human relations involves our spiritual integrity more deeply than this one—our relation to the Indian minority. In no situation on this continent could an awakened conscience do so much good, and do it so quickly."

RESOLUTION ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Whereas it has become the policy of the United States, since the passage of House Resolution 108 in 1953, to bring to an end all Federal considerations enjoyed by the Indians residing within the territorial limits of the United States, because of their Indian status; and

Whereas the Congress has further declared its intentions by enacting into law acts terminating the special relationships existing

between the Government and six separate tribes. Two of these acts break up tribes—the Klamaths and the Uintah-Ouray—forcing liquidation of tribal assets, placing tribal lands on tax rolls despite treaties, statutes, and long-standing customs. This creates a serious threat to homes, income; and

Whereas, this action, justified as a means of integrating the Indians into our common way of life, has been undertaken against the will and judgment of most Indian leaders. There has been almost no long-range preparation of the Indian by the Government for private citizen status. His inexperience in self-government requires formulation of an intelligent program for his eventual adjustment to American life. Only adequate economic opportunities for decent standards of living will make termination possible: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Gary Anselm Forum be on record as opposing all future legislation in the Indians' behalf without prior consultation and agreement with the tribes involved.

ANSELM FORUM,, INC.

GARY, IND., *April 17, 1955.*

Economic Aid for Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article that appeared in the New York Sunday Times and prepared by Dana Adams Schmidt of the New York Times Bureau in Washington. Schmidt indicates the projects suggested in the recent Presidential proposal for $200 million for additional Asian funds. The same boondoggling programs as have been worked on in the past are again to be considered under the foreign aid bill. Every Member of this House should fully understand the extent of this program.

The article follows:

ECONOMIC AID CUT CHARTED FOR ASIA—SPECIAL $200,000,000 FUND REQUESTED WOULD EXTEND LOANS AND MAKE GRANTS

(By Dana Adams Schmidt)

WASHINGTON, May 7—The President's $200 million special Asian fund which the administration has included in foreign aid requests would be used to help finance a regional economic organization in Asia. The requests are now before Congress.

Administration officials said today the organization might be set up within the framework of the Columbo Plan. This includes all Asian countries except Afghanistan in the so-called arc of free Asia.

Like the organization for European Economic Cooperation the Asian organization would originate and evaluate regional development projects. It would operate in 15 countries—Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Nepal, Ceylon, Burma, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, South Vietnam, Indonesia, the Philippines, Formosa, South Korea and Japan.

At present, the Columbo plan powers maintain only negligible administrative and technical staffs including a small bureau of technical cooperation at Columbo.

The kind of projects for which the President's fund would extend very long-term loans on easy terms would include river development, development of mineral resources, transportation and communications, assistance to small- and medium-sized enterprises, and establishment of training centers. In some cases, grants might be made.

The fund would be available for many years, depending on how fast projects were developed and how much was used for grants and how much for loans. It would allocate money only when complete engineering and economic plans had been submitted.

REGIONAL PROJECTS SUGGESTED

As illustrations, information to be furnished to congressional committees suggests the following regional projects:

Irrigation, transportation, and power developments of the Mekong River, which flows through or along the borders of Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam.

Development of iron-ore mining in India might provide a new basis of trade between India and Japan. The Indian ore is good but rail and port facilities are lacking. Elsewhere surveys of mineral resources and contributions to development of roads, short-line railroads, and harbor facilities might expand output to reduce costs.

Fisheries might be developed by studying new fishery locations and some investment in refrigeration.

Transportation and communications across land frontiers might be improved especially between India and Nepal, Pakistan, and Afghanistan, and between East and West Pakistan. For example, inland water transport between Calcutta and points in East Pakistan could be improved by adoption of modern tugs and barges.

Small- and medium-sized enterprises would be encouraged by providing part of the foreign exchange costs for such plans as those producing farm machinery, furniture, housing materials, and forest products, and those processing rice and fish. Enterprises in which an Asian country was working jointly with an American company or in which foreign investors were willing to risk sufficient capital would be favored.

Training centers might include an agricultural-training institution in Japan because the Japanese have an advanced agricultural system. Special aid might be given to the agricultural college of the University of the Philippines and a regional management training center might be set up to overcome the lack of business initiative and skill in Asian countries.

Exemption of Producers' Interstate Sales of Natural Gas From Federal Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the growing list of responsible State officials who are demolishing the various arguments of the natural gas and oil industry for exemption of producers' interstate sales from Federal regulation, I was very glad to note the able statements recently made before the House and Senate Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by Judge H. Lester Hooker, chairman of the State Corporation Commission of Virginia, and a former president of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two recent editorials from the Virginian-Pilot, of Norfolk, Va., commenting on the essential differences between the natural-gas industry and the coal and oil industries, and endorsing the strong arguments of Judge Hooker in behalf of maintaining Federal regulation of the interstate sales of nontransporting producers of natural gas as an essential protection to consumers.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Virginian-Pilot of May 1, 1955]

SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF NATURAL GAS SALES

The Richmond News Leader disagrees with the State corporation commission over the SCC's opposition to the Harris and Hinshaw bills to remove Federal regulation of the price of natural gas at the source. In doing so, the News Leader has stated one of the most frequently used arguments for the bills, as follows:

"If consumers should be 'protected' by government here, why not in a thousand other fields? Why not protect consumers from price fluctuations in food, clothing, steel, gasoline, coal, fuel oil, and building materials?"

The question overlooks one of the elementary facts in the problem. "Food, clothing, steel, gasoline," etc., are not conveyed to a consumer through a legal monopoly which binds him to one choice and no other. The businessman or homeowner who has sunk his investment in a stove or a heating system using natural gas has to buy from the only pipeline allowed on his street.

The News Leader suggests that competing fuels will adjust natural gas prices, saying: "If the producers of natural gas become so exorbitant in their demands, and hence push up the price to consumers, the consumers will turn to other fuels—to electricity, or coal, or fuel oil, or bottled gas. The city of Richmond, for example, does not have to stay with natural gas forever; it could go back to manufacturing its own gas."

The reliances cited are more theoretical than real. One of them would require the natural gas consumer to sacrifice his investment in stoves or heating equipment, to rewire his house and plant, or to install new-type burners. Another might require the city of Richmond, or the VEPCO in Norfolk, to go to the enormous expense of converting every gas stove and pipe connection in Norfolk back from natural gas to manufactured gas. These are desperate alternatives which would be undertaken reluctantly and, if undertaken, would cause considerable confusion and loss of money.

The natural gas producers are unlike the producers of other goods in that they cannot charge what they please. But they have compensating advantages: A steady market of about 20 million customers which has a high depressionproof quality and tax laws which take fully into account the special hazards of oil and gas production. Under wise regulation they have a guaranty of a fair profit.

The principle involved is more than 50 years old and was refined by men like Theodore Roosevelt and Charles Evans Hughes. It is that a consumer who is tied on to a utility line or pipe deserves regulation that gives him a fair price and the utility a fair profit. Virginia Congressmen would do well to consider the opinions of the State's official experts on utility regulation. They should not be misled by a comparison of the natural gas industry with industries quite unlike it in a thousand other fields.

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Virginian-Pilot of May 9, 1955]

HOOKER'S SOUND ADVICE ON NATURAL GAS REGULATION

Judge H. Lester Hooker, of the State corporation commission, put his finger on the chief technical problem of natural gas price regulation when he said: "If you are to have efficient and economical regulation of a utility, you of necessity must regulate its entire business." The commissioner spelled out this elementary proposition at the House Interstate Commerce Committee hearings on the Harris and Hinshaw bills to withdraw Federal regulation of the price of natural gas at the source.

The reason for Federal and State regulation of natural gas prices is that at the end of the line the consumer cannot choose between gas companies and must use the gas from the one and only company allowed to run a pipe to his house or business. For more than 50 years it has been a thoroughly accepted principle in this country that such a public-utility monopoly, which deprives the consumer of the benefits of full and free competition, should be regulated effectively to provide the consumer a fair price and the utility a fair profit.

What the oil companies and other natural-gas producers want is to remove Federal regulation at the source. That would leave natural gas prices subject to Federal regulation on the interstate pipelines and to State regulation on the retail distribution lines. Would such regulation be effective? The question can be answered correctly by applying the same procedure to fields where utility regulation is completely accepted.

Failure to set a fair price at the source of natural gas would be comparable, in the case of electric-power industry, to omitting the costs of operating the generators. It would be comparable, in water supply utilities, to omitting the cost of procuring raw water and including only the cost of treating the water and distributing the pure water. Such regulation would be a farce. The only way to arrive at a decision on a fair profit and a fair price is to take into account all the factors that go into the business.

It is not surprising that the oil companies are allergic to regulation of the price of natural gas and that their spokesmen and arguments sound as though the principle involved was something new—and something suspiciously radical—in this world. For years they let natural gas go to waste, burning it off at the wellhead just to get rid of it.

Now that millions of dollars have been invested in pipelines to make good use of this once-wasted product, and still more millions have been invested in converting stoves and connecting pipes, the use of the commodity must be subjected to the normal standards governing a public utility. Judge Hooker gave the House committee a sound outline of the procedures of effective utility regulation. Virginia Congressmen especially would do well to heed his expert advice from their own State.

Role of the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Louis B. Nichols, Assistant to the Director of the FBI, before the freedom forum of the Anti-Defamation League, which was published in the New York Herald Tribune of April 29, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOOVER AID'S SPEECH ON FBI ROLE

(Here is a partial text of the address of Louis B. Nichols, assistant to the Director of the FBI, before the Freedom Forum of the Anti-Defamation League last night.)

Since 1945, when the Communist Party reconstituted itself, it has had time to develop a new cadre with no open record of Communist Party activity. The FBI has observed their efforts in concentrating in vital areas.

We have seen them set up fronts and manipulate innocent dupes; we have seen them meet under the cover of darkness with their Soviet masters and we have observed them launch campaigns designed to undermine faith and confidence in the American way.

It is true that the formal strength of the Communist Party has declined in numbers. It is also true that a persistent effort has been made over the years to falsely evaluate this menace in terms of numbers. This was true in 1946 when Mr. Hoover pointed out, "The fact that the Communist Party in the United States claims some 100,000 members has lulled many Americans into a feeling of false complacency." And it was still true a few weeks ago when Mr. Hoover pointed out, "even though there are only 22,663 members today with their tentacles stretched out into the front organizations and the various educational and economic fields." The strength of communism must be evaluated in terms of its influence and not on the basis of numbers. And its influence is still potent.

The Communists for a hundred years have been advertising to the world their ultimate program of proletarian dictatorship. Yet the cold fact remains that Communist tyranny rules one-fourth of the world's surface and one-third of the earth's population. Nations have lost their freedom over night because they paid no attention to either the Nazi or Communist fifth columns which constituted only a small minority when they seized power.

COMPARISON WITH HITLER

It would seem that the lessons of history would not be so widely disregarded. Less than 25 years ago Hitler advertised to the world what he would do but was dismissed by most people, not as discerning as the Antidefamation League, as a "crazy little paperhanger."

In his book, Outline Political History of the Americas, which is widely used in Communist training schools, the head of the Communist Party in the United States pointed out, "Communist strength in this hemisphere, or elsewhere, cannot be measured even approximately by statistics * * * the Communist Party's strength runs far beyond all formal measurements." This is illustrated by one of our investigations. One who had served the Communist cause was awarded the Order of the Red Star with the advice that his work had equaled that of two divisions of Red soldiers.

The dimensions of the menace to security can never be measured in numbers. One person, whether or not he occupies a sensitive position, can do irreparable harm. And the sensitive nature of any position is merely a matter of degree. Let me illustrate by another of our cases. Even before we were involved in World War II, we identified an important Nazi espionage ring. Then we became baffled by frequent references to one known only as "Robert." We knew from the guarded references made to him that he was important. But we met defeat at every hand in seeking to identify him. And then 1 day we were rewarded. There was a loyal American employed in what would be considered as a nonsensitive job in a boiler room whose cooperation we enlisted. Officials of the German Consulate in New York brought their papers to the boiler room, where they were burned in a condemned furnace. The boiler room employee would personally take them out of their burlap bags and light a match to the top of the heap. Once the fire was started the consular officials would leave. The boiler room employee, however, had rigged the draft to stop the fire. One day he retrieved a cablegram from the German Foreign Office which instructed that Paul T. Borchardt should burn a letter from "Robert." Investigation very quickly identified the mysterious "Robert."

ARRIVED IN 1940 POSING AS REFUGEE

"Robert" had arrived in the United States in early 1940 posing as a refugee. He lived a quiet life in a private home where he could view the New York harbor. His background was even more revealing. He was an associate and disciple of Professor Karl Haushofer who blueprinted the Nazi plans for conquest. He was a professor of military science at the Polytechnical University in Munich, reportedly secretly run by the German Army, and had carried out such assignments as mapping the African desert where Rommel once ran wild.

"Robert" turned out to be Maj. Paul T. Borchardt, who, after his arrest by the FBI, stated he would rather die than reveal any secrets of the German Army. He received a 20-year penitentiary sentence in Federal Court in 1942 as the technical adviser for one of the most important Nazi espionage rings in the United States, and largely through the efforts of one in a nonsensitive job whose cooperation we had enlisted. Let us not underestimate the intelligence of our adversaries, until at least we can acquire the wisdom of a Solomon and properly determine what is sensitive and nonsensitive.

But you might now ask what this has to do with the present menace. Simply this: Human nature does not change.

Espionage techniques follow a pattern. This case can be used as an illustration, while pending or contemporary cases may not be disclosed. Even in espionage there must be a beginning. The person or persons who condition a youthful mind and make possible the later recruitment to commit Communist espionage or sabotage eventually must assume the responsibility and must account certainly to the natural laws upon which our Judaic-Christian society rests, if not the man-made laws.

One of the tragedies of our era is the fact that it has become necessary to have a security program. An even greater tragedy is found in the tactics employed by those who do not wish to face the facts. We are constantly impressed by the fervor, for example, on the part of some to learn the source of information on subversion rather than to learn the truth of subversion.

INVESTIGATION IS FIRST STEP

The investigative process is the first step in any security program. As it relates to the FBI. It is the simple one of securing facts. Yet even that has been obscured too frequently by diversionary tactics. In early 1940 the hue and cry was raised that the FBI was a menace to civil rights—that is was thought control—that it invaded privacy—that it inhibited freedom. In fact, some of those same old harangues are heard today. But we went through World War II without any enemy-directed acts of sabotage, and enemy espionage within the United States was kept under control.

History records the fact that even in time of war there was no abridgment of civil rights by the FBI. On the other hand, civil rights were maintained because the investigative process identified our real enemies

and laid the groundwork for action in the American way.

The FBI is the same institution today—only it is better as it has learned from experience, and it is proud of the role it has played in helping preserve American freedom. Compared with other Federal agencies, we are a youthful organization. The FBI was founded in 1908. It moved through an era of mediocrity and politicial abuse until 1924, when Mr. J. Edgar Hoover was appointed its Director. Since 1924 the responsibilities of the FBI have continuously grown. At present, we have jurisdiction over some 140 Federal investigative matters.

Since 1939 the FBI has been charged with investigating espionage, sabotage, subversive activities and related matters within the United States. Additionally, it is our responsibility to correlate information concerning the internal security of the United States and to disseminate that information to appropriate Government agencies. To give you some idea of the magnitude of these responsibilities, during the 1954 fiscal year the FBI received some 73,872 security matters for investigation. We handled more than 1 million requests from other Government agencies for subversive-type data to use in the interests of their own security. Additionally, more than 30,000 investigations of applicants, appointees, and employees of agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government were conducted by our special agents in the past fiscal year.

STRICTLY TO GATHER AND REPORT FACTS

The FBI is strictly a fact-gathering and fact-reporting branch of the Department of Justice. We do not clear persons for Federal employment; we do not prosecute violators of the law; we do not render opinions as to the guilt or innocence of persons whom we investigate, nor do we tell other Federal agencies how to manage their affairs by suggesting that employees be discharged or retained in office. The FBI gathers facts; it locates witnesses and evidence. Our role ends there. We are not—nor have we ever been—an accuser, prosecutor, judge, or jury in any case. Nor is the FBI an exposure agency, since its files are confidential.

Internal security investigations raise special problems. Take, for example, the matter of informants. One would think from the reams of material which has been written in recent weeks that the use of informants is peculiarly related to the FBI. The use of informants by the FBI has increased since the late thirities, but so have our menaces. For the first time in our national existence our generation has come face to face with underground organizations. If their clandestine meetings and activities are to be penetrated, clandestine methods are necessary. The most effective method of penetrating a conspiracy is to enlist the cooperation of the conspirators. Thus, informants have become a necessity in the protection of internal security.

Many good people are glad to furnish information if their confidence can be protected. This has been particularly true in security investigations of Government employees. Our regulations require our agents to secure signed statements from persons furnishing derogatory information. But some people simply will not furnish information under those conditions. The question then arises: Is the Government to be deprived of such information? Mr. Hoover at the very start of the loyalty program in 1947 put this up to the Civil Service Loyalty Review Board, which set the policies and we received an emphatic answer: Take the information under the bond of confidence if need be; and maintain the confidence.

USE OF INFORMANTS IS ANCIENT CUSTOM

The use of informants is as old as man. Informants as a means of acquiring information are recounted in ancient history and in the Bible. Our credit system is based in part upon confidential information. The free press would not long survive if newsgathering agencies could not have their confidential sources of information. The Anti-Defamation League, like other fact-gathering bodies, for example, must depend upon confidential informants and sources if it is to continue to discharge its assignments. Of course, some informants are found to be unreliable. In the FBI we constantly check and doublecheck information secured from informants—and make no mistake—if there is the slightest suspicion as to the veracity of the informant, this is set forth in our reports since the FBI does not evaluate the results of its investigations.

The Communist Party has made a most vigorous campaign against informants, seeking to discredit the former Communist whose testimony is necessary to expose the Communist conspiracy. They also have another reason: They want to discourage informants and other former Communists from telling the truth.

The former Communist who has seen the error of his ways and seeks to undo the harm he has done is deserving of every consideration. Those who seek to discredit the truly reformed, former Communist, just because he once was a Communist, do a real disservice. The former Communist renders a real public service and makes a positive contribution to enhancing our security every time he makes a full disclosure. And if it has to be in confidence, he can come to the FBI and the FBI has never broken its word.

INFORMANTS HELPED INDICT RED LEADERS

To date, 134 Communist Party leaders have been indicted for violation of the Smith Act. In each case where convictions have resulted—and in securing 83 convictions—there have only been 3 acquittals—former Communists and onetime confidential informants have supplied the evidence which led juries to conclude the persons were guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. If they are to survive, the Communists know that the FBI and its sources of information must either retreat or be destroyed. And you may be assured the FBI will not retreat.

Considerable misinformation has been circulated on the use of wiretaps by the FBI. We always have frankly admitted their use. They were prohibited until 1931. Then in 1940 they were discontinued by former Attorney General Jackson on Mr. Hoover's recommendation, only to be reinstituted by the late President Roosevelt, who on May 21, 1940, by confidential memorandum to the Attorney General directed and authorized the use of wiretaps. Mr. Hoover has said time and again that the use of wiretaps is justified only when the life of the Nation is in jeopardy, as in security investigations, or when the life of a human being is in jeopardy, as in a kidnapping case.

Six Attorneys General and three Presidents have ruled on and approved the practices of the FBI on wiretapping. In 1940, when President Roosevelt reinstituted the practice, Mr. Hoover insisted that the authority not be delegated to him, but, on the other hand, he submits the facts in each case to the Attorney General for his authorization.

There are less than 150 wiretaps by the FBI in existence throughout the United States and territorial possessions, each authorized by the Attorney General and each in a case involving security.

RECOVERIES FOR UNITED STATES TOP PAYROLL TOTAL

Mr. Hoover has never looked with favor upon extending the jurisdiction of the FBI because an organization such as ours functions best when it is tightly knit and highly mobile. We are constantly concerned over how extended we are. This becomes obvious when you realize that there is approximately 1 special agent to each 27,000 inhabitants in the United States, or only about 2 special agents for each county in the United States. While it has been expanded since World War II, its work has increased 13 times while its personnel has increased only 8 times. We have made up the difference by increased efficiency and burning the midnight oil. Last year alone the voluntary overtime for which Bureau agents were not compensated was valued at more than $9,900,000. And, while speaking of values, in the past 18 years it has cost the taxpayers $748,180,514 to maintain the FBI while fines, savings, recoveries, and claims adjusted in favor of the Government have totaled $1,052,808,902 in FBI cases. In other words, the monetary value of our work exceed our cost of operations by $304,628,388.

We have always taken special pride in the FBI's contributions to protecting civil rights. Mr. Hoover early established in the FBI the basic principle that we fulfill our responsibility only when we secure all the facts, fairly, impartially, and in a manner consistent with the judicial process. Thus, the fundamental objective in any investigation is to secure the facts.

Once the facts are secured, the innocence of the innocent and the guilt of the guilty inevitably follow. Last year convictions resulted in 95.8 percent of the cases investigated by the FBI which were taken to court. Of these, 91.3 percent resulted from pleas of guilty. This hardly could be possible unless there was a conscientious effort to protect the rights of those involved.

NO LYNCHINGS IN LAST 3 YEARS

It is a real source of satisfaction that in the past 3 years not a single lynching has been recorded in the United States, although in the past 10 years a total of 16 lynchings have occurred. The effectiveness of our investigations and the growing conscience of the country are best illustrated by pointing out that in the preceding 10 years, 65 lynchings occurred.

Since the investigative process is the first step in enforcing the criminal laws, as well as in maintaining security, it is logical to expect attacks upon the investigative process by those who are affected by strict law enforcement and by those who are interested in weakening security. In the FBI we have been blessed with an operation which steadfastly favors no one and impartially discharges its duties to all. Only the facts and the truth are important.

The effectiveness of any organization such as the FBI is governed in the final analysis by the character of its personnel and its leadership. The special agents of the FBI are the product of 750 colleges and universities. They are appointed solely on the basis of merit and character. They remain and advance in the FBI solely on the basis of merit. Leadership has been given to the FBI by its Director through periods of great strain, and his accomplishments are a matter of proven record. There is no one who has made a more significant contribution to civil rights, law and order, and the security of this country than Mr. Hoover.

KEY TO SECURITY IN WILL OF PEOPLE

In the final analysis the key to security must lie within the collective will and actions of all our people. We are free men, capable of making decisions and able to choose, with reason and intelligence, the path we will follow.

A healthy, virile republic, drawing upon the creative genius and energies of all its people, is irresistible. The enemies of the American way can succeed in this Nation only in direct proportion to our own weaknesses. Our task as a people is to eliminate these obstacles to security—security which means in the broadest sense the protection of our freedom; security which insures a strong Nation, materially and spiritually.

True security goes hand in hand with freedom. They are inseparable. Without security there can be no freedom. Freedom withers to extinction when real security ceases to exist.

Effect of the Housing Shortage on Combat Capabilities of the Strategic Air Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very outstanding statement delivered today before the Banking and Currency Committee, in connection with the hearings on the housing proposed legislation. The statement was given by Gen. Curtis LeMay, commander in chief of the Strategic Air Command, in connection with the family housing needs of the military.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

(Statement of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, commander in chief, Strategic Air Command, before the Subcommittee on Housing, Committee on Banking and Currency, U. S. Senate, May 19, 1955)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have been asked to express my views to this committee on how the shortage of adequate housing affects the combat capabilities of my command. I am particularly grateful for this important opportunity. For a number of years I have been in a position of demanding that my people work long hours under constant pressure to insure that we are ready to fight if the time comes. I have been able to give them comparatively little in return for their devotion to duty—a devotion which is responsible in a large measure for the combat capability we now enjoy. It will please them to know that I have been able to appear before you to discuss a problem that is so very important to them. A matter actually of great importance to us all. The lack of adequate housing on or near Strategic Air Command bases has three inevitable, immediate, and necessary direct bearings on the ability of this Nation to survive a major nuclear war and have in addition a long-range effect on our capability to build and maintain a professional force.

A. It delays the manning, training, and development of combat capability in new units. Since 1948, lack of family housing has been one of the major problem areas confronting us in the Air Force. It has caused the combat readiness of my command to be seriously retarded; because of it I have been forced to reduce manning and to make selective assignments of officers and airmen to certain bases. Specifically, during the past 2 years I have found it necessary to restrict manning at 4 bases, each designed for 1 or more wings, and to thereby delay obtaining combat readiness for these units for periods up to 8 months. These delays have resulted in a direct increase in costs ranging from $3 million to $12 million in attaining combat readiness at each of the 4 bases involved. This experience will repeat itself at new Strategic Air Command bases where available housing will not permit manning of the combat units consistent with completion of the installations and the arrival of aircraft.

B. Lack of adequate housing reduces the certainty our combat-ready wing will be fully effective in event of hostilities. We have a given number of wings ready to go to war right now, this afternoon or tonight. Ready, that is, with one qualification. Because the housing in the vicinity of bases and on bases is inadequate, in several cases many of our key operations personnel and combat aircrew members have been forced to go 10 to 50 or more miles from the base to find a satisfactory home in which to live. Now, what happens in case of a sudden red alert in the middle of the night? Can we be sure my operations personnel, pilots and observers can fight their way to their duty stations along highways and roads that may be choked with evacuating civil populations? It is certainly conceivable that the movement of traffic would come to a standstill. Under these circumstances it is probable many of our key people would never reach their duty stations in time. This would mean that certain of our bombers might never reach their assigned targets. Therefore, due to inadequate housing on and adjacent to our bases, the actual combat-ready units we have now will not give us survival insurance we are paying for and which we may need.

C. The lack of housing has a serious immediate and long-range effect on our air power. I have never believed that Air Force officers and men should be forced to live as second-class citizens. They are too important to the security of this country to be expected to accept substandard conditions. I believe the time has come when adequate measures must be taken to provide housing of the quality and quantity needed to assure the effective and efficient performance of the Air Force mission. In my opinion, not one man conscripted the day war starts will get into the decisive phase of the fight. The survival of the Nation in all-out nuclear war will depend on the character, the training, the readiness and the determination and courage of the men who are in the Military Establishment at the onset of hostilities. I believe that it is a well-accepted conclusion by everyone in authority that the type of air power which we have today and which we will have in the future can be sustained only by a professional force of officers and airmen. We cannot train and maintain such a professional force unless we are able to bring into the Air Force and to retain in the Air Force high caliber American men. Such is not the case today. We are not attracting the caliber of personnel that we require. As matters now stand the higher type of citizen can have much more assurance of providing his family with adequate housing and other advantages if he goes into civilian industry. That career normally provides him enough pay, opportunity of advancement and family stability to enable him to have satisfactory housing. Over the span of years awaiting us inadequate military housing will result in overall lower class citizens gravitating into the Air Force. As the years go by the dependence on air power for survival of the Nation increases. We must do everything that is required to assure ourselves of a professional force or else we are contributing to a paradox of considerable gravity as the stakes may be in the survival of our civilization. We not only are not attracting the type of people we require but we cannot retain for a sufficient period of time even those whom we do attract initially. In the Strategic Air Command alone, and in the fiscal year 1956, we will have lost through failure to reenlist in the past 4 years a total of 114,848 airmen. These airmen have been or will have to be replaced by others whom we will have to train at considerable expense. In addition to this monetary cost, a very high degree of degradation has been and will be imposed upon our combat capability. Unless something is done which will persuade high caliber people to come into and remain with the Air Force, these costs will be continuously recurring. In our surveys throughout the Strategic Air Command we have determined that there are 5 factors which influence retainability of an individual in the Air Force. These are pay, commissary privileges, post-exchange privileges, medical care and housing. Our surveys, further, have indicated that housing has a greater influence upon retainability than any of the other four. The Congress has already increased to some degree the pay scale. If we can now provide at an early date adequate housing at reasonable cost to the individual and can follow that with extended commissary privileges, post exchanges and appropriate medical care for the serviceman and his dependents, it is my opinion that we will have solved in a large measure the problem of retainability and will build our way toward the development and maintenance of a professional force.

Civil Defense Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished mayor of New York, Robert F. Wagner, testified before the Subcommittee on Civil Defense of the Armed Services Committee. Because his testimony will be valuable to mayors of other cities in measuring the progress of their civil defense programs, I ask permission to have his testimony printed in the RECORD at this time.

Mayor Wagner has been a most able and forward-looking chief executive of the world's largest city. It is fully in character that immediately on taking office he turned his attention to the problems of civil defense, problems, in the case of the metropolitan area of New York, greater than any in the Nation. That so much progress has been made there in this field is a matter of interest to all of us.

That Mayor Wagner has been so successful as mayor of New York is a matter of pride to all of us who knew his beloved father, who sat in this body with such distinction for so many years.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER, OF NEW YORK CITY, MAY 18, 1955, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL DEFENSE OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

I wish to express my thanks and deep appreciation in my representative capacity as mayor of the city of New York and personally for this opportunity to testify before your committee on this most important question. I also wish to express my thanks to your chairman, my good friend, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, for his kind invitation to me to appear here today.

I cannot overemphasize for you and for the people of the United States how deeply I feel about the subject of civil defense and how important this subject is to the safety of millions of our fellow citizens. It is for this reason that I have made this spe-

cial trip to Washington, to give you my views on this vital matter.

Shortly after I took office as Mayor of New York I directed that a survey be made in March 1954, of civil defense activities in the New York area. This survey reassured me that New York City had one of the world's best civil defense organizations, geared to the potentialities of the atomic bomb.

However, my investigation at that time convinced me that the scope of our New York City civil defense organization and concept, must be expanded to measure up to hydrogen-bomb requirements.

Accordingly a group of volunteer citizens were asked to study the problem, and come up with recommendations to expand our civil defense plans to meet the challenge of the hydrogen era, particularly a new and scientific exploration of methods of survival.

I should like to tell you very briefly of the men with whom I consulted, the men whom I charged with the responsibility of studying and reporting to me on the new needs in civil defense with the advent of the hydrogen bomb.

First, there is Lt. Gen. Willis D. Crittenberger, retired, who served as commanding general of the First Army at Governors Island, N. Y. General Crittenberger was, during the Second World War, commanding general of the Fourth Corps. After the war he was in charge of the Carribean Defense Command and was chairman of the Inter-American Defense Board. General Crittenberger is now president of the Greater New York Fund. I asked General Crittenberger shortly after my advent as mayor to serve as my official advisor on civil defense matters.

Second, there is the Honorable Thomas K. Finletter, who is familiar to some of you gentlemen in Washington as former Secretary of the Air Force in the Cabinet of President Harry S. Truman, Chairman of President Truman's Air Policy Commission, and the recent author of an outstanding work on strategic matters entitled "Power and Policy." Secretary Finletter was appointed by me as chairman of the subcommitee on civil defense of the mayor's advisory council.

Under the supervision of General Crittenberger and Mr. Finletter, three men worked on the volunteer planning report. They are: Mr. Wm. H. Kyle, vice president of the Bankers' Trust Co. in New York, a graduate of West Point, and former military aide to Secretary of War Henry Stimson; Mr. Jeeb Halaby, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, presently associated with Mr. Laurence Rockefeller and a part-time consultant to the Ford Foundation; and Mr. Presley Lancaster, Jr., who is assistant to the executive manager of the Atomic Industrial Forum. Mr. Lancaster was formerly a staff officer of the National Security Resources Board and the Office of Defense Mobilization. These gentlemen worked steadily and well, and I emphasize as volunteers, over a period of close to 10 months on their report.

This volunteer planning group report which was submitted to me on January 14, 1955, placed sharp focus on the fact that nuclear developments have expanded civil defense in the New York area from a local to a State and national level. From the report it was obvious that our efforts to solve a problem of these new dimensions would require outside assistance in augmenting local resources.

Accordingly, the survey recommended that the Governors of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut meet with me to consider initiating a broad attack on the problem of survival in the hydrogen age. The availability in the area of some of the world's formemost scientists, engineers, and civic planners facilitates such an approach to the problem. Such an initiative might result in establishing a technical leadership that would have far-reaching effects.

In conformance with this recommendation Gov. Averill Harriman, of New York; Gov. Robert Meyner, of New Jersey; and Gov. Abraham Ribicoff, of Connecticut, met with me in New York City on March 11 to consider the problem and at once recognized the need for an overall master plan for the metropolitan area, designed to weigh the requirements for warning, shelter, and dispersal, and all other civil-defense problems, with which New Yorkers are confronted in the Hydrogen Age.

In order to approach such overall planning, it became obvious that the Federal Government would have to assume a greater share of the responsibility for the survival of the 15 million people in the New York area, residing in three adjacent States, and embracing more than a dozen counties and 200 smaller towns and cities. From this brief analysis, you can see the magnitude of our problem. It is to acquaint you with this problem and request your help that I am here today.

I do not minimize in any way the challenge confronting my city, and I agree wholeheartedly with Federal Civil Defense Administrator Val Peterson who described New York City as the most difficult civil-defense problem in the United States.

Since my meeting with Governors Harriman, Meyner, and Ribicoff, President Eisenhower and Federal Civil Defense Administrator Peterson have requested the Congress for a special appropriation of $12 million for the coming fiscal year, of which $2 million would be for research and $10 million would be for studies of the kinds we had agreed was essential.

I believe that the proposed appropriation is urgently necessary, and express the earnest hope that the Congress will provide these funds to the Federal Civil Defense Administration. The undertaking of such studies as we have planned for the New York area, for example, should, in my opinion, be primarily a responsibility of the Federal Government, not only because of the limited funds available in many localities, but also because the problem is national in nature, involving as it does the defense of the entire country.

Therefore, as a first step in expanding this program to hydrogen bomb potentialities, I strongly endorse the $12 million FCDA, 1955 supplemental appropriation bill which was recently considered by the Senate Appropriations Committee. This emergency appropriation will make a real contribution toward financing studies and surveys of how to evacuate, shelter, and feed those who are displaced from our target cities. And the fact that these surveys will be paid for by the Federal Government is a real step toward the recognition of greater Federal responsibility for civil defense.

However, I am also concerned about the adequacy of the Federal Civil Defense Act, which vests primary responsibility for civil defense in the States and their political subdivisions. I believe that the technological development of the last few years has indicated the necessity for a comprehensive and thorough review of this act.

I strongly urge that you amend that section of the Federal Civil Defense Act to provide that the Federal Government should participate in all phases of both State and local civil defense programs.

The Federal Government should give priority to the development of plans for sheltering people during and after the evacuation of target cities. This planning should visualize sheltering evacuees en route from the target areas and in reception areas located on the periphery of evacuated cities. It will be necessary to organize and equip these assembly or reception areas in advance, and to take other complex and extensive measures such as stockpiling of food, medical supplies, power units, blood and other emergency items which will be needed to care for our displaced citizens. Only the Federal Government is equipped with the latest intelligence and technical information required to make informed decisions governing these various vital steps, and only the Federal Government has the financial resources with which to bear the brunt of the heavy expense that will be involved.

Moreover, the Federal Government should consider making Federal funds available, either on a matching basis or as outright grants, for the administrative costs of State and local civil defense organizations. It already provides funds for their operational supplies and equipment. The principle involved is the same. Supplies and equipment are useless without adequate personnel to administer their use.

To design and construct evacuation roads will be a difficult planning task and a monumental construction job. The citizens of New York City and New York State are being taxed to help pay for current street and highway programs. I have budgeted nearly $37 million for the operation, control and maintenance of our traffic system. The State has recently proposed a $750 million bond issue for a 10-year highway construction program, in addition to the hundreds of millions being spent on its present program. It is clear that to undertake the planning and the construction work necessary to develop civil defense evacuation roads will require Federal assistance.

As a result of our 10 months' study in New York, I am convinced that the Federal Government should and must accept more responsibility for civil defense. An attack upon any part of the country is an attack upon the Nation as a whole. If an enemy nuclear attack should actually materialize, then the whole country would be involved in a struggle for survival in which civil defense would no longer be distinguishable from national defense. At this point, the Federal Government's responsibility would, of necessity, be primary. To assume that, in event of a nuclear attack, local authorities could continue to exercise the main responsibility is unrealistic.

Civil defense is vital to the survival of the Nation. I, therefore, affirm my belief that a restudy of basic precepts in this area is urgently required.

Thank you.

Summary of Statement by Leon H. Keyserling on Proposed Amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Senate Subcommittee on Labor, headed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], has for the past few weeks been holding hearings on bills to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act. Although I am not a member of the subcommittee, I have been present at many of the hearings, because of my interest in this subject, as evidenced by my introduction of Senate bill 662, which would increase the minimum wags to $1.25 per hour, and would expand the coverage.

On May 11, the noted and respected economist, and former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers,

Mr. Leon H. Keyserling, delivered a most interesting and enlightening statement in support of an increase in the minimum wage and in favor of increased coverage, as outlined in my bill. I feel that Members of Congress and other Americans would benefit greatly by reading some of Mr. Keyserling's statement before the labor subcommittee. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of the statement by Mr. Keyserling.

There being no objection, the summary of the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I feel that the basic minimum wage standard should be lifted from 75 cents to $1.25 an hour. This would directly affect the wages of about 4 million of the somewhat more than 24 million workers now covered by the act. I feel also that coverage should be broadly extended to more than 4 million additional workers, of whom about 1 million would have their wages directly affected. I believe that these changes should be accompanied by appropriate provisions to prevent undue hardship upon employers and firms or industries in some cases, although, as I will indicate, I think that these prospective hardships have been overstated and are far outweighed by the benefits which these changes in the act would bring to the economy in general and to the directly affected businesses and localities in particular.

CHANGES IN AMERICAN ECONOMY JUSTIFY AND REQUIRE HIGHER MINIMUM WAGE

In 1939 and early 1940, our economy had by no means shaken off the ravages of depression. About 9½ million people, or 17.2 percent of the civilian labor force, were unemployed. Thus when one compares the American economy of today with the American economy of 1938–40, the alteration for the better almost defies description. If a minimum wage of 30 cents to 40 cents in early 1940 was not too high or burdensome, and it certainly was not, then the lifting of the figure to $1 or even to $1.25 today, by mathematical projections of changes in the cost of living and in productivity during the intervening years, results a figure which takes but inadequate account of where we now stand and where we want and need to go. A minimum wage of $1.25 now would be far less risky and far less burdensome than a minimum wage of 30 cents to 40 cents was in early 1940.

"It appears to me that many of those who are now so ebullient about the prospects for further advances in the stock market, and about the prospects for further business investment, are surprisingly lacking in confidence about our ability to correlate these advances with improvements in living standards where they are most needed. Since the recession started in 1953, the composite index of stock prices has gone up by about 47 percent. Are the companies whose values these stock prices are supposed to represent really 47 percent better off than they were when the recession started? Yet some people seem unduly squeamish about a change in the minimum wage law to $1.25, and the broad expansion of coverage, which would increase total payrolls by only about 2 to 2½ percent. If the stock advance reflects reasonable business prospects, on top of a $370 billion dollar current economy, there is plenty of leeway for a $2,500 basic standard of living for American families. If the stock advance indicates that the economy is getting out of balance, with too much speculative buying power at the top and too little in the food budget at the bottom, it is high time to restore a better balance.

"The accelerating productive power of the general economy easily enables us to increase our total national product, during the next few years, between fifteen and twenty billion dollars a year. It is estimated that, of the 24 million or so now covered by the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, about 4 million would be affected by a lifting of the minimum wage base to $1.25; that payrolls would be directly increased by about $2 billion; and that the indirect effects might lift this to about $3 billion. Sufficient expansion of coverage might raise this figure to about $4 billion or even $4½ billion. It would seem clear beyond debate that a supplementation of the incomes of low-income families by an amount equal to only about a fourth to a fifth of our annual ability to increase total output, and by an amount equal to only a twentieth to a twenty-fifth of our ability to increase annual output by 1960 above the current level, is well within our general economic capacities."

CRITICISM OF ADMINISTRATION'S POSITION ON MINIMUM WAGE

I am deeply disturbed by the recent testimony before this committee by the Secretary of Labor. As I interpret his statement, his argument for an increase in the minimum wage to 90 cents seems based almost entirely upon increases in the cost of living since the 75-cent minimum wage was adopted. But the idea that this basic floor should not be raised in real terms, instead of merely being adjusted to changes in the price level, seems to me sadly deficient. Do increases in the real per capita productive power and wealth of the economy as a whole have no bearing upon how high the minimum-wage floor should be? Even a minimum standard is not designed merely to keep body and soul together, but rather to reflect the rising achievements and aspirations of a progressing people. I find it particularly difficult to comprehend the enunciation of this static concept by one who, above all others in the United States, is charged with the high responsibility of protecting and advancing the fair interests of working people.

CAPACITY OF INDIVIDUAL FIRMS AND INDUSTRIES TO PAY HIGHER MINIMUM WAGE

Most of these firms, industries, and sections are in a better position to live through a $1.25 wage today than they were to live through a 40-cent minimum wage in 1940—and they lived through that very well indeed. They also lived very well through the 75-cent minimum wage established in early 1950. The sections of the country, especially the industrial South, where a substantial increase in the minimum-wage law would have a primary effect, have made amazing economic strides during the past 15 to 20 years; and higher labor standards have aided greatly in this progress. Furthermore, I have great confidence in the ability of American industry to compensate for higher wage costs by improved methods, and to benefit from the larger sales which higher wages bring.

There is almost no national economic policy, private or public, which helps everybody right away, and which occasions no problems of dislocation or even hardship at some points in the structure. It is the function of national economic policy to find the minimum wage formula which is best suited to the economic situation as a whole, and then further to assume such responsibilities as may be required to deal with hardship cases or with temporary dislocations.

NEW TASKS FOR THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

Our great economic challenge now and for the near future is not merely to avoid the calamity of depression but also to do justice. Poverty in the economy of the 1920's was unfortunate; the perpetuation of wide-scale poverty in the American economy of the second half of the twentieth century would be unthinkable. The question is no longer whether we can produce enough, but rather whether we have the brains and the heart to use our productive capacity in full and to confer its benefits upon all. Only by looking backward to the past which has gone forever does a $1.25 minimum wage seem a drastic or precipitate step. Looking at where we are now and where we need to go—looking ahead—a $1.25 minimum wage, which is at best a $2,500 annual income for the responsible and industrious American breadwinner at the bottom of our economic structure, is well within the range of our current and prospective capabilities. Thus it is, to my way of thinking, a fairly immediate and imperative next step for a Nation which can no longer fall short for lack of economic strength, but could only fall short for lack of moral rectitude and vision as applied to our economic affairs.

Regulation of Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made yesterday by the mayor of Covington, Ky., John J. Maloney, before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. MOLONEY, MAYOR, CITY OF COVINGTON, KY., BEFORE SENATE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, IN OPPOSITION TO LEGISLATION DESIGNED TO RELIEVE NATURAL GAS PRODUCERS OF REGULATIONS BY THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

My name is John J. Moloney, I am the mayor of Covington, Ky., a city of 65,000 people located in the northwest junction at the confluence of the Ohio and Licking Rivers. Covington is the largest city in the northern Kentucky group, comprising 22 municipalities, lying both east and west of the Licking River and extending along the south bank and south of the Ohio River. These 22 municipalities make up a total population of 175,000 people. Directly north and separated from the northern Kentucky cities by the Ohio River is the city of Cincinnati, Ohio.

While primarily I represent only my own city, it must be stated that Covington, Ky., is a member of the Northern Kentucky Municipal Association, organized for the sole purpose of representing the consumer in cases affecting natural gas rates and charges. All of the cities in the aforementioned organization receive their gas from the Union Light, Heat, & Power Co., a subsidiary of the Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., the later serving the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, and the surrounding cities in Hamilton County, Ohio. It is locally owned. So while I speak for my own city, all of those people living in and around the cities mentioned above are directly affected by the same rates and charges for natural gas.

I am appearing before this honorable body in protest to any legislation that would relieve the producers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission, because we believe that a monopoly exists, and for this reason the public and the market is best protected by the Natural

Gas Act of 1938 as interpreted by the Supreme Court in the case of *Phillips Petroleum* v. *State of Wisconsin*.

There is nothing new or novel about regulating a product at the source. Regulation of producers has been and is being practiced on products other than natural gas. These regulations are imposed on producers for various reasons, and I am at loss to find one single instance where they have destroyed or in any way crippled an industry or hindered a market.

The tobacco producers of this Nation have been regulated for some time. My own State of Kentucky is one of the largest, if not the largest producer of white burley tobacco in the Nation. Our great looseleaf markets at Lexington and Maysville rank among the largest in the world. Yet the tobacco producers of Kentucky do not want these regulations removed.

The regulation of the tobacco producers differ from that of the gas producers in that the production of the tobacco producer is regulated, whereas the sale price of the gas producers is regulated.

Should the same type of regulation be applied to the gas producer as is now regulating the tobacco producer it would mean that each gas producer would feed a stipulated amount of the requirements of each day's demand, into the carrying lines.

I hardly believe that any of us would agree to such a regulation for the producers of natural gas. Most everyone would reject this plan on the grounds that it is geographically impractical and economically unsound.

It is economically unsound because so many of the producers are separated from the present carrying line by many miles. These lines were built to receive their supply, for the most part, from the wells in the southwestern oil fields where the gas was formally a waste product and burned to eliminate the danger of explosion.

The mere fact that these lines were built to be served by certain fields is our first contention that a monopoly does exist.

Thus do I contend that in the physical structure of the industry lies proof of a monopoly. But the market itself does no more than reflect this monopoly in the manner in which the gas finds its way to the consumer.

The number of gas producers in the United States has been variously estimated from 4,000 to in excess of 5,000. The number is relatively unimportant in view of the fact that in 1953 approximately 100 producers supplied 85 percent of the consumers' needs; within this group of 100 producers (more or less), 7 companies supplied 35 percent of total consumers' needs.

Thus 15 percent of the market is left to a very top-heavy majority of the producers. The ratio of producer to amount sold then becomes 100 to 85 percent as compared to from 3,900 to in excess of 5,000 to 15 percent. This is hardly indicative of a free or competitive market and therefore becomes a monopoly. It would be so considered in any other industry and becomes axiomatic in the natural-gas industry.

Gas reserves buried deep in the earth have no identity. But acts of men give these reserves certain characteristics. By building pipelines from these wells to distant points beyond the State lines in which the wells exist definitely makes such gas taken from the well, interstate in character, because the primary intent is to deliver the gas beyond State lines for sale. An act of Congress could remove this product from interstate commerce by law but no act could remove it from interstate commerce in fact. The regulation of the well-head therefore belongs to Federal agencies as opposed to State agencies in which the wells exist.

How the price at the well-head affects the consumer is easily exemplified in my own community.

The Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co. and the Union Light, Heat & Power Co. buy their gas from the Kentucky Central Gas Co., who in turn receive their supply from United Fuel Co. Both Kentucky and United Fuel are a part of the vast Columbia system. United Fuel is supplied by Gulf Interstate and Tennessee Pipe Line, neither of which is a part of the Columbia system. From this point I do not know the identity or the number of lines that carry this supply as they follow a devious route to the wells in the distant Southwest.

The northern Kentucky cities enjoy a rate lower than the national average. The local market also differs in that the residential use of gas accounts for a larger portion of the total sales than is generally the figure in other cities. In 1954 the average residential rate was 64.85 cents per thousand cubic feet against a national average of in excess of 83 cents per thousand cubic feet; but the residential sales accounted for about 70 percent of the local market against a national average of approximately 55 percent.

In 1948 our rates were low, lower than they had been for some time. They did not begin to rise until 1952. Prior to 1952 most of our supply came from the West Virginia and Kentucky fields, but since 1952 practically all of the gas is brought in from the wells in the Southwest. The increase in rates that followed is nothing more than a reflection of the increase in rates at the wellheads.

The Public Service Commission of Kentucky has allowed little or no increase in consumers rates over the amount of increase in wholesale rates. Yet since 1952 they have allowed three increases.

Kentucky Public Service Commission case No. 2452, bearing an order date of January 24, 1953, permitted the Union Light, Heat & Power Co., to increase rates that would gross $349,200 more annual revenue; case No. 2640, order date July 22, 1954, allowed a $455,814 annual increase; case No. 2750, with an interim order date of March 21, 1955, grants an increase up to $376,794 annually depending on the outcome of cases now pending before the Federal Power Commission.

Comparing the low in 1948 with 1954 (after 2 increases) the effect on the consumer is readily seen. In 1948, 39,547 residential customers paid $1,965,214.97 for 3,243,187 thousand cubic feet; this is a yearly average of $49.69 for 82 thousand cubic feet per customer.

In 1954, 44,311 residential customers paid $3,993,073.81 for 6,157,345 thousand cubic feet or $90.11 for 139 thousand cubic feet per customer. Each customer therefore paid 81 percent more for 70 percent more gas in 1954 than in 1948.

The increase in the amount of gas used per customer is due to a more widespread use of gas for space heating. The interim order in case No. 2750, Kentucky Public Service Commission, may or may not increase this amount by $376,794 in 1955, depending on the outcome of the cases before the Federal Power Commission.

Thus is the residential customer affected, and the local retailer has also felt this change. In 1948 the Union Light, Heat & Power Co. paid 28.64 cents per thousand cubic feet for gas; in 1954 it was 39.11 cents per thousand cubic feet. Although some other factors affected their rate of return, it dropped to 3.15 percent in 1952 and to less than 3 percent in 1953. Due to the increases granted in 1953 and 1954 it rose to 5.31 percent in 1954. However no dividends were paid from April 1952 until December 1954.

During the period from 1951 to 1953, the average price at the wellhead rose from 7.3 cents to an estimated 8.3 cents. We cannot be definite on the wellhead price as our supply is received from various sources.

So the wholesaler, the retailer and the consumer are all vitally affected by the price at the wellhead. Should you remove the regulations at the source you only pass an unregulated product into a regulated market. Those regulatory bodies that must control prices beyond these wells are left no other alternative than to pass whatever price is fixed at the well on and on until it reaches the consumers, the greater number of which live in ordinary American residences. Thus the price is left to the will or the whim of the owners of the wells, too few of whom control too much of the market to leave it either free or competitive.

Converter of Chemicals and Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following reprint from Chemical Week, May 7, 1955:

CONVERTER OF CHEMICALS AND MEN

Oue of these new converts, Shakespeare once remarked,[1] there is much matter to be heard and learned. And so it is with Lewis Lloyd, head of business research for Dow Chemical Co., who came out of college as a freetrader and has now swung far enough to the other side to have devoted most of his spare time for the past 2 years to the writing of a book to be published next month: "Tariffs: The Case for Protection."

Inasmuch as Dow and other chemical concerns feel a need for a certain amount of tariff protection, this book is likely to be picked up by the industry as a convenient new weapon in its fight against what it considers unfair foreign competition. In fact, the Dow company has already ordered some 5,000 copies of Lloyd's book for distribution to company officials and others; and it is possible that other business groups may order supplies of their own.

Working within the chemical industry has brought about two conversions for Lloyd: from freetrader to protectionist, and from research chemist to economist. It was as a chemist, with a doctor of science degree from the University of Michigan, that he came to Dow in 1937; but having studied economics and social sciences as well, he was able to branch out into business research.

Professor's views prevailed: In college, Lloyd explains, he and his fellow students generally went along with the opinions of their economics professor, who happened to be a freetrader. And while he was working in the Dow laboratories, he never had occasion to reconsider those views.

But Lloyd moved on into company administration, and it happened that he was the one occasionally consulted by the authors of the biography of the Dow company's founder[2] when they needed help in understanding technical matters. At one such question-and-answer period, after those authors had received an explanation of the Dow method of producing low-cost phenol, they asked Lloyd why Dow's correspondence indicated alarm about chemical imports. Lloyd had to admit that he didn't know.

Footnotes at end of speech.

but said he'd find out. In exploring the problem, Lloyd says, he saw that his own position was based on false premises.

Free trade, Lloyd goes on, works well among the 48 States of the Union because approximately the same business conditions—tax rates, wage rates, currency system, business laws, and practices—are in effect in all the States. In this situation, there's fair competition among manufacturers, and industry is free to make use of whatever natural advantages—such as presence of raw materials—are available. But, Lloyd points out, there's no such uniformity among the various nations of the world at present.

Recommendations: Not wishing to be labeled as just an "aginner," Lloyd has worked out these suggestions for future United States foreign trade policy.

Keep present tariff rates in effect for an adequate testing period, to determine whether further reductions are desirable.

Set tariff rates so that they place foreign producers on an equal cost basis with United States producers.

In negotiating reciprocal trade agreements, insert a clause to keep other countries from negating the effect of their tariff reductions by applying other import restrictions.

Return to Congress the responsibility for administering tariffs.

Participate in GATT or similar agencies only on the basis of consultation.

Improve the wording and enforcement of United States antidumping laws.

Encourage other nations to adopt convertible currencies and to reduce restrictions on imports.

Except for United States defense projects, let private sources provide capital for foreign business ventures.

Always consider national defense in formulating trade policy.

Lloyd says his book is the first thoroughgoing exposition of the protectionist point of view, and is written for laymen. If the book succeeds in persuading its readers, the chemical industry—up to now a converter of chemicals only—may turn out to be an indirect factor in converting voters and statesmen on the tariff issue.

---

[1] "As You Like It," Act V.

[2] "Herbert H. Dow, Pioneer in Creative Chemistry," by Murray Campbell and Harrison Hatton, 1951.

The John Day Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I have here an article by Gene Smith which appeared in the New York Times, Sunday, May 1, 1955. Mr. Smith gives such a good analysis of my John Day bill, H. R. 5789, that I would like all of my colleagues to have the benefit of reading it. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD:

THREE UTILITIES INVITE UNITED STATES "PARTNERSHIP"—OFFER TO ASSUME NEARLY 90 PERCENT OF NORTHWEST PROJECT COST IN RETURN FOR POWER

(By Gene Smith)

The Federal Government can have its cake and eat it, too, under a major power project proposed last week by three Northwest utilities.

The $310 million project would supply more than 1 million kilowatts of additional power from the Columbia River. The three utilities—Washington Water Power Co., Pacific Power & Light Co. and Portland General Electric Co.—offered to raise $273 million or nearly 90 percent of the cost. The balance would be supplied from existing Federal funds for navigation, flood control, and irrigation.

An even more unusual feature is that the entire undertaking would be owned and operated by the Federal Government, at no additional cost to the taxpayers.

POWER WOULD BE SHARED

Representative SAM COON, Republican, of Oregon, introduced on April 21 a bill that would enable all types of private utilities and public bodies—such as State agencies, municipalities, public utility districts and rural electric cooperatives—to participate in the program. Each would share the power produced in proportion to its share of the financing.

The focal point for the venture would be the John Day Dam, a project already authorized for construction by the Army engineers. The dam site is about 55 miles east of the huge Bonneville Dam on the Columbia.

John Day is a navigation, flood control, and irrigation project. Latest estimates place its power potential at 1,105,000 kilowatts.

Its locks will extend the navigable waterway of the Columbia from the Pacific Ocean to Pasco, Wash., about 328 miles. The Dalles Dam, 25 miles west of John Day, is now under construction. When it is completed, only the John Day area will remain in the way of navigation.

UNITED STATES OUTLAY DEFINED

Under the Coon bill, the Federal Government would asume costs of navigation, flood control and other so-called nonreimbursable benefits. Engineers estimate these costs at only slightly more than 10 percent.

Representative COON emphasized that the John Day program, despite this unusual arrangement, would be a Federal undertaking in all respects and in keeping with the Eisenhower program of "partnership" between the Federal Government and private local power interests. It would be designed, constructed and operated by the Corps of Engineers. The dam and related facilities, including the power generation equipment, would be wholly owned by the United States.

"This is a straightforward businesslike proposal between the Federal Government and local power distributors serving the people of the Pacific Northwest, an arrangement designed to promote the earliest possible construction of a multi-million-dollar Federal project so that a critical power need can be alleviated without a burdensome outlay of money from the Federal Treasury," Representative COON said.

For their part, spokesmen for the three utilities emphasized that the dam's generators would be tied in with the Northwest power pool, and operation of the project would be fully integrated with other river developments of the region.

"It is definitely understood that participation in the plan is open to any electric system, public or private, that is willing to advance funds to help get the project built," a spokesman said.

If no other utilities are willing to participate, the 3 report they are ready to undertake the full $273 million financing.

"The feasibility of the financing plan has been discussed with responsible investment sources," they continued, "and assurances have been given that utilities interested in participating can get the money for construction of the power facilities on a reasonable basis."

Representative COON reported that there is "strong feeling of unity on this subject among my constituents who are sincerely interested in developing the full potential of our region."

"Most of our people feel they have been getting more verbosity than voltage and they want to see us get on with the job," he said.

The Lease-Purchase Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have made part of the Appendix of today's RECORD a statement made by Mr. Morris Kanfer before the Subcommittee on Public Buildings of the Senate Committee on Public Works on May 16, 1955.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I desire to make certain observations on S. 1290 relating to the proposed redevelopment of southwest Washington.

It would appear from newspaper reports and editorial comment that the so-called Zeckendorf plan for the redevelopment of southwest Washington is not only desirable but has encountered no opposition from the Washington community. Frankly, I believe that the Webb & Knapp organization has done such an excellent public relations job identifying itself with slum clearance, a project which everyone favors in principle, that the citizens and property owners of Washington have been disarmed to a point where no one has appeared before this committee to analyze whether the Washington community can absorb the impact of the $500 million development in one small section of the city.

I respectfully submit that there are three major objections to S. 1290 which should preclude its enactment.

First, I agree with the statements expressed by Senator CASE at the first hearing of the subcommittee on this bill whereby he questions the wisdom of congressional legislation to direct the General Services Administration to negotiate for the construction of office buildings in the southwest area with any one builder or under circumstances which would give any one builder a preference over other builders in the area.

Secondly, Congress should not assume the role of planners and direct the location of Government office buildings in any particular area within the District of Columbia without regard to the impact such a concentration might have upon traffic and security measures with which the civil defense is primarily concerned.

Third, this bill would, in effect, be a green light to proceed with the construction of $500 million in buildings and improvements of which, according to Mr. Zeckendorf's testimony, $100 million would represent Government buildings and $400 million private investments in housing and commercial facilities.

Now, let us consider in inverse order, these three objections. With respect to the need for new Government buildings there can be no dispute. Approximately 40,000 Government personnel are housed in temporary buildings which should have been demolished years ago. However, that does not necessarily mean that the new public buildings

to house the present occupants of the temporary buildings should be concentrated in the southwest area. Such buildings as may be required should, in my opinion, be distributed throughout the District of Columbia or on the periphery of the city, wherever suitable locations may be selected with regard to the convenience and the residence of the Government personnel presently housed in the temporary buildings.

It was my privilege to testify before the House and Senate Subcommittees on Public Buildings early in 1951 when the committee then had under consideration a bill authorizing the General Services Administration to construct Federal buildings outside of the District of Columbia, but in the vicinity thereof and accessible thereto. Mr. W. E. Reynolds, then Commissioner of Public Buildings, sponsored that bill and had he been successful there probably would be no basis for the so-called "Zeckendorf" plan to locate Government buildings in the southwest area today. Modesty prevents me from claiming that my testimony in opposition to that bill contributed to its defeat. However, the basis for my opposition at that time is equally applicable to my opposition today. At that time I stated, in effect, that new Government office buildings should be constructed on the periphery of Washington wherever the terrain would permit the construction of self-contained bombproof shelters for the protection of the Government personnel in the event of need. The Civil Defense people and the National Security Resources Board, of which Senator SYMINGTON was the head at that time, had approved the principle of dispersal, decentralization and underground protective space as the proper means of obtaining greater security for Government personnel and thus permitting the continuity of Government functions in the event of attack.

Nothing has happened in the international situation to justify changing that basic policy at this time. I had offered to construct such a building with underground bomb shelters on my property on the east side of Connecticut Avenue near Albemarle Street, part of which site is presently occupied by the Brandywine apartments. I suggested that the bill which Mr. Reynolds then sought should be amended to permit the General Services Administration to enter into a long-term lease which would facilitate obtaining the mortgage financing to construct such a building.

Mr. Reynolds then opposed the construction of new office buildings within the District. On February 8, 1951, he testified before the Subcommitte on Public Works of the House (which was considering H. R. 1728) and stated as follows:

"The buildings to be built from now on, with the possible exception of the completion of the State Department building we will say, at 21st and Virginia, which is only now the head house, should be in the peripheral areas."

I recognize, of course, that Mr. Reynolds is no longer in Government service, but has appeared before this committee in his private capacity as a consultant to the Webb & Knapp organization in support of S. 1290 and in support of the so-called Zeckendorf plan for the redevelopment of the southwest area.

It is proposed to construct housing, private office buildings and commercial centers in the southwest area in the expectation that Government employees who would be working in the office buildings in that area would move to the new housing in the southwest area so that they might be able to walk to work.

Has anyone submitted to this committee a survey to indicate where the present occupants of the temporary buildings reside? Is there any reason to believe that people who have established homes in the northwest and in the peripheral areas of the District would wish to uproot their families from neighbors and friends to fill the large number of dwellings in houses, garden type and elevator-type apartments which Mr. Zeckendorf proposes to build in the southwest area? Has anyone submitted any statistics to show what impact such a large concentration of apartments and office buildings in the southwest area might have upon the existing and established residential and office areas throughout the city of Washington? It is common knowledge that vacancies in both office buildings and apartment houses now exist throughout the entire city and some of the real-estate owners and managers predict an unhealthy surplus of both as soon as those projects presently under construction are completed.

Under those circumstances, would Mr. Zeckendorf consider it prudent for his firm to undertake large-scale office building and apartment house construction in the city of Washington with private finances, entirely apart from the proposed Government buildings in the southwest area? I have a very high regard for Mr. Zeckendorf's business ingenuity and, therefore, conclude that he would not be willing to sponsor with private financing the construction of any such large-scale office building and apartment-house venture as he proposes for the southwest area to be financed under Federal housing guarties, unless he also obtains the exclusive right to build Government projects.

The second objection to the enactment of this bill is based primarily on the fact that Congress is too burdened with its normal tasks of running the Government to undertake the study of city planning and it certainly should not enact any bill to direct the concentration of Government buildings in any one area without undertaking a comprehensive planning study. The National Planning Commission had previously indicated its objection to a further concentration of Government office buildings in an area where more than 15,000 Government employees presently work. The Civil Defense people have traditionally been opposed to concentration of Government buildings in the downtown area of Washington for civil-defense reasons, and the National Security Resources Board in 1951 approved the principle of dispersal, decentralization, and underground protective space as the proper means of obtaining greater security for Government personnel.

Although the Office of Defense Mobilization now appears to have no objection to the location of Government buildings in the southwest area, it specifically excluded, however, such Government facilities which are concerned with national defense.

In view of the foregoing, is it not obvious that this committee should hesitate to assume the responsibility for concentrating further Government office buildings in the southwest area since that is a job which can best be performed by the National Capital Planning Commission in conjunction with the Regional Commission and the specific Government agencies concerned with the need for office space?

The last objection relates to congressional policy, and I certainly shall not assume the role of an expert in that field. However, many people would agree with the views expressed by Senator CASE of South Dakota questioning the advisability of enactment of legislation to direct a Government agency to negotiate with any one firm of builders or under circumstances where one firm might be given an advantage over other builders. It was our adherence to the competitive system of private industry that made our capitalistic system successful and our Nation strong. While there may be circumstances occasionally to justify the giving of a private contract on a negotiated basis with restrictive features to protect the Government's interest, I respectfully submit that the construction of some office buildings is not such a circumstance.

Finally, I wish to direct this committee's attention to the fact that slum clearance and resettlement of the people presently living in dilapidated and uninhabitable homes should not be confused with the Zeckendorf redevelopment program. There is, in fact, nothing in common between the two projects. The builders or developers come in to purchase land which had been vacated by people forced out of the area—generally people of a low-income group bordering on poverty. The economic problems of these people are not solved by upgrading the southwest area with luxury-type apartment houses and office buildings. To some extent their conditions are worsened in that they are uprooted from the community, such as it is, in which they live. I believe this committee might wish to consider the need for low-cost or public housing to replace the inhabitants of so-called slums. It is not fair to identify the Zeckendorf plan with slum clearing, since that plan contributes nothing toward solving the problems of poverty, disease, and crime with which these people are afflicted.

The southwest area should be developed on a much more modest scale than that visualized by the present plan, but public office buildings, if any, should be constructed by the General Services Administration under its present authority by contracting on the basis of public bids. Elevator type of luxury apartment houses should be entirely eliminated from the southwest area as being unsuitable for such structures, unnecessary, and economically unsupportable at the present time in the Washington area. Some private residential housing, both single residences and garden type, might be advantageously considered, but the principal character of the development should be as a civic center consisting of a convention hall, stadium, opera house, parks, and recreational areas. It would be highly desirable to set aside approximately 100 acres for park lands to replace an equal number of acres of other park lands which eventually must be taken for construction of a parkway through Rock Creek Park to facilitate the movement of normal traffic from downtown Washington into Maryland as well as evacuation in the event of need.

In closing, I wish to thank Senator SYMINGTON and the other members of this committee for the opportunity of presenting my views, with the hope that I have been helpful.

Pakistan To Decline Gift of United States Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Matter of Honor: Pakistan To Shun Gift of United States Wheat."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MATTER OF HONOR: PAKISTAN TO SHUN GIFT OF UNITED STATES WHEAT

KARACHI, PAKISTAN, April 2.—Pakistani Food Minister Col. Abid Hussain said today

his Government this year does not contemplate approaching the United States for the rest of its wheat gift last year. He said, however, that wheat reserves in the country had fallen from 500,000 tons to 250,000 tons.

He told a news conference: "It is not an honorable course for an agricultural country like ours to beg at the doors of others for commodities we ourselves produce.

"If worse comes to worst, the Government will appeal to the people to consume rice instead of wheat."

General Medaris: A Distinguished Soldier and American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many of us in the Congress are acquainted with the splendid service to our Government that has been performed over the years by a distinguished soldier and American, Brig. Gen. John B. Medaris. It gives me great pleasure to report that his career and selfless service to his country as Chief of Ordnance's Industrial Division receives recognition in the current, May 27, 1955, issue or Collier's. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I also take this opportunity to add my word of commendation, respect, and admiration for this great general who started his military career as a Marine buck private in World War I and who today serves with distinction and honor in one of the most important positions in the Government service. It is a privilege to salute him and his able associates.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"SHADOW PLANTS"—OUR SECRET WEAPON

(By Vernon Pizer)

Michoud, La., is much too small to appear on any map. Fifteen miles east of New Orleans, between the Intraccastal Canal and Highway 90 in an area of winding bayous and cypress swamp, Michoud is only a single factory which is not even in operation. You might think, in fact, that Michoud is just a sleepy, swampland crossroads. But you couldn't be more wrong.

In reality, Michoud is a "shadow plant"—1 of about 300 in the United States. Idle now, but kept in constant readiness to go into production on a moment's notice, the plants are vital links in the mightiest chain of war-production potential that this country has ever forged.

Under the 43-acre roof of Michoud are complete assembly lines, tools, dies, and jigs to fabricate tank engines. A 9,900-ton dehumidification system maintains a constant temperature of 70° and a relative humidity of 40 percent to prevent deterioration of equipment; a skeleton crew of technicians lubricates and test-runs the machinery at regular intervals to keep it in tip-top shape. If the cold war turns hot, the Michoud Tank Engine Plant will be a shadow plant no longer, it will be an immediately productive segment of America's industrial punch.

But to understand the full significance of Michoud and the Nation's other shadow plants it is necessary to take a backward look. Michoud and the rest didn't just happen.

At the end of World War II, United States production wheels ground to a halt; then the plants were dismantled, declared surplus, and auctioned off to the highest bidder. In our haste to switch from a gun to a butter economy, war-production lines were ripped apart and the pieces that nobody would buy were scattered among various depots.

Five years later, Korea erupted. Almost from scratch, American military assembly lines had to be recreated with terrible urgency. The bits and pieces in the storage depots were woefully inadequate to meet the needs, and many of them had deteriorated. Army Ordnance worked frantically to rebuild America's productive capacity as the outfitting of troop units melted away existing stockpiles of weapons and equipment. It was a close squeeze, but the job was done before disaster could strike.

Korea was a police action. What would the outcome have been in an allout no-holds-barred war against a major nation or bloc of nations? All we can do is speculate on the probable answer—and raise a cold sweat as we contemplate it.

But Korea was 5 years ago. Today our military-production picture is far different, and Operation Ready is the reason.

A bold, visionary plan developed by the Army Ordnance Corps, Operation Ready is a unique conception in stockpiling instead of moth-balling mountains of weapons, munitions and equipment—and running the triple threats of deterioration, obsolescence and the bankrupting costs of maintenance—Ready maintains the means of manufacturing the mountains when they are needed.

PUTTING A THEORY TO WORK

The plan is a dramatic application of the theory of "more bang for less bucks." The cost of stockpiling the means of production is a fraction of the staggering burden of stockpiling the enormous quantities of end products our armed forces would need in wartime. And Ready, for the first time, gives us the secret of avoiding obsolescence. As improvements come from the drawing boards of the research and development engineers, they are immediately incorporated in the production machinery so that tomorrow's weapons will roll from today's standby assembly lines.

Operation Ready means that our young men will never have to fight with old, outdated weapons while industry retools.

The man who, more than any other, is responsible for keeping America's Sunday punch cocked is Brig. Gen. John B. Medaris, Chief of Ordnance's Industrial Division. No armchair general, he cut his military eyeteeth as a marine buck private in World War I before switching to the Army. In making a reality of Operation Ready, he had need for every bit of the keenness and drive which helped him climb through the ranks.

Medaris started mulling over the problem of military production long before World War II, but not until 1952 did he get a chance to do anything about it. In June of that year, he was assigned to the Ammunition Branch of the Ordnance Corps, and he was appalled by what he found: The almost complete dissolution of ammunition production capacity after World War II as a result of hasty demobilization; the crushing cost and the dangerous time lag in re-creating those facilities after the Korean shooting began. He listened attentively to those in the Armed Forces and in industry who recognized the dangers and had thought of ways of overcoming them. Prominent among the people he consulted was Col. Jean E. Engler, a brilliant Ordnance officer, who had been grappling independently with the problem of preserving the country's capacity to turn out tanks and heavy vehicles.

Medaris was determined that America never again in time of danger should find itself in a precarious industrial position, and from this determination he slowly built the basic framework of Operation Ready to include all types of war production. "Fortunately, a lot of fine people had done considerable sound thinking on the problem before I ever came to grips with it," he says. "Starting with their planning made my job easier."

When he was satisfied that he had devised a sound plan that would guarantee this country industrial superiority in wartime without crippling its economy in peacetime, Medaris buttonholed Ordnance experts and industrial leaders all across the country, inviting them to find flaws in his proposals. He refined and smoothed out his program as he went, adding a detail or reappraising a specification in hotel rooms, trains, and planes. When he was through, he knew that he had the right answers.

Then, as Medaris puts it, "I embarked on my sales career." As it turned out, this was the easiest job of all; his Army bosses listened with interest, asked penetrating questions, and became enthusiastic buyers. Maj. Gen. Emerson L. Cummings, Chief of Army Ordnance, who had handpicked Medaris for his job, threw his full support behind the plan.

In the spring of 1953, Medaris was authorized by the Pentagon to talk of the plan at congressional budgetary hearings. He spoke to Congressmen eloquently and with unshakable logic. After he had analyzed the problems, and had explained the solution he proposed, he pointed out that since the Korean war began, this country had been required to invest $5 billion in building war plants.

"Under the proposed plan," Medaris said, "we can maintain our industrial capacity in perfect condition for at least 17 years for less than the cost of replacement. If you gentlemen are willing to guarantee no war for over 17 years, I'm willing to fold up my plans and go home." Medaris left the hearings with the knowledge that the support of Congress was assured.

"At this point, I really became a traveling salesman," he says. He called on leaders of vital segments of industry, explaining in detail his plans and the roles he wanted industrialists to play. "American business proved that it doesn't spell patriotism with a dollar sign," Medaris says proudly. "Operation Ready discommodes these industrialists, it occupies plant space which could otherwise be used profitably, and it makes them no money. Yet, they offered their wholehearted support."

The first Operation Ready contract was negotiated in 1953 with Deere & Co., of Moline, Ill. Under its terms, Deere agreed to maintain in readiness its capacity for production of tank treads. Since then, about 300 more contracts for various phases of Operation Ready have been let. The constant, driving force behind all of them has been peripatetic General Medaris, who is impatient with delay and intolerant of bumbling. One of his close associates says of the ruggedly handsome, black-mustached general, "That guy is dynamite with a short fuse, but the explosion never comes unless it is needed. And when the dust settles, you always find that things are humming just the way they should have been all along."

WISE BARGAINING WITH FORD

In his program to put vital industrial capacity on a standby basis, Medaris has figured out a few new wrinkles. For example, in its Livonia, Mich., plant, the Ford Motor Co. had $35 million worth of special tools and jigs for production of medium tanks—and it had priceless experience in turning them out. Instead of permitting this vital complex to be scattered

to the four winds, Medaris' emissaries negotiated an unusual contract. The factory space was released for civilian production, but all of the special tools and machinery were removed to an adjoining field where an inexpensive, twin-walled, sealed warehouse was thrown up around them. Temperature and humidity are controlled, the machinery is oiled and tested, the skilled labor is on the spot, and the tank production means have been saved.

Because the unusual setup outmodes the former practice of maintaining equipment by cocooning it individually, no critical months need be lost hacking away cocoons and restoring machinery to operating condition; it will be necessary only to move the machines back next door and pull the switch.

But Operation Ready is a twin-barrelled program, and its string of shadow plants is only half the story. The other half is layaway. Medaris reasoned that many items of war materiel require manufacturing methods virtually indistinguishable from those needed to make civilian goods. In wartime, he figured a watch manufacturer could produce compasses and a cutlery plant could turn out bayonets—provided design specifications and the proper dies, jigs and special production tools were made available in a complete package.

"It was this line of thought that put me into the supermarket business," Medaris says with a chuckle. The Medaris supermarkets are a far cry from your grocery store. They stock the sinews of industrial strength—the means to convert assembly lines from civilian to military production.

What ordnance has accomplished in Atchison, Kans., is a good demonstration of how this string of supermarkets operates. Here, in a huge worked-out limestone cave, is the very essence of layaway. Packaged together are the special tools, the design drawings, and a sample of the end product required for each of a number of specific operations. A small maintenance crew keeps the equipment in perfect shape. Backed up by a foolproof recordkeeping system, the "stock clerks" can lay their hands at any moment on all the ingredients a customer might require to give an enemy a fatal case of indigestion.

Another of Medaris' industrial supermarkets is at the American Car & Foundry Co.'s Berwick, Pa., plant. Here, in a perfect state of preservation, are neatly stored some 24,000 different items worth nearly $18 million. During the Korean war, it took from 14 to 18 months to establish an ammunition production line; today, thanks to the layaway system, the Berwick supermarket can put an ammunition maker into production in about one-quarter of that time.

A GENERAL WHO GETS AROUND

Medaris has an office in the Pentagon, but you seldom find him in it. He is one of the "goingest" generals the Army has ever produced. Monday will find him checking on a stand-by howitzer plant in Cleveland; on Tuesday he will be inspecting the Atchison caves; and on Wednesday he will be in San Francisco conferring with key industrialists and ordnance officers on some aspects of Operation Ready. It is anybody's guess where Medaris will be on Thursday.

However, nobody has to guess about Medaris' feelings toward Operation Ready. "It is the cheapest and best insurance policy this country can buy," he says emphatically. "It means that the United States will have the industrial muscle it must have to survive in today's world, and it means that the strength will not be achieved by imposing a crippling burden on the national Treasury. The most vital industrial commodity in a war situation is time; under Operation Ready, America is buying time today while it is available, and at a bargain rate." (The total estimated annual cost of all phases of Ready is less than $175 million.)

The general has only one major worry. "Operation Ready cannot exist as a half-way measure," he says. "If only one tool is missing from an assembly line, the whole line is completely useless. Operation Ready exists on a budget-to-budget basis because it is authorized under temporary legislation. If America's life is worth insuring under Operation Ready, it is worth insuring on a permanent basis."

Which Highway Plan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Which Highway Plan?" published in the New York Journal of Commerce of May 11, 1955. The editorial deals with the administration's highway plan and a proposed substitute.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Journal of Commerce of May 11, 1955]

WHICH HIGHWAY PLAN?

The Senate Committee on Public Works has rejected the administration's highway bill and adopted the Gore bill as the basis of its legislative proposals.

As modified, the Gore bill bears only superficial resemblance to the administration plan. It has changed the basis for matching Federal-State funds for interstate highway construction to 90–10 percent, compared with the administration's 95–5 percent; the total Federal-aid highway expenditures for the coming 5-year period would be some $12 billion to $12.5 billion for both measures.

But the Gore bill cannot be regarded as a substitute for the administration bill. A brief review of the steps which have led to the present legislative predicament shows why this is so.

Present highway outlays from all sources now total some $4.7 billion yearly. Existing law, notably the Federal Highway Act of 1954, provides for Federal aid to so-called primary, secondary, and urban roads in the amount of $700 million yearly, but only $175 million yearly for the strategic interstate highways system of 40,000 miles.

Following an unprecedented study of this country's highway systems and needs, the Clay Committee formulated a 10-year program which it believed to be necessary if our highways are to be modernized to meet national defense and economic growth requirements.

What really came out of the Clay study was the glaring inadequacy of present steps to develop the interstate highway system. The committee put the cost of a 10-year modernization goal at $27 billion, proposing that the Federal Government—because of vital national interest—put up $25 billion of this modernization cost.

The committee presupposed that other highway outlays would continue largely as at present, totaling $47 billion in 10 years. And it found, in addition, that if States and local governments rounded out the remainder of the highway systems on a 10-year basis, they would spend $29 billion more than they plan to spend for the period. But that $29 billion was considered a matter for local concern.

The administration bill, S. 1160, which emerged, was thus a proposal to step up outlays on the interstate highway system to achieve the 10-year program. The Clay report covered a $101 billion overall program. But much of it included programs which have never been the concern of the Federal Government. S. 1160 pertained to the interstate highway system, and presupposed that Federal aid for other roads would be continued on substantially the same basis as the 1954 act provides—the highest on record.

Why is this interstate system worthy of priority? The present 37,600-mile national system of interstate highways joins 42 State capitals, 90 percent of cities of 50,000 population, carries more than one-seventh of all traffic. It is regarded as the key network from the standpoint of Federal concern in economic growth as well as in national defense.

The Clay committee proposed to expand this system to 40,000 miles, and to complete the job in 10 years. While existing roads would be expanded to some extent, the proposed system is primarily a new system of roads; General Clay has noted the difficulty of comparisons in view of the fact that a mile of right-of-way in Chicago costs about $12 million, compared with $400,000 in open country.

The Gore bill (S. 1048) was first and foremost a measure to step up Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban road-building.

Where Senator GORE's interest lay is best illustrated by the fact that, in its original form, it provided for a 5-year Federal expenditure of $5.5 billion for roads other than the interstate system, and only $2.5 billion for the interstate system.

Over 5 years, he thus planned for the Federal Government to spend on this important system an amount which totaled the required spending under the administration plan for 1 year. Without concern that the legislation should embrace a completed interstate system, Mr. GORE's bill is for a 5-year, rather than a 10-year period.

Senator GORE seemed to have considered that the interstate highway program need not be completed at any particular time; if he has, it has not been reflected in his expenditure plans.

The fact that Senator GORE's figures have been shuffled around and the totals for the interstate system revised upward does not change this fundamental difference of emphasis. Mr. GORE's bill is not a plan for an interstate highway system so much as a revised 1954 Federal highway bill which increases the amounts authorized under the various categories of highways, changes the matching basis and extends the period from 2 to 5 years.

Although in its most recent form the plan is for Federal aid to the highways to total approximately the amount which would be spent under the administration bill for the coming 5 years, the amount to be advanced for the interstate system would be $7,750,000,000. The administration plan was for the Federal Government to advance $12.5 billion for the same period.

Additional Federal outlays under the Gore plan would be diverted to other roads than the interstate system, augmenting present amounts.

The theory of this substitute plan, then, must be that the Clay committee and the administration are not to be taken particularly seriously in the priority and urgency which they assign to the interstate highway system.

General Clay called the interstate system "the roads for survival." Aside from defense considerations, he said they are vitally needed for economic growth. But he also testified that the movements of rescue equipment and people during an air attack

"might make the difference between hundreds of thousands of lives being saved or lost" and that without the proposed system evacuation would be "almost impossible."

The Clay committee availed itself of the advice of all organizations working in the highway field, it used extensive statistical and other data, drawing on the Bureau of Public Roads and the American Association of State Highway Officials. There is need for convincing evidence that conclusions based upon such a study should be set aside.

Niagara Project—Start Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 30 of this year I introduced H. R. 5377, calling for the immediate construction of the Niagara power project. I did this in order to reawaken interest as well as to break the stalemate in the dispute over development of Niagara power. Since the date of the introduction of the measure, a period of 49 days, about $8 million worth of power has been lost as a result of this unnecessary deadlock.

In support of the project, I offer the following editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, May 17, 1955:

NIAGARA PROJECT—START NOW

In deciding for underground tunnels instead of an open canal, the Army engineers have happily ended one argument about how the Niagara Falls power project should be designed. But settling this question does nothing whatever to bring the development nearer, or to break the deadlock over who is going to do the developing and operating.

Only Congress can settle that, and the signs that it will bestir itself to do it this year are none too encouraging. Presumably, the House is still ready to vote for a private-enterprise development, as it did by a 2-to-1 margin 2 years ago. But the Senate blocked action on a Niagara bill in the last Congress, and there are some indications that advocates of a State power authority development may be stronger there this year. The House, in any case, seems disposed to wait for the Senate to act first, and the chances of getting the two chambers to agree on either the private or public development seem none too bright.

Meanwhile, the water flows to waste, even as Canada begins to enjoy here share of the development agreed upon in the 1950 treaty. Soon the Canadians will be entitled to take our share, too, for as long as the deadlock in Congress permits it to go by default.

All of which attests the supreme economic folly of stalling any more years before even getting the project under construction on our side. Whether or not Congress can make up its mind which party should operate the development once built, there is no good reason why the actual construction cannot proceed at once.

This, at any rate, is the theory on which one Buffalo Congressman, EDMUND P. RADWAN, has approached the problem—with a bill that takes no sides as between private and public operation. All he proposes is that Congress give the Army engineers the go-signal to start building the project. So far as the engineering and construction go, it would be substantially the same project that advocates of both the private and the State power authority development are proposing. All Mr. RADWAN wants to do is get it a-building instead of wasting valuable time arguing about who will run it after it is finished.

The power to be developed, he notes, is worth $60,000,000 a year; this means we have already let $300,000,000 worth go to waste since 1950. And even if the project were started today, that much more power will be lost in the 5 years or so it will take to finish the job.

By getting the job under way now, Congress would be telling the State and private power interests either to settle their differences or to expect Congress to make its own decision before the project is finished. That way, when the deadlock is finally broken there will be power ready to deliver instead of a 5-year construction job ready to be commenced.

So long as there is realistic hope that this present Congress will decide the entire issue, the Radwan bill may seem premature. Actually, however, it could be passed right now without prejudicing the case in any way. Anytime Congress is ready to decide on the question of operation—this year, next year or 5 years from now—its legislation could incorporate a provision for the private or State interests to take over the construction contracts in an orderly way from the Army Engineers. Meanwhile, if the work has already been advanced by a year or two or more, who could possibly be the loser?

Thus, Governor Harriman misses the point completely when he shrugs off the Radwan proposal by saying: "I see no sense of avoiding or postpoining the issue" (of who is to operate the development). Neither do we and neither, we are sure, does Mr. RADWAN. If the Harriman-Moses group and the private-enterprise advocates can muster their forces for an immediate showdown this year, well and good. But if nothing more than another deadlock results, we simply will have wasted valuable construction time. Whether as immediate insurance that something will get started, or as a deadlock-breaker to be passed later in the session if it develops that neither the private nor public-power advocates can have their way, we thing the Radwan bill deserves to be taken seriously and supported as an alternative approach by all those who are sincerely interested in getting some kind of Niagara power development expedited.

Prices of North Dakota Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What's Happening to Prices of North Dakota Farm Products?" written by Perry V. Hemphill, and published in the Bimonthly Bulletin of North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station, for January–February 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S HAPPENING TO PRICES OF NORTH DAKOTA FARM PRODUCTS?

(By Perry V. Hemphill, Associate Agricultural Economist)

The North Dakota all-commodity price index for November 15, 1954, was 1 point higher than a month earlier but 2 points lower than a year earlier. The accompanying table shows that of the 21 major commodities included, 7 were higher in price for the month, 7 were lower in price, and 7 were unchanged for the month. For the year 10 of these commodities were higher, 10 were lower, and 1 was unchanged.

The products higher in price for the month were wheat, oats, alfalfa seed, sweet clover seed, retail milk, chickens, and eggs. The products lower in price for the month were corn, rye, flaxseed, potatoes, beef cattle, hogs, and milk cows. The products with no price change for the month were barley, calves, lambs, wholesale milk, butterfat, wool, and turkeys.

Recent price trends for North Dakota farm products were: Wheat up for 5 months with the upward trend for Durum wheat being much sharper than that for spring wheat, corn down 2 months, oats up 2 months, barley up 3 months, rye down 2 months, flaxseed little change for 3 months, potatoes down for 3 months, alfalfa seed and sweet clover seed both up for 3 months, beef catle and milk cows down for 5 months, calves down for 6 months, lambs and hogs down for 7 months, wholesale milk up for 4 months, retail milk up for 2 months, butterfat little change for 7 months, wool little change for almost 3 years, chickens up for the month but the trend has been downward for more than a year, turkeys up for 2 months, and eggs have shown an upward tendency for 4 months.

Percent of parity—North Dakota farm products—Sept. 15, 1954

Crops:	Percent
Wheat	93
Corn	65
Oats	69
Barley	75
Rye	57
Flaxseed	67
Potatoes	47
Alfalfa seed	81
Sweet clover seed	98
Livestock and livestock products:	
Beef cattle	67
Calves	67
Lambs	75
Hogs	85
Wholesale milk	86
Butterfat	80
Wool	84
Poultry and eggs:	
Chickens	39
Turkeys	72
Eggs	57

Henry P. Adair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a great Floridian and a great American who has in the past few days been called from his active life of service here on earth. I once had the privilege of being his employee, as a young law clerk in his office in Jacksonville. I love him like an elder brother, and I join his thousands of friends in paying tribute to him. The Florida Times Union has published the following challenging editorial on his passing:

H. P. ADAIR VIEWED LIFE AS PURPOSE, NOT DRIFT

The death of Henry P. Adair at the age of 71 brought rest to an indefatigable worker whose boundless energy was always a challenge to his younger associates.

In his love of hard work, Mr. Adair was a member of the old school, and he found a profession which gave wide scope to his noteworthy capacities.

He achieved high standing in legal circles, yet his energy carried over into banking, civic work, and public service. His service on the State board of control was a particularly important contribution to Florida's progress.

A career such as Henry Adair's reminds us that life is not a stream in which we drift, but an opportunity for mastery and achievement.

Mrs. America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to include within the Appendix of the RECORD a news item from the Lincoln Star and an editorial from the Lincoln Journal pertaining to Mrs. America of 1956, who comes from Lincoln, Nebr., the capital city of our great State, and which is within my district.

I think that these articles are unusually appropriate in that they refer to the fine qualities of Mrs. Deitemeyer and her high ideals, pertaining particularly to the home and church which can truly be said to be the foundation of our American way of life.

All Nebraskans can well be proud of the honor and recognition which have so properly come to Mrs. Deitemeyer.

The news item follows:

[From the Lincoln Star]

LINCOLN'S MRS. AMERICA PRAISED IN FLORIDA PULPIT

ORMAND BEACH, Fla.—The new Mrs. America, Ramona Deitemeyer of Lincoln, Nebr., went to church Sunday with her husband, Carl, "as we always go on Sunday" and was pointed out from the pulpit as an example for all homemakers all over the country.

The Reverend Douglas S. Wessell, pastor of Resurrection Lutheran Church, greeted the couple sitting in his congregation.

He said:

"Churches of the land can be highly honored with the selection of the current Mrs. America because of her churchly interests and activities back in her own community. She has a tremendous responsibility on her shoulders and sets an example for all homemakers."

Blonde Mrs. Deitemeyer, 35-year-old mother of five, teaches Sunday school and sings soprano in the choir of Christ Lutheran Church in Lincoln. Her husband, a magazine editor, is chairman of the congregation.

Upon being crowned Mrs. America 1956, Saturday, one of her first remarks was "I want the title to mean two things: first that the job of homemaking will be kept on a terrifically high plane and next that my church can be part of the title."

[From the Lincoln Evening Journal]

MRS. AMERICA

No better publicity could come to Nebraska than to have Mrs. Carl Deitemeyer chosen as Mrs. America. She truly represents the Nebraska way of life. In every little town and in every city of Nebraska there are many Mrs. Nebraskans who are making a career of homemaking and raising their families with a dedication that makes Nebraska's people its greatest product. It is because Mrs. Deitemeyer does typify that highest in Nebraska home life and because she does so truly represent the many, many Nebraska wives and mothers, that Nebraska can be proud. As she makes her public appearances the Nation will have an opportunity to see a truly representative Nebraska homemaker.

Nashville Girl Essay Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an essay written by Miss Annette DuBois, of Nashville, Tenn. Miss DuBois placed third in the national essay contest sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped:

Tiny hands clutching a baby bottle. Fat dimpled hands hugging a dirty teddy. Grimy hands holding a toy cap gun as their owner played cowboys and Indians. Proud hand held high as he called, "Look, Ma. No hands" on his trip down the bill on his bike. Awkward hands throwing a basketball as he tried out for the team. Ambitious hands, their fingers tapping the typewriter keys, turning out the sports article for the school paper. Competent hands wielding the gavel as president of the student council. Clever hands writing the college senior class prophecy. Eager hands gripping the football as they received the all-important touchdown pass. Hands trembling with emotion as they slipped the wedding ring on his bride's finger. Hands lighting cigarette after cigarette in the waiting room of the maternity ward. Hands timidly holding his son for the first time.

At Naval boot camp they became two of many hands stretching to touch two of many feet. Hands flinching with pain when the potato peeler slipped and cut a finger. Capable hands tapping out a Morse code message from the ship to the base. Steady hands aiming the deadly anti-aircraft gun as enemy aircraft flew overhead. Mangled hands lying bleeding across his unconscious body after the ship had been hit.

With one hand swathed in white bandages, the other sacrificed to save an arm from gangrene, he lay there, day after day in the base hospital growing more bitter with each passing monotonous hour. How could he support his family? Who would hire a man with only one hand?

During long months of convalescense, a hand and a stump held magazine after magazine, eagerly paged through pamphlets, reached out for newspaper articles to see what hope there might be for him at home.

He found just the medicine he needed to bring him out of his despondency. He discovered that during the last decade the vocational rehabilitation program had grown from a small part of the vocational education program to one of the most important of our country's health and welfare services.

Eagerly he read that the first great move toward helping the handicapped was made in August 1945, when the 79th Congress passed a law authorizing the annual observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. Since the inauguration of NEPH Week, activities have been taken over by the President's Committee on NEPH, Governor's Committees in 53 States and Territories and Mayors' Committees in many cities have taken up the cry, "It's ability, not disability that counts."

This cry has been echoed by various clubs, organizations, unions, and civic groups who have done much to open the eyes of the public.

He found that statistics prove that during the last 10 years State rehabilitation agencies have enabled 528,000 disabled men and women to lead useful productive lives. Most important is the fact that the majority of these are engaged in paid competitive employment or in business enterprises of their own. He learned that handicapped workers, with much greater disabilities than his, after being trained in sheltered workshops or at home, have excellent jobs on a highly competitive basis. Then, too, many industries such as the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Oak Ridge, Tenn., give equal rights and preference to handicapped workers. They had discovered the truth of the slogan, "Hire the handicapped. It's good business."

He found, with growing pride, that handicapped workers were frequently better than able-bodied; that they produced at slightly higher rates, avoided more accidents, were rarely absent, quit less often and were quicker to recognize and seize opportunity.

On August 3, 1954, President Eisenhower signed a new law which will be called the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. This act provides for, (1) funds to effect a progressive expansion of vocational rehabilitation, (2) the training of professional personnel in specialized fields of rehabilitation, (3) establishment and expansion of sheltered workshops and community rehabilitation facilities, and (4) the opportunity to carry on research into better and more effective ways of overcoming disability.

This new act directs the President's committee, the Secretaries of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare to cooperate in finding employment for those who have had rehabilitation services.

A year later, a twisted hand knocked hesitantly on the door of the State employment office. The personnel director in the office referred him to the rehabilitation bureau down the hall. Slowly he walked down the long corridor and paused at a glass door marked Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation. A friendly voice from within bade him enter as his hand gingerly gripped the knob and turned it.

The helpful receptionist, when told of his problem, arranged an appointment for the following day with a psychiatrist, a medical doctor, and a specialist in vocational rehabilitation.

He was pronounced in perfect physical condition and put through a series of tests to determine the capabilities of the handicapped person. Through the Selective Placement Service, his capabilities and limitations were matched against certain types of jobs to discover the type of work in which he was most likely to succeed.

Finally he was given a blank to fill out and turn in at the office. Haltingly he scrawled out the information with his left hand and when he turned it in he was given a list of prospective employers.

After much searching he finally found a job that really appealed to him, one that promised a good living for him and his family. It was a job at a suburban fire station answering the phone, keeping records in order and doing other office jobs.

One hand struggled, meanwhile, to master the intricacies of figures and letters under the wise and gentle patience of specially trained teachers at night school. Endless hours of patience practice brought mastery of the art of left-handed writing.

An awkward hand helped adjust the artificial hand, designed by rehabilitation experts to look exactly like a real right hand.

His hesitant hand, on the wheel of an automobile completely operated with levers on the left side of the steering wheel and with pedals within easy reach of his feet, faltered slightly at the gadgets.

After a series of lessons under a trained instructor, he was sure of himself and when he went to get his driver's license he proudly filled out the questionnaire and confidently took the road test, passing both with ease.

Experienced hands, working with ever-increasing efficiency at his job. Grateful hands always ready to help those who were so ready to help him. Hands extended to those in need, for he, like others who are handicapped, appreciates suffering, loneliness and need.

Hands folded in gratitude to God for a nation whose people, from the Chief Executive to the smallest schoolchild, realize more and more the tremendous potentialities of more than 7 million of their fellow citizens.

Hands lifted in petition that breadth of understanding and appreciation of the spiritual, mental and physical wealth of their disabled countrymen may continue to grow in the American people.

Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MEMORIAL DAY
(By William E. Daly)

(On May 30 we will observe Memorial Day, a day which is slowly fading in significance. Yet, it was not so many years ago that the ill-fated transport, *Joseph V. Connolly*, sailed into New York Harbor in the stillness of a Sunday morning bringing the first of our war dead from Europe.)

Sabbath stillness reigned that day
As a ship of somber grey,
Riding on the morning tide,
Brought to us our Nation's pride.
Church call sounded 'cross the bay,
Rollcall brought no answering "Yea!"
They had come too late to hear
Welcome shouts and greeting cheer.
Scan the names upon the page,
Trace the owner's lineage;
Names from worlds, both old and new,
Names of Moslem, Christian, Jew.
Adams, Bernstein, Collins, Dore, Evans,
Franco, Gibbons, Hore, Ibsen, Jablanski, Knott, Lawrence, Murphy, Nebbins, Ott, Pinkus, Quentin, Russell, Stahl, Terris, Udell, Verner, Wall, X-enakis, Yost, and Zand.
Sons of men from every land.
Such a list should make us pause!
They all died in freedom's cause.
Matters little what the name.
All have added to our fame.
Who gave thought to race or creed
When they joined in time of need?
All fought for the victory
Which insured our liberty.
Blood of Slav, of Pole, and Celt
Mingled in a common welt,
Mixed with that of Latin brew,
German, English, Russian too.
From a common melting pot
Men arose to share their lot,
That the world could clearly see
Products of democracy.
Thanks and honor we bestow
Mindful of the debt we owe
To the youths we rated best
Who came home at last, to rest.

Polish Art in Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include for its excellent cultural value an article by Alexander Janta, of Buffalo, N. Y.:

POLISH ART IN CANADA

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

While tens of millions of dollars are being spent yearly to fight communism with free news, truth, and circumstance, geared to penetrate the Iron Curtain, while well paid brains are being racked daily to provide ideas for keeping friends and influencing enemies on the other side of the world, an elementary lack of imagination or of understanding allows for the possibility of a new and perhaps critical loss of face by the Western World.

It is directly connected with the fate of the national Polish treasures, stored now in Canada. Evacuated from the Wawel Castle in Cracow, Poland, at the beginning of World War II, they have been brought for safekeeping to this continent.

As a result of the defeat in victory with which World War II has ended, they played an interesting role in the ensuing cold war, coveted as a prize item to add prestige to the Warsaw regime if recovered from Canada, but skillfully defended against extradition by representatives of the free Polish Government in exile.

After a game of hide and seek, the larger part of the treasure was taken under the custody of the Provincial authorities of Quebec, while smaller but equally priceless objects remain in the safe of an Ottawa bank as a private deposit.

Closely linked with many centuries of Polish history after a recent dramatic rescue, this national collection has grown to represent in the eyes of many Poles a symbol of national sovereignty with all the emotional attachment and political implications such notion can generate.

Quite recently public opinion among free Poles has been aroused by the publication of incomplete and exaggerated reports that due to moisture and inadequate storage, deterioration in some centuries-old tapestries has been noticed. A considerable number of letters and commentaries published in the free Polish press now advocate the return of these treasures to Poland, citing as an example the truly remarkable way in which monuments of ancient art and historical objects are being taken care of, restored and preserved under the present Communist regime.

Serious damage to the prestige of Western leadership has already been brought about as a result of this development. It is also of immediate American concern.

Assuming that due to the present deadlock, the Polish treasures will remain for some time yet in Canada, there are three immediate ways to repair some of the damage described above and avoid tragic reproaches if not outright condemnation in the future:

1. To appropriate necessary funds and assure the national Polish collection-in-exile the best available care and protection.

2. To form a Canadian-American commission of art experts and scholars who would be given access to the collection with the task of making a study of its content.

3. To initiate the publication of illustrated monographs (subsidized if necessary from government funds) and conceived as a Canadian-American contribution on the eve of Poland's birthday as a nation 1,000 years ago, which will be celebrated within the next decade.

With a more attentive and generous treatment of the national treasures of Poland, now on the American continent, and at a fraction of the cost which it takes, for instance, to keep radio free Europe in daily operation, the powerful influence of culture could be used and tested in the West-East relations to produce the effect of enduring memory and be made into the only long-range weapon for our victory—the weapon of attraction.

ALEXANDER JANTA.
BUFFALO, N. Y., *April 25, 1955.*

Decline in Net Farm Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "GTA Farm Study Shows $0.31 an Hour Return," published in the Farmers' Union Herald, of St. Paul, Minn., on March 21, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA FARM STUDY SHOWS 31 CENTS AN HOUR RETURN

Net farm income is slipping. And the pay for operating a farm is already slim for the farm families covered in the first Minnesota county included in the GTA family-farm survey.

Those are preliminary findings revealed in tabulations on the first 221 farms studied in this diversified, west-central county of the State.

When the average net income of these farms is broken down into an hourly return it comes to 31 cents an hour. That is all that these farm families got for their labor and management in 1954.

And both farmers and nonfarmers can well ponder this fact: The income of this group of farmers was less than they would have realized if they had simply sold their farms and invested the proceeds at 5 percent interest.

Here is the proof: The 221 farmers had an average net income of $1,736 for 1954. And the average capital investment in their farms was $37,905. If they had put that amount into an investment yielding 5 per-

cent, it would have returned them an average of $1,895. That's $156 better than they got by working and managing a farm.

If 5-percent interest on investment had been charged as an operating expense, there would have been no income left at all for time spent working the farm.

The survey covers 5 years of records on the individual farms studied. Highest average net income for the farms came in 1950 when it was $2,616.

The records are obtained by skilled interviewers working with the farm families cooperating in the survey.

To get a net farm income of $1,736, these farm families estimated that they averaged 5,576 hours of work per farm during the year.

Of the 5,576 hours of work on the farm, the operator, of course, put in most of it. But the wife also contributed 586 hours and children and hired help the remainder. The operator average was 3,569 hours for the year.

These farms averaged 222 acres in size, with 159 acres owned and 63 acres rented. Crop acres per farm averaged 168. Forty-eight percent of these farmers bought or took over the farms from their families. They averaged 3 days vacation per year.

Another fact brought out in this preliminary survey is the effort of farmers to hold up their net income in the face of declining prices. Gross income averaged $8,093 in 1952; $8,236 in 1953; and $8,410 in 1954. But their farm expenses were also on the rise, going from $6,350 in 1952 to $6,674 in 1954. So, even though gross receipts were higher in 1954, net income slipped down, whittled away by mounting operating costs.

Only costs reduced were those that can be controlled by the operator himself—items such as labor and feed. Items like fertilizer, gas and oil, taxes, interest, utilities and depreciation rose in the 5-year period. The increasing sums taken for these costs were due partly to rising prices and partly to increased usage.

The role of the farm family as a customer of Main Street is particularly emphasized by this preliminary study. It shows that 75 to 80 percent of a farmers receipts in that county go right back to the stores and shops to cover operating expenses. And the remaining 20 to 25 percent is the net income out of which the family must live. And most of that, too, of course, is spent in those Main Street business establishments.

Since operating costs are pretty much fixed, the squeeze is applied first to family living for farm people.

That a pent-up market exists for businessmen in these farm operators was also revealed. Asked what repairs they needed, answers showed they'd like to spend an average of $3,843 per farmer. This averaged $658 for repairs and painting, $2,118 for additions or replacements of buildings, and $1,067 for new equipment.

Among the farmers interviewed, 99 percent have high-line electricity, 98 percent have radios, 97 percent have refrigerators, 77 percent have running water, and 38 percent already have television. Most of these purchases were made in days when net income was higher. A number of farmers expressed doubt that they could replace many of these items under the present net income situation.

The figures show the great market created by rural electrification.

The debt picture for the farm families shows an average of $5,657 per farm for debts and obligations. Of this, $4,340 was in mortgages, $886 in notes payable, $228 in contracts payable, $178 in unpaid current accounts, and $25 in delinquent real and personal taxes.

The survey showed the average net income for 1954 was $1,736 per family. The GTA survey does not attempt to find out how net income is spent for family living. However, to find out how far that net income will go in covering family needs, it might be compared with what a group of 51 farm families is southern Minnesota reported they spent in 1953, as revealed in studies published by the University of Minnesota. The number of persons in the families in that particular group averaged 3.8 persons and the families spent an average of $2,232 per family.

The $2,232 covers food and meals bought, household, clothing, personal care, furnishings and equipment, education, recreation, medical care and health insurance, church and welfare giving, personal share of auto, house upkeep, taxes, insurance, and other items.

It is clear that the net remaining for the farm families surveyed in the GTA study of the first Minnesota county would fall a good $500 short of the amount spent by the average family submitting records to the university from southern Minnesota. All of which submits evidence as to why many of the families interviewed in the GTA survey say they would find it difficult or impossible to replace conveniences they have bought—conveniences that are an established part of the American standard of living.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on May 15, 1955, the Baltimore Sun published a searching tribute to our distinguished colleague from California entitled, "Mr. KNOWLAND'S lonely role on foreign policy." It would be well for all of us to read and remember this article. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of May 15, 1955]

MR. KNOWLAND'S LONELY ROLE ON FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. KNOWLAND was on his feet again in the Senate Friday to warn against the latest turns in Soviet policy. Good. Mr. KNOWLAND has a role and a function which need to be discharged. If there are some slight awkwardnesses in their discharge by the leader of the Republican minority, their importance is nevertheless plain. Mr. KNOWLAND is offering systematic criticism of some aspects of the foreign policy and systematic criticism of policy is the major way free governments have of avoiding error.

Several things need to be understood about Mr. KNOWLAND. First, he is not an isolationist. He believes as much in the defense of Europe as in the defense of free Asia. He is regular on domestic matters where his support of the White House position approaches a hundred percent. Most important of all, he is a person of substance and of character. He is respected by those who disagree with him and those who disagree with him are never diverted in their weighing of his views by strong personal animosity. Those are good qualities in an opposition leader.

One more thing. The recent history of Anglo-Saxon countries is not without other examples of strong and stubborn men who took a lonely and stubborn stand on high matters of foreign policy. Sir Winston Churchill, then plain Mr., took such a stand in England in the thirties. The parallel cannot be pushed too far and we do not push it far. That Mr. KNOWLAND sometimes sees things badly out of proportion he has demonstrated. What is said here is only that Mr. KNOWLAND's loneliness on foreign policy excuses no one from paying close attention to what Mr. KNOWLAND says.

Waste and Extravagance in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, editorials which have appeared recently in the Topeka State Journal regarding reports of Task Committees of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

These editorials refer to the waste and extravagance which have been called to the attention of the Congress and the country by the Hoover Commission. The sentiment expressed in the editorials is in keeping with much of the mail I am receiving from the people of Kansas.

The junior chamber of commerce, at its state convention some years ago at Pratt, Kans., urged approval of the original Hoover Commission recommendations. The national chamber of commerce adopted the same type of program and were very active in securing the approval of many of the Hoover Commission's recommendations.

This action on the part of the national and State junior chambers of commerce was most commendable, and they have rendered and are rendering outstanding service to our Nation.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Topeka State Journal of April 16, 1955]

HOW MUCH ARE YOU TAXED FOR WASTE?

Having finished calculating your income taxes for 1954, you may have wondered how long it will be necessary to pay such stiff levies. If you are a middle-class earner, taxes are taking the margin you once planned to set aside for a rainy day, the education of your children, investments, and old age.

You may have wondered how long it will be until the American middle-class taxpayer rebels, as the Frenchman has done. Premier Faure has told how he is going to reduce taxes in the face of notorious French evasion, but makes the point that the burden of taxes has reached the point where many people not only won't, but can't, pay. "It is more difficult for a $100-a-month earner to pay $30 taxes than for the $1,000-a-month earner to pay $300," he says. Even so, Americans know that the tax-evading French balanced many a postwar budget with American-aid funds. And lately the French have announced that they will forego the expense of an atomic-weapons program. We who go on paying for these things may or may not envy the French their greater independence, if nothing else.

At any rate, as you may have said to yourself, one wouldn't mind paying such taxes as one can afford in order to support the

really necessary outlays, but how much waste, boondoggling, and corruption get by?

The Hoover Commission, the second and current one, is still digging up the most shocking extravagances. These make the conscientious taxpayer very unhappy. They make one want to wave the tax return in some money-shoveling bureaucrat's face and shout, "You, look here." And then make him eat it, while still flavored with fresh ink.

We've been looking through a stack of recent Hoover Commission reports.

The paperwork study issued in January says the Navy was shown how to consolidate 3,161 forms into 752, in just 1 small functional area. All together, the elimination of 21,000 forms will save $3 million a year. The Commission says this sort of thing could be done all over the Government.

The legal services study in March shows the Government hires 5,300 lawyers in 54 executive departments exclusive of the Defense Department, which has 1,300 civilian lawyers and 3,100 military lawyers. As anyone can see, bureaucracy is great for the law business.

The transportation study in March shows military food shipments to Germany from the west coast via the east coast at twice the cost of using an all-water route. Some 25,000 pounds of cement was flown to Bermuda, and ping-pong balls were flown from Westover Field to Berlin. Dog food is flown rather than shipped to Okinawa. There are scads of these items, adding into large sums of unnecessary expense.

Taxes? Yes, for real need, but how do you feel about shelling out your earned money for the waste and the graft?

[From the Topeka State Journal of April 20, 1955]

HOW MUCH SURPLUS TAXES DO YOU PAY?

While writing an editorial on the death of Albert Einstein, we read in one source that he had been thoroughly stumped by one thing.

In 1944, it was recorded, the great mathematician had admitted to friends that he had to ask for help in preparing his income tax return. "It is not a matter for a mere mathematician," he joked, "but for a philosopher."

Well, our mathematics would be of subkindergarten grade—probably even cradle stuff—compared to the great theoretician's. But we've been going through a 96-page Hoover Commission report on "surplus" Government property, as it is called, and believe we know just enough algebra to let X mark the spot where the perpetrators of all this waste should be hung. And just enough geometry to be able to locate the shortagest distance from the "surplus" warehouses to the clink for those citizens who have abetted the perpetrators.

In a word the report means that "surplus" in a disgraceful number of cases is just a governmental euphemism for waste, plain and fancy. Look:

Just flipping through the report one finds such items and statements as these:

"Our task force found, for example, that the Army Signal Corps had an authorized stock level of 1,426,000 dry cell flashlight batteries—an 8½ years' supply of this short-shelf-life item."

At one Navy ships parts control center in Pennsylvania there was found a 128 years' supply of gear drives when related to the past 9 months' monthly issue rate.

In one recent auction of 70 to 80 tons of mixed metals, the bidders were found to be anxiously competing for the surplus. When the bidding was halted and the merchandise inspected, among the lots offered for sale as brass were detected substantial quantities of sterling silver medals, insignia, and other devices.

When some 400,000 pounds of tungsten powder became excess at a Government warehouse in Illinois, it was bid in by a dealer, at $1.20 a pound, who offered to resell it to General Services Administration at the going market price of approximately $4 a pound.

It was found that inventory directives issued by Congress more than 5 years ago have not been followed, and that with proper inventory control the Government could do very well without 10 to 20 billions worth of supplies now in warehouses.

Did the late, gentle Einstein say the tax return was a matter for a philosopher, not a mathematician? We'd say even a saint would blow his halo upon reading this report and seeing where some of those taxes go, and into whose pockets.

[From the Topeka State Journal of April 27, 1955]

HERE'S A REPORT THAT'S FULL OF BEANS

It is without levity, in view of the "bankache" the following will give to taxpayers, that we note a name in the news.

What's-in-a-name devotees should be able to make something of the fact that the Hoover Commission's task force director for clothing and food is C. D. Bean.

And you should see the beans this task force shelled in its thorough study of Government practices in the buying, storing, and using of some $1,700,000,000 worth of food and clothing a year.

This task force found that with ordinary efficiency and economy the Government could save 10 percent a year on purchases and another 10 percent a year on storage and handling of clothing and food.

That's 340 million beans a year—which just happens to be approximately equal to the amount of Federal individual income taxes paid by Kansans in 1953.

What are some of the ways by which this saving of over a third of a billion dollars a year could be made?

Mainly by making the obvious correction in such situations as the following, uncovered by task force experts:

We don't mean to keep harping on beans, but one task force inspection showed that Fort Carson, which consumes less than 5,000 pounds of dry white beans a month, received a shipment of 90,000 pounds.

Fourteen naval-supply points had on hand last year some 1,330,000 pounds of canned beef and gravy. At the current rate of consumption this would be enough for 79 months, or over 6 years.

If you think 6 years' supply of canned beef and gravy is anything, consider the Navy's 886,020 pounds of hamburger. At the present rate of consumption this supply would be enough for 719 months, or nearly 60 years.

In the field of handling, one learns that the Army shipped from California to New York 807,000 pounds of tomatoes, while during the same period the Navy shipped 775,000 pounds from the east coast to California.

As to clothing, the Army has 9.9 years' supply of women's serge shirts and 10.6 years supply of women's wool uniforms.

The Navy has 9.3 years' supply of blue jumpers and an 8.1 years' supply of blue trousers.

As to mobilization reserves, the services are holding and even procuring stocks above the $1½ billion worth marked for mobilization, but without a finished plan as to the number and type of units to be deployed. The task force says the clothing inventory of $2.7 billion could be halved, with an extra saving of $33 million a year in interest and storage.

Does patriotism require that we waste our substance thus?

Revision and Codification of the Military Laws of the United States

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the bill to revise, codify, and enact title 10 of the United States Code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32, entitled "National Guard," H. R. 6366, which I have just introduced, codifies the great bulk of the statutory law dealing with the military aspects of national defense. This bill grew out of a project initiated by the Department of the Army and launched in March 1948 under the initial leadership of Col. Alfred C. Bowman of the Judge Advocate General's Corps. As part of a larger undertaking begun by Congress in 1946 to revise and enact each of the 50 titles of the United States Code, the work has gone forward under the close supervision of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and in particular under its Subcommittee on the Revision of the Laws. The bill has been submitted as an executive proposal of the Department of Defense and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

The proposed text of the new titles is a thorough rearrangement and restatement, in simpler and clearer form, of existing military law of general significance. Perhaps its biggest contribution is to eliminate a great mass of dead, executed, and obsolete law. The result of this codification will be the elimination of countless hours and the great expense which would otherwise continue to be necessary to search and interpret the existing mass of military laws.

However, the bill is not intended to change, in any respect, the substance of the law now in force. All suggested substantive improvements in existing law have been faithfully reserved for future consideration by the particular committees of the Congress which have jurisdiction over the subject matter concerned.

The military codification bill was prepared by a group of very capable legal draftsmen in the Department of Defense. Special, high commendation is owed to the following:

For the Office of the Secretary of Defense: Dr. F. Reed Dickerson, LL. B., Harvard, J. S. D., Columbia, former Assistant Counsel, Office of the Legislative Counsel, House of Representative, and author of the recent book, Legislative Drafting.

For the Department of the Army: Col. Archibald King, LL. B., Harvard, LL. B., Boston University; Lt. Col. Joseph P. Raysay, LL. B., Harvard.

For the Department of the Navy: Lt. Col. George M. Lhamon, United States Marine Corps, LL. B., George Washington; Comdr. Enser W. Cole, LL. B., North Carolina, LL. M., George Washington;

Comdr. Katherine E. Shilling, LL. B., George Washington; Lt. Comdr. Charles J. Murphy, LL. B., Fordham.

For the Department of the Air Force: Mr. James B. Minor, LL. B., George Washington, former Assistant Counsel, Office of Legislative Counsel of the Senate, former Legislative Counsel, War Assets Administration; Mr. Alan J. Morrison, LL. B., Boston College.

During their long period of intensive and painstaking participation, these attorneys have devoted their efforts exclusively to the preparation of this bill. In this endeavor they received valuable assistance from a number of other attorneys from the three military departments and from the National Guard. Although it is not practicable to mention them all by name at this time, their contribution is gratefully acknowledged.

Of immeasurable help to the Subcommittee on the Revision of the Laws and its work was its Law Revision Counsel, Dr. Charles J. Zinn.

I certainly hope that this proposed legislation will receive the prompt attention of the Congress.

Federal Small Loan Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Further Inquiry Looking to Better State Legislation Is Finding of Federal Small Loan Insurance Field Study," published in the American Banker, of New York, on March 17, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FURTHER INQUIRY LOOKING TO BETTER STATE LEGISLATION IS FINDING OF FEDERAL SMALL LOAN INSURANCE FIELD STUDY—NO UNITED STATES LAWS NEEDED, BUT SOME STATES ALLOW ABUSES

WASHINGTON, D. C.—A continuing State-by-State investigation of benefits and abuses in the installment loan credit insurance field is in prospect, according to the report just completed by the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on the tie-in sale of insurance in small loans.

Heading the subcommittee is Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota. Other members of the subcommittee, in addition to Senator LANGER, its chairman, are: Senators EVERETT MCK. DIRKSEN, of Illinois; HARLEY M. KILGORE, of West Virginia, and ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee.

The subcommittee held hearings last September in Kansas, one of the States without adequate regulations. Its report promises inquiries in other States, where regulations are inadequate, and looks forward to enactment of remedial State legislation.

For the time being, according to the report, no Federal legislation is recommended by the committee. However, there are a number of areas of inquiry that invite Federal study, the subcommittee says.

Outlining the problem of the credit insurance field, the report observes:

"Those who are associated with the credit insurance industry have a choice between the high calling of a great public service and yielding to a single temptation or greed. It is most regrettable that some few have brought disrepute to an industry so great as the insurance industry."

ETHICAL VERSUS UNETHICAL

The subcommittee report differentiates very sharply between the sale of credit insurance by the ethical licensed lender who operates in States where there is adequate and successful regulation and its sale by the unethical, unlicensed lender, commonly called a loan shark, who sells insurance in States where there is no successful regulation of the sale of credit insurance. Loan shark operators, it may be noted, continue to flourish in the States which do not have an adequate small loan law such as Kansas, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, North Dakota, Arkansas, and Texas.

It is in these States that the abuse of credit insurance continues unchecked, and the subcommittee found the abuses of credit insurance "most pernicious—pernicious to that degree in which State regulation is ineffective or completely lacking."

Such States have a dual problem in eradicating abuses of insurance, according to the report, because:

"Credit insurance abuses may exist because of unethical practices indulged in both by finance and lending organizations and credit insurance companies. Where this is the case, it may be necessary to enact good State loan laws side by side with good State credit insurance laws. Again, it may be necessary to promulgate good State loan regulations side by side with good State credit insurance regulations."

This conclusion parallels a similar conclusion by the subcommittee of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, consisting of: Commissioners Frank Sullivan, of Kansas; S. H. Goebel, Kentucky; J. Edwin Larson, Florida, and Robert E. Barrett, of Illinois. That committee in its report of June 7, 1954, to the NAIC, said:

"Throughout the deliberations of this subcommittee, it has become apparent that it is impossible to separate the sale of insurance from the lending or credit transaction. As this field of insurance continues to grow, additional problems will no doubt arise due to the fact that the sale of insurance is interwoven with the credit transaction which cannot be properly controlled by regulations governing only the sale of insurance. We, therefore, feel that it is necessary that legislation be enacted to govern phases not controlled by regulations of the insurance department."

Thus both reports point to the need of adequate small loan legislation as the answer to the need for eliminating the abuses which have arisen almost entirely in the States without such legislation and reinforce the report of the insurance committee of the National Association of Small Loan Supervisors in its session of September 17–20, 1954. That committee concluded as follows:

"It appears as though the legislature should definitely determine in each instance, whether or not insurance is to be sold by small loan companies, setting out fully the rights, limitations and restrictions."

UP TO STATE LEGISLATURES

This seems to put the matter squarely up to the legislatures in these States where abuses exist. Certainly the Senate subcommittee has given adequate warning that action is needed in such States. The report points out:

"Credit insurance abuses may exist because of unethical practices indulged in both by finance and lending organizations of credit insurance companies. Where this is the case, it may be necessary to enact good State loan laws side by side with good State credit insurance laws. Again, it may be necessary to promulgate good State loan regulations side by side with good State credit insurance regulations.

"It is not the duty of this subcommittee, however, to recommend one type of State law or State regulation to Kansas or any other State over some other type of proposed State regulation. Instead, this subcommittee's inquiry here is limited exclusively to credit insurance abuses which have arisen by reason of a lack of State regulation, and which fall within the purview of the subcommittee's Federal antitrust and monopoly activities."

The subcommittee rejected the outright prohibition of the sale of credit insurance which has been proposed in some quarters.

Its report specifically states that: "Under no circumstances should those individuals and institutions who sell such insurance, without engaging in coercion, intimidation, or other unscrupulous activities be condemned because other lenders sell credit insurance unethically." The committee further found that, "individual credit insurance policies can be and are sold extensively without employing coercive or intimidating tactics" and that, "where contributory group credit insurance is employed, the source of extra profit to the lender is so modest as to afford little temptation to the lender who would employ unethical practices to sell it."

The Langer subcommittee report is an objective and thorough study of the subject in all its aspects and the findings of the committee should go a long way toward clarifying this issue which has become so confused in recent months because the stage has been occupied by an argument between those who would abuse credit life and those who would prohibit credit life. In the confusion, a reasonable objective view of the subject, which would preserve the obvious benefits of credit life while eliminating the abuses, has been lost in the shuffle.

SUBCOMMITTEE'S FINDINGS

The subcommittee study gives the first official picture of the actual situation in respect to the sale of credit insurance with loans of $1,000 or less in the country as a whole. The subcommittee found the present situation to be as follows:

1. Throughout the United States, the lending of money in sums ranging from $25 or less to not to exceed $1,000 has become a business of substantial magnitude.

2. The major portion of those people who borrow such sums are family men with incomes in the lower income brackets, laborers whose only source of income is a job.

3. Beset by unemployment, ill health, and poor housing, this group presents the greatest risk to the lender. At the same time, their need for credit is so great as to be the need for survival itself.

4. To prevent unscrupulous lenders from taking advantage of this situation, the majority of States have passed laws and/or regulations making it unlawful to charge interest beyond a fixed rate for money loaned these people, together with other statutory measures for their protection.

5. The individuals and institutions who loan money to the group here described fall into two categories: (a) ethical lenders, and (b) unethical lenders.

UNETHICAL PRACTICES

The ethical lender strictly complies with State laws and regulations. The unethical lender employs subterfuge to circumvent the law. While confining his interest charges to the legal rate, the unethical lender refuses to loan money unless the borrower becomes a party to some scheme which will yield the lender an extra source of profit in addition to interest charged for money loaned. To effect this purpose, he employs coercion and intimidation. In such instances, when

forthright action by public officials results in his conviction, blocks one practice, the unethical lender devises some other scheme whereby he may prey upon poor and necessitous borrowers.

One of the most recent devices employed by the unethical lender is the tie-in sale of credit life, health, and accident insurance in connection with small loans.

There are two types of credit insurance: (a) group credit insurance, and (b) the individual type policy.

TWO PAYMENT PLANS

Again, group credit insurance falls into two categories: noncontributory group credit insurance (where no part of the insurance cost is directly paid by the borrower), and contributory group credit insurance.

Under the noncontributory group plan, the sale of the insurance itself affords no source of extra profit to the lender. Similarly, where contributory group credit insurance is employed, the source of extra profit to the lender is so modest as to afford little temptation to the lender who would employ unethical practices to sell it.

Conversely, however, where the individual policy of credit insurance is sold, the policy is paid for by the borrower. A commission is paid to the seller. Tied in with small loans the sale is made by the organization making the loans or some individual connected with it.

ABUSES REVIEWED

The subcommittee found instances where lenders received as much as 85 percent of the premium paid by the borrower as commissions for the sale of the insurance. Of course, this income was in addition to the interest charged for money loaned. Where commissions of this magnitude are paid, very little of the premium dollar is expended in the payment of claims. In one instance, the subcommittee found the portion of the premium dollar returned to borrowers in claim payments was only slightly in excess of 7 percent.

The situation places temptations before the unethical lender which too often are irresistible. Coupled with this is the inferior bargaining power of the borrowers. Especially is this true in connection with small loan transactions.

This inequality of bargaining power is the basis for all interest regulatory statutes. Because of the borrower's inexperience in business, lack of other credit sources, his imperative need for money, the unethical lender finds it an easy matter to coerce and intimidate him into buying credit insurance. The borrower is in no position to do anything but accept the lender's terms. One of these terms often requires the borrower to purchase the insurance exclusively from the lender. In this climate, competitive rates, policy provisions are valueless. The purchaser has no freedom of choice. Thus competition is eliminated.

CAPTIVE MARKET

7. On the basis of the evidence obtained the subcommittee found:

(a) The tie-in sale of insurance by lenders under the circumstances just described creates a captive market.

(b) Serious abuses, including coercion and intimidation, attend the sale of credit insurance where the market is thus captive.

(c) These practices are literally so widespread as to inflict these abuses upon millions of American borrowers and their families.

8. To eradicate these practices a number of States have enacted laws and/or promulgated regulations governing the sale of credit insurance in connection with small loans. In those States where such sales are not adequately regulated, however, the subcommittee found the abuses of credit insurance are most pernicious—pernicious to that degree in which State regulation is ineffective or completely lacking.

9. Finally, the subcommittee found individual credit insurance policies can be and are sold extensively without employing coercive or intimidating tactics.

Under no circumstance should those individuals and institutions who sell such insurance, without engaging in coercion, intimidation, or other unscrupulous activities, be condemned because other lenders sell credit insurance unethically.

10. Quite aside from the question of coercion or intimidation, the subcommittee found a growing number of finance and lending organizations whose officers, directors, or stockholders likewise were officers, directors, and/or stockholders in credit-insurance corporations.

STATE LAWS NEEDED

On the basis of the aforesaid findings the subcommittee decided to investigate the situation by holding a series of public hearings in those States where, because of a lack of State regulation, it had found extensive evidence of abuses. The investigation was limited to States without adequate small-loan and credit-insurance regulations in view of the fact that the initial survey indicated that where the States have enacted laws or regulations governing the sale of credit insurance in connection with small loans, and where such laws or regulations are enforced, there are no abuses.

The subcommittee points out that there must be properly and adequately drafted State laws and/or regulations and that such laws must be administered in such a fashion as to culminate an effective enforcement.

KANSAS SITUATION STUDIED

The subcommittee held one hearing in Topeka, Kans., on Monday, September 20, 1954. Twenty-one witnesses testified, including State officials and executives and employees of lending, financing, and credit-insurance companies, officials of finance and credit-insurance companies, civic organizations, together with a group of individual borrowers. The oral testimony was supplemented by exhibits and other written data. As a result of the Kansas investigation, the subcommittee made the following findings in respect to Kansas:

1. That there was no evidence of any agreements between the finance companies and the credit insurance companies or their respective associations in respect to premium rates and/or commissions or a course of conduct which might create a monopoly. However, the committee did find a uniformity of rates between the national credit insurance companies and the Kansas insurance companies. Presumably such uniformity was determined by the market price. There was no other evidence presented.

2. The committee also found a close relationship between some finance and lending organizations and credit insurance companies and was concerned about the implication of the fact that the premium income of an insurance company is not subject to Federal income taxes as a possible motivating force for the formation of separate insurance companies by finance companies and vice versa.

In view of the widespread dispute concerning the presence of coercion, intimidation and other unscrupulous practices in the sale of credit insurance in connection with small loans the findings of the Subcommittee in respect to Kansas are interesting.

MANY GOOD PRACTICES

The subcommittee found that credit insurance is in many instances sold to borrowers in Kansas without abuse of any kind and that under these circumstances the borrowers themselves testified that they desired credit insurance; that it paid their debt when illness, accident or death would have made that difficult or impossible. In other instances the report found extensive evidence of coercion and intimidation. Furthermore the subcommittee found that abuses of credit insurance in Kansas exists for the following reasons:

(a) There are no adequate small loan or retail installment sales laws in Kansas;

(b) There is no administrative agency in Kansas vested with the power to directly control lending and finance institutions; and

(c) Because the sale of credit insurance when made in connection with small loans almost exclusively is sold by the lending organization or someone connected with it, when illness, accident or death would have credit insurance in Kansas.

The subcommittee also found that the lack of adequate State regulation of credit insurance in Kansas was largely due to the opposition to such legislation by unethical lenders which was effective through misrepresentation as to the effect of such proposed legislation and failure of the public to appreciate the seriousness of the problem in Kansas. The opposition of the unethical lender has been made more effective in the division of views in Kansas as to what type of State laws and/or regulations should be enacted to regulate credit insurance.

The abuse of credit life in Kansas represents only the current phase of the activities of unethical lenders in that State, it is pointed out in the report. Originally the unethical lenders employed brokerage and other schemes to avoid Kansas usury laws. When such practices were cut off by the attorney general, the unethical loan sharks turned to the sale of credit insurance so that the loan-shark problems in Kansas became credit-insurance problems to some degree at that time. It would appear that the credit-insurance problems will be eliminated as soon as the unethical loan shark is replaced by the ethical licensed lender.

FEDERAL LAW NOT RECOMMENDED

While the subcommittee does not recommend the enactment of any new Federal legislation nor amendment of any Federal laws for the moment, its report does recommend that the investigation continue through additional staff study and State by State public hearings in the States where credit insurance is not successfully regulated. It is the committee's recommendation that such further investigation should cover three general areas of exploration:

(1) Trade association relationships with member companies; (2) formation of companion credit insurance companies by finance and lending institutions; (3) coercion, intimidation, and other unscrupulous practices employed in such sales of credit insurance.

INQUIRY QUESTIONS

The subcommittee's recommendations that there be further inquiry in other States offers 14 suggestions for the lines of such inquiry. The final question of these 14 is: "Should new Federal legislation be enacted now?"

Then, under a further question, "if so," it asks whether such legislation should cover such points as:

Divorce of officer-director-stockholder relationships between credit insurance companies and lending organizations?

Prohibit lenders, employees, from directly profiting from credit insurance sales.

Prohibit tie-in or coercive sales?

Limit terms and premiums paid?

These questions relating to possible areas of Federal legislation are, of course, qualified by the fact that the subcommittee declares that it has no recommendation for Federal law now, but thinks that further legislation on the State level will solve the problems in the credit insurance field.

The subcommittee report listing the 14 points that should be explored in further investigation, points out that the body is aware that the present abuses of insurance are not exclusively confined to the field of credit insurance.

It appears that not only will the investigation of credit insurance continue in the States in which that type of insurance is not regulated, but that the investigation might well branch into other aspects of the insurance business beyond the sale of credit insurance in connection with small loans such as the sale of motor vehicle and property insurance by sales finance companies, the sale of insurance in connection with real estate loans and other transactions where the sale of insurance is coupled with another agreement.

In its conclusion the subcommittee notes that an impressive number of borrowers testified that credit insurance paid their debt when they were beset by illness, accident or by death of the head of their household and that credit insurance like all other forms of insurance, when not abused performs a most admirable function.

While abuses continue, the subcommittee does not think the Federal Government will forever accept attempts at regulation as a substitute for successful regulation. The report closes with the advice that the patience of the Federal Government some day may come to an end.

Farm Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, adequate farm income lies uppermost in the minds of hard-pressed farmers in the Midwest. A letter to the editor of the Detroit Lakes-Record displays great feeling and depth of thought. I think this letter a good rebuttal to the charge that prices went down under 90-percent supports. Under leave to extend my remarks I request that this letter be inserted into the RECORD.

The letter follows:

MAKES REPLY

To the EDITOR:

After reading Mr. Frank DeGroat's letter one wonders what sort of prapaganda he is talking about.

I am sure that most farmers have heard and had enough of the propaganda put out by Secretary Benson and the Farm Bureau. Mr. DeGroat tries to tell us that farmers had tough going under the parity program, which is pure poppycock. Farmers weren't complaining until these last 2 or 3 years when they realized they now have a Secretary of Agriculture whose chief mission seems to be the wrecking of the family farm.

As Mr. DeGroat states, the full effect of the flexible program hasn't caught up with us as yet. Mr. Benson knows how to flex in only one way. He has shown us that by lowering the prices of butter, oats, barley, wheat, rye, and eggs—in fact, all farm products. Pity the farmer when the flexible program really gets going. Mr. DeGroat's statement saying that farmers can get parity only through production falls flat.

He should remember the early thirties when farmers produced aplenty—but also went broke. Mr. DeGroat covers a lot of territory when he states that those Americans that use stickers on their cars such as "Don't Blame Me, I Voted Democrat," or other slogans, have lost faith in our form of government. No, Mr. DeGroat, they didn't lose faith in our Government by any means. They just lost faith in those Republicans who visit farmers only at election time and make those golden promises of nothing less than 90 percent to 100 percent parity. But after being elected they said "No, we really meant something else." You farmers misunderstood our program.

Now, Mr. DeGroat made many statements in his letter. Most could be passed over with just a mere shrug. But when he made the statement that there are many Americans who do not believe in our great democracy made me boil. By saying that he is doing the very thing that will divide and weaken us. He is sowing the evil seeds of suspicion and distrust among loyal Americans. There is no doubt that we may have a small number of defects or disloyal citizens. Those kind can be found in every nation in the world.

But let us, and may the good Lord help us, handle them calmly and coolly in our own American way. Let's not go wild making fantastic statements, and cast accusing eyes on our fellow Americans.

I do not mean to minimize any danger that may damage our great country. But, rather, let us be always intelligently alert and calm and let's not sow their evil seeds of suspicion and distrust, lest we forget the motto of "United, we stand; divided, we fall."

Respectfully,

JOE ZAYIC,
Ogema.

Old River Closure Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL B. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, due to the amount of interest that has recently been displayed in one of our major flood-control projects in the lower Mississippi Valley—the Old River Closure project—I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a talk made on this subject by the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, Maj. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis, Jr. This talk is entitled "An Old River in a New Era" and it was made before the last annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, in New Orleans.

I believe this talk explains very well the need for the initiation of early construction of this authorized project.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OLD RIVER IN A NEW ERA

One of the more pleasant aspects of my present assignments of duty is that it enables me to keep in touch with old friends and old scenes. There are none that I remember more fondly, or revisit with more pleasure, than those of the lower Mississippi Valley. I have the greatest admiration for the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association. To be invited to meet with you again this year is not only a pleasure but it is a thrilling experience to be again with old comrades in arms to reminisce about old victories and plan new campaigns against that inexorable but esteemed opponent, the great Mississippi River.

The stupendous project in whose development you have played so important a part is one of the pillars of the Corps of Engineers' civil-works program. Moreover, it has been a pivotal project in the history of water-resources development in our country. Yet we must face the fact that today we are passing through a troubled period in that history. The disruptions of the cold-war era have adversely affected waterway and flood-control development, as they have many other American activities, both public and private. The impact has been felt in other valleys and basins as it has been here in the Mississippi Valley. The solution of the water-resource development problems of this era is now a matter of common concern. In fact, they are national problems, and satisfactory solutions to the regional problems must be sought and can only be found on a national basis.

Hence, I consider it proper and appropriate that in my remarks today, I include a discussion of the present status of our nation-wide river-development program, viewed as a whole and as seen against the background of these times.

From my own experience in this and other regions of our Nation as well as from my office in Washington, I have had unusual opportunities to view the interrelationships between river basins and projects all over the United States. I have had the opportunity to see how these development programs of all regions mesh together, from an engineering and economic, if not from a political, viewpoint, and how they, in a real and critical sense, are dependent upon one another. Moreover, especially during the last decade, I believe this same evaluation is being accepted by the public in general and the individual citizen and taxpayer in particular.

During my tenure of office as Chief of Engineers, I have been impressed more than ever before by the fact that the field of water-resources development throughout the Nation is one indivisible physical phase of our economic life. My own experience leads me to the inevitable conclusion that acceptable solutions to our major problems will not be found unless they can be woven into this unified concept. Our local and regional problems all tap one common root system; so to attack them with purpose and effect, it is necessary to understand the structure as an organic whole.

Following the great disaster of 1927, the people of the United States undertook here in the Mississippi Valley a tremendous commitment. They did so in full knowledge of the great cost involved, realizing that the importance of the job to the entire Nation fully justified the cost.

Today, measured in terms of dollars appropriated, that original task is about two-thirds completed. Yet the partially completed project has already amply demonstrated its worth. Since 1927 no disastrous flood has ravaged this valley—in which devastating floods previously occurred about every decade. The benefits which have accrued from your project since 1923 have totaled nearly $5 billion, which is a return of more than $5 for each construction dollar spent so far. This is indeed not only a good investment for the people of the lower valley but for the Nation as well. In fact, I know of no valley where our work has been done whose people know more about it and value it more highly than in the lower Mississippi Valley.

All of you who have participated in the shaping of the lower Mississippi project can take pride and satisfaction in the subsequent highly successful record of performance of the partially completed project. Yet every one of you knows that insofar as the record on flood prevention is concerned, we owe some of it to good fortune. You still are vulnerable to damage from areas not yet completed. Furthermore we all know that partially completed works always beget a degree of risk considerably greater than is prudent. We also know that a partially completed project sometimes actually increases the hazards of a disaster as a result

of the rapid agricultural and industrial expansion on the still vulnerable flood plain which often takes place concurrently with construction. And hence we in the Corps of Engineers realize, as you do, the vital necessity for timely completion of this project and others like it. As the ancients have said, it is dangerous for man to tempt fate too long.

I believe that some of the pertinent facts available to me concerning the national picture should be passed on to you because I think they may be helpful to you, and I hope they will be of encouragement, in seeking the solution to your own problems and those of the Nation. I hope that your association will exert its leadership more than ever before to acquaint the Nation as a whole with the needs of your valley and those of others.

Following the disastrous flood of 1927 and the plan for the lower Mississippi Basin which was evolved, the whole Nation looked to you as the example of what other regions should do. With your project was born the modern concept of comprehensive basin development—a concept which spread rapidly during the next decade to every major river basin in America with an impetus generated by floods and other water problems in these areas. With the advantages of comprehensive development made strikingly evident on a large scale here on the Mississippi, there was exemplary reason for initiating similar protection and benefits to all other regions. But more than that—it soon began to be realized that over and above flood control, the Nation required the full development of its water resources as a necessary foundation for its continued growth and for the fulfillment of its destiny.

Thus, in the quarter of a century that has elapsed since the lower Mississippi project got underway, we have seen a great change in the appearance and size of our national resource-development environment born of the catastrophe of 1927. The area of common interest has expanded many fold, both financially and geographically. As a result, projects have changed in nature from single-purpose, or bipurpose navigation and flood-control projects, to many great multiple-purpose projects.

So today, as compared to the late twenties and early thirties, we have not one great river-basin project, but many, each tremendously important to the future security and welfare of America. We need all of them. We would all suffer evil consequences if we were to thrust aside one vitally needed project for another. They are all necessary parts of the interlocked machinery of our Nation's economic strength.

I stress this national picture because I am convinced beyond any doubt that your interests and your future are inevitably bound up with the Nation's interest and future. If the Nation's program walks, yours will also; if the Nation's program accelerates, so will yours. I am sure that you agree with me in principle and in theory; however, I must confess that there are some very practical obstacles to overcome if we are to succeed in satisfying this common need for an adequate program of water resources development.

I think it is time to face these obstacles and do something about them. For at least 15 years now—and for the first time in our history—we in America have been forced to fight and to be on guard without letup in order to insure the preservation of our very way of life as a free nation. We have been engaged in either a hot war or a cold war, and unfortunately the end is not in sight yet. This has entailed tremendous expenditure for our national defense. Even so, we all agree that whatever sacrifices are necessary—financial or otherwise—must be made to insure that we will always have the military might to counter, swiftly and victoriously, any death blow that might be directed against us by an unprovoked aggressor.

These costs of national security, added to the sum total of all the other costs of operating our Government, pose a most difficult budgetary problem for our lawmakers and other leaders who bear these tremendous responsibilities for safeguarding the interests of our Nation. We must face the fact that these budgetary problems have been, and will continue to be for the foreseeable future, a prime factor to be reckoned with in planning for the development of our water resources.

How have these budgetary problems, resulting from the effects of hot and cold wars, the enlarged area of governmental activity, and the expanding regional water resources needs, affected the Nation's water resources programs? Let us look at some of the pertinent facts.

Although the idea of basin-wide development of our water resources was well along toward becoming a general pattern throughout our Nation before World War II, it was not until experience during the war had highlighted the need for the development of power in the regions of power shortages, for the conservation of water for domestic, industrial, and agricultural uses in areas of water shortages, that such multiple purpose project developments as those in the Pacific Northwest and the Missouri basin came into full prominence. These projects not only provided for the age-old basic needs of navigation and flood control but they also filled urgent and important corollary needs such as supplying water for domestic, municipal, and industrial water supply, pollution abatement, and for irrigation and power.

In the fiscal year 1946, when the large multiple purpose developments were just getting under way, they received about one-sixth of the total appropriations of all civic works construction throughout the country. This percentage was increased each year thereafter until in the fiscal year 1954, multiple purpose projects received approximately two-thirds of all funds appropriated for civil works construction. This maximum percentage occurred in a year when overall construction appropriations were reduced by about 30 percent from those for the previous fiscal year, as a part of a strong effort to balance the budget. For the current fiscal year, 1955, the total appropriation for multiple purpose projects was about three-fifths of the total for all civil works construction.

Now, I do not intend to convey the thought that this was an inequitable or unwarranted division of appropriations—what I am attempting to point out is that these large scale multiple purpose projects—and I should add, worthy, urgently needed projects—once started, require relatively large sums of money to assure economical construction and to permit them to advance within a reasonable period of time to begin to do the job they were designed to do. These monetary requirements for continuing the advancement of the large multiple purpose developments during a period of ceiling controls has had the inevitable effect of militating against the appropriation of larger sums for other projects under way or projected.

In the national picture total funds appropriated for civil works construction for the period 1946 to date varied from a low of $176 million in the fiscal year 1946 to a high of $518 million for the fiscal year 1950; and, then the trend was downward to $313 million for the fiscal year 1954 and slightly upward to $335 million for the present fiscal year 1955.

Nor did the lower Mississippi project receive the amount of funds that you and I would like to have seen it receive. Funds for construction of Mississippi River Commission projects for fiscal years 1946 through 1954 varied from a low of $31,700,000 in 1947 to a high of $51,200,000 for fiscal year 1950; since then they have continued to drop to a low for the fiscal year 1955 of $31,500,000. This is indeed a regrettable situation but let me emphasize that your problem points up one that is general throughout most of the Nation. The only consoling fact is that your original project for the lower Mississippi also is farther advanced towards completion than is any similar valley project in the Nation. This is illustrated by figures on the status o fcompletion of the other major river basins. Measured by the amount of funds appropriated, the original lower Mississippi project is 66 percent complete; the Missouri Basin, 43 percent; the Ohio Basin, 29 percent, and the upper Mississippi River Basin, 46 percent—all upstream from you and materially contributing to your benefit. The status of authorized programs in other areas of the country vary from a mere beginning to a little more than half complete.

The partially-completed programs now under way upstream from you are of importance to you because they are even now producing important downstream benefits and they will continue to do so, and in increasing amounts as the projects progress. The partially-completed reservoirs on the Missouri and Ohio not only have held back floodwaters that otherwise would have come down upon you on the lower Mississippi, but by storing these floodwaters during the flood season and releasing them during the low-water season have made possible uninterrupted navigation on the Mississippi, have alleviated the salt water intrusion problem at New Orleans and have provided much needed "booster" flows for domestic, industrial, and pollution abatement purposes all along the Mississippi River.

Furthermore, the tangible effects of these interlocking systems have served to produce a trend toward a reorientation from the previous east-west axis of commerce to one which is more nearly north and south. This promises a further very auspicious improvement in the economy of the lower Mississippi region. Even now, more and more industries are moving into this great central valley. With the completion of the Cal-Sag project connecting the Mississippi to Lake Michigan and the St. Lawrence seaway—both of which are needed and which, I grant, will cost money—I visualize an even greater acceleration of trade, commerce, and industry in the Mississippi Basin.

The point I wish to make is, that these projects—yours and the many others—are worthy, are essential, and must go ahead if our internal economy is to be adequately sustained. And, at this point I want to heartily commend the Mississippi Valley Control Association for its action in going on record last year indorsing the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. There is not the slightest question in my mind that the St. Lawrence seaway project is not only of prime importance to the Nation for defense, but that it will be a great stimulus to the entire internal economy of the midcontinent are, particularly the Mississippi Valley, as well as to the Nation as a whole.

As I have already indicated, the advancement of these newer programs, as worthy as they are, will necessitate the appropriation of funds for these additional requirements in the face of the fact that the trend in appropriations for construction since the fiscal year 1950 has been downward. However, I wish to emphasize that I do not believe there is a single person in the Congress who would not like to see our appropriations and construction keep better in step with the Nation's vastly expanding water resources requirements. Our Nation's leaders are, unfortunately, harassed by many problems in the field of appropriations. As Chief of Engineers, I am not in a position to evaluate any

other program than the navigation and flood-control missions entrusted to me, and certainly I am not in a position to weigh all the problems of the Nation against each other; however, I do know—and I consider it my duty to apprise you of the facts as I see them—that we aren't moving fast enough in those fields of flood control and navigation for which I am responsible.

Let me give you some of the facts to illustrate my point. In 1927 when the disastrous flood of that year had created nationwide interest in river control, the total approved program of civil works amounted to—in estimated cost—about $1,200 million—that is some $1.2 billion. About $800 million had been appropriated to carry out this authorized program—which means that a backlog existed at that time of about $400 million worth of work—at 1927 prices.

By 1937—10 years later—following the increased interest in flood control and waterway development reflected in the passage of the 1936 Flood Control Act (with its declaration of policy that prevention of floods in cooperation with the States and other local political subdivisions was a proper activity of the Federal Government the backlog of uncompleted projects had grown from $400 million in 1927 to $900 million worth of construction—at 1937 prices. That is, the backlog more than doubled in 10 years. In 1947 after World War II, and when the concept of basinwide development was being generally accepted, the backlog had grown to $5.4 billion—at 1947 prices, or reverting to 1927 prices, the backlog of authorized projects had increased fivefold.

Today the estimated cost of construction of all civil works projects which have been approved for construction by the Congress is $18.8 billion, of which a total of $6.6 billion have been appropriated; thus, there exists today a backlog of projects, either not started or not completed, of about $12 billion worth of work at today's prices or 10 times the backlog in comparable dollar value to the backlog that existed in 1927.

Admittedly certain of these projects in this backlog have now become obsolete, or for some other reason should not be built. So for the sake of discussion, let us assume that one-third of all the work represented by today's accumulated backlog should, for some reason or another, never be built. Even so, there would still remain $8 billion worth of economically sound, urgently needed, congressionally approved work either not started or not finished. This amount—$8 billion—is greater than the accumulated total of all appropriations made since 1824 for new construction for the Corps of Engineers' civil works projects.

Now certainly, gentlemen, if there is any statistical support needed for my belief that our water-resource program is critically lagging it can be found in this ever-mounting backlog of highly justified projects from $400 million in 1927 to the $8 billion of today. I submit that this at least a read flag we must heed in connection with our endeavors to insure the welfare and even the survival of future generations.

Obviously something should be done about this situation; obviously something has to be done to bring our lagging water resources development programs more nearly into step with our country's urgent and expanded needs. The question is What can be done? I suggest we examine the methods open to us for a solution.

First, we can formulate a united national program of minimum annual water-resource development designed specifically to meet these growing needs of water transportation, power, and flood protection, and all other water resources problems, to the end that the security of our country's future generations will not be jeopardized.

Second, with such a minimum program patterned to fit the critical needs of the Nation we can examine the overall funding problem on a realistic basis to determine whether a searching examination should be made of all needs of the Government to ascertain whether any adjustments elsewhere are warranted which could be applied to our lagging water resources program.

In both these endeavors—the development of a national unity of purpose including the formulation of a rational long-range program of water resources development, and the provision for a minimum-funding program to carry out these requirements—I look to the Lower Mississippi Valley Association with confidence that it will exert its valued leadership and know-how in bringing about an early solution.

For those who perhaps are not satisfied by the impelling backlog statistics alone, which I have cited, let us come back to the lower Mississippi Valley, where the Old River problem is a striking illustration of how urgent project needs exist for expeditious action. Last year, as I promised you, we finished our report on Old River on schedule. It was submitted to Congress and duly authorized with many other worthy projects in the 1954 omnibus bill. There it has joined the current backlog of $8 billion—in fact forms part of it.

The corps has been thorough in its investigation of this possible diversion of the Mississippi River down the much shorter Atchafalaya route to the Gulf of Mexico. In fact, the corps has prepared many reports on this subject and has had Old River under study and surveillance for over half a century. Recently an engineering and geological study has been completed that may in future years be ranked with the work of Humphrey and Abbott. In connection with this study, the corps has engaged as consultants leading geologists and internationally known engineers. It is the unanimous opinion of these outstanding consultants and our own engineers, both officers and civilians, that a major catastrophe will take place unless we do something and do it within limited time. We have, as you know, executed a contract for the necessary pile tests and foundation explorations, and the work on these studies is now under way. We are prepared to follow with actual construction as soon as funds are made available for that purpose.

This is not only one of the world's greatest and most complex engineering problems but a costly undertaking too. We are dealing with the largest controlled river in the world. The situation is not one based merely on someone's wants for local advantage; it is a threatening situation imposed by nature as a serious challenge to human resourcefulness.

The control structures, exclusive of the navigation locks, are estimated to cost about $47 million. Although detailed plans and design work are not yet completed, we estimate that the final cost of the project will be in the neighborhood of $80 million. Hence, completion of the job in 8 to 10 years—which could be just about the period of grace left to us—would require expenditures of $8 million to $10 million per year. Since this is a project of emergency nature which nature has forced upon us, I hope that it can be carried out without delaying or disrupting the other work in the valley.

Let me emphasize before I close that we in the corps appreciate and share your concern as to the need of a more rapid rate of completion of the Lower Mississippi Valley project as a whole and an early start on the Old River project. But we would break faith with you if we confined ourselves to lamentation and failed to point out the fundamental conditions you and the Nation face today that did not operate to make the funding problem a critical one during earlier decades when the project was started. Candor, I feel, is urgently needed in the discussion of this problem in order to arrive at the most intelligent remedial action.

As always, we are anxious to assist you in solving your problems and, as in the past, we will never let you down. Our young officers and civilians are working today on this great Mississippi River just as they did in my generation; just as they did in the days of Humphrey and Abbott, a century ago. Then, as now, its control is the ultimate challenge to the engineering world and an inspiration to those of us assigned the flood-control mission.

With the expanding economy and growing population of the South, in general, and the lower river in particular, never has the river been a greater challenge, than it is today. And, believe me, never have the engineering forces of the Army's Corps of Engineers reached a higher state of technical competence, interest, and integrity, ready to serve you and the Nation efficiently and unselfishly, than they have today under the incumbent persident of the Mississippi River Commission, Brig. Gen. John R. Hardin, his civilian employees, his district engineers, and their civilian members.

I am certain that if we intelligently analyze and courageously attack the major problems currently in the path of progress toward a complete project, we can jointly eliminate them not only in the interests of this region but of the Nation itself.

I know we can count on your inspiration and leadership in this mutual endeavor and, proud of our heritage as Army engineers, I assure you of the wholehearted and continued cooperations of the corps in this never-ending battle to control with fortitude, intelligence, and the greatest engineering skill known to man, the terrifying whims and dynamic emotions of Ole Man River.

A Regrettable Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I deeply regret the decision of the President to veto the postal pay bill reported by the conference committee and approved by overwhelming vote both in the Senate and the House.

Anyone can take some artificial date and say that, compared with that date, the pay of postal and of other Government workers has been raised adequately, and that an 8.8 percent pay rise now is too much.

Across the past 20 years, however, the pay scales of Government employees, whether postal or classified, have fallen proportionately behind the pay scales of industry and other private employment. It is not just a matter of juggling figures and job descriptions and saying, as the veto message said, that the 8.8 percent bill was not "necessary either from the standpoint of pay for comparable work or from the standpoint of increase in the cost of living."

From the standpoint of maintaining proper relations between the rising scales in private employment and the

pay of postal workers, the 8.8 percent bill was fully justified. A 10 percent bill would have been justified, and there are no figures available to the Post Office Department to refute it.

We have often heard the President proclaim as his philosophy the doctrine that the Government should be conservative in economic and fiscal matters but liberal in its attitude toward people. Where was the liberalism, or the liberality if that is the word, toward postal workers, and toward the classified workers of the Federal Government who wait in turn?

I repeat, I regret the veto. I think it was unwise and ungenerous, that it imposes a continuing inequity on postal and classified workers. A philosophy proclaiming itself as liberal toward people is all very well, but it ought to be more than a slogan.

Brooklyn's Ambassador of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

TESTIMONIAL DINNER TO MAX ABELMAN "BROOKLYN'S AMBASSADOR OF GOOD WILL," BY THE MEDICAL BOARD OF THE JEWISH HOSPITAL OF BROOKLYN, SEPTEMBER 30, 1954

The testimonial dinner tendered to Mr. Max Abelman, "Brooklyn's ambassador of good will," by the medical board of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn, convened at 8:15, Thursday evening, September 30, 1954, at the Unity Club, 101 Eighth Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y. Dr. Lewis H. Baretz, vice president of the hospital medical board, presiding as toastmaster

Seated on the dais were the following:

Dr. Ralph M. Schwartz, president of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn, alumni; Supreme Court Justice Maximilian Moss, chairman, executive committee of the hospital; Judge Emil N. Baar, former president of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn; Dr. Louis J. Morse, president of the medical board; Mr. Max Abelman; *Dr. Louis H. Baretz (deceased), vice president, medical board, and toastmaster of the donner; Mr. Alan Nathan Abelman; Dr. Irving M. Pallin, secretary-treasurer, medical board, chairman, dinner committee; Dr. Adolph P. Raab, president of Junior Staff Society; Dr. William Pomerance, member dinner committee.

Seated at the guest of honor table were the following:

Mr. Victor F. Ridder, publisher; the Honorable Hyman Bashay, judge of the county court; Supreme Court Justice George A. Arkwright; the Honorable A. David Benjamin, city court justice and president, Unity Club; Mr. Frank Schroth, Sr., publisher, Brooklyn Daily Eagle; the Honorable James G. McDonald, first ambassador to Israel; the Honorable Abe Stark, president of the city council of New York City; Dr. Frank Kingdon, columnist, New York Post, and radio commentator; the Honorable Mitchell May, former supreme court justice, president of the Brooklyn Federation of Jewish Charities; the Honorable Jacob J. Schwartzwald, justice of the supreme court, trustee of the Jewish Hospital; Mr. Maxwell Hamburger, friend of Mr. Max Abelman and of the hospital; Dr. John J. Masterson, former president of New York State and Kings County Medical Society; the Honorable John J. Bennett, chairman, New York City Planning Commission; Morris Goldman, Esq., former assistant district attorney, New York; the Honorable Leo S. Rayfiel, United States Federal court justice, Second District; Prof. H. G. Bousfield, chief librarian, Brooklyn College; Prof. H. Alyea, Princeton University; Dr. Ralph E. Snyder, dean of the New York Medical College, Flower Fifth Avenue Hospital; Col. Barnett J. Nova, chairman, board of the hospital; the Honorable John MacCrate, appellate supreme court justice.

(Jeno Barell and his orchestra played the Star Spangled Banner and Hatikvah.)

(After dinner a waiter walked down in front of the dais carrying a huge birthday cake with an inscription thereon reading as follows:)

"To Max, congratulations on your well-earned retirement from the activities at the hospital. May your life in the future be as fruitful as it has been in the past. From his friend, Mr. Joseph Borok of Dubins Bakery."

(The toastmaster, Dr. Irving Pallin, then welcomed the guests.)

Dr. IRVING M. PALLIN (secretary-treasurer of the medical board). Honored guests, friends, colleagues, I welcome you all tonight in the name of the medical board of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn. We are glad to have you.

This dinner started out as a rather small affair for the medical board, who wanted to honor Max Abelman for the wonderful things he has done for our hospital and our community. As soon as the news got out, we got more requests than we could possibly handle.

I would like to introduce our toastmaster of the evening, the vice president of the medical board, our chairman of the executive committee, Dr. Lewis H. Baretz.

Toastmaster Dr. LEWIS H. BARETZ (vice president of the hospital medical board). Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and friends, the medical board in the past has given many dinners to many of its medical colleagues.

This, I think, is an unusual occasion, because we are honoring tonight a layman, one of the outstanding laymen of the hospital family.

Max Abelman has attended many of the dinners in the past, and we all know that there was no occasion without Max Abelman having his hand in it, but it is a great pleasure for us of the medical group to honor Max Abelman for his many years of service to the hospitals.

Max has a reputation, as you know, of being acquainted intimately with many celebrities. He knows generals, he knows presidents, he knows professors and leaders and moving-picture magnates. As a matter of fact, he is supposed to be friendly with some of the royalty in Europe.

We have quite a collection of letters that evolve from the fact that these people have met Max in the past several years and have remembered him well, and remembered what he has done in Brooklyn and at the hospital.

"I regret that I cannot attend the dinner to be given in your honor by the Jewish Hospital Medical Board on September 30th.

"You have rendered your country a great service. You have really been an ambassador of goodwill of Brooklyn. You have extended your help and hospitality to many of my countrymen and I want you to know how grateful I am to you for your kindness.

"With best wishes for your continued good health, I am,

"Sincerely yours,

"CARLOS P. ROMULO."

Over the years, Mr. Adelman has seen many of our doctors come and go. He has seen the fathers being replaced by their sons on the staff. Tonight we have with us the son of an esteemed father, and it is my particular pleasure to present one of the sons, a very worthy son, of one of our most esteemed hospital doctors. The president of the Junior Staff Society, Dr. Adolph Raab, son of Dr. Meyer Rabinowitz.

Dr. ADOLPH P. RAAB (president of the Junior Staff Society of the Jewish Hospital). It is a great privilege to be here tonight and to be allowed to participate in this expression of thanks to our good friend Max Abelman. We of the medical staff are grateful for his help in the many affairs staged. It was always assumed that the assistance of Max Abelman would be available whenever needed, and, of course, it was.

I, for one, shall always remember those events which came about through his efforts and which made our hospital more conscious of its position in the outside world. Such extra touches as Wendell Willkie's son joining our medical rounds and the then Governor Lehman attending our clinico-pathological conference gave an added feeling of importance to that which we tend to regard as routine.

Again, may I say, many thanks and best of luck.

Toastmaster BERETZ. I would like to read excerpts from a few more of these letters:

"Word comes to me that the medical board of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn will give a dinner in your honor on September 30 on the occasion of your retirement as director of public relations.

"Half a century of faithful service. What memories this must bring, and what joy in the knowledge of the good things that have come about through your efforts—not just to the hospital here in Brooklyn but to the community as a whole. How far-reaching the blessings of the many Jewish philanthropies which have felt the touch of your tireless devotion.

"I recall so vividly the delightful dinner we had together 2 years ago—you, the trustees, and friends of Jewish Hospital—when I addressed the graduating class of your nurses. Hardly a department of that great institution which has not benefited from your energies as public-relations director. I can understand the reluctance of the hospital to part with your services, but know that it will always have your devotion as a friend of humanity.

"May the years ahead be rich in blessings for you and yours.

"Always with kindest regards,

"Sincerely yours,

"FRANCES P. BOLTON,

"Congress of the United States, House of Representatives."

"It was most thoughtful of the Board of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn to ask me to the dinner given in your honor on Thursday, September 30. You are richly deserving of this honor and I know of no one serving in a capacity similar to yours who has made more friends among people of all faiths and all walks of life. The capacity to make and hold friends which is yours to an amazing degree, has greatly served the community which you have so deeply loved and helped build.

"I do wish I could be with you and your dear friends at the Unity Club Thursday night but unexpected family events foreclose that possibility. If there should be any change I shall phone you at once.

"With the very warmest personal regards, I am,

"Sincerely yours,

"H. A. WALLACE."

Max and I have been friends for many years. We were friends for a while—as summer neighbors, and it is our habit to go back

and forth up to and from the hospital together during the summer months.

During these days Max used to teach me a lot about politics. He showed me a lot of things I could never read in newspapers, and who was going to run for President, and what Tom Dewey said, and Al Smith said about this thing or the other.

I never believed him, of course, but sometimes they turned out to be true.

We are happy to have with us tonight a very brilliant son of one of our famous alumni at the hospital. It is a great pleasure to introduce the president of the Alumni Society, Dr. Ralph Schwartz.

Dr. RALPH M. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Toastmaster, Max Abelman, and guests, it gives me great pleasure to be here this evening to do honor to Max Abelman. Max Abelman has done so much for our hospital, for our alumni society and for our community.

I have known Max Abelman for many, many years, but it has only been recently in the past few years that I have known and appreciated him. He has made many of our alumni society affairs a huge success, and some two years ago, as a small token of appreciation for all the work that he had done for us, by unanimous vote of the entire alumni society, we made Max our first honorary member.

Max, on behalf of the alumni society, we wish you well and Godspeed.

Toastmaster BARETZ. Reading from a telegram, it says:

"Regret my inability to meet with your many friends on Thursday evening to pay tribute to you for your many years of most valuable services rendered the Brooklyn Jewish Hospital, and to commend you in highest terms for your great humanitarian efforts.

"Indeed, your services reach beyond this great institution in having you engaged in eliminating limitations and restrictions to exclude Jewish boys from our medical schools.

"I remember well your fight in Boston, and I recall other notable and worthwhile deeds on your part for human kind.

"May your retirement give you the rest and comfort you so richly deserve. May each succeeding year to come prove ever joyful and filled with good health to Mrs. Abelman and yourself. Regards.

"MATTHEW WOLL,
"American Federation of Labor
Vice President."

"I cannot tell you how sorry I am that I cannot be with you and your many friends at the testimonial dinner being tendered you this evening. Mrs. Farley's illness and the necessity of my staying pretty close to home prevents my going out evenings as I should like.

"There is no affair I would rather attend than this dinner for you. I know of no man in Brooklyn who has done more humanitarian work than you, and I pray to God that you will be spared for many more years and that you will continue to enjoy good health and happiness so you can carry on as you have in the past.

"JAMES A. FARLEY."

Dr. LOUIS J. MORSE (president of the Jewish Hospital Medical Board). Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members of the medical board, and friends of our honored guest, this is indeed a rare occasion in Jewish Hospital Medical Board history. Never before have we striven to do honor to one of our hospital family other than one of our own profession. The graciousness, the warmth, the indefatigibility of our honored guest in behalf of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn prompted and richly merited this action.

Max Abelman found no chore too great, no aid too menial as long as he helped. That aid was sought by high and low alike.

His acts bear cogent testimony to his philosophic credo "that wherever there is a human being, there is an oportunity for kindness." It mattered little to him whether that human be an intern who needed help in getting his son's Bris well supplied, or a president who warmly presented him with his autographed photograph; whether an attending surgeon sought impossible train reservations for a Florida vacation, or an orderly strove to get some discount on his radio purchase, it mattered little to Max.

If a medical school sought recognition, or a student struggled for admission to medical college, Max was the benefactor. He achieved much. He attempted the impossible. Is it small wonder then that on January 27, 1947, the Brooklyn Eagle should editorially comment that "Abelman never learned to say 'No.'" Letters that jam his files bear tribute of the great and near great and those who are great in our honored guest's eyes.

Hon. James J. Heffernan, in the House of Representatives, spread on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 18, 1949, this tribute to Max Abelman, then secretary to the board of directors of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn:

"For four decades he has served as the unofficial public relations man for any worthy cause, even any worthy individual that needs a hand. He is concerned primarily with trying to live up to the maxim that sums up his philosophy of life of 'never living a day without doing a kind act for someone else.'"

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, on August 20, 1954, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter written to Max on the occasion of this evening's dinner:

"Your service to the Brooklyn Jewish Hospital has been particularly noteworthy over a period of nearly half a century. I want to express my appreciation and thanks for what you have done for the people of New York."

Max, we of the medical board are appreciative of what you have done for the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn. We know you did your utmost to make this institution one of the best in Brooklyn, not only to the advantage of our house staff and the advancement of the prestige of the visiting staff, but especially to the comfort and well-being of the patient.

As a token of our appreciation, please accept this gift of a cruise which we hope gives you a well deserved vacation. For a more enduring permanence, may I present this scroll which bears this inscription:

"Reception and dinner tendered to Max Abelman 'Brooklyn's ambassador of good will' by the medical board on the occasion of his retirement as Secretary to the President of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn and Director of Public Relations.

"He has been a very active member of the hospital family since 1909, and has contributed much to the development of our institution and its medical staff.

"LOUIS J. MORSE, M. D.,
"President, Medical Board.
"IRVING M. PALLIN, M. D.,
"Secretary-Treasurer, Dinner Committee,
"WM. POMERANCE, M. D.
"RALPH M. SCHWARTZ, M. D."

(Dr. Morse presented the scroll to Mr. Abelman and the audience stood and applauded.)

Mr. MAX ABELMAN. Gentlemen, before I speak, I just want to thank Dr. Morse, as president of the board, and later on I shall have something to say, and I have a few suggestions that possibly the Medical Board and my friends that will hear, who have done everything possible, may appreciate, so will you excuse me until the other gentlemen are through? Thank you.

Toastmaster BARETZ. Save it until later.

We have a gentleman here that I am very happy to call upon, one of our medical colleagues, a former president of the Kings County Medical Society, and a former president of the New York State Medical Society, Dr. John J. Masterson.

Dr. JOHN J. MASTERSON (former president of the Kings County Medical Society and former president of the New York State Medical Society). Mr. Toastmaster, Max Abelman, and guests, first, I want to express my appreciation to the medical board of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn for inviting me to this very happy occasion.

Your very presence here tonight testifies more eloquently than anything that I can say of how you feel toward Max Abelman.

Friendship is only gained by good deeds. It is said that a man who has riches and no friends is poor, but a man who has friends, regardless of his worldly possessions, is rich beyond words.

So tonight, Max, you should feel very happy and proud at this distinguished gathering who have come here tonight to pay you honor and tribute. I wish you well and hope the good Lord will spare you for many years; that you may continue on in the good work you have been doing all your life.

Before I sit down, I want to extend to you the felicitations of our county and State society. You have been so interested for so long in matters of medicine that we feel that you are one of us. We wish you well.

Toastmaster BARETZ. No party of a hospital would be complete without introducing one of its outstanding members, a man who spends his entire time, practically half of the day of each week in ironing out the problems of the Jewish hospital. It is a great pleasure to present the president of the Jewish hospital, Mr. Isador Leviton. I will ask him to take a bow.

(Mr. Leviton takes a bow.)

TOASTMASTER BARETZ. I would like also to take a bow, if he will, at this time, the dean of the New York Medical College, Flower—Fifth Avenue Hospital, Dr. Ralph Snyder.

There are so many others here tonight that I would like to call upon who are not medical men, so I have asked Mr. Justice Maximilian Moss at this point to introduce all of the others.

And here is a telegram from Moses Ginsberg, New York, N. Y., addressed to Max Abelman, Unity Club:

"Please accept my heartiest congratulations and best wishes on the retirement dinner tendered to you by the Medical Board of the Brooklyn Jewish Hospital. I regret very much my inability to be present at your dinner on account of my poor health due to my age. In the 50 years or so that I have known you, I know that you have given your best and most faithful service to the hospital and to the board, and although you will not be engaged actively, I am sure you will continue to give your best service as heretofore, and I hope you will be able to have the strength for a good many years to come.

"Sincerely yours."

The Honorable Maximilian Moss (justice of the supreme court). Mr. Toastmaster, Max Abelman, before tonight I was under the impression that men should not retire after they reached 65, but I have changed my mind. What happened here tonight has changed my mind because Max has established a pattern, and that pattern is that, having retired, and being somewhat economically established, that he can devote the rest of his days, without hope of reward, in appreciation for what God has given him in his earlier days. And I say that, admittedly, because Judge McCrate sometimes assigns me to the matrimonial bar and I had Max Abelman sit next to me sometimes, and as these couples came in for a divorce and separation and dissolution, I asked Max to take them over in the chambers. And

today, and this is a fact, there are many couples living together happily as man and wife because of what he has done. And the statistics which the Eagle and others have proven that to be a fact.

Therefore, if in the professions and industry we could get men who will retire and they gratuitously give the remainder of their lives to their country and their communities, I think it is a wonderful thing.

Max, you have done nobly in showing a way that might very well be followed.

Now my job is only to introduce the laymen. This was supposed to have been a doctor's party, but we horned in, and at the table you see here—the head table in front of us up here—the first speaker that I would like to call upon is my boss, our senior judge, a man most beloved in Brooklyn, not limited to Greenpoint, a great friend of the president, Leviton, a warm and good friend of Max, Mr. Justice McCrate.

The Honorable JOHN J. MCCRATE (senior judge of the supreme court). Mr. Toastmaster, Max, and "Max," you write out your resignation now and I will witness it for you. I was born in Scotland, and I am not resigning.

I have to get off next year, Max, because of age and what the rules say and the constitution declares, that I am past a certain age at that time. I was wondering, after these telegrams were being read and about the things that were said as to the great men that Max knows.

I am glad that time has reversed that, and we have the opportunity on this occasion just to pay a tribute to you.

Somebody said that they don't know your politics. Max, when you get nearly 70, it doesn't make any difference what your politics have been.

As I looked at Mitch May, I said, "They will say everything about that man, but the best they will ever say about him is that he was all heart," and, Max, you have lived long enough so that the people who know you will say, "He has been a great heart." And that, perhaps, is the best compliment that can be paid to you.

As I was listening to these people talk, I was thinking of the change that had come over this community. The minority of yesterday has become the majority of today, and how foolish it is for a majority of any date to crush down and depress or overlord the minority.

I always get the Scotch stories. One of our judges said to me, "John, have you heard the latest story about the Scotsman?" I said, "What is it? Shoot." He said, "Two Scotsmen left Scotland 30 years ago, and one of them had a bottle of Scotch with him." He said, "Jock, if there is a great event that happens in America, I will open this bottle and we will celebrate." He said, "Fine."

Thirty years went by, and the bottle was never opened, and one day Jock got a note from Alec, and it said, "Dear Jock: Doctor says I can't live more than 6 weeks. Will you come and see me?"

So Jock went and saw him. He said, "Alec, what is up?" He said, "The doctor says I can't live more than 6 weeks." Jock said, "Oh, doctors make a lot of mistakes. You will live more than that." "No, I am not going to live," he said "and I want you to make a promise." "What promise do you want me to make?" asked Jock. "Well," he said, "do you remember that bottle of Scotch I brought with us from Scotland, and I was going to save it for a great event? I am going to die. When I die, will you do this for me? Will you promise me this?" So Jock said, "I will promise a dying man anything, and I will keep a promise." "Well," said Alec, "when I die, will you take that bottle of Scotch and sprinke it over my grave?" Jock looked at him, mystified, and said to him, "Alec, would you mind if I pass it through my kidneys just once?"

We have ways of honoring our friends. That isn't a typical Scotch way, but what we do hope, Max, is that if you do sit in with these judges and help to solve matrimonial matters, you will do better, be more successful, than we have been.

Judge Moss. The next speaker is a gentleman who has a distinction which will never be held by anyone else, now or at any other time, and that is being the first Ambassador to Israel. I have the great privilege and honor now to present to you His Excellency the Honorable James MacDonald.

The Honorable JAMES G. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman and Max; the doctors have set an admirable example of brief speakers, and I am afraid that judges and the rest of us outside the medical profession will have difficulty measuring up to that standard. I am glad to be here. I want merely to say to Max that I have the warmest remembrance of his friendship to me when I first came to Brooklyn, a friendship which he has consistently maintained. I join with the rest of you in wishing him not only long life and health, but also that recognition which is given him tonight, and devotion of his whole life.

Judge Moss. The next speaker has more in his office than councilmanic duties, for no philanthropic or communal endeavor of any kind is started without an effort on the part of those starting it first to ask this man to be its chairman. I was at the city hall today at 4 o'clock. There was a large group of men calling on Abe Stark, and the whole purpose was to swindle him into becoming chairman. He then stated to us, "Well, gentlemen, so and so has asked me to do that and this, and that organization and the other organization have * * * " and we found that we were at the tail end of about twenty different organizations asking him.

You can imagine what the life of a president of a city council is.

The Honorable ABE STARK (president of the city council of New York). Thank you, Judge. Max, my dear friends, listening to the letters of commendation that were read about Max from some of the most distinguished and important people throughout the world reminds me of an underprivileged group of young boys and girls, and I notice, by the way, there is no mention made of it at all, glancing through this brochure. A group of boys and girls who, over a period of pretty nearly 8 years, Max has done so much for. Today, because of Max and four other people who are in this room that I am going to mention, Victor F. Ridder, Dave Benjamin, Frank Kingdon and myself, who traveled to all parts of the country to make it possible, they have become doctors in this city of ours. Principally, most of them came from the city of New York, where, unfortunately, through no fault of their own, but due to the shortage of medical schools, they could not enter into any medical school and be approved. That fight we conducted for a good many years. Max Abelman was our guiding spirit throughout those years, and if it were possible to bring in this underprivileged class that I mentioned, who are now, most of them, in fact all of them, I should say, doctors, establishing great records throughout the country, you could have filled a place just twenty times as big as this, because they would all love to be here to pay their respects to Max Abelman.

So, Max, may I say to you, on behalf of all of them, on behalf of myself, in the midst of the Hebrew New Year, may God give to the one you love the most, your wife, good health.

Judge Moss. The next speaker is the publisher of the Brooklyn Daily "History" because it seems no matter where you go, when you look back through the years as you did in this particular circle, you find always that past history is recorded in the Brooklyn Daily Eagle. That has been so from the beginning of the Eagle. It is more so today than ever before, under the guidance of its publisher, Frank D. Schroth, whom we now wish to hear from.

Mr. FRANK D. SCHROTH (publisher of the Brooklyn Daily Eagle). Mr. Chairman and Mr. Abelman: I would like to file a dissenting opinion to Justice Max Moss. He said "Max Abelman should now begin to serve without hope of substantial reward." In my opinion, for nearly 50 years he has been serving without hope of substantial reward.

You men have confined your remarks very largely to his activities in connection with the Jewish hospital, and with Jewish communal affairs. I take a little different point of view about Max Abelman. I know of nothing in Brooklyn that is worthwhile where, if you went to Max Abelman, you would not get his support and help. He did not confine himself to Jewish communal affairs at all. He was useful in every aspect of community life in Brooklyn. In my history I have seen a great many men grow to importance and then dwindle away on the vine, but as he grows older he gets more ripe and mature, and is now at the peak of his success and ripeness.

We have no more welcome visitor in our shop than Max. We know that when he comes, he is speaking for something that is worthwhile. We know that when he comes in, he has no selfish purpose to serve. We are glad to see him. We hope he goes on for a great many years.

Judge Moss. With the permission of Mr. Justice McCrate, might we not make the dissenting opinion the majority opinion?

Judge MCCRATE. I'm for him, anyway.

Judge Moss. Here is a man whom everybody knows. I now call upon Dr. Frank Kingdon.

Dr. FRANK KINGDON. Every part of the world, as far as I know, has its own natural phenomena. If you go to South America you expect to see a volcano erupt. If you go to Japan you expect to see an earthquake to explode in your face. If you are in Florida, you are likely to run into a typhoon. All these places have these natural events which occur at regular intervals, and in New York those of us who are sensitive to the atmosphere know that every once in a while there is going to be an atmospheric spontaneous combustion, which will explode into a dinner for Max Abelman. This has happened so frequently and so regularly that it is not only a habit but a pleasure to be a part of it.

I have wandered into other parts of the country, and they said to me, "Why on earth does a man live in New York?" I say, "The reason is simple. If you go to live in New York you will come to a dinner for Max at least once a year." Then I go to Europe. "Why does anyone want to be an American?" I am asked. I say, "That is very simple. If you are an American you can go to a dinner for Max once a year." So the legend grows and grows.

I was delighted to hear about this group of people who sent so many telegrams and letters to Max. I think it is literally true that I have never heard so many tributes from so many diverse sources. In a very sense, he is a "catholic."

Mr. VICTOR RIDDER. We will take him in.

Dr. KINGDON. I know that. Let us not get into that argument, for there may be another story in the Brooklyn Eagle. But the point I want to make is that without any question one of the major factors in the development of not only Brooklyn's civic life, but in the development in the life of this metropolis, has been Max. I am delighted to be associated with him, and, with all his other friends in paying my tribute to this natural phenomenon.

Judge Moss. As one illustration of the natural phonomena, I merely need to say tonight that seven judges of the lower court here, besides the senior judge from the appellate division, are here, and I know of no dinner where anyone was able to get 8 judges together in 1 night to do honor to 1 man.

The next speaker is a man whose name has been used by Frank Kingdon, by the publisher of the Eagle, by the president of the city council, and that is Mr. Victor Ridder, a distinguished publisher. I think at this time it is meet to call upon him. Mr. Victor Ridder.

Mr. VICTOR F. RIDDER. I would like to thank Dr. Kingdon. I am glad to come here this evening, because Max Abelman and I were really engaged in a tough fight, a fight that wasn't easy. We ran into some very unusual situations, and I don't mind saying here that the most unusual situation was when I was trying to get the Archbishop of Boston to run a Jewish educational institution, and I nearly succeeded, and if it wasn't for Dr. Kingdon, I would have expected some applause from you.

I mention that to show that nothing is impossible with Max. I will say that he is a good fighter. We are proud of him. We have worked with him, and under him. We are happy. We can only say that I think that if Max could be half as happy as we wish he would be, he is going to be plenty happy.

I am over here because for many years I was on the State Board of Social Welfare. We had a lot of trouble with different hospitals, but there wasn't a more valued adviser in that whole organization, nobody we went to with more security, and we would call up Max and say, "How about this or that place, or this or that man?" When an official body like that gets to a point when they really rely on a man to set their judgment for them, it is a tribute to him.

I think that what makes me so happy is that I can come here with so many different men in different activities and find that we are all exactly brothers of Max Abelman. Thank you.

The Honorable A. DAVID BENJAMIN (city court justice). Judge, Max, and friends, the lower court doesn't often get such a rare opportunity. I welcome it. Those of us who are in the enviable position of having to expect nothing, to experience nothing but Scotch justice from this serene, kindly-looking, distinguished judge, and who get nothing else glory in the opportunity of talking back. I finally found the weakness in the armor of this distinguished jurist.

I should like to say this, purely by way of reflecting that which has already been said so beautifully and graciously by our two distinguished publishers, Victor Ridder and Mr. Schroth that one cannot appraise Max Abelman in terms of any particular enterprise.

I sat on the shores of a little lake in the Finger Lake region this summer, and suddenly great waves burst on the shore. It was an amazing scene, and I looked to see what occasioned this phenomenon. There it was. Just a little speed boat a mile out in the middle of the lake, which had set up a little ripple, which had gathered momentum until the time came when it caused the waters to break in waves upon the shore. And that is the way of Max Abelman, because he has done, in more than a third of a century of activity, things that appeared sometimes small and inconsequential, but which have gathered momentum through the years in an ever-accentuating and increasing tempo of public accomplishment.

I look back, for instance, to this little situation described by Abe Stark, and Victor Ridder, the fight for the licensing of the boys who graduated from Middlesex, and from the school in Newark, and in Chicago, and it was a fight for more than to save those thousands of lads for the medical profession.

It was a fight to do away with bigotry and prejudice in our system of medical education. When that fight came to the governor of this State, who made possible the relaxing of the rules so that these boys would ultimately become licensed, it brought to the attenion of the educational authorities the need for more greatly expanded schools of medicine, for new schools of medicine.

That fight had, as its aftermath, the great new School of Medicine, which is part of the New York University. It had, as its aftermath, the final accrediting of a great school in Chicago, and an increasing awareness and understanding of the need for establishing additional facilities for medical education.

In the same way, we look back 35 years or more ago to the time when Max was the director of the federation here in Brooklyn. It was a small federation in a way. We raised, I think, at most $800,000, but it wasn't the $800,000 that counted. It was the fact that here in Brooklyn, for the first time in America, there came into being the concept of groups, of organizations, working together within that framework which was common to all, the need to meet their budgetary requirements, and out of that came this entire concept of the federation and welfare funds, which has revolutionized fund-raising philanthropies throughout this country.

And so, when we speak of the accomplishments of Max Abelman, we must speak in terms of the catholicity of his achievement, because it is not one thing which he has done, but the impact of all which has made America a greater place in which to live, a finer place in which to live, for Jew and Gentile alike.

That is why we have come here tonight to do honor to him—men of distinction from the sciences, the educational world, the professions, and government—and their presence tonight, Max, is a memory, I think, that you will always cherish because it speaks far louder than words can ever tell the story of the love which has come to you because of the love which you have given mankind.

Judge Moss. One of those men of science whom Judge Benjamin referred to is in this room here tonight. He is an internationally known professor of chemistry in Princeton University, Professor Alyea.

Prof. H. ALYEA (Princeton University). I am happy to pay tribute to a great humanitarian. As you know, we, as professors, have many thousands of boys passing through our school, and we look at them wondering what they are going to be after they go out. You see those fresh, upturned faces, and you wonder whether they are going to do good in the world, or what is their fate. The contacts that I have had with Max Abelman again and again lead me to believe that if only the boys could learn to be as fine as he is, I would be very grateful.

I will tell you one thing that perhaps you don't know about Max Abelman. When he first began to take on responsibilities at the Jewish Hospital he began to feel that perhaps this was too much for him, and he came to the anesthetists and asked if he could have a bit of Twilight Sleep. "You?" they said. "Oh," they said, "you are mistaken. That is for women in labor." Max said, "I thought it might be good for men in management."

In our science, again and again, we think of lucky accidents that have meant so much to us: The discovery of penicillin, for example, that came to Fleming's prepared mind; the accidental discovery of the lacquers because an observant youngster noticed that they were painting over pictures with the New Skin lacquer, and eventually put it on an automobile; and the plastics that grew out of the fact that John Wesley Hyatt cut his finger and went to get New Skin, which was tipped over and solidified, and eventually led to cellulose and our first plastic.

Many of our discoveries have been lucky accidents as the result of a prepared mind. I think, and I say this with a great deal of humbleness and thankfulness for having had Max in my life, because I know that he has made many of us feel that the world was worth much more because of that experience, that the luckiest accident in Brooklyn was when Max Abelman came to it.

Judge Moss. I am sure everyone here tonight would like to say a few words about Max, but at the same time you are all anxious to hear from him, so I will call on only one more speaker and then we will have Max speak in his own defense. In calling on the speaker, talking about defense, I call upon Judge Schwartzwald, city court judge of the city court of New York.

The Honorable JACOB J. SCHWARTZWALD. Mr. Chairman, Max, and gentlemen, for almost 30 years I, and many thousands of men in this community have walked in many paths through philanthropy, communal activities, hospital work, and so forth. All of us in our rounds would meet the guest of honor, whether it was the Red Cross, United Hospital Fund, or Inter-Faith, or what have you, there would be Max.

I always felt that Max and I had something in common, in that regard, and tonight we have one other thing in common. We are both unemployed.

As city court judge sitting in the court on September 17, I resigned and today, as Judge Benjamin knows, I received my last check for part of 2 weeks. And so, Max, you and I can commiserate with one another in that regard.

Max could be unemployed as far as vocation is concerned, but Max will never be unemployed as far as his love of his fellow men is concerned. This outpouring tonight from these great men indicates to you, Max, the love and affection the community has for you.

Judge Moss. And now, I am sure we will all want to rise as a signal for Max to deliver that which we are very anxious to hear from him.

Christian and Jew United Behind Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of this week, Members of this body, Democrats and Republicans alike, from the State of Illinois, together with the senior and junior Senators from our State, the Honorable PAUL DOUGLAS and the Honorable EVERETT DIRKSEN, will break bread with representatives from the Jewish organizations of Illinois at a luncheon in the Speakers' room of the House restaurant. The Honorable THOMAS O'BRIEN and the Honorable SYDNEY YATES are the hosts to whom we of Illinois are indebted for this opportunity to meet with Rabbi Berman and the other distinguished visitors from Illinois and with them to discuss the problems of the State of Israel.

In advance of the visit to Washington of this delegatiton representative of Jewish thought in our State, has come

a letter from the Chicago chapter of the American Christian Palestine Committee. The chairman of this committee is Victor Obenhaus, the secretary, David Harris Cole, and members of the advisory board are James Luther Adams, Preston Bradley, States' Attorney John Gutknecht, John Harr, James Hoban, Leslie T. Pennington, J. Coert Rylaarsdam, and Albert N. Williams. I am extending my remarks to include the full text of a letter that merits the careful and thoughtful reading of my colleagues. The letter, which is addressed to all Members of the Congress from Illinois, follows:

It has come to our attention that on Thursday of this week a delegation of Illinois Jewish leaders will confer with you in Washington on certain problems in the Middle East. Many members of this delegation are personally known to us as dedicated leaders for all that is good in our State and Nation, and we are aware that matters of no small importance take them to Washington.

We have carefully studied the memorandum which they have addressed to you and find ourselves in strong basic agreement. We would have you know that in these expressed concerns the Jewish community does not stand alone. To many Christians, the regeneration of the Holy Land and the rebirth of Israel represent one of the great historic achievements of the modern era—a notable example of international cooperation, of Jewish creativity and self sacrifice, and of Christian conscience.

At least a half dozen of the leaders of our Chicago chapter have traveled extensively in the Arab countries and Israel in recent years. Several have spent as much as 2 years in the region. Others have made the Middle East an area of careful study.

Out of this background of experience comes the strong and mutual conviction that the Middle East desperately needs increased economic aid rather than military aid. More than this, the best interests of the United States, in our considered opinion, call for economic aid and not military aid in the Middle East.

We regard our policy of arming Arab nations as a serious mistake because it represents a threat to Israel, a disservice to the Arab peoples themselves, and an invitation to communism to breed on the increased area tensions that the arms will inevitably generate.

Our arms threaten Israel because we are arming nations that have repeatedly avowed their belligerence toward Israel, a friendly democratic nation which has continually sought peaceful means of solving area problems.

Our arms do not serve the Arab peoples because they face massive tasks of building themselves up economically and socially before it can ever be hoped that they can use arms effectively against Communist expansionism. Indeed, under present conditions, the tendency will be to use the arms internally, against each other, or against Israel.

In great preference to this dangerous path of arming belligerent states in a troubled and economically backward area, we strongly urge that the United States adopt a positive program of aiding the region's economy and guiding it toward peace. We feel that not only will this be in the best tradition of enlightened world leadership by the United States, but that it will present a far more formidable bulwark to Communist designs in the area.

As you know, the ACPC is concerned for all countries in the Middle East. Our many delegations who have visited the area have observed the pressing need for a greatly enlarged program of economic assistance aimed at self-help which will dissipate the tensions between the Arab States and Israel.

By lending American material and moral suport to such a program and by insisting on direct peace negotiations between the Arab countries and Israel, our Nation can insure the long-term friendship of the entire Middle East which, through our help, will become an increasingly significant addition to the cause of the free world.

VICTOR OBENHAUS,
Chairman.
DAVID HARRIS COLE,
Secretary.

Sarnoff Submits Program for Political Offensive Against World Communism To Win Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following memorandum presented to the White House on April 5, 1955, by Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America:

A firm and open decision to win the cold war, as the surest way to prevent a hot war, was urged upon our Government by Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America, in a memorandum presented to the White House on April 5, 1955, and made public on May 10, 1955.

Pointing out that the Kremlin's fixed goal is world dominion by means short of an all-out war—propaganda, fifth-column subversion, civil strife, terror, and treacherous diplomacy—General Sarnoff declared:

"Logically, we have no alternative but to acknowledge the reality of the cold war and proceed to turn Moscow's favorite weapons against world communism. Our political counterstrategy has to be as massive, as intensive, as flexible as the enemy's.

"The question, in truth, is no longer whether we should engage in the cold war. The Soviet drive is forcing us to take countermeasures in any case. The question, rather, is whether we should undertake it with a clear-headed determination to use all means deemed essential, by governments and by private groups, to win the contest."

General Sarnoff's memorandum, entitled "Program for a Political Offensive Against World Communism," grew out of his discussion of the subject with President Eisenhower in Washington on the morning of March 15, and announced at the time by James Hagerty, White House Press Secretary.

The same afternoon, at the President's request, General Sarnoff conferred with Nelson Rockefeller, Special Assistant to the President on psychological warfare, and officials from the United States Information Service and the Central Intelligence Agency. At the end of the meeting he undertook to submit his views on the subject and a suggested program of action.

The result was this memorandum, in which he emphasized that "we must go from defense to attack in meeting the political, ideological, subversive challenge. The problem," he said, "is one of attaining the requisite magnitude, financing, coordination, and continuity of action. The expanded offensive with non-military means must be imbued with a new awareness of the great goal and a robust will to reach it."

People everywhere, and especially behind the Iron Curtain, General Sarnoff recommended, should be told that "America has decided, irrevocably, to win the cold war; that its ultimate aim is, in concert with all peoples, to cancel out the destructive power of Soviet-based communism."

General Sarnoff declared that his proposals "should not be construed as a substitute for adequate military vitality," both in the newest weapons and balanced conventional forces.

"But short of a blunder that ignites the third world war which nobody wants," he added, "the immediate danger is the debilitating, costly, tense war of nerves that is part of the cold war. The primary threat today is political and psychological."

If we allow ourselves to be defeated in the cold struggle, he warned, "we will have bypassed a nuclear war—but at the price of our freedom and independence. We can freeze to death as well as burn to death."

Existing organization for fighting and winning the cold war must be "adjusted and strengthened in line with the expanded scale and intensity of operations," General Sarnoff said. He proposed a "Strategy Board for Political Defense, the cold war equivalent of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the military side," functioning "directly under the President, with Cabinet status for its head."

The conflict on the political front, he said "is not a preliminary bout but the decisive contest, in which the loser may not have a second chance. It must therefore be carried on with the same focused effort, the same resolute spirit, the same willingness to accept costs and casualties, that a hot war would involve."

The specific activities cited as examples in the memorandum would be carried out not only by official agencies but by private groups such as labor unions, veterans' organizations, churches, youth and women's groups. The Soviet-controlled countries, it showed, are extremely vulnerable to precisely the kind of psychological pressures the Communists are using against free nations.

In outlining a vastly enlarged propaganda effort, General Sarnoff drew attention to opportunities opened up by new technical developments in communications. For instance, "mobile big-screen television units in black and white and in color" would be effective in non-Communist regions where "their very novelty will guarantee large and attentive audiences."

"Vast regions in Asia and elsewhere, where illiteracy bars the written word and lack of radios bars the spoken word," General Sarnoff explained, "could thus be reached."

His plan also included mass distribution of "cheap and lightweight receivers tuned to pick up American signals." In addition, "a simple, hand-operated phonograph device costing no more than a loaf of bread" and "records made of cardboard and costing less than a bottle of Coca-Cola" could be made available by the million in critical areas.

"Propaganda, for maximum effect, must not be an end in itself—it is a preparation for action," the memorandum stated. "Words that are not backed up by deeds, that do not generate deeds, lose their impact."

The arena of action is the whole globe, General Sarnoff believes. We must aim, he said, "to achieve dramatic victories as swiftly as possible, as token of the changed state of affairs." He saw great possibilities for encouraging and guiding "passive resistance" by individuals, with a minimum of risk, in the Soviet Empire.

At the same time he took note of the fact that "pockets of guerrilla forces remain in Poland, Hungary, the Baltic States, China, Albania, and other areas." These "must be kept supplied with information, slogans, and new leadership where needed and prudent."

"We must seek out the weakest links in the Kremlin's chain of power," General Sarnoff declared. "The country adjudged ripe for a break away should receive concentrated study and planning. A successful uprising in Albania, for instance, would be a body blow to Soviet prestige and a fateful stimulus to resistance elsewhere."

Among the specific activities discussed in the memorandum were intensive collaboration with emigrees and escapees from Communist countries and special schools to train personnel for political psychological warfare.

Tuesday's Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to what I consider a very important article by Mr. Walter Lippmann, the distinguished authority on international affairs, which article appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Thursday, May 19, 1955. Mr. Lippmann has very ably expressed a line of thinking with which I fully agree, and I hope that my colleagues in the House will take time to give Mr. Lippmann's views very serious thought.

The article follows:

TUESDAY'S SHOW

Watching the performance which was put on at the White House on Tuesday evening, it was painfully evident that television plus professional stage management is not necessarily what it professes to be—a new and better way of informing the people, of letting them see and hear directly and at first hand what their officials are really like and what their officials are really thinking. These stage-managed shows with props made out of the White House furniture with live officials reciting or reading the script, are not a new and advanced form of journalism and true reporting. They are fiction and theater meant to give the illusion that they are true reporting.

This is by way of saying that the picture painted by Secretary Dulles of the great movement of things in the world today was true only as far as it went, which was not very far. He painted a picture of the Soviet Union receding because of the unity and strength of the Western nations. This dramatic and attractive picture leaves out one of the great and determining developments of our time—namely, the increasing tendency of the smaller, most vulnerable nations to pull away from the military orbits of both of the two great atomic powers. What Mr. Dulles talked about was at best only half the truth. The other half of the truth is that with their new policy the Soviets are riding a wave of the future with good prospects, if we do not look out, of attracting wide popular support in Europe and in Asia.

There was not even a hint of these developments in the Tuesday show, and that was, it seemed to me, disturbing. For if in the coming encounter with Moscow and Peiping our own public opinion is crystallized on the half-truth which was Mr. Dulles' theme, the administration will not have the kind of informed support in Congress and among the people which it will need to have.

We shall be underestimating the force of the new Soviet policy if we assume that it is merely a retreat made necessary by economic trouble at home and by failure of the old policy. The essentially new thing about the new policy is that it rests on a new appraisal of a worldwide tide of popular feeling, and that it is shrewdly designed to make the Soviet Union stand forth as the champion of what the peoples want.

We can, I think, understand better the inwardness of the new policy if we remind ourselves how in Asia the Soviet Union managed to identify its own interests with the popular demand for national independence and for the liquidation of foreign and native ruling oligarchies. If the new policy of neutrality and disengagement is given a free run, if it is merely denounced with stereotyped phrases, the Soviet Union will be in a position to monopolize and to exploit an enormous wave of popular feeling. This is the desire for escape from nuclear warfare, a longing comparable with the longing in the Asian peoples for freedom from the white man's rule.

It is wishful and, indeed, highly conceited thinking for us to tell ourselves that we are leading from strength and that our great adversaries are leading from weakness. For when every allowance has been made for the economic troubles in Russia and in China, the fact remains that in reaching out for the support of the masses of mankind who want to disengage themselves from nuclear warfare the Soviets are by way of acquiring new and very great popular strength.

A Tribute to Dr. Philip A. Traynor, Former Member of Congress and Distinguished Citizen of the State of Delaware, Upon the Occasion of the Celebration of His 81st Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I join with the members of the Santa Maria Council, Knights of Columbus, Wilmington, Del., in paying tribute to Dr. Philip A. Traynor, a former Member of this great body, on the occasion of his 81st birthday.

Dr. Traynor was born in Wilmington, May 31, 1874. As a youth he gained recognition as an athlete of considerable merit, and rode and trained horses for his father. He was graduated from the University of Pennsylvania with a degree in dental surgery, and has since been a very highly skilled and kindly dentist.

He is the oldest living and continuous member of St. Peter's Cathedral Parish from which he has never moved. He will long be remembered for his unselfish devotion to the poor and in his charity has administered to the dental needs of the schoolchildren of St. Peter's without charge for over 40 years.

He was a member of the Delaware State Militia for 3 years and served in the Spanish-American War.

In 1940 he was elected Representative at Large from Delaware to the 77th Congress. In 1942, seeking reelection, he was defeated. However, in 1944 he was reelected to the 79th Congress, but was again defeated in 1946 for the 80th Congress. Among his many achievements while serving the people of his State was his great effort in securing the passage of a bill for the construction of the Delaware River Bridge. He served on the Post Office and Post Roads Committee and introduced the bill for the first postal increase. During the housing shortage in Washington Dr. Traynor commuted daily from Wilmington and continued to do so in spite of a painful accident in which he suffered a broken shoulder.

Dr. Traynor is considered the father of Columbianism in Delaware, since he signed the Santa Maria charter on December 13, 1896, and thus formed the first council of the Knights of Columbus in Delaware. He is the lone surviving signer of the charter, and his interest in this organization has never faltered. Dr. Traynor is also a 50-year member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, and is still an active Democrat.

It has been my good fortune to have known Dr. Traynor for a number of years. He has been a good friend and loyal citizen of his State and Nation. As a lifelong and ardent Democrat, he has always given of his time and effort for the best interests of his party; however, he has never allowed his partisanship to becloud his good judgment in supporting legislation in the Congress of the United States that was for the best interests of all of the people. Dr. Traynor was well equipped to use his good judgment when questions of public welfare were to be decided. He has been one of the people, and his life is a living example of dedication to the welfare of his fellowmen.

Mayor David L. Lawrence Stresses Pittsburgh's Stake in Proposed Natural-Gas Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VERA BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the drive to exempt the producers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Government is based on a desire to raise the price of gas in the field higher and higher at the expense of the consumers of this fuel in my district and in other areas of the country.

Those of us who want to protect the consumers' interest in this matter oppose any legislation at this time. We believe that the Federal Power Commission should regulate the price of natural gas in the field as the Supreme Court said it should in the Phillips case.

Taking the lead in the consumers' fight against the proposed legislation to exempt the producers of natural gas

from Federal regulation is a committee of mayors of our larger cities. I am proud that Mayor David L. Lawrence, of pittsburgh, has been one of the organizers and founders of this committee of mayors and one of its most active members on behalf of the consumers in this fight. Yesterday, Mayor Lawrence testified before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the Fulbright bill, which is in many respects similar to the Harris bill now pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Mayor Lawrence opposes both bills.

He told how Pittsburgh has increased its gas requirements as a result of the remarkably successful smoke control program so that any increase in the price of natural gas will certainly affect our consumers in Pittsburgh and in the surrounding communities.

The text of the prepared statement presented by Mayor Lawrence before the Senate committee is as follows:

STATEMENT OF MAYOR DAVID L. LAWRENCE, SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, OPPOSING SENATE BILL NO. 1853, WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 1955

I am David L. Lawrence, mayor of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., and I appear here today in behalf of the citizens of Pittsburgh.

As this committee may know, I have joined with Mayor Joseph S. Clark, Jr., of Philadelphia, and Mayor Robert F. Wagner, Jr., of New York City, in a call upon other mayors of this Nation to form a special committee in opposition to the proposed legislation now being considered.

Today, I am speaking as the chief executive of one of America's major cities, the industrial capital of this Nation. Beyond the testimony which I shall present, I have filed with your committee a copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of Pittsburgh, in which that body, in unanimous action, has expressed its strenuous objections to this legislation.

Senate bill No. 1853, like the Harris bill in the House of Representatives, proposes to deprive the Federal Power Commission of jurisdiction over sales of gas at the wellhead by producers for transportation in interstate commerce.

Controversy over this subject has been waging for many years. There is little chance that anyone at this stage of the proceedings will add anything new to the many arguments which have already been advanced in respect to this legislation.

Therefore, I propose to describe briefly the city of Pittsburgh's use of natural gas, and to summarize the reasons for our opposition to the bill under discussion.

Pittsburgh has a population of approximately 700,000. It is the governmental, commercial, and cultural center for Allegheny County, which has a population of 1,500,000. Pittsburgh, as you know, is intensely industrial and Pittsburgh, as you also know, represents a large and important section of this country.

The city and its surrounding areas are served by three natural-gas companies—the Equitable, the Peoples, and the Manufacturers' Light & Heat Co. By far the greater part of the gas which these companies sell in Pittsburgh areas is purchased in the southwest.

In the instance of Manufacturers' Light & Heat Co., southwest gas accounts for 95 percent of all the gas sold.

Manufacturers' is a member of the Columbia Gas System, and the Peoples Natural Gas Co. of Pittsburgh is a member of the Consolidated Natural Gas System. These companies sell their gas to residential, commercial, and industrial users within the city. Their prices for such usage are subject to regulation by the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission.

These same firms purchase gas from pipeline companies, which transport the product from the producers' southwest fields to the distributing companies in the Pittsburgh area. Among the pipeline companies so engaged are Tennessee and Texas Eastern. Pipeline companies are subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission and these companies are dependent upon the producers in the southwest for their source of supply.

To free producers of regulation will be to create an obvious gap in the regulatory processes.

It will, in effect, destroy the regulatory processes over the distributing and pipeline companies, thereby placing the consumer at the mercy of the producers in the southwest.

The desire to be free of such regulation can only arise from selfish motive. Anyone subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission is still entitled to a fair return on his money invested, and to adequate compensation for expenses. The local distributing companies are under the jurisdiction of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission and the consumers and the companies, themselves, have come to accept such regulation as a necessary element in the economic life of the city. The companies have monopolies in the areas in which they sell. It is too much to expect that, if unregulated, their prices will not rise to a point where they will be unfair to the consuming public. The necessity for, and the justice of, such regulation has been recognized thousands of times in the courts of our country, from the Supreme Court of the United States down throughout all the lower courts in the Nation. To me it is obvious that the same principle applies to the matter which you are now considering.

The price of gas purchased by the three distributing companies in the Pittsburgh area from the pipelines has been increased at a startling rate in recent years. The distributing companies are now faced with the prospect of being priced out of their markets. If they lose a large part of their industrial load to competing fuels because of the everrising price of natural gas, the small consumer will be saddled with all the overhead that has been, up to now, carried by the large consumers. Therefore, the rise in gas prices is more dangerous to the ultimate consumer than just a rise in cost of gas purchased by the distributing companies. It may have far-reaching effects. I cannot believe, either, that regulation is going to damage the producers. I think in the long run it will have a salutary effect upon the whole industry.

One of the principal arguments advanced by the producers is that the price of gas at the wellhead represents only a small fraction of the price paid by the ultimate consumer.

I have three answers to this: First, as Commissioner Draper said in his dissent in the Panhandle case:

"The majority should be aware that the test of a proposed increase or decrease in rates is not the impact on the individual consumer. The test is, of course, whether the proposed rates are reasonable when measured against the company's cost of service, including a fair return which the company should have the opportunity to recover in its rates."

Second, Mr. J. French Robinson, president of Consolidated Natural Gas Co., testified beore the House committee that the field price represents 25.1 percent of the average rate which the company receives for all gas sold.

Third, in the Phillips case, Mr. Justice Minton, speaking for the majority, stated flatly that, if the price of gas at the wellhead is not regulated, this will mean a substantial increase in the price of gas to the ultimate consumer.

I am not at all impressed with the few pennies argument. It is obvious that even a few mills in the price of a product may have a substantial impact on the consuming public, and that pennies, or even mills, may quickly become millions of dollars when multiplied by the number of days in a year and again by the number of gas consumers in a given community.

We have heard it argued that competition will regulate field prices and will tend to increase reserves of natural gas. I cannot believe that the producers are going to relax their efforts to discover new sources of supply merely because they are subjected to regulation. I know of no instance where this has proved to be the case. On the contrary, it seems to me that public utilities have advanced as well, or better, under regulation than if unregulated.

More and more Pittsburghers each year are demanding gas for space heating, but the local companies are having difficulty keeping pace with this demand. Thus the small consumer has invested a large proportion of his capital in gas-burning equipment with the expectation that prices will be fair and stable, based on the cost principle. To scrap this principle at this time is to break faith with the large consumer interests in our national economy. This is a harsh thing to do and one which will have reverberations that will benefit no one.

We in Pittsburgh want the security of knowing that, if the price of gas becomes out of line, we can have a forum to which we may address our complaint. If the increase is justified, we will pay it. If it is not, we feel that we are entitled to address either the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission or the Federal Power Commission. We consider this a part of the American system.

In the hearings in the House some representatives of producer interests asserted that regulation amounts to confiscation of their properties. There is no validity to this argument. We no longer hear this assertion from public utilities, and yet they have as much cause to cry "confiscation" as do the producers. The principle of regulation of monopolies has been too well established in law to be seriously questioned at this time. It is our firm belief that regulation will result in a fair deal to all.

It is our position that no legislation is necessary on this subject. We have heard it argued that there is a great deal of confusion on the subject now. We cannot agree that this is the case. This is a smokescreen. The proponents of the legislation are merely attempting to create the illusion that there is confusion. I think the situation is remarkable for clarity. The Natural Gas Act reads, in part, as follows:

"It is declared that the business of transporting and selling gas for ultimate distribution to the public is affected with a public interest, and that Federal regulation in matters relating to the transportation of natural gas and the sale thereof in interstate and foreign commerce is necessary in the public interest."

In the Phillips case it was admitted that sales by the producers for transportation to consumers in other States is actually transportation in interstate commerce. Thus, as the situation now stands, the Federal Power Commission does possess jurisdiction over the price of gas at the wellhead. We think the matter should be left there. There will be problems in the administration of the cases that will come before the Commission, but these are normal. There are always problems in administering justice. We are not in favor of unduly burdening the small consumer (or the large consumer, either, for that matter) with any unnecessary redtape. We are in favor of eliminating, so far as pos-

sible, the admitted annoyances which do accompany regulation. These, however, are trivial when compared with the great principle now before the Congress of the United States which, reduced to simple terms, is whether a relatively small group of citizens shall be given carte blanche as to the prices they shall charge the rest of the Nation for natural gas.

I wish to thank the Senate committee for affording to me the opportunity of presenting here the views of the city of Pittsburgh.

Stone Mountain Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding scenic attractions in the Southeast is the great block of granite known as Stone Mountain, in DeKalb County, Ga., near Atlanta.

Some years ago carving was begun of a huge memorial on the base of Stone Mountain, which still remains uncompleted.

Visitors from every section of the United States and from other sections of the world go each year to view this famous mountain. The carving should be completed, and the Junior Chamber of Commerce of DeKalb County is actively promoting the development of Stone Mountain and the completion of the carving upon its face. At a meeting of the State junior chamber of commerce held at Americus, a resolution was adopted on February 12, 1955, urging the completion of this memorial. Mr. Arthur Withers, Jr., is State chairman of the committee which is actively working toward the completion of this project. I am confident that he and the State committee of which he is chairman will continue to work vigorously and energetically for the achievement of the goal set by the State organization, and I feel that it will not be long until this magnificent carving will be completed and available to be viewed by the hundreds of thousands of persons who in the past have expressed an interest in this great project.

I insert herewith the resolution above mentioned which was adopted by the Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce:

Whereas the DeKalb County Jaycees are actively promoting the development of Stone Mountain and have adopted Stone Mountain as the symbol of the club; and

Whereas Stone Mountain, the eighth natural wonder of the world, is Georgia's greatest natural tourist attraction; and

Whereas Stone Mountain is rich in history and is world famous; and

Whereas the unfinished Confederate memorial on Stone Mountain could be a great and enduring monument to the Confederacy and our glorious heritage of valor, chivalry, and honor; and

Whereas Stone Mountain is now visited by many thousands of tourists a year in its present undeveloped state and this number could be greatly multiplied: Be it now therefore

Resolved, That the Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce sitting in regular session at Americus, Ga., this 12th day of February 1955, go on record as urging the State of Georgia to purchase Stone Mountain immediately and to develop the proper park, lake, and picnic facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the State to complete the memorial to the Confederate States of America and to the honor, glory, and memory of our fathers who fought in that cause; and be it further

Resolved, That the State president appoint a committee to actively work for the goals stated in this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the governor, the lieutenant-governor, the speaker of the house, the chairman of the Stone Mountain Park Authority, and the newspapers, radio, and television stations.

A Giveaway of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL CHUDOFF
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works and Resources of the Committee on Government Operations, I want to take this opportunity of giving every Member of the House the chance to read an excellent and fair editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on Monday, May 16. Public power is essential and important to the entire Nation, and no House Member should fail to read this editorial:

A GIVEAWAY OF POWER

A shocking account of private power companies manipulating the Department of Interior's public-power policies has been given to the House Government Operations Committee. The source of the account is a regional officer of Interior, James D. Geisinger, former special assistant solicitor of the Department.

There can be no question of the right of the Eisenhower administration to prefer electric power to be produced and distributed by private companies rather than by public agencies. And despite disclaimers by Mr. Eisenhower in his campaign 3 years ago, and occasional concessions to public-power opinion throughout the country since his election, that has been the prevailing policy.

What is shocking is not Interior's new philosophy, therefore, but the eager servility with which the Department has made itself the tool of the private power industry, and its dereliction of its plain duty to consult REA and other public agencies that would be drastically—perhaps dangerously—affected.

Mr. Geisinger told the committee the Interior Department invited private power companies to suggest changes they would like to have made in the Department's power regulations. The companies' Washington lobby responded. Four months later 10 of the 13 suggested changes were ordered by the Department. They were verbatim as suggested by the private power lobby. They had been made without consultation by the Interior Department with the Rural Electrification Administration or other low-cost power agencies which they affected. And the new regulations were issued without publicity and became known only through the investigations.

One of the ten changes stands to require the Federal Government to build powerlines duplicating private-company lines, with purchasers of the electricity bearing the cost in higher rates. Formerly, when a private power company wanted rights-of-way to build a transmission line across public lands, the Government required an element of reciprocity. The company must agree to transmit Government power over any unused capacity of the line at cost.

That regulation has now been abandoned, with not even an attempt at public justification. It was scrapped at the behest of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., according to Walton Seymour, who directed Interior's Division of Power in the Truman administration.

The House Government Investigating Committee is performing an invaluable public service by disclosing these backstage manipulations of national policy and the hidden alliance of lobbyists and officials which perform them.

A Call for Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK IKARD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, shortly the House will be considering legislation to limit the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. One of the best newspaper comments I have read on this important question is an editorial entitled "A Call for Statesmanship," which appeared in the Bridgeport (Tex.) Index under date of Friday, May 13, 1955. This fine editorial is as follows:

A CALL FOR STATESMANSHIP

There are more than 24 million natural-gas consumers in the United States. There are thousands of industries which use natural gas either as a fuel or as the source of ingredients for the products they make. For these millions of home users and thousands of industries, it is essential that we find and produce the gas they need.

It is also vital that we find and produce this gas from the standpoint of national defense.

With the national well-being at stake, it is important that the public understand the danger of any action which could deprive us of assured supplies of natural gas. That danger exists, clearly and strongly, in Federal control of natural-gas production.

Those who advocate Federal control of production say it is necessary to protect the consumer. Actually, on a national basis, 90 percent of the cost of natural gas to the consumer represents the expense of delivering it from the source of supply to the burner tip; a service already regulated by various governmental agencies, Federal, State, and local.

Nobody has objected to this control of 90 percent of the natural-gas business. It is accepted that regulation of rates is necessary where any monopoly exists in providing public service, whether it be natural gas, power and light, street railway, or telephone and telegraph. No such monopoly exists in natural-gas production. It is one of the most highly competitive industries in the Nation today, and the price of its product should continue to be determined by this competition—not by rigid Government control.

If it is logical to apply Federal price controls to natural-gas production, it would be

equally logical for the Federal Government to fix the prices of iron, zinc, lead, copper, corn, or any other product. Thus applied, it would be destructive of the right of the States and the individual. It would amount, in final effect, to nationalization, to confiscation of property.

These are ultimate dangers. The immediate danger in the case of natural gas is that Federal control will discourage the search for and the production of a vital source of energy, and in time leave us without supplies adequate to meet the public demand and to serve the needs of national defense. Natural-gas production is risky business, and who will take that risk if, when a successful well is drilled, its operation may be subjected to changing and capricious restrictions of a Federal board?

It is so hoped that the Congress of the United States will act promptly and positively to reverse this un-American trend and so return natural-gas production to private enterprise, under State conservation regulations. The Nation's future supply of an essential source of heat and energy will in that way be assured for many years to come, the needs of national defense will be met, and both the national economy and the natural-gas consumer will be better served.

International Educational Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from President Kenneth Holland, of the Institute of International Education, Inc., which is self-explanatory.

I certainly share the sentiments of the author of this letter in hoping that the reduction in the appropriation for the State Department international educational exchange program will be restored by the Senate.

The letter follows:

INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION, INC.,
New York, N. Y., May 16, 1955.

The Honorable THOMAS M. PELLY,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PELLY: I have read with great interest the April 14 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with your encouraging remarks concerning the international educational exchange appropriation. Most thoughtful citizens will, I believe, be deeply concerned by the reduction of $10 million in the sum recommended by the President and the Bureau of the Budget for international educational exchange activities.

I regret that the House committee report refers to an Institute of International Education publication and concludes that, of the 34,000 foreign students now attending institutions of higher education in the United States only a relatively small percentage, 2,656, received financial assistance from the State Department's program. In accepting this ratio at face value one may easily overlook two important facts. First: government-supported students, unlike those who come on their own, are selected with great care in their home countries by binational committees on the basis of the technological and social needs of their countries, and are carefully placed in the United States colleges and universities which best meet their needs. Second: other foreign students are usually supported by their families and consequently represent an economically selected group. Our Government's share in the program is, therefore, an investment in human resources and democracy which we can ill afford to abandon.

Private organizations and foundations are, of course, doing a great deal in the exchange field. It is, however, impossible for them to carry the programs on a scale which meets our national needs.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will consider restoring the cut and that in the House-Senate conference an effective program may be assured.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH HOLLAND,
President.

Vigilance—and the Price of Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VERA BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the effort to prove that natural gas rates in the field should not be under Federal regulation merely because these prices have not yet risen to exorbitant and unconscionable levels was well-answered yesterday by Pittsburgh's mayor, the Honorable David L. Lawrence, in testimony yesterday before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mayor Lawrence was asked if it was not true that Pittsburgh's natural gas rates are among the lowest in the country. His reply, according to Miss Ingrid Jewell, of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, was that it was the result of vigilance on the part of city officials, who have fought price increases before the FPC and the State utility commission whenever they were out of line.

It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that the present city administration of Pittsburgh has been in the forefront of the battle over the years, both in Congress and in the Federal and State regulatory agencies, as well as in the courts, to hold down utility rates generally to a fair and reasonable level, and particularly natural gas rates. Mayor Lawrence and his aides deserve great credit for this vigilance. Now, in fighting this move to exempt the producers they are again exercising vigilance for the consumer.

Miss Ingrid Jewell's news story on Mayor Lawrence's appearance yesterday before the Senate committee follows:

MAYOR HITS AMENDMENT OF GAS ACT—LAWRENCE JOINS OTHERS IN OPPOSING CHANGE BY CONGRESS

(By Ingrid Jewell)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—Pittsburgh's Mayor David L. Lawrence today joined the mayors of other large natural-gas-consuming cities in opposing amendment of the Natural Gas Act before Congress.

Both Commerce Committees are considering legislation which would forbid the Federal Power Commission to fix the rates at which natural gas is sold at the wellhead by its producers to interstate pipeline companies.

WARNS OF GAP

"To free producers of regulation would be to create an obvious gap in the regulatory processes," the mayor told the Senate Commerce Committee.

"It will, in effect, destroy the regulatory process over the distributing and pipeline companies, thereby placing the consumer at the producers of the southwest.

"The desire to be free of such regulations can only arise from selfish motives. Anyone subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission is still entitled to a fair return on his money invested, and to adequate compensation for expenses. * * *

"The price of gas purchased by the three distributing companies in the Pittsburgh area from the pipelines has been increased at a startling rate in recent years. The distributing companies are now faced with the prospect of being priced out of their markets.

"If they lose a large part of their industrial load to competing fuels because of the ever rising price of natural gas, the small consumer will be saddled with all the overhead that has been, up to now, carried by the large consumers.

"So the rise in gas prices is more dangerous to the ultimate consumer than just a rise in cost of gas purchased by the distributing companies."

CHAINED TO GAS AS FUEL

The mayor added that Pittsburghers have a tremendous investment in gas-using equipment, and are therefore almost chained to gas as a fuel no matter what the price may become.

Senator PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, a committee member who supports the proposed amendment of the act, reminded Mayor Lawrence that Pittsburgh's gas rate * * * about 69.3 cents per thousand cubic feet * * * is one of the lowest among large cities. He suggested that this was the result of free competition in the industry.

Mayor Lawrence countered that it was the result of vigilance on the part of city officials, who have fought price increases before the FPC and the State utility commission whenever they were out of line.

Proposed Exemption of Nontransporting Producers of Natural Gas From Reasonable Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record a most penetrating and timely editorial, entitled "The 'Big Switch' in Gas Controls," printed in the Denver Post on May 16, 1955, which effectively points out how the recently proposed alleged compromises in the natural-gas legislation would leave the Nation's gas consumers without any adequate protections, and which otherwise answers the various arguments of the nontransporting producers of natural gas for exemption from reasonable regulation. This is one of the most comprehensive and able, brief analyses I have

seen of the natural-gas issues before Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE "BIG SWITCH" IN GAS CONTROLS

Natural gas producers who hope to win immunity from Federal regulation in the present Congress have suddenly switched their signals.

They are now saying they might accept a compromise which, they claim, would provide consumers with protection from price gouging without bringing the producers under full-scale regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

This change is attitude may mean that the gas industry has found public opposition to such schemes as the Harris bill is stronger than they expected. The industry has been spending $1,500,000 in a propaganda campaign to sell consumers and Congress on the idea that a repeal of regulation—which would mean higher gas prices—would be a fine thing for everyone.

It may have believed the outpouring of propaganda would silence effective opposition to the Harris bill so it could go through Congress just as the Kerr bill did a few years ago.

But there are more gas consumers today than there were when the Kerr bill was passed. Also most of those gas consumers have been nicked for one or more gas rate increases in recent months so they have become increasingly price conscious.

In Denver, for example, the average house heating customer now pays about 20 percent more for gas than he did before the Republicans took over the FPC. How much higher gas prices will go in the near future if the Harris bill should be adopted is anyone's guess.

Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, an economist and expert on the gas industry, estimates independent gas producers will put the squeeze on consumers for another $200 million to $400 million a year if they are freed from regulation. Obviously the producers are playing for high stakes.

The compromise now being promoted in Congress would give an appearance of regulation without actually providing effective regulation.

Independent gas producers are those who drill, own, and operate gas wells. They sell gas to interstate pipeline companies which transport it to cities from coast to coast where it is sold to local distributing companies which, in turn, sell it to consumers.

For years, the FPC did not regulate the independent producers although it did regulate pipeline companies by permitting them to earn no more than a fair return on their investments.

About a year ago, however, the United States Supreme Court in a case involving Phillips Petroleum Co., one of the larger independents, ruled that it was the duty of the FPC to regulate producers as well as pipelines.

Since then, FPC regulation of producers has been pretty much of a farce. Standard methods of regulation have not been applied to the producers and other suits are now pending in an attempt to require the FPC to do an adequate job.

The Harris bill was introduced in Congress to get around the Phillips decision and remove restraints on the prices charged by producers for gas—prices which have risen from an average of 4 cents per thousand cubic feet a few years ago, to 12, 15, and even 18 cents per thousand cubic feet today.

Sales contracts made by producers with pipelines have contributed to these rising prices. It is not uncommon for the contracts to contain escalator gimmicks.

Some provide for an automatic increase in price every few years. Others have provisions that the contract price shall go up whenever any other producer in the same field gets a higher price for his gas than original contracting producer has been getting.

Escalator clauses, of course, have added to the price of gas but the principal cause of the increase has been the tremendous increase in the demand for gas which has resulted from the extension of pipelines into every part of the country.

The congressional compromisers say they are willing to have the FPC give some protection from escalator clauses but otherwise they want producers and pipelines to have almost a free hand to negotiate for any price that might suit them.

The theory that a pipeline company will always want to get gas as cheap as possible and thus will drive a hard bargain is somewhat mythical. Experience has shown that pipeline companies don't worry much about the price they have to pay for gas. The price of gas is passed on by the pipeline to the distributor and by the distributor to the consumer.

Higher prices for gas do not mean any reduction in pipeline profits. The pipeline is guaranteed a fair return on its investment, no matter what it pays the producer. Normally pipelines are more concerned with getting additional gas than they are with buying gas at lowest possible prices.

The compromises being talked in Washington would remove independent producers from FPC regulation, except: (a) any new contract between a pipeline and producer would be subject to scrutiny by the FPC to determine if it were fair, and (b) certain escalator clauses would be banned—but not escalator clauses calling for higher prices on specified future dates.

Consumers should not be deluded that such provisions would give them any real protection. The present FPC has shown it is willing to consider almost any going price for gas as fair, without any regard for the amount of the producer's investment or the size of his profit.

There is no hope that the type of scrutiny contemplated in the compromises would prevent profiteering. And regulation would be a joke if escalator clauses became legal and unassailable merely because they contained specific dates when specific price increases were to go into effect.

Jerome K. Kuykendall, Chairman of the FPC, has testified in favor of the compromise legislation which would leave his Commission with inadequate authority to prevent gouging. If he and the majority of the FPC are not in sympathy with the purpose of the gas act, which they have sworn to enforce, they should resign.

Gas producers argue that the price they get for gas represents only 10 percent of the price to the consumer and that 90 percent of what the consumer pays goes for transportation and distribution of gas. Therefore, they say, regulation of producers is unimportant.

That may have been true at one time but the producers' share of the consumer's dollar has been increasing rapidly. In Denver approximately 20 percent of the average gas bill represents the price of gas at the gas field in Texas or Kansas.

If field prices for gas continue to mount because of inadequate regulation, the percentage may be 30 percent or more before long. Consumers whose bills have gone up because of higher prices to producers won't be impressed by the 10-percent argument.

Producers also are telling Congress—and the country—that exploring for gas is so risky a business, that drilling will be discouraged if profits are held down because of regulation. This sounds like the argument the oil industry used in Colorado to fight the severance tax which, it was claimed, would discourage wildcatting.

Actually, drilling activity increased after the passage of the tax law.

When the oil and gas industries (which really are one industry) talk about needing incentives because of the risks they undertake, we sometimes wonder how many incentives they believe they should have.

Under recognized methods of regulation, a gas producer drilling a dry hole would be allowed to charge off the cost of that drilling job to business expense and the price he would be allowed would take his expenses into account. In other words, gas consumers would pay for the dry hole and the producer would be taking less risk than he would without regulation.

Also, oil and gas producers receive a special 27½ percent tax-free allowance on their net incomes that most businesses do not receive. The special tax treatment was passed on the theory it would take care of the special risks involved.

It seems to us that incentives already provided producers should be sufficient without also granting them regulation-free status. Producers are part of a public utility industry which does a monopolistic business with 20 million American homes. As such they should not expect to escape regulation.

World Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the late John T. Jones, director of Labor's Non-Partisan League, United Mine Workers of America, was a lifelong foe of communism. His intense love of America and all it stands for made his hatred of communism more active.

His pastor, the Reverend Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, had asked John T. Jones to speak from the pulpit of Washington's Foundry Methodist Church on world communism. Unfortunately for America, the United Mine Workers of America, and laboring men and women throughout the world, John T. Jones died on March 3, 1955.

On Sunday, May 8, 1955, at a memorial service for Mr. Jones at Washington's Foundry Methodist Church, where for many years he had been an active member, Dr. Harris read to the congregation the paper which Mr. Jones had planned to deliver on World Communism.

Because I believe everyone, everywhere, should read the important message, I am inserting in the RECORD the entire paper as written by Mr. Jones:

The greatest weapon of communism today is the confusion existing in the free world.

I'll venture to say that if I passed slips of paper among those of you here tonight and asked each of you to write down his own definition of communism, I'd get as many variations as there were slips of paper.

But perhaps, right at this point, I had better put in two solid reasons why I presume to attempt an exposition of communism to such a group as this—a group in which the predominance, numerically at least, is of American birth, and from the strata of society that Communists place in the hated categories of the bourgeoisie, the capitalists, the nationalists.

I am, by birth and occupation, from the general classification which the Communists claim as their greatest potential field for recruitment. I know—first-hand—how they attack. I am foreign born—from Wales. Here in America the Communists first directed their efforts toward the insidious undermining of the loyalty of the foreign born and attempted to organize them by encouraging an "apartheid" program—a withdrawing into groups.

It so happens that the Communists have never had much success in inducing the men of Wales to embrace the Godless atheism of their creed that proclaimed that religion is the opiate of the people. Maybe we Welsh are a stubborn people. Maybe, too, we—trained for centuries to look for the pay-bearing lode in the earth—adapt the same critical faculties in evaluating the words of outlanders.

Be that as it may, ever since I first came to this country as a young man, such thoughts as I have had on ideolcgies and politics have been thoughts in keeping with the men of Wales—belief in God, belief in freedom, belief in the dignity of the common man, belief in the sanctity of the pledged world.

Perhaps I have one advantage over native-born Americans. I am one of those who chose to be an American, who desired to be a citizen of the United States, who believed sincerely in the Constitution of the United States, in the Bill of Rights, and in the American way of life—and who cherishes all the freedoms that those beliefs imply.

Because of that, I am even more jealously alert to recognize the aims of world communism than are those who have taken for granted the premise that no foreign ideology aimed at the overthrow of our form of government could possibly attain success.

I am, and have been all during my life in these United States, a member of the United Mine Workers of America.

Throughout the world the leaders of communism have sought to attack capitalism by organizing the workers and the peasants for its overthrow. It is with great pride, therefore, that I point to the documented record that it was the United Mine Workers who, more than 30 years ago, first presented to the members of organized labor in the United States, the fact that communism was aimed at the very roots of the freedoms so basic in America.

I have in my possession a document that is very dear to me—and to every member of the United Mine Workers of America. It is Senate Document No. 14 of the 1st session of the 68th Congress. It bears the date of January 3, 1924. It was presented to the Senate by the first Senator Lodge, ordered to be printed, and released through the Government Printing Office. On the title page it is described: "Attempt by Communists To Seize the American Labor Movement." And then that title page type continues: "Prepared by the United Mine Workers of America and published in newspapers of the United States."

The document put into the official record a series of six articles in which were described in detail the plan of Moscow's international Communist control group to infiltrate the ranks of American labor unions, incite revolution, and eventually overthrow our Government by force. The data which went into the document came from more than 2 years of investigation by the United Mine Workers, and the acquired knowledge of the real purpose of communism in America.

Today American labor is unswervingly loyal to America, and I firmly believe that the anti-Communist position of the United Mine Workers is a basic reason for the stand of labor against the Communists today.

No Communist may be a member of the United Mine Workers; and that rule has been duplicated in a vast majority of the unions, some of whom have had to learn the hard way the importance of that edict of the miners:

But, to go back to what I said in the beginning, the greatest weapon of communism in our country today is confusion.

That confusion is carefully generated by the handful of Godless men who direct world communism from their guarded security behind the walls of the Kremlin.

In this war-weary world there is no more ardent desire on the part of all men and all women than the desire for peace. No nation in the world, from 1812 to 1917, enjoyed more years of peace than our United States, with the possible exception of perpetually neutral Switzerland—permitted to have peace because her mountainous defenses made any effort to subdue Switzerland more costly than the strategic or economic advantage to be gained by her subjugation warranted.

No major power in the world has sought less in the way of territorial expansion imposed by use of arms, in the last 100 years, than our United States. On the other hand, no nation in the world has taken more land, more peoples, more raw material wealth, into its orbit in the last 100 years than has Soviet Russia, the seat of world communism.

These points must be remembered in any analysis of world communism and its objectives:

The ultimate target of world communism is the control of the world. From soap-box rabble-rousing prior to World War I, the world Communist movement today controls 900 million persons, or approximately a third of the population of the world.

World communism today controls the greatest land area ever under single domination in the history of mankind—and the vast wealth that lies beneath that land.

World communism's base of operations on the Eurasian Continent is an integrated land mass, stretching from the Baltic and the Black Seas eastward to the Pacific, from the Arctic Ocean south to the borders of Greece, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, India, Burma, what is left of Indochina, and half of Korea.

World communism's pattern in attaining this vast area of land, the people on that land, and the great wealth under it, has never varied.

Agents of world communism go into an area marked for absorption. They seize upon the problems of the least fortunate elements of the social scale in that area. They promote class hatreds, religious differences, and, if possible, foment these differences until the outcome is violence, riots, and even rebellion.

World communism looks far ahead. The move to sovietize China began in 1922—only 2 years after the Bolshevik revolution—financed by the German General Staff—overthrew the Menshevists who were in power after the downfall of the Czarist regime.

From 1920 to 1934 the Bolsheviks sought fruitlessly to win recognition from the United States. That recognition, won finally in 1934, opened the floodgates for Soviet propaganda through the channels of their diplomatic embassies and consulates, their trade missions, their establishment of cultural exchanges between Soviet Russia and the United States.

As Soviet efforts to gain a beachhead in the United States progressed, other groups of agents worked in Europe, in Africa, in South America.

Always the pattern was the same. Time and your patience does not permit a country-by-country exposition of just how the Communist program has been carried through.

To go on with the pattern, the Mau Mau rebellions and massacres of white people in Kenya, the race riots and similar violence in South Africa, the never-ending uprisings in North Africa, all can be traced to activities of Moscow-directed agents.

World communism's abysmal hypocrisy in shedding crocodile tears over the sufferings of the downtrodden bears small resemblance to the cynical ruthlessness of world communism in dealing with the same downtrodden—whose very lives may be callously written off if those lives interfere with a Communist plan.

There is no more typical instance of this than one sequence of history from Red China. Certainly no country in the world—not even India with her recurrent starvation, squalor and disease—has more downtrodden than exist in the half billion souls of Mao Tse-tung's expropriated empire.

Six months before the Communist half of Korea, backed by and goaded into action by Moscow and Peiping, rolled south over the 38th parallel in late June of 1950, a treaty of Sino-Soviet friendship was signed in Moscow. That was a publicly announced treaty. It guaranteed that Soviet Russia would come to the aid of Red China if attacked—and vice versa.

What wasn't published appears in the text of a secret Chinese-Soviet treaty recorded in part one of the hearings on the Strategy and Tactics of World Communism, before the Senate Internal Security Committee last May 27.

That secret treaty, according to the Senate committee hearings, was signed at Moscow on February 12, 1950, by Chou En-lai for China and by Andrei N. Vishinsky for the Soviet. The secret treaty consisted of 19 articles. Under its terms the Soviet offered $300 million in gold to aid Communist China, plus military equipment, technical instructors in handling the Russian weapons, and a vast quantity of machine tools to build up the Red Chinese industrial economy.

In return Red China guaranteed to build its military force to 4 million, to train them under Russian direction, and to accept command from the highest officials of the Soviet army; to permit Soviet technicians and troops to occupy a dozen or more Chinese cities, to give Soviet Russia preferential trade treatment; and to give the Soviet control power in allocating minerals.

But article 7 of the secret treaty contains this ghastly language:

"The population of the Chinese People's Republic must, owing to the existing lack of resources, be diminished by 10 percent, since otherwise they cannot be sustained. Its detailed procedures are to be determined by the Chinese People's Government themselves.

Picture it. The leadership of Red China and the Soviet, balancing the economic books of Red China's capability to support her population, and the volume of that population, calmly order 40 million to 50 million human beings diminished.

The Soviet magnanimously permitted Peiping to work out the method for the diminishing of Red China's population to fit in with Moscow's estimate of what population would make Red China a sound economic unit.

Some of that diminishing undoubtedly came during the Korean war a few months later. Our casualties in Korea over the period from June 25, 1950, to the cease-fire 3 years later, totaled 143,000.

The Red Chinese volunteers, poured into that Korean war, attacked in close packed masses, against rifle, machinegun, and artillery fire of terrific intensity from trained troops well dug in. Eyewitnesses reports and Signal Corps motion pictures taken in actual battle scenes show the screaming Chinese Reds being mowed down like wheat before a scythe. Aerial bombardment, liquid gasoline, mines—all the weapons of modern war rained down on the close-packed, fanatical attackers. Hard-boiled military men sick-

ened at the useless waste of human life in the Chinese method of attack.

Conservative estimates have placed total Red casualties in the 3 years of the Korean war at more than 1.4 million. That didn't diminish the Chinese population sufficiently to fulfill the Soviet formula for the proper population to make Red China a sound economic unit—but it was a start.

Since 1950, according to various other reports, more than 10 million Chinese have been sent to Siberia and other areas of small population under Soviet control to carry out Red communism's vast building expansion plans in Asia.

Such labor entails high death rates—but does serve to diminish excess population. The only trouble is that Peiping today reports the population of Red China has increased to 600 million—in spite of all the diminishing. Some of this gain is due to Red China's taking over of Tibet—but the sound economic unit idea seems to have gone off schedule.

In our own hemisphere, the recent Guatemalan upheaval is clearly in the minds of all of you. It is perhaps less known that the Guatemalan powder keg exploded only after the fuses of rebellion, lit in 1942, had smouldered for more than 14 years.

Mexico has been a hotbed of Communist intrigue for more than a decade. Cuba's revolutions have been inspired and agitated by Communist agents.

Brazil, although the Communist Party as such is outlawed, has an active Red underground that could create paralyzing disruption if there should be a third world war, requiring every ounce of our effort to prevent the accomplishment of world communism's objective of world rule.

It is well to remember that today Chile and Bolivia are in technical state of siege, that the Republic of Panama—flanking our strategic canal—has been the recent scene of the assassination of its pro-American president, that British Guiana found it necessary to use troops to put down open rebellion there.

These far-spaced outbreaks of radicalism throughout the world do not occur through any sporadic series of coincidences. They are planned.

The center of the worldwide spiderweb for the initial propaganda operations—propaganda to create sympathy for Communist activities—is in Moscow. It is known as VOKS—the initialled abbreviation for the All-Soviet Society for Cultural Relations Abroad.

The most powerful of the groups sponsored and financed by VOKS is the World Federation of Trade Unions. This group is now so well recognized as a completely Communist organization that it has no power in our own country, but it still does have vast power in other countries.

It might well have been a potent force in our own labor movement, but exposure wrecked that potentiality. In 1945, when the World Federation of Trade Unions was formed, the Congress of Industrial Organizations fell for it—and became a most active force in its organization.

In parenthesis let me say that this was after—some years after, in fact—the United Mine Workers withdrew its affiliation from the CIO. And thereby hangs a tale in itself, a tale which has never been completely told. Suffice it to say, that the United Mine Workers adheres to its prinicples.

But to go back to my story, the CIO invited the British Trades Union Congress, the French Confederation of Labor, the Soviet All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, to visit the United States. The Soviet group came first, visited American industrial cities, many of our greatest production plants, and, to quote the subsequent CIO, I had many opportunities to meet with CIO unionists and to establish closer ties of friendship and understanding between our two movements."

Neither the United Mine Workers of America, the Railroad Brotherhoods, nor the American Federation of Labor were so hoodwinked.

Subsequently the CIO's leading officials accepted an invitation to pay a return visit to the Soviet—and went. Eleven top ranking officials of the CIO made the trip. The chairman of the CIO delegation—and again I quote from the CIO's own report of the trip—wrote in the visitors' book at a Soviet trade exposition in Leningrad:

"To the heroic people of Leningrad: We hail your great feats that have surpassed anything in history. What you have accomplished to defend the freedom of the people of your land and the civilization of the world, will remain in the memory of the workers forever. On to victory together, with peace and prosperity." Signed, by the chairman for the CIO delegation.

Subsequently, as the all-Communist purpose, and the all-Communist domination of the WFTU became obvious, the CIO withdrew from the WFTU. And 5 years later, the CIO expelled several of its unions for too closely adhering to the Communist Party line. At least 4 of the 11 CIO leaders on that trip to Russia have since been identified in sworn testimony before congressional committees as Communist Party members or sympathizers.

WFTU IS AGENT OF WORLD COMMUNISM

Today the World Federation of Trade Unions is the recognized agent of world communism in the labor field outside of Soviet Russia itself. It maintains world headquarters in Vienna, and operates from there.

Other offshoots of VOKS are the World Peace Council, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the International Union of Students, the Women's International Democratic Federation, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, the International Resistance Rally, the World Federation of Scientific Workers, the World Peasant Youth Congress, the International Congress for Child Welfare, the International Organization of Journalists—and many more. It would take hours to outline the activities of each and every one of them in the countries in which they have operated in the past, and in which they are operating today.

But the very titles of the organizations show the scope of the world Communist program of infiltration, indoctrination, and undermining of the governments of the free world. In the brief time limits tonight, however, I would like to summarize some of the activities of the more important of these groups.

The Women's International Democratic Federation, at its conference in Copenhagen in July 1953, drew "observers" from organizations such as the International Cooperative Women's Guild, the Women's League for Peace and Freedom, and the Young Women's Christian Association.

The next major event scheduled for this Women's International Democratic Federation will be in Vienna, in April of this year. It is to be an "International Congress for Child Welfare." Certainly such a title will draw sympathetic reactions from Christian men and women everywhere.

The insidious factor is that delegates and observers, thinking in terms of human welfare, do not read the fine print in resolutions passed at such organization meetings—resolutions with hidden meanings, resolutions which make these people naively willing to listen when approached in their own countries by promoters of groups with fine-sounding names—groups which later turn out to be new fronts for world communism.

The World Congress of Doctors had its genesis in the second meeting of the World Peace Council, held in Berlin in February 1951, when French and Italian doctors were organized to "struggle against this pernicious influence of war preparations and protect the health of the popular masses." From that developed a World Congress of Doctors To Study Present Day Living Conditions.

The World Peace Council went further with the doctors. It sponsored the International Union of Doctors for Peace, the Union des Medicins pour la Paix, the Medical Association for the Prevention of War, the Doctors' Peace League, the Doctors' Anti-Warfare League, and others.

The World Peace Council promoted congresses and conferences under such titles as the "International Economic Conference," "In Defense of Children," "Defense of the Rights of Youth," "Science for Peace," "Artists for Peace," "Authors' World Peace Appeal," "International Congress in Defense of Children," the "Writers and Artists Congress of 20 American Countries," the "Peace Conference of Asian and Pacific Regions," and others.

Professor Joliet-Curie, of France, amply identified as pro-Communist in thought and action, is the president of this World Peace Council. A World Peace Council is to be held in Europe early in the spring of 1955. Its preliminary planning calls for an agenda denouncing the European defense program, colonialism, American warmongering, and imperialism, and other key points of the program of the Western World to halt the creeping encroachments of world communism throughout the world.

Perhaps one of the least publicized, and yet one of the most dangerous organizations to the free world is the World Federation of Scientific Workers. That organization was responsible, more than any other, for siphoning data on the atomic, and later on the hydrogen bomb from laboratories in the Unted States, Great Britain, and other countries—for the world Communists. Munn-May from Canada, Pontecorvo from Italy, McLean and Burgess from England, Klaus Fuchs and a dozen other German scientists—the roster of shame carries these and many other names that have taken our inner secrets of free world defense to the Soviet.

Yet, today, Moscow and the satellites load the airwaves with their blather of the peaceful aims of Red Russia, Red China, the Red satellites—all dedicated to forceful and bloody imposition of the world dictatorship of communism on the freedoms of the non-Communist world.

Our United States, the Nation which freed Cuba and the Philippines and bore the brunt of the Korean war; our United States, which twice poured blood and treasure into World War I and World War II to halt the power-mad Kaiser and the maniacal Hitler; our United States, which preserved freedom in the Western Hemisphere under the Monroe Doctrine; our United States, which has no colonies and covets none; our United States is pictured by the Soviets as imperialistic, warmongering, and seeking to dominate the world.

This Kremlin coterie, which, in a space of 34 years, has forced Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and Albania into the Red orbit; this world Communist directorship, which backed Red China in the seizure of half of Korea, northern Vietnam, Tibet, and which even now is reaching out for Indonesia, Burma, and South Korea, would prefer not to step the present cold war up to a shooting war—at least, not yet.

DESPERATE DRIVE FOR GROWTH THROUGH TRADE

The current corollary to its hypocritical peace campaign is a desperate drive for economic Communist growth through trade. Communist Russia seeks to lure the free-

world nations of Europe and Asia into trade with her direct, or indirectly through China, Tibet, North Korea, North Vietnam, and the European satellites.

It is no trade secret that were the free world to impose economic sanctions on the Communist world, the Communist world would die of economic malnutrition. There are no products of the Soviet and her satellites but what can be produced in the free world. But without products from the free world, the Communist world cannot bring its 900 million people out of their barbaric inefficiency.

Our allies of the Western World are badly confused. They fail to see that building up the economic strength of the Communist world through trade is furnishing the Communist world with the sinews of military power with which to overrun the free world when the Red world considers Red power unstoppable.

I would ask:

"How can any Christian, or any Christian nation, traffic with a nation or group of nations under leadership which calls all religion the 'opiate of the people'?

"How can the free world be so blind as to consider peace or coexistence with a nation or group of nations which builds the greatest destructive forces in the world while prating about disarmament?

"How dare we, who believe in religion, in the Constitution, and in the Bill of Rights, fail to challenge the movements and the people who condone programs which would destroy us?"

I urge:

"Look deeper than the label on the package. Don't sign petitions labeled 'mother love' in big type at the top without reading the small type to find out if the headline tells the story.

"Don't contribute to a cause, or to a group, no matter how fine the avowed purpose may be, without knowing who directs its activities, his or their backgrounds and associations, and in what manner he or they operate. It is well in supporting fund-soliciting groups to follow the Better Business Bureau's advice—'Before you invest, investigate.'"

I would say:

"Overcome confusion with knowledge. Know the objectives of the world Communist enemy. Become familiar with the pattern of his methods. Budget half an hour of your daily time to gaining knowledge about the enemy within our gates. Learn to recognize the silhouette of Communist ideology as well as the photographs of Bulganin or Molotov or Mao Tse-tung.

"Become competent to challenge a purveyor of the Communist line with the fallacy of his presentation. Show him how we have, in our form of government, the power to amend and correct any abuses, to strengthen and protect our people with their consent and at their wish.

"And, at least once a year, read through the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights. Let them be a guide as to what will be forever lost if the entire world falls under Communist dictatorship."

I said at the beginning that communism's greatest weapon is confusion of the free world. I think that one big element of that confusion lies in the misunderstanding of who will fight the war to halt communism.

I don't believe the tycoons of big business will do that fighting. There is too strong a tendency on their part to have open ears for the siren song of Communist world trade, written in the notes of billion-dollar contracts.

I'm not sure that the "advanced thinkers" in our colleges can distinguish between the glitter of Communist ideological promises and the gold of free thinking by freemen in a free world.

I am not even too sure that all men of religion are too clear about the relative values of humanity and equality, Moscow style, and the creed of mercy, compasssion, and salvation as taught by Jesus Christ.

But I am sure that the men and women in the field of labor will fight, because they know, from fighting Communist infiltration in this country for more than three decades, that Communist accession to power in any land invariably means an end to—

Human dignity for the individual.

Christian faith.

Incentive and hope.

And these things are the attainments for which the men and women of labor have striven through the centuries. They are the things for which the men and women of labor will fight to the death.

Insurance Against Blindness Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill in the House of Representatives which I have entitled the "Insurance Against Blindness Act." The measure seeks to amend title II of the Social Security Act to aid the blind.

Specifically, the bill provides that any individual working in an industry which is covered by old-age and survivors insurance would, upon the onset of blindness, be deemed fully insured and to have reached retirement age. Under these circumstances, a person losing his sight from any cause and in any way while employed in a so-called covered occupation shall be entitled to full benefits and eligible to receive monthly payments under the social security system from the time and blindness occurred.

I am informed that approximately 12,000 persons in the United States go blind each year due to various reasons and causes. This means that under my bill approximately that number of persons would start receiving "insurance against blindness" benefits in any one year. At the same time, it must be emphasized that these payments would not be in the nature of a grant; they would constitute an annuity which the individual bought and paid for, and which would be payable without any restrictions in the event the individual becomes blind. In other words, it would be an insurance proposition similar to that of the individual who is paying premiums toward a paid-up policy.

Under my bill, anyone who has four quarters or more of coverage under the Social Security Act and then becomes blind would be entitled to this insurance. The four quarters need not necessarily be of continuous service in 1 year, but may be acquired over a period of years. Where an individual ceases to be blind and becomes rehabilitated, no benefits shall be paid until he reaches the regular retirement age of 65.

A blinded person, particularly a newly blinded person, should be given every encouragement to become employed and to attempt to become self-sufficient. In order to lend such encouragement, the bill provides that the individual would not lose any benefits under the social-security system due to the earning capacity which he might develop in time.

Mr. Speaker, the proposals contained in my bill have been endorsed by the American Foundation for the Blind and also by the American Association of Workers for the Blind, an organization composed of individuals serving the blind. Miss Helen Keller is associated with the aforementioned foundation as counselor of the Bureau of National and International Relations.

Incidentally, I am sure of all my colleagues will be interested to learn that Miss Keller, who is one of the great pioneers in the world for the blind, will be 75 years old on June 27 of this year. She has just completed a long tour throughout the Orient and is known to the whole world as a "good will ambassador" for the cause of the blind.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no finer birthday greeting and gift to Miss Keller than the adoption of my bill to provide insurance against blindness for those who will be needing it in the years ahead. I urge you to take early and favorable action on this measure.

Zinc, Lead, and Logic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David L. Hurwood:

President Eisenhower was obviously an unhappy man when he agreed last summer to raise the tariff on Swiss watches. He had manifested his support of liberal foreign-trade policy time and again; no one could doubt his sincerity. Only irrefutable considerations of national security could force him to take this action so much at variance with his personal convictions. People who had looked to him for foreign-trade leadership and who were pained at this concession to the high-tariff bloc nevertheless accepted the act as one dictated by overriding interests of national defense.

We were all fooled. A Defense Department report, suppressed for 11 months and just come to light, has exploded the whole case and refuted the protectionist argument point by point. Technical skills of workers in the jeweled-watch industry are not indispensable for national defense. Imports of Swiss watch movements were not undermining our military security. The tariff increase was not warranted.

The revelation of this shabby deception should engender suspicion of any protectionist plea that sounds the national-defense trumpet. The claim that a certain domestic industry is esseential to the Nation's defense wins attention where the old, shopworn, discredited cliches of protection would go unheeded. It will be plugged to the limit in the months ahead, and it will bear searching scrutiny every time it appears.

The argument is now being applied not only against imports of manufactured goods, but also against raw material imports. As the national debate over H. R. 1, the administration foreign-trade legislation, nears its climax, domestic mining interests are exerting pressure on the Senate to restrict imports of minerals and metals. Amendments are now pending before the Senate Finance Committee, and will no doubt be proposed on the Senate floor, that would cripple the entire trade program if adopted. Senator MALONE of Nevada has even gone so far as to propose that the President and Tariff Commission be stripped of all authority over tariff rates on strategic metals and minerals.

Among the minerals involved in the controversy are bauxite, copper, zinc and lead. Second in importance only to iron and steel, these metals are vital to our national security. While we were formerly self-sufficient in them our needs have risen so steeply that we now import most of our bauxite, two-fifths of our copper and up to half of our zinc and lead.

Some of our zinc and lead mine operators are unhappy over this high level of imports. Undaunted by the rejection of their plea for a tariff increase last August, they are again urging that imports be restricted. "If our mines are shut down because of imports," they argue, "we will be at the mercy of foreign suppliers, and this will make America vulnerable in time of emergency." A plausible enough argument on the surface—but is it any more valid than the one for higher tariffs on watches when you get right down to it?

Item: Our reserves of zinc and lead are far more limitless. We have left about 16 years' supply of zinc and a smaller amount of lead. (Our copper would last about 20 years at the expected rate of consumption.) If we shut out foreign supplies and accelerate the depletion of our own reserves the day will come when we have nothing left. Then we will really be dependent on foreign countries for our entire supply. It is hard to understand how the premature exhaustion of America's mineral deposits would be in the interests of national security.

Item: The countries from whom we import these metals are Canada, Mexico, and the South American nations. These countries are among our best friends and most dependable allies. They are also our best customers—and we, in turn, are the most important market for their exports. No better way could be devised to alienate and embitter these countries than to cut down on imports from them—imports which provide the margin between depression and prosperity in their economies.

Item: The Defense Department has stated two principles which should govern our mineral-import policy. The first is to encourage production where it will be available to us in time of need. This means the United States of course—but it also means Canada, Mexico, the Caribbean countries, and other accessible areas having large deposits of high-grade ores. The second principle is to foster strong economies in nations friendly to the United States. This means not undercutting their economies by blocking their dollar-earning exports to America.

Boosting the tariff or placing quotas on copper, zinc, and lead would violate both principles. It would not strengthen our security—it would weaken it, wasting our irreplaceable resources, alienating and demoralizing our allies.

This is not to say we should not have a sound mining industry. Of course we should. But that does not involve the protection of high-cost producers who would be in trouble, imports or no imports. Secretary Humphrey (a man who knows something about mining) has noted that the Korean war encouraged a lot of production that will never be economic at all. These marginal zinc and lead producers are the ones who feel the competition of imports and seek tariff protection in the name of national security.

As in the watch case, the argument for higher tariffs on minerals bears looking into. The watch lesson should be remembered. Before buying any such arguments we had better delve beneath the surface to see if a tariff boost might not have just the opposite effect from that which is intended, imperiling our security instead of strengthening it. The watch tariff should have proved a lesson. "Twice * * * is a fool, indeed."

Protect the Family Farm Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Congresswoman from Minnesota [Mrs. KNUTSON], has recently had published in Better Farming magazine for June 1955, a most interesting and heart-searching article containing the views of farm women around the country who are concerned about the survival of family type farming.

In our attempts in Congress to arrive at a comprehensive farm program that will conserve the best elements of agriculture, uppermost of which is the farm family, I recommend this article Protect the Family Farm Now to the Members of this body.

I also call your attention to a prize-winning letter from Mrs. John Goldmark of Double J Ranch, Okanagan, Wash., which was inspired by the election to Congress of the Farm Woman's Congresswoman and the first woman to sit on the House Agriculture Committee, Mrs. KNUTSON:

FARM WOMEN TELL WHY WE MUST FIGHT TO PROTECT THE FAMILY FARM NOW

(By Representative COYA KNUTSON, Member, House Committee on Agriculture)

The invitation, extended through Better Farming, to the farm women of America to write to me about their problems and their ideas for making farm living a better living, brought a response that has fairly overwhelmed me. Letters have come from farm homes in 45 different States.

I have read all of them. They tell a story I wish every public official and every Member of Congress could know and feel as I do now. The spirit and courage they reflect, the brave struggle to stay in farming during these difficult times, make me prouder than ever that I have the opportunity to represent the farm women of this country. They show clearly why we must take up the fight to protect the family-type farm. Some excerpts from the letters tell all this better than I can.

"I washed today," wrote Mrs. Jerry Urbanek of Lusk, Wyo. "With the aid of an electric washing machine and REA power I washed quickly, but my washing machine is a secondhand model and so ancient that I catch the oil which drips from the motor in a can. I hold the wringer together with one hand while I feed in the clothes with the other. Dangerous, perhaps, but it will be a long time before I can afford another.

"My husband and I have been farming for 25 years. I do a man's work in the fields because we cannot afford hired labor. We have a capital outlay of $45,000 invested in 900 acres of land, a full set of machinery and 44 head of cattle. Until 2 years ago we were out of debt. Last year we planted 200 acres of grain and harvested enough to get our seed back because of drought. We cut enough hay for our cattle and we're more fortunate than others, who have been buying hay at $40 a ton to keep their foundation stock.

"I like farming, but my husband and I worked 4,800 hours at farm work last year, for which we cannot show 1 cent of remuneration. While we were working we were also wearing out high-priced machinery and receiving less than 2 percent on the capital we had invested. We could have taken the loss of our grain crop without going into debt if the prices of the cattle we sold had been in line with the prices we had to pay for the necessities we bought."

Mrs. John E. Allen, of Mobeetie, Tex., tells of the situation from another angle of farming.

"We have 200 acres, 75 seeded to improved pasture. We raise and put up our own silage, raise our own grain, have a 50-cow herd and raise our own replacements. We are working hard to organize and establish a producer association to protect us against the big handlers. As it is now they can test and weigh our milk any way they like. A number of dairymen have had to take what they could get for their investments and quit. On our own herd we received $2,000 less money in 1954 for more milk shipped than in 1953. But the consumer paid the same price for what he bought, and our feed, groceries, and clothing were even higher."

The same experience is told in a letter from Mrs. Floyd Waldo, Route 3, Winona, in my own State of Minnesota:

"On our farm we produced 65,717 pounds more milk last year and received $204 less. Our costs remained inflexible while our markets were unstable. But consumers have not benefited from this farm price cut."

To this Mrs. Burnis Brigham, route 1, Genesee, Idaho, adds:

"It's bad enough to see farm returns go steadily lower but it's even worse to know that consumers never benefit. * * * Last fall the processors of our grade A milk made a big thing of a cent a quart price reduction—made possible by producers getting that much less. The reduction in our price was very hard for us to absorb but we did feel good that milk would cost townfolk less. In exactly 2 weeks the consumer price went back up, but, of course, the producer price did not. This is the type of price usury that farmers are generally as helpless as babes to cope with."

Another phase of the low-price, high-cost situation is described by Mrs. Mildred Reinhardt, of Palisade, Minn.: "One of the most unjust and disheartening circumstances facing farm women today is the exorbitant costs of establishing and maintaining a laying flock as compared with the infinitesimal net profit eked out from egg sales." What this means is told by Mrs. Waymon Wood, of Spiro, Okla.: "On most small farms, such as ours, the wife takes charge of the laying flock and expects the profits to be her part of the family's spending money. How can she make any spending money when feed costs remain high while eggs go down to from 20 to 30 cents a dozen?" And Mrs. Sara E. Demaree, of Malden, Mo., wrote: "Feed prices remain the same while eggs have gone down, down until farmers feel compelled to sell their flocks, keeping only enough for home consumption. So went the farm woman's income, thereby robbing her of her independence in helping out the family income."

Many, as did Mrs. Reinhardt, blame the indiscriminate grading of eggs, or lack of it,

and the costly and backward system of egg distribution. As Mrs. Mary B. Brinson, route 2, Gosport, Ind., wrote: "If we had a good graded egg market, as we do for grade A milk or livestock, I feel that egg prices to farmers would be much better, at least fairer. In our locality all eggs, regardless of how good or bad, bring the same price." Many pointed out that, with the inadequate grading methods in vogue, the dealers stood to reap the profits from better-quality eggs.

How this sometimes affects the farm family's life is told by Mrs. Elmer Whitney, of Oregon, Ill.: "The thing that hurts me most is that many of our rural women are taking town jobs to provide needed requirements of the farm family * * *. In the past farm families have all taken deep interest in mother's poultry and garden because they knew the surplus sold meant a new rug, new clothes, or perhaps a family trip. After continued disappointments, because there was no surplus profit, these ventures have been abandoned. In search for a way to provide these things the wife takes a town job. The brave little family tells her 'We'll do our best to keep things going at home.' But their best falls far short without mother. It can mean a crippled family life and a weakening of family unity, which is a vital and precious part of our way of life."

Oh, so often the letters tell of such sacrifices. One Fountain Run, Ky., farm woman told of traveling 25 miles from home each day to work in a store to help her husband hold their farm. But she added, "I had to give up my job. It was just too much." And, as Mrs. Albert H. Holtz, Route 1, Holden, Mo., wrote: "In our community we have had falling prices, drought, grasshoppers, feed shortages until in nearly every family the husband or wife has had to get an outside job. This makes it difficult to farm efficiently. My husband has worked in town for the past 3 years and I handle all the chores alone. Why do families stay on farms under such circumstances? You would be surprised at how many of our neighbors (and ourselves) have given up much better livelihoods in the city because they believe they can bring up their children better on a farm, and are willing to make the physical sacrifices necessary for this."

The situation is forcing some hard decisions upon many, as this letter from Mrs. Dorothy Biggs, route 1, Potwin, Kans., tells: "I am a Kansas farm wife with 3 children, ages 10, 7, and 3. I think being a homemaker is the most challenging and interesting career any woman can have. But I am facing a crossroad, which I imagine other other farm women also face.

"I have much to be thankful for—a good home, a good husband, plenty of food, and the ordinary comforts. But, like many other farm women, I'd like to be able to save a little or purchase a few bonds as I go along to help with the children's higher education that will eventually come. We raise and sell livestock and do make a profit each year; but after taxes, repair and maintenance, insurance, new machinery, and immediate living costs, there is nothing left to save. I work hard, sew, mend and make over garments, can, raise chickens, etc., to help make ends meet. This all takes time and does not leave enough time or energy to help train the children in stronger spiritual lives, which they need now, not later. This work, however, as a farm homemaker I must do.

"The crossroad I mentioned is this: As soon as our youngest is in school, I intend to go to work outside the home. I have had considerable business experience before marriage, plus training and hours for teaching. I would much rather stay in the home doing my own work and be a true homemaker. My choice is not my own, for I want our children to have an opportunity to receive a higher schooling so that some time they may not be placed in the same position. While I do not want to raise all the funds (if that were possible) I do want to help so that each one can get a start and then they can go on for themselves from there."

The pressure of these conditions means extra burdens on all members of the family, sometimes to the heartache of the parents. This letter from Mrs. Elsie H. Bechtel, Manor Farm, Adams, N. Y., is expressive of that fact: "There is certainly something wrong in Washington and it is good to know that a real farm wife is working on it. * * * The greater part of the income of farmers in this district consists of proceeds from the sale of dairy and poultry products. Everyone in this section is feeling the price squeeze on farmers now.

"Many small farmers and some larger ones around here have been auctioning off their places and are being forced into terrific losses. Others, like ourselves, have had to see their wives go to work and have been forced to put small children to work beyond their years because the income from the place will not bear paying wages to hired labor. Our 11-year-old girl is doing more work than we would like to see her do, but she does it willingly and we don't know what we would do without her. It sounds terrible, like you are dependent on a child, but my husband and I are doing all we can (we have over 50 cows in the barn) and the help she gives us is the difference between being able to go on and quitting. A man does reach a stage where he can't add any more to his burdens."

Scores of other letters tell the same story of struggle and sacrifice, of a determination not to be forced out of farming and a feeling that something is terribly wrong at present. They reveal, too, how little consideration our policymakers have given to farm women and the farm home. They "do not want sympathy," as one after another wrote, only that "after all our labor and expense there will be something left for the needs of the family." Many letters contained useful ideas and suggestions for improving the situation. Some of these will be reported in the pages of Better Farming next month.

A Ranchwoman's Remedy for What Ails Agriculture

Okanogan, Wash.

Double J Ranch, February 26, 1955, before noon—temperature, 10 above.

Dear Mrs. Knutson: Early this morning, my husband brought in a calf. We were too late. It died, frozen. I then made up my mind that I would, in some way, have to make up the cost of that calf, for it meant a lot to us. Braving a bitter north wind to feed and water the chickens, I came back in the kitchen to drink hot coffee and sat down to see if Better Farming would cheer my heart. It did with news of your election and the possibility of making up for that calf just lost. So while the men are out feeding the cattle and trying to solve the problem of watering them, I will write to you. Water is a touchy problem for most farmers. We had a dry fall, the lake was low, and now the ice has frozen solid and there is no water beneath, I shall not go into this detail as I realize that you cannot legislate about wind and weather.

You can, however, legislate about water, and while I am a firm believer in voluntary associations and agreements, I truly feel that the time is coming when we shall no longer be wealthy enough to be easy and casual about soil and water. I say to myself, we must not only conserve, but increase our water resources and the must is so urgent in my mind that I am no longer tolerant of the man who allows water to flow off his land in deep gullies, lets his topsoil blow away, overgrazes the grass, cuts down the timber without replenishing the forests, wastes the heritage of this country.

I am a firm believer in the family-size farm not only because I am presently devoted to one but because in the back reaches of my mind (or is it just a romantic notion?) I believe that the type of life and economy typified by the American family farm is a bulwark to the kind of democratic society we wish to preserve. It may be that large corporate farming would fill the Nation's shopping basket, but would it fill the heart of the man who produced it and the man who consumes it? Would a large corporate farm economy assist in making our national economy vigorous, expanding, and democratic? I think the answer is "No." But this question is one which many people, legislators like yourself, must not only answer but must be firm about. If the family-size farm is what we really wish to preserve, then all of our thinking, planning, and agricultural legislation should assist in nurturing and protecting it.

It becomes harder and harder for an individual, while youth and vigor are with him, to "buy in" to many types of farming. This is due to the price of machinery, stock, available land. Unless he falls heir to a farm or money, a young man can seldom enter the field. One of the results is that the old experts in the Department of Agriculture grew up on farms and know their problems. The young experts have no experience outside of books and summer jobs at experiment stations or nurseries. This is not good.

Another result is that, unless a farmer has good luck with weather or outside fortune, he is unable to expand his first holdings. There is nothing like an RFC for the farmer-entrepreneur so that he could extend his investment to meet competition or operate on a more equitable scale. The family-size farm is in competition with large corporate and city-controlled financing. Money made in Hollywood, on Wall Street, or in industry is mighty hard competition for the lone farmer.

I also confess to a great dissatisfaction in thinking of the Halls of Congress being battered down by tobacco men, wheat men, cotton men, peanut vendors and the like. Our agricultural economy must be looked at as a whole—production, distribution, price, freight, advertising, perishables, livestock. Unless economists and right-thinking men sit down and think about the whole future—land, water, products, and the increasing populations of our own country and the world, and our Nation's economy that needs to get out of the "fix" we seem to be it, whether it be parity price or interest rate—it doesn't seem to me that we shall get very far. I do not believe that the top-flight men of farm organizations or of farm production groups should be consulted in building the first basic agricultural policies. They all have special interests and they are there to protect them.

We do need disinterested social economists and planners to grapple with the larger issues at stake. Somewhere along the line the farmer has to grapple with these problems too. He should be able to do so without feeling that he will lose his status in the community because he does not agree with the Secretary of Agriculture or the righteousness of the sugarbeet growers. He should be able to do so without being caught in a vise which is his vote to cut his acreage or get a lower price for his product. He needs straight thinking without pressure. This last item I know is hard, for the American people, including the farmer, are getting to the point where they can't act or react unless the radio and newspapers scream and the face on the screen threatens.

I must go and feed three hungry, cold, tired men a large noon dinner, so I close with these suggestions:

1. The formation of a nonpolitical, non-ax-grinding agricultural planning board. Such a group should look backward as well

as forward to see if this country really wants to preserve the family-size farm as part of our national life and livelihood; and if they do, to consider if and how it can be best subsidized and protected, and set up penalties for those who are not interested in doing it in such a way as to conserve our resources.

2. The creation of a Government agency, such as the RFC, to protect the small-size farm from being grabbed by the mortgage holder or corporation; to permit the small farm to grow and expand to the best economical operating capacity; to subsidize the man who wants to enter into the farm business.

3. To get the Department of Agriculture and farm organizations of all types to stop talking so much and scaring people and putting on pressure; to listen for a change and encourage people to think rather than carry a banner.

I feel as if I had been standing on top of a soapbox and now need to get down and put dinner on and see to the children. It was a pleasure to take off time and to write to you.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. JOHN GOLDMARK.

Words to a Lady in Distress for Doing Nothing, or Even Less

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the New York Post for Wednesday, May 18, which describes the horrible tragic mess which Mrs. Hobby, the Secretary of Not Much Health, Very Little Welfare, and Almost No Education has made of the Salk vaccine program.

The editorial follows:

WORDS TO A LADY IN DISTRESS, FOR DOING NOTHING, OR EVEN LESS

(The following lines were inspired by Oveta Culp Hobby's immortal remark to a Senate committee: "No one could have foreseen the public demand for the Salk vaccine.")

A toast to Mrs. Oveta Hobby,
Pin-up girl of the AMA lobby.

Custodian of the Public Health
(Welfare and Education).
Possessing a proper respect for wealth
(And, well, fair education).

There came, after rumor and hope and talk,
The medical miracle known as Salk.

Midst clamorous public anticipation
Oveta's plan was no preparation.
Valiantly resisting every faction,
She stoutly defended complete inaction.

Of course it was not that she scoffed at polio
(Or that Ezra Benson is soft on oleo),
But hers was a lofty patriot's contempt
For collectivist thoughts of men unkempt.

Hers was woman's heroic role
Fighting from birth all Federal control
Which might somehow have implied consent
To spending by the Government.

Mrs. Hobby's view
Was impromptu.
As confusion mounted,
It was all discounted.

Nothing could move her, nothing compel,
She firmly did nothing, and said little well.
Should she have known, should she have planned?
How could she, when the New Deal's banned?

I had no idea, she was later to say,
That ever, but ever, there'd come a day
When so many people would want the stuff.
I was always sure there would be enough.

The success, she confessed, of the Salk vaccine
Was utterly, utterly unforeseen.

Where was she, they asked, before April 12th?
Guarding the Nation's spiritual health,
Protecting our children from New Deal planners,
Those people of evil, and very bad manners.

So drink the toast with one long gulp,
The name is Hobby, Oveta Culp.
She's beaten socialism to a pulp.

This is the moral of the story,
A tale of fairest laissez-faire glory:
Though Mrs. Hobby has produced no goods,
We're ideologically out of the woods.

We're true to our sacred national goals,
We've routed the dread disease of controls.

The Small Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the old horse-drawn sulky plow is behind us, but the problem whether we are to promote large farms is debated among farmers themselves as well as Government spokesmen. I include letters from farmers to the editor of the Farmer magazine under leave to extend my remarks, reflecting some of this thinking:

THE SMALL FARM PROBLEM

To the EDITOR OF THE FARMER:

In an editorial in the March 19 issue of the Farmer you invited comments by readers on the so-called Small Farm Problem. If deprivation and pauperism is all our Nation has to offer a portion of its future citizens then would it not by all means be more practicable, at least more human to invoke a plan for birth control instead?

However it is hard to believe that our Nation has come into such a sorrowful state of affairs that it must propose to dispossess one segment of our farm population in order to perpetuate prosperity and security for another. Certainly one cannot consider it a wise policy or a healthy one for our Nation to allow its wealth and resources to become concentrated into fewer and fewer hands. It places limitations on freedom and opportunity for a large portion of our populace and that is un-American because it is contrary to the principles upon which our Nation was founded.

And can we consider it a sound policy for our Nation to spend a considerable portion of our wealth and resources in attempts to keep democracy alive abroad and at the same time liquidate farmers and cause dissension and hardships at home?

Faced as we are today with a rising tide of unemployment, it is sheer folly, even hazardous, to suggest such a plan. This diabolical plot came about because farmers had the audacity to ask for their just share of our Nation's productive wealth and it has been given further impetus by food processors and distributors whose chief concern is higher profits for themselves with no breaks for the consumers. We have a glowing example of that right today.

So what we need today is not a plan to move farmers off their land, but a plan to inject some good common horsesense into Government. Then we can all be happy.

E. GUNLEIUS.

CLEARWATER COUNTY, MINN.

BELIEVES IN SMALL UNITS

To the EDITOR of the FARMER:

I read with interest your editorial, The Small Farm Problem, and as a strong believer in small units of all kinds, I make the following points:

1. "What does it profit a man if he gaineth the whole world, but lose his own soul?" says our Bible. Regardless of one's religious faith, I believe most realize we are only on earth for a short time during which we are to work and pray and prepare to meet God in eternity. It would seem we should try to preserve the world as God made it for us to enjoy.

2. "In unity there is strength" means the more units anything is made of, the stronger it is. That statement has been proven true many, many times. These United States were built up by small-family units in all industries, including farms, small schools, and everything. To tear them down is like destroying our strength.

3. Farm families are not only God's chosen people and close to Mother Nature for children to be reared, but they are the most happy and contented—and everyone knows what our Nation and the world needs most of all is contented people at peace.

4. Every farm family, regardless of size, purchases not only goods for their home, but also equipment for the farm. Therefore, the more farmers we have the more consumers we will have for all products of farm and factory.

5. If legislation could be passed today to limit every person to say 160 acres of land on which he had to reside or pay double taxation, and no tree could be cut without a permit with a new tree to be planted, the future of our land would be much better than the trend of today indicates. Our trees that are left are being slaughtered and none planted—soon our land will lose the benefits God planned we would receive from the trees.

6. Which is best for our Nation and people—a farmer with a 50-acre farm owned and on a money-making basis or a 500-acre farm plastered in debt beyond payment, and losing money? We have much of that today.

7. Your editorial asks, "Which is better to have, two farmers who cannot make a good living or one farmer who can make a good living and an ex-farmer moving to town to get a job? My answer is the two farmers because the farmer moving to town may soon be on WPA as in the early thirties.

8. What is real progress? Certainly not the size or speed of anything, but rather the results from it. An auto traveling 70 miles an hour may be called progress at the time, but how often do they crash?

9. For the past 50 years or more, both our political parties have talked against monopoly and for small business, while they have both worked continually in the other direction?

JIM HALLETT.

BLUE EARTH COUNTY, MINN.

MAKE MORE FARMING

To the EDITOR OF THE FARMER:

By all means keep the small farmer, even if the Government has to loan him some money to get him on his feet. There are too many in the towns now for the jobs available. I know of some on small acreages

making more than they could working for someone else.

There are many different ways to make more than a living on a small farm. The family and their ability, the location and many other factors have to be taken into consideration. By all means forget the tractor—they are too expensive for most small farmers.

I know 1 man on a small acreage who had only 1 horse and did most of his work and made a better living than some did working out. If they are making a good living on a small farm, they won't ask for old-age assistance.

RENNIE IRISH.

TODD COUNTY, MINN.

KEEP BOTH BIG AND SMALL

To the EDITOR OF THE FARMER:

At the present time, let's keep small farms and the big farms. In the future, when this great country has 600 million inhabitants, then divide and make the big farms smaller. But in the meantime, let's keep price supports. That is the most important, not only for the farmers but for the whole Nation's well being, and here is my suggestion how to sell farm surpluses for cash at United States prices.

Since my income comes mostly from dairying, I will elaborate on the dairy surplus only. We should try to sell dairy surpluses to the satellite countries—East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. We must prepare and pack butter, cheese, dry milk—no cans. The pack should not exceed $5, including postage.

The pack must be put on display, first in New York, Chicago, and Detroit, and it is most important to advertise it in the foreign-language press. And we, the foreign born, will pay for it in dollars and ship to our cousins in those particular countries, but I am sure the English, Irish, or Scandinavian could do it too. I think it should be handled by the well-known CARE.

MATT RYBAK.

BELTRAMI COUNTY, MINN.

WHO'LL EMPLOY THEM?

To the EDITOR OF THE FARMER:

I was very interested in your editorial, the Small Farm Problem. There is just one question I would like to have someone answer. Who is going to hire the displaced farmer who is generally over 40 years of age, has no particular trade, skill, or vocation?

On account of my age, which is past 45, with a business college education and years of experience, I was unable to secure employment in the city and was forced to go out and buy one of the so-called small farm units to enable me to make some kind of a living for my family.

W. R. CHAMBERS.

WRIGHT COUNTY, MINN.

BIG PROBLEM NOW

To the EDITOR OF THE FARMER:

The small farm problem is really a big problem nowadays and far different than years ago. I remember when farmers made a living on 40 to 80 acres of land and raised big families, too. But everything in the world changes and farming, like everything else, is a pain in the neck.

In referring to your statement, "Which is better, two farmers who can't make a good living or one farmer who can and an ex-farmer who is a good customer?" Naturally, one who can make it is better than two who can't and with ex-farmers as good customers would be the cat's whiskers. But for an ex-farmer to become a good customer is another problem, and the problem is employment.

Our cities ad towns are swamped with idle workers due to unemployment and getting more farmers to town won't help matters any, as it looks to me. But no one can tell what's around the corner—we can only hope.

ERNEST BECKENSTEIN.

ANOKA COUNTY, MINN.

Farmers Doing Fine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following which appeared in the Punxsutawney (Pa.) Spirit of May 13, 1955:

FARMERS DOING FINE

"The Nation's farmers, despite much Capitol Hill lament about weakening farm prices, appear to be doing fine," reports the Wall Street Journal in a news roundup. It adds that "spot checks in rural communities around the country find farm folks in many instances spending more freely than a year ago." Most farmers, it seems, talk more about recent drought troubles than about the easing in prices, which are off an average of some 5 percent from the comparable periods of 1954.

The newspaper then describes what has been happening in and to agriculture. It's a story of a peaceful revolution and of amazing progress.

First of all, the farmer's economic gains can be truly described as spectacular. Due to greatly increased output with greatly decreased manpower, per capita cash income from marketings has increased nearly sixfold in 15 years, as against a threefold jump in nonfarm per capita personal income. Secondly—and this will come as a surprise to most nonfarmers and perhaps to many farmers as well—the best money returns have not been from the crops which are bolstered by Government price support, such as wheat and cotton. They have come, instead, from cattle, hogs, and chickens, which are not supported and are sold in the free market.

The output-manpower relationship is the big thing. Between 1910 and 1940 there was little change in the farm population—it held to a 30-million-plus level. "Then," says the Wall Street Journal, "came the machines. Between 1940 and 1954 the number of trucks and tractors on United States farms increased threefold. Milking machines increased fourfold, grain combines fivefold, mechanical cornpickers sixfold. And, after holding steady for 30 years, farm population suddenly slumped nearly a third—to about 21 million." In that same brief space of time, agricultural output sored by more than 30 percent, smashing all past records to smithereens. There was a great deal more money, and a lot fewer people to share it. In 1940 farm per capita income was $272—last year it was about $1,367.

As the paper also points out, "Farm income is not scattered evenly around the land." The top 12 farm States have more money income than the other 36 combined. California is now first in marketings, closely followed by Iowa. Illinois, Texas, Minnesota and Indiana come next, in that order, and the other middle States, with New York, are among the leaders. On the other hand, a group of Southeastern States starting with Louisiana and running across through South Carolina, but excluding Florida, had the poorest showing. Their incomes in 1954 were down as much as 21 percent from 1953. A big cut-back in cotton planting and severe drought were the reasons for this. Even so, the paper quotes an Atlanta observer as saying Southeast farmers "are not singing the blues," and that "there is no reason to believe that they are not making their normal average purchases at the retail counters throughout the area."

To sum up, the farm picture in general is not as black as some paint it, even though prices are down from the peak. And by comparison with the conditions of 15 years or more ago, farmers are doing extraordinarily well.

Social Security for Self-Employed Lawyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very interesting and enlightening article that appeared in the May 1955 edition of the Bar Bulletin, issued by the Boston Bar Association and edited by William A. Parks:

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR SELF-EMPLOYED LAWYERS [1]

The tax committee has been asked to report on the possible desirability of social-security coverage for self-employed lawyers. This question has arisen from time to time since 1949 when Congress first added certain groups of self-employed persons to those covered by the law. The American Bar Association has opposed at all times the inclusion of self-employed lawyers (at least on a compulsory basis), although the position of the association is apparently to be reviewed in the near future.

The 1949 amendment added substantially all self-employed persons, except farm operators and various professional groups, with Government and charitable organization employees placed on a special semioptionl basis. The 1954 amendment further broadened the coverage to include farm operators, architects, engineers, funeral directors, and accountants. Ministers, both employed and self-employed, were placed on a special optional basis. This leaves the only substantial groups not covered as follows:

1. Lawyers;
2. Doctors, dentists and related branches of the medical profession; and
3. Certain ministers, Government employees and employees of charitable organizations. Of the No. 3 group, most of them are expected to be covered except those already covered by special plans of their own.

A brief outline of the relevant provisions of the social-security program insofar as it would apply to the self-employed lawyer may be helpful. First as to cost, the tax on self-employment earnings is now at the rate of 3 percent, applicable to the first $4,200, or a maximum of $126 a year, payable at the same time and as a part of your final income tax return. The rate will increase by steps to a top rate of 6 percent, or a maximum tax of $252 a year beginning in 1975. This rate is 50 percent higher than the tax on employees since the employer also pays a tax which goes in part for the direct benefit of the employee.

The benefits are somewhat complicated. For purposes of general discussion they may be broken down as follows for a fully insured person:

[1] This is a report of the committee on Federal taxation which studied the problem at the request of the council.

1. Retirement benefit to the taxpayer on retirement after reaching age 65 will be $108.50 a month if he has no dependents and will be increased to as high as $162.80 a month if he has a wife who is also age 65, and it will be further increased to $200 a month if there are at least 2 dependent children. These benefits will be less, of course, if his taxable earnings have been less than $4,200 a year.

2. Survivor benefits to a dependent widow and children in the event of the death of the taxpayer are slightly different. For a widow alone the maximum is $81.40 a month, increased to $162.80 if she has one dependent child and to a maximum of $200 a month with two or more dependent children. A widow must be at least 65 years of age to qualify, or have a dependent child living with her. A child will be treated as a dependent only if under 18 years of age and if he was dependent on his father at the time he died.

3. Lump sum death benefit of not more than $255.

The circumstances under which the old age retirement benefit becomes payable is of special interest, since merely reaching age 65 is not enough by itself. There is no limitation because of other earnings after age 72 (formerly age 75), but below that age there is a deduction in benefits for annual earnings in excess of $1,200. The rule is a little complicated in its application, but roughly it provides for a loss of 1 month's benefit for each $80 of earnings over the $1,200 limit. There is no deduction for unearned income or for pensions, but the old concept of income from covered employment was abandoned in the 1954 amendment. This means that no longer can a lawyer who has been on a salary as a corporate officer retire as an officer at age 65, continue to practice law as a self-employed person, but collect a social security pension based on no income from covered employment.

Since by far the majority of working Americans, both employed and self-employed, are covered by social security, perhaps we should ask why self-employed lawyers should not be. The arguments against coverage fall under two headings, roughly as follows:

1. Social security is a bad investment for a lawyer.

2. It is against public policy.

We are hardly qualified to give a full analysis of the actuarial soundness of the social security program for the average lawyer. From the foregoing outline, however, it is obvious that for a young lawyer with a wife and several young children social security coverage offers inexpensive term insurance which is most attractive. Likewise the advantages are very great to the lawyer who, for one reason or another, is either entirely uninsurable or insurable only at very high rates. Less obvious, but nevertheless true, the retirement pension for an older lawyer, who is either nearly 72 years of age or who plans to retire from active practice shortly after age 65, may provide a ridiculously high return on his investment. Using an extreme example, a man may obtain a pension for himself and his wife of $162.80 for a payment of only $189 in taxes over an 18-month period before retirement.

It is equally easy to see that a young bachelor with no dependents or intention of marriage and a poor life expectancy might look upon social security as a very bad investment. Even if he has a long life expectancy he may intend to continue active practice until age 72 and hence feel that he is being discriminated against in failing to collect benefits during the first 7 years after he reaches age 65. He may also object that he must be getting less for his money than wage earners in lower income brackets, since the act is weighted in favor of a higher return for this group.

Beyond pointing out these extremes we do not feel competent to advise on the financial aspects of social security. Perhaps it will be helpful, however, to observe the reaction of the life insurance underwriters to this matter. They not only have not objected to being covered, but they arranged even before the 1949 amendment to obtain coverage for underwriters who might have escaped on the theory that they were self-employed. Apparently they consider social security to be less expensive than regular life insurance.

All this leads to the question of whether the whole social-security system is not actuarially unsound and hence may break down and not pay off in full. It seems fair to assume that if social-security funds prove to be inadequate to pay the promised benefits, the deficiency will be made up out of general revenue. Since we must make up this extra revenue in the form of general taxes, perhaps we should share in the benefits which we are helping to finance.

In an article in the November 1953 issue of the American Bar Association Journal (p. 971), Arthur Larson, dean of the University of Pittsburgh Law School, discusses the advisability of social security for self-employed lawyers and recommends their inclusion under the general scheme of coverage. In support of the argument that social-security benefits are not inconsequential, he cites Department of Commerce figures that in 1947, 73.6 percent of self-employed lawyers were in individual practice and that group had, before Federal taxes, a mean net income of $5,759 and a median net income of $4,275. To the members of such a group the old age and survivors benefits under the present act are quite substantial. In rebuttal of the argument that earned income in excess of $900 (now $1,200) per annum would disqualify many lawyers before they attain the age of 75 years (now 72 years), he states that the average retirement age of all persons under social security is almost 69 years.

Next let us consider the public policy aspect of social security. Many have suggested that we compromise our independence by participating in a Government welfare program. Others have suggested that compulsory as opposed to voluntary savings encourages a weakening of the moral fiber that should be avoided. Still others feel that the broadening of social-security coverage weakens the likelihood that the Reed-Keogh bill (now Jenkins-Keogh) will be passed. This latter bill, in substance, permits a limited postponement of income tax liability by contribution into a fund which will operate somewhat the way a pension trust does for employees. We cannot very well add any special light on the first two policy considerations which have not already been expressed in the Malkasian article in the January issue of the Boston Bar Bulletin. On the third question of Reed-Keogh the argument is not persuasive since most persons who would benefit from the bill are already covered by social security, so that the inclusion of lawyers should be of no real significance.

It has been suggested that lawyers be included under social security on a voluntary basis. This method was followed in the 1951 Lodge proposal and is currently proposed by H. R. 443 which has been introduced into the House by Congressman LANE of Massachusetts. But this approach was flatly rejected by the House version of the 1954 amendment which included lawyers on a compulsory basis. The only precedent for voluntary coverage appearing in the 1954 amendment is the provision for clergymen, whether employed or self-employed. This unique provision is explained by the Senate Finance Committee report as follows:

"A provision for coverage on an individual election basis, while not generally desirable, is considered by your committee to be justified in this area because of the special circumstances. Many churches have expressed the fear that their participation in the old-age and survivors insurance program as employers of ministers might interfere with the well-established principle of separation of church and state. Many church representatives also believe that individual ministers who do not wish to be covered on grounds of conscience should not be required to participate in the program."

But the same report makes the following comment about the treatment of lawyers:

"Your committee concluded, however, that extension of coverage on an individual voluntary basis involved grave dangers with respect to the financing of the system, as well as discrimination against the great majority of workers covered under the program on a compulsory basis. Therefore, where the committee found that substantial agreement did not exist among a group as to whether it desired to be covered, the committee concluded that it would be wiser to continue the exclusion of that group rather than allow its members to elect coverage as individuals."

The House Ways and Means Committee report was even more emphatic in its disapproval of voluntary coverage:

"Coverage of self-employed professional people, like the coverage of the self-employed now under the program, would be compulsory. Your committee is aware that some groups have expressed a preference for coverage on a voluntary individual basis. There are, however, fundamental objections to that approach. The history of voluntary social insurance on an individual elective basis in the United States and in other countries indicates definitely that only a very small proportion of all eligible individuals actually elect to participate. Those who do participate are usually not the people of below-average income who are in the greatest need of the protection afforded. Moreover, voluntary coverage attracts almost exclusively people who, because they are already old or for other reasons, can expect a large return for their contributions. This 'adverse selection of risks' could result in a significant drain on the funds of the program."

Certainly voluntary coverage presents a serious problem if social security is to be administered on any sound basis. Furthermore, it is difficult to see why lawyers should be treated any differently than bankers or any other business group as to voluntary coverage. In any event, it seems most unlikely in view of the statements quoted from the House and Senate committee reports that voluntary coverage for lawyers can be obtained.

The real question would appear to be whether self-employed lawyers should be covered on a compulsory basis. Last year the accountants decided that most members of their profession would benefit from immediate coverage. This would appear to be equally true of self-employed lawyers.

There are presently pending two bills dealing with social-security coverage for self-employed lawyers. One is H. R. 443 filed by Representative LANE of Massachusetts and would include lawyers on a voluntary basis. The other is H. R. 855 filed by Representative VAN ZANDT and calls for compulsory coverage.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*____
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*__6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*_____4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*___
Albert, Carl, *Okla*_____
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*__
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*_____
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*___
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*_____University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*___4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*_
Andrews, George W., *Ala*___3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*____
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*_____4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*___
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*___
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*__Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*_113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*___
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*___
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*_
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*___
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*_
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*__2737 Devonshire Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*____
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*_____
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*_____
Bates, William H., *Mass*____
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*_
Beamer, John V., *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*_____1727 Mass. Ave.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*_____
Bell, John J., *Tex*_____
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*___1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*____7304 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*___
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*_____2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*____
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*____
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*__
Boggs, Hale, *La*_____
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*___
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*_____3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*___2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*____
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*__The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*_____
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*_____4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*_____
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*_____The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*_____
Bray, William G., *Ind*_____
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*_____
Brooks, Overton, *La*_____4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*__Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*_____Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*_
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*_____
Buchanan, Vera, *Pa*_____
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*__
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*___
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*__
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*_____2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*____
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*_____
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*____
Byrne, James A., *Pa*_____
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*_____1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*_____
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*_____
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*_____The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*____
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*_____
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*_
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*_____The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*___
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*_
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*_____
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*_
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*__1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*_____
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*_____
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*_____The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*____1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*__
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*____The Dorchester
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*_____
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*_____The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*_____
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*____
Cramer, William C., *Fla*___4454 Tindall St.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*__
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind.*
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*__
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*____3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*_____
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*_____
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*___
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*_____4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*_____2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*_____
Dawson, William A., *Utah*__
Dawson, William L., *Ill*___
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*____
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*____
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*__2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*__
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*_
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*_
Dies, Martin, *Tex*_____
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*_The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*____
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*_
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*____
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*____
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*____3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*__The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*_
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*__
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*_____
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*____
Dowdy, John, *Tex*_____
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*_____3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*_____The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*_3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*_____
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*_____
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*____4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*_____3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*_____5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*_____
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*_____
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*_
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*_____3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*__200 C St. SE.
Fine, Sidney A., *N. Y*_____
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*_____
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*_____Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*_____
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*_____The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*_____
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*_____3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*_____4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*__514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*_____
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*_____The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*__Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*____
Fulton, James G., *Pa*_____
Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*____
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*___
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*_____
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*_____6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*_____
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*_____
George, Myron V., *Kans*___3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*____
Grananan, William T., *Pa*__
Grant, George M., *Ala*_____4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*_____
Green, Edith, *Oreg*_____
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*__
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*_____2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*_
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*_____
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*___
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*____
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*_____
Hale, Robert, *Maine*_____2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*_____
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*___4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*_____
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*_____The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*_____
Harris, Oren, *Ark*_____1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*_____4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*__
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*_____314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*_____The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*_____
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*_____104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*__125 Marthas Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*_____
Heselton, John W., *Mass*___
Hess, William E., *Ohio*_____
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*__
Hill, William S., *Colo*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*__
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*_____
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*__2108 Suitland Terrace SE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*___Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*___
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*_____
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*_____
Holt, Joe, *Calif*_____
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*____
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*____3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*_____
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*_____
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*_____
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*_____
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*_____
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*__
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*____200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*_____
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*__The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*_____
Jensen, Ben F., *Icwa*_____The Washington House
Johansen, August E., *Mich*_
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*_____630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*____3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*_
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*_____3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*___
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*__
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*____3063 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*____
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*_____2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*_
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*_____Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*_1249 31st St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*_____
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*___
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*_____
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*____The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*_The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*_____3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*_____
King, Cecil R., *Calif*_____
King, Karl C., *Pa*_____
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*__
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*_____
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*___
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*_____
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*_____
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*_____The Coronet

Appendix

The Salk Polio Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 20, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has held a series of hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 46, the Mental Health Study Act of 1955. This legislation would provide Federal matching moneys for a 3-year study of the entire problem of mental illness in this country.

Our committee has also held hearings on the Medical Research Facilities Act of 1955. During the course of these hearings we heard testimony from a number of distinguished psychiatrists as to the urgent need for laboratory facilities and equipment in the field of psychiatric research.

I was therefore, very pleased to note that on the night of April 12 the See It Now television broadcast on the Salk vaccine carried a powerful plea for a major attack upon mental illness. All three of the doctors on the program—Dr. Jonas E. Salk, Dr. Thomas Francis, Jr., and Dr. Alan Gregg—were unanimous in declaring that mental illness was the most serious health problem facing this country today.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the broadcast of April 12, containing the opinions of these three great physicians.

There being no objection, the text of the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MURROW. Good evening. This is See It Now, produced by Murrow and Friendly, sponsored by the Aluminum Co. of America. April 12, 1955. The entire program originates live from the polio vaccine evaluation center, the director's office at the University of Michigan. Today a great profession made a giant step forward and the news that came out of this room lifted a sense of fear from the homes of millions of Americans. In this room is the man who made the vaccine, Jonas E. Salk; Dr. Thomas Francis, the man who made the nationwide test; Dr. Alan Gregg, of the Rockefeller Foundation, a medical statesman who spoke for history today.

On this table the products of a year of testing and measuring were evaluated. Upstairs in this small building were the records of some 1,800,000 American youngsters. Some had vaccine. Some didn't. No one knew who had it and who didn't except Dr. Francis and his colleagues. He made his report in a 130-page document which will be a model for future tests. Dr. Francis, tell me, is it true that you wanted just to write this report and make three copies and mail it in, and have nothing to do with all this business of radio and television?

Dr. FRANCIS. That was really my first suggestion, because I thought it would save a great deal of difficulty and confusion.

Mr. MURROW. I wonder if you could highlight the report for us briefly?

Dr. FRANCIS. Well, the major problems were those of identification and registration of the people who were involved in the study and then the subsequent problem of determining who got sick, who developed poliomyelitis, and of following them, having proper investigation of the case so that we had records that we could depend upon and were complete and from which we could draw valid conclusions. The basic data showed, I think, quite distinctly that the vaccine had a protective effect of no insignificant level and that if one were to measure it against the most clearcut cases of the disease that there was something in the level of 80-percent effectiveness against paralytic poliomyelitis; that the effectiveness was less distinct against type 1 of poliomyelitis virus infections, but against types 2 and 3 of poliomyelitis virus infection or disease was quite pronounced.

Mr. MURROW. Dr. Francis, what about the harmful effects? Were any children made ill as the result of the inoculation?

Dr. FRANCIS. We carried out some studies under controlled conditions again of that effect, and so far as we can determine there was nothing that seemed to be related to the vaccine which had any significant harmful effects. In fact, the frequency of what were called reactions was just about the same in the vaccinated or those that got controlled inoculations or even among those who were uninoculated, so that there was nothing in that series of studies that suggested that the vaccine created any harmful effect; and when one came to the cases of disease, there were quite pronounced disease; it seems that they were incidental or coincidental rather than related to the vaccine itself.

Mr. MURROW. Well, sir, we have heard the word "placebo" several times today. Could you tell us what it is and why was it necessary to use it?

Dr. FRANCIS. Well, the accuracy of a study depends upon the unbiased character of it, and if one has to depend upon observations which are related to memory or to opinions, then one has a great deal of difficulty. And in a study where everyone who is vaccinated is known, then there is the opportunity for the introduction of a virus, even though it's unintentional. But if a group of children are inoculated with a material which seems to be the same as the vaccine, and no one knows who got what, then the reports and investigations are carried out in completely unbiased, objective fashion, and this results in much more solid and much more convincing data.

The term "placebo"—Dr. Gregg reminded me this morning—comes from the Latin: the future; placio. It means "I shall please" or "I shall placate" and it really is the medical term used for something which given as a substitute, or as a pacifier, let's say, rather than a real therapeutic agent.

Mr. MURROW. Sort of like a blank cartridge?

Dr. FRANCIS. Yes; it is a blindfold test.

Mr. MURROW. Your figures go from 60 to 90 percent in effectiveness depending upon the type of polio. What about going to 95 or 100 percent? What are the prospects?

Dr. FRANCIS. I think we must say we are limited in this study by the fact that these were done under certain conditions with certain preparations of vaccine and that these results apply only to this particular study. Dr. Salk indicated today that with the preparations of vaccine that are being made at the present time that they are far superior in their capacity to produce antibodies and if the antibodies' level is the indication of the degree of immunity, then one should anticipate that it would be improved, but when you talk about 95 to 100 percent, there is no vaccine that really gets beyond that point in the—or even reaches that point except under very ideal conditions, because one has to be concerned and one is confronted with the conditions under which it is used and the time and all the other factors which might make a difference so that a study of this sort and the results of this study are related to this study itself. The future depends upon the future.

Mr. MURROW. Dr. Salk, you ought to be at home in this building. I think two of your children were born in this building.

Dr. SALK. I paced the floor right upstairs a few years ago.

Mr. MURROW. What do you think of the chance of total immunity?

Dr. SALK. As you were talking to Dr. Francis about this, it reminded me of our conversation of several weeks ago when we discussed the question of is this the year of victory, and I believe I said then I preferred to regard whatever the findings were as indicating a trend. Well, I think what Dr. Francis has provided today is a very substantial indication of trend and the mere fact that there were differences in the degree of immunity, with respect to types 1, 2, and 3, is part of the indication of the trend. Now as you were speaking together I felt a bit excited with respect to the challenge. Dr. Francis said that no vaccine is better than 95 to 100 percent effective. Well, this may be so and I think that this is one of the things that would be very interesting to try to do something about. There is built into the results of these studies the indications of the trend plus the additional studies that we have done this past year an understanding of the dynamics of the immune process. That is to say how does this immunity come about.

Mr. MURROW. Yes. How long will it last, this immunity, now?

Dr. SALK. Well, this is part of the answer to this question. The question of degree of effectiveness and the degree of immunity or persistence of immunity are linked together.

We have indications that it should be possible to produce long-term immunity. Now, if you come back and say does this mean life-long immunity, I would like to say we will discuss that at sometime in the future.

Mr. MURROW. Yes. Dr. Gregg, in your lifetime you have seen a lot of diseases whipped, beaten, brought under control. What would you say about the possibilities, the probabilities or the certainties in connection with this vaccine?

Dr. GREGG. Possibilities, probabilities, and certainties. Well, I should think that the main possibility and I speak this guardedly because I think it is extremely important not to take any part in any disillusionment later, but I think the main possibility is that, thanks to the vaccine, we shall have a protection comparable to and perhaps better than the protection we have in the case of

two other virus diseases, namely smallpox and yellow fever. Now that's a way of stating something that is already reasonably familiar, but I think perhaps the best way of describing the situation would be by the comparison to the question of having a town free from any large conflagration. A house on fire is a disaster to the owner but it is a danger to the neighbors and with communicable diseases it is somewhat the same thing. A person who is protected so that he does not have a communicable disease is also a protection to his neighbors because he no longer or does not become a source of infection.

Now you can never say that every house in a town has to be fireproofed in order to have no fires there, but you can say that if fireproofing is widely adopted either by reason of law or by reason of private intelligence the chance of a big conflagration is very small. Now the analogy is fairly good. We could get up to a certain point of the population protected and the chances of what one would call an epidemic or conflagration—it is much the same thing—are greatly reduced, so much reduced that there are occasions when the contact simply doesn't take place and there is a whole community freed from what otherwise might be a serious epidemic.

Now the two other possibilities: One is that this technique of mass experiment with controls that are simultaneous, secret, impartial, and scientific, will be adopted for the study of and the control of other diseases and I would like to think that sometime we will be able to control what appeals to me as the urchin among the diseases—namely, the common cold in a somewhat similar set of studies.

A third possibility is that the success of this entire enterprise, which was due to a reasonable number of well-trained doctors and medical scientists, will throw attention back where certainly attention is needed and that is in the quality of our medical education. Medical education in this country at the present time is languishing.

Personally I think the medical school deans ought to put the medical schools on the dangerous list, which is the hospital slang, as a warning as well as from those who are concerned—rather a warning from those who are responsible to those who are deeply concerned. The American public is deeply concerned, and I would want to serve a warning to them that they must support medical education better than it now is.

Now probabilities and very briefly: There is an important probability that improvement will be made in this vaccine; possibly other vaccines will be found. This was a semiprediction that I made as of last week. It is already vindicated very considerably by what Dr. Salk has told me. Namely, that since the 1954 trials and this mass experiment the vaccine has already been improved and improved substantially. It may continue to be improved and especially the methods of administration. And I think among the certainties, the biggest certainty is that we face now as a nation, and the laymen face it as well as the doctors, a desperate test, and the test is, are we good enough to receive this boon, in the sense will we refrain from bootlegging, cheating, quarreling in order to get a little snack of the vaccine for ourselves or our own? That's a very serious certainty that there may be trouble in that quarter.

Mr. MURROW. I think we might come back to the matter of bootlegging in a few minutes. Dr. Salk, you have been talking with medical experts all day. Would you mind a few simple laymen's questions?

Dr. SALK. With great relief.

Mr. MURROW. What about the supply: how many children will be inoculated before the polio season arrives?

Dr. SALK. Well, I can't be sure of that, Mr. Murrow, but I can report one thing that we did discuss today. I have recommended on the basis of our new findings that two—rather than 3 doses of vaccine be administered. This is not cheating. On the contrary this will make the supply go further, but the real objective is to make immunity last longer. On the present basis from the figures that I have read in the newspapers, whatever was estimated, I believe somewhere in the vicinity of 20 million, the possibility now is that 30 million could be inoculated. But that is only a small part of the total requirement and one is tempted to wonder and to think about the possibility of giving everyone some hamburger instead of sirloin steak to a few and this is a problem with which we are seriously concerned. How can we make that which is available go farthest in order to prevent the kind of conflagration that Dr. Gregg refers to. We must look on this not only as an individual disease, but as a community disease. This has occupied our very serious attention.

Mr. MURROW. Have you reached the point yet of considering booster shots and how often they may be necessary?

Dr. SALK. Yes, I think we have a formula that seems rather clear, and well substantiated experimentally; that two doses of vaccine given at an interval of 2 to 4 weeks—that is to say 1 now and the second one 2 to 4 weeks from now with the booster dose to be given before the next polio season but not earlier than 7 months from now. It takes that long for the maturation of the hyperreactive mechanism to make the booster a booster.

Mr. MURROW. What about the priorities? Who should determine who gets what in this limited-supply situation?

Dr. SALK. Well, I think it is unfair really to let everyone decide for himself who gets what. It would be as if everyone on your show decided what he wanted to do if and when he wanted to do it. It seems to me there ought to be some central intelligence that could indicate, at least suggest, what should be done—if not specify. The way in which one would approach this problem from an intelligent viewpoint to solve the problem would be to begin at the peak of the epidemic curve or the age incidence. For example, we know that the disease is of low frequency in the youngest ages, then it reaches a peak and then it begins to descend. If one would see that vaccine was administered to the children who are the greatest risks as more becomes available to descend both limbs of the curve, I think we would then use the available supply to its greatest advantage until the supply and the demand can meet each other.

Mr. MURROW. What is the cost likely to be on what might be called the open market?

Dr. FRANCIS. Again I must refer to what I read in the newspapers and what I hear on the radio. The information that I have is indirect in that way. I have learned $2 is what the cost of 1 cubic centimeter of vaccine is expected to be. It is likely to be less.

Mr. MURROW. What about the youngsters who may be allergic to such things as penicillin? Is there any danger there in inoculating them?

Dr. FRANCIS. We have discussed this earlier today and the indications are there are no contraindications to the use of the vaccine and I want to make that general statement for those who have written to me and who are concerned as to whether or not a child with a kidney infection or some other consideration should not be inoculated. We have not been able to ascertain the existence of any contraindications. The child with allergies takes the vaccine just as well as the one without, and children who are allergic to penicillin, we have failed to substantiate any reaction in penicillin-sensitive individuals.

Mr. MURROW. Dr. Francis, in passing, a question about that placebo: Have the children who have received it, have the parents been notified, and will they subsequently get the vaccine?

Dr. FRANCIS. All those records have been sent out to health departments of each area and should be in their hands at the present time. We started to mail them out last Friday with a decoding so that each child that had placebo or vaccine in those areas could be specifically identified. May I say something at the present time? You are talking about the effectiveness. This may be a little off your schedule.

Mr. MURROW. Nothing is off our schedule.

Dr. GREGG. I think there is quite a difference between this and the problem of smallpox. In other words, smallpox is a disease that is of a nature that if a susceptible person is exposed to it the chances are very, very high he will get the disease. In other words, the contagion, let's say, is very high; of what we call the disease index it is very high. In poliomyelitis, if you take a year such as 1952, which was the highest year on record, it was only about 42 cases of paralytic poliomyelitis per 100,000 and 17 percent of those occurred in this age period. Well, it means in the end that you practically have to vaccinate some 20,000 children to prevent a case of poliomyelitis. Therefore, it is much more difficult to measure 100 percent effectiveness than it would be in a case of smallpox. Furthermore, under those conditions, the probability that a child would get poliomyelitis is much less than it would be if he had been exposed to an active case of smallpox and were unvaccinated, so I think the parallels are not entirely as easy as they seem.

Mr. MURROW. Is there in prospect any method of discovering whether a child is already immune to polio so he or she need not be vaccinated?

Dr. SALK. We carried on some studies of that kind in Pittsburgh and we have recently done a study in 15,000 children utilizing a drop of blood from the finger. We worked out what you might call a micro test. The intention was to develop something similar to the test that's used for susceptibility to diphtheria, the Schick test. We have not been able to utilize the skin test as yet. We find that such a test is really not useful or necessary. By such a survey not more than 10 percent of the children would be excluded from vaccination.

Mr. MURROW. I see.

Dr. SALK. So it makes such a test unnecessary. We are using this test, however, for follow-up purposes and to simplify our research problem. But from the practical viewpoint it would be easier to vaccinate. In keeping with this, Mr. Murrow, let me point out, that because of the fact that three doses of vaccine were given so close together last year, we do not consider that the children who had three doses have received a booster inoculation. We are, therefore, proposing, which is contrary to what has been announced to the press up to the present, that all children who were vaccinated last year will receive a dose this year which can truly be considered a booster dose.

Mr. MURROW. Dr. Salk, I remember when we were in your laboratory several months ago. You had samples there of all the vaccines sent out by the pharmaceutical houses and you checked them for potency, etc.

Dr. SALK. Yes.

Mr. MURROW. Who is going to do that now? Who's going to be sure that it meets the proper requirements?

Dr. SALK. The manufacturers test potency. The National Institutes of Health do spot checks occasionally. We ourselves have tested a large proportion of the batches of vaccine that are going to be used in the 9 million children that the foundation is going to inoculate. We will follow this through and be sure that the standards are going to be set and are going to be maintained, but the National Institutes of Health has the responsibility ultimately for assuring potency.

Mr. MURROW. Who owns the patent on this vaccine?

Dr. SALK. Well, the people, I would say. There is no patent. Could you patent the sun?

Mr. MURROW. Well, I would like to put this question to all three of you gentlemen. It seems to me that we are a "have" Nation and we are not accustomed to be rationed and I go back now to something that Dr. Gregg said earlier about the possibilities of a mad scramble, a black market. What is to be done about it, Dr. Gregg?

Dr. GREGG. I should be rather inclined to think from experience, including perhaps the difficulties we had with alcohol, that unless the people understand the issues pretty clearly there will not be support enough to make any pure legal procedures effective, but there is a difference there too, namely, here is something in which safety is involved, children are involved—and the drive, to be very sure that your child or grandchild is protected is a very powerful drive. I would myself prefer to see this under some paragovernmental or semigovernmental control, with the withdrawal of licenses— the teeth that it puts in any such board or group.

Mr. MURROW. Dr. Francis?

Dr. FRANCIS. You recall when penicillin was first available that it had to be put under very strict control and there was a body organized through the National Research Council who really decided its distribution. Well, I think the amount of vaccine that may be available this year is much larger than was available—than was true of penicillin—but it seems to me that the major thing is the same type of discipline from the American public that they have displayed in this study and that I would hope and expect that they would be reasonable in their understanding that this was a limited product at the present time and that everybody couldn't get it and they would, as Dr. Gregg said, avoid the bootlegging and the personal demands which would make it available to the suspcetible children.

Mr. MURROW. Dr. Salk?

Dr. SALK. Well, Dr. Francis and Dr. Gregg have both expressed points of view that are some distance apart, and I somehow would feel a little more certain if I knew that the distribution curve of the disease agewise was being followed as far as distribution of vaccine is concerned.

Mr. MURROW. Well, gentlemen, you all stand on something of a summit of achievement here. Where do you think preventive medicine should go next, mental disease, cancer, heart?

Dr. FRANCIS. I have always had a great inclination in the field of mental disease, because I think it is one of the areas in which we need to understand who are the susceptibles, just as we talk of who are the susceptibles in poliomyelitis is needed and what are the factors that can help control it.

I do not believe that mental disease is basically separated from the normal biochemistry or physiology of the body, and it can't be handled in a vacuum. It seems to me there is a great area there in which continued investigation can be carried out to great advantage. This is not precluding the fact that there are still plenty of other diseases that need a good deal of attention.

Mr. MURROW. Dr. Salk, where do you think we should go?

Dr. SALK. Well, I think that where we can go is to apply the methodology that has been utilized in these investigations to any other problem that needs solving. I would agree with Dr. Francis that the area of mental disease is one of the largest by far and particularly desperately in need of quantitative measures that tell us precisely what we are dealing with, so that when one can measure the dynamics of the process as we have tried to measure the dynamics or determine the dynamics of the infectious diseases. Rather than continue to remain in purely a descriptive qualitative area, it would be splendid to apply quantitative terms. We have many analogies between immune phenomona and phenomena that are associated with mental disturbances. Perhaps one can bridge the gap between the two.

Mr. MURROW. Dr. Gregg?

Dr. GREGG. I agree with Dr. Francis, it is probably the mental and emotional diseases that need the attention the most, but I would feel that one should be very candid in admitting and in foreseeing the fact that that may be the area which is one of the hardest ones in which to make progress because what is technically or sometimes known as "the leads" are not so numerous. But determination to do that will make the difference.

Mr. MURROW. Well, thank you very much indeed, gentlemen, for sitting here on the anniversary of Franklin D. Roosevelt's death and discussing with us the achievements that have been made in the whole area of poliomyelitis. I think it would be appropriate to use a phrase that Carl Sandburg likes very much and say that, "we are very much beholden to you." Thank you very much. Good night and good luck.

The Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 20, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Mr. Ray Murphy, former national commander of the American Legion, and present chairman of the American Legion special committee on covenant of human rights and United Nations, before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Judiciary Committee considering Senate Joint Resolution 1, on April 29, 1955.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. RAY MURPHY, NEW YORK CITY, FORMER NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, AND PRESENT CHAIRMAN OF AMERICAN LEGION SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON COVENANT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND UNITED NATIONS, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE CONSIDERING SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1, APRIL 29, 1955

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the subcommittee, on three separate occasions, the American Legion, which I have the honor of representing today, has heartily endorsed the proposal for an amendment to our Constitution limiting the treatymaking power. At its last national convention held here in Washington, D. C., on August 30–September 2, 1954, the Legion reaffirmed its position by the adoption of a resolution which, in part, reads as follows:

"To clarify the Legion's current position we propose the submission by the Congress of the United States of a constitutional amendment, at the earliest opportunity, providing (1) no provision of a treaty or other international compact or agreement which conflicts with the Constitution of the United States shall have any force or effect; (2) no international compact or agreement which has not been concurred in by the Senate, as provided in article II of the Constitution, shall be, or have the dignity or legal effect of, a treaty under article VI of the Constitution; (3) no treaty or other international compact or agreement shall be effective as internal law within the United States except to the extent it may be made so by an act of Congress enacted to enforce or implement the same that would be valid in the absence of a treaty; (4) no treaty shall be concurred in by the Senate, except by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of a quorum of the Senate, on which the yeas and nays shall be entered on the journal; and (5) the Constitution shall not be in any way or to any extent altered or amended except by one of the methods provided in article V thereof."

It will be apparent to the members of the subcommitee that this resolution goes considerably beyond the proposal (S. J. Res. 1, 84th Cong., 1st sess., introduced on January 6, 1955 by Senator BRICKER), now under consideration. Since it is Senate Joint Resolution 1 which is now under consideration, I shall direct my remarks thereto, believing as I do that it would constitute a necessary minimum safeguard to the preservation of constitutional rights.

My remarks will be brief, for I can add nothing new to the great debate of the past few years. The work of scholars and researchers has been thorough, and the case, pro and con, has been fully documented and will, I am sure, be fairly considered by your subcommitee, and the Committee on he Judiciary, and eventually, by the Congress, and finally by the people of America. I do suggest that the issue is one which, after due and proper legislative consideration, and in the exercise of legislative powers, should be submitted to the people. I have been gratified to note that the minority of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, in connection with Senate Joint Resolution 1, 83d Congress, 1st session, and despite their opposition to a treaty-power amendment, stated:

"Senator BRICKER and the cosponsors are entitled to feel that they have stimulated the forces of public opinion."[1]

It is well, I think, that the public has thus been alerted to the hazards and uncertainties that lurk in the treatymaking power, and in possible judicial interpretation and even expansions thereof. Even the opposition to amendment, many in all good faith, by parading all manner of frightening specters, have served to waken public interest in a momentous matter. And the Migratory Bird case, *Missouri* v. *Holland*,[2] a 35-year-old Supreme Court decision, formerly required reading for law-school students only, and heretofore wholly unknown to the average layman, has suddenly taken a place alongside such landmark decisions as *Marbury* v. *Madison*, *Gibbons* v. *Ogden*, and the Dartmouth College case.

In the opinion of many something more has happened. Those who have been recently apprised of the treatymaking problem, now for the first time, realize that in this constitutional area there is no commonly accepted interpretation with respect to either fundamentals or details. No one today can define with any degree of assurance the respective areas of treaties and executive agreements, nor determine what treaties are self-executing. This whole field of important constitutional law is fraught with uncertainty. It is, therefore, clearly understandable that Mr. American Citizen strongly favors resolving some of these uncertainties. We believe it is not enough that our people be alerted to the intricacies of the treatymaking power. That would be analogous to diagnosing a serious illness without attempting to prescribe a cure.

I can assure the members of the subcommittee that an overwhelming number of the

Footnotes at end of speech.

members of the American Legion are wholeheartedly in favor of an amendment to the treatymaking power. Outside American Legion circles, my contacts with people throughout the country indicate an equally overwhelming support for a treaty amendment. The situation, in my judgment, is similar to that existing in 1789 when the people, fearful and uncertain of their rights under the newly created Constitution, sought assurance through constitutional amendments, giving birth to our Bill of Rights. In that fateful year many good men and true, some of them framers of the Constitution, felt that the first 10 amendments were unnecessary. The Bill of Rights has become the glory of the Republic, and time has proved that Jefferson and others who proposed them were eternally right.

Some able opponents of a treaty amendment ridicule the possible loss of constitutionally guaranteed rights by treaty power. Pointing to *Missouri* v. *Holland*, they ask what right has any American citizen lost thereby except perhaps the right to kill the only surviving migratory duck. Of course, no citizen lost a constitutional right by that decision. The case is important because the rationale goes far beyond validating the Migratory Bird Act. That decision permitted the Congress, pursuant to a treaty, to enact domestic legislation which it could not constitutionally pass in the absence of such treaty. It is conceivable, therefore, that treaties, and they could be self-executing treaties, or even executive agreements, under the *Missouri* v. *Holland* rule could alter constitutional rights. With this the eminent and scholarly lawyer who is now the Secretary of State, in the past, in effect has agreed.

Certainly we must all agree that the present Federal-State relationship can be completely upset by the Federal Government by virtue of authority derived from treaties. Under an expanded concept of interstate commerce, the authority of the Federal Government has already increased sufficiently to cope with the greater responsibilities of our Federal Government. It would be a grave mistake, perhaps even fatally injurious to our Federal-State system, to leave unchecked the treaty-making power which we know can upset this delicate relationship.

Some have asked why this has not happened long ago. Actually, it has long been happening on a limited scale,[3] but it has only been in recent years that treaties have gone beyond the field of normal international relations and dealt with and impinged upon internal law and individual rights, most of which have been long recognized as solely within the jurisdiction of the States.

Certainly in the years which lie ahead we can anticipate an ever-increasing number of treaties and agreements, covering many intricate phases of our international relations. Many not only will impose obligations on the contracting parties, but will also affect the rights of individual citizens of our country. Two recent cases, *U. S.* v. *Capps*[4] and *Keefe* v. *Dulles*[5] illustrates the way treaties and executive agreements can involve the affairs of our citizens, even though the final determinations in both cases avoided the constitutional issue.

There are those who appear to believe that to favor a treaty-power amendment is to favor isolationism and a retreat from reality in the conduct of foreign affairs. There are those who would have the people believe that proponents of amendment are opponents of every effort in the field of international cooperation, whether through the United Nations organization, or otherwise. There are those who charge that proponents of a treaty-power amendment seek with knowing design to shackle, and tie the hands of the Executive, in our relations with other nations and in the exercise of the essential powers of his office. If there be proponents of treaty-power amendment of such design and purpose, the American Legion is not of them or with them. We are confident that such an amendment as is envisaged in Senate Joint Resolution 1 contemplates and would result in no such constriction or strangulation of the necessarily broad powers of the Executive, powers which we know must be vast and fluid and flexible, powers which are not and should not be susceptible of specific limitation and definition. We know that in any charter written for the ages there must be "growing room." We of the American Legion would be the ultimate last to cripple the Executive or the Congress in the exercise of any power necessary to cope with the perils of the atomic age and with the implacable and unappeasible communistic, materialistic ideology that with ever-increasing capacity and ever-expanding dynamic power, inexorably presses on to world domination.

It has been said that some Americans oppose any treaty-power amendment because in fact they favor concentration of power in the Nation's Capital and in the Executive, which, as they hope, may lead to such international commitments as will eventually culminate in a political world government. It is evident that there are such people. We are not with them.

The American Legion has given consistent support to the United Nations from its conception to its creation, and through its all too often faltering administration. We will, I personally feel, continue to support it to that time when it appears to serve the cause of world government rather than the cause of the United States and the other nations of the world yet free, who make common cause with us that the whole world may be free. In all personal friendliness and sincerity, I wish to warn other supporters of the United Nations that they serve the United Nations ill if through it they appear to serve the cause of political world government. The fear exists that there are many advocates of world government who wish, by charter amendment, so to change the character of the organization as to make it in part a form of world government. If there are such people, they play into the hands of absolute isolationists and the clamoring hate groups of this country, who are against all that is, and would fervently heil an American Hitler.

The American Legion believes in a government not of men but of law. In this issue it is not concerned with personalities. It can share the general confidence that the Executive of today is highly conscious that his office is a public trust, and is completely certain that the man in the White House today is a just man, a truly great American, and no seeker for power. Nor do we seek to take away the power that is his under the Constitution. We seek rather, and seek only, to preserve the rights that belong to the States and the people under the same Constitution, rights which we feel sure are in jeopardy today for all the reasons that Senator BRICKER, the American Bar Association and many other groups and individuals have so ably stated.

The American Legion urges approval of Senate Joint Resolution 1 as the very minimum of protection and clarification of the people's rights.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Report No. 412, accompanying S. J. Res. 1, 83d Cong., 1st sess., p. 39.

[2] 252 U. S. 416 (40 S. Ct. 382).

[3] For example, *U. S.* v. *Curtiss-Wright* (299 U. S. 304, 57 S. Ct. 216) and *U. S.* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203, 62 S. Ct. 552).

[4] 75 S. Ct. 326.

[5] Decided by United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia, on September 16, 1954—not yet reported; certiorari denied 75 S. Ct. 440.

Testimonial Dinner to Rabbi Benjamin Schultz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 20, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by J. B. Matthews at the testimonial dinner to Rabbi Benjamin Schultz on April 20, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By way of introducing what I have to say about the guest of honor this evening, I wish to describe briefly two important events in the story of mankind—the one modern and the other ancient. These two events will, I believe, furnish an appropriate context for the career of Rabbi Benjamin Schultz.

The first event took place in Moscow on the 2d day of August 1935. The seventh world congress of the Communist International was in session.

The long-delayed meeting of this seventh congress had whetted the expectancy of Communists all over the world. Obviously, something new as in the making.

Finally, the great moment came. Georgi Dimitroff, recently freed from a Nazi prison and newly chosen head of the Communist International, was presented to the delegates with a long-winded speech by Wilhelm Pieck, German Communist leader. Communist speeches are notoriously long and Dimitroff's lasted more than 4 hours.

Near the end of the second hour of the speech came the burden of the new tactical orientation. It was an historic pronouncement. As it has been carried out in practice, its consequences have weighed heavily upon the lives and reputations of thousands of Americans. In four brief sentences Dimitroff spelled it out. "Comrades," he said, "you remember the ancient tale of the capture of Troy. Troy was inaccessible to the armies attacking her, thanks to her impregnable walls, and the attacking army, after suffering many sacrifices, was unable to achieve victory until with the aid of the famous Trojan horse it managed to penetrate to the very heart of the enemy's camp. We revolutionary workers," shouted Dimitroff, rousing the delegates to a high pitch of enthusiasm, "should not be shy about using the same tactics."

The tale of Troy's fall, as told in the immortal epic poem of Virgil, has several dramatic aspects which Dimitroff's bare reference to the deception of the wooden horse did not include.

According to the story in book II of the Aeneid, the Greeks laid siege to the walled city of Troy in a war that lasted 10 years. In Greek mythology, the conflict between the Greeks and the Trojans was attributed to a case of wife stealing. Paris, son of Priam, King of Troy, eloped with Helen, wife of Menelaus, King of Sparta.

The gods concerned themselves deeply with the prolonged strife. Poseidon, Hera, and Athena aided the Greeks, while Ares and Aphrodite took the side of the Trojans. Zeus and Apollo were neutralists.

At the end of 10 years, Troy remained impregnable to the attacking Greek force of Agamemnon. It was then that one Epeus, of the besieging Greeks, built the famous wooden horse, eminently fitting analogy of Dimitroff's proposed strategem.

The Greek Army, pretending to concede defeat after 10 fruitless years of battle, sailed away to Tenedos, leaving the huge frame of the wooden horse filled with picked warriors on the beach outside the walls of Troy. With the cessation of fighting, the curious Trojans went out to look over the deserted camp of the enemy. There they found the horse, and, shortly thereafter, a lone Greek soldier named Sinon.

According to Anaeas, the narrator of the epic tale, the Trojans promptly separated into two factions, the prohorse and the antihorse, the trusting and the skeptical, the latter constituting a dissenting minority. The few skeptics were led by a bold minister of religion named Laocoön.

The unheeded warning of Laocoön should be told in Virgil's own words: "The giddy multitude is split into opposite factions. Then it is that the foremost, before all the rest, followed by a great crowd, Laocoön eagerly runs down from the heights of the citadel, and from afar he cries: 'Wretched citizens, how has so wild a frenzy seized you? Do you believe that the enemy have sailed away? Or do you think that any Grecian gifts are free from fraud? Is such your knowledge of Ulysses? Either the Greeks are enclosed and concealed in this frame, or this is an engine wrought against our walls, or there is some hidden deceit; trust not the horse, ye Trojans. Whatever it is, I fear the Greeks even when they bring gifts.' So he spoke, and hurled his mighty spear with impetuous force against the flank and belly of the creature with its curving joints. If it had been our divine destiny, if our minds had been clear, Laocoön would have prevailed upon us to smash with our swords the lurking place of the Greeks, and Troy would now be standing, and thou wouldst still remain, O lofty citadel of Priam."

Laocoön paid dearly for his skepticism and his attempt to warn his fellow Trojans. He was castigated by other priests and by the heads of state, for making accusations without producing proof.

Concerning the finding of the lone Greek soldier, Sinon, the poet Virgil recites the following: Lo, some Dardan shepherds meanwhile came, dragging to the king with loud shouts a youth whose hands were bound behind his back, who, though they knew him not, had without compulsion put himself in their way as they approached him, in order to effect his plan, and open Troy to the Greeks, being confident in soul, and prepared for any event, either to work out his scheme, or to submit to certain death."

At first, the Trojans showed animosity toward Sinon, but after questioning him and hearing his tearful tale their anger turned to pity. Sinon told a carefully rehearsed story of how he had been chosen from among all the Greek soldiers to be offered up as a human sacrifice demanded by the oracles of Phoebus. After he had been prepared for death upon the altar, he managed to break his bonds and escape, hiding all night in a muddy marsh with his hands still bound behind him.

The fake refugee told his story so convincingly and with such copious tears that the Trojans, who had given asylum to many bona fide refugees, believed him. In fact, Virgil says that King Priam was "the first to bid that the man be released from his manacles and tight fetters," and spoke to him in friendly words, saying: "Whoever you are from this time forward lose and forget the Greeks; you shall be ours."

The trusting ones among the Trojans then hauled the huge frame of the wooden horse into the heart of the city, believing Sinon's word that it had been constructed by the departing Greeks as a propitiatory gift for Athena.

Translating this ancient story into some of its modern equivalents we find: That very day the trusting Trojans went about setting up the Trojan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born; got up an impressive list of sponsors headed by King Priam's wife as honorary chairman; and threw an applejack party at the residence of Paris and Helen to raise money to fight for the repeal of the Trojan Internal Security Act of 1950 B. C., which measure, they alleged, placed discriminating restrictions upon the admission of refugees bearing Greek gifts and culture.

The Committee on Un-Trojan Activities was hurriedly called into session, after issuing subpenas for Sinon and the sponsors of the prohorse organization. There was a loud outcry when it appeared that the chairman of the committee was conducting a one-man hearing; the opposition members of the committee were at Helen's applejack party. Taking the witness stand, the Greek refugee Sinon stuck by his story about the wooden horse but declined to tell the committee whether or not he was a Greek spy. When the sponsors of the Trojan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born were called to the stand, not one of them would disavow his affiliation with the prohorse organization, but with one voice they asserted that they were in good company, each relying on the reputation of another to establish his innocence by association.

The New Trojan Times denounced the Committee on Un-Trojan Activities, editorially, for its abusive treatment of Sinon and the prohorse sponsors, and declared that the committee had by its own un-Trojan procedures inaugurated an era of hysteria and thought-control.

While all this was going on, the Trojan Senate adopted a resolution of censure against Laocoön for hurling his spear with impetuous force into the belly and flank of the wooden horse.

The Trojans for Democratic Action met and passed a resolution charging Laocoön and his followers with damaging Trojan prestige abroad, especially in Athens and Sparta.

Meanwhile, at the Trojan University on Eveningside Heights, Professor Commageripides lectured his afternoon class—the last, as it turned out—on the menace of Laocoonism.

But that night—that night which was to live in the annuals of men down through all time—the Greek Army sailed back from Tenedos; Sinon slipped quietly from his bed of feigned slumber, and released the warriors within the wooden horse who, in turn, opened the city gates and admitted the waiting army of Agamemnon.

The Sinonites, aided and abetted unwittingly by the Priamites, had won the day. The Laocoönites had nothing but the facts on their side.

Thus in 1 day the Greeks accomplished by the deceit of a wooden horse and the trickery of a fake refugee what they had not been able to accomplish by force of arms in 10 years: Troy was wiped from the face of the earth.

Now we are back in the 20th century, more than 3,000 years after the sack of Troy. We sit once more in the Hall of Columns in Moscow. It is August 2, 1935. We hear a booming voice from the platform cry: "We revolutionary workers * * * should not be shy about using the same tactics."

Such was the origin of the Communist-front organization, the wooden horse by which the Communist Party has successfully penetrated to the heart of American public opinion. In the person of Ben Schultz, the spirit of the ancient Trojan priest, Laocoon, lives again. For these many years, he has been hurling with deadly accuracy and with impetuous force his spear into the flank and belly of this contraption of deceitfulness.

In 1946, Rabbi Schultz was the first to expose, in an article written for the Hearst newspapers, the antisemitism of the Soviet regime.

In 1947, he pioneered the exposure of the Communist infiltration of the churches, and like Laocoon of ancient Troy he paid the penalty for his exposure.

For 5 years he has led the Joint Committee Against Communism in New York and has made it, with the help of Lottie, the most effective organization of its kind in the United States.

As executive director of the American Jewish League Against Communism, he has traveled tirelessly across the Nation, year in and year out, warning his fellow countrymen, "Equo ne credite." "Believe not the horse."

J. Edgar Hoover has written that Rabbi Schultz deserves "the Nation's gratitude for his fight to educate our citizens on the true meaning of communism." KARL MUNDT has declared that "our country needs a Rabbi Schultz in every community."

I am honored to nominate Benjamin Schultz for the high priesthood of the Ancient Trojan Order of Laocoon and His Descendants.

Nationwide Examination of Educational Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 20, 1955

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I have before me an article in which is included an exclusive interview with Neil H. McElroy, president of the Procter & Gamble Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, and chairman of the Committee for the White House Conference on Education. It appeared in the April 1 issue of the U. S. News & World Report.

Since this article appeared, all of the 48 States and the Territories scheduled to participate in the President's program have announced plans to hold conferences on education. This massive study of our educational ills, as President Eisenhower has so aptly described it, is unparalleled in our history. The White House Conference next November 28–December 1 in Washington will climax the statewide studies. More than 2,000 citizens and educators are expected to attend this national gathering, first of its kind ever held in the educational history of this country.

This nationwide examination of our educational problems is of importance to every teacher, educator, citizen, and child in America. In many ways it parallels my own efforts to attract good teachers to the public schools by raising their salaries, for one of the chief subjects planned for discussion and analysis at the White House Conference concerns the problem of "How can we get enough good teachers and keep them."

I ask unanimous consent to have this article made part of the Appendix of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Question. Just what has been your connection with the educational problem of America, Mr. McElroy?

Answer. I've gotten a good deal of background on it from working in the National

Citizens Commission for the Public Schools.

Question. What is that commission?

Answer. It's an organization that was put together 5½, 6 years ago—something in that range—headed by Roy Larsen. I think I'm right in saying that Jim Conant, of Harvard, is the fellow who really stirred the thing up. He has a deep interest in secondary education—everybody in college and university life does have, because that's what they have to build on.

The quality of their educational product is whatever the quality of the secondary-school education is. It became apparent at that time just on plain mathematics that the number of children born was going to put a proportionate load against the school system. This load was going to give dimensions to the problems that were so abnormal that the people of the country needed to be aroused to it.

* * * * *

Question. Of course, usually we think of the States running education. How does it come about that we are getting into it at the Federal level?

Answer. The thought was that if the prestige of the White House and the prestige of the governors—there are State conferences in each one of the States that are preliminary to the White House Conference—could be put against the consideration of these problems, there would be focusing of public attention which could not come about in any other way. That really is the reason for all of this.

In addition to that, of course, Congress was willing to appropriate Federal money to finance both the White House Conference of next November and the State conferences, so that you wouldn't just have a State conference here and a State conference there, depending on whatever the legislature decided in each particular State. Since the financing had already been arranged by Federal funds—which were not of great importance, a modest contribution for the Federal Government to make to the encouragement of local solutions of these education problems—you could have a greater assurance that the State conferences, which are really the basic thing in all of this, would be held broadly over the country and at about the same time.

* * * * *

Question. What have they come up with?

Answer. Well, the fields of study are pretty much the fields that we are indicating as obviously the ones that need the attention of practically every one of these conference groups, whether State, local school district, or national.

Out of these conferences comes a clarification, let's say, of what you need to do to attract schoolteachers. We know that one of the things is money. But that isn't the only thing. Sometimes it's the matter of the working together of the training institutions that train teachers. There has been a sort of conflict between the liberal-arts schools, for example, and the so-called normal schools, and the basis of preparation in the higher education levels is one of the kinds of things that have been worked on.

Another example is the kind of thing that is currently being done in Detroit.

The problem of finding enough qualified teachers is, I would guess, the knottiest problem of all. You can get money out of people, because people have money. I mean this country can finance any reasonable kind of educational standard it wants, because the country is really that productive. It is merely a question of deciding that you want to put your money on that kind of thing instead of buying books or buying another suit or another television set, and so on.

However, you can't just manufacture teachers by appropriating money. You have to have the teacher candidates and then give them time to become good teachers. In Detroit, school authorities are going to people who may have been teachers before they married or maybe to just college-trained women who got married—and now are 45, 50, their children have grown and moved from home. These women are being asked to return to teaching.

Now, Wayne University, in Detroit, in cooperation and encouragement of this program, which is the kind of thing a citizens' group can stimulate, has put together some refresher courses which help that kind of person get prepared to step into a school and do teaching in a relatively short period of time, say 6, 7, 8 months. This is really a kind of emergency solution, but emergency solutions to the schoolteacher shortage have got to be found.

* * * * *

Question. Have you people been given a directive by the President as to what you are supposed to do?

Answer. The directive was in the legislation: "A conference broadly representative of educators and other interested citizens from all parts of the Nation, to be called the White House Conference on Education, to consider and report to the President significant and pressing problems in this field of education."

Question. What States do you have assurance will hold conferences before the November conference?

Answer. Well, there are 53 States and Territories eligible under this law. Forty-eight of them have notified us that some action has been taken leading toward a conference. Out of the remaining 5, 4 have done something, but not through the governor.

Question. What are the main problems that you are going to take up at this conference?

Answer. I can best give you a quick look at them here. The order of consideration agreed on by the White House Conference committee reads as follows. We have regarded this order as a logical sequence.

First of all is the question: "What kind of school program do we want?" Some people say "goals." That's kind of a fancy word for me. It's really a question of what should our schools accomplish. How much vocational education do you want? Do you want to teach children to drive autos in the public schools? How much athletic program do you want? All of these things have a price tag on them. So, we believe the first thing that people need to consider in any educational conference, whether State or national or city, whatever it may be, is what they want to provide for these youngsters.

Question. That is, what your goals are——

Answer. Yes—what are your goals? All right. That is one section of the problem.

Second on the list is this question: "In what ways can we organize our school system more efficiently and more economically?"

Now, a good deal could be done to make the operation of the school dollar more effective by getting the actual governmental organization of the school districts better arranged. As an example of the kind of thing I'm referring to, I think most of us are conscious of the need for pulling together a lot of these little red schoolhouse areas into central high-school districts and then bringing pupils in from 10, 15 miles, if need be, to get them to these schools, which are big enough to permit the assignment of high-grade teachers and the provision of various kinds of physical facilities which, because of the scattered nature of the areas, you couldn't do otherwise.

Question. Isn't that being done pretty generally?

Answer. A good deal of it, but a good deal not. I mean there's much more can be done.

Question. You are not concerned only with high schools, though, are you?

Answer. With both high schools and elementary schools in their relationship to the whole educational system of the country.

Question. Then it isn't for athletics and a big plant?

Answer. It is primarily for the quality of teaching. Any time you have several grades being taught by a single teacher, and that kind of business, the quality of teaching has to suffer. When you pull the groups together so that you can give each class a teacher for that particular grade, you have a better opportunity to give them a better education.

Question. What are the other questions on your list?

Answer. No. 3: "What are our school-building needs?" There you have the question of such things as what is the right number of children to put into a schoolroom. Until you can get a conclusion about that, you can't reach a conclusion on the number of classrooms needed. And, of course, as you well know, you can't just take a number of children, divide by 27—if that's the number to a schoolroom—and say that that's the number of schoolrooms you need. Life isn't that simple. It has got to be done by localities.

No. 4: "How can we get enough good teachers and keep them?" You might eliminate matrimony, of course. But we have to find more practical ways to keep them. It's part of the question of the competition of industrial money, and all of that kind of thing.

No. 5: "How can we finance our schools, build, and operate them?" That's both the construction and the operation cost.

No. 6: "How can we obtain a continuing public interest in education?" That is the field of interest in which we would hope that these conferences, when held, might develop local citizens' groups like the one in Cincinnati or in Mamaroneck, N. Y., or the State of Delaware which are very active, and have them take a continuing interest. Let's say, encourage the holding of a State conference each year, whether there's a White House Conference or not, so that these problems, whatever they may be—and they may vary as the years go by—can have good citizen attention put against them.

* * * * *

Question. Educators are a little busy to be setting standards; aren't they?

Answer. Educators can't set standards without public support. If there are some specific things that citizens would like to have in some community of which they are a part, they can get them if they're willing to say, "All right. As far as I'm concerned, you can tap my tax bill for that, and I'm going to like it." If enough people get together in the conference kind of mechanism, and they're the right kind of people, then you have a chance, it seems to me, of getting that kind of public acceptance of what needs to be done.

In our particular community, thanks to the fact that in Cincinnati there's been no political influence on the school board or the school system in any way—and then, too, partly, I guess, because people in Cincinnati think it's important to have a good school system—they've put up the money when they had to put it up, and a lot has been requested.

Now, there are some areas where that isn't being done, and it usually turns out to be an area where you have some sort of damaging of the public confidence in the school system. It could be some one or more persons on the board of education. It could be the superintendent of schools, himself. It could be any one of a number of things. The idea is that you might say the schools have been a local concern in this country. The local people have said what kind of an educational system they wanted and they paid the bill. When I say local, that includes the State, because, under State constitutions, the State has the responsibility for the educational program in that State,

so the State and the communities work together.

Now, there's the big question as to what extent Federal aid has to come in. There is no doubt but that one of the questions that will be pushed in these various conferences will be an analysis of what the States and communities can do. If they believe and feel confident that they cannot do it themselves, they may push even harder at the Federal Government.

Question. If the Federal Government gets into it, will it be on the construction end or providing money for operations as well?

Answer. Well, I think the current pressure is largely for building. Whether it goes beyond that, I guess we don't know. The building needs run into very large money.

Question. Do you have any figures on how much it would run?

Answer. I have a figure. I get it from another source, and I don't know that it's right, but it's about as good as a figure as any around. This is from a report that I have obtained from the National Citizens' Commission, of which I was a member, but am no longer because it seemed improper for me to stay on it in view of this new job. But during the closing months of my membership I was on a subcommittee called Financing Public Education in the Decade Ahead. This report was issued by the National Citizens' Commission; it states that $34 billion for school construction between now and 1965 would be needed to catch up.

Question. That just catches up?

Answer. It catches up, but also takes care of all of the needs that accumulate during that period.

Question. That's about $3 billion a year. The present rate of spending is about $2 billion a year, isn't it?

Answer. I think it is.

Question. If you give the State a completely free hand, you still haven't solved the problem, have you?

Answer. Well, the thing that bothers a good many people is that if it turns out to be a Federal program, unless it's extremely generous, you have a tendency to do the way you do in the airport development of the country, and other facilities, where the Federal Government has indicated that it would participate, but never quite participates, and the development of these things is delayed because people wait for their share of Federal aid. It's the kind of thing that unless it's very well conceived and very well done may delay this program of school building instead of helping.

Question. Do you consider one of the objectives of your conference the development of this program of Federal aid?

Answer. No; not in those terms. What we do believe one of our responsibilities, is to answer the question of how the school program, both in building and in operation, can be financed. If local and State sources are not adequate, then the question of Federal aid will have to come in.

Question. Will you recommend legislation in your conference?

Answer. Our responsibility is to make a report to the President. Now, if we make some recommendation which, in order to become effective, will involve legislation, then that may be indirectly recommending legislation.

* * * * *

Question. Is it true that most of the privately endowed colleges and universities are broke or are in bad shape?

Answer. It's true that a great many of our really good schools, that have produced good people for this country, within the range of 400, 500 total pupils, are in bad straits. What's been happening, which is even worse, is that in order to keep from actually being broke, they've been taking it out of their teachers, so that professors in some of these smaller, privately endowed colleges are making less money than high-school teachers in many cities.

It's the kind of thing that ultimately will result in such a decline in the quality of college education that the country will pay for it in the educational preparations of its youth.

Question. Are you getting any complaints from the country generally about the quality of education?

Answer. Yes. I would say that I personally don't get so many of them, but they certainly get enough of them at the National Citizens Commission. You see, we haven't really been underway long enough for the conference itself to have received a great many comments of this nature.

Question. What is the nature of those complaints, as you understand them?

Answer. The general kind of criticism that goes on—and when I say "general," I mean in a good many places—is that the traditional kind of education that was given to children in the days of the parents seems not to be given anything like as much attention as the kind of education that attempts to fit a child into a society, to the comparative undertreatment of such fundamentals as reading well and writing well and doing arithmetic. And, depending on your point of view, you either think your child is being well educated or you don't. A parent may say: "You can't even spell common words, and you're in the eighth grade. I could spell better than you when I was in the fourth grade." Or something like that. Well, I think everybody's got a right to have a crack at the subject of educational standards and goals. That's one of the first things confronting us.

Question. Isn't the quality of education always a good deal poorer than it was a generation earlier?

Answer. Well, I think that's likely to be true in the mind of everyone. There are some figures that show the changes from 1900 to 1922 to 1949, and the percentage of students enrolled in the schools who take a particular subject. Now, English has gone up sharply—these are high-school figures: 38.5 in 1900, 76.7 in 1922, and 92.9 in 1949. United States and English history: In 1900 it was 38, in 1922 it was 18 and in 1949 it was 22. General science has gone from 18 in 1922 up to 20 now.

Question. These are not compulsory courses, are they? These are electives?

Answer. Yes. One reason for the changes is that the number of courses is greater and there are more courses which are electives. You'll see that as you get down here in industrial arts, and all that sort of thing.

Now, here's one that bothers people like Jim Killian.

Not enough youngsters take mathematics. Unless they have a reasonable amount of mathematics in secondary schools, they are poor prospects for MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) and the scientific schools.

You're all familiar with the statement that's going around pretty freely that Russia is now graduating more scientists and engineers than the United States colleges and universities are. Jim Killian of MIT is one of our committeemen, and I'm sure that one of the reasons he accepted appointment to the committee is that he's got to be concerned about the quality of secondary-school education, because, unless the quality of secondary-school education steps up, he isn't going to have what he needs to build on. Well, 56 took algebra in 1900, 40 in 1922, and 27 in 1949.

Here are figures which are disturbing to the people who believe in the cultural subjects. Latin: 50 in 1900, 27 in 1922, 8 in 1949. French: 8 in 1900, up to 15 in 1922, and now down to 5.

Question. What about other foreign languages?

Answer. Spanish came in at 11 in 1922 and went down to 8 in 1949. Industrial subjects went from 14 percent in 1922 up to 27 percent in 1949.

Question. That's vocational schools?

Answer. Vocational schools, or some limited industrial subjects that can be taken in the general high school.

Question. Is there anything on the study of government?

Answer. Not as such. Some other figures: Physical education goes from 5 to 69. Well, that's probably compulsory.

Music: 25 percent up to 30 percent.

Question. Does that mean that more youngsters in high school take music than take algebra, percentagewise?

Answer. In certain grades of high school you may have a compulsory course in music.

Question. Take your study of the southern schools. Is the question of integration going to complicate your problem of studying those schools and appraising their capacity, and so on?

Answer. Here's what we think about that. At our first meeting, the group approved a position we would take on that, and I would like to read that to you. This is what the committee for the conference approved as our policy at this stage:

"The committee recognizes the importance of the problem of segregation of races within the public schools in some areas of our country. It also recognizes, however, that this problem, important as it is, now is in the hands of the Supreme Court of the United States for final adjudication. The committee, therefore, considers that it would be inappropriate for it to concern itself directly with the question at this time."

Now, if between now and the time the conference is held the Supreme Court comes up with its bill of particulars on how this problem is to be handled, then, it seems to us, all that that does in the State that is concerned is to add another problem of school construction and of school cost of operation in that State over and above the problem that is already there because of the increasing numbers. So, as far as we're concerned, it's just another factor which complicates the local problem where it is a problem—but that's all.

Question. You've given us some figures on the needs of colleges for the next 20 years or so. Can you give us those for the secondary and elementary schools?

Answer. Yes, roughly. My previous figure was between 1954 and 1970—that was the doubling in the colleges. This is from 1954 to 1965, about a 10-year swing. There will be about 40 percent more pupils in the elementary and secondary schools in 1965 than there are in 1954. That is combined. There will be about one-third more in the elementary-school ages and about 60 percent more in the secondary schools.

Question. Then that is going to create a problem for the high schools?

Answer. Yes. You see, it's a wave. You've got the first impact now in your elementary schools. It's a wave that's complicated by the thing that I've tried to describe, this increased staying power, which comes about with an increased standard of living.

Question. What about schoolteachers' salaries—how do they average, compared with other segments of the population?

Answer. They are low, and it's one of the things we will take up.

Question. Do you have figures on that?

Answer. We have figures, but, again, it is from this study. The study is roughly thinking in terms: that, in all probability, in order to attract the number of people to the teaching profession we are going to be needing—and this is assuming a quality standard of teaching, also—something in the range of a 50-percent increase in the overall operating costs of our school, which, of course, includes teachers' salaries, will have to be assumed.

Question. For what length of time—right now?

Answer. Within this period.

Question. Is this 50-percent increase on just the present salary scales?

Answer. You would be adding numbers as well.

Question. What is the average pay of a high-school teacher?

Answer. Right now it is about $3,200. That's a nation-wide average.

Question. And within that average there is a very, very wide range, isn't there?

Answer. There'll be a range, perhaps from $1,400 to $7,500.

Question. Does that include elementary school?

Answer. This is for high school. This discussion of the method of public education in the decade ahead, this 1954 to 1965 period that we've been talking about, is an interesting rationalization of the fact that the money is there—the people have just got to say that they want to use it for this purpose. And it goes in this way—and to me it's an interesting way of making the statement.

Our economists say you can figure on somewhere around $360 billion of gross national product, produced by this country in 1954. It's now being projected that by a decade from now, or let's say 1965, it will be $525 billion. $525 billion against $365 billion is $165 billion additional money.

It is suggested here that if the step-up that is probably needed to attract and hold the quality of teaching talent that we need for this program is done, there will need to be an additioal $10 billion added to the budgets of these schools. Then the comparison is made of the $10 billion against the $165 billion of added output by our people's efforts, and that leaves plenty of room for the stepping up of the standards of living of the people after providing improved education for our increased numbers of school children.

* * * * *

Question. The general pattern of White House conferences on special topics in the past have been that they chiefly served the purpose to provide publicity and set up sort of a springboard for Federal legislation. Would you say that that is the primary purpose of this one—to get through some Federal-aid-to-education law?

Answer. We don't think of it as such. Now, people with different viewpoints in this field think of it in two ways. One group thinks of it as a delayer or a kind of blind alley for the Federal aid that they think should be distributed quickly.

The other people think that the conference is for the purpose of developing a public interest and a public support for a Federal-aid program. We think of it as neither. We think of it as a conference which genuinely has the desire to develop and assemble the factual material that bears on these six basic problems that education faces. We believe that the people that we have can think objectively on these things and can come out with what seem to be conclusions indicated by fact. Now, if we are that kind of people, then we won't do either of the things of which we are being accused.

The Role of the American Merchant Marine in the Atomic Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by Hon. Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy, before the Propeller Club, port of Washington, D. C., as follows:

THE ROLE OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE IN THE ATOMIC ERA

(Address by Hon. Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy, before the Propeller Club, port of Washington, D. C., on the occasion of National Maritime Day, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., Thursday, May 19, 1955)

I am very grateful for the opportunity of speaking to this audience in anticipation of National Maritime Day. Following closely the observance of Armed Forces Day on May 21, the celebration of National Maritime Day on May 23 is particularly timely and appropriate. For the American merchant marine is as much a part of our defense system as the combat elements of the Armed Forces themselves. Quite accurately, the American merchant marine is referred to as our fourth arm of defense.

There is little doubt that we have come a great distance down the road into the atomic era. We have seen dozens of atomic weapons tested in a variety of forms in all their awesome power. We have seen the first combat naval ship under way on atomic power and progress has been made in the field of atomic propulsion for aircraft.

In the peaceful applications of atomic energy, we are seeing increased use of atomic and nuclear physics in medicine, in research, in science, and in industry. Early this month an agreement between the United States and Turkey was announced whereby we will lease 6 kilograms of uranium to Turkey for the construction of a small-sized reactor which will be used for scientific research activity. We have seen the initial steps taken in our own country and Great Britain to adopt atomic power to industry and commerce, and just a few days ago President Eisenhower made his historic announcement recommending that the American merchant marine have an atom-powered ship.

In this era of bewildering progress, when one advance leapfrogs another, and as science gives us new creations and inventions, we are apt to conclude that everything old is to be replaced. While this is often true, it is not always so. The automobile replaced the buggy, and the electric light the gas lamp; but more often than not, a new development of achievement supplements or improves the old and makes it better, rather than replaces it. For example, we see jet engines supplementing diesel and piston engines. We know now that atomic power will only supplement other types of ship propulsion in selected applications. In these cases, the trend will be to increase the efficiency of our merchant ships rather than replace them.

The advent of the atomic age does not lessen our need for a strong and adequate merchant marine; for it is a fundamental truth that the United States cannot get along without merchant vessels. Without our own ships, we cannot be assured of obtaining the necessary raw materials we need. Without our own ships, we cannot defend ourselves. Without ships, we cannot assist our allies. Without ships, we cannot grow and prosper. The advent of the atom does not alter our dependence upon the need of workaday merchant ships crossing the seven seas. The merchant marine remains as indispensable to our prosperity as it ever was, and fully as important to our defense as the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, or the Marines. It may be said that victory in World War II was assured on the day when our merchant ship construction exceeded our losses.

Our American merchant marine does not serve the interests of just the coastal States and the Great Lakes area. It reaches into every inland pasture, field, factory, and workshop. The farmer in Kansas, Illinois, or Iowa may never have seen an ocean or a merchant ship, but his livelihood is directly related to this Nation's maritime strength. Millions of tons of his products are sent across the seas by ships. The dairy farmer of Wisconsin, Illinois, and Missouri is likewise affected. Ships carry his products around the world. The auto worker in Detroit is also concerned. Ships take overseas millions of dollars worth of the automotive equipment that he makes. More than ever, no segment of our population is self-sufficient and no part of this Nation is unaffected by affairs of the sea. Farmer, laborer, industrialist, stenographer, housewife—whatever the trade, occupation, or livelihood, it is connected to and affected by our maritime industry. Accessibility to foreign markets enriches our lives and supplies our needs.

Living as we do at a time when creature comforts and household labor-saving devices are commonplace, and in a bountiful country which enjoys the highest living standard the world have ever known, it is hard to convince the average American that his country is a "have not" nation. But this fact is nothing new. We were a "have not" nation in 1776 and have been ever since. In colonial days we had to trade to expand and to prosper just as we do now. We were as dependent on the sea then as we are today. We imported most of our metals and many of our luxuries, such as tea, pepper, sugar, spices. As America has grown and prospered, our "have not" status has widened. As recently as 1940, we had lumber and petroleum to export and we were almost self-sufficient in copper, zinc, and lead. Now we must import all of them in increasing quantities. Advancing science has hastened and enlarged our needs. At one time in our history, iron used to be good enough; then we started adding to it other minerals to make it lighter, stronger, resistant to stain, to heat, to sea water, and vibration. We have alloyed manganese, cobalt, and chromium and other rare metals with steel to make it do more necessary tasks and these special ores must come from abroad.

Thus, the automobile you own is not entirely made in Detroit, but partly in India, from whence we get manganese to make its steel. It is partly made in Bolivia from whence we get the antimony to make its bearings. Your refrigerator and your washing machine are not entirely made in New York or Cleveland but partly in Africa and South America from whence we get many of the raw materials that go into them. Your television set is not entirely made in Schenectady, but partly in Korea and India from whence we get the tungsten and mica.

The list of strategic and critical materials which are essential to our economy numbers 77 items. Yet, of these 77, the United States is sufficient in only 11. As far as our defense production is concerned (and we are still the free world's arsenal), one example will suffice to show how dependent we are on the overseas sources of raw materials which can be supplied in the quantities needed only by ships. Essential to the manufacture of our combatant aircraft are such raw materials as aluminum, chromium, titanium, antimony, tin, cobalt, mica, and tungsten. The largest percentage of these materials must be brought by merchant ships from overseas. Ever such prosaic but necessary items such as coffee, sugar, tea, and many vegetable oils must be carried by ships from overseas by ships to our ports.

The atomic age, therefore, has not changed this fundamental fact: that no matter who you are, where you live, or what your livelihood depends, your prosperity in peacetime and your security in wartime are definitely related to the oceans and to the merchant ships which cross them to take our products overseas and to bring back essential raw materials. The answer, then, as to why we must have a strong merchant marine in this atomic age is, first, that it is essen-

tial to our continuing prosperity; and second, that it is vital to our security in time of war. Thomas Jefferson's conclusion about the American merchant marine is as true today as it was in 1793: "As a branch of industry it is valuable; but as a resource of defense essential."

The United States Navy and the merchant marine have always been inseparably bound together. Since the very beginning of American history, the United States Navy has been closely related to the merchant marine. John Paul Jones was a merchant mariner for 16 years before he became famous in our Continental Navy. Stephen Decatur commenced his naval career as a privateer. The American Navy of the Revolutionary War, in fact, was entirely created from the American merchant marine.

One of our early Congress' first acts was to establish a merchant marine. Our forefathers foresaw that if our country was to grow and to prosper, it was necessary for us to have a first-class merchant marine. Our rugged and talented merchant mariners gave us this with the succession of the fast packets, the legendary New Bedford whalers, and our world-famous Clipper ships.

In every war, the American merchant marine has played a vital and indispensable though, sometimes, an unpublicized role. It has been the vital determinant of whether we fought a war on our homeland or beyond our own shores. This was demonstrated beyond question in World War II when the vital importance of sea transportation as an element in the logistic support of our military forces was so positively shown.

The military movements incident to the recent war in Korea furnish an excellent example of the logistic problems which overseas military operations entail. Every fighting man sent to Korea was accompanied by 5 tons of supplies, and it required 64 pounds of supplies and equipment every day to keep him there. The support of that war involved the sea transportation of 54 million tons of dry cargo and 22 million tons of petroleum products from and within the Korean theater. In the performance of this task the privately operated American merchant marine devoted itself unstintingly and was quick to respond to every demand made upon it. More recently, in Indochina, the American merchant marine participated in the little-publicized Operation Passage to Freedom conducted by the Navy, which involved the evacuation by sea of some 300,000 anti-Communist refugees and 200,000 tons of cargo from North to South Indochina.

Despite the fact that the merchant marine is essential to our personal prosperity in peacetime and vital to our security in wartime, it is unfortunately true that our shipbuilding industry is currently in a distressed condition. Eight-tenths of our present merchant ships will be obsolete in another 10 years. Nine-tenths of them are too slow for wartime use against the modern submarine. We are still short of tanker tonnage sufficient to meet our mobilization needs. There is very little merchant shipping now under construction in our yards. Within the past year the United States has fallen from 7th to 12th amongst shipbuilding nations. Countries such as Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Norway, Germany, Italy, and Japan outbuild us in terms of modern ships. A great many of these foreign-built ships are of the highest quality, having air-conditioning, modern fireproofing, safety equipment, and, in most cases, could comply fully with the high standards traditionally demanded by our United States Coast Guard regulations and the American Bureau of Shipping. It is worthy of comment also that since 1939 13 nations which did not even have merchant fleets have entered the maritime scene. Even landlocked Switzerland now has a 30-ship merchant marine.

We canot allow our merchant marine to approach disuse and decay on the ground that we can trust to luck and improvise to meet our next emergency as we did both in World War I and World War II. In this atomic age if general war should unfortunately ever occur, despite our patient and intense efforts to prevent it, there will not be time to resurrect a merchant marine. Our survival in a global war will be largely dependent upon the merchant shipping which is available during the critical initial period. It is also my candid opinion that it would be folly for us to depend on the shipping and the shipbuilding facilities of other nations in the event of war. We must have our own American merchant marine, and it must be strong and adequate.

While there are many troubles and problems which beset our maritime industry (and none of them is of quick and easy solution), there have been some recent encouraging developments recently. First of all, the St. Lawrence seaway project has been approved. Since the beginning of this year, seven new shipping lines (unfortunately all of them flying foreign flags) have announced their plans to commence Great Lakes operations. I earnestly hope we may soon learn of similar plans on the part of some of our American-flag operators. Commerce on the St. Lawrence will inevitably increase as the seaway project approaches its completion. I disagree with those who believe this project will mean only a shift of ocean traffic from our coastal areas into the Great Lakes. It is my opinion that this development will not only increase trade into the Great Lakes ports of Duluth, Milwaukee, Chicago, Detroit, Toledo, Buffalo, and Cleveland, but as the years go by it will also increase the overall marine traffic on our seaboards. The seaway, in my opinion, will result in greater trade and traffic for all; and not just for marine traffic, but for railroads and truckers as well.

The second encouraging development has been the Congress' approval of a project to deepen the upper Delaware River above Philadelphia and open it to ocean traffic. This is going to mean a great deal to that great industrial area of the East. It will relieve congestion in Philadelphia Harbor, it will enable full use of the terminals at Camden and Trenton, and it will mean a steady increase and expansion of marine traffic in the Delaware.

A third encouraging factor in our maritime affairs is the vigor and foresight which our Maritime Administration is showing. In conjuncture with industry, they have developed several new designs of merchant ships for the replacement of our aging fleets largely built during World War II. These new designs not only incorporate maximum commercial utility, but at the same time, assure the Department of Defense of the availability of acceptable auxiliary vessels in times of emergency. The Maritime Administration has also been conducting extensive research and development activity in the atomic propulsion field as well as in the field of gas turbines, free piston engines, diesels, and improved steam turbines. These programs being vigorously pursued by our Maritime Administration cannot do other than help our maritime position.

Another encouraging development is, of course, the President's very recent proposal to build an atomic-powered merchant ship. The construction of such a ship has a larger purpose than maritime gain. It will demonstrate to the world in a tangible way that we intend to use the power of the atom for peaceful use and for nothing else, if we have our way. The President mentioned the construction of this atomic merchant ship in these words:

"We have added to the United States program for peaceful uses of atomic energy, an atomic-powered merchant ship. * * * The new ship, powered with an atomic reactor, will not require refueling for scores of thousands of miles of operation. Visiting the ports of the world, it will demonstrate to people everywhere this peacetime use of atomic energy, harnessed for the improvement of human living. In part, also, the ship will be an atomic exhibit; carrying to all people practical knowledge of the usefulness of this new science in such fields as medicine, agriculture, and power production."

This first atomic-powered merchant ship will have large exhibit space, and perhaps a large theater, so that as it travels the trade routes of the globe and stops in major ports of the world, it can exhibit our American system of liberty and free enterprise.

Obviously, a great deal of hard work in research and development is necessary before marine atomic power can be produced at a cost equal to power from fossil fuels. A great amount of such work is now being carried on in connection with both military and civilian power projects in atomic energy. As the necessary techniques are developed, they will be applied to merchant shipping exactly as were techniques of using iron and steel for hulls, welding in lieu of riveting, and very high versus low steam pressure. As the United States Navy took the lead in those developments, which were later taken over, modified and used with great success by the merchant marine, so the United States Navy has led and will continue to show the way in marine atomic propulsion.

The first two plants to produce significant quantities of useful atomic energy in the United States were naval developments—the *Nautilus* powerplant and its land-based prototype in Idaho. The technology developed in these plants is being adopted as the basis for the first United States civilian powerplant at Shippingport, Pa., and will be used for the atomic-powered merchant vessel which the President recommended.

As you all know, the Navy has now been operating the atomic-powered submarine *Nautilus* for many weeks and we are very pleased with the progress and the performance which this vessel has shown. We feel that the future of atomic propulsion in the marine field holds immense promise. Our experience and research, of course, will contribute greatly to the building and operation of the atomic-powered merchant ship. The Navy will cooperate fully to assist the American merchant marine to produce and sail this atom peace ship as quickly as possible. No one appreciates better than the American Navy the need for a strong and adequate American merchant marine.

In summary, I believe that the prospects of our maritime affairs in the future are brighter. The American people, when aware of the facts, always act promptly, resolutely, and intelligently, and I am sure they want and will support the strong and adequate American merchant marine for which your Navy had consistently been in the forefront as its stanchest champion.

Dairy Difficulties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 20, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the problems confronting the dairy industry at a time of declining return to the pro-

ducer are well summarized in an article entitled "Dairy Difficulties," published in the Wall Street Journal of May 17. I ask unanimous consent that this news survey by Burton P. Sauer and George Melloan be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAIRY DIFFICULTIES—PARED MILK PRICE PROPS ELIMINATE SOME DAIRIES—OTHERS BUILD UP HERDS—FARMER KIRCHNER BUYS MORE COWS, BUT DAIRYMAN FRANK SWITCHES TO HOGS—SLIGHT EBB IN RIVER OF MILK

(By Burton P. Sauer and George Melloan)

KENOSHA, WIS.—Step into the big white barn here on Walter Kirchner's farm and you can count 40 dairy cows busily munching hay. In a few months, there'll be 45 cows; a year ago there were only 36.

Forty miles west, on George Frank's rolling 290-acre farm near Milton, there are 78 empty cow stalls in the spacious dairy barn. Mr. Frank had his 50 cows auctioned off last week.

The contrary actions of these two dairy farmers stemmed from the same situation—lower milk prices. A little over a year ago, Federal price props on butter, cheese, and other dairy products were lowered 10 percent. This meant smaller checks for dairymen selling fluid milk, and led to some farming changes throughout dairyland.

SOME OPPOSING OUTLOOKS

Farmer Kirchner and Farmer Frank, for example, looked at the same lower milk prices, but they reacted differently. Mr. Kirchner explains his decision this way: "We're expanding cow numbers to raise production. That will enable us to maintain our income despite the fall in milk prices." Mr. Frank has an equally good reason for selling his herd. "At present milk prices," he explains, "there's no incentive to keep cows. I'm switching to hogs."

Other dairy farmers here in the Nation's heaviest milk-producing State and elsewhere have followed similar divergent trails, but there has been one general result: Fewer dairy farms, with generally higher production on farms that remain.

For example, the Pure Milk Association, a big Chicago cooperative group of milk producers, says 22,771 farmers in the surrounding milk marketing shed were shipping milk to the city at the end of February. This was 1,400 fewer farmers than 14 months earlier, but average weekly milk production per farm was nearly 50 pounds higher than a year earlier.

The trend in the area around Shawano in northeast Wisconsin is fairly typical of what's happening in other predominately dairy regions. George Rupple, manager of Consolidated Badger Producers Cooperative in Shawano, estimates that there are 7 percent more cows, but 2 percent fewer herds, in the region than a year ago.

PRICE PROP HEADACHE

Although dairy price supports were pared in April 1954, the hoped-for decline in milk flow didn't result immediately. The price proppers' headache got worse, in fact. Milk output in Wisconsin rose 3.5 percent to a new high; output nationally climbed 2.1 percent.

But in recent months, the river of milk has been ebbing. Wisconsin production during the first quarter of 1955 fell three-tenths percent under a year earlier; national output dropped 1.5 percent. With Americans drinking more milk, and eating more dairy products, supply and demand are slowing swinging into balance. Lower prices have helped some, as has the high-gear promotion of some dairy foods in past months.

There's little likelihood, though, of a steep decline in milk flow. For one thing, big-scale dairying has become a specialized business; it's a costly and time-consuming job to shift to another kind of farming, even where soil and climate permit.

Much of the decline in dairying has been among smaller, often marginal, producers. One Wisconsin farm auction specialist estimates that 3 out of 4 sales his company has handled this spring and last winter were for young farmers who entered dairying within the past 4 years. A number of substantial producers have quit, of course: Some to retire, some to switch to other types of farming and some because hired help is hard to find. But generally the dairymen who have ridden out a year of lower prices are high volume operators who have the equipment and capital to keep going at a lower price level—often by boosting output to compensate for pared prices.

Mr. Kirchner, for example, shipped 401,000 pounds of milk in 1954, compared with 268,000 pounds in 1951. In that same period, his gross income from milk rose to $15,000 from $12,000, despite the fact that milk prices fell from about $5 a hundred pounds to nearly $3.

BRING DOWN COSTS

"If a dairyman can't shift to something else that will make him more money he stays in dairying and increases production," explains Mr. Kirchner, who holds a master's degree in agricultural economics from the University of Wisconsin. "At this level of prices, I can still make money on milk if I have good cows."

"The best way for a farmer to cut costs is to add volume to bring down unit costs," comments E. W. Tiedeman, head of the dairy division of the big American Farm Bureau Federation.

Some big dairy States have seen milk-cow populations increase as dairymen try to step up production. In Wisconsin there were 2,656,000 dairy cows on farms at the start of the year—52,000 more than a year earlier, according to the Department of Agriculture. New York, an important dairy State because of the huge consumption of the metropolitan area, also saw milk-cow numbers increase during 1954. The Nation's milk-cow population was almost stable in 1954, showing a decrease of only 0.01 percent during the year.

"If you're going to be in the dairy business today, you have to be in it big," says Gene Bailey, who, with his father and brother, runs a 400-acre dairy farm near Racine.

To be "in it big," the Baileys are spending $10,000 to add 10 cows to their present 65 and to remodel their barn for easier working. By remodeling, the Baileys not only are making room for more milkers; they're rearranging the barn so 2 men can do the chores that originally needed 3. Shaving the cost of had-to-get farm labor can be as important to a dairy man as adding cows to boost overall production.

"If the price of milk will stay half way decent, we'll be way ahead of what it costs us," says Mr. Bailey.

Quality as well as quantity counts in today's dairy herds. Mr. Kirchner keeps close check on the amount of butterfat his cows produce, since the price he's paid by the local creamery is keyed to the milk's butterfat content. "When I came here 6 years ago we had 1 cow that produced more than 425 pounds of butterfat a year," he relates. "Now there are 12 producing more than 500 pounds each." He figures a cow that makes over 445 pounds of butterfat a year nets him $100 annually at present milk prices.

BIGGER, BETTER HERD

These increases in production per cow have been achieved through culling out poor milk givers and use of good cows and high-grade bulls available through artificial insemination to breed a better, as well as a bigger, herd.

The increase in numbers of farmers who've decided in the past year to get out rather than try to expand shows up in reports from farm and livestock auctioneers.

"We've had sales involving dairy herds every day except Sunday in recent months," states Bert Kelhnofer, of the Elkhorn branch of Thornton Finance Corp, a Fond du Lac firm specializing in farm mortgages and auction sales. "Normal for us is 10 sales a month."

Charles Hoffman, who runs an auction firm in the northeast Wisconsin town of Manawa, reports more sales of farms this year than ever before. "It's due to the drop in farm income," he avows.

Decisions to quit are not always attributed by farmers to lower prices, but most admit that they might not be quitting had prices remained at the high levels of 2 years ago. For one thing, dairying is hard work with long hours and no days off.

"I'm getting too old for dairy work," says Alvin Wenger of Yorkville, Wis., who sold his 26 milk cows in January. "I wouldn't know where to find a single man to work here. When inability to find hired help and low prices both faced me, I decided to quit." Mr. Wenger thinks he might add to his 130 hogs and possibly buy some steers for his 226-acre farm.

Stricter requirements by dairies buying grade A milk are another factor prompting some farmers to sell off cows. Many dairies are handling milk in tank trucks, called "bulk handling," instead of cans, to save labor. "An awful lot of farmers in this area have become discouraged because they felt they couldn't put up a new milk house and bulk milk set-up," says John L. Anderson, who runs an auction and loan firm at Union Grove. "A milk house and tank might cost $4,000 to $5,000 and a number have quit rather than scrape up that much."

SOME HARDSHIP CASES

Most of the true hardship cases among farmers are turning up in the northern half of the State where alternatives to dairying are few because of the short growing season and poor quality soil. Some of the farmland there will grow only enough pasture to feed dairy cows in summer and enough hay to keep them alive in winter," says one farm spokesman. A similar situation faces farmers in a good part of neighboring Minnesota's dairy belt.

Farmers living some distance from cities must sell most of their milk for use in butter, cheese, and other manufactured products. Consequently, the price they receive averages about 50 cents a hundredweight lower than the price for grade A milk going into the big city bottle markets.

In the northern sections of the State, a number of farmers are switching from dairying to raising potatoes.

Southern Wisconsin farmers often have enough arable land to provide them with the alternatives of raising hogs, beef cattle, or cash crops. Their decision on switching from dairying generally is based on whether they have enough capital to carry them while beef cattle or hogs are maturing, and whether there are prospects for a better return than on milk. Don Smith, manager of Walther Dairy, in the southwest Wisconsin town of Platteville, reports 10 percent fewer farmers selling to his dairy than a year ago. Hog production in the area, a practicable corn-hog farming region, is increasing, according to Mr. Smith.

MILK PRICES CUT, BUT COWS CONTINUE COSTLY MUNCHING

KENOSHA, WIS.—Although dairy price supports were lowered more than a year ago, there's still bitterness in dairyland, mostly because dairy farmers felt the first major whack in props.

The dairy farmer was crucified, complains veteran farmer John Voelkering. He argues that if he had "sold all the corn, grain, and other feed I raised last year, I would have made $4,000 more than I made by feeding it to dairy cows. But I've been building that purebred herd for 20 years and you don't quit that easily."

Like many another dairyman, Farmer Voelkering's biggest complaint is that dairy product prices were lowered without an accompanying cut in costs of feed the cows keep right on eating regardless of the price paid for their milk.

Price Discrimination and Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, businessmen of Wisconsin are seriously and understandably concerned over the report of the Attorney General's Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws. The following column by Mr. C. Wilson Harder, of the National Federation of Independent Business, points up the reason for this concern:

WASHINGTON AND SMALL BUSINESS
(By C. Wilson Harder)

Unless something reverses trend, spring of 1955 might well go down as Washington's silliest season.

Report of Attorney General's Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws appears major contributor to season's silliness. As already pointed out by Representative HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, 22 of the 60 committee members were corporation lawyers engaged in fighting Government on antitrust matters.

But probably outstanding absurdity was inclusion of Edward F. Howrey, Federal Trade Commission Chairman, on committee.

Apparently, even Howrey recognizes the absurdity. In commenting on fact that he signed report which included recommending elimination of antitrust laws, Howrey is quoted "This should not be construed as prejudgment of issues which may come before the Commission in individual cases."

Inasmuch as FTC is a quasi-judicial body, this is somewhat akin to situation that would exist if judge went on solemn record stating pickpockets do no wrong, then orally assuring everyone this would have no bearing on his trials of pickpockets.

Howrey's appointment was opposed by National Federation of Independent Business on grounds he was actively engaged as lawyer for rubber firm fighting FTC quantity-discount rule.

This still-to-be enforced ruling provides there is reasonable limit to quantity a dealer must take to obtain top discount. Involved is vital principle applicable to many antitrust cases now pending, or certain to arise.

But before Senate confirmation committee, Howrey promised to divorce himself from tire case, and by inference, from any case in which this principle applied. This led Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, Washington, to remark, "I am afraid you might be on a vacation almost permanently."

It is significant that since Howrey has been serving as chairman, this vital FTC ruling has not been enforced. Now Howrey, FTC head, goes on record as opposing principle involved, same position he took prior to appointment as a rubber corporation attorney.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur was removed from command for much less.

But this is not only evidence of current stillness along the Potomac. Recently, Senators seeking facts about foreign giveaway program, and specifically on a contract that looked dubious, were informed by FOA officials they could not report on how people's money is being spent under orders from their superior, Harold Stassen. Somehow, it appears the American FOA has "lend leased" an iron curtain from the Soviet GPU.

Besides being head of "operation giveaway," Stassen is now also filling a specially created job to promote disarmament and world peace.

With this act of censorship in mind, some observers express hope Stassen's first official act as peace promoter will not be clamping rigid censorship down on age-old expression "Peace on earth and goodwill to men." It is somehow felt there must be some limitations on bureaucrats.

The Medical Center: Its Present and Future Role in the Nation's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 20, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Joseph C. Hinsey, director of the New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center, on the occasion of the installation of Dr. Robert C. Berson as vice president for health affairs, University of Alabama, and dean of the Medical College of Alabama, which was delivered at Birmingham, Ala., on Sunday, May 15. Dr. Hinsey's splendid and challenging address is entitled "The Medical Center: Its Present and Future Role in the Nation's Health."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MEDICAL CENTER: ITS PRESENT AND FUTURE ROLE IN THE NATION'S HEALTH

(Address by Joseph C. Hinsey, director, the New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center, New York City)

President Carmichael, Senator Hill, Governor Folsom, Dr. Berson, and members of the staff and friends of the University of Alabama and its medical center, I bring you the greetings and congratulations of those interested in the health sciences and our Nation's health. It is a special privilege for me to be here because of my long friendship with many of those interested in the development and advancement of your institution and particularly because of close friendship and admiration for the physician and educator who is being honored today. Our institution, the New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center, has been fortunate through the years to have had among its student body and staff outstanding young men and women from the State of Alabama, some of whom have come back to practice in this area. Although this number has decreased since the full 4 years of medicine has been presented here, we still are fortunate to have an occasional Alabamian. I knew the late Dean Stuart Graves over many years and have had long discussions with him during the planning stages of your medical center. Likewise, the late Dean Roy Kracke was close to many of us in the field of medical education. I have visited with Dr. Durrett here on two different occasions. The program of this medical center, as we have just heard it described, is testimony that real progress has been made and that there is a great future ahead.

Before proceeding with the theme of my discussion here today, I should like to pay tribute to the contributions of one of your distinguished sons, Senator LISTER HILL. The Hill-Burton bill which he cosponsored has been and is one of the greatest factors in the improvement of a better distribution of medical care in our country. He served on the advisory council of our survey of medical education of which Dr. Berson was associate director. During recent weeks, we have worked with him in the development of Senate bill 1323 which the overwhelming majority of medical educators consider to promise much needed help to the medical schools of this country. The son of a physician and one who has been extremely sensitive to the health needs of our Nation, Senator HILL knows how much the Nation depends upon medical centers like this to forward the better health of its people.

The term "medical center" has developed as education, research, and service in the various health sciences have elaborated and expanded and have been brought into close proximity with the medical college. We have just heard how this has taken place here and how dentistry, nursing, teaching hospitals, and graduate work in the medical sciences have been integrated with the medical college. Here then is an intellectual environment in which students in the various health sciences carve out their educational background, working and developing shoulder to shoulder with each other. In the academic year preceding the present one, there were 295 medical students, 98 dental students, 123 nursing students, 46 student technicians, 7 physicians taking basic science courses for specialty boards, 11 physicians with fellowship appointments, 14 interns, 70 residents, 75 other graduate students in basic medical sciences. There was a total of 739 students in these different groups who were participating in the educational activities. Not only are the educational programs in the various health sciences strengthened by having students and staff working in close proximity in a center like this, but research in these various fields thrives in such an environment. The availability of the beds in the Jefferson-Hillman Hospital, and the other teaching hospitals, is a great asset to the overall research potential of the research laboratories. This relationship is reciprocal because it is axiomatic that the medical care of patients is best carried out in a hospital environment where teaching and research are being carried on.

During 1952, I served on the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation, and was most impressed by the emphasis upon the team approach to better health and by the personnel shortages in so many of the health professions. With increasing emphasis upon the total patient, the physician finds himself working with the nurse, dentist, the social-service worker, the sanitary engineer, the occupational therapist, the physiotherapist, and I could go on with many more. Just recently the National Health Council with the support of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States has published two books—Partners in Health and Health Careers Handbook—prepared for our young people and their vocational counselors. The distribution will be made to 29,000 public and secondary schools and junior colleges in the country and their 7½ million teen-age stu-

dents. In a census list of 77 major occupational groups, the health services are seventh from the top.

This guidebook lists 156 health-career opportunities: 22 in administration of health services, 25 in basic sciences related to health, 21 in the medical profession, 12 in dentistry, 15 in nursing and related services, 6 in dietetic and nutritional services, 3 in food and drug production services; 8 in medical technology, 3 in speech and hearing therapy, 6 in health information and communication, and many others.

A medical center such as this must be devoted to affording educational opportunities in as many areas as can be developed with high standards. Quality must be the watchword. It has been said that the Nation doesn't need one more poorly trained doctor and the same applies to every one of these workers in the health fields. In the Nation as a whole, greater facilities must be afforded for the education of personnel in these many health professions. Most of our privately supported institutions do not have the financial support to undertake many of these activities. Society in the long run must depend upon publicly supported institutions like yours to create the facilities and opportunities for many of the health personnel. However, wisdom dictates a slow and careful expansion in keeping with financial and staff resources.

Medical centers with their units have become intertwined into their communities and their influence is exerted at the local, State, national, and international level. While the assumption of greater social and community responsibility on the part of our centers has had real significance in the progress of health, it is not without its real hazards. Pressures, political, community, and other kinds, lead to the assumption of greater service responsibilities in our outpatient clinics and in our hospitals than can be done and yet maintain high standards. Conservative estimates reveal that each year over $100 million worth of free medical service to our 2 million men, women, and children are given by our Nation's medical schools. While medical- and health-service responsibilities play a most important role in our educational programs, there is a limit beyond which it is unwise to go either with financial or with human resources. The people of the State of Alabama should know what portion of the funds they provide for this center are devoted to service responsibilities and know how much to education and research. The support for education and research must be adequate beyond the support given for service functions.

It has been said that there is no such thing as a purely local medical school. While at the present time admission to the first year of the medical school has been limited to citizens of your State, in the long run your best interests will be served by permitting out-of-State students to enroll. Over the years, your State has depended upon graduates from out-of-State institutions to supply a significant portion of your health personnel. I would hope that you still would have opportunities for out-of-State graduates as well as it would be desirable for some of your graduates to go elsewhere. Provincialism carried too far does not promote the advancement of our health education.

In our endeavors to maintain the highest quality of health education, let us be mindful that physical facilities, while of great assistance in reaching the desired goal, are not sufficient unto themselves. The "bricks" in our temples must be inhabited by "brains" and outstanding personalities. If we add to our buildings and their equipment a stimulating and able staff and an intelligent, alert, curious, observant, and devoted student body, it won't matter so much what the curriculum is and whether you use vertical, horizontal, or spiral integration. We need outstanding people who will epitomize the art as well as the practice of medicine, dentistry, nursing, and the other health services.

From my contacts with the Association of American Medical Colleges, I am confident that greater emphasis is being focused upon the members of our staffs as teachers and upon the student and his place in the educational programs of our medical colleges. The student of today is the alumnus of tomorrow. If he is made to be a member of our health team now, whatever his profession is, he will be an intelligent expositor in the years to come. He or she can be a part of the most effective public relations arm of our universities. Let's see to it that they are for us and not against us.

In order to provide for administrative leadership for the activities you are today inaugurating a vice president for health affairs and a dean of your medical college. At a conference held recently to consider problems of undergraduate education is psychiatry, a few of the functions of a dean were outlined as follows:

"Be responsible for selection and promotion of faculty members.

"Represent the school in the community and the university administration in the school.

"Be directly or indirectly concerned with the selection of students.

"Control the balance between various courses and assign their relative importance.

"Be responsible for ancillary training programs.

"Maintain liaison with the alumni.

"Assume the overall administrative responsibility for the teaching hospitals, in order to coordinate patient care, teaching, research, and public relations.

"Have minimal but real contact with students through participation in the teaching program and the regular activities of one of the school departments.

"Assume responsibility for community leadership.

"Develop, secure, and maintain an adequate budget."

Dr. Berson is the coauthor with Dr. John E. Deitrick of a valuable monograph published in 1953 and entitled "Medical Schools in the United States at Midcentury." On pages 128 through 132, one finds their evaluation of deans and vice presidents of medical affairs. You folks don't need to guess about where he stands because it is all down in black and white. A significant paragraph says: "Regardless of background, however, it is of the greatest importance that the individual who occupies the post of medical vice president possess vision, judgment, and administrative skill to a high degree. Since the medical vice president has far greater authority and responsibility than the dean, and is more remote from the faculty, he should be skillful at obtaining the cooperation and confidence of the faculty and the dean. He must delegate to the various members of the team authority commensurate with the responsibilities they must carry."

The vice president must be fair in his dealings with the various units of this center and thus maintain the proper balance. The ability to delegate authority and responsibility will make it possible for him to assume overall leadership. He must be an educator to teach the staff, the students, the university administration and the public what the mission, the objectives, the programs, and the needs are. His fundamental character, understanding and kindliness will win the confidence and the teamwork so vitally necessary to the success of the work of this center. I have known Dr. Berson over a period of years and am confident he possesses those qualities that will make him an able leader here. He knows what quality in health education, research, and care means and how it should be obtained and maintained. With the help he will receive from his charming wife, from President Carmichael, and from all of you, I know he will succeed.

We are much impressed by the great potential that exists here for greater attainment as the years go by. A few months ago when I was asked to express what liberty had meant to me, I wrote: "In addition to the traditional freedoms which have been emphasized in the political, social, and religious realms, I have treasured the freedoms to observe, to investigate and experiment, to consider and to evaluate, and to develop conclusions, about which I have been free to write and speak. These are the elements of the scientific method which are the requisites in the pursuit of truth." Albert Schweitzer said: "Because I have confidence in the power of truth and of the spirit, I believe in the future of mankind. Ethical world and life affirmation contains within itself an optimisitic willing and hoping which can never be lost."

What a wonderful opportunity and challenge lies ahead for those of you here and for the students who come to seek and know the truth and, in so doing, to serve mankind.

From V–E Day to Now—A Prosperous Decade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 20, 1955

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, as worrisome rumors continue to fly and the world struggles and writhes in what seems to be a constant turmoil, our Nation quietly, but efficiently, forges ahead.

The city of Baltimore can be accepted as a criterion for the rate of progress made in the past decade as an article published in the Baltimore Evening Sun, of May 12, 1955, clearly shows.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article, entitled "From V–E Day to Now—A Prosperous Decade," made part of the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM V–E DAY TO NOW—A PROSPEROUS DECADE—NOTES ON THE PROGRESS OR LACK OF PROGRESS IN THE CITY AND STATE

Ten years after V–E Day it is hard to recall the Baltimore of rationing, overcrowding, price ceilings, and the entertainment curfew. Those were tense days, before the final German capitulation, and the celebration of the victory in Europe was sober. Rejoicing over the downfall of Hitler's regime was tempered by the thought of the fighting and sacrifices still to come in the struggle with Japan. Another tempering influence was fear of the unemployment following demobilization.

Indeed, it might almost be said that the mood of that day was one of confidence as to the international future and of misgiving about the domestic business outlook. What a change today! International difficulties have dimmed the high hopes of success in that field, while our marvelous productive system has dispelled most of the misgivings about jobs, earnings and the things earnings will buy. We have problems, in the cold war, in balancing our budgets and paying our

taxes, in combating juvenile delinquency and disease. In general, however, the past decade has put to shame those who feared the impact of peace upon our industrial and financial machinery.

While the Nation has been moving up to new levels of prosperity, Maryland and Baltimore have been keeping pace. In fact, the relative standing of the State in population and income is better today than it was in 1945. Ten years ago, the State's population was estimated at 2,096,000; the figure on July 1, 1954, was 2,602,000, and, of course, it is even higher today. The United States as a whole showed a gain of 22 percent in population between 1945 and 1954, while Maryland registered an increase of 24 percent in the same period.

In income the growth is equally impressive. Income payments for 1945 to residents of Maryland were estimated at $2,539,000,000. By 1953—the latest year for which figures are available—the amount had jumped to $4,402,000,000—an increase of 73.4 percent. The national increase was slightly less at only 72.1 prcent.

If we look at per capita income payments; that is, at the average for all the State's men, women, and children—we find again that Maryland is a jump ahead of the rest of the Nation. Taking the United States as a whole, per capita income payments for 1945 amounted to $1,191, but by 1953 the figure had risen to $1,709, an increase of 43.5 percent. The increase for Maryland was 45.4 percent, or from $1,277 to $1,857.

Recalling that income payments represent purchasing power, it is easy to see how the people of this State bought the homes, the automobiles, the television sets, the furniture they have acquired since the war.

PROSPERITY'S BACKBONE

The State's prosperity has been due to many factors, but its backbone is to be found in the building boom, in industry, in the port, and agriculture. The extent of building may be indicated by the fact that permits for more than $1,300,000,000 worth of new construction were issued in the city, and in Baltimore and Anne Arundel Counties between 1946 and 1954. According to the Manufacturers' Record, in 1945, 255,000 workers engaged in manufacturing in Maryland produced $1,570,000,000 worth of goods. Last year 275,000 workers turned out $3,385,000,000 of manufactured products.

In the decade since the war the port has had its ups and downs, being directly affected by such things as the booming wartime shipments in 1945 and Marshall plan shipments in the postwar period. Nevertheless the total value of exports and imports was more than half as much again in 1954 as in 1945, having risen from $617,200,000 10 years ago to about $950 million in 1954. Ore, of course, accounted for much of the increase. Ore imports rose from 1,650,000 to 9,164,000 tons during the period.

Vessel arrivals are up from 4,015 in the last year of the war to 4,828 in 1954. Three field offices of the Association of Commerce, in Chicago, New York, and Pittsburgh, now try to turn up business in those areas. And whereas the port was served by only 19 steamship lines 10 years ago, there are 91 today.

Despite the all-out effort made by Maryland farmers during the war, they are producing more on fewer farms and getting more money for their products than in 1945. Consolidation—and some conversion of farmland to other purposes—cut the number of the State's farms from a little over 41,000 to about 36,000 in 1950, and the number is believed to have remained fairly constant since then. But farm receipts have risen from $191,500,000 in 1945 to $245,500,000 last year.

In two important commodities, milk and broiler production, the trend has been sharply upward. The annual output of broilers went up from nearly 40 million to over 58 million in the 10-year period. Milk production increased from 1,081,000,000 pounds in 1945 to 1,448,000,000 pounds in 1954. The dollar figures tell a somewhat different story. While milk production was rising by about one-third, the value was going up by more than half. But although broiler production went up by almost 50 percent, the total value of the birds rose by only 15 percent, reflecting the greatly increased competition offered by other areas of the country which have gone into broiler production.

POPULATION

In population, Baltimore has had many comings and goings. The July 1, 1945, estimate of the health department was 930,000; the July 1, 1955, estimate is 966,000. That means a gain of only 4,000 a year since the 1950 Federal census.

During this period, as people moved to the county, the white population is held to have declined from 732,800 to 708,000; while the nonwhite total has risen from 197,200 to 258,000, or percentagewise, from 21.2 percent then to 26.7 percent now.

Birth rates have climbed: White, from 18.2 to 21.1; nonwhite, from 23 to 33.2. Simultaneously death rates have dropped: White from 11.6 to 10.6; nonwhite, from 14.6 to 10.6. The evening off of white and nonwhite death rates is a noteworthy event to population experts.

The full story, of course, must include the tremendous growth of Baltimore's suburban area. The Baltimore County department of education calculates that the current population is 345,000—against a 1945 total, including war workers, of not more than 200,000.

BOOKS AND ARTS

Material progress, then, was marked in many ways. There were changes, too, and sometimes striking advances in the cultural interests of the community and in its educational institutions.

In 1945 the book circulation of the Pratt Library was 2,863,005 among 155,240 registered borrowers. Last year the circulation was 3,434,886 among 204,297 borrowers. Since VE-day the Pratt has opened 2 new branches, doubled the size of 2 others, and started plans for 5 more. It has added 2 bookmobiles to its service (239,249 books were drawn from these shelves on wheels last year), and opened a film department which lent 6,481 educational films to various groups in 1954. And very recently there were 2 innovations that 1945 could hardly have dreamed of—the Central Library made room for a smoking nook and was fully air conditioned.

Both the Walters Art Gallery and the Museum of Art were busier too. The Walters attendance, 49,190 in 1945, was up to 53,334 last year. It presented 5 major exhibitions 10 years ago; in 1954 there were 6 major displays among the 40 that were offered the public. Its total educational events for children and adults rose in the same period from 224 to 521 and last year 15 of these were presented by radio and television against none in 1945.

The museum had 52 exhibits last year as compared with 55 in 1945, but its general schedule of events was far greater and attendance rose from 93,615 to 122,696. Moreover, the museum is incomparably richer in permanent possessions than it was 10 years ago. In the course of the decade it has acquired the great Cone collection as well as the May, Gallagher, Wurtzburger, and Woodward collections and the Nelson Gutman accumulation of Toulouse-Lautrec posters and prints. The Saidie A. May wing, providing an art center for young people, has been added and work will soon begin on a new wing that will house the Cone collection.

Other forms of entertainment did not show such progress. In the case of the Baltimore Symphony it has about held its own. The 63 concerts of the season 1945–46 attracted 95,100 persons. In 1954–55 exactly 96,519 were drawn to 67 concerts. Ford's Theater presented 18 shows in the season 1944–45, including 1 week of Gilbert and Sullivan repertory. The season that ended April 30 offered 13. Nineteen hundred forty-five was a great boom year for the movie houses of which Baltimore then had 105, 12 of them first-run theaters. That peak year was followed by a sharp decline which in turn has been followed by gradual but steady recovery. Today there are 93 movie houses in the city, 13 of them showing first-run films. However, the number of "little," or art, movies has increased from 1 to 4.

Of course, the most spectacular of all arrivals is television. Maybe there were a few experimental sets around in 1945 but you could count them on your two hands probably minus thumbs. But since TV really came of age some 602,800 sets have been sold in Baltimore.

HIGHER EDUCATION

Higher education has been transformed in the last 10 years. At the end of the war, campuses were almost bare of students and faculty alike. Now they are teeming, though the numbers of students are not as great as in the late forties, when GI benefits supported an army of veterans in college. How the colleges have changed may be seen from the fact that enrollment of degree candidates at the University of Maryland rose from 4,105 in 1945 to 16,254 in 1953.

The look of the campuses has certainly altered—the University of Maryland, the University of Baltimore, Morgan State College and the Johns Hopkins University (both Homewood and the medical institutions), in particular, have several new buildings each; while Goucher College, with but one building in Towson a decade ago, now has shifted its whole program there.

The cost of education to the student has almost doubled. Undergraduate tuition at Johns Hopkins, for instance, has risen from $495 to $800; at Goucher, from $500 to $750 with a further increase in effect next year. Board and room in each instance have almost doubled.

SCHOOLS

At the close of World War II the Baltimore public-school population was at low ebb—only 104,658 pupils. Immediately after the war the enrollment began increasing and kept on increasing, until the present total of 144,090 was reached. To accommodate them all, the Department of Education utilized spare 1945 space and then provided new or refurbished spaces for 30,265 additional children, through last year. This year buildings to hold 13,185 more are underway or close to that point. The cost from 1945 through this year amounts to a tidy $73 million.

The decade brought three substantial changes in the school system, as well as a flood of new students. In 1947 a State law went into effect which required children to remain in school until they were 16 years old, instead of 14 as formerly. In 1951, February admissions were stopped in Baltimore, forcing beginning pupils to start school in September or wait until the following September, depending on their age. And then in 1954 the Supreme Court ruled racial segregation unconstitutional in education, and Baltimore schools shifted last fall to a nonsegregated basis.

ROADS, TRAFFIC, TRANSIT

Postwar growth also brought a great expansion in motor traffic and roads. The total of all motor vehicles in all Maryland, back in 1945, was 492,487, of which approximately 175,000 were registered to Baltimoreans. When the last new car and truck is registered this year the total is expected to 964,162, or almost double that of a decade

ago. The Baltimore total will then be something like 285,000.

Maryland came out of the war with a roads system more outdated than most of the eastern States. A report just before the war had estimated that 2,500 miles of our 4,500 miles of improved highways were obsolete. Every person who was driving in 1945 knows how bad things were.

In 1947 Governor Lane started a big new program of rebuilding. In 4 years the State spent $163 million in major road work. In 1952 and 1953 something more than $50 million additional was laid out. These 2 years formed an interim period. With 1954 the new 12-year program on which the McKeldin administration is now working was initiated. It is expected to entail an outlay of at least $568 million. These amounts do not include the $44 million Bay Bridge nor the $135 million harbor tunnel.

Already as a result of these expenditures the State has such dual highways as the new road to Frederick, Maryland's share of the Washington Parkway, and many roads such as the new Route 50 on the Eastern Shore.

The other side of the great increase of motor traffic is the intensification of one of the city's most acute problems. In 1945 the general assembly approved the establishment of a traffic engineering bureau in the police department. The city then had 434 intersections with signal lights and only one major pair of one-way streets: Franklin and Mulberry.

Now we have Mr. Henry A. Barnes, and a separate department of traffic engineering with 129 permanent employees and a budget close to $2 million a year. New traffic lights or rebuilt old ones go up at 4 times the 1946 rate, paint is spread in 15,000- to 20,000-gallon-a-year lots, and new signs mushroom at the rate of 15,000 a year.

Baltimore now has 690 intersections with traffic lights, and is getting more all the time. The city has more one-way streets than many motorists can keep straight, and in addition, some major street improvements have been made: the expressway route to Washington, extension of Potee Street, Edmondson Avenue-Hilton Street underpass, Baltimore and Ohio Railroad overpass in Brooklyn, and repaving galore. But peak-hour traffic jams are still with us.

Mass transit costs, like practically everything else, have risen during the period. In 1945 you could still ride the bus or trolley-car for a dime. Successive increases through 12½ cents, 15 cents, and 17 cents have brought the fare to its present 18-cent level. But price increases are about the only thing the transit situation has in common with the rest of the economy. Otherwise the pattern has been one of contraction. Revenue mileage rolled up by the transit company's vehicles was 38,620,000 in 1945. Now it is down to 28,540,000. But decreased patronage tells the most dramatic story, down from almost 260 million in 1945 to only 140,500,000 last year.

TALK

We all seem to be more wordy today than on V–E Day. For evidence look at the rise in Baltimore post office receipts from $10,313,109 in 1945 to $16,889,698 in 1953; but a better way—since many people today can't be bothered to write but simply talk—is with telephone statistics. Baltimoreans in 1945 averaged 728,100 phone calls daily, less than 1 per person; the present average is 1,239,700, about 1 apiece for the population of the metropolitan area.

This is attributable in part to the increasing number of telephones. The national total rose 98 percent, but Maryland's more than doubled—another index of the State's comparative advance. Maryland's total last January 1 was 852,690.

SPORTS

But phone conversations aren't the only vocal exercises we are enjoying today. There is no question but what organized sports have gained, though there have been downs as well as ups. In wartime, schedules were curtailed and spectators usually couldn't make auto trips. Even so, boxing bouts were held weekly. Baltimore had two league soccer teams; the new-born basketball Bullets were second in their league's division.

In 1955, however, the big-league Orioles and Colts have sent local sports patriotism to a new pitch. Navy's crew and the University of Maryland's football team are national powers. Facilities, too, have been much improved: viz, new stadia in Baltimore and College Park, and one expected in Annapolis. Baltimore still has no modern indoor arena, but does have the promise of one.

Supporting Statements Developed by the Maritime Division of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Maritime Board should disapprove any future rate agreement that may be filed by the Pacific Westbound Conference and the Far East Conference which fails to establish a freight-rate differential to the Orient properly reflecting the lower costs of transportation from the west coast. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement supporting this position which was prepared by the maritime division of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, as follows:

SUPPORTING STATEMENTS DEVELOPED BY THE MARITIME DIVISION OF THE SEATTLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Since the end of World War II, various organizations on the Pacific Coast have endeavored to negotiate with the steamship lines for a freight-rate structure to the Orient which would give recognition to the geographical advantage enjoyed by the west coast over competing areas on the Atlantic and gulf. The present steamship rates between the west coast and the Orient do not reflect the proper relationship when compared with the rates from competing Atlantic and gulf coast ports. A recent survey conducted by the Stanford Research Institute declared that Pacific coast port rates to the Orient are generally equal to rates published from ports of other coastal districts. The report also states that on local traffic, the Pacific coast suffers a rate disadvantage to Far Eastern territories on about 25 percent of the items listed in the applicable ocean tariffs.

One of the most important factors in rate-making is the cost of performing the service. In the present instance, carriers between the gulf and Atlantic coast to the Far East suffer considerably higher costs of operations than do carriers from the Pacific coast.

Nautical miles from:	*To Manila*	*To Yokahama*
Seattle	5,969	4,257
New York	11,365	9,700
New Orleans	10,780	9,115

This means approximately an additional 30 days at sea for carriers operating out of Atlantic ports, with an estimated per-day cost of operation of $2,500. This results in a 1-way cost to carriers from Atlantic coast of approximately $70,000 more than that experienced from the Pacific coast. Additionally, vessels operating from the Atlantic and gulf coasts must pay Panama Canal tolls of from $4,500 to $7,300 per vessel.

The Orient, historically and potentially, is avery important export market for the Pacific coast and northwestern manufacturers and growers. The ability of western industries, manufacturers, and agriculture to retain and expand their natural outlets in the Far East is dependent on a fair rate structure. It is felt that the present structure unjustly discriminates against industries and agriculture in the West.

In the 1920's and early 1930's, a working agreement was in effect between the Pacific Westbound Conference and the Far East Conference and under this agreement, rates from the west coast to the Orient were generally lower, by approximately 25 percent than those from the east coast. During the late 1930's and early 1940's, a highly competitive situation resulted in a gradual reduction of this advantage so that eventually the rates were generally equalized. The equalization of freight rates to afford equal opportunity in a given market is not sound and should not be continued.

On traffic to the Hawaiian Islands, the substantially longer haul from the Atlantic and gulf coast is generally reflected in the rates and is an accepted pattern. Generally the carriers that serve the Hawaiian Islands from the west coast also handle tonnage from the Atlantic coast and gulf ports as is the case to the Orient.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Business and its Political Mythology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently the Honorable William Benton, formerly a Member of the United States Senate, made a very interesting address to the Young Presidents National Convention meeting in Phoenix, Ariz. The subject of his talk was "Business and Its Political Mythology." It is a very interesting, thought-provoking, and constructive address, and I commend a careful reading of it to everyone.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the speech exceeds by about a half column the amount that is allowed without an estimate of the cost, and that the cost of printing is estimated to be $200. I now ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the cost, the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS AND ITS POLITICAL MYTHOLOGY

(Address of Hon. William Benton, chairman of the board, Encyclopedia Britannica, Encyclopedia Britannica Films, Muzak Corp., before the Young Presidents National Convention, Phoenix, Ariz., April 4, 1955)

Mr. Chairman and other presidents, this is my first opportunity to speak to an audience of presidents.

The Senate of the United States is called the world's most exclusive gentlemen's club. But you here today can boast that the Senate can't be considered more exclusive than your own. Yours is the only club where every member can now claim a future as long and as bright as his past. You differ from the Senate also in this: the Senator fears he won't be in his club for long; you know you won't be.

Many of you think you know your future—bigger and brighter and better businesses. As I shall explain to you shortly, I regret such personal self-assurance about the wave of the future.

I was once a young president. I sold out as the president and owner of a successful business 20 years ago—to become vice president of a university. Today, at 55, I sometimes regret my reputation as a bright young man. I can't keep up with it. The key question is never how old you are. The key question is always how good you are. As you grow older, you will face grave difficulties in becoming half as good as your admirers now think you are.

I salute you as you convene here in Phoenix to review your poportunities and to consider your responsibilities. I have selected as my keynote the allegedly golden strand of your futures. Lyle Spencer and Mitch Mitchell have told me you get down to business quickly. They have described your seminars. They have told me you often become preoccupied with management details. They suggested that I therefore emphasize the larger setting of business. This seems to me to indicate not so much where you are as where you are going. And they have hinted that I shouldn't hesitate to be provocative; that I should pull no punches; that you can take it; and that you'll take me apart later.

As we look ahead, the larger setting of business is politics. The destiny of man, as Thomas Mann observed, presents its meaning in political terms. To a businessman politics embraces not only the wide, philosophic area that covers all group relations including his own relationships with his own employees. Politics includes also the narrower sphere of his relationships with his government.

But let us take war as the most obvious example of political action in its impact on man and on his businesses. War—total war—nuclear war—the preparation for war and the prevention of war—these are political questions. They embrace and dwarf the daily problems with which you grapple in business. They are the larger setting.

The preservation and enlargement of human freedom is the primary aim of our society. This is a political goal. So also is justice. And so also are the problems of depression, of mass unemployment, of inflation. These have become political questions. They are the larger setting of business.

This was not always true. Throughout much of the 19th century in America, if we can exclude the Civil War, the impact of politics on busines was far less than today, a midget in contrast to a giant. Most 19th century presidential campaigns were fought on economic issues. But with few exceptions—for example, the political decisions involved in our tariff policy and our antimonopoly laws—the decisions of Government were minor compared with the myriad of key decisions taken privately. For example, economic historians do not now believe it would have made much difference if William Jennings Bryan had had his way on silver. According to one authority, the invention of barbed wire alone was probably more important to the West than the 16-to-1 formula.

Politics, once the game played around the periphery of the economy, is today operating at its heart. And this is not only because our survival as a free people is at stake. If the Soviet Union were to sink into the sea tomorrow we would not go back to the day, only 30 years ago, when the Federal budget amounted to less than half of corporate profits in a good year, and when the Government lacked the most elementary weapons to combat the wilder swings of the business cycle.

As businessmen, you and I can't afford to misunderstand politics. We can ignore it only at our peril. Neither can we afford to nurse the prevalent myths about politics which have been dear to businessmen for nearly a hundred years.

Traditionally, a seminar begins with a text. I'm now going to give you two to chew on. The first is from the March 1955, issue of Fortune magazine. It is two short sentences from the article, Why the Depression Lasted so Long, by two members of the Fortune staff, Gilbert Burck and Charles Silberman. Here are the sentences—the key sentences in their analysis:

"Franklin Roosevelt was haunted by the ideal of a balanced budget, and his deficits were too small to counteract the decline in private spending. And in 1936 he lost his nerve and practically balanced the 1937 budget—with disastrous results."

Fortune is perhaps our most self-conscious expounder of business philosophy. In this article it is saying that the New Deal wasn't New Dealish enough. I suggest as a seminary research project—perhaps for the School of Business Administration at Harvard—a report on what the business press was saying about the New Deal in 1936. In that year, you will recall, 86 percent of American newspapers supported Landon against Roosevelt. Apparently they even sold Roosevelt on the idea of a balanced budget.

My second text is from a source perhaps equally respectable, the Economic Report of the President, issued from the Whate House this January. This report explains, with modest pride, why the recession of 1953 and 1954 wasn't worse. "It is well to recall," the report says, "that we have developed in our country a fiscal system that tends to cushion or offset a decline in private income." Then it continues, on page after page, to list the steps that were taken by the Federal Government to offset the decline; the budget and tax measures, Federal Reserve and Treasury measures, public works and social security measures.

Now I cheerfully concede that it would be too much to expect President Eisenhower to tell the name of the system he invoked. The name of the system is of course the New Deal. But in the interests of public education could we not perhaps have expected him to name a few of the authorizing acts of Congress under which he says he proceeded? For example, and to name only a few, his economic report referred to results flowing from the Emergency Banking Act of 1933 and the Banking Act of 1935; the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933; the Social Security Act of 1935, the Housing Acts of 1934 and 1937; the creation of the Export-Import Bank in 1934. These measures are now blandly taken for granted, as part of America's inheritance. But please remember, there was nothing bland or taken-for-granted about them at the time they were proposed. They were fought tooth-and-nail and chiefly by the business community. The banks of the country, which bless the acts now, joined almost unanimously in fighting all the great acts passed by Democratic Congresses, from the Federal Reserve Act of 1913 through the Banking Act of 1935, the most important piece of legislation passed by Congress in that difficult and trying year, which included the Federal Deposit Insurance program. Please remember this background, my young executive friends, as you look forward hopefully to taking your places on the boards of directors of the banks most revered in your communities.

The businessmen of the thirties were surprisingly illiterate economically; most other Americans were, too; but Calvin Coolidge's and Herbert Hoover's America presumed that business men were knowledgeable in economic matters because they looked like economic practitioners. The article from Fortune I've just quoted says, "The basic reason

the depression lasted so long was, of course, the economic ignorance of the times."

In 1942, after the outbreak of war, Jesse Jones, the Secretary of Commerce, asked Paul Hoffman and me to build up an organization of business men who would plan and prepare to prevent depression and unemployment when the war ended. This organization became the Committee for Economic Development. We built into its bylaws a Research and Policy Committee, to bring economists and business men together. I am proud of the shelf of policy papers which has resulted from their joint efforts. After the war, the Research and Policy Committee took over the CED. The close cooperation with top ranking scholars made the CED distinctive among business organizations—and today, in my opinion, makes the CED the most broadly influential of all business organizations in Washington.

I was asked by the CED, in 1942, to draft a basic statement of its position. The statement appeared in Fortune in 1944, after going through 44 drafts and much debate, under the title "The Economics of a Free Society." Most of my key 12 points were, I hoped, eloquent statements of our American free enterprise philosophy. A few of the ideas seemed shocking at the time to many business men—"In a democracy there is a place for private enterprise and there is a place for public enterprise."

* * * * *

"To compensate for the weakness of their individual bargaining position, wage earners need the right to combine into organizations for collective bargaining."

* * * * *

"The people's elected representatives are responsible for establishing fiscal, monetary and other policies that help prevent the fever of inflation and the paralysis of deflation and depression."

In retrospect, it seems clear to me that the greatest single service rendered by the CED has been the education of its members from the business community in politics and economics. Most of them, however, and most of you will be relieved to hear this, have remained loyal to the Republican Party—although many of these, I hope you will regret to hear, are somewhat suspect within it.

Now I come to the most pervasive and pernicious myth of American politics—for young presidents. Here is where I ask you to open your presidential minds. Please examine with me and within yourselves the myth that the Democrats are against business, and that Republicans are somehow better for business.

Like all myths, the notion that the Democrats are hostile to business has a foot in history. Once the Democratic Party was dominated by the agricultural southern and border States. Once the rank-and-file of agrarian democracy, in its fierce determination to foster and defend its faith in private property, clashed with the new business men of New England over monetary policy and the tariff. That was a long while ago. Now we in New England worry about the competition of the industrial South. Now the nucleus of Republican strength lies in the agricultural areas of the Midwest and West.

The myth that the Democrats are against business carried over into the 20th century—in many respects with even greater force, though with far less justification. It is with us still.

Woodrow Wilson, the first Democratic President of this century, sponsored legislation under the slogan, "The New Freedom," which struck many business men as antagonistic and evil. The New Freedom included the creation of the Federal Reserve System; the Clayton Act, which strengthened the antitrust laws; and the Federal Trade Commission Act, which brought the force of Federal law to bear on various forms of business piracy and fraud. The Wilsonian program attacked monopoly business and threatened the 1913 version of big business. The economic illiteracy of our era—with some help, I agree, from the one party press—has twisted and distorted this great Wilsonian program into one unfriendly to business.

Although to most business men of Wilson's time his program looked like radicalism—yes and like socialism—today not even the most intellectually antique business spokesman would seriously propose to repeal the New Freedom, or to contend that it has proved bad for the country or for business.

If the New Freedom produced suspicion among businessmen, the New Deal, 20 years later, was greeted with fury. You here today were in your teens, or even younger, as the New Deal program unfolded. You can scarcely remember the bitterness it evoked.

Yet as the passions now dissolve and as saner views prevail, we find businessmen today defending New Deal legislation as their protection and even their salvation.

I again refer to the current economic report of President Eisenhower. Here is the application of the New Deal legislation for combatting the deadly cycle of boom and bust—the instruments of credit and debt policy which can temper the economic climate without prescribing the raindrops, which can improve the atmosphere in which business functions without intefering with the businessman's daily decisions.

When social-security legislation was first proposed, it was looked on by the business community as a special evidence of hostility to business. Unemployment compensation—the dole—would destroy the labor force by converting the sturdy American workingman into an idler. Old-age insurance would ruin the incentive to save. The self-reliant American would be reduced to a spineless pulp.

These things were predicted and far, far more, and far, far worse. Yes, they were predicted by the young presidents of that day, aping the old. But they didn't happen, and no one now supposes that they ever will. Employers now testify before congressional committees that social security provides protection which the worker needs and which the private employer can never adequately provide. Further, social security is now recognized as an important cushion under purchasing power when things go wrong either in a depressed community or in the country at large. Our social-security laws are a strategic part of the businessman's defense against depression.

The Securities and Exchange Commission was once taken as proof positive of New Deal hostility to business in general and to Wall Street in particular. Now we find the business witnesses before Senator FULBRIGHT'S committee citing the SEC as further proof of the proposition that the market is much sounder now than it was in 1929. We hear the chairman of the SEC, the successor of the radical Bill Douglas of the New Deal days—we hear him testify like a certified public accountant working for the chamber of commerce and the NAM.

One New Deal act which was greeted with some warmth by large segments of the business community was the National Industrial Recovery Act. This would have wiped out most of our defenses against monopoly. This act put us on the road to a cartel system. As a young president, I'm proud to report to you that I fought a provision in the proposed code for the advertising agency business. This provision made it illegal to employ a man from an agency competitor without notifying his boss. My opposition, perhaps because I was growing fast and employing the best men I could procure and at the highest wages then paid—it was my opposition that beat the projected code. Under such codes, a lot of young presidents here today would still be buried in accounting or shipping departments, as many of your counterparts are today in Europe. Happily, the NRA was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court.

The New Deal farm legislation was thought by many businessmen to show the Democrats at their hare-brained worst. Certainly our farm legislation is far from perfect, and many adjustments lie ahead. Yet in recent years, as export markets have declined and more and more of our farm surpluses have been thrown back into the domestic market, support prices have cushioned the decline in farm prices and farm income. Those businessmen who sell to the farmer—the farm machinery manufacturers, the mail order houses and chain stores, the feed and fertilizer companies—will tell you that what has been good for the farmer has been good for them. Only time can tell whether the Republicans will deal more constructively with this issue than the Democrats. I wish them luck.

Finally, I must mention the Democratic so-called partiality for labor. Here, some of you may say, there has been an alliance against business.

But is this indeed so? Did not the Wagner Act merely speed up the process of getting most of American industry under a sound system of collective bargaining? Wasn't it better, even in the narrowest business view, to shorten the agony? And I wonder how many businessmen there are who suppose that there is any other practicable solution to labor relations than the development of mature and stable unions bargaining collectively on behalf of their members.

I could continue to pile up examples. But the pattern is clear. Much that the business community once labeled as evidence of hostility to business now turns out to be the bastion of business strength. When the political cycle now brings the Republicans back into power they accept the gains, and sometimes even claim the credit. Wasn't Theodore Roosevelt the champion trust buster, after all? And don't we now hear from Republican apologists that much of the New Deal was foreshadowed by steps taken by President Hoover?

I won't argue with any of the Republican apologies or explanations. I use them myself for the Democrats when I can develop them. I won't even deny that the Republicans have also been helpful to business. Indeed, have you ever considered how helpful it is sometimes just to relax, to relax into the simple device of doing nothing? My point is merely that the Democrats have been at least as good for business. And that they have been at least as good for freedom of enterprise. I am merely seeking to destroy the myth, which I fear grips most of you, that the Republicans are better for business than the Democrats.

I do indeed contend that there is more freedom of enterprise in the United States today, in any meaningful sense of that phrase, than there was in Mark Hanna's day. I pick Mark because he's Secretary Humphrey's ancestor. I contend that if the philosophy of Mark Hanna had prevailed in the United States throughout the first half of this century, the outlook for freedom of enterprise in the second half would be bleak indeed.

I suggest also that if the Democratic Party has been hostile to American business, then it has aided, strengthened, buttressed, and invigorated its enemy as no antagonist has ever done before in the long history of human strife.

I fear I cannot close without asking the obvious question which flows from much of the foregoing: Can it be that the Democratic Party in this century has had a better view on business welfare than the business leaders themselves? I believe this to be true, but it is true not so much because the Dem-

ocrats possess greatly superior business wisdom but because they have tended to take a somewhat larger view of American society as a whole. Their party has not been dominated by any one group. Believing in democracy, they have held with fair consistency to the conviction that our American people, when they seek what is good for our American society as a whole, are also seeking what is good for American business.

What is my moral for you, if you conclude I must have one? Shall I now seek to make a case for a future alliance between business and the Democratic Party? I suggest no such alliance. On the contrary, I argue against them. I do not want to see business, or labor, or farmers tied immutably to either party. I feel the same way about an alliance with the big cities—or the immigrants or the Daughters of the American Revolution. Our two political parties should seek to earn and reserve the support of each and every major group, and deserve it continuously.

By and large, our farm leaders have successfully avoided a permanent commitment to either party; they have sought to preserve their bargaining position.

Most of our labor leaders, perhaps less successfully, have sought to avoid fixed party alliances. We have heard labor leaders denouncing Democratic Presidents, and Democratic Presidents denouncing labor leaders. Labor has sought to avoid taking responsibility for the Democratic Party, and I would oppose with all by strength, in the interest of the Democratic Party itself, and of labor, and of the country, the kind of alliance between the Democrats and labor that has existed between business and the Republican Party.

The spokesmen for business have not been politically as wise, in my opinion, as they should have been. They have encouraged the development of the clear, open and long-standing partnership between business and the Republican Party.

This we have the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. McKay, telling a business audience, "We're here in the saddle as an administration representing business and industry."

This presumed partnership isn't justified by enlightened self-interest. Its risk and penalties should be examined and continually reexamined by the business community. Take this message home if you will: first, the partnership tends to unite rival interest groups in opposition to it; and secondly, business violates the simplest of political rules by leading with its chin. Operating under the myth that the Republicans are better for business than the Democrats, the business community asks to be saddled with responsibility for the mistakes of the Republican Party. Or am I overstepping in suggesting that there may be mistakes—at least in 1955 and 1956, even if not in 1953 and 1954?

Most of us Americans believe in the two-party system. Regardless of the party to which we belong, we want two vigorous parties. The best way to keep our two parties competitive and healthy is to encourage each to be as inclusive as possible, to keep reaching for the other party's constituency, to try to speak for the best interests of all groups and thus for the entire country.

Our European friends are puzzled by our party system, and a little scornful of it. They think of political parties as factions representing social or economic classes or interests, or as the action fronts for rigid political dogmas. They point out that our parties don't seem to stand for anything; that they are shifting coalitions of mutually conflicting interest groups, without inner consistency or intellectual structure. As they view us, Europeans are right. But these very qualities are one great source of America's political strength and stability.

As seen from Europe, our two parties are indeed very much alike in their professions and in their ideologies. Because they are, we don't experience violent shifts when power changes hands—with nationalization of industry in one regime and denationalization in the next. Our two parties proceed pragmatically—opportunistically, if you will—to try to solve problems as they emerge, compromising as best they can the pressures of the many self-interest groups. Neither party can be opposed to business in such a system. Likewise, business should be opposed to neither party, and identified with neither party.

I now come to my moral for each of you young businessmen as individuals. I urge each of you to get into politics. You owe it to your community and to your country, in a world where politics is increasingly determinant. Traditionally, our businessmen have avoided and even scorned close participation in political life. They have adopted political attitudes from the viewpoint of their narrow business interests, such as on tariffs or taxes. They have moved in aggressively only where they have seen a dollar-and-cents stake in franchises, or utility rates, or public contracts. Most of them dodged direct and personal political responsibility.

They must dodge no longer. They are now desperately needed in bigtime politics. The next time the Republicans take over, let us have more businessmen with political savvy and experience, ready and willing for public office. Ditto with the Democrats. And I'll let you in on a secret. Businessmen will enjoy politics. If you'll take one man's testimony as evidence, politics can be even more interesting, and far more satisfying, than making money.

I urge each of you, if you have not already done so, to join a political party in your own community. I urge you to work at it. You will find that your influence on political policies, as well as on the choice of candidates, will be a hundredfold greater inside the party councils than outside.

Most of you probably suspect by now that I am a Democrat. I hope some of you are too, and that many more will become Democrats. But unfortunately I'm not too optimistic about this. My observation is that young men on the make in business often tend to be more conservative, even more orthodox and traditional in their politics (meaning Republican) than their successful older associates. Perhaps they feel a greater need for respectability. If their eye isn't on their election to the board of the bank, the banker's eye is on them, or they think it is.

I suggested earlier that there is little difference in ideology between the parties. Thus you may ask, why the Democratic Party for a young president? I reiterate that I do find a difference in spirit between the parties. The Democrats are believers in action and readier to act; they are more generous and humane in attitude; they have the qualities to appeal to the young.

If you still insist on being Republicans, I urge you to be active Republicans. Be combative Republicans. Be working Republicans, working inside the party councils. Speak up aggressively for your own ideas. Apply to your party some of the originality and resourcefulness—and the willingness to try new ideas—you apply in business. There is no necessary reason the Republican Party needs to be stodgier than the Democrats. There is no law that requires the Republicans to carry a higher quotient of stuffing in their shirts.

If the Democrats have better issues, appropriate them and improve them. For example, right now President Eisenhower desperately needs help in putting over his ideas on reciprocal trade and reduction of tariff. These are good Democratic issues which I gladly commend to you young presidents. Help President Eisenhower on this American program, perhaps the greatest and most significant of his present issues and the one most likely to be defeated by a hard-core Republican opposition. If you don't believe what President Eisenhower has to say about this great issue—get your secretary to develop for you the long background of support by the Democratic Party. Write your Senators. They'll read your letters. You look like potential campaign contributors.

I began by telling you that you can now claim that your futures are as bright as your pasts. Perhaps you will find, as I did, that you will shortly want to explore new fields of action while you are still young enough to adapt yourselves to them.

In either case —in any case—in business—in poltics or in both—Republican or Democrat—I congratulate you on your youthful eminence and I wish you well. You are a promise to your country. You are the wave of the present. You call to my mind that great and hopeful line of Carl Sandburg, "The strong young men keep coming on."

An Un-American Labor Practice Which Should Be Curbed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address which I delivered this morning before the Rock Creek Women's Republican Club, in which I touched on a developing situation which, in my opinion, should command the prompt attention of all liberty-loving Americans. I desire to call this to the attention of the Congress and the country through the insertion of a news release covering my address.

Federal and State laws protect stockholders of corporations from having their resources dissipated by business leaders through contributions to political campaigns in support of candidates selected by these top business officials. Unfortunately, it appears that Federal and State laws are ineffectual in providing the same protection for workers belonging to labor unions whose leaders frequently impose contributions upon union members for use in political campaigns, even though the individual worker may prefer some opposing candidate. Obviously, this is an un-American and an unjustified use of labor-union authority.

The State of Wisconsin last week approved legislation barring these practices. By State and Federal legislation the freedom of the laboring man to support only such candidates as he individually prefers should be restored.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESSS DELIVERED MONDAY MORNING BEFORE THE ROCK CREEK WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUB IN WOODWARD & LOTHROP AUDITORIUM, BETHESDA-CHEVY CHASE BRANCH

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 23.—Speaking before the Rock Creek Women's Republican Club here this morning, Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, urged the assembled women to "use the vantage

point of your location here in our National Capital to warn American women everywhere that the great crusade they led in 1952 in electing President Eisenhower must be climaxed by even greater efforts in 1956 in order to preserve the peace and protect the new moral tone in Government and over-all prosperity which have come as dividends from the last Republican victory."

Senator MUNDT warned the women of a "growing menace to freedom" which he said, "is hidden in the increasing tendency of labor bosses in powerful unions to invoke the tyranny of taxation without representation upon their members by forcing them to make involuntary political contributions by the check-off system to campaign war chests created for the purpose of electing left-wing Democrats to office."

The South Dakota Senator continued, "With the sly approval and secret urging of certain national Democratic officials, the recent merger of the AFL and CIO labor organizations is being employed to expand the un-American practice of forcing union members to pay out portions of their hard-earned dollars for the use of big labor bosses in the selection and election of New Deal and left-wing Democrats in State and National campaigns. Like nazism and communism, this pernicious practice denies laboring people their rights of free choice. It makes them captives of the political party they are forced to support with their earnings even though by their votes they frequently prefer to vote for the very candidates their earnings are being taxed to defeat.

"This new menace to freedom has grown so great that such States as Wisconsin, Ohio, Michigan and several others are already considering legislation to make compulsory contributions to political campaigns illegal and other progressive States are certain to pass legislation protecting their people against such perniciously un-American practices. Southern Democrats would do well to join Republicans and all liberty-loving Americans in supporting legislation designed to prevent a labor monopoly from employing strong-arm methods and unlimited campaign war chests to bludgeon and batter the American political climate under the control of power-hungry labor bosses.

"Even the most casual study of the financial records filed with the clerk of the House of Representatives in the last election gives a startling and shocking picture of the alarming degree to which labor unions have been using vast sums of money to control public elections. It is futile to discuss improvements in our campaign methods and legislation unless we take steps to keep American elections free from this unholy marriage between labor bosses in big cities and the left-wing Democratic officials who work with them to control conventions as well as primary and general elections. Freedom of the ballot must once again be made to mean freedom to decide individually which candidates and which parties, if any, a voter may desire to support with his personal funds."

Control of Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address concerning the control of juvenile delinquency, delivered by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], at the University of Missouri at Columbia, Mo., on April 29, 1955. In my opinion, his address was an important contribution to an understanding of this major social problem.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI CONFERENCE ON THE CONTROL OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, COLUMBIA, MO., APRIL 29, 1955

Senator Noble, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: It is a twofold privilege and pleasure for me to take part, with you, in this tremendously important conference on juvenile delinquency; first, because it affords me an opportunity to speak on a problem that is so close to my heart; and second, because it is a source of real gratification to have this inspiring evidence that you and the people of our own State of Missouri are not sitting back and waiting for someone else to find the answers to this difficult problem for you. You have taken the leadership; you are pointing the way; you are setting an example—an example of democracy in action—an example, I might add, of the kind of action that should be taking place in every State of the union but that, unfortunately, is not.

All of you who have joined as individuals and as organizations in making this conference possible are performing a real and worthwhile service. You can indeed be proud of your part in this conference and I know it goes without saying that you recognize that the responsibility doesn't end here. We haven't solved the problem of juvenile delinquency because we have met here to talk about it. We have just taken the first step—an important and necessary step, to be sure—but the real job lies ahead of us.

At the outset, I want to make it clear that I do not claim to be an expert in this field. I am sure that the distinguished and able speakers who have preceded me are experts in their fields and have contributed a great deal to your thinking. I also feel sure they would agree with me that just as the causes of delinquency are many and diverse, so the answers must be sought from many and diverse sources. Out of my own experience as a prosecutor and district attorney, and out of my service as a member of the Senate Committee on Federal Penitentiaries and the Senate Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, I have learned—just as you doubtless have learned through your own experiences—that the more we know about this problem, the more we realize that we are not going to find the answer all done up in fancy trimmings and handed to us in a nice neat package. It isn't that easy.

The hard, unpleasant truth is that we are not even holding the line against juvenile delinquency. We are losing the battle. And each day, each week, each month that we procrastinate, we are losing further battles and wasting more of our resources, not just financial resources, but human resources. After all, we are dealing with human lives, and each day more and more young people—more and more children—are coming into conflict with the law.

Our recent committee report, covering more than 16 months of intensive work in this field, minced no words in this respect. We said, bluntly: "If this Nation continues its present feeble attempts to prevent juvenile delinquency, we can be certain that the harvest we will reap in later years will be a bigger and tougher crop of juvenile delinquents and youthful and adult criminals, ultimately requiring more and more prisons." We pointed out that the stream of children through the Nation's juvenile courts grew from 300,000 in 1948 to 435,000 in 1954, and that if it continues to mount at this same rate the figures may well reach 785,000 in the next 5 years. But this is only part of the picture, because we also know that only 1 in 3 cases reported to the police ever reaches the courts. So we have the appalling figure of a million and a quarter youngsters every year coming into conflict with the law. The tragedy is that in a great majority of these situations a youngster could be saved for a happy, productive life and useful work in society.

Much of the problem exists today because of apathy—apathy of the local and Federal Government, apathy of parents, churches, schools, and all the other pillars of our society. This is a blunt statement, but I don't think you invited me here because you wanted to hear some fancy phrases about how well we're doing. This is the way I see the situation today. Now, I do not say all parents, nor all schools, nor all churches, but in every community in our country enough of them are falling down on the job to be contributing factors in this complex problem of juvenile delinquency.

In California a bewildered mother testified before our committee. She told us the tragic story of her son's addiction to narcotics, of his ventures into crime, and of his inevitable conflict with the authorities. "Why?" she asked us. "What was the reason?" We couldn't give her the answer.

Wherever we go we are approached by parents, teachers, social workers, interested citizens, and reporters, and they ask us, "Do comics cause juvenile delinquency? Does television cause juvenile delinquency? Do slums cause juvenile delinquency?" Everyone seems to be searching for a simplified, prepackaged answer, so that we can go right out and correct the situation. We can't give these people a simple answer, either, but the work of our committee is helping to find the answers. What we can do—and what we are doing—is to set the framework within which this many-faceted problem can be solved. We can recommend—and we have—corrective legislation on the part of the Federal Government. We can—and I believe we have—aroused communities to action by focusing the spotlight on those who benefit from the exploitation of youth. And we will make progress, if we are willing to devote our energies and resources to the job.

When our recent report was issued, one national news service commented: "Seldom in the memory of veteran legislators and newsmen here has Congress issued so shocking a report." I'd like to tell you some of the things the report said—and some of the things it did not say.

Last year, we went about our hearings this way: We went north to Boston, south to Miami, west to San Francisco. We studied the problem in the District of Columbia and in New York and Philadelphia, and along our southern border at El Paso, Texas, and San Diego and in many other communities. What we tried to do was to take a representative sample of the Nation, and by the time the community hearings were completed, we had perhaps not a complete, but certainly a comprehensive picture of the national problem. In community after community, we heard testimony about local conditions that duplicated the problems we found everywhere else. The most disheartening thing, I think, was that so many of the factors contributing to juvenile delinquency could have been prevented.

One of the most distressing factors brought to light by our committee's investigation is the use of narcotics. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to get any reliable statistics on the extent to which narcotics, marihuana and dangerous drugs are used by juveniles because the methods of reporting differ from those of other criminal activities.

Most of us have been vaguely aware that there exists a narcotics problem, but seldom has this been more clearly illustrated than in our committee's hearings. The readily available evidence that an increasing number of children are becoming drug addicts was presented to us over and over again.

From the evidence presented to our committee, it would appear that this is a major problem in perhaps a dozen of our largest metropolitan areas and in cities close to the Mexican border and in port areas through which narcotics are smuggled into our country. But it is a potential danger in every other community where narcotics syndicates can gain a foothold because State or local statutes are weak or unenforced.

In testimony before our committee, a chief probation officer in California reported frankly that there was an alarming and rapid increase in the use of narcotics by teenagers. In Denver it was revealed that in one section of the population, 80 to 90 percent of the teenagers had used marihuana at least occasionally. In Iowa—yes, in our calm, peaceful midwest—the superintendent of the State training school for girls testified that 25 percent of the girls coming into her institution had used marihuana. One responsible organization estimated that 7,500 youngsters in one city alone were narcotic addicts. In our hearings we found a direct correlation between the users of narcotics and juvenile delinquency. Most of the young people arrested for narcotic offenses already had a police record. Many youngsters turned to criminal activity in order to raise the $20 or $30 a day necessary to keep them in drugs.

There was considerable evidence, too, that many youngsters take to drugs or narcotics just for the thrill of it. Once addicted, the road back is long and doubtful. Only in two cities in the entire United States, for example, are there follow-up centers for the care of cured narcotics addicts, yet some estimates of recurrence run as high as 99 percent.

What about Federal Government activity in this field? It can be summed up in three words: understaffed, overworked, and underpaid. To illustrate, in El Paso, Tex., almost 34 percent of the total narcotics arrests were youngsters under 21 years of age. Yet the Federal Bureau of Narcotics has only one man in El Paso and another in San Diego. These two men not only must police the entire Mexican border—a major entry point for narcotics—but are also responsible for policing the thousands of legitimate outlets for narcotics and drugs as well as for maintaining their own offices and doing their own clerical work. On its face, this is an impossible situation. Is it any wonder that so many youngsters in El Paso come under the influence of narcotics?

As in so many other contributing areas of juvenile delinquency, most middle income families tend to feel that drug addiction is something that can't happen to their children. But sometimes they are abruptly shaken out of their lethargy, like those parents in pleasant Oklahoma City where over 250 juvenile addicts were arrested last year in just one police roundup. All of these children were between 13 and 18; all of them were from middle and upper-middle income homes.

In this connection, our committee made three recommendations to the Congress. We recommended more narcotics agents. We recommended compulsory hospitalization of addicts. And we recommended mandatory graduated sentences without suspension or probation for convicted narcotics peddlers.

Not, perhaps, so sensational an area so far as newspaper headlines are concerned, but nevertheless an important problem in this field is the matter of runaway children. Our committee found that at least 200,000 children became runaways each year and more than half of them go from one State to another. We found tremendous variations among State and local agencies in dealing with children who run away from home. Detention facilities in most cases are grossly inadequate. We found such practices as "border patrols" or "sunset patrols" which consisted of escorting the youngster to the edge of a community or county—sometimes after a night's lodging and a meal—and admonishing him to move on or get home any way he can. We found that one of the major problems was lack of funds to pay for transportation or care for the runaway. It is perfectly understandable that most States are reluctant to spend their limited funds for out-of-State children when these funds are so badly needed for the care of their own children. The result is that thousands of youngsters annually are apprehended as destitute or delinquent and are thrown into jail where they are exposed to every kind of vice and crime until someone works out the puzzle of how to get them home.

With two of my colleagues in the Senate, I have introduced legislation aimed at correcting these situations. One of our proposals would provide Federal assistance to the States on a temporary basis and with a clause for Federal reimbursement, to assist in getting runaway children back to their own communities as quickly as possible.

Narcotics and runaway children are but two of the many contributing causes to juvenile delinquency. There are also the problems of fathers who desert their families, of the traffic in crime and horror comics, and of pornographic literature, and of crime and violence on television. Our committee made intensive investigation into these problems, but I mention these factors now only in passing because there are other matters I would like to talk about.

Now, we know that a child doesn't grow in a vacuum—that his immediate physical environment plays a major role in the development of his attitudes and actions. With this in mind, we went into studies of housing, health, and education.

I am sure that it is not necessary for me to spell out to anyone here the overcrowded conditions prevailing in our classrooms. Nationwide, we need at a minimum 300,000 additional classrooms. Here in Missouri we will need close to 10,000 additional classrooms in the next 5 years. Serious as our situation is here, in some areas it is even more shocking. For example, with 200,000 children now attending school on a part-time basis because of overtaxed and overcrowded facilities, the county of Los Angeles would have to dedicate a new 1,300-pupil school every Monday morning of the year, merely to keep abreast of increased enrollments.

I would like to read you just one sentence from Nation's Business for May. Under the heading "Education: Crisis Will Continue," it stated: "Today more than 600,000 children are attending school on a half-time or part-time basis because of lack of available classrooms, and in 526 urban communities, one-third of the children were in classes of 35 or more."

What happens in these overcrowded schools? The teachers in our elementary and high schools who are in the best position to spot signs of maladjustment and emotional tension are trying desperately to handle large classes and must necessarily plan their programs to meet the needs of the normal, well-adjusted children. The child with problems—and the delinquent child, in the vast majority of cases, has been a problem child in school—is inevitably neglected because in the average school in the average American community today there is no time, there are no funds, and there are no facilities, no special classes, no remedial teachers, no skilled social worker or visiting teacher programs to help families and children with difficulties. Here, where we could identify and help a troubled child before he becomes a delinquent, we are neglecting him instead.

Local school districts simply are unable to meet this problem. If our school facilities are to be anywhere nearly adequate, the Federal Government must assist. I am glad to be a sponsor of legislation to make Federal funds available for school construction. Our schools are in the first line of our Nation's defense against delinquency, and all the arguments about economy, all the false propaganda that Federal assistance means Federal control, all the conferences to review for the 100th time the extent of the need, all the classrooms that we may, perhaps, get around to building 10 or 15 years from now, will not mean a thing to the troubled child who needs help today. Nor will they result in one penny's saving in our annual crime bill and in the funds we pay out each year for prisons. We can make a bold, realistic attack on our shameful school situation, or we can drift along and hope somehow things won't get too far out of hand. The choice is up to us.

What about housing and juvenile delinquency? We have all heard over and over again that slums breed delinquency and crime. That statement, of course, is not literally true. Some of our finest citizens were born and raised in slum areas, but those Horatio Alger stories are the exception, not the rule. The fact is that a disproportionately large number of delinquents do come from slum areas. All children—some more than others—are affected by the sights and sounds to which they are exposed every day. We know that slums have a demoralizing effect on the kind and quality of home life, and we know that they expose children daily to examples of every kind of vice and crime and to the kind of distorted values that make the neighborhood hoodlum the local hero.

We need more slum clearance and more low-cost public housing—a need that is not being met by private builders because other types of home building are more profitable. Here again, we have a choice—are we willing to vote local bond issues or spend Federal funds to wipe out squalid slums and provide better housing, or are we going to spend that money to pay the cost of adult crime and to try to punish or rehabilitate adult offenders.

Treatment services and facilities, including detention homes and after-care services, were found in our hearings to be one of the weakest links in the chain of rehabilitation for juveniles. It is incredible, but true, that so many communities still seem to expect that if they put a delinquent boy behind four walls in an institution lacking adequate facilities and staff, and that if they keep him there for a period of months, by some miracle he will be rehabilitated. Too often, exactly the opposite happens. Yet, every year, over 100,000 boys and girls are confined in ordinary jails with older and hardened criminals as their companions 24 hours a day. Other institutions for the rehabilitation of youngsters are sorely overtaxed, and nationwide there is a severe shortage of trained personnel to care for such youngster.

Another major problem in the field of delinquency, our committee discovered, lies in the whole complex area of the authority of the juvenile courts and their relationship to probation officers and welfare agencies. I am sure that this was discussed in detail in your sessions yesterday, but I would like to add just one thought. Our committee found an impossible state of confusion in the laws relating to children and the family. For example, we asked numerous juvenile and domestic relations judges to define the legal status of a child who is committed to a training school. What rights remain to the child's parents—what are their obligations? Can a training-school superintendent decide to place a child in a foster home, or must the consent of the parents be secured? The amazing answer was re-

ceived was: They just don't know; the law isn't clear. In the field of family law—a field that affects the day-to-day lives of so many people—why have we not devoted more thought to codification and resatements of the law? I think this conference could perform a tremendous service if it were to set in motion a real effort for such a codification and restatement.

Another service to youth demanding immediate attention is the area of mental health. Our committee heard considerable testimony as to the value of mental-health clinics in preventing juvenile delinquency. It is estimated that from 10 to 20 percent of the young people who will appear before the juvenile courts this year—and there will be four to five hundred thousand of them—will be in need of residential care under the supervision of a psychiatrist. The emotionally disturbed child can often be saved for a happy and productive life in society if his problems are noted early enough and treatment is promptly available. But all too often, the testimony revealed, treatment is available only after many months of waiting. This is another field in which Federal assistance is needed, and, to this end, I have joined with a number of other Senators in sponsoring legislation to provide for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness by qualified nongovernmental groups. This study should result in a well-knit body of knowledge that will be of incalculable value to us in the study of the mental-health problem.

Another major concern to our committee is the tremendous gap that exists between the amount of money required and the amount actually available for family welfare work, for education, psychiatric treatment, parole work, court work, and recreational facilities. The problem here is so basic that we have to face up to the fact that lack of adequate funds will hamper our efforts to combat juvenile delinquency for some time to come. I have repeatedly said, and I firmly believe, that the emphasis in the delinquency fight must be placed upon local endeavor, but there are many areas—some of which I have mentioned today—where Federal participation is essential. I might say, in this connection, that not a single witness who appeared before our committee nor a single one of the thousands of people who wrote to us suggested that any of the Federal services now in effect be curtailed or discontinued. Rather, the majority expressed a desire for expanded Federal activity.

Now you may say—and I certainly concur—that most of the recommendations we have made will cost money. You can't build schools and clear slums and train personnel and provide additional services with good intentions. These things cost money—and so does crime. For the year 1954, the crime bill of our Nation was $20 billion. This is the appalling figure presented by J. Edgar Hoover when he testified before Congress. This amount would buy 100 supersize aircraft carriers. It represents a cost of $495 for each family in the United States. For every dollar we spend on education, we spend $1.82 on crime. For every dollar contributed to all the churches in America, we spend $10 on crime. In fact, if we combined all the contributions of all Americans to all charities, we would find that crime costs twice that amount. How shortsighted, then, to think that a dollar lopped off our educational budget is a dollar saved.

In all of this, we must remember that delinquency is a product of our very complex society and of the conflicts and tensions that surround all of us all of the time. We must keep ever in mind that there is no one simple solution—that the answer is not to be found merely in more recreational facilities, or in better housing, or in more institutions, or, for that matter, in psychiatric care, although all of these measures are important and will help alleviate the problem. Competition between gangs reflects the sharp social and economic competition in our general culture. Gang fights between children of various ethnic groups reflects the antagonisms and prejudices of adults in a society that preaches democracy for all, but, all too often, practices discrimination against some because of their membership in racial, national, or religious groups. In the final analysis, this problem is a symptom of the weaknesses in our whole moral and social fabric. The responsibility falls upon all of us, for it is the delinquent family, the delinquent community, the delinquent society that breeds a delinquent child—children are not born delinquent.

We do know that delinquent behavior is usually rooted in the home in early deprivation and neglect, and by this, I mean emotional and spiritual deprivation as well as physical. As parents, we must strive to maintain the kind of home life where, irrespective of economic circumstances, our children will feel the warmth of love and affection, will feel that they are an integral part of the family unit and are wanted and understood. We must look also to our churches and to our schools to help impart to our children a feeling of security, a feeling that they really belong.

What can we here in Missouri do?

One of our committee's major findings was the almost complete lack of coordination among agencies interested in the problem. In many areas we found no machinery whatsoever geared to cope with the problem of juvenile delinquency. What you are doing here, today, in this conference, represents one of the most constructive steps in fighting this problem. The coordination and cooperation represented here should be carried on, not only within the State, but by maintaining a liaison with the Senate committee and with other Federal, State, community, and national and local private agencies in the field. Out of this conference can come the leadership not only for groups throughout our State, but for other States. You can keep public attention focused on the problem. I don't suggest sensationalism. The true picture of juvenile crime is altogether too sensational. It is that bad.

Here are some other suggestions that have come out of our committee study: Each police force should have at least one man and woman, and larger cities should have a squad, specially trained in handling juveniles.

Each community should investigate its own detention facilities for young people. They should not be confined indiscriminately with adults.

Physical and psychological examinations should be given to every youngster who comes into serious trouble with the law.

All courts should have an adequate probation staff, and I want to stress here, that we should make sure the caseload does not negate any efficient operation of the system. We should also work out better systems of cooperation between the courts and the social agencies.

We should establish and adhere to fresh, modern standards for institutional care that will insure that training schools are a place for juvenile rehabilitation; not a place for training criminals.

Is the problem so broad, are the efforts and the funds required so great that the situation is hopeless? I heartily reject such a defeatist attitude. We must have the courage and the will to begin where we are, just as did the men who drained the swamps to combat malaria, long before DDT was discovered, just as did Sister Elizabeth Kenny, long before Dr. Jonas Salk found his wonderful vaccine. We can never look forward to finding a DDT or a vaccine to prevent delinquency, but we can, like those courageous citizens, begin where we are.

I realize this is no small order. But this is Missouri. And in Missouri we have the courage, and the heart, and the will to do the job.

The Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Mrs. Robert A. Murray in regard to Senate Joint Resolution 1.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MRS. ROBERT A. MURRAY, NATIONAL COORDINATOR, VIGILANT WOMEN FOR THE BRICKER AMENDMENT, BEFORE THE SENATE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, MAY 11, 1955

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is Ruth Murray. My address is route 4, Oshkosh, Wis.

I want to thank you for this opportunity to speak in favor of the Bricker amendment. I am sure I can add nothing to the erudite and legalistic arguments already presented in these hearings. My statement will deal primarily with the grassroots interest in the amendment and with questions which many of your lay constituents are asking.

I am here as a spokesman for the Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment. With me is Mrs. Lewis Barker, of Chicago. She and I are the two national coordinators of the Vigilant Women. The success of our organization is proof of the tremendous popular interest in the Bricker amendment and related issues.

The Vigilant Women for the Bricker amendment is a voluntary, nonprofit association dedicated to upholding and defending the sovereignty and the Constitution of the United States. To that end, we seek the adoption of a treaty-control amendment that will adequately protect personal rights, States' rights, and national independence. In our judgment, the pending resolution (S. J. Res. 1) adequately safeguards what Mr. Dulles once described as an extraordinary power, liable to abuse.

The Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment is probably the least organized organization ever to come to your attention. We have no constitution; no bylaws; no board of directors; and no advisory council. We have no formal membership and no dues. We cannot even estimate how many thousands of people are associated with us in this historic fight for constitutional government. We work through State coordinators and other key workers in all the 48 States. We work through scores of national and State organizations which support the Bricker Amendment but whose primary interests are in other fields. Let me tell you how our organization was born and what it has accomplished.

In August 1953, 8 women met in Milwaukee—4 from Illinois and 4 from Wisconsin. We met to decide what, if anything, we could do to prevent our basic liberties from being undermined by proposed treaties which Secretary Dulles himself had described to this committee as "alien to our traditional concepts" of human rights. We were deeply

concerned about the One World propaganda of UNESCO; about the ILO description of itself as "a world parliament for labor and social questions"; about Dr. Charles Malik's statement that recent amendments to the Human Rights Covenants were Communist-inspired; and about various backdoor approaches to world government. We saw the utter futility of fighting scores of un-American proposals on a piecemeal basis. The Bricker amendment seemed to provide a permanent, overall remedy. It seemed to be the one banner around which all defenders of American sovereignty could rally. Out of that Milwaukee meeting in August 1953 grew the Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment.

Little did we realize the response we would receive from our initial efforts to awaken the American people to the dangers of treaty law. In less than 3 months we obtained more than 300,000 signatures on petitions urging passage of the Bricker amendment. In January 1954 we staged a successful rally here in Washington on the eve of Senate debate. More than 300 women came at their own expense from all over the United States.

After the GEORGE portion of the Bricker amendment failed to pass the Senate, we returned home dedicated to a stepped-up program of education which would result ultimately in the election of Senators sympathetic to our cause. Beginning last September we have published each month a Newsletter on the Bricker amendment and related issues. Our Newsletter now goes to more than 5,000 people and the number is growing rapidly. We have printed more than 300,000 copies of this pamphlet, "Why We Need the Bricker Amendment." We have reprinted and distributed huge quantities of speeches by Senator BRICKER and others on the subject of treaty law. We have just published a detailed plan for revision of the United Nations Charter. I would like to submit a sample of our literature for your inspection.

Prior to January of this year our organization was financed entirely by unsolicited contributions and by sales of literature. Our increased activity, however, made a fund-raising campaign necessary. We succeeded in raising sufficient money to carry out a greatly expanded program of education. Contrary to certain smear attacks, however, we are not financed by so-called Texas oil money. Contributions of $5 or less account for 95 percent of the total, both in number of contributors and dollar-wise. Unlike the Atlantic Union Committee, we have not requested or received any tax-exempt status. Unlike many of our one-world opponents, the Vigilant Women do not use literature provided at the taxpayers' expense or furnished by the large foundations. This might seem like an unequal contest, but eventually we are going to win.

I have given you this detailed statement on the Vigilant Women organization for just one purpose. If there were not tremendous popular support for the Bricker amendment, no organization such as ours could have grown and prospered. Neither Mrs. Barker nor I claim any unique talent or special competence for the work in which we are engaged. We are just ordinary housewives imbued with the old-fashioned notion that the sovereignty of our country and the freedoms of our children are worth fighting to preserve. I hope that I have now qualified myself to report accurately the ground swell at the grassroots about this amendment.

The people may not know all the legal jargon of *Missouri* v. *Holland* or the Pink case, but they do understand that Section 2 is the heart of this amendment. This committee could make no greater mistake than to assume that supporters of the Bricker amendment would be satisfied with Section 1. We all know that legislation is the product of give and take; that a desired end can be achieved by many different forms of language. Nevertheless, I can assure this subcommittee that an amendment containing only the first section of Senate Joint Resolution 1 would be widely and, in my judgment properly, interpreted as a fraud and a hoax. The Vigilant Women and the organizations allied with us in this fight may not have enough strength to pass a strong amendment in this Congress. We are willing to wait. Do not think for 1 minute, however, that the fears of the American people are going to be calmed by some toothless, watered-down substitute. If, therefore, this committee should report such a substitute, we may become the Vigilant Women Against the Eisenhower Amendment or whatever it may be called.

Why isn't an amendment containing only Section 1 adequate? Section 1 of the Bricker amendment provides that no treaty or executive agreement which conflicts with the Constitution shall be of any force or effect.

Section 2 of the amendment provides that no treaty or executive agreement shall become internal law except through appropriate legislation.

The effect of eliminating Section 2 is to write into the Constitution by the strongest possible implication the following language:

"The President shall have power to make internal law for the United States by international agreements, provided such agreements do not conflict with the Constitution."

A treaty-control amendment containing only the first section of Senate Joint Resolution 1 would concede that by executive agreement the President has power to—

1. Raise or lower tariffs;
2. Regulate interstate and foreign commerce;
3. Declare war;
4. Make rules for raising, supporting, and regulating the Armed Forces;
5. Amend or repeal immigration and naturalization laws;
6. Take powers from the States and give them to the Federal Government; and
7. In general, supplant the Congress as the national legislative body.

We do not suggest that section 1 of the Bricker amendment is superfluous. It would, for example, prevent the U. N. human-rights covenants and other dangerous U. N. treaties from authorizing what the Constitution expressly forbids. Why is the administration apparently willing to accept the restrictions embodied in section 1? Is it because the elimination of section 2 would give the President unimpeachable constitutional authority to make one-man law by executive agreement?

That is why the Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment cannot support an amendment containing only the language of section 1. That is why the one-worlders concentrate their heaviest fire on section 2.

Secretary of State Dulles testified, in effect, that he would accept the bulk of section 1 for reasons of "political expediency." What an appalling confession. The Secretary would be willing to clutter up the Constitution with what he regards as a meaningless provision merely to throw a political sop to the American people. Since Mr. Dulles says he is wiser today than he was in Louisville 3 years ago, he ought to have the courage of his newly born convictions. Of course, I think Mr. Dulles was right when he said in Louisville that treaties "can cut across the rights given the people by their constitutional Bill of Rights." Mr. Dulles' famous legal somersault proves not his wisdom but that of Lord Acton, who said: "Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

Back home we hear every day the question, "Why is the President mixed up in this fight when the Constitution does not provide for his participation in the amending process?" The question is usually phrased more pungently than I have stated it. Oddly enough, no witness in these hearings has challenged the propriety of Presidential intervention in this debate. Needless to say, I have no idea of gagging the President. He has as much right as I have to express a purely personal opinion on the Bricker amendment. I do not criticize this committee for seeking the legal opinion of the Secretary of State and the Attorney General. What I object to is the White House intervention described by Senator BRICKER in a speech made shortly after the Senate vote last year:

"The deciding factor was the furious lobbying of White House and State Department aids in the corridors of the Capitol, in the Senate cloakroom, and by telephone. By this form of personal and political pressure, enough votes were changed to prevent the amendment from being sent to the House of Representatives for consideration."

Article V of the Constitution provides for its amendment. The President is not mentioned in that article. The power to amend the Constitution was intended to lie wholly in the legislative domain—Federal and State. That this was the intent of the Founding Fathers is shown by the constitutional construction of their contemporaries. Justice Samuel Chase, of Maryland, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, wrote for the Supreme Court of the United States in *Hollingsworth* v. *Virginia* (3 Dall. 378, note 381 (1798)):

"The negative [veto] of the President applies only to ordinary cases of legislation. He has nothing to do with the proposition or adoption of amendments to the Constitution."

Attorney General Brownell testified as follows before this subcommittee:

"Changing the Constitution is a serious undertaking. The checks and balances which it provides are delicate. They are intended to prevent tyranny and dictatorship."

The Attorney General is right. But so far as we can judge, the only violence done or proposed in this debate to the separation of powers principle has been the highly improper intervention of the President and his aids in the purely legislative function of amending the Constitution. Elihu Root was the illustrious predecessor of Messrs. Brownell and Dulles at the New York bar and Mr. Dulles in the office of Secretary of State. We commend to them Mr. Root's advice to President Hoover:

"The Constitution does not contemplate any relation of the President to its amendment. You can veto any other form of legislative action but you do not have that power in relation to constitutional amendments. That distinction was made for the definite purpose of holding alterations of the Constitution away from the President, who is solely an enforcement officer in this relation."

We are often asked, and cannot answer, how any Senator, without violating his oath of office, can bow to the demands of the executive branch in this matter.

In my judgment, arguments of opponents of the amendment are not making much impression with the average person. Take, for example, the argument that the Bricker amendment is an attack upon the Constitution and that opponents of the amendment are its stanch defenders. You would be well advised, gentlemen, not to suggest to your female constituents that they obtain the right to vote by means of an assault upon the Constitution.

The fact, of course, is that the Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment and like-minded organizations are working in an honest and open manner to amend the Constitution in the manner prescribed by the Constitution for its alteration. We would not even be engaged in this work if the advocates of omnipotent treaty power had not emascu-

lated constitutional safeguards by subterfuge and indirection. I realize that some advocates of world government and Atlantic Union have the intellectual honesty to advocate a constitutional amendment. Unfortunately, there are others who seek shortcuts to a superstate by international agreements and even by a so-called liberal interpretation of the U. N. Charter and North Atlantic Treaty. All that we are seeking to do is to pass a bill of rights against the treatymaking power. Our Constitution was intended to prevent abuse of all forms of governmental power—legislative, executive, and judicial. Why should the power to make international agreements be any exception to this cardinal rule?

Another totally unconvincing argument is that we should trust the President and two-thirds of the Senators present and voting. But the President and the Senate are not infallible. Who is? If any proof of presidential and senatorial fallibility were needed, it was supplied by ratification in 1953 of the infamous NATO Status of Forces Agreement. For the first time in American history, American servicemen abroad were subjected to trial and imprisonment by foreign courts under the brutal system of criminal procedure prevailing in the courts of some countries. Significantly, diplomatic personnel, who go abroad voluntarily, retain immunity from local criminal prosecution. So the argument that the President and the Senate should be trusted never to make a dangerous treaty does not carry much weight with the parents and wives of American servicemen.

Then there is the threadbare argument that we must not tie the President's hands. How many millions of lives would have been saved if the hands of President Roosevelt had been appropriately tied at Yalta? We think that it is a good thing to tie down this administration and any future administration from bartering away at international conference tables American independence and the liberties of the people. So we say, yes, tie their hands.

Even less convincing is the argument of Secretary of State Dulles that this administration does not intend to use treaties and executive agreements to legislate on matters of purely domestic concern. No one is so stupid as to believe that Mr. Dulles has any power whatever to bind his successors in office. Even this temporary assurance by the Secretary of State is qualified by his statement that the boundary between domestic and international concerns is not to be considered as "rigid and fixed for all time." If this fight for the Bricker amendment should be abandoned, I am sure that Mr. Dulles and any like-minded successor would then conclude that the human rights covenants and the Genocide Convention are fit subjects for the exercise of the treaty power. Being a mother of four children and a grandmother, I view with alarm any power to make motherhood and its attendant privileges—deciding how and when you're going to nurse your own baby—an appropriate subject for international agreements.

In conclusion, I would like to present several questions to this subcommittee. I asked these questions in a letter dated April 11, 1955, addressed to my distinguished senior Senator, Mr. WILEY. Senator WILEY replied on April 19, 1955, as follows:

"I am interested in your further questions on the very important problem of treaties and agreements. I would be delighted to spell out what I think would be some helpful answers, at least from one man's viewpoint, to these significant inquiries but, as you can kindly appreciate, with my mail today numbering several hundred pieces, it is physically impossible to attempt to do more than acknowledge them, because extended replies would make it impossible to attend the committee meetings, floor sessions, or handle other duties.

"I hope, however, that the problems which you have raised may be somewhat resolved in connection with the hearings which will shortly open before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee. There is a good opportunity for both sides to try to get, as a matter of record, some of these important legal questions resolved, to the extent that this is feasible."

Inasmuch as Senator WILEY indicated that this subcommittee should try to answer my questions, I respectfully submit them:

1. What powers now held by the individual States do opponents of the Bricker amendment want to transfer by treaty to the Federal Government? Or to some international body?

2. What powers of Congress do opponents of the Bricker amendment want to transfer to the President? To the U. N.?

3. Why should the President and a foreign power be able to make treaties and executive agreements which give the President or the Congress powers not delegated to them by the Constitution?

4. What do opponents of the Bricker amendment want the executive department to do that the Bricker amendment would prevent? Is it to use international agreements to cut across the Bill of Rights?

Socialism Creeping On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from a recent issue of the Topeka Daily Capital entitled "Socialism Creeping On."

In 1933 a special House committee found 232 enterprises, most of them dating back to World War I, being operated by the Government in direct competition with private business. The committee at that time deplored the fact, and recommended that the Government divest itself of the direction of most of those enterprises.

It is interesting to note that under the latest Hoover committee report, there are now approximately 2,500 individual enterprises operated by the Government in competition with private business. This increase in the number of facilities operated by the Government in competition with private business has taken place despite the recommendations of congressional committees and special commissions on Government operations that Federal activities of this kind be decreased.

The Hoover Commission noted that the Department of Defense has already scheduled for elimination 97 competitive business-type facilities which were studied by the Hoover Commission.

This is proof that such facilities in many instances can be eliminated. President Eisenhower's own philosophy that the Federal Government should not be doing what private enterprise can do as well or better should be given greater consideration.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIALISM CREEPING ON

Congress will do well to heed the admonitions of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, which recommends closing out of many Government enterprises. The latest committee report suggests that about 1,000 individual facilities of the 2,500 now owned and operated by the Government should be eliminated without injury to the national defense or to any essential Government function.

During the emergencies of war the Government creates many business-type enterprises, or develops projects which are not adapted to private enterprise because of their nature or magnitude, the committee notes. Then—one of the major problems is getting the Government out of the business after the emergency ends. At present the United States Government has $15 billion invested in businesses competing with private enterprise.

The committee does not blame bureaucracy entirely for the tendency toward perpetuation of these enterprises. "By the time their tasks are completed their personnel and the citizens of the communities where they operate resist termination," it notes.

The Hoover Commission has found that the Government business enterprises often charge lower rates for goods or services than private enterprise. The reason for this is that they do not include all their costs. They pay no taxes, little or no interest on capital invested, seldom charge depreciation, and frequently their directing personnel is not included on their payroll. Moreover, in addition to the fact that most of them pay no taxes, they deprive the Government of taxes which would otherwise be paid by private enterprise.

This continuing trend toward Government in business is illustrated by this statement: "From 1929 to 1948 public wealth has grown 278.5 percent while private wealth has increased only 78.7 percent. In 1929 the public wealth, represented only 15 percent of total national wealth, in 1948 the public wealth amounted to 27.3 percent.

"Is this creeping socialism?" the committee asks.

Perhaps the businessmen of the country who must buck competition from the Government enterprises can answer the question.

If it isn't creeping socialism, then what do you call it?

Loans to Brokers and Dealers in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Sobering Market?" which appeared in a recent issue of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SOBERING MARKET?

Loans to brokers and dealers in securities by New York City member banks rose $55 million in the week ended last Wednesday, to $1,870 million, the highest figure touched in 11 years.

These are loans extended to finance new securities issues, dealers' inventories of securities, and margin buying by customers. As recently as a month ago there would have been little doubt in the mind of anyone who was watching the action of the stock market that these additional loans were headed for the accounts of brokers' customers trading on margin. At the end of last week, however, no such easy conclusion was possible. For since the last week of April, when the New York Times daily averages of 50 combined stocks reached their high of the 1953–55 stock market boom, the speculative spirit has been, for the time at least, definitely on the wane.

As a matter of fact, should the tendencies evinced by the market since the end of January turn out to have been prophetic in character both the Federal Reserve authorities and Senator FULBRIGHT would be entitled to take a bow. It would be difficult to persuade the future economics historian, in the absence of further serious speculative eruptions or major misadventures in the months immediately ahead, that the Federal Reserve's two 10-percent hikes in margin requirements and the focusing of the spotlight on the market by the Senate Banking Committee were events totally unrelated to the recent evidence that the speculative fever might at last be subsiding.

By the term "the recent evidence" we are not referring to the sell-off in prices since the second increase in margin requirements raised them to 70 percent just a month ago. What we have in mind is the recent rather clear-cut trend in two important statistics which usually reflect the speculative state of stock trading. The daily volume of market activity crossed the 3-million-share level in the so-called Eisenhower market last November, when it averaged 3.2 million shares. In December it rose to 3.5 million and in January to 3.6 million. Since then it has receded every month, falling to 3.2 million in February, 2.9 million in March, 2.7 million in April and 2.3 million thus far in May.

The latest monthly figure of the New York Stock Exchange on a customer debit balance (the best single yardstick we have of the amount of margin buying) shows the total to have been $2,750,000 at the end of April. That, it is true, represented an increase for the month of $50 million, but it confirmed earlier evidence that the rate of advance was tapering off. In November, December, and January the monthly increases had been, respectively, $110 million, $150 million, and $170 million. With February the trend was reversed, and the monthly rate of expansion has moved steadily lower.

As it stands at the moment this is an encouraging picture of returning sobriety, even though it is necessary to add in the interest of realism that it is a picture that is subject to possible change without advance notice.

A Decade of Progress in Employing the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great feeling of pride that I would like to include in the RECORD for the benefit of the Members of the House an essay written by Mr. Edward Petyak entitled "A Decade of Progress in Employing the Physically Handicapped." This essay placed first in the national essay contest conducted by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

Edward Petyak is a junior student at Brophy College Preparatory, a high school conducted by the Society of Jesus in Phoenix, Ariz. In winning the first place award, Edward won out over competition from high school students in all 48 States and United States Territories. In this accomplishment, he has brought great honor to Brophy College Preparatory, to the city of Phoenix, and to the State of Arizona.

I think it would be well for every American to take to heart the concluding words of advice that Edward's essay ends with, "give the disabled a chance, not charity."

Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, is to be commended upon the able method in which the committee has encouraged our American young people, as typified by Edward Petyak, to concern themselves with the problems of our physically handicapped fellow citizens.

I am sure that each and every one of us are grateful to Edward Petyak for his contribution to increase understanding of the problems of a large segment of our population.

Edward's essay is as follows:

A DECADE OF PROGRESS IN EMPLOYING THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

(By Edward Petyak, Brophy High School, Phoenix, Ariz.)

A man with a slight limp came off the bus in front of a local factory; his right hand carried a lunch pail, his left sleeve dangled uselessly at his side. He seemed to carry the lunch pail proudly; but the most obvious characteristic of the man was that he displayed an honest smile to the world—a smile of security and self-respect.

This same smile can be seen throughout the crossroads of America; in professions, business, commerce, industry, and agriculture. This smile can be seen on 7 million men and women carrying an artificial limb, a white cane, or displaying some form of physical impairment; for these are people who are happy and content. Happy to be useful members of society; content to be able to do their best at a job.

These are physically handicapped people who are employed.

This, in part, is the gratifying result of the past 10 years of efforts by individuals; local, State, and national agencies; and countless private organizations who have taken upon themselves the responsibility of giving the handicapped an equal chance of employment.

These efforts are supplemented by nationwide actions; and in 1945 the first "National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week" was proclaimed by Congress as a timely reminder of the responsibility our country has in encouraging equal opportunity for the handicapped to obtain employment.

In the same year the National Association of Manufacturers compiled pamphlets on the rehabilitation and readjustment of the handicapped. In 1948 representatives of virtually all business and industry in the United States pledged to do everything possible to create job opportunities for the handicapped. Besides all these job aids, hundreds of thousands of handicapped persons found jobs on their own initiative.

These 7 million are a living proof to the fact that a handicapped person, properly placed, can do just as well or better than an able-bodied person.

These handicapped are from your town, they are your friends and neighbors. They are veterans and civilians alike who were disabled by accidents; some by war and disease, others affected from birth. World War II contributed 2.4 million loyal Americans to their number; the Korean conflict added another 100,000 men to the ranks of the disabled—Americans all.

During the past 9 years, 466,000 men and women have been rehabilitated to the fullest physical, mental, vocational, and economical usefulness. They are now earning their own way. By the efforts of State employment services, over 2 million handicapped men and women were placed in jobs which could make the best use of each worker's abilities. For instance, the leg amputee who works as a television and radio speaker repairman at a local service shop; he mastered the work during night classes. The blind woman through her senses of hearing and touch has proved of great benefit to the inspection line of a large factory. These are real examples of the uses of abilities which the disabled still have and can use. There were also over 600,000 disabled veterans who received vocational rehabilitation.

Countless surveys by various government and civic organizations, such as the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Department of Labor, have attested to the fact that properly placed handicapped workers adapt quickly and satisfactorily to the job conditions; they are as good as or better than other workers in job performance; they have better attendance records than other workers at the same jobs; they are careful and their safety records prove this fact; they are reliable since they switch jobs less frequently than others; and above all, they are capable of holding positions; they are earning a living in nearly all types of occupations.

Even with all that has been done to acquaint employers with the facts and records of the handicapped and to advance employment of the physically handicapped, there are still some prejudices remaining in the minds of some employers; still some who fear accidents will be incurred by the disabled, or that they will not be able to properly adapt themselves.

The facts outweigh the fiction. The physically handicapped have proved themselves to be as good as other workers. They have been employed to fill jobs that they can manage. They have managed these jobs at a profit to the employer and society.

Each year the Government has a $400 million relief bill to pay for aid to over a million persons, disabled and their dependents. If these persons were rehabilitated and employed (converting them from tax consumers to taxpayers), the Government would earn $10 in taxes resulting from their employment for each dollar spent for their rehabilitation, besides, cutting the national relief bill to a minimum.

Wastes of manpower cannot be tolerated by a trouble-strewn world in which the only chance of survival is to strive above the opponents of freedom in fields of moral, scientific, industrial, and military strength. The best way to accomplish this goal is to make use of every able and disabled loyal citizen in America.

Great employment progress has been achieved, but there is still much to be accomplished. The physically handicapped of this Nation of ours wish only an equal opportunity at employment. They can do the job. Their record has been proved. It is up to the employer.

Give the disabled a chance, not charity.

What Is Wrong With This?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I have here a copy of an editorial of the Corvallis Gazette-Times of May 11, entitled "What Is Wrong With This?" The writer of this editorial has set forth in everyday down to earth language the vital points of my John Day bill, H. R. 5789. If all of my colleagues will read this editorial I believe the passage of H. R. 5789 will be speeded up; therefore, under unanimous consent, I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHAT IS WRONG WITH THIS?

SAM COON, Oregon's United States Representative from the Second Congressional District, spoke Monday before the Oregon Cattlemen's Association. A part of his talk was directed toward his bill (H. R. 5789) for the immediate construction of the John Day Dam on the Columbia River.

Advocates of both private and public power should be interested in this particular bill because it may be the solution which will satisfy both sides. At least if both sides are willing to give just a little and be reasonable, it should satisfy them.

Here is the gist of the proposal: It is estimated by Army engineers that the dam will cost $310 million. Of this amount the Federal Government will be asked to supply only $37 million (one-tenth of the total cost) which will be for the nonreimbursable features of the dam which include flood control, navigation, and so forth, parts. The rest of the money will be raised by selling the power output in advance.

This procedure differs from the way Bonneville and McNary were built in that for these dams the Government put up all the money and is now selling the power produced to pay for that part of the dam that is charged to power. The rest of the cost is not repaid.

Under Mr. COON's bill the John Day Dam would be owned at all times by the Federal Government, and they would construct it and operate it. But no money for the power features of the dam would be taken from the general tax fund of the Government, the Federal budget is not increased, and taxes are not higher until the money is repaid.

Under the terms of Mr. COON's bill the power would be sold in advance to any electric utility, public or private. The Federal Trade Commission will decide how the power is to be allocated among the utilities which want to take part in the financing.

Another great feature of this plan is that construction of the dam could begin almost immediately. This is most important. Almost every one knows that unless we get a tremendous increase in power developing facilities we will be severely hurt by 1960 and be in critical condition by 1965. The latest figures show that close to $1 million a day will have to spent on this construction if the job is to be done. Another way of saying it is that we will have to complete a job the size of Bonneville every year.

Now here is where the plans of MORSE, NEUBERGER, and GREEN fall by the wayside.

Out here in the Pacific Northwest we have been getting one-third of the entire amount appropriated for public works over the whole United States. This sum is clear out of proportion to our population and tax payments to the Federal Government. Even if our Washington delegation were working together, it is a cinch that this bounty would be cut down. Eastern, midwestern and southerners have been complaining about this out-of-balance situation and are sure to change our ratio.

But even if we could continue to get one-third we would not be getting enough to have the Federal Government do all the building necessary. Actually, what we would need is two-thirds of the usual yearly appropriation for public works. (Some authorities estimate we would need all of it.)

Another set of figures which show how unlikely we are to get the needed development by following the Morse-Neuberger line of all-Federal-or-nothing thinking is the list of 1,115 public-works projects which have already been authorized by Congress but for which no appropriation has been made.

The amount of money needed to complete these 1,115 projects is $9.7 billion. Just think, this number of projects already approved but no money appropriated. We would have to get our projects and then battle it out with the other 1,115 to get appropriations to build them.

As of now there are 171 public-works projects under construction by the Federal Government which will cost $6.1 billion to complete. Of this amount $2.7 billion has yet to be appropriated.

How do you think we are going to stack up in this list to get even a part of our needed development?

Mr. COON's suggestion for financing the John Day Dam is a honey and should have the support of the entire Oregon delegation—but it won't.

Why? Well, some of our delegation has to play politics. They would rather fight it out and die on their all-or-nothing plan (to the unhappy detriment of their constituents) than to go along with an intelligent compromise. So we may get nothing.

We would be interested in knowing just what holes the all-out public power boys can find in Representative COON's plan. Send them in, but please restrict the length.

Navy Gains Larger Atomic Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of May 18, 1955:

NAVY GAINS LARGER ATOMIC ROLE

The Navy's increasing role in atomic warfare was illustrated again yesterday with the brief disclosure that an underwater atomic device had been exploded off the west coast.

The Navy has been the first of the services to use atomic power in driving warcraft. The submarine *Nautilus* now is undergoing sea tests.

Navy air power is equipped to carry nuclear weapons. The Navy also is known to have been experimenting with the use of atomic warheads on devices which might be fired from ships or submarines.

If this newest explosion has proved that an atomic blast would be effective against submarines, the Navy will have added a defense weapon of tremendous value to the United States arsenal.

The Russian Navy has stressed submarines and is believed to have an underwater fleet of 375. This explosion may mean that submarines, like troops, ships and planes, no longer will be able to operate safely in close proximity to each other.

It might be expensive to use an atomic bomb to destroy a single sub, unless it has a special mission. But this blast may signal the end of wolf pack tactics which were successful in World War II.

Since World War II there has been an intensive effort to perfect anti-submarine weapons. Technical equipment has been designed for hunter-killer planes, fast surface ships, and submarines whose task would be to hunt other subs.

The brief dispatches available make it appear that this test was different than that made underwater off Bikini in 1946. There the ships in the explosion area all were surfaced. It is hinted that some of the vessels and targets tested this time may have been submerged.

The underwater explosion off Bikini did far greater damage to the fleet than did the bomb set off in the air. Besides sinking more ships, the underwater blast contaminated target ships so thoroughly that some test vessels remained radioactive for years. This bomb may have been smaller than those at Bikini.

Unusual secrecy has surrounded the undersea test, but there is little question that more of the preparations were made in San Diego than at any previous time.

The American Navy leads the world in the development of offensive atomic power and weapons as adjuncts to sea power. New leadership now may have been attained in defensive tactics. With Russia banking on a submarine navy, the value of these tests cannot be overestimated.

Hon. L. Mendel Rivers Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an article from the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of May 17 concerning the festivities at L. MENDEL RIVERS Day in Charleston on May 16.

It is good to know that the people of the First South Carolina District appreciate the outstanding service rendered his district and the Nation by our colleague, MENDEL RIVERS. It has been said that "a prophet is not without honor save in his own country." Rivers Day proves that that is not always the case.

The article follows:

Armed Forces Week started here yesterday with what turned out to be an L. Mendel Rivers Day, honoring the Charleston Congressman who is one of this Nation's greatest supporters of the military services.

The words were those of Joseph P. Riley in introducing Mr. RIVERS at a giant luncheon in the Francis Marion Hotel. Arranged by 7 service clubs of the area, it was attended by 457 persons. Included were top echelon Army, Navy, Marine and Air Corps personnel, and civic leaders in all walks of life.

Each service club had a part in the program.

Paul Quattlebaum, Jr., chairman of the Chamber of Commerce Military Affairs Committee, was master of ceremonies. The Reverend Ralph S. Meadowcroft, president of Ro-

tary, pronounced an invocation, after the 6th Naval District Band played the national anthem.

Mr. Meadowcroft first asked 10 seconds of silent tribute to the memory of Gen. Charles P. Summerall, former president of the Citadel, who died Saturday in Washington. He then said two prayers: one for the men and women of the armed services, another for the Nation's men in authority.

The program centered entirely around Mr. RIVERS. He was introduced by Mr. Riley as president of the Lion Club and the response was by T. Frank Simmonite, president of the Charleston Exchange Club.

Harold A. Petit, president of the chamber of commerce, then read a number of tributes to Mr. RIVERS, including letters and telegrams from such persons as Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense, Robert T. Stevens, Secretary of the Army, Adms. Arthur Radford and Robert B. Carney and Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway. All members of the South Carolina delegation in the National House of Representatives also sent tributes to their First Congressional District colleague, and other expressions came from civic and business leaders. The entire collection, mounted in glassine pages in a heavy leather case, was presented to Mr. RIVERS.

Civilian honor guests were next introduced by Julius E. Burges, president of Kiwanis, and military guests were presented by Herbert N. Steinert, vice president of the Uptown Exchange Club. The latter represented commanding officers of all Charleston area and Lowcountry installations, including the Parris Island Marine Base.

Final tribute was presentation to Mr. RIVERS of a handsome silver tray, appropriately engraved. This was done by Richardson M. Hanckel, president of Sertoma.

In addition to expressing his thanks, Mr. RIVERS' address was a general discussion of the military services and their problems, with which he has been connected closely as a member of the Armed Service Committee of the House of Representatives.

He emphasized the great size of military expenditures—65 cents, he said, of every tax dollar—and the deadly nature of war in an atomic age.

"Our armed services have got to be smart," he said. "They play a deadly game."

In two occasions he departed from a prepared text to make side comments on items which have figured recently in the news.

Taking note of disclosure that some of the armed services are heavily overstocked on foodstuffs—including enough hamburger in the Navy, one story has said, to last some 400 years—Mr. RIVERS said the services have to be prepared for any eventuality: "I would rather they had too much than too little."

Of recent cutbacks in the Armed Forces personnel, including an attempt by President Eisenhower to stabilize manpower on a permanent basis just short of 3 million men and women Mr. RIVERS said: "If anybody knows manpower problems, Dwight D. Eisenhower is the man. If he doesn't, nobody does. There have been peaks and valleys in armed services manpower which have been unconscionably costly. If manpower can be stabilized, then we can plan intelligently."

"The world," Mr. RIVERS said, "has seen more dramatic changes in the techniques of warfare in the last 20 years than was witnessed in the 5,000 preceding years. To cope with fantastic developments, amazing discoveries, requires a new type of individual in our Armed Forces.

"Today we have electronics specialists, nuclear physicists, radar experts, sonar operators, engineers fully versed in the problems of supersonic speeds, experts in the defense against biological warfare, men trained in the highly complex field of guided missiles, submariners who are conversant with atomic power—all performing duties unheard of 20 years ago.

"So when you see a member of our Armed Forces today you are not looking at a young man who has merely acquired the simple attributes of a sailor, or a soldier, or a marine, or an airman. You are looking at an individual who must be conversant with weapons and equipment, and techniques that were unknown to mankind 25 or 30 years ago. The itellectual level of our Armed Forces has necessarily increased. We demand more and more from our young servicemen and thus they are entitled to even greater respect and admiration from every American citizen.

"They must be prepared to fight a conventional war or a nuclear war. They must be prepared to combat hydrogen bombs, atom bombs, biological warfare, and all of the newest devices that are capable of destroying. This is a double burden.

"Now we hear a great deal about waste and duplication in our Armed Forces. And we all hate waste just as we are all opposed to sin. But I would caution you against the specious remedy of consolidation, that is usually proposed in the guise of eliminating waste and duplication. There is oftentimes a fine line of distinction between duplication and competition and if we eliminate competition because it involves some bits of duplication, we may be playing with the fate of our Nation.

"We are undergoing a reduction in strength today in our Armed Forces. Next year the end-strength of the Armed Forces is estimated to be 2,859,000 men and women. On December 31, 1954, we had an armed force of 3,180,000 men and women. There, of course, is a savings in manpower and a savings in dollars. Unfortunately, there are few people in the world who are competent to estimate exactly what strength we must maintain to be sure of safety. Obviously, it is better to err on the side of too many, than it is to err on the side of too few. If those who have been trained for the greater part of their lives in the strategy of war can assure us that our commitments can be maintained and the defense of this Nation guaranteed on a force of 2,859,000 men, then it must abide by their decision. In announcing this estimated end-strength for next year, the President has also indicated that for the foreseeable future this strength will not be materially diminished. Thus for the first time in the history of the United States we are entering into a long-range military program of a predetermined size which augurs well for our own security. It means that the days of valleys and peaks are a thing of the past. It will permit orderly planning and orderly procurement."

Northwest Ports Seek Relief From FMB Examiner Unabashed Basham's Unfair Cargo Decree

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the ports of the Pacific Northwest are being unfairly discriminated against by the Pacific Westbound Conference which permits ocean carriers to divert cargo produced in the Northwest to San Francisco for shipment to the Orient. An unfair freight absorption practice approved by the Federal Maritime Board permits transpacific carriers to ship out of San Francisco at the same cost as from Seattle. This uneconomical and unfair practice has been recently condoned and approved by an Examiner of the Federal Maritime Board.

Recently the Marine Digest of Seattle published an editorial analysis and denunciation of this practice. I fully agree with the comments made in this editorial and believe that this practice which has stifled the maritime development of the Pacific Northwest should be brought to the attention of the Members of Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial in the RECORD:

[From the Marine Digest of May 21, 1955]

NORTHWEST PORTS SEEK RELIEF FROM FMB EXAMINER UNABASHED BASHAM'S UNFAIR CARGO DECREE

Slugging it out like a doughboy wearily wading through a mucky trench, step by step the port of Seattle and the commission of public docks edged forward this week when they filed a reply to exceptions to unabashed FMB Examiner F. O. Basham's recommended decision to the Federal Maritime Board.

The next move will be taken when the oral arguments are presented in Washington, D. C., by attorneys for the port of Seattle and the commission of public docks.

Seattle and Portland justifiably contend that Northwest ports are being unfairly discriminated against by the Pacific Westbound Conference, which permits transpacific ocean carriers to divert cargo, produced in the Northwest, to San Francisco for shipment to the Orient.

Although Wenatchee, for example, is 155 miles from Seattle and 1,001 miles from San Francisco, the through rate to the oriental ports is the same. This unfair discriminatory freight absorption practice, approved by the Federal Maritime Board, permits transpacific carriers to ship out of San Francisco at the same cost as from Seattle.

STRIPPING NORTHWEST PORTS

Carriers are stripping Northwest ports of Northwest products by paying the exporters the difference in cost of inland transportation, thereby shrinking their own revenue by upwards of $15 per ton, in order to divert traffic to San Francisco and away from Seattle and Portland. The carriers absorb on an average of 23 percent of their freight revenue on this type of cargo.

Yet unabashed F. O. Basham brazenly declares that the Northwest is "economically tributary to San Francisco."

Why?

The Federal Maritime Board has established trade routes for subsidized lines. Subsidized carriers, operating on route 29, are authorized to operate only from California ports to Far East destinations and not from ports located in Oregon and Washington.

Thus, they are not permitted to call at Washington and Oregon ports to lift Northwest products. Through devious means, known as freight absorptions, they are able to siphon off Northwest cargo to California ports.

ARTIFICIAL COMPETITION

What about the nonsubsidized lines This situation, created by the subsidized carriers, forces the unsubsidized lines to meet this artificially created competition or forego the traffic.

Thus, these unsubsidized vessels, which make Northwest ports regularly, are unable to load Northwest cargo in Northwest ports and, instead, sail to the Orient via San Francisco where they lift Northwest cargoes to meet artificially created competition.

To compete with other subsidized carriers they are obliged to lift Northwest cargoes in San Francisco destined for the Orient.

YET BASHAM FINDS EQUALIZATION NO THREAT

In spite of this siphoning off of Northwest cargoes which are funneled down the drain to San Francisco, unabashed Basham yet amazingly states: "The whole practice of freight equalization does not pose a threat to the existence of the complaining ports (Seattle and Portland). They continue to enjoy considerable steamship service, and the heavy volume cargoes on which they depend primarily, such as lumber, flour, and grain, are not affected by equalization. What effect the extension of the practice would have is speculative."

SUBJECTS SCARCELY SPECULATIVE

Any freshman student in a beginner's transportation course, would not have to speculate to any learned extent to arrive at the obvious conclusion. The uneconomic practice of equalization as approved by unabashed Basham, would ultimately funnel almost all Northwest products down an expensive drain to San Francisco. Other ports from Bellingham to San Diego might just as well close up shop except for part-time employment if this ubiquitous practice is to be continued.

NORTHWEST ECONOMICALLY TRIBUTARY

Examiner Basham at least put all his cards on the table when he brazenly declared that the Northwest was economically tributary to San Francisco.

Not only does unabashed Basham come to the amazing conclusion that it is quite proper to divert Northwest cargoes from Northwest ports to San Francisco but is equally unabashed when he states that it is speculative as to what effect absorption rates by the Pacific Westbound Conference would have on so-called base cargoes such as lumber, flour, and grain.

COLUMBIA BASIN POTENTIAL

Northwest shipping interests visualize an ever-increasing volume of high-grade cargo produced in the Columbia Basin. However, any intelligent person (with little or no shipping background) would know that if the Maritime Board sanctions this ridiculous practice of skimming off the cream of the Northwest cargoes, there is little doubt as to which direction the other traffic will flow before it becomes overseas cargo over San Francisco docks.

Ships call where the cargo offers. This is fundamental. Basham's recommended cargo diversion practice strikes at the very foundations upon which the Northwest shipping interests seek to build Northwest shipping progress.

The only hope for Northwest ports to receive the traffic to which they are justly entitled, and once enjoyed, is that the Federal Maritime Board will not follow the recommended unfair and uneconomical decision of Examiner Basham.

Northwest ports are fighting for their economic lives. They will not meekly yield as slaves to a presumptuous ruling by Examiner Basham, who autocratically decrees that the Northwest is economically tributary to San Francisco.

On With Cal-Sag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two editorials which recently appeared in Chicago daily newspapers concerning the Cal-Sag Channel improvement project. The widening and improvement of the Cal-Sag Channel has great potentialities for the development of industry and commerce in the central section of this country from the northern to the southern boundaries.

There is a great interest in the Chicago area in this project because the most immediate results of this industrial development will undoubtedly be felt there.

The editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily News on Monday, May 9, 1955, and that which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times on May 16, 1955, are substantial evidence of Chicagoland's interest in this development. I commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

ON WITH CAL-SAG

The House Public Works Subcommittee that heard testimony in Washington Friday in favor of the Calumet-Sag Channel improvement project ought to waste little time in recommending release of the $4 million in initial funds allocated in the last Federal budget for a start on construction.

If there was ever any doubt about the importance to the national economy of this long-deferred project, it ought to be dispelled by the evidence put forward by the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee.

Henry E. Seyfarth, committee chairman, presented the conclusions of the first thorough economic survey ever made of the potential benefits in this project, the St. Lawrence seaway project and Chicago port development planned at Lake Calumet. The report was prepared with the aid of Dr. Harold M. Mayer, University of Chicago economic geographer.

Among its conclusions are:

There are more than 15,000 acres of land potentially available in the Calumet district for industrial expansion.

Using the most conservative figures, the committee's researches indicate that full industrial development of the region will support a total population of about 2 million persons.

The Lake Calumet development, at the lower end of the Great Lakes and on the Cal-Sag link to the Lakes-to-Gulf shipping routes, will become the major port terminal for the seaway. It will also be the main transshipment terminal for a vast barge traffic on the inland waterways.

There can be no question of broad benefits of widening and modernizing of the 16-mile "bottleneck" Cal-Sag channel. It is the key to an industrial expansion which would add immeasurably to the wealth of the Nation.

The project itself was authorized by Congress in 1946, but no money has ever been made available. Last year, under the urging of Seyfarth's committee, the entire Illinois delegation in Congress signed a memorial to the White House urging action.

As a result, the first appropriation of $4 million was recommended. Seyfarth's committee, with the cooperation of Dr. Mayer, has presented the final, clinching argument for getting underway.

CAL-SAG AND 600,000 NEW JOBS

In terms of industrial expansion and employment opportunities, the projected widening of the Calumet-Sag Channel opens up an awe-inspiring vista of the future.

Proponents of the project estimate conservatively that it would create 300,000 new industrial jobs in areas yet to be developed along and near the Calumet-Sag route between Blue Island and Gary.

In turn, they say, these jobs would create 300,000 more in retail establishments, local transport and other service activities of various types.

On the basis of 3.5 persons per family in urban areas, a total of 600,000 new jobs would mean a 2-million increase in the population of metropolitan Chicago.

Those are the figures which have been laid before Congress by the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee, a nonprofit organization composed largely of industrialists, businessmen, and civic leaders seeking to promote the widening project.

Very wisely they have placed on the committee spokesmen for large segments of organized labor in the Chicago-Gary region. Management and labor have thus been able to present a united front to Congress in trying to obtain an initial $4 million appropriation to get the Cal-Sag project started.

A report prepared by Dr. Harold M. Mayer, University of Chicago economic geographer, and presented to Congress by Henry E. Seyfarth, makes out a highly convincing case for the project.

Widening of the Sag Channel from its present width of 60 feet to 225 feet would provide the final vital link between the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and the Illinois Waterway route to the Mississippi. And it would make 15,000 acres of land available for industrial development.

Local private interests have already given assurances that they will spend nearly $18 million as their share of the first stage of development. Moreover, improvements already made out of local tax funds would cost $403 million to reproduce at the price levels that prevail today.

This is not the case therefore of a local community trying to put the squeeze on Uncle Sam to provide it with improvements at no cost to itself. And while metropolitan Chicago would be the most direct beneficiary of the project, the entire vast area along the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence and Illinois-Mississippi water routes would benefit indirectly.

River barges now reach Lake Calumet through the Illinois waterway and the Cal-Sag Channel. Great Lakes and overseas vessels can reach Lake Calumet by navigating the 6-mile Calumet River link with Lake Michigan. Plans for the development of Lake Calumet Harbor by the Chicago Regional Port District are going forward rapidly at the present stage.

Widening of the Sag Channel and completion of the St. Lawrence seaway would make Lake Calumet Harbor possibly the world's greatest transshipment point for ocean and river cargoes. Moreover, since cold weather doesn't stop river traffic, the harbor would be the only one on the Great Lakes to remain open the year around.

Since the Cal-Sag project was first authorized by Congress in 1946, not 1 cent has been appropriated to implement it. The time has come for Congress to act without further delay.

The Party of Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of May 22, 1955:

THE PARTY OF YOUTH

(By Edwin Gill)

The Democratic Party is peculiarly the party of youth. Its founder, Thomas Jefferson, never permitted his mind to grow old. Even in advanced age, he was always open to new ideas, fresh appraisals, new approaches to the problems of the day. Our party is also the party of youth because it is committed to action after the manner of Andrew Jackson. In other words, we not only talk about good government, but we actually translate our ideas into practice. If democracy gets its mind from Jefferson, it gets its courage and initiative from "Old Hickory."

When we say that the Democratic Party is the party of youth, we refer not only to its appeal to young people, but to the state of mind that respects tradition yet refuses to be bound by it—to the mental attitude which is optimistic in that its bright hope for the future grows out of its faith in mankind. And this youthful outlook characterizes good Democrats of all ages, for true Democrats are those that are young in heart.

The Democratic Party is truest to Jefferson when it insists upon a free press and the right to worship God according to the dictates of one's conscience; when it champions the freedom of the human mind; when it takes its stand against all those who would burn books, defame human character or in any way limit the search for truth. More than any other man in American history, Jefferson is the symbol of the questing spirit, the inquiring mind, the hopeful faith—all of which are so necessary to the progress of mankind.

FOR COMMON PEOPLE

The Democratic Party is truest to Jackson when it takes militant action on the side of the common people; when it is willing to fight courageously against great odds for what it believes to be right. In addition to Jackson, other Democrats who gallantly fought for their convictions are Cleveland, Wilson, and Roosevelt. These men have not been without their faults, but no one can say that they were ever afraid to face the crucial issues of their day. In fact, they seemed to glory in the stress and the strain of battle, and to be entirely willing to risk all in defense of the principles in which they believed. With each of them courage and action were the order of the day.

Our most recent Democratic President, Harry Truman, undoubtedly belongs to the Jacksonian tradition. He loved a good fight and neither asked nor gave quarter. Because he flourished in an atmosphere of heated controversy, it will be many decades before there can be anything like an objective appraisal of his administration. You may differ with his views; you may not approve his technique; but certainly no one can seriously question his great courage or his deep devotion to his country.

Until the election of Jackson, the common people of America had never felt that they had a champion who fully understood their needs and aspirations. They worshiped Washington for his massive integrity, but stood in awe of his great dignity. And, except for Jefferson, who came into office with some popular acclaim, the others came to the presidency largely through the influence of experienced leaders. But with Jackson, it was different. His election was a real upheaval; for the rank and file, the laboring man, the small merchant, the farmer, and the man of the frontier—all saw their own image in "Old Hickory."

I am happy that my party was founded by Jefferson and not by Hamilton. For the philosophy of Jefferson, so well stated in the Declaration of Independence and reaffirmed in the Bill of Rights is the real foundation of this Republic. I have always had admiration for Alexander Hamilton. He was a brilliant man of outstanding ability and integrity. He undoubtedly made an important contribution to the thinking of those who created a new nation, but I shall always be glad that he failed in many of his recommendations to the Constitutional Convention of 1787, for most of his views were based upon fear of the common people. I am indeed happy that this infant Nation turned from Hamilton to Jefferson and placed its faith in an enlightened electorate.

FAITH IN PEOPLE

Jefferson, of course, had faith in the people provided they were well informed. So in 1900, the Democrat, Charles Brantley Aycock, imbued with the spirit of Jefferson and fired by the courage of Jackson, Aycock went up and down the length and breadth of North Carolina making war upon the forces of ignorance, preaching that the salvation of our democracy lay in universal education.

The record of the Democratic Party in North Carolina is one of great progress which has placed human welfare above material assets. We have, of course, made mistakes and have by no means reached perfection. However, on the whole, it is a record of progressive achievement, unequaled by any of our sister States.

I am proud of the fact that North Carolina has not neglected her human resources; that we have made a substantial investment in schools, roads, health centers and institutions for mental care. In my opinion, the 1 million children in our public schools today are both our greatest asset and our greatest responsibility. We must do all within our power to give them a fair chance in life through education.

For 45 years the Democratic Party has been in power in North Carolina, and we are proud to give an accounting for this long and unbroken record of good government. For, under the leadership of the Democratic Party, North Carolina has steadily grown not only in wealth and prestige, but in grace and in the intangible things of the spirit. At the turn of the century, Aycock not only had a dream, but had the courage to do something about it—to try to make it a reality. So our great State, in its effort to be true to the vision of Aycock, has kept faith with both Jefferson and Jackson in that we have not only dreamed dreams, but have had the ability and the courage to bring them to pass.

While Jefferson and Jackson in many ways symbolize the philosophy and character of our party, perhaps we should add to these two names that of another great Democratic President, Woodrow Wilson, who first proclaimed the duty of this Nation to the world at large—to the oppressed and underprivileged everywhere. For it was Wilson who broadened our vision and set goals beyond the borders of nationality, thereby declaring that our party stood for some sort of world order which would bring peace to mank.nd.

Milk Price Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I noted in the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., for May 22 an article by Alex R. Preston. I read the first paragraph of the article:

Within the last 10 days Virginians have been treated to a couple of rare spectacles. First, the State Milk Commission, one of several powerful agencies whose regulations have the force of law, declined to extend its price-fixing powers into an eight-county northern Virginia area.

I think this article is excellent. It points up and informs the public of something it should know. The Federal Milk Control Act came into being to assist the producers and the municipalities in overcoming what had, too often, been cut-throat milk wars which were often disastrous to producers' groups, most destructive to distributors, and great trouble to consumers.

Properly administered, Federal orders and State milk commission can render a good service to all. Improperly administered, they are not only a hindrance, but often cause grave injustice. I, therefore, call this situation to the attention of all Senators.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article reprinted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE POLICY OF MILK UNIT IS BIG ISSUE

(By Alex R. Preston)

Within the last 10 days Virginians have been treated to a couple of rare spectacles.

First, the State milk commission, one of several powerful agencies whose regulations have the force of law, declined to extend its price-fixing powers into an 8-county Northern Virginia area.

This was only the second time in its 23-year history it had turned down such a request from producers. In this instance it said it found insufficient evidence of price cutting.

Then, last week, news came out of Richmond that a group of milk producers had asked the commission to mend its ways, so to speak.

The dairymen offered suggestions which they said "we hope they'll follow * * * for if they don't they're on their way out."

One of those suggestions, according to John Seibel, of Roanoke, president of the State Dairymen's Association, was to increase the difference between prices on milk sold in stores and that delivered to doorsteps.

It seems as though the dairymen were, at least, seeing the handwriting on the wall.

Consumers have long wondered why they have been forced to pay such high prices on milk bought in stores when the stores themselves claimed they could still make a profit by selling for less.

TRUE TO FORM

Yet, there was another news development that ran true to form.

Governor Stanley, like other governors before him, turned down a request to abolish the commission or curtail its powers. A request to do away with it entirely came last week from Israel Steingold, Richmond attorney.

The commission is made up of three members. One is a producer, another is a distributor and the third represents both interests.

There is no provision in the law for a consumer representative.

This state of affairs has resulted in such situations as this: Safeway Stores and High's Ice Cream Co. have asked the commission for permission to sell at prices under those the State forces them to charge. It is not unusual for such requests to go unheeded.

IRATE CITIZEN

Last week a Falls Church citizen vented his spleen in a letter to the Governor.

"I am addressing this to you," he wrote Mr. Stanley, "because you must bear the responsibility for the citizens' growing agita-

tion at the impossible milk price situation which your milk commission has created.

"It is my personal opinion that 'fed-up' milk consumers will not again vote for a Democratic administration in Virginia. * * * It would well behoove you to bestir yourself and bring some degree of sanity to this situation. * * *

"On the front window of my dairy store in Falls Church is a huge sign advising me that the dairy regrets it cannot sell me a gallon jug of milk for 73 cents, but if I will drive to nearby Washington, D. C., or nearby Maryland, they can let me have it. They tell me, on this huge sign, that the Virginia State administration forbids them to sell me milk for some 20 cents less per gallon, much as they would like to do so."

Arlington's delegation to the general assembly has sought for years to abolish or curtail the commission's powers. Failing that, they have sought to have a consumer representative added to the body.

But the legislature, dominated by representatives of rural Virginia, never lets such a proposal see the light of day. At the last session, a study resolution by Delegates J. Maynard Magruder and Harrison Mann, of Arlington, was killed in the appropriations committee by a vote of 10 to 5.

CHAIN'S COST ESTIMATE

Mr. Magruder said the record of a previous hearing showed that Safeway Stores Co. stated it could profitably sell milk for one-half cent less a quart than the commission forces it to charge.

Delegate John Webb, of Fairfax, a member of the committee, said, "Considerable testimony was produced before the committee indicating, to my mind, a real necessity for a test study of the activities of the milk commission.

"The commission, however, had many friends in the House of Delegates and on the appropriations committee. * * * They objected to any investigation. It was my position that no State agency was beyond investigation."

The President's Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the Jewish Times of May 12, 1955, published in Brookline, Mass. It brings out a facet of President Eisenhower's character which might easily be unnoticed in the more dramatic events which are usually publicized from Washington. I congratulate Mr. James Kahn, editor of the paper, for this thoughtful editorial:

THE PRESIDENT'S VIEWS

Much is always made in the press about acts of discrimination and bigotry—and rightly so, for by exposing such vicious, un-American acts is to nip them before they can take root. However, quite frequently in the swirl of exciting and sensational stories, editors overlook the simple things that carry with them a positive affirmation that there is more on the positive side of the ledger on brotherhood and understanding than on the negative.

One such incident occurred this past week in the Nation's Capital and involved the President of the United States. Last weekend President Eisenhower graciously took time out from his busy schedule not only to address the congregation of the Washington Hebrew Congregation for 10 minutes but also to attend the religious services conducted in conjunction with the dedication of the modernistic new $1,500,000 temple.

In his remarks, the President warned that whoever enpoys God-given rights must defend them for his neighbor's sake or lose them. "It is not enough," he said, "to know that God gave rights to you and your neighbor. It is well to remember this also: you may not protect those rights only for yourself; you must protect them for all, or your own will be lost."

In answer to the question of why he should attend the services at all, the President explained: "A few moments ago, before this service began, I was privileged to meet some of the distinguished members of this congregation. Several of them voiced a word of amazement that the President of the United States should attend a service of a faith not his own and, in spite of other preoccupations, come both to the religious service and to the dedication of this great temple. I personally think that this is natural. There is nothing unique nor particularly extraordinary about it."

He then added solemnly and with great significance: "Today the President of the United States, the official head of the country, is after all the official head of a great Nation that is religious in its background and which has a spiritual foundation on which to stand." Therefore, it is entirely fitting and in keeping with his office that he should come to such a great and significant event in the lives of one part of the great faiths that have made this country what it is, to pay his respects to that faith and to the event and to the people who have made it possible.

Such is the religious credo of our President and his words should serve as a timely inspiration to the antiprejudice movements throughout this country. For by this simple act of attending a Jewish religious service and addressing the congregation, President Eisenhower has set a worthy precedent (since, to our knowledge, no other President has ever attended an actual Jewish religious service). Yet in the rush of the more sensational news, as was pointed out earlier, this event was more or less overlooked in the Nation's press. A few more concrete examples of this type of understanding by other leaders might add substantial strength to the Nation's brotherhood endeavors.

Good Will Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's homeowners owe a great debt through the years to the volunteer fire departments, which serve so well thousands of communities, incorporated and unincorporated, throughout the Nation.

One of these volunteer units, the Good Will Co. of Carlisle, Pa., is celebrating its 100th anniversary. I congratulate this splendid organization of civic-minded men, who give practical expression to their devotion to their own community.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an editorial of commendation for the Good Will Co. from the Carlisle Sentinel of May 17.

OBSERVING CENTENNIAL

The volunteer fire company is a distinct type of community organization and one of the best. It is comparable to the old-time military companies—the home guards, as they were known. These organizations were formed and supported by men who were willing to give their time and their service, and to run grave risks of sacrificing even life itself, for the protection of their families and their properties. They served voluntarily, without conscription by any branch of Government, and without pay.

The history of volunteer fire companies in America goes back to the days of Benjamin Franklin in the first half of the 18th century. At first they were little more than bucket brigades—not very effective but doing what they could to protect the lives and properties of themselves and their neighbors from the consuming element. Their firehouse also served somewhat as a community forum and as a social center. More recent times have seen a change; we still have volunteer fire companies, but at the same time they have support of municipal government financially, and have modern equipment which, in the hands of trained firefighters does not call for so much service of the volunteer members.

In Carlisle the first volunteer fire company was formed in 1789. A second was formed about 25 years later, and then in 1855 the third company was organized. This company was the Good Will, which this week is observing the centennial of its organization. The Good Will has had a continuous existence, although with the ups and downs with which fire companies are so familiar, for these hundred years; it has been progressive, has rendered a vast amount of useful service, and has been the means through which thousands of Carlisle men have been able to feel that they were doing something worthwhile for their community, in fighting fires. It is indeed a significant occasion and the Good Will "boys" are to be congratulated—much more so the community itself.

In the Oval Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of May 18, 1955:

IN THE OVAL OFFICE

There was a deceptive informality about the broadcast that came last night from the Oval Office in the White House, with President Eisenhower asking a question now and then and Secretary of State Dulles giving the replies. Nor did the listening and watching millions learn much that they had not known before.

But this very informality is something that no unfree country dare risk. It is, in fact, a quality deep in the nature of the American people. It is in the tradition of the country store and the town meeting. Sometimes the words did not come flowingly, but they were never stilted or stuffy.

Mr. Dulles gave us a few phrases that stuck in the memory. He thought the events of the past week might "really mark

a turning in the tide of world history." He had the "sense of a great event as the Free German Republic took its place" at the NATO conference table. He spoke of Asia and our policies there, and had tried, he said, to make his European friends realize that "we don't have a double personality"—if we believe in freedom in Europe we likewise believe in freedom in Asia. He thought we could now "face the future with new confidence."

Secretary Dulles was obviously in a good humor. He felt successful. The President, too, was relaxed and smiling. The most cynical of our critics could hardly look at the two men or at the circle of Cabinet members and others who were briefly on the television screen, and see in them a group of conspiring warmongers. The deep hunger for peace was an almost visible part of the atmosphere, an almost tangible yearning. The two men talked of peace as though the present cold war were a sort of disease from which they now began to hope the patient might recover.

And this was right. The success or failure of one Secretary of State on one of numerous missions, the prestige of an administration, these, as the President and Secretary would be first to admit, are secondary. These men have hoped much and done well, as last night's program humanly and rather humbly showed. But what counts is whether civilization as we know it lives or dies. That must have been in all men's minds last night.

Too much optimism, as we were duly warned, is dangerous. We must not relax. We must not lay freedom and honor on the altar of peace. But this we do know beyond doubt: that the longer the world remains at peace the greater the probability that honor and freedom will survive.

This was no polished presentation, this drama from the Oval Office. Perhaps it appealed the more to our hearts, for in the very quietness of its lines, the homeliness of some of its gestures, it was unmistakably and touchingly sincere. Millions must have felt this as they heard and looked, praying that mankind might awaken soon from the nightmare of threatened war and universal ruin.

Legislation for the Improvement of Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my distinguished colleagues from Nebraska, Hon. A. L. MILLER, Hon. R. D. HARRISON, and Hon. JACKSON B. CHASE, I wish to include for publication in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Legislative Resolution 32, passed by the Legislature of Nebraska, in its 67th regular session on May 19, 1955:

Legislative Resolution 32 re memorializing Congress to pass legislation for the improvement of wheat

Whereas the United States wheat producers have lost much of their foreign markets for wheat; and

Whereas Nebraska is one of the major quality wheat-producing States; and

Whereas much of this market is lost because of the poor quality of wheat offered for sale in foreign countries; and

Whereas present grain standards have not been revised to reflect technological improvements in the handling and processing of wheat: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 67th session assembled:

1. That the Members of Congress and the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture be urged to provide the necessary legislation and regulations to achieve an improvement in the quality of product offered for sale in foreign markets by raising the standards, and lowering the tolerances for foreign material, damaged grain and mixed varieties, and to tighten inspection procedures in the case of export shipments to insure that wheat moved on a grade basis actually meets the official requirements for the grade assigned to it.

2. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture.

C. J. WARNER,
President of the Legislature.

I, Hugo F. Srb, hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of Legislative Resolution 32, which was passed by the Legislature of Nebraska in 67th regular session on the 19th day of May 1955.

HUGO F. SRB,
Clerk of the Legislature.

Grand Rapids, Mich., Armed Forces Day Expositicn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last Friday evening to present Gen. Lemuel G. Shepherd, Jr., Commandant of the Marine Corps, to an audience of 3,000 at the Grand Rapids, Mich., Armed Forces Day Exposition. This exposition was in celebration of Armed Forces Day and of Michigan Week.

On Friday our people gave special attention to the noble heritage which has been bequeathed us, and to all that is being done to preserve and protect that heritage.

General Shepherd spoke of our military strength and its power for peace.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of General Shepherd and my own remarks in presenting him:

INTRODUCTION OF GEN. LEMUEL C. SHEPHERD, JR., COMMANDANT, THE MARINE CORPS, BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD, JR., ARMED FORCES DAY, GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., MAY 20, 1955

Mr. Chairman, it is indeed an honor to be able to participate in this Armed Forces Day Exposition in Grand Rapids, my hometown. And, ladies and gentlemen, it is well that this event occurs during Michigan Week, and on our Michigan Heritage Day, for "I'm glad to live in Michigan." It is a State of which we all may be proud, the arsenal of democrary, the powerhouse of victory, a mighty weapon for peace.

Michigan has a long and noble heritage, and Michigan has been foremost among the States in doing what needs to be done to make our country and our heritage secure against any danger from the Godless, atheistic, Communist forces that seek to destroy us. And, my friends, standing between our heritage and every potential danger since our Nation was born, has been the United States Marines. We are highly honored this evening, on the eve of Armed Forces Day, and on Michigan's Heritage Day, to have in our midst the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., the first of the Marines.

It is now 150 years since our land, this soil of the Chippewas, the Ottawas, and the Potawatomies became the Territory of Michigan. In that century and a half, through diligent use of its natural resources, and the effective application of its human knowledge and skill, a State of 7 million people has evolved as the arsenal of democracy and as a mighty power for peace.

In our recent conflicts the bulk of Michigan's war production was accounted for by the automobile industry and its skilled and conscientious workers. Yet it was only 59 years ago on March 6, 1896 that the first successful car built in Detroit appeared on the streets of that thriving and dynamic city. Just 1 month before, on February 10, there was born at Norfolk, Va., the man who is today Commandant of the Marine Corps.

In 1917, 5 days after the declaration of war, Lemuel Shepherd was commissioned a second lieutenant. In 1917, our Camp Custer was built at Battle Creek, and Michigan's factories began to turn out the all important Liberty engines, tanks, trucks and shells.

In France, Lieutenant Shepherd was twice wounded at Belleau Wood, and in 1918, for the third time was wounded in the Meuse-Argonne offensive. Michigan-Wisconsin's 32d Division, the Red Arrow, was there too, and its officers and men won 134 Distinguished Service Crosses. Back home, our civilians in Michigan exceeded their quota in the Second Liberty Loan drive by over 140 percent.

In 1928 Captain Shepherd was on duty in China, and Michigan elected to the United States Senate for the first time, our revered and beloved fellow citizen, Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Grand Rapids. During the following year, while Captain Shepherd was a student at the Marine Corps School, the completion of Ambassador Bridge between Canada and the United States expressed two nations' lasting friendship.

Promoted to lieutenant colonel in 1936, our speaker was assigned to the Naval War College at Newport, R. I. The same year in Michigan the UAW–CIO was organized to promote the cause of workmen in the automobile and related industries.

War clouds were again hanging heavily in 1940, and the 32d Division was again mobilized. Many here this evening can well remember how GI after GI marched off to Camp Beauregard. Undoubtedly there are many in the audience tonight who marched with them in the cause of freedom. In 1942, the 32d Division landed in south Australia and New Guinea, and Colonel Shepherd assumed command of the 9th Marine Regiment. In 1943, the Red Arrow Division was back in New Guinea, and Brigadier General Shepherd was helping to dig out the enemy on Guadalcanal. The next year found the 32d Division on Leyte and Luzon, while General Shepherd was leading his brigade in the invasion and recapture of Guam.

Back in Michigan, the MacArthur locks were jammed, bow to stern, at the Soo. Eighty-five percent of the vitally essential iron ore required by American industry passed through this crucial waterway. At Willow Run, 18 powerful bombers were coming off the production line every 24 hours, and the tank arsenal at Detroit turned out General Grants, General Shermans, and General Pershings at the rate of 1,000 a month. And then victory.

In 1945, General Shepherd received the surrender of the Japanese in the area of Tsingtau, China, and Michigan's Senator Vandenberg helped frame the charter of the United Nations to preserve and protect that peace.

Five years later our honored guest was in command of the Fleet Marine Forces in the Pacific with duties which carried him with our troops to Korea during our head-on struggle against the diabolical forces of Soviet Russia and Red China. On January 1, 1952, he was appointed Commandant of the Marine Corps. We are happy, General Shepherd, to welcome you to our State, which during the past 4 years has supplied for the defense of this Nation nearly $9 billion worth of military hardware.

Michigan's arsenal, like the United States Marine Corps, and all the Armed Forces, exists only for the protection of that great heritage which, under God, is ours to have and to hold. General Shepherd, I have the distinct honor of presenting you, a great patriot, to my friends in Michigan, and at the same time introduce my fellow-Michiganders to you.

Ladies and gentlemen, the first of the marines, Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., Commandant.

REMARKS BY GEN. LEMUEL C. SHEPHERD, JR., COMMANDANT OF THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS, AT GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., ON ARMED FORCES DAY, MAY 20, 1955

I am both pleased and honored to be here to celebrate this Armed Forces Day with you.

This annual observance has developed into an event of major significance—because Armed Forces Day now symbolizes the bond which exists between the military forces of our Nation and the citizens whom we serve.

In particular, these occasions afford an opportunity for representatives of your armed services to meet directly with you—and to review the status of our national security and some of its problems.

In my own case, I am especially happy to be in Grand Rapids. From personal experience I am aware of the continuous and active attention given to national defense by the citizens of this community.

Furthermore, the strategic nature of this area, associates it closely with the basic elements of our national strength. Your great industrial capacity, coupled with excellent and varied transportation facilities, combine to make Grand Rapids of real importance to our defense.

There is also your direct and personal interest in military affairs which is manifested by the thousands from this vicinity who have and are serving in the various armed services.

You are, moreover, particularly fortunate in being represented in Washington by a man whose own distinguished record as a naval officer provides him with such insight into the complex problems of our national defense. I refer, of course, to Mr. GERALD R. FORD, JR., of the Fifth District.

We of the Marine Corps have a special interest in the Grand Rapids area since it provides some of the finest young men who enter our corps, and it is also the location of one of the elements of the Organized Marine Corps Reserve.

So you can see that my reasons for pleasure at being here are well founded. I have already been made to feel at home in your midst—and there is no need for me to request an interest, which is already so apparent on your part, in the subject of our national security.

On this sixth national Armed Forces Day, all Americans are provided a timely occasion to take a serious look at our preparation for defense. I am with you today for that purpose—not simply as Commandant of the Marine Corps, but as a representative of all the Armed Forces—the Army, Navy, and Air Force as well.

In this capacity, I would like first of all to discuss briefly some of the principal aspects of our defense program in terms of today, or the present. Following this, I wish to offer for your consideration certain basic principles which furnish guidance for future planning.

At the outset let me say that our greatest strength, our real source of security, lies—as it always has—in the intelligent and informal patriotism of the American people.

In any list of the factors of our national power, the awareness, responsibility and determination of our citizens constitute the key upon which all else depends.

I feel no need to describe for you the nature and extent of the threat that confronts us—and all free men—in the world today. Our free press, radio, television—indeed all of our news media—remind us daily of the relentless, determined and enduring efforts of international communism.

Following this knowledge, we as a Nation have been steadily advancing into a position of greater strength. There is ample evidence that in the crucible of three wars, we have at last really learned that freedom and strength are synonymous. Moreover, we have recognized that the father of this country spoke for the centuries when he said,

"If we desire to secure peace . . . it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

Specifically, we have achieved the hard won realization that our national strength can no longer be sustained through intermittent effort. The individual citizen knows that the wisest course is the steady, consistent endeavor of preparedness for an indefinite period of time.

This understanding is our best hope for the future. And from it, despite some widespread gloomy forbodings, our country has in the last few years achieved defensive capabilities greater than ever before. And with each advance we have made, our aim of peace has been made more possible.

At this point I wish to say that I do not hold with those persons who believe that another catastrophic worldwide war is inevitable. Nor do I hold with those who think that such a war can be prevented simply by the renuniciation of war on the part of those who hate it.

In fact, there is little to choose from between those who would advocate preventive war and those who would put all their trust in the semantics of peace at any price or appeasement. Both groups are apostles of defeat. Historically, their divergent paths have led again and again to disaster.

Our best assurance, therefore, against losing our freedom and way of life lies in a posture of strength—always working for peace—but always being prepared for whatever sacrifices and risks that may confront us.

Working from this understanding, we have achieved a defense program that has resulted in a steady acquisition of enduring military power. Let me list for you some of our key achievements.

First, we have a strong retaliatory capability, and we are going to keep it strong. It is an instrument of infinite power and responsive to instant demand. We have a long-range Strategic Air Command without peer, and we have balanced naval task forces capable of projecting their power ashore wherever needed—unmatched by any other nation. In both of these vital elements we possess a capacity to counter large-scale aggression in a manner never before possible.

Second, we have strong land, sea, and air forces which can be used in a variety of situations and in the manner which special circumstances may require.

Most important, we are not placing undue reliance upon any one weapon or concept. We have not crippled ourselves by anticipating just one kind of war.

As a matter of fact, in recent years new definitions of warfare have evolved from the problems with which our military strategists have been confronted.

We have learned to distinguish clearly between two very different kinds of war; the all-out nuclear war, where the sky is the limit, and the so-called limited war, or cold war.

The all-out war needs no description—but the concept of limited war is something relatively new, something we have not faced before.

We have discovered—the hard way—that the cold war means not only war by proxy and by satellite, but that it includes propaganda, subversion, armed threats, political infiltration, and all the other Communist tactics with which we are familiar.

It is apparent, therefore, that we must be prepared for both kinds of warfare, if we are to avoid defeat which could come by either route. With this in mind, we are maintaining our military forces in a degree of preparedness and flexibility never before attempted as a long-range effort.

We have tactical air forces that can carry a great variety of weapons depending upon what the target requires. We have Army forces in being, equipped and ready to do their part in the accomplishment of military decisions when and where required. We have naval forces that can be tailored into balanced units capable of roaming three-fourths of the earth's surface and able to be exactly fitted to whatever special tasks may arise. We have a Marine Corps—3 divisions and 3 air wings strong—that is kept in instant readiness to move with the fleet to any part of the world where their striking power may be needed.

In short, we have a balanced, powerful Armed Forces team. It represents the greatest defense effort that our Nation has ever undertaken to maintain during a period when we were not actually engaged in a shooting war.

In the precarious and uncertain field of international relations, this fact enables our country to speak from strength instead of weakness.

Third in my list of achievements lies the fact that we have allies. Collectively, the free world has increased its ability to withstand Communist assault. To meet local aggression, a growing reliance can be placed on those allied forces now being strengthened in many parts of the world. At the same time, we stand ready with our forces to continue military assistance and cooperation with our friends. Thus, within admitted limits, the pattern of our own effort conforms to that of various members in several great alliances.

Fourth, we have in the United States an industry-science-military team which, in my opinion, presents an unbeatable combination.

We often hear of the disadvantage which confronts a free society in its need to match the efforts of a dictatorship which can ruthlessly regiment and exploit every resource available. I submit that the achievements of our American system have produced military strength of a kind impossible to a slave state.

To be sure, the Communists have a vast military machine. Certainly they have been able to produce atomic and hydrogen bombs. We must assume, moreover, that they are pressing with all possible speed toward the development of newer and even more effective weapons.

But here in America, a free science and a free industry are the partners, not the servants, of our military forces. Indeed, the services are themselves organized to utilize our national scientific, technological, and productive abilities. Science helps us to devise new weapons and new techniques. Industry makes them for us with speed and dispatch.

It is my firm conviction that no slave society, however ruthlessly administered, can ever in the long run match our system. Inevitably, communism must become the prisoner of its own mistakes.

So far I have been discussing some of our more important sources of military strength. These, of course, are based upon conditions that obtain today.

I would not wish you to believe that we have solved all our problems or that we have achieved absolute security and safety. Indeed, we should review our defensive power with mixed feelings.

We can derive satisfaction and assurance from the strength available to protect our way of life.

We can also be sobered by the contemplation of a modern weapons system in the hands of a callous, ruthless antagonist in the years which lie ahead. In a lawless world, we must be prepared for a fight—of varying proportions—at any time. And we must be prepared with weapons and techniques better than those which may be used against us.

This leads me to what I wish to say concerning the future.

No military man of any experience ever believes that he can see with absolute clarity into the years—or even the weeks—ahead. But there are certain basic principles which do give us some guidance.

We know by its very nature that the Communist threat must be an enduring one. No system that depends upon the acquisition of power for its continued existence, can ever voluntarily change its course or retreat from its fundamental objectives.

We also know that—in the long struggle that stretches out before us—we must press our every natural advantage if we are to survive. Constant vigilance and unremitting effort are to be a long term demand. All of our sources of strength must be utilized to the best and most efficient degree.

In this framwork is found a vital role for each of your Armed Forces.

Our Air Force, with its vast atomic capability, must continue to maintain a superiority that renders it a major deterrent to all-out war. In addition, it must defend our continental air space from aggression and it must continue to provide modern tactical air support of the Army ground forces.

The United States Army—as always—must continue to provide the major elements of those men who fight upon the ground. The men, I might point out, whose presence upon the ground of an enemy continue to represent an indispensable ingredient of military victory.

From the point of view of naval operations, the entire prospect of future strategy has been greatly altered by the realinement of the power balance between nations.

Today, the United States alone possesses adequate functional means for a comprehensive exercise of sea power. Only we have the balanced naval establishment that can fully control the oceans and the air above them—and this situation will obtain for the foreseeable future.

We are, therefore, not faced with the prospect of generating our naval power on the land—as in World War II—and applying it against the fleets of an antagonist on the high seas. Instead, defense of the free world requires that we have the capability of applying great naval power, generated from the sea, against a ponderous, landlocked antagonist—an opponent who is vulnerable the world around to attack from the ocean.

For the Marine Corps, this strategic reality has the deepest significance. It means that amphibious landing operations—our primary responsibility—must inevitably assume a greatly increased importance.

So long as we maintain our naval command of the seas—and the air above them—we are endowed with a form of power and flexibility not available to a continental enemy. It is an area of great superiority—one which if effectively exploited could be decisive.

But all these forces are not sufficient in themselves.

Military forces are at once the product and a measure of the society which they serve. In other words, the true strength of any country lies in the vigor and spirit of the citizens which compose it.

And herein, as I said before, lies the real power of our country.

Each one of us—as citizens—has an obligation and a responsibility in the organization for defense.

Every man who alines his own hopes and aspirations with those of his community—is making a fundamental contribution to the cause.

I am sure that all the citizens of Grand Rapids will agree with this.

In this world of 1955, nothing less than each individual's personal freedom and safety is at stake. And it is at stake 24 hours a day.

That freedom will never be lost, so long as we are willing to pay the price—in willingness to accept whatever sacrifices may be required—in willingness to devote any effort needed to the defense of the ideals we cherish.

That spirit, coupled with close understanding and teamwork between our Armed Forces and the American people—will generate the "Power for Freedom" we much have to defend our heritage of freedom; the heritage which remains the hope and inspiration of all mankind.

The Hoover Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS BASS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an editorial by Mr. W. D. Hastings, which was published in the Daily Herald of Columbia, Tenn., relating to the so-called Hoover Commission.

THE RAMBLER
(By W. D. Hastings)

Herbert Hoover, President of the most disastrous panic this country ever knew, is, it seems, one of Ike's leading advisers. Of course, Ike appointed Herbert to head a large delegation of investigators into the many things of the Government, and the general opinion is that he appointed Hoover for the purpose of crippling, and if possible, doing away with TVA and all of its holdings, all of which is for spite and the burning jealousy of the moneyed interests of the East and North, who, by the way elected Ike, and who give him instructions regardless of whether or not he thinks it right or justifiable, how they want the Government run under his, Ike's administration, is again erupting about TVA and wants it sold, lock, stock, and barrel.

Well, we know that Eisenhower stated time and again that he would not have anything happen to TVA, in fact he made several statements which were in high esteem for the Authority, but soon after the election in November 1952, the political bug, that spite bug, that envious bug, up in the East and also in some of the Northern States began to bore, and they continued to bore. The Dixon-Yates child was born, and who the father and mother are is something else, but it would seem that it is one of those births that have the name of a "wood's colt." Ike doesn't seem to want to play the role of father, and while the great power lobby is moving heaven and earth to destroy TVA, none seems to want to come out in the open and take the initiative (none but Hoover), so they conveived the idea of the Dixon-Yates scheme, and these two men, well versed in such matters, readly saw the advantages. The great amount of money to be made, even in the construction, possibly of the West Memphis $107 million steam plant so they got the contract from the Atomic Energy Commission, which Commission was ordered to sign the contract by President Eisenhower himself.

Hoover of the task force, has repeatedly said: "I see no reason why we must support President Eisenhower's preelection pledges to operate TVA at 'maximum efficiency.'" We all know that Hoover hates TVA and any and everything that is for the interest of the Southern States. Yet, Eisenhower made those statements before the election, and at the time he knew that he was going to appoint Hoover at the head of this task force, and with the authority to name his committees, which Hoover did.

Ike may have been sincere in his statements made before the election, but he certainly had a sudden change of heart, as he completely had a rightabout-face toward the great moneyed interests, and it is this great moneyed interest, that is piloting the old ship of Uncle Sam, and will take us through some turbulent waters and, if possible, they will dump the entire South into these turbulent waters and drown us so thoroughly that we can't meet our demands and obligations, and along with the disposal of this great TVA will also pass many of the manufacturing establishments that depend upon TVA to furnish the electric power with which to operate their plants.

Keep the Reds Guessing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a column from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel. It is written by Clifford B. Ward and very well expresses the sentiments of a great many people in our community:

Whether we will or will not fight in defense of Quemoy and Matsu is something known only to President Eisenhower and he is not saying. That seems to make a lot of persons angry, but I am not one of them. Why shouldn't we keep the Reds guessing, as they are constantly keeping us guessing. We have no obligation to anyone to say in advance what we will or will not do, particularly when saying it may be a "go-ahead" signal for more Communist territory-grabbing.

We have said that we will defend Formosa and it is an Eisenhower decision to determine whether or not defense of Quemoy and Matsu is necessary to defense of Formosa. It is a military decision and he certainly should be qualified by a lifetime of military experience to make that decision. And despite what anyone may say, Ike has said or done nothing to show an appetite for avoidable war. It was he who brought the meat-grinder operation in Korea to a halt, even though it meant

defeat for us, but it was the thing to do in the face of our previous policies of not winning the war. He picked up the chips in Korea and called it a day, which under the circumstances was about all we could do.

PLAYING FOR TIME

I think Ike and Dulles both are playing for time now, hoping as peace-minded human beings that something will upset the Communist juggernaut from within. It is likely that the Chinese Reds would give anything at this time to know whether we are bluffing with respect to Formosa policy, but I see no reason why we should tell them. If we do, it is certain that the Reds will start moving on Quemoy and Matsu immediately, putting themselves in position for an attack on Formosa.

The American people seem to have fondness for believing that the Communist leopard can change its spots overnight. We are so anxious to reform the Communists that if we don't hear anything threatening from them for a few days or a few weeks, we think they have reformed. It is not very practical or realistic to believe in something without a basis for so believing. The Communists today are the same Communists with whom we dealt yesterday and the day before. They are also the very same Communists with whom we fought a disastrous and losing war in Korea. It is an odd thing but Americans still don't seem to realize that they have fought a war with Russia and China in Korea. Who do we suppose fired those bullets that killed and injured more than 100,000 men in Korea We have a war against communism in our record book, just as indelible as the one which Franco fought in Spain.

DON'T UNDERSTAND POLITENESS

If there is anything upon which all experts on the Russian character seem to agree it is that the Russians regard all polite, courteous requests as signs of weakness and that they treat with respect anyone who pounds the table and yells at them. Yet we keep on trying to treat them as cultured Europeans, avoiding anything that might make them angry. The Russians have falsely accused us of war-mongering, but it is highly likely that if we had taken some determined positions against them in the past we would be getting along with them now better than we are. They don't seem to understand polite notes, but they do seem to have an understanding of a threat to punch them in the nose.

What happened to all those Democratic appeals during the Roosevelt-Truman administrations for a bipartisan foreign policy? They are now debating foreign policy up and down the country at every precinct meeting. To my mind that is good, but not when there is insistence that the President let the whole world see what cards he is holding.

Address by Anthony B. Akers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the text of an address delivered by Mr. Anthony B. Akers, of New York, at the annual Armed Forces Day parade and review, in York, Pa.

I believe I should call the attention of my colleagues to Mr. Akers' high qualifications to be a principal speaker at an affair honoring our Armed Forces. During World War II he rose from a seaman to be a commissioned officer in the Navy. He served, in a civilian capacity, in the Air Force during the Korean action. In World War II he was in the PT boats. He was one of the principals in the book, They Were Expendable, one of the early best selling books of the war, which told of the great heroism and courage of a small band of men who were challenging Japanese ships of the line in small wooden craft that had only speed, agility, and the courage of the men who operated them to combat the heavier guns.

I had the privilege of sharing the platform with Mr. Akers and listening to his talk. I recommend it to all my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY ANTHONY B. AKERS, ARMED FORCES DAY CELEBRATION, MAY 21, 1955

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a particular privilege and honor for me to be with you here in celebration of Armed Forces Day. This is a day in which I take great pride and one with which I feel especially at home; for I spent 6 years during World War II from 1940 to 1946 in the United States Navy and then after I had returned to my law practice in New York City and settled down to raise a family—the Korean War began and I spent more than 2 years of the Korean war in a civilian capacity with the Secretary of the Air Force. All I have to do now is to join the Army and I will have made the rounds of all the services. And don't think I forgot about the Marines. As soon as I joined the Navy in early 1940, I was of course turned over—as were all of us volunteers—to the tender hands of a marine sergeant for indoctrination in the manual of arms and close order drill. I have had a healthy respect for the Marine Corps ever since. I shall not soon forget one of the sergeant's first words of wisdom to us. He said: "In this man's Navy and Marine Corps there are going to be plenty of times of crisis when a solution may not be readily at hand." He continued: "We have a saying in the Navy that is perhaps facetious but which helps under such circumstances: "When in danger or in doubt, run in circles, scream, and shout."

It seems to me that as a nation we sometimes perform as the sergeant said we "run in circles, scream, and shout."

Because of the terrible nearness to every individual citizen of the awful shadow cast by the hydrogen bomb, and because of the explosive situation in Asia today, I should like to address most of my remarks to foreign policy and defense. In the world of the jet plane and the atom, the two are inseparable and our very lives depend upon their success.

I believe that I speak for most Americans when I say that we must be militarily strong. The time in which we live is perilous indeed. The Soviet Union is the strongest potential enemy we have ever faced. The men of the Kremlin and their satellites have so far respected force alone. I recognize this as strong talk, but it is also very straight talk.

I believe that I speak for most Americans also when I say that from a position of military strength we must seek every possible means of achieving an honorable and lasting peace for the world. We live in a time which will try the souls of men. As the majority leader of the Senate recently said: "This is no time for a war party, no time for a party of appeasement." I should like to add that we must make the right decisions, whether we are Republicans or Democrats. Atom bombs plummeting down upon us are not going to be marked for Democrats only, or for the GOP. Always in the recent past when the politicians talked of a war, or, of getting into a war, it meant putting a certain number of our young men under arms, and together with the necessary materials of war, shipping them off to fight in a foreign land. Today, when we talk of fighting and of war—there always exists the definite possibility that a horrible catastrophe will be visited upon untold millions of helpless men, women, and children right here in this city, all over America and in lands abroad. War today is too abhorrent to ponder—yet ponder it we must in order to devise means of avoidance.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, former Secretary of the Air Force, declared on Wednesday that the United States of America "may have lost control of the air" to Russia. He said in a Senate speech that he was shocked and astounded by the Defense Department's disclosure a few days ago that flights of intercontinental bombers—the kind that can fly to Pennsylvania, Connecticut, New York, and the rest of the country and return—had paraded over Moscow. The announcement showed that Russia has all but drawn even with the United States in development of jet bombers capable of delivering the hydrogen bomb. The Defense Department said that this and other Russian technical advances had forced a revision of American estimates of Russian warplane production. Senator RUSSELL, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, also voiced concern over Russian plane progress. Meanwhile Army Secretary Stevens urged a Senate Armed Services Committee to give prompt approval to $160 million for the new Nike guided-missile bases of this country's air defenses. Mr. Stevens did not link his pleas with the announcement of new Soviet air strength, but he said the project, amounting to 32 percent of the Army's request for construction money, is of the utmost urgency. SYMINGTON said that Russia's incredibly rapid development of jet bombers shows that the Russians have more air strength than anybody knew about and said that this might revolutionize present air strength planning over here. He noted that the Secretary of Defense had said only last year that the Russians were building primarily a defensive air force.

Representative BROOKS, of the House Armed Services Committee, in another interview this week said: "Major Red airbases are said to have been quadrupled in the past 4 years. The 20,000-plane Red air force has a strength of 600,000 men." He also said that the Russians have long-range guided missiles and have built launching platforms "at dozens of points in Europe and Asia."

In contrast to this the Secretary of State in a television appearance this week said that the entry of West Germany into NATO, the signing of the Austrian treaty, and the Soviet agreement to a Big Four meeting may mark a turning point in the tide of history. In discussing the Big Four Conference, Mr. Dulles dwelt rather cautiously on its dangers, in particular the danger that the world would let its hopes soar and then if an agreement was not reached would drop into disillusionment and dismay and regard war as the only alternative. The President of the United States broke in at that point (they were appearing on the telecast together) to say that he did not believe that "that danger is as great as it once was." He went on to say that the United States would not be discouraged in the hope "that a new dawn is coming even if the sun rises slowly."

All of the Western World wants peace. I hope that we will confer with anyone in the world whenever it may further, or hold out the chance of furthering, peace. We need not be timid in meeting others. Let us be strong and keep strong, and confer and confer and confer. I believe that we have the resilience as a Nation to meet any setbacks as they come, but our internal politics

should never be allowed to prevent meetings with foreign powers whether at the summit or otherwise. We should be big enough to explore every opportunity and adult enough to accept the fact that every meeting with a foreign power does not necessarily mean failure even if it does not succeed or produce outstanding results.

The death of Joseph Stalin in 1953 provided a golden opportunity to end the Korean war and to arrive at a framework of settlement for all of the problems of Asia. We got out of Korea—at a terrible price—without even the assurance of the return of our American boys who were prisoners of war. Even Vice President NIXON said: "A better decision might have been made during the Korean war that would have inflicted a substantial defeat on the Chinese Communists."

Do not misunderstand me. All of us thank God that the death of Stalin provided the opportunity for a cessation of hostilities in Korea. We shall reexamine our thankfulness, however, if we are called as volunteer firemen to put out an Asiatic blaze which we have been led to think of as under control. My friends, we cannot engage in the most dangerous of all possible games. It might be called bluff, bluster, and retreat. We seem often to be saying to the Soviet Union: "Make one false move and we'll cut another $10 billion out of our defense budget." We got out of Korea at a terrible price—a price measured in sacrifice, toil, blood, and tears. It was as though we finally said to the Communists: "Let's forget that anything ever happened out here." As soon as the pressure of our Armed Forces was removed from the Korean scene the Communists began to shift their efforts toward another fertile Asian field—Indochina.

In the meantime, we cut our defense program dangerously. In 1952 our defense program called for more than $40 billion. By 1954 our defense program had been cut to less than $30 billion. As Deputy for International Negotiations I spent 2 years with Thomas K. Finletter in the Office of Secretary of the Air Force. I earnestly suggest to you that you read at least the first page of Finletter's book, Power and Policy. Among my most solid convictions is the thought that he who tells you in this age of modern weapons that he can get defense for you on a wholesale, cutrate basis is whistling in the dark, just outside a hydrogen graveyard.

In 1953 our Air Force was dangerously cut. The scheduled 143-wing program was cut to 120 wings. Five billion dollars and 50,000 personnel were sliced from the program by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. When Senators asked if the $5 billion cut would jeopardize our security, our Defense Secretary said that, "We would have a better Air Force with the cut." A Senator on the Armed Services Committee demolished this illogical premise by stating: "Then for heaven's sake cut it $10 billion and make it twice as good."

After almost a year of budget cutting, the pressure of public opinion indicated that defense might be running into troublesome waters. An Air Force program of 137 wings was then scheduled. The earlier and more comprehensive program had been scheduled for completion in 1955. The lesser program is now scheduled for completion after 1957. The juggling and see-sawing of this vast air program by the Budget Director has cost the taxpayer huge sums in wasted funds. But perhaps even more important, it has caused us to lose 2 precious years versus the Soviet Union. If the U. S. S. R. should be ready to strike before 1957 it will take a lot of the Budget Director's unusual brand of logic to explain.

Furthermore, our all-important research and development program has been depleted. As a result we may lose supremacy in the field of punch-button warfare—the IBM—the intercontinental ballistic missile, the terrible air vehicle of tomorrow which is just around the corner.

In the Korean truce we failed to obtain a substantial settlement in Asia. In the wake of this failure, terms such as the "New Look," "disengagement," "flexibility," "deterrence," and "massive retailiation" were unveiled before the American public and given great currency.

* * * * *

My friends, we have sometimes followed policies which added up to bluff. To bluff and then to follow a negative course can be dangerous. In that vast world of defense and foreign affairs what are the recognizable characteristics of bluff? To threaten to take military action which in the judgment of serious military men cannot do what it is advertised to do. Let's take an example: The talk about our military saving Dien Bien Phu contained an element of bluff for the reason that we were not prepared to make the necessary parallel political decision to engage in a general war in Asia. The net effect of our talk about the United States saving Dien Bien Phu has been to heighten the feeling that we may be reckless, and to diminish the weight of what we say.

Never threaten to do what you are unable or unwilling to do. Never take a few steps up a path unless you are prepared to go to the end of it. Since the Korean war, the professional soldiers know that air forces may not be a decisive weapon in a limited Asian land war. With almost absolute control of the air over North Korea we were unable to prevent the Chinese from building up an army that was stronger at the end of the war than at any other time. We must not minimize the efforts which would be needed in order to defeat the Communists in defending Quemoy and Matsu, both within swimming distance of the Red China mainland. If we are to go to war we must be prepared to go all the way if necessary.

Since nobody is thinking of putting an American ground army in Red China, and since it would be unwise to estimate what the size of such a force would necessarily be, there is a serious risk today that our enemies will reach a false conclusion about our intentions and our power.

There is grave danger that they will think we are bluffing and can do very little, because we cannot or will not do the kind of things we talk about doing.

Our true position of strength in the region of China must be founded upon at least one great undeniable reality.

That Red China lies at the outer limits and not at the center of our effective military power.

Anything which we say which ignores that reality will be judged by the world as having in it an element of bluff, or, worse still, an element of blind imprudence.

The world has never seen or known a land like America. We are by far the richest country that has ever been. In 1954 our national product was in excess of $360 billion. We win a war and do not seek to impose our will upon anyone. We give freely of our substance in foreign aid to help other nations help themselves. We have most of the world's automobiles and telephones. We have the highest standard of living and the greatest sharing of prosperity in all the world's history. Of course, we are dependent upon other countries and our allies and friends, not only for military alliances and political alliances, but they also sell us many products without which we would experience great difficulties. The United States depends on the outside world for 100 percent of its tin, mica, asbestos, and chrome; for 99 percent of its nickel and manganese; 93 percent of its cobalt; 67 percent of its wool; 65 percent of its bauxite; 55 percent of its lead; and 42 percent of its copper. So we are dependent in many concrete ways as you can easily see upon the rest of the world.

What does a nation like America and its people want? As always, we want to live with the rest of the world, to trade with the rest of the world, to get along with the rest of the world; and, above all, to have peace in the world, a peace which is honorable and which will preserve intact our liberties and freedoms, a peace which will last for many generations. We are on the verge of a new life in the United States. At a time when the geographical frontiers of the United States and, for that matter, of the world, have shrunk, the frontier of the atom has just opened up. There are limitless horizons before us. But before we can develop these vast new promises we must put a controlling chain on the possible diversion of the atom to destructive purposes. If there is to be peace, we and the Soviets must come to some disarmament agreement. But it must be a program of relative disarmament, which balances what one nation gives up against what others keep. There is, of course, one luxury which none of us can afford, and that is wishful thinking in regard to the Soviet government.

Freedom is a deeply rooted and highly cherished heritage of the American people. It is an enduring base upon which our Nation has grown and prospered. It is the foundation of the American way of life, whether in religion, speech, press, or petition. Twice in our time freedom has been threatened by dictators who reject the dignity of the individual and espouse the mastery of the state.

In both world wars, the broad expanse of ocean provided our Nation with the safety of space. More than that, our allies faced the full fury of the enemy in the early phases of the war and thus gave us the priceless ingredient of victory—time. With the safety of space and the shield of time, the energy and skill of American agriculture, industry, science, and labor fashioned the weapons of war for the allied combatants.

During the last decade science and technology have advanced rapidly along an ever-broadening front. Today, modern aircraft and new weapons have telescoped time and space. If another war comes, the oceans will be no barrier to those who would attack us. The time for preparation may be minutes—not months.

Threats to world peace are evident in many parts of the world. To meet these threats our Nation's economy must be strong and our military forces must be ready.

Today's wars are not fought solely by armies, navies, or air forces. Wars are fought by nations. Both halves of the civilian-military team must be fully aware of this. Both must understand the tremendous and complex problems inherent in a life-or-death struggle for survival.

Our scientists can perform prodigious and frightening miracles, but their miracles can be exaggerated and overrelied upon, for they have not found the answer to the disturbingly unscientific question of how to prevent war.

Our Nation's economic and military strength must be maintained, but always in the primary interest of attaining a position of power from which we can negotiate for peace and disarmament.

In the history of mankind we have always been subjected to recurring cycles of war and violence. The great yearning of our time is to be freed of such horrible crises * * * to be free of the threat of catastrophe * * * to live with our fellow human beings in a peaceful and productive world. The disturbingly unscientific question of how to prevent war must be answered through skill and will and strength if the challenge of our time is to be met and the threatening crisis avoided.

Our Armed Forces give us protection in a vastly troubled world. They provide us with security while we try to make the world over in an image nearer to our hearts' desire.

Our Armed Forces have contributed gallant and heroic chapters in our history—in our defense of that brilliantly shining light of liberty and freedom which Americans love so well. It is for all of us an affectionate pleasure and a wonderful privilege to salute and to honor the men and women of our Armed Forces today.

Thank you very much.

Random Thoughts on the United States Transportation Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared recently in the Daily Bulletin, of Mexico City.

This editorial is indicative of the widespread interest in the provisions of a bill which I and several other Members of Congress have introduced to remove the tax on travel to Canada, Mexico, and the Central American and Caribbean Sea areas, the only remaining taxable areas in the world.

This editorial is also significant in that it points up that these countries are not only very aware of this tax, but are justifiably resentful of this discriminatory levy which has the net effect of deliberately discouraging travel to their shores:

RANDOM THOUGHTS ON THE UNITED STATES TRANSPORTATION TAX

In a few weeks the transportation tax issue should be again in front of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. The approaching debate brings to us some pertinent thoughts.

Many Americans feel that the transportation tax was justified during the war not only as a source of revenue but to discourage travel by other than the military, but that when the war was over, restraining movements of civilians was not necessary. Nevertheless, the need for revenue was great and the transportation tax did afford a good source for it, so the tax was maintained.

Pressure by affected carriers succeeded in repealing the tax on transportation to Europe, Asia and South America, where its effect on the private pocketbook was greatest, but in doing so, the largest source of revenue of this sort was cut off. Only the small-revenue-producing tax on travel to Canada, Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean area was left, although these countries together probably take or should take the largest number of American tourists every year since they are more accesible.

Thus, the movement-restraining quality of the law looms large in the mind while the reveune-producing one is dwarfed in comparison.

The transportation tax comprises two portions: The part of the trip within the United States boundaries and the part outside of them. By far the largest revenue comes from the first portion because of the number of trips rather than their individual length.

Of the second portion the areas which brought in the greatest revenue have been exempted. Maintaining the tax on the others seems like a deliberate effort to discriminate against them. On the other hand, eliminating the tax would foment travel to them, thus increasing the revenue from the domestic portion.

In the last few years we have seen the United States make unusual efforts to appease countries which we consider enemies.

Our Latin American friends, who for decades have suffered injustice at the hands of previous American administrations feel understandable resentment. They need a little appeasing and some soothing action to make up for past mistakes. One such appeasing gesture would be to remove the discriminating clauses from the transportation tax law. It would be fair anyway, fair to them and fair to the American traveler.

L. POYO SKILLIN.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution adopted at Buffalo, N. Y., on May 1, 1955, commemorating the adoption of the Polish Constitution:

RESOLUTION

At a mass meeting commemorating the adoption of the Polish Constitution of the 3d day of May, held at the Polish Union Hall at 761 Fillmore Avenue in the city of Buffalo, N. Y., the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the year 1955 marks the 164th year of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, which document was the most liberal and democratic constitution of its day, and in which were documented Polish respect for the dignity of the individual and the lofty aspirations for freedom;

"Whereas the Republic of Poland has been deprived of her political independence, and has suffered the loss of approximately one-half of her eastern territory and 13 million of her citizens having been unjustly and arbitrarily absorbed by the brutal action of the Soviet Union;

"Whereas the Soviet Union is still, 10 years after the termination of hostilities of World War II, in total and complete domination of what remains of the Republic of Poland with her Red army and the Polish puppet government;

"Whereas as these unfortunate events that followed the end of World War II were conceived and agreed upon at the now infamous conference of the Big Three at Yalta, and from recently published documents it conclusively appears that because of the temporary political expediency democratic principles were scuttled and solemn pledges of the Atlantic Charter were broken;

"Whereas the present western boundaries of Poland on the Oder and Nisse Rivers have been historically Polish territory through the ages;

"Whereas the Polish people for upward of 1,000 years practiced their religion according to the dictates of their conscience, having established beautiful shrines to the Blessed Mother of God, and having erected magnificent churches and cathedrals to the greater glory of God, and having always been faithfully devoted to their bishops and priests; and

"Whereas communism still continues to threaten our own liberties in these great United States of America through infiltration into our schools, into our factories, into our Government agencies and various other institutions and organizations: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, as Americans dedicated to the freedom of all nations we feel dutybound in the name of justice and equity to take a firm stand in defense and restoration of the just rights of our ally, the Republic of Poland, whose voice today is silenced by Soviet Russia; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we firmly believe that the decisions of the Yalta Conference concerning Poland and other nations, arrived at without their representation, be revoked and repudiated; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we protest against any change in the present western boundaries of Poland as presently constituted, inasmuch as they have always been historically Polish; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we, as Americans of Polish ancestry who can practice our religion according to the dictates of our conscience, vigorously protest the arrest, detention, and enslavement in labor camps of the Polish clergy by Red Russia and the Polish Red puppet government; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we petition and appeal to our Government to continue all necessary military preparedness on land, on the sea, and in the air to keep us strong in order that we can properly defend our homes and our loved ones against any totalitarian aggression by Soviet Russia and her satellites; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we, as loyal citizens of the United States of America, hereby repeat our pledge of loyalty and allegiance to our great and beloved country; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles; to the Vice President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon; to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate; and to Congressman Edmund P. Radwan."

RESOLUTION COMMITTEE
MICHAEL E. ZIMMER,
Chairman.
ANN SKULICZ-MIKOLL,
JOSEPH S. MATALA,
BUFFALO, N. Y., *May 1, 1955.*

Federal Aid To Libraries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 25, the House Committee on Education and Labor will start hearings on several bills introduced in Congress and referred to the committee to determine what action Congress should pursue in Federal aid to libraries.

I am greatly interested in this program, as I represent a rural area consisting of 16 counties in northern Michigan.

In Michigan at present we have 835,000 persons who are without public

library service. However, Michigan has not been derelict in meeting its obligation for library service. State aid to libraries was established in Michigan in 1937 and has continued with appropriations annually since that date; however, we do have this area where no library service exists. This has been brought about mainly by the rapid growth in population and the question of libraries is unsolved.

Michigan Library Service is attempting at this time, to develop a five county regional library in Grand Traverse, Benzie, Antrim, Leelanau, and Kalkaska Counties. This new service would serve approximately 90,000 people.

I, therefore, recommend favorable consideration of legislation which would bring Federal aid to States where there are areas without public library service. My colleague, the distinguished gentlewoman, Miss THOMPSON, from Michigan's Ninth Congressional District, joins me in this request.

International Trade Centers in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the introduction of House Resolution 237 "creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of methods of promoting the establishment and improvement of international trade centers, trade fairs and expositions in the United States" was impelled by the overwhelming response to my bill H. R. 5301 which I have received, and the further confirmation of my convictions that the establishment of an International Trade Commission is vital to the creation of international trading posts within our Country, where foreign and domestic traders can meet together.

The time element in world travel is being so reduced that it is now practical for foreign buyers to do their business in this Country, as well as to see such an assortment and wide selection of American products as it would be impossible for us to send abroad.

The recent Inter-American Investment Conference in New Orleans during March of this year, demonstrated that the foreigner will come to our trade centers, when there is a real reason, and where we have proper foreign trade facilities.

The letters I have received from an eminent cross section of thought in America connected with our industry, and its promotion, both at home and abroad, has borne out my judgment in presenting bill H. R. 5301. Not only have, with two exceptions, these letters been enthusiastic, but they have even waxed poetical. The expressions of opinion from abroad, both personal and in the press have further added to my resolution of pressing the passage of my bill. Possible replies to my letters have run about 85 percent.

The reactions to my bill have been so favorable that I felt we should begin, immediately, to assemble the most experienced thought in this country, so as to lay a ground work for the operations of a future International Trade Commission as well as to satisfy the Congress that my request for a $100 million revolving fund was within the realm of reason. I can substantiate this sum, but, have certain doubts as to whether the House Appropriations Committee would accept my bare word, without broad and experienced confirmation. Hence my suggestion that we begin assembling the available facts, as soon as possible.

The investigations and studies of a select committee can be of real assistance to the President's program for Government participation in foreign international trade fairs, as well as the United States participation in the Brussels Universal and International Exposition of 1958, where the Belgian Government intends to spend some $200 million in connection with this exposition, which will only last 6 months; although Brussels will get some fine permament buildings as a result of the exposition. Should we not advance sums, which will be repaid, toward the establishment of permanent centers and other media for the furtherance of our international trade, at home, when one of the smaller nations can spend such a sum for a temporary manifestation?

I regard our participations in foreign international trade fairs and the Brussels Exposition as feeders to the foreign trade media, which my bill H. R. 5301 is intended to provide in the United States. They are really our salesmen abroad, for the enhancement of our dignity and prestige, and in addition to stimulating our trade throughout the world, have the important mission of bringing the foreigner to our shores, where he can see how these United States really live and function in their daily life and pursuits. Here he can do business in a real American atmosphere, the contacts with which will advance international understanding and help us forward on the rugged road to permanent peace.

Farmers and Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter which appeared in the Marshfield News-Herald of May 11, 1955. This letter was written by Mr. Ray F. Heinzen, a farmer who resides on Route 5, Marshfield, Wis. Mr. Heinzen was picked as the outstanding young farmer in the central Wisconsin area a year ago. His letter has been directed to my attention and mailed to me by 10 of my constituents in the Seventh Congressional District. The letter is as follows:

FARMERS AND PRICES

EDITOR, NEWS-HERALD:

The Wisconsin legislative committee which is investigating the spread in dairy prices between farmer and consumer, no doubt has good intentions and it is possible that something worthwhile will come of it. However, perhaps we farmers would do well to think ahead a bit before we go overboard in cheering this committee.

History indicates it is risky business to depend too heavily on elected representatives to safeguard our economic position. Some day the shoe might be on the other foot, and consumers, who outnumber farmers about 6 to 1, could put pressure on the legislature to establish a ceiling for farm prices as well as a floor.

Our high standard of living is due not only to high production of consumer goods, but also to adequate distribution of those goods. Research shows that it costs about 50 percent more to distribute goods than it does to produce them. Since only about 14 percent of the workers in America are engaged in the production of farm products, it seems reasonable to expect that a greater number are engaged in some phase of distribution, which naturally means that distribution costs more than production.

Considering this, is it strange that a highly perishable product like milk should bring the producer 6 to 7 cents a quart while costing the consumer 19 cents? Suppose this committee finds that the middleman is taking too much profit. What will the committee, or anybody, do about it? Free enterprise in America is still free enough so that competition is a highly potent factor.

Have we forgotten that we farmers can be our own middleman? Both our State and National Governments have recognized the relatively weak bargaining position of farmers, due to minority in number and also in the very nature of agricultural enterprise.

Laws have been passed making it possible for farmers to establish cooperative associations through which we can get farm supplies, credit, insurance, and so on, at near wholesale prices. We can also manufacture, process, and market our products ourselves through our own organizations. These are being done successfully.

We might do well to further explore our opportunities along this line. You know, our Founding Fathers never intended that the Government should use its power to help one group at the expense of another. Rather, it was intended that the Government would guarantee to every group and to every individual the right and the opportunity to help themselves. We have that right and we have the opportunity. To exercise that right is a far safer course than to depend on investigating committees.

RAY F. HEINZEN.

MARSHFIELD.

Price Supports Essential to Nation's Economy

SPEECH
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under

consideration the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, much has been said by my distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle in support of H. R. 12, which has as its purpose the reestablishment of price supports on basic agricultural commodities at 90 percent of parity. If the Nation needed further evidence of the fact that the principle of guaranteed prices for farm commodities is supported by able and informed Congressmen of both political parties, it has had ample proof today. This is particularly so in light of the unqualified support given this measure by the distinguished Democratic chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. COOLEY] and the equally distinguished former Republican chairman of that committee who is now the ranking minority member [Mr. HOPE], as well as my Minnesota colleague, Hon. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, who is known throughout the Nation for his service to the dairy farmer. These 3 gentlemen have been leaders in the fight for the farmers of our Nation for nearly 30 years and I am proud to have joined with them over many years in fighting for a square deal for the farmers of America. Flexible price supports, with a support floor of 75 percent of parity, obviously is not a square deal.

There is so much at issue here today. The future well-being of American agriculture—even of our whole economy—hangs in the balance. The price ratio in agriculture is now a little beyond 86 percent, compared to the 113 percent of parity prevailing in 1951. It is true that it fell some 19 points prior to the time that our President took office, but that is no comfort to farmers and those who look to them for business. The main point that discourages and dismays me is the fact that the price ratio has further declined an additional 8 percent since Mr. Benson became Secretary of Agriculture, and evidently no promise of a reversal of this trend is in sight today.

When our farm commodities get down around the 86 percent of parity level, where the price is now, the storm signals are up on our economy.

This present condition in farm prices reminds me of what happened in the late twenties. Everything was up except agricultural prices, everything looked rosy, but you all know what happened. We tailspinned into the greatest depression that this great Nation of ours had ever known. We saw the bankruptcy of hundreds of thousands of our farmers and the effects of that particular bankrupt period did not leave us until we entered the period of World War II in 1941. I remember when I sealed my corn in 1938 for 54 cents a bushel that I had to wait until the war clouds came on in 1941 and 1942 before I could get 90 cents a bushel for that corn.

Let me refer you to what the greatest agricultural leader and expert in this House said yesterday. I refer to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] who in conjunction with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], and others whose judgment I respect, represent to me the best source of information as to what is best for agriculture.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] said yesterday:

> The passage of this legislation will not entirely prevent that decline but it will ameliorate it. The question today is not controls—it is not the principle of price supports. The question today is: Will we do something to at least slow up this decline in farm income or will we let it continue to go down, down, down just as it did in the 1920's and end up as then not only in an agricultural depression but in one which affects the entire economy?

WHY ARE FARM PRICES STILL FALLING?

Many reasons have been advanced, Mr. Chairman, for the persistent decline in farm prices. Most of the answers advanced by so-called authorities are so theoretical or their authors are so biased as to make them unworthy of mention. However, I would say to those who sincerely advance the proposition that rigid supports at 90 percent of parity on our storable commodities are the cause of the decline; that this argument, in my opinion, is not substantiated by the facts. The unfortunate truth is that their discussion and their constant urging of the flexible price support program has had a most adverse effect upon the market. To illustrate, if an announcement were made by responsible authorities that the price of shoes was to be increased 10 percent, millions of pairs would be sold before the increase took effect. On the other hand, if it were announced that a price reduction of 10 percent would soon be effected, people would either wait to buy their shoes or insist on immediate reductions before they would buy. This is precisely what has happened and is happening today in our agricultural economy.

I sincerely regret that circumstances compel me to take a position of such complete disagreement with our Secretary of Agriculture on this issue. But the fact remains that despite his brilliant performance in other important fields, such as research, extension, and education, the Secretary has failed at almost every justifiable opportunity to use the powers and influence of his Office to stabilize farm prices and reverse the downward trend. The poultry market of last fall is a good example of this statement. When action was needed, that action was not forthcoming. The poultry and egg producers suffered.

In the course of my service as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture—more recently as ranking minority member—and in other contacts with Secretary Ezra Taft Benson, I have come to know and respect his great qualities of integrity and strength of character. There can be no question of the sincerity of his position in this issue. It must, therefore, be assumed that he is either misguided, misinformed, or simply, in my opinion, is not basically in sympathy with the essentiality of price supports beneath agricultural commodities.

THE EFFECT OF LOWER PRICE THINKING

When the Secretary first began to be taken seriously by the Congress of the United States—when we first realized the futility of our hopes that he could be convinced that he was wrong—the price of hogs in my area of Minnesota was $24 a hundredweight. Today it is about $16. I mention hogs because they are not and have not been subject to mandatory price supports. I mention them because there are not great quantities of pork products stored in warehouses by CCC as is the case of wheat, corn, and cotton. Why then, if the rigid price supports have not applied in this instance and vast quantities of pork are not in storage hanging over the market—two of the fundamental reasons advanced by the Secretary for falling farm prices—why, Mr. Chairman, have hog prices fallen so disastrously? Surely, this is contrary to the Secretary's pronounced opinion.

The only valid answer I can find is that this psychology of pushing prices further down by law and regulation has had a far-reaching effect upon the entire agricultural market. As a result, this price-reduction philosophy has cost the hog producers in the last 14 months the huge sum of $1,750,000,000 alone. Is that beneficial to the farmers of America? Is it beneficial to anyone? The cost of living index has not dropped appreciably so not even the consumers benefited from these tragic losses to our farmers.

As the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] pointed out yesterday, the corn and the wheat and the cotton farmers have already taken a reduction—even if H. R. 12 and its 90-percent price level is agreed to—for the simple reason that the modernized parity formula is coming into effect next January 1. At best, the price of corn at support level automatically goes down 22 cents a bushel; the price of wheat will decline 39 cents a bushel, even if we maintain a 90 percent as we are attempting to do in this bill. Drop the price level of corn, and hogs, beef, poultry, and such products follow it downward eventually. This is a proven maxim and any feeder of livestock knows that the price level of his products tends to maintain a direct relationship with feed grain prices.

SEVENTH DISTRICT FACES HUGE LOSS ON CORN ALONE

Many arguments, most of them theoretical, have been advanced in opposition to our efforts to continue reasonable price supports under basic storeables at 90 percent of parity. I shall undertake to present our side of the case in practical, factual terms. In so doing I shall direct my remarks to the situation in my State and the district I represent, leaving to those from other sections of the country the discussion of their peculiar problems.

I am talking about millions of income dollars, Mr. Chairman, not just percentages of parity or the flexible application thereof. I am talking about income dollars to feed and clothe farm people; dollars to at least maintain if not advance the standard of living of farm families; dollars to pay operating expenses and retire mortgages; dollars to sustain essential businesses and make jobs throughout our Nation. I am not talking about surplus or excess income—I am talking about modest incomes that keep families together and educate children, dollars already spread too thinly with

little opportunity to spread any further in a Nation expanding its economy as it should.

Agriculture is Minnesota's top industry. Most of our commercial and industrial economy is directly or indirectly dependent upon our No. 1 industry—agriculture. As I shall undertake to illustrate, trends in our agricultural economy are immediately reflected in our business economy. There is not a merchant, banker, or other businessman in our State—and particularly in my seventh district—who does not look to the farms for a large measure of his business transactions. They, too, have a vital stake in this issue of according to the farmer his rightful and earned share of the national income.

Referring to the 1950 census reports, we find that Minnesota farmers in 1949 harvested almost 208 million bushels of corn. At the 1954 support price of about $1.52 per bushel—90 percent of parity—this corn had a value of more than $315 million, regardless of how that corn was disposed of. If the Secretary should be permitted to reduce supports to 75 percent of modernized parity—and he seemingly insists he must have that authority—it would cost Minnesota farmers and Minnesota businessmen $83 million in farm income on corn alone, based on a drop of 40 cents a bushel below last year's support level.

My district, the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota a commercial corn-producing area, would be especially hard hit. We produce more than one-third of the corn harvested in Minnesota, with about 81,831,270 bushels harvested in 1949 according to the census reports. If the support price was reduced 40 cents a bushel—the difference between the support price of $1.52 on the 1954 crop of 90 percent of parity and the support price of about $1.12 at 75 percent of modernized parity—this would represent a loss in corn or feed equivalent value of about $33 million for our district. Let me give you a listing of the annual income loss on corn alone—or products produced from corn—that could be visited upon each of the 19 counties in my district. Based on corn-harvest reports in the 1950 census, the value of that corn at present 90 percent of parity, and its value at 75 percent of modernized parity, each county could suffer the following annual loss of income:

County:	*Loss in corn or equivalent feed value*
Big Stone	$662,592
Chippewa	2,029,465
Douglas	498,422
Grant	664,220
Kandiyohi	1,896,142
Lac qui Parle	2,132,980
Lincoln	1,171,143
Lyon	2,560,974
Murray	2,435,572
Nobles	2,725,264
Pipestone	1,269,331
Pope	679,329
Redwood	2,997,069
Renville	3,172,518
Rock	1,676,304
Stevens	1,118,874
Swift	1,678,257
Traverse	786,479
Yellow Medicine	2,677,480
7th District	32,792,508

Please note that the total of almost $33 million represents prospective income loss for corn or its products alone in the Seventh District. Couple this with the additional losses which could occur in flax, oats, and barley, compound it by acreage reductions, and you can see nothing but economic disaster at the worst and hardship at the best if the advocates of flexible price supports should succeed in driving farm prices down to an unprofitable level.

FARMERS' AVERAGE INCOME SMALL

And what do these figures mean in terms of the total farm economy? Let us take a representative county in the Seventh District. According to the 1950 Census, the 3,000 commercial farms in that county represent an average investment of $30,000 for land, building, and equipment. The average value of all farm products sold from each farm was about $8,300, while the estimated average operating expense were about $4,300. This left an average gross return of around $4,000 per farm. Allowing an average return of 6 percent on capital investment—considered a minimum in industry—of $1,800, this leaves the average farmer and his family a gross return of $2,200 for labor management, risk, and so forth.

To those who think the farmers have been doing too well under price supports, I would like to ask them how they and their families would like to work the long, arduous hours farmers do for a return of $2,200 a year? But think if you will what could happen to this return if price supports on corn were reduced to 75 percent. The average farm in this country would have its corn, hog, poultry, and beef income reduced by $1,000, which would leave only a total return of about $3,000 or a return of $1,200 for labor and management if a 6-percent return is allowed for capital investment or retirement of mortgage indebtedness.

I have listened with sympathy and understanding, Mr. Chairman, to our colleagues from other sections of the country as they reported the economic difficulties and needs of their constituents. I have likewise been sympathetic to the pleas of others for essential flood control and similar projects calling for the expenditure of millions of appropriated dollars in their districts. Now I am pleading for sorely needed income for my people—income already drastically reduced by falling farm prices and faced with the prospect of still further reductions if we fail in our efforts to reverse the trend.

Farmers alone are not going to suffer. This is spendable income I am talking about. It is money that is used to buy the necessities of life. If we allow further reductions, there will not be a merchant in the Seventh District who will not see business fall off, nor will there be a wholesaler or manufacturer who will not see his orders from those merchants reduced or canceled. Low farm prices are the ingredients from which depressions are spawned. The effects of such prices are the seeds of economic disaster for our beloved country. The 1932 depression should amply prove this to any reasonable person.

WHY PRICE SUPPORTS ARE JUSTIFIED

Agriculture is, in simplest terms, a combination of labor and small business. Each farmer is an independent businessman, and he and his family provide the bulk of the labor necessary to conduct that business. He both buys and sells at the prices quoted by others. The people with whom he does business in both respects are dependent upon profits for their success. The plain and simple truth is that in a free economy, men in business for profit will buy what they need at the lowest possible price and sell it at the highest. If left entirely to their own devices, they will pay the farmer as little as possible for his products and charge him as much for theirs as the market will bear. In keeping with the free-enterprise system, we are not asking for undue restraints on the prices the farmer must pay; but we are asking, and justifiably so, that he be given at least a minimum measure for protection on the prices he receives for that which he and his family produce.

There are those who say that price supports at 75 percent of parity are good, but that at 90 percent they are evil. My position is that if justice is to prevail in this, the land of the just, price supports at 90 percent of parity are so much more equitable as to leave no room for argument. Since the issue is not one of price supports but rather one of degree or level, then justice demands supports at a more reasonable or equitable rate.

There is much more at issue than a simple matter of price-support formulas, percentages of parity, rigidity or flexibility. It is a matter of economic life and death for hundreds of thousands of farmers. It is a matter of economic health or stagnation for thousands of small-business men who look to farmers for their incomes. It is a matter of preventing the collapse of one segment of our Nation, with ensuing damages to all others.

At the present time rural America has approximately 80 percent of the buying power it had in the 5-year period 1946–50. This dislocation cannot go on indefinitely. Farm production and income represent the primary source of new wealth, national income, and capital profits. Industrial production and commercial transactions cannot expand beyond the foundation of our new wealth production, except through a continuation of deficit spending on the part of our Federal Government and in our capital investments. This would imperil the future financial stability of our Nation.

AGRICULTURAL PROSPERITY ESSENTIAL

We talk of a balanced budget. We hope that this goal may be attained in the forseeable future. But it is my considered opinion that Congress cannot balance the Federal budget nor can our economy know real stability unless and until farm products and other raw materials are at parity. No doubt this economic principle prompted the President to take the stand he did at Kasson, Minn., and at Brookings, S. Dak., in support of the continuance of price supports at 90

percent of parity. He, however, later followed the advice of Secretary Benson and other flexible support advocates rather than follow the advice of more experienced leaders like the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], and most of the farm Congressmen from the Midwest.

Farming today is a complex operation. The conduct and management of a farm today is as different from a generation ago as the automobile is from the horse and buggy. Thousands upon thousands of farmers have geared their financing to a prosperous agriculture, and if we allow their income to be seriously reduced their entire financial structure will be faced with collapse. Countless young veterans returned hopefully from war to make their lives and living on the soil. Like their urban brothers, they turned to long-term financing and small initial investments to buy their homes, their land, and their equipment. But unlike the more fortunate veterans in other endeavors who see nothing but rising wages and standards of living in the offing, these farmer veterans are today faced with possible loss not only of their land and their investments of toil and treasure but also of the way of life they fought to attain. We must redeem our pledges of a better tomorrow to these young men and women.

BALANCE OF FARM PROGRAM IS GOOD

Aside from this urgent problem of falling farm prices and the need for firm price supports, we today have the finest farm program in the history of American agriculture. There are several reasons for my personal pride in this accomplishment. Under the present administration of the United States Department of Agriculture we are reaching the fulfillment of many years of hopeful planning. As a member of the Agricultural Appropriations Committee, and as its chairman for the past 2 years, I have helped the Department to dramatically expand its research and educational programs. Taking first things first, we have increased appropriations for research and have expanded important areas of research. The Department, working in close cooperation with the land-grant colleges, is moving forward on a variety of research projects and programs which will mean so much to both producers and consumers.

But research alone is not enough: the results of this work must be applied where needed in the treatment of the soil, the production of plants and animals, and the marketing of such products at best advantage. By expanding the Extension Service through increased appropriations, new knowledge and new techniques will be brought to the men and women on the land itself. County agents, burdened in the past with so much to be done and so little to do it with, will have new means to advance and extend good farming practices. The great programs for our young farm people like the 4–H Clubs, FFA, and others will be given new impetus, and more farm boys and girls will enjoy greater opportunities to enjoy real farm life.

Rural electrification, together with the recent rural telephone program, are adequately financed by appropriated funds and loan authorizations to bring these benefits to more of rural America. We know that the day is not far off when virtually every farm in the United States will have available to it low cost, dependable electric power, and trustworthy telephone service. REA has always had my unqualified support, and I think my personal pride in the success of this program is justified. Next week I will once again lead 20 of our REA cooperatives in an effort to extend the transmission line from the Missouri River into the Seventh District and Minnesota.

Our Soil Conservation Service has been encouraged by my committee and by the Congress to press forward with its programs of conservation. We have been successful in our efforts to thwart moves to unjustifiably reduce the staff and funds of this agency which has done so much to conserve our land and water resources. As an important adjunct to this activity, we have seen the Andersen-Hope watershed protection program grow in a few years' time from a modest effort into one of the major conservation activities of the Department. Two of these projects are under way or will be shortly in the Seventh District. There is probably no better example of Federal-State-local cooperation than is evidenced by these watershed projects.

Adequate funds have been made available for the Farmers Home Administration to continue its program of credit assistance for farmers. Efforts have been made, and will no doubt be made again, to reduce the staff and curtail the loan operations of this important agency, but I am optimistic in the belief that we will be able to sustain it so long as it continues to serve the useful purpose in the future that it has in the past. It has meant much not only to our people long engaged in farming; it has meant the difference between success and failure for our returning veterans and many others.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, our farm programs are the best that we have ever had. If we can today by our affirmative action pass a bill which will halt and possibly reverse this tragic downward trend in farm prices, then I believe that those of us who have fought the farmers' battles in Congress for years past can face our constituents with the certain knowledge that we have not only done our best but that we have gained victories which cannot be successfully challenged. I am proud of the part I have played in the development and operation of these fine programs.

OUR SURPLUSES A BLESSING

Although I hope I have made my position clear in that I believe price supports at a reasonable level provide the economic cornerstone upon which our agricultural stability may be anchored, the impression cannot be left that price supports alone will solve all of our problems. Quite the contrary. It is of equal importance that other essential programs be advanced to implement the price-support program and make the best possible use of its benefits.

Much has been said about the so-called surplus production accumulating in storage facilities throughout the land. Critics of our farm program have pointed to this stockpile of food and fiber as a horrible example of the evil of price supports, and have tried to use it as a lever or wedge to force upon us a greater evil—flexible and reduced price supports. To me, this abundance is but another example of the great blessings of providence upon America.

If you had had the opportunity, as my Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture had year before last, to see the starving millions of people throughout the world—in Pakistan, in India, in the Arab world and particularly around the Israeli border—you would thank God for His kindness and mercy. You would think, as I think, in terms of the best use to make of this blessing rather than means of destroying it. You would see our stacks of grain as food for hungry stomachs; you would see bales of cotton as clothes for unclad people.

Three years ago my subcommittee cited the grave need for strengthening our foreign agricultural service and brought to the attention of the House the urgent necessity for a sound, practical program for the disposition of some of our surpluses abroad. The Congress confirmed our judgment and approved the transfer of our agricultural attachés from the State Department to the Depart of Agriculture to provide the latter a more direct means of expanding and coordinating our export sales program. This expanded sales effort will benefit both the countries to whom we sell our food and fiber and our own domestic economy. We know from recent events in Russia that food shortages represent a far greater problem than any surpluses of too much food about which some of our people complain.

We also recognized the need for better diet among our own people. My subcommittee has consistently recommended that the necessary surplus foods be taken from our storehouses and channeled into our great school lunch program to the thousands upon thousands of children who would not otherwise have at least one balanced meal per day. Along these same lines, we propose that these stocks be drawn upon to implement and improve the diet of our aged and otherwise helpless people. We believe that no deserving person in this land should be without adequate food, and that such people should be enabled to obtain it without loss of dignity or self-respect.

SURPLUSES TEMPORARY

As you can see, Mr. Chairman, we propose first that the best possible use be made of our bountiful production to raise the standards of living both at home and abroad. We know that within a fews years—perhaps 10 years or less—our present production will be no more than enough for our own domestic needs. If drought or other natural disasters should intervene to a significant degree, that time could be foreshortened.

In recognition of the temporary problem of production in excess of immediate consumption, I have proposed that at least 30 million acres of the Nation's cropland be taken out of production on a temporary basis to create what I call a soil fertility bank. The principles of this plan are gaining increasing support from responsible farm and conservation organizations.

Two years ago I introduced a bill providing that such land taken out of production be leased on a voluntary basis at a rental approximating $10 per acre, depending upon its normal productivity. Our soil resources are irreplaceable. It is, therefore, absolutely essential to our survival as a prosperous people in the years ahead that these resources be preserved for future generations. My soil bank of fertility program would accomplish both the temporary necessary reduction of production and the conservation of our soil and water resources for future needs.

These are but a few of the programs we are advancing for the benefit not only of our farmers and our Nation as a whole, but also for the good of mankind throughout the world. Give us this economic cornerstone of fair price supports to place us on a par with other segments of our industry and we will make the most of our blessings.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. I commend the gentleman wholeheartedly for the fight he is making for the American farmer. I know of no man on this floor who has fought harder for the American farmer than the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to him, regardless of political considerations, he has always been steadfast for the American farmer. I do commend him wholeheartedly.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I want to say that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has been one of the finest, most intelligent, and effective friends the farmer has had on this floor. Every time we have farm legislation before us, he is here speaking for the farmer, regardless of politics.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I thank the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] for their kind references to my work here in Congress. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I say that I listened to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] with great interest, when he said:

We have a tough job ahead of us and we are trying to solve it.

I agree, Mr. Chairman, we do have a tough job here, but in my opinion the solution for the problem does not lie in beating down the price the farmers receive for their agricultural commodities. Mr. Chairman, I yield the floor.

Another Betrayal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass.:

ANOTHER BETRAYAL?

For 3 days Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, have been engaged in secret talks with Chiang Kai-shek. They went to Formosa as personal emissaries of President Eisenhower.

Now, Radford and Robertson are returning home, but during their absence significant and conflicting statements on United States Formosan policy have come from official sources in Washington.

Do these contradictory statements signal another betrayal of our ally, Chiang, and, in fact, another betrayal of the best interests of the American people in their fight against communism?

On Saturday the State Department said, in reply to Red Chinese Premier Chou En-lai's phony peace bid at the Asian-African Conference, that talks with Peiping were out of the question unless the Chinese Nationalists were represented.

On Tuesday Secretary of State Dulles announced the United States would not insist on Chiang being represented at talks with Red China if they were limited to the question of a cease-fire in Formosa Strait. He stated this policy in spite of the fact Chou had said on Sunday Red China still was determined to liberate Formosa.

Yesterday President Eisenhower supported Dulles' position and remarked that the State Department's declaration of last Saturday may have been an overstatement.

Eisenhower and Dulles both expressed the view that a cease-fire in Formosa Strait is a question that does not concern the Chinese Nationalist Government.

Chiang's Nationalists hold Formosa on one side of Formosa Strait, Quemoy and Matsu on the other side, and the Pescadores Islands in the middle. How a cease-fire in Formosa Strait could be considered of no concern to Chiang is inconceivable.

The story of the United States relationship with Chiang Kai-shek revolves about one betrayal after another.

In February 1945 at Yalta, President Roosevelt granted Russia broad concessions in China without Chiang's consent or knowledge. Manchuria and Outer Mongolia were occupied by Soviet troops after the end of World War II, paving the way for Communist seizure of all China.

In November 1945, President Truman sent Gen. George C. Marshall to China as a special United States envoy to negotiate a truce in the Chinese civil war. The terms arranged by Marshall forced Chiang to accept Communist leaders as key officials in a coalition government and Red military units in the Chinese Army. The Communist threat thus was strengthened instead of destroyed.

In 1947, the civil war was resumed, and lack of United States supplies and arms forced Chiang to flee to Formosa in 1949.

When the Korean war broke out in 1950 President Truman sent the United States Seventh Fleet to Formosa Strait to defend Formosa and at the same time to prevent Chiang's armies from attacking the mainland. Chiang thus was denied the opportunity to regain a foothold in China while the Chinese Reds were engaged in war in Korea.

When Eisenhower became President there was hope for a change in United States policy toward Chiang. This hope was bolstered on February 2, 1953, less than 2 weeks after Eisenhower entered the White House, when he limited the mission of the 7th Fleet to defense of Formosa, ostensibly releasing Chiang's armies to attack Red China. However, Chiang was not given sufficient offensive equipment to make a landing in China.

Last January 24 Eisenhower asked Congress for authorization to use United States military forces in defense of Formosa and the Pescadores Islands, an authorization which was granted by votes of 409–3 in the House and 85–3 in the Senate. Despite this overwhelming support, the President now talks of negotiating the Formosa issue with Red China without participation by Chiang.

In February, Chiang was forced by the United States to abandon the Tachen Islands, some 200 miles north of Formosa. This narrowed Chiang's island possessions to Formosa, the Pescadores and the offshore islands in Formosa Strait.

So it has been almost constant retreat for Chiang's Chinese Nationalists since the end of World War II. A point now has been reached where another retreat could deal a fatal blow to the morale of Chiang's armies and the strength of his Government.

Is still another betrayal of Chinag in the making by his United States "ally?" Are the American people, as well as Chiang, going to be forced to bow once again to demands of an insatiable Communist aggressor?

Digging for Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I request permission to insert in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Digging for Issues" which appeared in the May 17, 1955, edition of the Commonwealth Reporter, published in my home city of Fond du Lac, Wis.

I believe the editorial reflects the thinking of many of my constituents with respect to the statesman now occupying the White House.

The editorial follows:

DIGGING FOR ISSUES

When a party is out of power, as the Democrats now are at the White House, the leadership naturally grasps at every straw which may turn out to be a salable issue at the polls.

The task can be especially frustrating when the party in power has a very popular President, as is the case right now. The outs inevitably are torn over the question whether or not to attack him personally. And even if they do, they have no assurance they will hurt him materially.

Often they are exasperated to find that a popular President can ride out blunder after blunder without important loss of stature. The Democrats at the moment are busy cataloging what they believe are some of Mr. Eisenhower's errors in office. But a few of these go well back into 1953, and the public opinion polls measuring the Presi-

dent's popularity suggest these things didn't upset many people.

Politicians close to events frequently magnify in their own minds the impact these developments will have on the public at large. They get all stirred up in Washington over matters that won't cause a ripple 200 miles away.

Some of them then proceed to bemoan the indifference of voters. No doubt there's plenty of that, but it's certainly not the whole story in Mr. Eisenhower's case.

It's been said before and it can be said again: Most Americans trust him deeply. They believe he is sincerely concerned for their welfare and safety. They believe he is qualified to keep them out of war. The very political ineptitude his critics allege actually helps convince many voters Mr. Eisenhower is above politics.

When this is the case, it isn't going to hurt him much to point out that he doesn't know the name of the head of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Or to charge him with cruelty to the squirrels on the White House lawn. A few critics did seriously suggest these little things could help do him in.

As a matter of fact, there is evidence that Mr. Eisenhower can even commit "bobbles" in the very field he is considered most able to deal with—foreign and military affairs—and not suffer unduly.

Whenever a man gains the deep confidence of the people as he has, the cry always goes up that Americans again are worshiping the father image. In other words, that they seek a great protector, and when they think they have one they don't worry much about the details of his performance.

This may be so, and it may have its bad aspects. But the whole blame for this state of mind cannot be laid on the people, at least not in Mr. Eisenhower's case. It seems indisputable one of the prime reasons they picked him in 1952 was their conviction he was not an ordinary politician.

The mood of 1952, and since, has been one of continuing distrust and often disgust toward the standard politicians of the major parties. The votes show it. People have no real faith in either party. They are fed up with short-sighted political maneuvering in a time of great stress.

No man can safely be said to be unbeatable. But the fellow who beats Mr. Eisenhower will first have to earn from the people the kind of trust he has won. And that will not be easy for any man or party.

Tito Planning To Shed Pro-West Mask

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, when it is suggested that by relaxing pressures on Communist China we may be able to make a Tito out of Mao Tse-tung, it should be noted with chagrin that our aid did not make a Tito out of Tito.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

TITO PLANNING TO SHED PRO-WEST MASK

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Sometime at the end of this month Josip Broz Tito, Lord Marshal of Yugoslavia, will spread out the red carpet for the visit of his eminent Communist peers, Premier Bulganin and Minister (and Communist Party Secretary) Khrushchev of the U. S. S. R. This will end a 6- or 7-year interparty feud between mother Russia and the boy Tito whom mother considered to have grown too big for his breeches.

When ordered by Moscow to be spanked, boy Tito refused. To avoid mother's wrath, he sought (and found) the economic and military aid of the United States and a local military alliance with Greece and Turkey that might have served him in good stead had Moscow ordered satellites Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria to club together and teach rebellious Yugoslavia a lesson.

By accepting United States military aid and flirting with NATO, Marshal Tito proved himself—in Satlin's eyes—to be not only a rebel but an apostate. For years Soviet radios screamed against the traitorous Yugoslav marshal. "Judas Tito" was one of the mildest epithets Pravda flung at his head.

END OF STALIN

Until Stalin died back in 1953. Then things began to change. Tito had maneuvered the United States very cleverly. He had got the arms and the economic help that very possibly saved him respectively from the wrath of Stalin and the wrath of his own hungry people whom his collectivist experiments had introduced to famine.

Tito gave nothing binding in return. To the United States, to NATO, he gave the promise of defending himself if attacked by Communists—something any Yugoslav Government would do without a promise. But he never gave anybody—not even his allies Greece and Turkey—a firm promise to fight if one of them were directly attacked. In other words, what he offered was an armed neutrality.

Moreover, he never retreated an inch from full theoretical communism or ceased being a dictator.

So long as Stalin lived his doctrinal purity would have done Tito no good. Stalin never forgave disobedience. Therefore, during some 4 years, say roughly from 1949 to 1953, the United States Government, by the threat of washing its hands of Tito, could have compelled him, in return for our aid, to change both his communism and his dictatorship—or perish.

To have done this would have excited the anger of pinks like Britain's Nye Bevan. But aid might have been given on a take-it-or-leave-it basis with the quasi-certainty that at some point Tito would have given way and, in a literal sense, cried "Uncle."

SOVIET OVERTURES

Stalin's death freed Tito from this pressure. For nothing remained between him and full reconciliation with the Soviet successors but memories. To Bulganin and Krushchev, Yugoslavia is worth a full pardon. They immediately made overtures of friendship.

Tito did not at once respond directly. Instead, he began pushing the kind of neutralism that will, unless stopped, deprive the United States of allies, while leaving the Communist camp intact. Tito was all for an undecisive end to the Korean war. He favors full recognition of Red China. He has paid a ceremonial visit to neutral India. He has renewed diplomatic relations on a full scale with the U. S. S. R.

After each gesture of this type he has, of course, looked quickly at Washington. He could not afford to forfeit American aid. However, Washington said nothing, raised no objection. Aid continued to flow. So now Tito has gone almost the full way—he has invited the Soviet leaders to kiss and make up in Belgrade at the end of this month.

To be sure, he now says that this will not affect his "relationship with the West."

PROBABLY WON'T

The pity is, it probably will not. In the new foreign-aid budget presented by the President to Congress are funds for "neutral" Tito. There are even great minds in Washington who say they welcome Tito's reconciliation with Russia as another of those famous means of "relaxing tensions."

To me such people seem mad. I am convinced that Tito will continue getting the maximum from the United States while drawing closer to the Soviet Empire until—again feeling himself strong—he will cast off the pro-West mask he has worn so successfully, rejoin the Soviet Communist church—and tell a bewildered Uncle Sam where to get off.

Maybe not, of course. Maybe Tito is a faithful ally of the United States. But if he is, cannot our administration induce him to state his position in some nonreversible manner—such as making his military alliance with Greece and Turkey automatic?

Historic Proposals for Cultural Interchange To Meet the Challenge of Communism—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks both William Randolph Hearst, Jr., and Gen. David Sarnoff have called for the greatest political offensive in history to win the cold war. In a brilliant speech before the National Press Club in Washington, D. C., on February 26, 1955, Mr. Hearst declared that—

> Preparedness alone will not win for us the battle of coexistence * * * the western program of building armed strength should be widened into a more flexible and imaginative strategy for competitive coexistence with the Communists in every field and on every front.

Mr. Hearst went on to say that our reliance upon armed strength alone as our primary concern is permitting communism to take long strides forward in those fields which we have largely neglected. He pointed out that in Russia and the satellite countries—

> Sports, ballet, the theater, literature—all are shaped toward aiding communism's long-range scheme of world domination. Top artists know they are not only expected to perform, but to give their services at clinics where the plastic minds of youthful visitors can be influenced.

Mr. Hearst advocated the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence. This board should develop plans for getting the peoples of the world on our side. Sports, the theater, educational exchanges—no field should be neglected in this competition of the two conflicting systems.

In a memorandum presented to the White House on April 5, 1955, General Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America, advocated the same strategy which Mr. Hearst urged earlier. He suggested the expenditure of up to $3 billion a year for the kind of political warfare which Mr. Hearst had in mind.

General Sarnoff stated in his memorandum that—

Before essaying a breakdown of cold-war methods and techniques, we should recognize that many of them are already being used, and often effectively. Nothing now underway needs to be abandoned. The problem is one of attaining the requisite magnitude, financing, coordination, and continuity—all geared to the long-range objectives of the undertaking.

The gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], and I have introduced bills—H. R. 5724, H. R. 4893, and H. R. 5040— which would carry out some of the major proposals advanced by Mr. Hearst and General Sarnoff. These bills are before the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives.

I am happy to be able to say here that a subcommittee has just been established to consider these and the other bills before the committee calling for increased attention to our American arts and cultures and providing for a program of cultural interchange with foreign countries to meet the challenge of competitive coexistence with communism.

The chairman of the subcommittee is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY]. With the challenging proposals of Mr. Hearst and General Sarnoff before us it is my hope that the hearings will be held quickly and that legislation meriting the support of my colleagues from both major parties will be reported to the floor in time for consideration by this Congress.

The administration's plan for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts was recently introduced in the Congress by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT]. The text of the executive communication which accompanied the administration proposal is included here. It is expected that the administration proposal will also be considered by the subcommittee.

There is also included articles from the New York Herald Tribune and the New York Times on the cultural interchange program being carried on by the Department of State and the American National Theater and Academy. Title I of the bills I have mentioned, written by officials of the Department of State, is designed to make this program permanent, a program which is proving to be one of the finest and most important ambassadors our country has ever sent abroad. This program was given an appropriation of $2,500,000 by the 83d Congress at the request of the President.

It seems to me that what General Sarnoff has to say about not abandoning what is already underway, the problem, rather, being one of attaining the requisite magnitude, financing, coordination, and continuity applies especially to the kind of program which the congressionally-chartered American National Theater and Academy is carrying on.

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas has called for the "greatest political offensive in history to win the cold war. Senator JOHNSON spoke at a meeting called to honor General Sarnoff and urged support for the general's plan for an all-out cold war against communism.

Now Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in an historic address given at the Wayne University student forum, in Detroit, Mich., has called for all-out support of the congressional proposals for cultural interchange and the rest of the Hearst-Sarnoff program.

The communication and articles follow:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, February 8, 1955.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed for your consideration is a draft of a bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes. The proposal is designed to carry out the recommendation of the President, contained in his state of the Union message delivered to the Congress under date of January 6, 1955. In that message he said:

"In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation."

Encouragement of the arts is a demonstration to itself and to others of a nation's belief in its spiritual resources and creative destiny. Throughout the great epochs of history, civilization has been importantly exemplified by masterworks of art and architecture, music and the dance, drama, and literature. Achievements in these fields represent, of course, one of the enduring criteria by which history appraises any nation.

The United States despite its relative youth, is rich in artistic achievement. We have contributed new power of design in architecture, created new rhythms in music, and developed a literature which commands worldwide attention. In the theater and film, and in the ancient form of the dance we show a creative vitality. Our great museums, art galleries, and orchestras are a source of pride for our people. Yet there are many respects in which we lag behind other nations in the general position we accord to the arts in our society. For example, new ways should be sought to bring the enjoyment of and participation in the arts to more of our people. We should also find ways to develop individual talents in the arts. There are in our Nation many persons of talent and genius, whose gifts need the encouragement and recognitiion which persons in other comparable fields enjoy. Private organizations and individuals and public organizations, at both community and State levels, have provided strong support for the arts, and that is as it should be. On the other hand, our National Government has not lent its encouragement and prestige to the arts to the extent that is desirable.

The enclosed draft legislative proposal would provide for a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts which would undertake studies of, and make recommendations related to, appropriate methods for encouragement of creative activity in the performance and practice of the arts and of participation in and appreciation of the arts. Such studies would be conducted by special committees of persons, expert in the particular field of art involved. After considering reports on these studies, the Commission would make recommendations in writing to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In the selection of subjects to be studied and in the formulation of recommendations the Commission would obtain the advice of interested and qualified persons and organizations.

Federal encouragement of the arts should go forward in accordance with the traditional principles which the American people believe should guide the relationship of their National Government to them. The draft legislation therefore recognizes three essential governing principles: (a) that the growth and flourishing of the arts depend upon freedom, imagination, and individual initiative; (b) that the encouragement of creative activity in the performance and practice of the arts, and of a widespread participation in and appreciation of the arts, promotes the general welfare and is in (the) national interest; (c) that the encouragement of the arts, while primarily a matter for private and local initiative, is an appropriate matter of concern to the United States Government.

The proposed legislation creating the Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts would not supersede the laws or orders vesting certain authority in the Commission of Fine Arts, and the draft bill has been prepared in consultation with that Commission.

We shall appreciate it if you will be good enough to refer the enclosed bill to the proper committee for consideration.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that enactment of the proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Secretary.

[From the New York Times of May 23, 1955]

SYMPHONY OF AIR ENDS JAPAN VISIT—ORCHESTRA IS HAILED FOR BUILDING GOOD OPINION OF UNITED STATES ON FAR EAST TOUR

By William J. Jorden

TOKYO, May 22.—The Symphony of the Air, formerly Arturo Toscanini's NBC Symphony, will end this week a triumphant 3-week tour of Japan.

Through a series of concerts here and in other major cities, the orchestra undoubtedly has done much to raise Japan's opinion of the United States and to create good feeling.

Performances of the orchestra have won highest critical praise in the Japanese press. There was also a surprising display of enthusiasm from intellectuals and students, the groups who were inclined to be most critical of America and its "materialistic culture."

"I do not believe there have been any musicians from abroad who ever so successfully grasped the heart strings of the Japanese people as did the Symphony of the Air," one critic wrote.

When tickets for the concerts went on sale hopeful music lovers began to line up at box offices as much as a day and a half in advance. Young students and musicians bundled themselves in quilts and slept on the ground rather than lose their chance to hear the symphony, the first to visit Japan since the end of the war.

Thousands of Japanese have been unable to attend 1 of the symphony's 16 scheduled concerts. Tickets bought by scalpers sold for as much as $50, more than most Japanese make in a month.

FREE CONCERTS GIVEN

For the benefit of many others who could not get tickets, including American servicemen at air bases such as Misawa and Tachikawa, the orchestra has given free and unscheduled concerts. Yesterday, the Symphony of the Air played in Tokyo's Hibiya Park, where thousands of young Japanese were able to hear them for only 100 yen (about 25 cents).

After its final appearance in Japan on Tuesday, the orchestra will fly to Korea for both military and civilian concerts and then to Okinawa, where it will play twice for the American Armed Forces and their families. It was announced today that the symphony's Far Eastern tour had been extended 2 weeks and that it would play in Bangkok, Singapore, Colombo, and Kuala Lumpur as well as at Manila and Hong Kong.

The Asian tour of the Symphony of the Air is sponsored by the International Exchange Program operating through the American National Theater and Academy. The Japanese newspaper Mainichi was cosponsor of the orchestra's tour in Japan.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 8, 1955]

ARTS PROVE GOOD ENVOY IN BUSY ANTA PROGRAM

(By Paul V. Beckley)

The ambassadorial work of American culture abroad will reach its greatest peak this summer when the international exchange program of ANTA alone will send or take a hand in sending 610 musicians, actors, singers, and dancers to most of the nations of the world. For the first time 3 of this country's major symphony orchestras will go abroad, 2 to Europe and 1 to the Orient.

The symphonic visit to the Orient is already a fact, because the Symphony of the Air made its Tokyo debut—the first American orchestra ever to appear there—on Tuesday night and proved a thorough success. The Tokyo enthusiasts stood in line in front of the box office for 24 hours, and 2 hours after it opened all seats had been sold for the orchestra's 3 performances.

THE MANAGER

General manager of this exchange program is a dark-haired, quick-talking expert in the theatrical business, Robert C. Schnitzer. Mr. Schnitzer stepped to one side of the "series of overlapping crises" which the program naturally entails, long enough to offer some explanations, definitions and statistics.

This summer the program is involved to some degree in the appearances overseas of the New York Philharmonic-Symphony, Philadelphia Orchestra, Ballet Theater, New York City Ballet, and the Symphony of the Air and the Sauter-Finegan Band, as well as the companies which will produce Oklahoma, Medea, and The Skin of Our Teeth.

RUSSIANS ARE BUSY

The importance of all this cannot be overestimated in terms of good will generated in favor of this country. Mr. Schnitzer pointed out that the Soviet Union has spent $3 million in the last 2 years sending its own artists abroad "as propaganda pure and simple" and then he added, "not so pure perhaps."

It might be noted that the Soviet effort in this field is not so "simple," either, but is actually a smart play for international prestige in the minds of people who hold such artistic efforts in high esteem. Although willing enough, perhaps, to enjoy an American soft drink or reap the advantages an American tractor may afford, they are more disposed by reason of cultural traditions to reserve their applause for a pas de deux, a Beethoven sontata or—as has been demonstrated—a Porgy and Bess.

Neither Mr. Schnitzer nor any one else in the program looks on it as a piece of nationalistic propaganda. Although the results may serve that purpose, these displays of this country's spiritual, esthetic and emotional side is mainly intended for what it is—self-expression.

In 1950 the program handled the administration for the Ballet Theater when it became the first American company to make a European tour. But in 1951 came the first large Government allotment. The foreign ministers of America, France and Great Brit-ing had met the previous summer and concluded it would be nice to give a festival in West Berlin when the Russians planned their youth rally in the eastern sector.

This first attempt came off very nicely. ANTA sent over Oklahoma, Judith Anderson in Medea, the Hall Johnson Negro Choir, Juilliard String Quartet, Angna Enters, the dance mime, and Astrid Varnay (who sang with the Berlin Opera). An RCA-TV group went along, too, to show the Germans what television was doing over here, and put sets in a hundred shopwindows in the Kurfurstendam district. Also in the Potsdamer Platz, where the western sector meets the eastern, they erected a theater-size screen. When they televised Oklahoma, there were riots in the Platz when 20,000 East Germans tried to get across the border to see it.

HOW IT WORKS

Administratively, the program begins when an American group submits a plan for a foreign tour. Mr. Schnitzer takes it up with 1 of 3 advisory panels of experts on the dance, music, and drama. Nothing further happens unless they agree the project under consideration will best represent the artistic activity of this country.

With the panel approval, Mr. Schnitzer goes to work with the manager of the group involved, setting up a tentative schedule and budget. He looks into the interest shown in the area to be visited.

LAST SAY BY COMMITTEE

The final decision is in the hands of a committee with representatives from the State Department, the United States Information Agency, Defense Department, Foreign Operations Administration, and a few others. "So far," Mr. Schnitzer said, "They've not turned us down on anything we've presented." In addition, they have not and Mr. Schnitzer said they will not force anything on ANTA that its artistic panels opposed. "Anyone saying one can't get Government subsidies without political controls has been disproved," he observed.

Historic Proposals for Cultural Interchange To Meet the Challenge of Communism—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include here a brilliant and historic speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, senior Republican of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which he delivered at the Wayne University Student Forum, Detroit, Mich., on Thursday, May 19, 1955:

THE NEW CHALLENGES OF "COMPETITIVE COEXISTENCE" A PROPOSED THREEFOLD UNITED STATES OFFENSIVE FOR PEACE

(Address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY (Republican, of Wisconsin), senior Republican, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, at Wayne University student forum, Detroit, Mich., Thursday, May 19, 1955)

The most important single challenge in the world today is for the free world successfully to combat the new and old strategy and tactics of the Soviet Union, aimed at world domination.

I should like to propose a threefold United States peaceful offensive, designed to fulfill this challenge, an offensive which will entail—invincible United States military preparation—an intensified United States cultural, propaganda effort—and all-out support of effective Eisenhower-Dulles diplomacy. Now, what of the Soviet counterchallenge—new and old?

THE OLD STALINIST APPROACH

The old tactic was, of course, the belligerent, tough unyielding Stalinist approach.

It included naked, direct aggression, such as the brutal invasion of the Republic of Korea. It includes formenting internal civil war, with full outside aid, such as the long and bloody civil war in Indo-china—a war which only ostensibly ended with the Geneva Peace Conference. It included unceasing, worldwide revolutionary agitation, including stirring up of the ferment of nationalism and racialism among under-developed peoples against the Western powers.

THE SOVIET'S NEW MASK

Most of these phases continue. The new tactic of international communism has changed only somewhat. There is only a partial new mask on the Kremlin. It is the mask of "peaceful coexistence," or, as it is sometimes called, competitive coexistence."

But the worldwide revolutionary agitation does continue. The night-and-day espionage, the sabotage, the sedition, the treason by Red Trojan horsemen—throughout the world persist.

What has altered, however, is the previous bluntness, directness, and crudity of Soviet external relations. Moscow and its Peking junior partner are intentionally and slyly showing a somewhat softer face to the world. Why? Principally, no doubt, because of the historic western success in ratification of the Paris Pacts.

FOUR ILLUSTRATIONS OF NEW SOVIET TACTIC

The most dramatic illustration of the new face of the Kremlin is, of course, in the form of the surprisingly concluded Austrian State Treaty.

The agreement on that treaty, ending 9 long years of negotiations, involving more than 400 talks, attests to the fact that the Soviet Union now wants to be regarded by the world as "flexible," as changing its traditional policies, as conciliatory.

A second illustration was quick Soviet acceptance of latest proposals for a meeting in mid-summer of the heads of the four major states, the so-called Meeting at the Summit, involving President Eisenhower, Premier Bulganin, Prime Minister Anthony Eden, and Prime Minister Faure.

A third illustration is the impending visit to Belgrade and to that arch-Communist heretic Marshal Tito on the part of a top-drawer delegation headed by Nikita Khrushchev and Nicolai Bulganin. This visit represents another about face from previous Moscow denunciations of "Titoist Fascist deviationism." It is supposed to further demonstrate Soviet efforts to "normalize" and make more cordial Moscow-Belgrade relations.

A fourth illustration of the new mask of the Kremlin was the conciliatory approach which has been shown at the Bandung Conference and alsewhere by Chou En-Lai and by the Peking government. It consists in part of the indications that the long-imprisoned United States airmen—outrageously imprisoned, I may add—may be "magnanimously" released.

And there are other signs of the new tactic on the part of the Kremlin, such as in the Soviets' new version of disarmament proposals.

SOVIET BEAR WANTS MORE MEAT

Now, I have used the word "mask" and I have used the word "tactic" for very exact purposes.

I say "mask," because the basic fact of the matter is that the Soviet bear may put on a sheep's head or sheeps' clothing, but it is

still obviously an aggressive, hungry beast which desires more human meat.

Already the Russian bear holds under its bloodstained paw almost a billion people on the face of this planet; 1.5 billion people still live in the non-Communist world. But the lips of the bear drool with the desire to take them over as well.

Temporarily, the Soviet bear is following a new tactic. Instead of growling and roaring and uttering defiance, it is meowing like a pussycat. It is purring as though it wants to be stroked gently and as though it is really friendly.

But the basic fact is that nothing has really changed concerning the Kremlin's long-range revolutionary strategy. The Soviet Union is still intent upon complete world domination. Marxist dogma has not changed in that respect.

I should like to point to the words of Nicolai Lenin which are still regarded as atheistic gospel:

"As long as capitalism and socialism exist, we cannot live in peace. * * * We must say that either those who want to cause our destruction must perish * * * or the capitalists will live and in that case the [Soviet] republic will perish."

And Joseph Stalin said: "Who will conquer whom, that is the whole question."

The fact of the matter is that the millennium has not come and is nowhere near coming. The Kremlin has not altered one iota its long-time instructions to the Communist insurrectionists in Malaya, to the Communist saboteurs in southern Vietnam, to the Communists agitating in north Africa or in South America or in our own country. The Austrian State Treaty is signed, but no Soviet spy has voluntarily given himself up. The Reds hope to neutralize West Germany. But no Soviet saboteur in the Federal Republic has announced that he is going out of business, so to speak.

OMINOUS SOVIET ARMS BUILDUP CONTINUES

What is more, the massive Soviet military buildup continues. Most ominous in that buildup is the latest grim news of our air intelligence in Moscow. It indicates, as you know, a Soviet formation of latest-type intercontinental jet bombers—equivalent to our B'52's—has already been seen flying over Moscow. Thus, those among us who have been unfortunately smug, those of us who are overconfident have been given a rather rude shock. It has been proven once again that the United States is not nearly as far ahead in the technological race for air superiority as we mght have hoped. On the contrary, the Soviets, by going all-out in long-range air development, by going all-out in nuclear development have been exceeding the buildup schedule which some people had originally anticipated.

Thus, once more, some of us have been wrong in our military estimations of them. Once more some of us have erred, on the dangerous side of underestimating their capacity, underestimating their iron determination to catch up with us and pass us.

Meanwhile, too, far up, facing the Arctic Circle, the Soviets continue to build their series of Siberian rocket-launching sites for what they hope will be intercontinental missiles. These may be both intercontinental ballistic missiles, fired like bullets, or artillery shells, and intercontinental guided missiles controlled by Soviet electronics equipment.

These missiles—with atomic or hydrogen warheads—could, it is estimated, when they are developed (which may only be a matter of 5 or 10 years or so), conceivably reach the city of Detroit a mere 30 minutes after they might be fired. They could blast this and other centers of production and population into radio-active rubble.

So, these basic facts or prospects have not changed. The basic conspiratorial nature of the Kremlin has not changed.

Tactics may be changed, but not long-range Soviet strategy.

Now, then, what should be our answer? I believe that the answer must basically be threefold.

INVINCIBLE UNITED STATES MILITARY PREPARATION

1. In the first place, we must continue our defense preparations at the highest level of efficiency.

This does not mean mere quantity, because a quantity of planes, tanks, or ships can grow quickly obsolescent.

But it does mean quality in the most advanced weapons and training. It does mean having our defense factories tooled up to high efficiency, so that at instantaneous notice, they could go into mass production of the most advanced models of weapons and weapons systems.

We must never again fall asleep. We must never again lay ourself open to another disastrous Pearl Harbor attack. It could be the last such attack suffered in United States history, a fatal attack from which we might not be able to recover.

We must never again overcentralize our production facilities. I am pleased that Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson—an able man, but one with whom I have not agreed in this respect—has begun to decentralize defense procurement. It is long overdue. We offer at present a few key "over-ripe" bomb targets, which, if hit, could result in paralysis of America. We are far too vulnerable, far too centralized.

We must decentralize if we would survive. And we must strengthen our civil defense as well, instead of treating it as an orphan child untended and ignored.

A CIVILIAN "JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF"

2. Secondly, we must accompany our efforts for military preparation by taking the offensive in the political, cultural, social, propaganda field. Why? Because "man does not live by bread alone," and he will not survive by armaments alone.

Illustrating the type of offensive which I have in mind is the brilliant long-range program outlined by Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, who has proposed, in what is truly an historic memorandum, a strategy board for political offense—a cold-war equivalent of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the military side.

General Sarnoff's proposal rightly suggests that this operation be headed up by a leader directly under the President with Cabinet status. The able Chairman of the Board of RCA, one of our foremost leaders in American communications for more than a quarter of a century, suggests, of course, the most modern types of techniques be used, for example, "mobile big-screen television units in black and white and in color" to be used in non-Communist regions where "illiteracy bars the written word and lack of radio bars the spoken word."

He reiterates a striking proposal which he had made some years ago, for mass distribution of cheap, lightweight receivers, tuned to pick up American signals. He suggests "a simple hand-operated phonograph device, costing no more than a loaf of bread" and "records made of cardboard and costing less than a bottle of beverage."

EXPLOITING WEAKNESSES INSIDE IRON CURTAIN

He emphasizes that we exploit the weak link in the Kremlin based on the hunger for facts inside the Iron Curtain and based upon the Soviets own miserable failures at home.

I point out to you, my friends, that for example, Soviet agriculture indeed is in a state of collapse, as attested by redfaced Soviet leaders, themselves. We should exploit the Red farm breakdown to the fullest, but it will take the sort of audacious, imaginative program as General Sarnoff has suggested to penetrate the Iron Curtain and accomplish our goal.

The program, which has been welcomed and commended in principle by President Eisenhower, commands the earnest consideration of the Congress and of the American people.

This in no way depreciates the steps which are now being carried on by the Operations Coordinating Board, by the United States Information Agency, and by other means, but it does signify that we all recognize that infinitely more could and should be done.

Historic Proposals for Cultural Interchange To Meet the Challenge of Communism—No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the concluding half of the great speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, delivered at the Wayne University Student Forum, Detroit, Mich., on Thursday, May 19, 1955, follows:

USIA PERSONNEL ARE FRONT LINE FIGHTERS FOR PEACE

But it certainly won't be done if the Congress slashes USIA's funds. I say that these USIA information personnel, working in 210 posts and 79 countries are frontline fighters for peace and they should have our fullest support instead of needling, peevish criticism which has too often been their lot.

In 38 languages they faithfully disseminate truth around the world. Over 29 television stations, alone, in 21 countries they are "giving light so that the people will find their own way."

The President's atoms-for-peace program is a particular highlight of USIA's message. This is by far one of the most thrilling, constructive subjects which can be conveyed to the world in our time, particularly as the prelude to the historic UN Geneva Conference, opening in August. Eighty-four nations have been invited to this precedent-breaking assembly on peaceful application of atomic energy—an assembly which may open up whole new vistas for mankind.

But why is it that we are invariably so willing to appropriate billions for aircraft carriers, destroyers, giant bombers. And yet, some people are so reluctant to appropriate far lesser sums for truth dissemination which may help completely to prevent the dark day when the military weapons have to be used at all? Isn't it most important of all to prevent war from coming in the first place, rather than concentrate our efforts almost exclusively on winning a war, if it should come (as crucial as the latter is, under that circumstance)?

I point out now that General Sarnoff's wise war-prevention proposals were paralleled in a most enlightening and significant address which had been made back on February 28 before the National Press Club by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr. He had recommended a competitive coexistence council which would match and surpass the So-

viets in every field of human endeavor, whether it be in the 1956 Olympic games in Melbourne, Australia, or in the field of the ballet, theater, art, literature.

Since then, the Hearst newspapers have done an excellent job in amplifying the vital necessity for such a council.

Now there may be differences as to the details of this effort. There may be differences as to the actual level of appropriations for it, particularly in view of the importance of adequate aid under the mutual-security program, as such, for the next fiscal year especially for southeast Asia.

There may be differences as to how the Council is to be organized. But the basic idea, particularly that of all-out effort by private American groups, is fundamentally sound. The Soviet Union does challenge us today in everything from the Olypmics, to cultural exhibitions, trade fair pavilions, and the like.

Recently, for example, at a luncheon meeting which I arranged in the United States Capitol, an eloquent representative of the International Exchange Program, managed by the American National Theatre and Academy, a congressionally-chartered group, pointed out that within 2 years the Kremlin has sent 2,000 performing artists into France alone.

And evidences have poured in from other quarters regarding massive Soviet efforts to win the minds of the world. We cannot ignore this. We cannot sit back and let them beat us by our own smug default.

RESTORE FULBRIGHT FUNDS

Now, of course, there are ceilings to the amount of spending which we can devote to this and similar tasks. The United States Treasury hardly has unlimited resources. We are already running a serious deficit.

But I believe that within reason we could and should greatly step up our programs. I see no justification for the House of Representatives, arbitrary slash of 40 percent in the international student exchange program. To my way of thinking, that is one of the soundest programs that the United States possesses to counteract Soviet lies. It is, in my judgment, exceedingly poor economy to slash what are rightly known as the Fulbright scholarships. Instead of slashing them we should be increasing them. Only 7,000 grants could be made this year. Every single student or other leader who can, after judicious selection, come to the United States, who can gain a better, more accurate, more personal understanding of American culture, of the American home, the American community, can be a potential, vital asset to our cause.

That doesn't mean that everybody who comes here, will automatically thereafter be our friend. On the contrary, you and I know that we could do far more to improve the program so that the 35,000 foreign students who are new here—of all races and creeds—do bring back with them the best possible impression. But at least we have got to bring people over in the first place to give them a chance to see us and understand us.

ENCOURAGING THE LIVING ARTS

Now, there is one further observation which I should like to make on this matter of victory through things of the spirit.

We here in this country should look to our own cultural laurels. There has been a magnificent flowering of the arts in this free country, but we could voluntarily do more—far more—to encourage the creative arts—music, literature, poetry, ballet, the living stage. And if we do so, we will, by that much, be strengthening our foreign policy. Because we will be further demonstrating to the world that, far from being a "crass, materialist civilization," we have a deep and abiding interest in the "things of beauty which live forever."

A FINE ARTS CENTER FOR WASHINGTON, D. C.

Recently, I was delighted to see that the House of Representatives approved a bill, H. R. 1825, to create a Federal Commission to formulate plans for construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, a center for music, drama, the fine arts, and mass communications. Its counterpart on the Senate side is S. 1321, offered by one of my able colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee—one of the youngest men in spirit in the Senate, Senator THEODORE GREEN of Rhode Island. On the House side, a leading spokesman for this cause to bring this great asset to our Nation's Capital has been a Congressman from New Jersey—young in years and another Democrat, if you please, Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., of New Jersey. He has also been in the forefront of the effort to set up a program of cultural interchange throughout the world. Congressman THOMPSON has offered H. R. 5040, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor for the latter purpose. It is my intention on my return to the Capital to explore the possibility of companion legislation on the Senate side.

I feel that by steps such as these we can fill in a domestic and foreign program which definitely needs filling in.

The sending of musical troupes like Porgy and Bess over seas—a stage group which met with thundering acclaim everywhere—should not have to be financed out of the President's special funds, but should be gladly authorized on a regular annual basis, as should, for example, United States participation in trade fairs.

And, here in our own country, in the Capital of our Nation, in the shrine to which young and old—in hundreds of thousands—come, I say that there should be a national civic auditorium—a great fine arts center.

I want every American to be prouder than he has ever been before of the Capital of our land. I want every American to feel that not only is the District of Columbia the political center of this great Republic, but that it is a center for the worthiest aspirations and creations of the human spirit. Let the best in the art, the music, the literature, the ballet, the stage in the 48 States—blossom in the city named for the Father of our Country. Let Americans revere the city of Washington as the Frenchman reveres Paris—for far more than governing; for the expression of the essence in national culture.

And so, I turn to the third of the three-pronged proposals for peace.

SUPPORT EISENHOWER-DULLES DIPLOMACY

Now, my third point is that we should all give our support to the wise foreign policy which is being so soundly spearheaded by the statesmanlike President of the United States and by his able Secretary of State.

It has been a troubled foreign policy—not without its difficulties, not without its crises—for that is the very nature of modern diplomacy.

But it has been a bold, forthright, creative policy, carried out in sound cooperation with our allies. And it has numerous spectacular achievements to its credit; one of the foremost of which is the long-awaited, now-fulfilled entry of West Germany into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

WE MUST BE WILLING TO NEGOTIATE FURTHER

In carrying out our overall policy further, we should, in my judgment, approach the new Soviet tactic with a sense of realism, a sense of caution, but with a willingness to go halfway.

There are some people who deplore the meeting of the Big Four and who want us completely to shut the door to further negotiations with the Soviets.

These people are falling victim to their own inflexible, unchanging judgments. Their position is not, however, completely without logic. They contend the empty Soviet word isn't worth the paper it is written upon. And it is indeed a fact that out of 52 major agreements which we have made with the Soviets in the last 22 years since we recognized Russia, they have broken 50 of the agreements. They have lived up to only two small agreements. One was for entering the fighting against Japan in World War II, and the other was to permit the Western Allies aerial corridors to Berlin. As you can see, the first of these two agreements was certainly to the U. S. S. R.'s definite advantage, because she came in for a lion's share of the spoils from defeated Japan. And the second is certainly a modest concession on her part, because she should never have been given the right to encircle Berlin by land in the first place. Her previous tactic in sealing off Berlin from direct land access and in requiring us to conduct the costly Berlin airlift was outrageous.

In view of her record of treachery, some impatient people throw up their hands in disgust and say that almost all agreements with the Soviet Union have been futile. That is largely true. But that does not mean that future ironclad commitments, backed up by action, will not work.

These people say that the Soviet Union goes into conferences usually, principally for propaganda purposes or to lull their opponents to sleep. And that is true.

These people say that no one knows whether an overturn in the shaky Soviet hierarchy tomorrow could completely reverse present Soviet tactics and reinstitute the tough Stalinist line. And that is true.

DO NOT BRAND ALL TALK AS APPEASEMENT

But my point is this: that notwithstanding these facts, the United States must very definitely not slam the door on further negotiation. On the contrary, we must prove ourself ready, willing and able to talk, to negotiate, to confer. We must not permit anyone to brand all talk as appeasement. Such criticism is utterly unjustified.

We will not appease, and we never intended to. We will not sell out an ally like Nationalist China or anyone else. And to negotiate does not mean that we are going naively to place faith in an empty Soviet pledge. It does not mean that we are expecting any miracle solutions to our problems overnight.

But it does mean that, as the wise chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator WALTER GEORGE, well said, in effect: the United States is great enough, strong enough to show to the world that, so long as there is the slightest chance of success, we will never slam the door on a peaceful approach.

We have talked for 8 futile years about control of atomic weapons. But I say we should talk more. We have talked for 7 years about overall disarmament, but I say we must talk more. We have talked for 10 years about unifying Germany through free, uncontrolled elections, but we must talk more.

We must talk not for the sake of hearing ourselves talk or to hear the Reds talk, because certainly, we have had our stomach full of Red double talk.

But, rather, we must be patient. We must strive as hard—as unswervingly—for the goal of peace as we strove for the winning of the war. The lives of you young men and women and of all of us are at stake. Why should we be half-hearted or reluctant to do our all?

The world is hungry for signs of peace. The world is desperate that the United States take all possible steps to avoid a nuclear Armegeddon.

LET'S NOT GIVE FUEL TO RED PROPAGANDA

The Soviet Union would like to picture us to the world as a war-mongering, saber-

rattling power. The Soviet Union asserts in its propaganda to the world that the United States is "not interested in peace; it is only interested in a so-called preventive war of aggression. It does not want to talk; it wants to bomb."

That is a vicious lie.

But if we were to put ourself in the foolish position of slamming the door on negotiations and hurling all sorts of belligerent, ill-conceived ultimatums, we would simply be providing fuel for Soviet propaganda. We would be estranging ourselves from our allies and from the neutral peoples. I say, therefore, that we must, as we will, sincerely, earnestly, devotedly continue to confer for peace—at the summit and below the summit.

I repeat, however, we must not expect miracles. We must not change our realistic conception of the Soviet bear. We must not be a pawn in Soviet propaganda tricks. But we must leave no stone unturned to try to find some firm, active basis for relieving East-West tension.

We can do so without being soft, for the Soviet Union despises softness.

We can do so without appeasement, because appeasement is utterly futile and self-defeating.

We can do so without naivete or gullibility.

We can and should do so with full confidence in our leaders. Certainly, the President of the United States deserves our confidence. Certainly, the Secretary of State of our country deserves our confidence. There is nothing in either what Dwight D. Eisenhower or John Foster Dulles has ever done which should make us feel the slightest doubt in their ability to conduct negotiations in the most forthright, most constructive manner, with firmness, yet with understanding.

We must not be afraid of conferences. We must not be afraid of ourselves. We must not underestimate our own abilities.

We must not listen to ill-tempered talk of unilateral "blockades" and ill-thought-out angry threats to Moscow and Peking. To be hard and strong is one thing; to put a chip on your shoulder and arrogantly dare someone to knock it off is another.

Avoiding extremes—avoiding half-baked cure-alls—this is essential if we would save the peace.

These, then, are my suggestions for combatting the efforts of the U. S. S. R. to control the world by peaceful or forceful means.

Our Congress to Date

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include within the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from one of our country's leading newspapers located in the heart of America, the Kansas City Star. It is particularly timely and appropriate and I commend it to all of my colleagues for their consideration.

[From the Kansas City Star of May 19, 1955]

OUR CONGRESS TO DATE

Just what has been accomplished so far by the present session of Congress is not a matter of opinion but of factual record. Opinion may be slanted, politically or otherwise, and some views of the session to date would have to be gaged with that thought in mind.

Party leaders on both sides of the fence have naturally sought to make the best possible case for themselves, and each group has twitted the other about failure to support the administration's program. Actually, however, both parties have done better than might have been expected. That goes for Republicans known to be indifferent about several of the Eisenhower proposals, and for Democrats who supposedly would seek to block various measures just as an ordinary matter of partisanship.

Incredible as it may appear, there has been less party squabbling in Congress than on the outside of that body. Democrats and Republicans have not ceased to be what they were anywhere. Yet it has been left mainly to the party chairmen and others not in the legislative chambers to do the heavy work of fighting the party battles and talking about 1956.

About the record of Congress to date there can be no jubilant claims. As usual, more will be known as the session moves along. But the impartial Congressional Quarterly takes the measurement and finds by an actual tabulation of committee and floor procedure that, up to the present, more has been accomplished than was shown at the same time last year. That also would apply to various other sessions going back into previous administrations.

The number of measures adopted or advanced at a given time is not necessarily a dependable gage of achievement. But in and out of Congress there has been obvious respect for the administration's leadership. At no time should Congress be merely a rubber stamp. It is a coordinate branch of the Government and its Members have a right to their individual convictions—a situation that Ike himself has respected.

Judgment needs to be suspended until the session is over. But as of the moment this Congress seems to be doing a fair job.

The Public and the Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the RECORD a statement by the Honorable James A. Campbell, national president, American Federation of Government Employees, which appeared in the Government Standard, as follows:

THE PUBLIC AND THE PUBLIC SERVANT

This week is the height of the teen-age tourist season in the District of Columbia. High school graduating classes from all parts of our land are making their annual pilgrimage to the Nation's Capital.

One sees the youngsters everywhere, lined up in cafeterias, being herded into sightseeing buses, winding their way through the corridors of the Capitol, visiting our great national monuments and looking at everything through fresh, alert eyes.

It is interesting and challenging to talk to them, to try to answer their questions and fill in some of the background. They are impressed with the center of Government. Yet, like most people, they are amazed to learn that only 10 percent of the Nation's Federal employees are located in the District of Columbia. Few of these youngsters could name a Federal agency or installation in their own home towns except, perhaps, for the post office.

These boys and girls will be the citizens and taxpayers of tomorrow. Through ignorance, they could accept the distorted picture of Federal employees as bureaucratics drones, responsible for high taxes.

The attitude of our fellow-Americans towards their Government has much to do with both the prestige and effectiveness of the Federal service. If our fellow-citizens have an understanding of the many services provided by the Government and of the work done by Government employees, that attitude will be reflected in congressional consideration for Federal employees.

All this is a preamble to a very simple suggestion which I hope will find its way to the management level of agencies and installations in the field service.

Why not seek out the cooperation of the schools—from grade school to university—and invite them to make a study of Federal agencies in their area as a part of their school work. Let classes and study groups occasionally visit Federal agencies, interview the officials, find out what jobs the employees are performing. And if there is a defense installation in the area, let them see that Government employees work at lathe and saw as well as at tabulating machines and desks.

Here, too, is a wonderful opportunity for the Civil Service Commission regional and branch offices to do some early recruiting. Civil Service Week can be an opportunity for school projects based on a study of the merit system and of the employment opportunities in the Federal service.

To be sure, it will mean some extra work and planning. And it won't produce miracles overnight. But such a project could signal an important, long-range change in the attitude of the public to the public servant.

JAMES A. CAMPBELL,
National President, AFGE.

Wildlife Refuges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, here is a recent release from the Wildlife Management Institute as follows:

GIVEAWAY OF WILDLIFE REFUGES STARTS

Giveaway of important parts of the national wildlife refuge system, which seems to be in the pattern of the present administration, is underway, according to the Wildlife Management Institute. On May 25, a meeting will be held in Las Vegas, Nev., between officials of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the Nevada Fish and Game Commission to determine the fate of the Desert Game Range, the home of a remnant band of desert bighorn sheep. Nevada game officials have advocated the elimination of the national wildlife refuge in order to open the area to public hunting. Desert bighorn rams of trophy size outside the refuge have been eliminated in the past three hunts that were authorized by the State.

A couple of Members of Congress, who ordinarily are good conservationists, are supporting this move and may attend the meeting. Reappraisal of the Federal refuges established primarily for resident non-migratory game was advocated in the Interior

Survey Team report last June, and the move is known to have the active support of 3 of the 5 regional directors of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. The disposal of such refuges can be effected by the Secretary of the Interior with a stroke of the pen.

Also involved and due for discussion at the forthcoming meeting is the Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge near Fallon, Nev. Strong pressures also are being brought against the Secretary of the Interior to reduce still more the size of the Tule Lake and Lower Klamath Refuges along the California and Oregon line; to transfer the Lake Lenore National Wildlife Refuge in Washington and the Sheldon and Hart Mountain National Antelope Ranges in Oregon and Nevada, to the States.

The survey team which examined the operations of the Fish and Wildlife Service last year recommended that the importance of these areas be reevaluated by the new director of the service. The reassignment is being made, however, by regional directors who obviously are interested in getting rid of a few routine administrative headaches by disposing of or reducing the size of the Federal holdings under their authority.

These local pressures are not restricted to the Far West. The Moosehorn National Wildlife Refuge in Maine is in jeopardy, as is the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge in Oklahoma, and the Cabeza Prieta Game Range and Kofa Refuge Unit in Arizona. Threats against the refuge system are coming from every quarter, from military agencies to selfish personal interests.

This important question is also discussed in the June issue of Sports Afield in an article by Arthur H. Carhart. His article follows:

ONE MAN CAN WIPE OUT OUR WILDLIFE REFUGES

(By Arthur H. Carhart)

By merely signing a typewritten order, one man can wipe out great national wildlife refuges. In the same way, he may open the gate to oil drillers, stockmen, rocket shooters, or others who would overrun our refuges and destroy their value to wildlife.

This appointed official can take such action without hearings, advance public notice, or discussion with outdoorsmen and conservationists. He can blot out a million-acre refuge, or open one to commercial interests, merely by putting his signature on an administrative order.

Who is the man with such life-and-death power over our Federal wildlife refuge system? He's Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.

But perhaps you believe that such administrative orders would never be given. Maybe not. But let's look at the evidence.

Whiffs of what's cooking leaked out, and Sports Afield said, "Dig into this and report." Here's what was uncovered by 6,000 miles of travel, visits to threatened refuges in 6 States, and weeks of probing.

At least 40 refuges appear to be in immediate jeopardy. And though abandonment proposals are more in the open for some great game refuges in the West, the pattern holds black implications of what may be ahead all across the Nation.

We have 254 Federal refuges in 40 States; and 18 in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. They contain about 17½ million acres, less than 1 percent of the total area of the Nation.

Their sizes and critical services vary greatly. The 210-acre Great Meadows Refuge in Massachusetts is a little haven for migrating waterfowl; the 38,933-acre Noxubee in Mississippi is a winter home for ducks and geese, breeding stock flying northward to summer nesting. The Lower Souris in North Dakota, seriously threatened by both oil drillers and a Reclamation Bureau scheme, contains 58,571 acres, vital nesting grounds for waterfowl, prairie chickens and sharptailed grouse.

The 23,648-acre National Elk Refuge in Wyoming saved, and now maintains, the biggest elk herd in the Nation. This refuge provides excellent hunting in adjacent acres by supplying indispensible wintering grounds for the elk.

In the Southwest, the Kofa, Cabeza Prieta, and Desert Refuges undoubtedly saved the magnificent desert bighorn sheep from extinction; they're built up flocks so that limited hunting has been permitted for several seasons.

Each refuge meets definite, high-priority needs of one or many types of game. They protect scarce or important species from decimation or extinction. They produce stock that can be transplanted to suitable, unpopulated areas. They are testing stations for game-management programs that, when proven out, can be applied to millions of other acres in other localities.

These refuges are so small a percentage of our Nation's area, and so vital, that any official who would reduce their acreage or allow uses that would disposses the birds and animals on them, would deal a grevious blow to our wildlife.

This is no local issue. It's nationwide.

The issue is this: Will the Secretary of the Interior hold fast to gains in our Federal refuge system? Or by using the power he has, will he proceed to wipe out some refuges completely and allow conflicting uses in others that will degrade their wildlife values? Are we about to see a creeping disintergration of the whole Federal wildlife refuge system?

The first solid step of what appears to be a plotted course is an official memorandum signed on March 31 last year by Assistant Secretary Orme Lewis and Under Secretary Ralph A. Tudor. The memo established a five-man survey team to overhaul the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Interior Department agency that supervises the Federal refuge system.

On June 2, last year, after 6 weeks of intensive study and investigation, the team reported. There's no question of the integrity and good intentions of the men in that group. They probably didn't know the grief some statements about national wildlife refuges might bring.

They first recommended that all existing refuges should be subjected to critical scrutiny to determine if they fit the overall objectives and responsibilities of the Service. That could be a constructive angle.

But the fuse that can blow the main demolition charge is this statement by the team: "There are certain existing refuges the continued maintenance of which under Federal control seems of doubtful value."

That gave Interior the springboard to make the next jump. Early this year, a directive went out to the regional directors of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to study refuges, with a plain suggestion of abandoning any of doubtful value.

That survey team may or may not have known that 3 of the 5 regional directors of the Fish and Wildlife Service already, either by act or statement, have shown positively their inclination to move out of large Federal wildlife refuges and let other interests take over. This move could do untold harm.

The threats to our refuges vary. The best way to understand what's going on is to scan some case histories.

There's a good illustration of the overall picture in the Hart Mountain National Antelope Refuge of southeastern Oregon and the famous, nearby Charles Sheldon National Antelope Refuge.

Both of these refuges are mountain masses bulging up out of semidesert flats. They contain high-country grasslands, spots of forest, rough canyons and most important of all, vital watering places.

The Sheldon Refuge was one of the first areas to be dedicated to protecting vanishing wildlife. More than 30 years ago, Dr. T. Gilbert Pearson, then president of the National Audubon Society, visited the area. He learned about the desperate plight of the antelope and began talking about a refuge to save the remnants.

In 1919 Martin S. Garretson, Secretary of the American Bison Society, spent days in the area appraising the situation. Garretson found antelope shot and used for wolf bait. He was told there were herds of "thousands" in that section. But methodical checking indicated there were less than 200 animals.

Aroused, the Audubon Society and the Boone and Crockett Club raised funds and bought 2,377 acres of key lands from private owners to make the refuge project feasible. These lands were donated to the people of the United States. Federal funds were used to purchase over 300 additional acres of private lans. And President Hoover, on January 26, 1931, issued an executive order establishing the refuge, and adding public domain so the total mounted to 31,439 acres on which wildlife welfare has first position.

This first unit, known as "Little Sheldon," did not contain vital winter range. The Audubon Society bought and donated additional properties, the Government spent $153,926 to secure 23,881 key acres, and 520,525 acres of public domain were added, to set up the Charles Sheldon Antelope Range, surrounding and supplementing the Little Sheldon.

Nearby Hart Mountain was made into a refuge because many of the antelope move back and forth between it and the Sheldon, finding good kidding grounds and summer range at Hart Mountain. The Government purchased 57,898 acres of private lands in the Hart Mountain area for $250,422, added enough public domain to bring the unit up to 240,644 acres.

The two areas—Hart Mountain and Sheldon—are segments of one management unit, none of which can be so well managed if any portion is cast out.

In 1919 Garretson counted 200 antelope in the vicinity; now there are 6,000 to 7,000 head using 2 refuges. In addition there are mule deer, sage grouse, and a host of other wildlife dependent on the refuge areas.

In the early 1930's, Dr. Olaus Murie studied the range on the Sheldon and found it being grazed down to nubbins. But now the range has come back. There still are 500 to 600 head of cattle grazed on the Sheldon game range because that portion of this reserve is under the joint jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Land Management, successor to the old Grazing Service. But there is genuine local cooperation between agencies, and wildlife at least gets a decent break on the Sheldon Game Range.

The drift from these refuges has restocked surrounding areas; there is open-season hunting there. Deer hunting is allowed within the refuges in designated areas and ways; it's necessary to keep the animals in balance with the available forage resources. That's the record of Sheldon and Hart Mountain.

These two refuges are in region 1 of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Regional director is Leo J. Laythe. When asked if recommendations of the five-man survey team would lead to the Fish and Wildlife Service getting out of these refuges, he said frankly he was inclined "to turn them over to the States for management." He explained that this would be "purely a matter of economics"; that the Service's funds were too small to do a job at Hart Mountain and Sheldon.

The same Mr. Laythe later said emphatically there was no move on for the Service to dump the refuges. Apparently turning them over to the States wouldn't constitute dumping.

If you know the pattern of Western States' politics you realize how stockmen dominate the scene. After 20 years of range and wildlife management, the Sheldon and Hart Mountain areas look like a cow paradise to stockmen. The forage has come back since overloading ended; your money and mine has built excellent watering places. It would be slick to have this area subject to local politics and pressures.

Men who know how State lands have been handled in the past figure that "turning the refuges over to the States for management" would just be one step in a series that even the best-intentioned department couldn't ward off surrender to grazing interests.

Regardless of Leo Laythe's declaration that there is no move to dump these refuges, one of his staff certainly did approach the Oregon State Game Commission, feeling out its attitude toward having Hart Mountain put in State hands. Oregon has its own, well-planned, and thoroughly plotted program for acquiring wildlife lands and managing them. The State apparently figures it will need all the funds it has to carry through its own program.

In Nevada it's a different story. A driving campaign is on there to get the "federals" out of the Sheldon Range. The Washoe County Game and Fish Commission, an official segment of Nevada's oddly organized department, has adopted a resolution to have Federal control of the Sheldon done away with.

Are stockmen behind this? It's a good bet. And other forces are mixed into this campaign.

The same sort of campaign is going on to wipe out the desert game range in southeastern Nevada, near Las Vegas. On March 9 this year, Frank Groves, director of Nevada's fish and game department, was in Washington, putting on the pressure to have the desert range turned over to the State, lock, stock and buildings, plus other improvements paid for with Federal wildlife funds. Any State would be happy to have such a gift. And Nevada would have a lot to say about grazing livestock on refuge lands.

This great wildlife area was established in 1936. It contains 2,203,711 acres. Its main features are two craggy mountain ranges on opposite sides of a big desert valley. It was set up to prevent extinction of the desert bighorn sheep. And it has done the job in spite of a crazy quilt pattern of various agencies having various jurisdictions over it.

Incidentally, if you think that refuge areas are all dedicated to wildlife, the situation on the Desert Game Range will set you straight. There are 61,567 acres within the refuge that are under the primary jurisdiction of the United States Forest Service. There's teamwork in this quarter; forest and wildlife men work together. Over the remainder of the Desert Range, the United States Bureau of Land Management has equal jurisdiction on paper with the Fish and Wildlife Service. Actually the Bureau of Land Management has more say than the wildlife officials. About 650 cattle, owned by 8 individuals, graze 61,390 acres of the refuge. On top of that, the Air Force has a gunnery range plastered on top of a third of the area.

When the Desert Game Range was created, there were an estimated 300 head of desert bighorns in the area. They were skidding toward zero. Now there are about 1,200 head, and drift has allowed hunting for this magnificent trophy animals in areas outside the refuge. There's a chance now to trap and transplant bighorns to many other areas in Nevada where they were poached off. If the State has the money, there's a place to put it.

Regional Director Leo Laythe is the man who will study the Desert Range with a view perhaps, to putting the Fish and Wildlife Service out of the area.

Southward, near Yuma, Ariz., are two other refuges, set up to save the desert bighorns and the rare Sonoran pronghorn antelope. These are the Kofa refuge, containing 660,041 acres, and the Cabeza Prieta, with 860,041 acres. Like the Desert Game Range, they are mountain islands surrounded by desert.

In all three bighorn ranges, water is the key to maintaining animal life. On the Desert Range, 30 water holes have developed; 9 on the Cabeza Prieta where there was only 1 spot of water before; about a dozen installed on the Kofa. The cost of these water developments ranges from a relatively few dollars in hand labor, to blasting ingenious stub tunnels into solid rock at a cost of several thousand dollars per unit. These tunnel "holes" are filled by flash runoff from slashing thunder showers; wing dams prevent rubble from getting into the tunnels, but allow overflow water to fill them.

As on the Desert Range, there is a scramble of jurisdictions on these Arizona game refuges. In addition to the Cabeza Prieta being in a "grazing district" with the Bureau of Land Management and a local grazing board in the picture, the Air Force has a rocket range covering most of the refuge.

When air-to-air shooting goes on 5 days a week, not even wildlife officials may enter the Cabeza Prieta. Air Force "Keep Out" signs are all over the place, and spent rocket cases plummet down and bury themselves a foot or so in rock-hard soil.

Not long ago, without the knowledge of our wildlife men, ground targets were set up, and air-to-earth shooting started inside the refuge. That was stopped.

The Army also coveted this refuge. It proposed using a major portion of the Cabeza Prieta as a poison-gas training area under battleground conditions.

Recommendations to abandon these bighorn refuges would come from John C. Gatlin, regional director, Albuquerque, N. Mex. There isn't much question of what his viewpoint has been; he has already studied and recommended. In June last year, Gatlin spelled out how he would have the United States Fish and Wildlife Service move out of the Kofa and Cabeza Prieta, and turn the areas altogether into the hands of the Bureau of Land Management; Arizona then would be given permits for the wildlife to use the waterholes, and the wildlife property could be transferred to the State.

The waterholes are a sweet setup for livestock to be grazed in this area. But there isn't enough water in the Desert, the Kofa, or the Cabeza Prieta to support both game and domestic stock.

Beside the "economic" argument advanced for turning the refuges over to other interests, those in favor of such a move say that wildlife on the refuges is "resident game" and therefore should be handled by the State. The refuges saved the wildlife when it was "resident game" in the first place; without them there's a chance that what has been saved could be totally lost.

If the resident-game argument is valid, it should apply to all resident species.

Very well; coyotes and rodents certainly are residents. The allotment for refuges in the 1954 United States Fish and Wildlife budget was only $100,000. But for predator and rodent control it was $956,241—nearly 10 times as much. So nearly a million was set up largely to benefit individual stockmen in Western States. If it's a governing principle to have States take over the management of all resident wildlife, then let's insist that they take on their coyote and rodent control as well; save a million.

I have indicated only a few of the refuges that are in jeopardy. They set the overall pattern of what appears to be a general movement to dismember our national game refuges. Only a few of the others that are threatened can be listed here.

The Little Pend Oreille, in eastern Washington, contains the indispensable, crisis winter range for a head of the largest whitetailed deer in the West. It had been skinned to bare earth by domestic stock; the Resettlement Administration bought up the land on a distress basis. The Fish and Wildlife Service took it over and rehabilitated the range; the deer have prospered. Now stockmen lick their chops as they look at the area. It's something they'd like themselves.

There are whisperings that the National Bison Range in western Montana, the National Elk Refuge in Jackson Hole, Wyo., the Sullys Hill Refuge in North Dakota are likely to be classed as of doubtful value in the Federal wildlife lands.

In Oregon and northern California there's a hell-roaring campaign on to wipe out the last of that most vital key area in the Pacific coast flyway—the Klamath and Tule Lake Refuges. The Reclamation Bureau is in there, interested in draining the last fragments of the once-great marshes so they can give lands to settlers that got bum homesteads on another reclamation unit. If this area is blotted out as a wildlife sanctuary, the center is knocked out of the whole Pacific flyway—no less.

In Oklahoma the Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge is threatened again. Late in 1953 the Army unveiled plans to expand Fort Sill Military Reservation. Since the area surrounds the Wichita Refuge on three sides like a vise, Army officials eyed the refuge for a new weapons-testing area. The Oklahoma Outdoor Council, together with sportsmen across the country, raised a protest. The Army pulled in its horns.

Now, local rumors persistently point to a revival of earlier Army plans. An item in the Army's budget calls for expanding military areas, and Fort Sill is on the list for expansion. Army officials locally refuse to comment on Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge; but it is no secret that transfer of Government land from one agency to another merely involves some paperwork and no cost.

On other refuges, oil interests have tried to get in to drill. An order that would have allowed this reportedly got as far as the desk of Secretary of the Interior McKay. This move became public knowledge. Protests were made. As this is written, the order is believed to be on that desk, perhaps cooling off and ready for action later.

In Maine, another Fish and Wildlife Service regional director, David R. Gascoyne, has made moves to get rid of the Moosehorn Refuge. This is an area in which management techniques have been worked out for increasing upland birds.

The list of national wildlife refuges that are in jeopardy could go on at length. This isn't a local issue.

Remember, this scuttling and junking can be accomplished quietly and smoothly, without any knowledge by sportsmen of what's going on.

This isn't like that battle with the land-grab gang that your letters helped to beat in Congress last year. A refuge can be dumped by Secretary of the Interior McKay merely by signing an administrative order. No hearing, no discussion; the job can be done wholly within the Interior Department.

For example, Secretary McKay, by issuing a land order, could turn over all the public-domain lands of the Hart Mount Refuge to the Bureau of Land Management. They'd go into a "grazing district" with a local board of livestock operators having a lot to say about what happens on those ranges.

Lands bought with Federal wildlife funds could be declared surplus. They'd be of-

fered to any other agency that might want to control them.

What legal involvements might result in dumping the lands that have been purchased by conservation groups and given for refuge purposes to the United States is a question. But these lands could be turned over to the States outright under the Coordination Act. They could be tossed into a Federal-aid project, become State property, no longer Federal refuge lands.

Whatever may be the reasons for the various regional directors wanting to get the fish and wildlife out of managing our game refuges, if they study the areas and recommend their being junked as of doubtful value, that's a steap toward the breakup.

These wildlife refuges have been built up through a quarter century, through labors and often heartbreak, with literally millions of dollars of sportsmen's money.

The focal point is not in the regional directors' offices, nor even in the office of their boss, John Farley, Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. It's in the office of Secretary of the Interior McKay.

There's enough evidence on this issue for sportsmen and conservationists over the Nation to demand that the Secretary of the Interior define his policy on our national wildlife refuges. Is there or isn't there a sell-out shaping up for wildlife?

I have recently introduced a bill, H. R. 5306, which would require prior congressional approval on the disposal of any segment of the Federal refuge system. The bill was referred to the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Chairman HERBERT C. BONNER, of North Carolina, is receiving requests from conservationists from all parts of the country to schedule an early hearing on this bill.

Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, Assistant Secretary Orme Lewis, and regional directors of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service Leo Laythe, Portland, Oreg., and John Gatlin, Albuquerque, N. Mex., are receiving strong statements from conservationists from far and wide in opposition to these proposed giveaways of the refuge system.

This Nation Under God and Christ

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in this great legislative body a resolution seeking to add amendment 23 to our present United States Constitution to the end that the basic and fundamental law of our land might recognize the Master Architect, Creator, and Builder of the Universe, the Almighty God, who hung out the stars and lit the burning taper of the sun and draped the glorious rainbow as a scarf about the shoulders of the storm; and also to the further end that there may be recognized in that same Constitution Jesus Christ as the Son of God and Universal Saviour of all mankind. Many people, I believe, think the greatest deficiency of our present Constitution lies in its failure to recognize specifically God Almighty and America's definite position as a great Christian nation. In this modern day of paganistic and mundane attitudes, when communism and all of its philosophy of atheism and statism and materialism hold full sway in many places of the earth and embrace millions of its peoples, there is surely a great neeed for America to assert humbly her unalterable dependence upon God and her own daily followership of Christianity as the prevailing ideology of most of her people. As most everyone knows, the Constitution is whatever the people decree it shall be, and since most of the American people are God fearing and Christ following, the Constitution itself should make manifestation accordingly.

This proposed amendment is in no way any encroachment upon the demarcation line of church-state separation that has always characterized our Government, since this amendment would neither recognize nor support with tax revenue any church organization whatsoever. While this amendment would not in anywise establish a church, yet it would in a positive way recognize the authorship and authorityship of the Supreme Being and His Son, Jesus Christ, as the Saviour of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, the Holy Bible tells us:

Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord.

And the great Apostle Paul once wrote:

For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.

I hope our great Constitution may come to recognize God as our Lord and may also come to recognize that the Nation's foundation must be laid upon Jesus Christ as the firm Rock of Ages and Saviour of the world.

A Doctor's Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, during the last several weeks the press and the air waves have been filled with statements, charges countercharges and so forth, regarding the Salk vaccine and its distribution program. Little, I believe, has been heard from those hard working and dedicated people on whom falls the real burden of caring for our ills—the ordinary doctor of medicine.

Today I received a letter from a doctor friend of mine, a resident of the congressional district which I represent. His letter is short and to the point and was inspired because "when they begin to talk of $30 million it is time to say something."

I think the Members of the House will be interested in reading the terse observations of this doctor. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the doctor's letter, which follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ELLSWORTH: I had not been much concerned about the hysteria in Washington regarding polio vaccine, however, when they begin to talk of $30 million, it is time to say something. If such an appropriation does come up, I hope you will consider the following points:

1. We doctors have been vaccinating children for diphtheria for many years. Formerly, diphtheria killed and crippled about 20 times as many children as polio.

2. We are now vaccinating children for tetanus, typhoid, smallpox, mumps, and influenza as well, without any help or assistance from the Federal Government.

3. Each county society has a very well worked out plan to vaccinate the needy children. After all, we would know a great deal better who the needy children are than Mr. Eisenhower or Oveta. We have been taking care of their runny noses, runny ears, and runny bowels without any assist from the Health, Welfare, and Education Department, and I'm sure we can continue to do so.

4. Since the doctors of the country are expected to administer the vaccine and care for the children, I think they are in the best position to allocate it and use it most strategically while it is scarce. We did the same with penicillin and hundreds of other medical preparations.

Since the above letter was a personal communication to me and I do not have the permission of the doctor to publicize his name, I do not do so. However, I am inclined to believe that the above expresses the views of many thousands of our medical men.

Have Our Allies Forgotten Munich?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, some of our European and neutralist allies, and some circles in America, have stepped up their efforts to persuade our Government that peace will come if only we will give in more to the Reds. Fortunately, our top leaders are not taken in by this notion which history repeatedly has proved so tragically wrong. But it is important that our people constantly be reminded of that history so that we too will not be misled into believing peace can be obtained by yielding to tyrants.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a splendid analysis by Constantine Brown of the brainwashing to which we are being subjected:

HAVE ALLIES FORGOTTEN MUNICH?—THEY ARE TRYING TO TELL US THAT PEACE WILL COME IF WE GIVE IN MORE TO REDS

(By Constantine Brown)

There is more activity in preparations for the Big Four talks this summer than appears on the surface.

While the United States is cautious about the meeting—and with good reason—our Western European allies are enthusiastic. Their problems are much different from ours.

The administration has not failed to note a recent Moscow broadcast stating without attribution to any specific spokesman: "Peace in Asia and Europe has become truly indivisible since the emergence of the Chinese Peoples' Republic with its 600 million inhabitants as a first-class power."

This means that if we want a relaxation of world tension we must pay the price by "pensioning" Chiang Kai-shek and handing over Formosa and the offshore islands to the Communists, thus weakening our defense arc in the Pacific.

A number of policymakers in Washington seem sure that the Russians will demand that Chou En-lai be brought into the picture at the Big Four meeting and that our Western European allies will support them. Our allies feel this is essential to any relaxation of tension.

As a sop to America, the Russians may agree to Chancellor Adenauer participating in the second meeting which will be materially more important than the one which is now being openly discussed.

European chancelleries are saying that there is no war threat in Europe at the present time. But the situation is explosive in Asia where the Chinese Nationalist forces, backed by the 7th Fleet, are facing an imposing Chinese Communist force backed by the U. S. S. R. There can be no partial relaxation of world tension, our allies tell us. And in this they are strongly supported by Moscow, which made its views clear by the announcement that "peace in Europe and Asia has become indivisible."

Neither President Eisenhower nor Secretary Dulles is willing to consider yielding on the Formosan issue.

But how long the administration will be able to withstand the diplomatic "brainwashing" it has been subjected to for the last year by our Western allies is difficult to say.

Some strange reasoning has come to the fore in recent months in conversations between American and European diplomats. For instance, some of our European friends have pointed out casually that the great mistake made by Prime Ministers Chamberlain and Daladier was not in signing the Munich pact which could have assured peace in our time, but in taking up the cudgels on such insignificant questions as Danzig and Poland. After having sacrificed Czechoslovakia, they say, the premiers should have gone further and accepted the surrender of Danzig and agreed to a fourth partition of Poland.

Peace is a precious thing, the European diplomats say, and if small nations have to be sacrificed on its altar it is worthwhile. On a mistaken sense of international honor, they say, Britain and France went to the rescue of Poland whose existence was very shaky anyhow, and the world was thus plunged into an unprecedented war. They say Chamberlain and Daladier's crimes did not consist of yielding to Hitler's military might at Munich, but of having fought for Poland, which was doomed even before the first gun was fired.

Let us not repeat these blunders, we are being told. Substitute the words Quemoy and Matsu for Danzig and Formosa for Poland and we have a repetition of the 1939 situation. The only difference, the European diplomats impress on us, is that while ethnically and historically the Nationalist areas are Chinese there were racial differences between Germany and Poland. And this makes a much stronger case for the contentions of Moscow and Peiping that the islands will be liberated by force or by agreement.

Chiang, we are told, exists only by the grace of American support. If the Seventh Fleet were withdrawn and military aid cut off he could maintain himself for only a few weeks.

In answer to our objections that we cannot sell some 8 million people into Communist slavery and that our Pacific defenses would suffer immeasurably if Formosa were to fall into unfriendly hands, we are told that peace is universal and indivisible.

Once the "legitimate" national aspirations of Red China have been satisfied, our allies say, there is no likelihood of any particular tension in the Pacific to demand a strong peripheric defense arc such as we now have.

We are urged to weigh these considerations against unleashing an armed clash in the Pacific for the sake of living up to treaty commitments.

There is no indication the administration has been softened by these arguments. But this kind of diplomatic brainwashing could affect our policymakers if it is continued for long in the present strong doses.

Problems of Agricultural Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, coming from a State whose basic industry is agriculture and where water and soil are its most valuable assets, I earnestly call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the May 18 Lincoln Star by J. E. Lawrence.

The thoughts expressed by this writer are representative of the sentiments of farm people everywhere. The concern and hope of those who till the soil are wrapped up in the problems that have been thrust upon all agricultural communities, and which, in so many instances have affected the family-sized farm operator.

The editorial follows:

[From the Lincoln Star of May 18, 1955]

OF MEN AND THINGS

(By J. E. Lawrence)

Even now I can remember the delight of a green, lush countryside the first time I gazed upon the fields of central Nebraska. The combination of good black earth and water in the growing season brought a sense of peace and of well-being. I can remember that same stretch of Nebraska when in the thirties as a member of the 3-man Nebraska PWA Advisory Board on countless occasions we passed through howling, weird "black blizzards" and searing heat which transformed one of nature's most beautiful pictures to a bleak scene. The contrast was painful, depressing, and unforgettable.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Over the weekend we talked to many people while attending the delightful annual spring meeting of the Nebraska State Historical Society at Grand Island. There is a common language today. It describes the lack of moisture, the mounting concern of a predominantly agricultural people, the fears and the hopes of a region that has been through much and yet until recently seems to have forgotten that which it learned through bitter experience only slightly more than two decades ago. In that earlier uncomfortable atmosphere of heat, and angry, coppery skies of the thirties two thoughts engraved themselves upon me. Never did people display a greater measure of faith, coupled with courage and perserverance than when they were called upon to place costly seed in powdery dust, expecting it to take root and to produce. There was a sublime demonstration of faith. And it seemed to me after days and days of travel through these same Nebraska counties that their peoples, until they drew their last breath, would carry with them a knowledge of the hazards of farming. But one generation succeeds another on the farm. The bitterness and the pain are forgotten, and a sense of security replaces it. It cannot happen again, these people say. I am inclined to agree with the more hopeful outlook that the grim struggle of the thirties will not be repeated here in Nebraska in all of the precise, authentic outlines of that era.

But we are in trouble, and we are approaching more serious trouble unless conditions change. Our shelterbelts have helped us to retian the semblance of greenness. Even more, infinitely more, our expending irrigation has softened the threat of continued moisture depletion. Where there is irrigation, either from streams, now running low, or from wells, it is still green. Where there were no poultry flocks in the thirties there is poultry. There are hogs and cattle. There is a substantial amount of leftover corn. Whether it belongs to the man who produced it or passed on to the Government's hands, I cannot say. But this season has brought trouble, and because it has a hardy, prudent, intelligent Nebraska should at this time be expending energies in reappraisal of the situation here.

CALLING UPON THE WELLS

What is needed most at this time is live stock feed to preserve what has been throughout all of Nebraska's history one of its most vital branches of agriculture. There should be action now, not next month, or in mid-July. This paper has said repeatedly that where irrigation is possible it should be had. This paper feels that if in thoughtful, determined spirit Nebraskans find it possible to expand well irrigation so that a hundred thousand acres of thirsty land is added to the irrigated empire each year for 10 years, our pocketbook will be that much more stable. But it is livestock feed today while the stabilizing steps are being taken that comes first. It is not a question of a give-away program. It is, however, important that red tape be stripped of procedures, reasonable credit made available, and most of all a sound, intelligent attitude on the part of the Department of Agriculture shall take command. Let hopelessness and futility gain an upper hand, and the damage will be more irreparable than all of the actual loss that has taken place.

Farmers are experiencing difficulty in planting their fields of corn. Small grains are deteriorating. Alfalfa has taken it on the nose to some extent. Step by step what actually is taking place could be set down here if the space permitted. It is enough to say that what we need at this time is understanding leadership. So far as this farm country is concerned there never was a more important need for understanding and single purpose.

Rumors About First Lady Are Dispelled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to revise and extend my remarks and include a great story by a brilliant writer, Betty Beale, of the Washington Star, telling about some of the experiences—hardships and pleasures—of the First Lady, the great First Lady of the greatest land on earth—Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower, the wife of the President of our great Nation; a great woman who has done and is doing such an outstanding job in helping her husband, who is

not only the most popular man, in my judgment, at this time, in his own country, but in the world, and who has the love and respect of so many people. So has this wonderful woman. In talking to a great and God-fearing man, Dr. Billy Graham, who is doing such a wonderful job far across the seas, he said that he thought that President Eisenhower and Mrs. Eisenhower were one of the greatest couples and were doing the finest job of any President and any First Lady that he had ever known.

She has had so much to do, but always with that pleasant smile, and she goes out of her way to be nice to the highest and the lowest of this land. She has a way about her that just commands love and respect, and I would like for all of our men and women who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, not only in every beat in this Nation and in every library, but in many foreign lands, to know a few things about this wonderful woman whom God gave to our great President to help him along the way.

All of us know that man cannot do much without a good wife, a good mother, a sister, or a good woman to steer him along the way; and that is what this great and wonderful woman has been doing and is continuing to do at this time—in these troublesome times; in the times when we not only need strong men, but strong women; and we have in these two great people just such a couple. We all know that they are doing their best, and their best seems to be mighty, mighty good, and we are thankful that we have such a great man and such a great woman in the White House, to lead us along the way.

It is a real pleasure to see our great leader, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, and other Democrats cooperating and working together with our good Republican friends to put the President's program through, or at least that part of it where the Democrats and the Republicans agree.

God bless this wonderful woman, our First Lady, and this marvelous man, our President of these United States, so I say with millions of other people all over the earth, God bless our President and our First Lady and give them strength to carry on the great work they are doing that has helped to bring us peace, prosperity, and plenty.

The story follows.

RUMORS ABOUT FIRST LADY ARE HEREWITH DISPELLED

(By Betty Beale)

Always a hot caldron of rumors, this town has been boiling with them ever since Mrs. Eisenhower canceled all her engagements for this past week. Here are some of the stories that have been repeated as gospel, and after each, to the best of my knowledge, is herewith the gospel truth.

Rumor: Not 1 but 2 doctors were called in during Mrs. Eisenhower's recent stay at her Gettysburg home.

Truth: A doctor is always in attendance where a President or First Lady is concerned. Maj. Gen. Howard M. Snyder, the White House physician, was up there checking on Mamie as she attempted to recover from a virus infection, and when he left, his assistant took over.

Rumor: The DAR's were furious because Mrs. Eisenhower said last year when she didn't receive them that she would receive the larger organizations every other year. But she didn't receive them this year, after all.

Truth: The DAR's didn't ask to be received this year, says Mamie's secretary, Mary Jane McCaffree, because they may have felt it would be an imposition to do so.

Rumor: Mrs. Eisenhower is refusing to receive all kinds of organizations that used to get the A–1 treatment at the White House.

Truth: Mamie says there are literally hundreds of women's groups that have never been inside the White House or received by any First Lady, and until each has had a chance she is not going to keep on duplicating. According to her staff no group is too small or insignificant to be invited to the White House, providing she can see them on the day requested. * * * She is no longer receiving 600 women daily, as her staff said she did her first year in the White House. Now she receives only on days not already filled with other functions, a state dinner, luncheon, tea, etc. She tries not to tax herself with 2 or 3 things in 1 day.

Rumor: When she gave her luncheon for Senate wives a fortnight ago, before they entertained her first (as has been the custom in years past), she probably had no intention of attending their luncheon this past Tuesday.

Truth: No such thought entered her mind, because her calendar is drawn up months ahead. She picked the earlier date simply because there was room for it on her engagement book.

Rumor: Mary Jane McCaffree is a slave driver who forces sweet, warm, agreeable Mrs. Eisenhower to accept more than she can possibly do.

Truth: This is the most absurd of all. It will even give Mamie and her secretary a good laugh. Mary Jane is a very efficient gal with a mind of her own, but Mrs. E. is one of the strongest-willed women they know, say her close friends. It's true that she's an agreeabe warm person, but nobody has ever said she was easy to handle and it would never occur to one of her employees to try it.

Rumor: By withdrawing from the Senate wives' luncheon and the Congressional Club brunch, Mamie was giving another indication that her husband wouldn't run again, said some early this past week. To disappoint these groups that reach back into the grass roots of every State was pretty good proof, they said. Especially since this was the first time in the 47-year history of the club that a First Lady had missed a party in her honor.

Truth: The doctor made the decision, not Mrs. Eisenhower, and the President's appearance at the brunch in her place completely discounted such talk. Better indication that Ike won't run again is his conversation at his stag dinner of 10 days ago. Only 16 were present and Ike spent much of the time pointing out to them that no President has ever lived to be 70—not in the White House. If Ike were reelected he would see his 70th birthday in the White House, if, that is, he were the only President in history to be so lucky. Why should he tempt fate when he has been serving his country, his wife points out to friends, ever since he was 21?

Rumor: Mrs. Eisenhower wastes most of every day playing her favorite card game, Bolivia.

Truth: To say this of any official wife in Washington, least of all the top one, indicates an appalling ignorance of the demands of officialdom. Here's how Mrs. Eisenhower spends an average day:

She breakfasts around 9 o'clock and afterward, between telephone calls that never cease, she discusses the business of running the White House with at least two people—the usher and the housekeeper. Every single thing connected with the house is brought up, whether it concerns a homey thing as the breaking down of the washing machine, or a difficulty with 1 of the 45 servants, or the planning of the meals, or fresh flowers for the Red, Green, and Blue Rooms. Her secretary then sees her and she's presented with the endless requests to appear, to receive, or to patronize.

By that time, it's noon and she gets dressed to: Receive a couple of hundred women; go out to an official 3-hour luncheon; lunch with a member of her family; or lunch alone when she may start tackling her mail. She signs between 100 and 200 letters every day and she has to have some idea what she's signing. Sometimes she can't even get to the mail until late in the day.

In the afternoon, if she is not receiving groups and posing for a picture, she might have a visit from a personal friend or more likely one from her sister, Mrs. Gordon Moore, who likes to bring her little granddaughter, "Peaches," whom they both adore. When her mother is staying at the White House, she spends a part of each day with her. She's lucky if she can find time to play Bolivia one afternoon a week. In fact, and this is meant to be gospel, she hasn't played it for weeks and weeks.

Everybody in this world is subject to some false speculation and unkind comment, but I'll bet there's a new unfounded rumor born every few minutes about the President of the United States and the First Lady, whoever they may be. Apply commonsense and remember it's two decent people you're hearing about and you can automatically dispose of most such talk.

Free People Everywhere Rejoice With Austria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Free People Everywhere Rejoice With Austria," which appeared in the May 20, 1955 issue of the Owensboro Messenger of Owensboro, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

FREE PEOPLE EVERYWHERE REJOICE WITH AUSTRIA

Free peoples everywhere can rejoice with Austria that at long last it has a peace treaty which will restore it to the fraternity of free nations.

Austria has been absent from this company too long. On March 11, 1938, Hitler's Nazi legions marched into Austrian territory, reducing the little country to a mere eastern province of Germany. Not once in the 17 years that followed was the nation free of foreign soldiers.

When the Allies crushed Hitler, their armies moved in and replaced Nazi control. There they have remained, in their respective zones, as West and East dickered fruitlessly through the years over peace terms.

Only a sudden change of heart by Russia, evidently dictated by new strategy for coping with increased western strength in Europe, finally made possible a successful settlement.

Under the treaty terms, all Russian and Allied occupation troops are slated to leave Austrian soil before 1955 is out.

Russia also agrees to restore to Austria oil and shipping properties they had taken

over as war reparations. The Kremlin first made this striking concession in a preliminary agreement signed with Austria in Moscow weeks ago. It balked at including it in the treaty, until the West made clear it would not sign otherwise.

That the Reds finally yielded on this point was the measure of their eagerness to conclude this treaty. Naturally enough, they did not give so much without believing they had made important offsetting gains.

As a price they demanded and got assurances of Austria's neutrality. The treaty cannot speak on this matter, but it is expected a separate pact will be prepared for this purpose.

But surely this is not what the Kremlin conceives to be its real victory at Vienna.

Moscow's prime goal in Europe is Germany. Though the Reds loudly said they would never discuss German unity if West Germany was taken into NATO, they already have offered new unity proposals. Germany's neutrality is a key aim. Austria is the model, the lure, the proof of good faith.

Russia failed to block West German entry into NATO, with all it can mean for western strength. Now the West is on test to show whether it can work for German unity without giving up what it worked so hard to gain. A neutral Germany would be a Germany ever in peril of Russian domination.

Whatever developments flow from the Kremlin's new strategy, we can accept with deep satisfaction its notable byproduct—the long-hoped-for treaty of freedom for Austria. A fabled land has found its own breath again, and that is no triumph for communism.

The Economics of the Upper Colorado Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the other body of the Congress has given its approval to S. 500, a bill to authorize the construction of the upper Colorado storage project. Hearings on this subject have been completed in the House Committee and it is my hope that before the session ends the program will be reported and passed by the House. To that end, and as a part of necessary general information, I should like to include in my remarks an economic evaluation of this program made by Dr. Morris E. Garnsey, a professor of economics at the University of Colorado.

I should like to say further that Dr. Garnsey is no stranger to resource economics. He has written for various publications in this field and in 1950 authored the book, America's New Frontier, the Mountain West, published by Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., of New York. In this book, he carefully analyzed the resources of the mountain West. The particular reason that I am calling attention to this statement of Dr. Garnsey is that it is addressed directly to the presentation made in the other body while S. 500 was under debate by the Honorable PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois. Mr. DOUGLAS is an economist of considerable merit himself but, as Dr. Garnsey indicates, this does not insure that his statement in the RECORD reflects a complete or final view.

The larger reason that I believe this article to be worth while, that is as more than a lesson in economic evaluation, is that it represents the research of a particular specialist, a resources specialist, in the complex field of economics. While we cannot be specialists in every field of legislation, we can derive great value from careful attention to the studies of applicable specialists. For those who wish to have the benefit of the studies of a competent economist regarding resource development, I highly recommend the following analysis by Dr. Garnsey on S. 500:

On April 18–19 Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, spoke on the floor of the Senate in opposition to the upper Colorado River storage project. Since Senator DOUGLAS is an eminent economist, as well as a distinguished Member of the Senate, his views on this project are particularly important to other economists. Accordingly, I have studied Senator DOUGLAS' speech carefully in order to understand as clearly as possible his reasons for the stand he has taken.

Senator DOUGLAS gave three economic arguments in opposition to the project: (1) Excessive irrigation costs, (2) excessive power costs, and (3) excessive capital investment in relation to the propsed reserve capacity of the reservoirs.

Senator DOUGLAS begins his argument against the project by calling attention to the magnitude of the investment proposed for irrigation and power development in the upper Colorado; and he states that the decision to make such an investment should be based on use of "the yardstick of the good of the Nation." He recognizes that a large investment in a particular region will have beneficial economic effects within that region by stimulating employment and income payments with the region, but he asserts that such regional benefits are not large enough to meet the test of the national interest. In so saying he ignores the fact that much of the economic impact on employment and income of an investment in any geographic place in the United States spreads rapidly and directly to other regions. In fact, studies of the economic characteristics of the construction industry have shown that although the effects on local wage payments and retail trade of a construction project are important in the first instance, the real and larger impact of the subsequent, successive rounds of investment and wage expenditures is spread throughout the national economy. While the building of a reservoir on the upper Colorado will, of course, stimulate retail trade and some types of local manufacturing in the immediate area, the major effects of the construction period will be felt in the areas where turbines and electrical equipment are manufactured, where blast furnaces produce structural steel, and where automobiles, machinery, textiles, shoes and clothing are produced. Senator DOUGLAS ignores these facts in order to describe the upper Colorado River project as a selfish, sectional boondoggle.

Senator DOUGLAS then suggests that since the investment in the upper Colorado will be in high-cost irrigation and power projects to be paid for by taxes collected generally across the United States, greater economic returns could be realized if this money were used instead for other consumption and investment expenditures elsewhere in the United States. Here again the economic analysis of Senator DOUGLAS is incomplete. He assumes that if the money were not spent on the Colorado, it inevitably will be spent elsewhere, and that it will be directed automatically to desirable investment projects elsewhere. These are unwarranted assumptions. Money not spent on the Colorado may not be spent at all for consumer goods; and if it is saved, it may or may not be invested. Or if invested, it may or may not be invested in profitable or desirable ways. Given the complex nature of our economy, it is unwarranted to assume that unknown alternatives to the Colorado project will automatically contribute to the national welfare. The project cannot be discredited by simply assuming that all other investment is in itself more desirable.

Senator DOUGLAS does make specific comparison of alternative costs and returns from investment on the Colorado and elsewhere. He cites the high costs per acre of irrigating new land in the upper Colorado, and asserts that other land in other areas could be reclaimed much more cheaply. However, he does not extend his analysis of either type of land beyond this simple first step. He gives us no clue as to the processes by which this other land in other areas is to be reclaimed. Is it by the independent action of individual farmers? By Government agencies? When will it be done? What will be the indirect costs? What social and legal obstacles must be overcome in order to reclaim such land? At what costs?

In the case of the irrigated land in the Colorado Basin, the Senator does make some effort to compare costs and benefits. He deplores the fact that much of this land is best adapted to alfalfa and irrigated pasture for feeding livestock; and he compares the returns per acre on such land with returns on the fertile corn and wheat lands of Illinois, in order to conclude that forage and pasture land in the upper Colorado should not be brought under irrigation.

It is, of course, correct that an acre of fertile land planted to cereals will yield more food for human beings than an acre which supports meat animals destined for human food. In this sense the cereal land is economically superior. However, if only this factor is given any weight, it follows that the American people should give up red meat as a part of their diet and adapt a cereal diet comparable to that of the cereal-eating countries of Asia.

It is difficult to believe that the Senator means for us to become a Nation of cereal eaters. Surely he would agree that there is room in the American economy for a meat-producing area based on an integrated agricultural economy of irrigated pasture and open range. In such a livestock economy in the semiarid West the irrigated lands not only provide concentrated feeds for fattening and finishing, but also the production of such feeds reduces the pressure on the rangeland toward overgrazing and destruction of the soil cover. No one would pretend that a western acre of grazing land or irrigated forage cropland can compare in cost-yield ratio with the lands of the Middle West. Nevertheless, most of the western agricultural lands are not submarginal when costs of production are related to direct and indirect benefits to be obtained from their use. A single-step, simple analysis such as appears in the Senator's speech is not a sufficient basis for the determination of the economic feasibility of an investment in new irrigated lands in the West.

Given the complex character of the modern industrial economy of the United States, no one can safely depend upon a simple, short-run analysis of its behavior. Most of our business enterprises today make investment decisions in terms of long-run forecasts of ultimate profitability rather than in terms of immediate short-run profits. The Government of the United States must make its decisions concerning the future development of our resources on an even longer run basis; and it must also give weight to considerations of general welfare and national security

which go beyond the cost-profit responsibilities of private business.

The West is a part of the United States and its problems must be dealt with nationally. A generation ago when the Panama Canal was being built at the then tremendous cost of $40 million, some economists, concerned with transportation costs in this great continental republic, suggested that it was regrettable that all of the United States between the Great Plains and the Sierras could not be snipped out and thrown away in order to reduce the long, expensive haul between the Pacific Coast and the Middle West. The people of the West are themselves addicted to the humor of exaggeration and they were able to see the joke. But they just went ahead producing copper, oil, uranium and tungsten, and sheep and cattle and dude ranches to the immeasurable enrichment of this Nation. True, they were short of water, and after 1902 they worked on this problem with the help of the Federal Government. True, they developed the best sites for irrigation first and left the bigger, more expensive projects until they were needed. But it is no less true that water is still a primary need not only in the West, but throughout the United States. Water is needed in the West not only to develop more land but to conserve what we already have. It is needed on the land not only to grow crops but also to protect the soil against erosion. It is needed to provide more power for factory, farm, and home; and it is needed for domestic consumption by a growing population. We can't snip out the semiarid West and throw it away to solve its problems. But what we can do is to make the most of its valuable resources and in doing so, to help raise the value of its less profitable resources to an economic level. This is the long-run, overall point of view which looks at the resources problems of the region and the Nation as a complex and interrelated network of problems, necessarily analyzed and dealt with as a complete whole, and not as a piecework of unrelated parts.

Senator DOUGLAS' second argument concerns hydroelectric power. He cites the generating costs of power at such great Federal projects as Bonneville and the Tennessee Valley Authority, where present generating costs range from 0.6 mill to 1.1 mills per kilowatt-hour, and compares such costs with estimates of 4.2–4.7 mills at Glenn Canyon and 6 mills elsewhere on the upper Colorado. He then concludes that the upper Colorado projects are high-cost projects and that, therefore, they should not be built. He states further that in all probability alternative methods of generating power by coal-steam processes would be cheaper than 5–6 mills in the upper Colorado Basin because of the coal deposits there. He concludes that the Federal Government might well undertake new power projects on the Columbia and the Niagara, but not on the Colorado.

Senator DOUGLAS' figures on hydropower costs in the upper Colorado Basin are accurate enough, but his estimates of costs of other types of power in the area are unrealistic. Power can be generated at Glenn Canyon and delivered to load centers such as Salt Lake City, Denver, and Albuquerque, at about 5 mills per kilowatt-hour. The average cost for the total power system is 6 mills. This price includes the power subsidy to irrigation contemplated in S. 500 as passed by the Senate, based on a 50-year amortization period. If power factors alone were used in the cost computation, the system's power could be sold at the load centers for 5⅓ mills on 50-year pay-out program.

Alternative costs are much higher. The costs of coal-steam generation computed on the same basis as the hydropower works out at 7.3 mills according to Bureau of Reclamation data. The costs of generation of power by privately owned utilities in the region are higher still. Based on data from the new and highly efficient Gadsby plant of the Utah Power Co., and including estimates of transmission costs to the load centers of the region, the public utilities of the region are experiencing costs of 8 to 11 mills per kilowatt-hour. It is understandable, therefore, that the major utility companies in the region have expressed a willingness to purchase power from the upper Colorado project at 6 mills. (See hearings on S. 500.) In the light of these data Senator DOUGLAS' suggestion that it might cost a little more than 3 mills to generate power from coal in the upper Colorado must be regarded as highly unrealistic.

We may, of course, agree with Senator DOUGLAS that 6-mill power is high-cost power when compared with 0.6 or 1.1 mills power in other parts of the United States. But this is no argument against the upper Colorado project. The upper Colorado Basin needs power and it will need more power as time goes by. It cannot buy cheap power from the Columbia or the Niagara. It must generate its own power as cheaply as possible within its own region. The region's best chance for low-cost power accessible to the region is the hydropower of the upper Colorado project.

In his third argument Senator DOUGLAS expresses concern that the capital outlays required to construct the reservoirs in the upper Colorado project will never be fully utilized, because the reservoirs will not be filled. He bases this view on a comparison of the proposed capacity of the reservoirs with the annual average flow of the river during the last 10 years. However, neither Senator DOUGLAS nor the persons testifying before the Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation seem to have made use of some recent and valuable information relative to the subject of streamflow on the Colorado. Recent advances in the sciences of meteorology and astronomy have given rise to new views concerning the relation of disturbances on the sun to the weather on this planet. These new views are reported in Fortune magazine for August 1954. The relevant data can be stated briefly as follows:

1. For the United States as a whole, East as well as West, the weather during the next 60 years probably will be characterized by lower temperatures and higher rainfall than during the past 60 years.

2. For the Western States, there is a scientifically valid probability that rainfall during the period 1965 to 1975, when the reservoirs will be in full operation, will be appreciably heavier than during the last 10 years.

3. Concerning the Colorado River specifically, the flow of the river during the last 10 years (except 1952) has been generally subnormal compared with the last 60 years, and there is every likelihood that the flow in the years ahead will be adequate to fill the reservoirs proposed for the upper Colorado River project.

In concluding this statement, I would like to make it clear that I have the greatest respect for Senator DOUGLAS as an economist and as a statesman—a respect in no way diminished by my disagreement with the effectiveness of his arguments against the upper Colorado project. My own support of the project, moreover, is derived from a positive analysis of the economic feasibility of the project. I have been engaged in a continuing economic analysis of the regional economy of the West for the last 15 years, and I am familiar with many of its problems and potentialities.

There are many valuable resources in the upper Colorado River Basin as yet underdeveloped.[1] There are also great human resources in the form of a growing population and labor force, which must be utilized by means of constructive opportunities for employment. By 1980 the population of Colorado will have reached 2.2 million—an increase of 860,000 or 64 percent, in 30 years. During this same period Colorado's labor force is expected to rise by 403,000—an increase of 68 percent. Job opportunities for these 403,000 persons must be developed somewhere and the logical place to begin is with the development of the unutilized resources of the State and region.[2]

One such resource is the oil shale of upper Colorado. There is a strong possibility that the next 30 years will witness the establishment of a large-scale shale oil industry along the main stem of the Colorado River between Glenwood Springs and Grand Junction, Colo. A full-scale retorting and refining industry in this area would supply a substantial part of the Nation's needs for petroleum, and would create a population increase of some 500,000 persons in the immediate area. The industrial and domestic water and power requirement of such a population cannot be met without the reservoirs and generating plants envisaged in the upper Colorado River project. It would be most fortunate if such power were forthcoming at 1 mill per kilowatt; but even at 6 mills the power would be economical and competitive with alternative sources. In addition, it would be possible at this stage of development of the region to utilize gas from shale oil to produce steam power in the area. Such power would offer an admirable, low-cost complement to the hydropower of the project.

Our country is entering a new stage in its economic history. A rapidly growing population and a rising standard of living with high-level employment give rise to many problems of resources utilization far different from those of the last 50 years. Resources are becoming less abundant in relation to needs. They are also becoming of lower-grade and higher cost. Resources problems are dynamic, complex, and inter-related. The economic value of resources is relative to the place, time, and technological and cultural setting which determine their use. Under these circumstances it is becoming more and more necessary to analyze resources on a regional basis, by studying the resources of a region and the best ways to utilize them within the framework of the national economy and the national welfare.

When looked at from this point of view specific resources problems appear in a new light. The upper Colorado River project must be conceived as a multiple-purpose project for long-term regional development. Analysis of the project shows that the utilization of the resources of this largely undeveloped region is in the national interest, and that the time has come to begin that development in order that the upper Colorado region may begin now to make an increasing contribution to the national welfare during the next half-century and beyond. This is not a conclusion reached from a narrow, selfish sectional point of view, but a conclusion reached through analysis of this western region as but one part of a national economy. The purpose of regional resources development is national development and national well-being. So conceived and so analyzed the upper Colorado project can meet the test prescribed by Senator DOUGLAS. It measures up to the yardstick of the good of the Nation.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] See Garnsey, America's New Frontier, the Mountain West, Alfred A. Knopf, 1950.

[2] See Garnsey, Morris, and Pelze, R. E., A Projection of the Population to Colorado to 1980, to be published by the University of Colorado on May 30, 1955. These estimates are the result of a population projection using the cohort-survival method.

Agriculture Department Takes Role of Apologist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Labor's Daily of May 19, 1955:

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT TAKES ROLE OF APOLOGIST

(By Sidney Margolius)

Both the United States Agriculture Department and the food processing industry are sending out an increasing amount of publicity claiming that retail food prices remain high while farm prices have sunk because more foods are now semiprepared and ready-to-cook, and labor costs have increased marketing expenses.

In fact, the Agriculture Department—in a departure from its assigned and traditional role of helping farmers and consumers—has become a leading apologist for the increased spread between farm and retail prices. This Government agency recently has sent out a number of publicity releases indicating that processed foods and labor costs are responsible for stubbornly high food costs, and has just published two "information booklets" along these lines. One, addressed to wage-earners, is called "More and Better Foods From Today's Pay Check." It shows how an hour's take-home pay now buys more bread, meat, etc., than 30 years ago. It also points out that then, most foods had to be prepared at home, but now you can buy all kinds of ready-to-serve and prepared foods, and that while "the extra services cost money * * * they save time for the housewife."

CONVENIENCE FOOD PRODUCTS

The Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., association of food processors, has also sent out releases attempting to show that convenience food products have taken much of the work out of the home kitchen. But the manufacturers came up with a different conclusion than the Agriculture Department. They said the processed foods are cheaper. They point out that in baby foods, a jar of strained green beans costs 10 cents, while the quantity of fresh beans needed to prepare the same serving costs nearly 3 cents more; that a can of frozen orange juice concentrate costs less than 20 cents and equals the juice of nine to a dozen medium oranges at a cost of 40 cents a dozen; that the ingredients of a typical devil's food cake costs 56 cents, but a ready mix, plus 2 eggs, costs 45 cents.

Actually, neither the Agriculture Department nor the manufacturers are quite accurate in the conclusions they are passing out via newspaper stories, columnists, and State food-processing services. It will pay you to know the facts, not only for the sake of accurate information on why food costs remain high, but so you can know how to save your own money in buying and preparing foods.

REASON FOR PUBLICITY

The reason for the publicity barrages attributing high market costs to labor costs is that farmers are getting less now for food crops, but the public is paying close to peak levels. The Dun & Bradstreet wholesale food price index is now 13.6 percent lower than a year ago. But retail food prices, as measured by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, have come down only 1½ percent since last year. In 1946, the farmer got 52 cents of every buck you spent for food, and 48 cents went for processing, marketing, and transportation to bring it from farm to retail counter. By 1954, the farmer was getting 44 cents of your food dollar, and 56 cents was going to distribution.

The Agriculture Department apologizes for the increasing spread by saying in its new booklets that middlemen's profits are only a small proportion of the widening margin between farm and retail prices and the most important single cost is labor. It points out that the number of workers engaged in food marketing increased 53 percent in those 30 years, so the proportion of workers engaged in food marketing is the same as before, if not lower. Secondly, as Meyer Sherman, of United Packinghouse Workers, has pointed out, the new packaging methods often actually lower costs by making savings in labor and shipping costs instead of increasing them. Retail clerks' unions, for example, are facing a growing unemployment threat to produce clerks because of the increase in prepackaged frozen and fresh produce.

THE REAL REASON

You can find the real manufacturers are processing and prepackaging more foods in a recent announcement by Armour & Co., meat packer, that it is pushing sales of packaged products because wider profit margins are possible on these products than on bulk goods. Fifteen years ago, about 75 percent of Armour's bacon was sold in slabs which the butcher sliced. Today over 75 percent is sold in half-pound and one-pound packages carrying the Armour brand name.

Britain Must Choose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Britain Must Choose," which appeared in the May 20, 1955, issue of the Park City Daily News, of Bowling Green, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

BRITAIN MUST CHOOSE

In a few days British voters will go to the polls to choose their Government for the next 5 years. Recent reports suggest that the outcome may be closer than was thought likely at the start.

The practiced observers believe the ruling Conservatives will win. But they feel that the margin of triumph over the rival Labor Party will be fairly slim, about like the winning edge in October 1951.

When it first became apparent that a spring election might be called, forecasters spoke freely of an easy Conservative victory. Their reasons were the Conservatives' success in lifting Britain to record levels of prosperity and the Labor Party's deep internal split.

Those things have not changed materially. The latest opinion polls, however, have indicated a very close popular division between the two parties. It will be recalled that in 1951, though the Conservatives gained a House of Commons majority, their total vote was less than Labor's.

Add to this the fact that this is the first time in many years that the Conservatives have gone to the electorate without Sir Winston Churchill as their leader. Prime Minister Eden is well liked, but he has never caught the public imagination as did his illustrious predecessor.

Furthermore, as such expert analyzers of the British mood as Barbara Ward point out, Britons are not necessarily disposed to vote Conservative simply to express gratitude for prosperity. Their deeper concern today is the avoidance of war.

Sensing this, Sir Anthony has gone out of his way to assure the nation he is as willing as his Labor opponents to sit down with Russian leaders in any conference that might hold genuine hopes for peace.

The ruling party presents no ready targets. It has steered clear of stand-pattism, has offered forward looking welfare plans, and has fostered growth in the country's economy. Its platform calls for more of the same.

On the other hand, no patches can conceal Labor's split. Leftwing Leader Aneurin Bevan is basically as irresponsible and unmanageable as ever. Voters must wonder how a party can govern the country when it cannot govern itself.

Labor's program is a faded copy of the now outworn Socialist doctrines. Leaders groping for new policy lines have not found them.

The party's one real hope is that it might make hay by playing on the average Britisher's abiding fear of war and specially of the hydrogen bomb. Its platform stressed these issues. And here Bevan's ranting anti-Americanism could make impact.

But if the Labor Party did win, it would suggest to outsiders that Britons had let their emotions rule. For Labor has no real foreign policy alternatives, either.

It is the Conservatives who have the ideas and the energy in 1955. On May 26 the world will see whether this is what the British electorate wants.

Labor Ignores a Good Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an editorial from the New Brunswick (N. J.) Home News of May 20, 1955, entitled "Labor Ignores a Good Friend":

LABOR IGNORES A GOOD FRIEND

The two major labor organizations, the AFL and CIO, have displayed a consistent hostility toward the Eisenhower administration since it took over.

It's a free country, of course. But, as a practical matter, it's hard to see how labor's cause can be steadily advanced if it be assumed that only one party feels any responsibility toward the needs of the workingman. The Democrats held power 20 years. Suppose the Republicans should do likewise? That's a long time to keep oneself on the outside looking in.

Labor's attitude has a special irony right now because most union leaders well understand that the present Secretary of Labor, James Mitchell, is one of the ablest and fairest persons ever to occupy the post.

Mitchell has arrayed himself on the side of reasonable change in labor laws which may be unfairly restrictive of labor's rights. He has acted to modernize his Department. His 1954 annual report, written in simple, human, often narrative style, was a refreshing breeze through the jungle of officialese. His public appearances stamp him as one of Mr. Eisenhower's top men.

Yet labor acts and talks as if he did not exist.

Pertinent Questions on Salk Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the hearings which will begin on Wednesday, May 25 before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, are scheduled to deal primarily with two specific bills, namely, H. R. 6286, the administration's $28 million poliomyelitis immunization assistance bill, and H. R. 6207, a bill designed to give authority to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through an amendment of the biologics control law, to supervise and control, in the interest of protecting and preserving the health of the American people, the distribution and use of biological products.

I have introduced both of these bills. A companion bill to H. R. 6286, the administration's immunization assistance bill, has also been introduced by Congressman CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, Republican, of New Jersey, ranking minority member of this committee, being H. R. 6287.

On the surface, it might seem as if the subjects covered by H. R. 6286 and H. R. 6207 are related to each other only in an incidental way. A closer study of the bills, however, will make it apparent that the relationship between the two is rather close and direct.

The purpose of this statement is to point up the way in which the subjects covered by these two bills are related to each other and generally to give a proper focus and perspective to these hearings.

The hearings on H. R. 6207 and H. R. 6286 are the first ones to be held by this committee since the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, on April 12, licensed six manufacturers to produce the Salk vaccine. This action was taken by the Secretary under the biologics control law which may be found in section 351 of the Public Health Service Act.

The events which has occurred between April 12 and the present day are too well-known to be repeated in any detail. A summary of these events is contained in the Secretary's report to the President and that summary will probably be brought up to date by one of the witnesses speaking for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Being the first hearing on a subject on which many, and perhaps too many, statements have been made which have been interpreted by some people as having a partisan slant, I want to state categorically that this committee never has and I hope never will approach any public health problem in a partisan spirit. Rather, this committee will seek to approach the problems created by the attempt to secure rapid mass application of the new Salk vaccine in such a way that prompt action may be taken on bills dealing with some of the immediate problems. On the other hand, this committee would feel derelict in its duties if it failed to give at the same time close attention to the long-range implications of the Salk situation.

The second point I wish to make is that this committee's interest in and concern with the Salk vaccine situation is not a recent and belated one.

Several weeks before the licensing of the vaccine by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I contacted Dr. Scheele and Dr. Keefer with respect to any plans which the Department might have to provide for allocating the scarce vaccine so that the vaccine would go to those classes of persons where it would do the most good. Also, the question of making the vaccine available to all children regardless of their parents' ability to pay, was discussed. At that time, I was advised by Dr. Scheele and Dr. Keefer that no legislative action was required.

Two days following the licensing of the vaccine, on April 14, 1955, I addressed a letter to Hon. Oveto Culp Hobby, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which summarizes, briefly, the views expressed by Dr. Scheele and Dr. Keefer at that time. The letter also requested the Secretary to review the situation and to advise the committee whether the Department might feel the need for additional legislation granting the Department power to allocate the vaccine.

The bill on which the administration now has requested action is designed to authorize an appropriation of $28 million to assist the States is providing, for a limited period, Salk vaccine immunizations to children of parents who may not be able to pay for the cost of the vaccine. In connection with this bill, the administration has proposed a voluntary system of allocations and priorities to assure that the Salk vaccine, during the initial scarcity period, will be distributed fairly among the several States and will go to the children in those age groups which are most susceptible to the disease. The administration has not sought any additional powers to police this system.

A great deal has been said already by spokesmen for the administration, interested groups, organizations, and Members of Congress, with regard to the adequacy of a voluntary plan. Many bills have been introduced in Congress to give additional powers to the President for a limited period of time to deal with specific allocation and priority problems arising from the present scarcity of the Salk vaccine.

I have introduced H. R. 6207 for the purpose of raising the question whether permanent legislation is needed granting powers to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare through an amendment of the biologics control law to control, through regulations, in the interest of public health, the distribution and use of biological products.

I have particularly in mind that these additional powers may be needed in all instances where as, in the case of the Salk vaccine, rapid mass applications are attempted of new biological products.

In this connection, I further desire to raise a question whether there is continued justification for differentiation in responsibilities of the Federal Government with regard to: first, new biological products; two, new drugs; and, three, insulin and certain specified antibiotics.

I want to call to the attention of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, the State and local governments, the voluntary agencies, the pharmaceutical trade, and the medical and pharmaceutical professions, and last, but not least, the American public generally, the new problems created by the rapid mass application of new wonder drugs as exemplified by recent experiences with the Salk vaccine. Therefore, I have directed the committee staff to prepare a series of questions which will focus attention on some of the problems created by the new phenomenon of rapid mass application of new drugs.

The answers to these questions cannot and will not be forthcoming during the few days of hearings that this committee can hold on the two bills now before it. However, the answers to these questions should be found at a reasonably early date.

The best way, in my view, to secure reasonable answers, including necessary additional Federal legislation, is to conduct an intelligent discussion of these questions. In order to promote an early start of this discussion, I am making the questions public at this time in advance of the hearings in the hope that all interested groups and individuals will give their careful attention to these questions.

In closing, I want to emphasize again that in spite of the broad scope of the committee's inquiry, there will under no circumstances be any delay in taking up H. R. 6286, which contains the administration's proposed authorization of $28 million to assist the States in providing immunization aganst polomyelitis for children whose parents are unable to pay the cost of vaccination.

BACKGROUND PROBLEMS RELATING TO H. R. 6207 AND H. R. 6286

A. Responsibilities of Federal Government under present law:

First. Under present law, what are the responsibilities of the Federal Government with respect to new drugs as to (a) production and safety; (b) distribution; and (c) application and use?

Second. Under present law, what are the responsibilities of the Federal Government with respect to new biological products, as to (a) production and safety; (b) distribution; and (c) application and use?

Third. Under present law, what are the responsibilities of the Federal Government with respect to certain new drugs, including insulin, and several specifically enumerated antibiotics, as to (a) production and safety; (b) distribution; and (c) application and use?

Fourth. What accounts for the difference in responsibilities?

Fifth. Is the difference in responsibilities justified?

B. Rapid mass application versus gradual individual application:

Sixth. Are there any public policy considerations which distinguish rapid mass application of new drugs from gradual individual application with re-

gard to (a) production and safety; (b) distribution; and (c) application and use?

Seventh. Do these considerations differ according to whether such drugs are primarily preventive or curative?

C. Respective responsibilities:

Eighth. What are the respective responsibilities—legal and other—in connection with rapid mass applications of new drugs—(a) preventive, or (b) curative of—

(A) Governmental agencies—Federal, State, and local;

(B) Voluntary agencies;

(C) Manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, and pharmacists;

(D) Medical profession—individually and collectively; and

(E) Others?

Ninth. Are these respective responsibilities the same in the case of rapid mass application and in the case of gradual individual application of new drugs?

Tenth. Are present Federal laws adequate for the discharge of Federal responsibilities in connection with rapid mass application and gradual individual application of new drugs—preventive or curative—with regard to (a) production and safety; (b) distribution; and (c) application and use?

The President's First Show of Firmness Denies Justice to Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include the following editorial from the Madison (Wis.) Capitol Times of May 20, 1955:

It is going to see strange to the Nation as a whole, and particularly to the postal workers, that President Eisenhower, who has been so vacillating on other issues, should show such single-minded purpose in his opposition to a modest increase in the postal workers' pay.

From the beginning he has taken a firm position against the 8.6 percent salary increase which Congress passed so overwhelmingly and which he has now vetoed. This determination is indeed a change from the Eisenhower who has swung from "massive retaliation" to "agonizing reappraisal" to "peaceful coexistence" and a dozen other conflicting slogans in the conduct of our foreign policy. It is a change from the administration that won't take responsibility for the chaotic execution of the security program, that swings from dynamic conservatism to progressive moderation with the greatest of ease, and that does all the other things so baffling to our own citizens and our friends abroad.

Here is an administration that shrinks from its responsibility to develop a program for the quitable distribution of polio vaccine; an administration that is too timid to accord men like Edward Corsi and Wolf Ladejinsky the elementary decency of fair treatment.

But it can stand like Gibraltar in its determination to deny the postal workers a meager measure of justice.

It is significant that President Eisenhower should discover the power of the veto on this now. He apparently didn't know that it was available to him when he signed the tidelands oil giveaway and turned over billions in the public domain to the fat and greedy oil interests. Nor did he when he signed the rich man's tax bill and the other giveaways.

He thought it quite fair that Congress should vote to raise its own wages by 50 percent. And he no doubt agrees with the measure currently before Congress to provide ex-Presidents with a $25,000 a year pension and a staff of Government-paid workers.

The President's unwavering hostility to a decent wage increase for the postal workers is a long way from the warm friendship and sympathy he expressed for them when he spoke to one of their conventions in 1952 when he was looking for votes.

But, then, it should be remembered that the President was lavish with his promises to the farmers, too, in 1952. He promised price supports at 90 percent of parity and the promise was almost immediately repudiated in the Benson flexible price-support program. The House of Representatives has voted to restore the 90-percent level and the Senate will soon act on it. But the word around Washington is that the President is going to be a strong man again and will veto it if Congress passes it despite the fact that his promise was clear and unequivocal in 1952. The trouble with the postal workers and farmers is that they aren't in the oil business.

The simple and most fundamental principles of justice demand the overriding of this veto from the hand of a President who has signed some of the most outrageous giveaway legislation in recent history.

In This Atomic Age National Defense Requires Conservation of Scientific Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, we are all vitally interested in building and maintaining a strong national defense which will afford the United States the defensive strength to meet any conceivable emergency and, in the event of attack, to defend and repel the invader.

Such a program must, to be effective, embrace within its structure all the elements necessary for such defense. And there must be no weak link in the chain of our defensive strength if it is to stand the test should this ever be necessary.

We now have plans under consideration to bring our manpower to a maximum strength for defense purposes, and there is no doubt that a satisfactory plan to utilize the manpower strength of the Nation will become effective.

We also appropriate huge sums for all branches of our armed services to keep the weapons of war in constant readiness and to replace obsolete equipment.

However, a review of our existing defense policy brings to light one phase which could be that dangerous weak link in our overall national defense policy. This is the present lack of an effective policy to recognize the importance of a maximum effort in the field of scientific research and development, and the fullest possible utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources.

When we realize the full extent to which we must depend upon our scientists and technological experts, not only to develop and operate atomic weapons of war, but equally important, to provide the antidote to neutralize the effectiveness of such weapons in enemy hands so that we may be assured of national survival in the event of conflict; then we can begin to fully appreciate the paramount importance of utilizing the talents and abilities of Americans already trained in these fields as well as our young men and women who exhibit outstanding ability in scientific research and technological development.

The American Chemical Society has made an exhaustive study of this problem as related to a sound long-range plan for defense and the needs for development and production of items which make our manpower a stronger combative force. As a result of this study, the Society has issued a statement of policy which contains recommendations to be considered in any proposed manpower program.

These recommendations are worthy of the thoughtful appraisal of all Members of Congress, and I am inserting them herewith for consideration:

When Congress passed legislation to provide for the military strength of our country it declared that "in a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the Armed Forces and the Reserve components thereof should be shared generally, in accordance with a system of selection which is fair and just and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy" (sec. 1 (c) of Public Law 51, 82d Cong.).

The obligation and privilege of serving one's country in time of need has appealed to the patriotism of millions, yes, billions of people in literally hundreds of different countries. The United States has no monopoly on this feature. It is in the desire to assure a fair and just system of selection that the United States differs sharply from many other nations, and it is particularly important, in the interests of freedom and democracy, that every effort to provide such a system be made. Congress realized this when in the same law (sec. 1 (e)) it declared that "adequate provision for national security requires maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development, and the fullest possible utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources."

These statements were incorporated into Public Law 51 on June 19, 1951, when the United States was playing a leading role in the Korean action. Since then there has been a gradual change in the world situation and in the part played by the United States. The so-called cold war which followed has developed into what more accurately may be called a technological war. Recent authentic information from Russia indicates that her leaders fear our technological superiority more than anything else. In view of the Russians' greater numerical strength, technological superiority offers the best hope of assuring our national security. It is logical that the degree to which national security can be assured is in direct proportion to our margin of superiority.

While the Soviet Union is conscious of the role of technology as the basis for both military and economic power, it is also conscious of its accomplishments in this area, accomplishments that have eliminated our superiority in certain fields, and left the margin uncomfortably narrow in others.

This being true, it is even more certain now than in 1951 "that adequate provision for national security requires maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development, and the fullest possible utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources."

Therefore, in the interest of immediate as well as long-range needs of our Nation, it is the opinion of the board of directors of the American Chemical Society that every step should be taken:

1. To assure maximum and uninterrupted growth of scientific and technological developments by promoting a strong educational system at all levels which will produce an adequate flow of specialized personnel of outstanding qualifications.

2. To assure optimum utilization of specialized personnel through a system whereby both military and civilian needs will be fulfilled. This objective will require expert civilian and military judgment to determine where each person can contribute most to the national interest.

These broad objectives are not being met today. Because they are not being met, it is the opinion of the board of directors of the American Chemical Society that those in Government having responsibility for the administration of the manpower program should seek:

1. Modification of Public Law 51 (Universal Military Training and Service Act) and its administration, including a change in title, in order to guarantee the selectivity features of the law.

2. Legislation to establish a National Manpower Board in the Office of the President composed of both civilian and military personnel whose duty it shall be to determine policy and implement the administration of matters relating to specialized personnel. This legislation shall also provide for proper organization at State and local levels to ensure adequate recognition of individual abilities and local situations which provide realistic proper utilization of each reservist.

3. Legislation to provide an immediately callable reserve, under the control of the military, of such a size that it can be well organized, highly trained, and quickly mobilized to provide an effective striking force in the event of aggression, and also

4. Legislation to provide a selectively callable reserve, whose members shall not be recalled to the military except on a selection basis under the direction of the National Manpower Board.

A Proof That Silence Can Be Golden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this time a very pertinent editorial on the rewards of silence, which appeared in the April 27 issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, and I particularly recommend it to the reading of my colleagues in sincere concern for our common health, welfare, and wisdom.

The article follows:

THE REWARDS OF SILENCE

There is something fascinating in the story of the Reverend Dr. Frederick M. Meek of Old South Church, Boston. It reveals the virtues of silence in a unique way.

Six months ago Dr. Meek came down with an unusual throat ailment that caused him to lose his voice completely. He could not even whisper. For a minister, it would seem to be a tragedy.

But Dr. Meek did not find it so. Cured at last, he broke silence Sunday in a sermon. He said that his affliction had been a great blessing. It had knit his family closer together. It had freed him from bondage to the telephone and to the other thousand and one petty demands of life.

"Nearly 6 months lived as a layman," he observed, "master of my own time, reading the Gospels solely for their own sake, with time to watch other lives and my own, have combined to rub off a layer of professional veneer which accumulates almost inevitably."

Somehow this strikes a responsive chord. How many of us, wearied of the sameness of our routine, fagged out, and drained of inspiration by the gnawing, endless, impatient little demands of life, would not welcome a period of silence and reflection? How refreshing, how soul-renewing it would be to have the time to browse, reflect, and contemplate, with no sense of urgency goading us on. How delightful it would be to be relieved of the necessity for answering every word directed our way, every banal observation, every challenge to opinion. How wonderful merely to listen.

"Master of my own time." That is the way Dr. Meek put it. How many of us, caught up in the hurly-burly of our days, can make that claim? There is no question about it: Dr. Meek found a blessing in misfortune.

The Amazing George Stringfellow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I once referred to George E. Stringfellow as a man who had dedicated himself to the good of his fellowman. I made this statement because I knew firsthand of his unrelenting crusade against cancer. From others I learned of his many other activities—all humanitarian. I can understand why Mr. Stringfellow is so well respected and admired by many. I am pleased, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Trentonian on May 16, 1955, entitled "The Amazing George Stringfellow":

THE AMAZING GEORGE STRINGFELLOW

One of the most amazing men I have ever known is George E. Stringfellow, who lives in West Orange, N. J., but is usually to be found almost anywhere else, including Trenton, where he spends a lot of time.

One of the most amazing things about this man is the fact that he doesn't appear to be amazing at all. In fact, you might even say that he gives the impression of being shy and retiring, even though he is not shy and retiring at all.

Mr. Stringfellow earns a living as the executive vice president of the Edison storage battery and the Edison voicewriter divisions of the Thomas A. Edison Laboratories in West Orange. But this is only the beginning of his activities.

His offices are spacious, the most spacious I have ever seen. Adjoining his office is a private kitchen where lunches are prepared for him and his guests. And adjoining that is his private gymnasium, where he also has installed complete equipment for a Turkish bath and massage.

But this isn't really important, because he spends comparatively little time in these most comfortable of offices, and yet these two divisions of the Edison Laboratories are moneymakers. Mr. Stringfellow has an answer.

SECRET OF AN ADMINISTRATOR'S SUCCESS

"It isn't necessary for me to spend time here. I have an organization," he said.

Perhaps that is the secret of his success. In fact, he explains it this way:

"Success as an administrator depends on four things. First is a plan. Second is an organization. Third is delegation of authority, and fourth is supervision. Failure of any of these four steps will mean failure for the rest."

Thus, having accomplished these four steps in his business operation, George E. Stringfellow has sufficient time to do the myriad other tasks which he has accepted.

Among other things, he has been the president of the New York Kiwanis Club. Until recently, he was a member of and chairman of the board of the New Jersey Soldiers Home.

At the present time, he is president of the New Jersey Taxpayers' Association, and works at this job with indefatigable energy.

But his chief interest is in the Ancient Arabic Order, Nobles of the Mystic Shrine. He is a member of Crescent Temple in Trenton, but that is only the beginning.

For the past 10 years he has been working in the Imperial or National Shrine, and at the present time is the imperial high priest and prophet, which means he is fourth in line. Barring unforeseen circumstances, he will be the assistant rabban next year. The following year he will become chief rabban, and the next year after that he will become the imperial potentate, which means that he will have final and dictatorial authority over some 900,000 members.

SERVES TWO COLLEGES

In addition to all of this, he is also a member of the board of trustees of Ithaca College, and is the vice chairman of the board of Indiana Technical College.

To give you some idea of his activities, here is a recent schedule. Monday: In his office, including conferences with his staff and with union representatives. Tuesday: All day Shrine meeting in Brooklyn. Wednesday: Taxpayers' Association meeting in Newark. Thursday: Masonic meeting in Bloomsburg, Pa. Friday: Fly to Charleston, W. Va., for Shrine meeting. Saturday: Fly to Columbus, Ohio, for Shrine meeting. Sunday: Fly home. Monday: Office. Tuesday: Meeting of Shrine Crippled Children's Hospital Committee in Philadelphia. Wednesday: Shrine meeting in Richmond, Va. Thursday: Fly to Spokane, Wash., for Shrine. Friday: Address Rotary Club in Seattle, and Shrine meeting at night. Saturday: Portland, Oreg. Sunday: San Francisco, and so forth.

This goes on all of the time. And through it all, he maintains a calm, unperturbed attitude toward life in general. He maintains a soft Virginia drawl from his youth, dislikes talking about himself, is a devoted husband to his Carrie, and believes friends are his most important asset—and he has thousands of them, knows them all and calls them by name.

Quite a guy, eh?

Mary McLeod Bethune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday night, after 79 years of incredibly rich and productive life, Mary McLeod Bethune died at her home in Daytona Beach, Fla. Hers was, indeed, a rare spirit, marked by true greatness of soul, of wisdom, and of heart. Her death is a loss which the whole world will feel.

Life was not easy for Mrs. Bethune, although she would be the last person to say that it was cruel or unjust. She was one of 17 children whose parents had been slaves. Yet despite the seemingly overwhelming obstacles in her path, she has left behind her enduring monuments to her greatness that will forever enrich the lives of the people of her country and will stand as an inspiration to the people of the world.

There is no need here for a detailed discussion of her accomplishments. They are now a permanent part of our national treasure. Suffice it to say that we shall forever be in her debt for the college she founded and served so long and brilliantly, for the organizations which she created and served so well, and for the inestimable services she performed for her Government over a period of many years.

Mary McLeod Bethune held degrees from 14 colleges and universities. Cuba, Haiti, Liberia, and other foreign countries decorated her for her work. She was the recipient of honors and awards too numerous to mention. Certainly no one ever deserved them more.

Mary McLeod Bethune was a woman of great courage, infinite faith, profound wisdom, and boundless determination. No one understood better than she the problems of her race and the ideals of her country. Without these qualities she could never have succeeded; with them she could not fail.

The ultimate tribute that we, the living, can pay to Mary McLeod Bethune is to carry on her work and to strive to attain her ideals. That is the way she would have wanted it. We owe this much to her, and we owe it to ourselves.

Mrs. Bethune was a warm and close friend of both my father and my mother, and I am sure that her many friends in this Congress who perhaps did not read my mother's column of May 20 will appreciate seeing her tribute to Mrs. Bethune. I, therefore, append it to these remarks:

MY DAY

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

NEW YORK.—I was distressed to read in the newspapers Thursday morning of the death of a really great American woman, Mary McLeod Bethune.

Dr. Bethune started life under conditions which must have made her education seem almost impossible, but both she and her parents had a great desire for her to gain knowledge and they seized on every opportunity. And the opportunities came, as they so often do, when people are ready to use them.

The newspapers were full of stories of how she led her remarkable life. Beginning with a dollar and a half she built a Negro college in Florida. She fought for the rights of her people but never with resentment or bitterness, and she taught both her own people and her white fellow Americans many a valuable lesson.

I always liked the story of how once a patronizing pullman-car conductor, asking her for her ticked, said: "Auntie, give me your ticket." She let him repeat it twice. Then, looking up sweetly, she said: "Which of my sister's sons are you?" This was a way of turning the tables on a gentleman, which was far more effective than any amount of anger would have been.

She had a deep religious faith, and religion was not academic with her. It was both a weapon and a shield. She has told me very simply how time after time she has prayed for things, never for herself, but she always believed that if they were good things the Lord would hear her prayer. And there must have been many, many times when people were moved to answer her needs just because of this faith. She helped herself and the Lord helped her.

I knew Dr. Bethune best, of course, in the years when she worked for the National Youth Administration and she did good and courageous work for the young people of her race in a difficult period. But I have kept in touch with her all through the years and I will miss her very much, for I valued her wisdom and her goodness.

I would like to be at her funeral but I doubt if that will be possible. I have many commitments that would mean disappointment to various causes, which I think Dr. Bethune would be the first to feel should come before one's personal desires. Nevertheless, I will cherish the spirit she lived by and try to promote the causes that she believed in, in loving memory of a very wonderful life.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column, Keenotes, for the week of May 23, 1955, concerning a visit that a number of my colleagues and I had the pleasure of making aboard one of our aircraft carriers, the U. S. S. *Intrepid*, off the coast of Norfolk, Va., to witness some tactical operations. The column follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

The United States Navy—and God bless those who make it great—has a long and awe-inspiring tradition of fighting on against any and all odds, and of persevering no matter what. Its great names, John Paul Jones, Oliver Hazard Perry, Dewey, Halsey, Lawrence, and the others, are names of men who fought on and won, or who went down fighting to the end.

But the Navy has now demonstrated that, in addition to knowing how to fight on stubbornly, it has finally learned how to give in. Not in battle, of course—never in battle—but about this matter of Congresswomen.

In previous years, invitations to Members of Congress to board fighting ships for demonstration cruises or maneuvers were always carefully limited to Congressmen. Women Members of Congress frequently are outstanding friends of the military services, but while the Navy might have appreciated that very much in the past, it still made certain not to include us in the invitation list for congressional cruises. Our protests went unheeded, until this year.

This year things were different, and a group of Congresswomen went along with the congressional delegation which boarded the U. S. S. *Intrepid*—a 40,000-ton attack aircraft carrier with a flight deck the size of three football fields—for a weekend glimpse up front of carrier tactics in a task force which also included a battleship, four destroyers, and two submarines. We saw, among other things, jet aircraft takeoffs and landings at sea, a night attack on a submarine, a drone shoot, gunnery practice by the battleship *New Jersey*, and an underway replenishment exercise. We saw the men of Carrier Air Group 4 fly their F9F–8 Cougar and F2H–2 Banshee jet fighters, and AD Skyraider propeller-driven attack planes in a series of exercises designed to help protect America and keep us safe. I was especially lucky to rate an overwater helicopter tour of the task force group, a real thrill.

Enjoyable as all of this was—and indeed it was—it was no junket. For it gave us a much better realization of the problems of the Navy and of Navy personnel, of the needs and requirements of the service, of the demands of modern warfare at sea. We have to provide the funds for the Navy; it is important that we know something of the way the funds are used.

Equally important, it gave us a new insight into the lives of the fine young men who risk their lives to protect the lives of all the rest of us—who proudly wear their Navy uniforms as a badge of courage and of fidelity to country.

There is no doubt about the courage of today's Navy. After all, in defying its previous superstition—for that's all we insisted it was—against Congresswomen on board, the Navy went all the way and took us aboard on Friday the 13th. Truly that ship was well named the *Intrepid*.

Excerpts From an Address by Dr. Perry Epler Gresham at the Lincoln Memorial on April 30, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following digest of an address delivered during the Washington Pilgrimate on April 30, 1955, at the Lincoln Memorial by Dr. Perry Epler Gresham, President of Bethany College:

FAR LIGHTS AND TALL RAINBOWS

For years I have lived with Lincoln. I have read, memorized and quoted his thoughtful addresses. I have pondered his biography and his personality. After 20 years of consideration I have formulated the central beliefs which his unquestioned utterances reveal. The 7 articles of faith are buttressed by direct quotations and the more eloquent language of his life.

1. The affairs of men and nations are under the sovereign control of almighty God.

2. International and domestic strife whether military, racial, economic, or personal is the judgment of God in history consequent upon the hatred, pride, greed, and perversity of man from generation to generation.

3. Prayer brings men and nations to understand and cherish the will of God. It is not a device to achieve egocentric or nationalistic advantage. The prayerful heart seeks to be on God's side; not to enlist God on his side.

4. The center of the Christian religion is to love God with the whole heart, the whole soul, the whole strength and the whole mind and to love one's neighbor as one's self.

5. Every human being is a child of God worthy of respect, dignity, and brotherly love.

6. Humility is one hallmark of a man's religion.

7. Integrity, fellowship and freedom are the American heritage which we are individually and collectively responsible to preserve and enhance.

Treaty Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an important editorial from the May 9 issue of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer. This editorial points out what the Supreme Court has done to impose treaty law upon our domestic affairs:

TREATY LAW

President Eisenhower has said, and Secretary of State Dulles has testified, that they would accept Section 1 of the Bricker Amendment.

The section declares that no treaty or other international agreement conflicting with the Federal Constitution shall have "any force or effect."

But Section 1 is a lesser part of the amendment and is of little value in itself; for Section 1, standing alone, has already been nullified by Federal court decisions under which the executive branch may disregard the Constitution without appearing to violate the Constitution.

Section 2 completes Section 1 by stipulating that a treaty or other international agreement may be made domestic law for the United States only by "valid" legislation.

Every important foreign country except France, the Netherlands and Mexico retains this self-protection against excessive executive action. As to executive action in foreign affairs, the Bricker amendment only asserts that such actions must be constitutional.

"Legislation by treaty" can be, and has been, imposed on the United States outside the Constitution both by formal treaties and by informal executive agreements.

The Constitution does not even mention Executive agreements.

It provides that treaties "made under the authority of the United States" are "the supreme law of the land," along with the Constitution itself, and it empowers the President to negotiate treaties.

For 132 years, the supremacy of the Constitution in treatymaking, was hardly questioned.

Then came, in the following order, corrosive court decisions which have shunted the Constitution aside:

1920—The migratory bird case: The Supreme Court held that treaties may authorize Congress to pass legislation which the Constitution forbids Congress to pass. Under this decision, the President and two-thirds of the Senate may nullify the Bill of Rights, including the 10th amendment (States' rights).

1936—The Curtiss-Wright case: The Supreme Court ruled that the treatymaking power does not derive from the Constitution, but is "an inherent power vested in the Federal Government as an attribute of sovereignty." This decision is tantamount to the obsolete Bourbon doctrine of the divine right of kings. By its terms, the Federal Government is not restricted by the Constitution in making laws for the American people in the guise of treaties.

1942.—The Pink case: This decision concerned an Executive agreement—not a formal treaty—with Soviet Russia. The Supreme Court noted that a treaty is a "law of the land" under the Constitution and asserted that "such international compacts and agreements" as the one then in litigation "have a similar dignity."

This reasoning does violence to the Constitution.

According to the Constitution, a treaty becomes a law of the land only if approved by two-thirds of the Senate. But an Executive agreement is not required to go before the Senate for scrutiny.

The Supreme Court decision therefore permits the Executive branch to evade Congress and the Constitution, and to dictate laws to the Nation, by merely substituting Executive agreements for treaties.

The danger to our institutions from treaty legislation is relatively recent, but has become very great.

At a bar association meeting in Louisville in 1952, Mr. Dulles, speaking as a private citizen, warned that treaties can abrogate "the rights given our people by the constitutional bill of rights."

Now, as Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles opposes the Bricker amendment. He pleads that the Eisenhower administration would not make a bad Executive agreement or an unconstitutional treaty. But there will be other administrations after this one.

On this point, the Hearst Newspapers prefer the admonition of Thomas Jefferson, who said:

"In questions of power, let no more be said of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

Jordan Condemned by U. N. Body for Attack Termed "Premeditated"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following news item which appeared in the May 6, 1955, issue of Israel Digest:

JORDAN CONDEMNED BY U. N. BODY FOR ATTACK TERMED "PREMEDITATED"

JERUSALEM.—The Israel-Jordan Mixed Armistice Commission last week blamed Jordan for the blowing up of a house in the Jerusalem Corridor village of Zakariya on April 16. The Mixed Armistice Commission found that the house was blown up over the heads of its inhabitants, burying them under the debris. Three women and two men were wounded and the house destroyed.

The attack was described as "premeditated" and a "serious violation" of the armistice agreement by the Commission resolution.

Following is a partial list of border incidents during the past 2 weeks:

On April 16, Jordanian marauders wounded a woman in Eshtaol in the Jerusalem Corridor.

On April 17, Jordanian infiltrators opened fire upon watchmen of Eshtaol.

On April 18, Jordanian infiltrators attacked an Israel unit patrolling near Bar Giora in the Jerusalem Corridor.

On April 18, an Israel unit encountered an organized band of Egyptian marauders near Nir Izhak. The unit was attacked by an Egyptian military post as it chased the Egyptians back into the Gaza Strip.

On April 18, Syrians opened fire on a number of Israel fishing boats on Lake Kinneret (Sea of Galilee).

On April 19, two Egyptian military positions opened fire on an Israel observation post north of Sheikh Hab'an in the Negev.

On April 19, an Israel unit patrolling the border near Nir Izhak was attacked by an Egyptian military position after the Israelis had chased Egyptian marauders back into the Gaza Strip area.

On April 20, Egyptian marauders, who penetrated Israel territory west of Mefalsim, were chased back into the Gaza Strip by an Israel unit.

On April 28, an Israel patrol uncovered a land mine laid on the road south of Nirim. Members of the patrol, left to guard the site, were attacked by an Egyptian military position.

Making Farmer Prosperous Without Subsidies Is Unsolved Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted, I desire to insert at this point in the RECORD a very interesting and timely editorial, entitled "Making Farmer Prosperous Without Subsidies Is Unsolved Problem," which was carried in the May 8, 1955, issue of the Paris News, published at Paris, Tex., which is in the congressional district I am privileged to represent.

Mr. A. G. Pat Mayse is the publisher of this newspaper and the author of this editorial. Mr. Mayse has been interested in the farm programs and the farm problems for many years, and has conscientiously worked in the interest of the farmer. Mr. Mayse is one of the best informed publishers on these matters that I know. He has cooperated, not only by devoting much space in his newspaper to disseminating helpful information, but by giving his time and energy to making constructive and helpful suggestions.

The editorial is as follows:

MAKING FARMER PROSPEROUS WITHOUT SUBSIDIES IS UNSOLVED PROBLEM

To get an opinion direct from a dirt farmer the Paris News asked one of many farmer friends the other day what he thought about the agricultural situation. "I've worked and lived on the farm all my life and I like it,

but you know, it has come to the point where I can no longer make both ends meet in my farm operation and now I am too old to leave the farm and move to town to get a job like so many younger men are doing, so I guess I'll just have to stick it out as long as I can." He is a good farmer, one who works hard, keeps up with improved methods, diversifies, has increased his production per acre, and he lives at home and boards at the same place.

A few years ago during the farmland boom when city dwellers were buying farms and ranches and cattle, he was offered and refused $50,000 for his farm. He didn't want to leave the farm and said he wouldn't know what to do with $50,000 in cash. So, he is still out there on his farm growing most of the food required for himself and family. He grows some cotton, is trying this year for 100 bushels of corn per acre on 8 acres, has good pastures, good grade beef cows and a registered bull, and grows feed for them. His calves bring top-market prices yet his income does not match the outgoing expense and he is puzzled over what to do. He says taxes are as much as ever and that everything he buys costs more and while he economizes in every way he knows he still cannot show a profit.

He was not bitter and not envious of the record earnings being made by industry and higher wages for their workers but he reasoned: "I just can't help but wonder how much longer business and industry can continue to pile up profits and riches and the farmer continue to suffer and still have national prosperity."

People continue to leave the farms for jobs in the cities and this has been going on for many years and there seems no prospect of this flow stopping. This farmer doesn't know the answer to the problem but he feels a solution must be found.

This condition is doubtless receiving serious thought from many people other than farmers. It does not seem reasonable to expect a continuation of unprecedented prosperity with one segment of the national economy while the other continues to suffer.

Russian Riddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Boston Traveler of May 19, 1955:

RUSSIAN RIDDLE

Secretary of State Dulles has returned from Europe in a state of pleasant puzzlement.

He's like a man who has just won a pet for a prize but doesn't know whether it's going to bite him. He'd like to pat the thing, but he's ready to jump back and kick it.

More than anything else, that's the message that emerges from his folksy cracker-barrel report to the Nation. It was a comfortably informal report, with President Eisenhower acting as straight man. It contained a fine collection of cliches and scarcely any specific news.

And it contained the disclosure that Dulles can't quite decide whether he's bought a nugget or a gold brick.

The baffling factor behind the whole situation is the inability of any of us to know for certain what's in Russia's mind. Why the sudden turnabout? Why the concessions at Vienna, after years of threats and table-thumpings? Russia doesn't make a switch like that just by chance, or just because the flowers look pretty in the spring.

Dulles has been frank enough to admit his bewilderment at the Soviets' attitude.

Here are some of his words, taken from text, with no attempt at continuity:

"I don't think anybody yet knows the significance, the full significance, of that * * *."

"Why they are doing it, we are not quite sure * * *."

"Everybody wonders why the Soviets may be willing to change their practices. Nobody can be sure * * *."

"I don't think for a minute that they have got religion or been converted * * *."

We can be certain, though, that the Soviets have a solid purpose behind their sudden change of face. We can be certain, too, that it's designed to do us no good. We'd better be careful where we step.

President Eisenhower called the Dulles' talk "a brilliant report."

We call it an admission of misty perplexity, somewhat brightened for home consumption.

The Worchester Telegram Salutes Joe Martin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to include an editorial, entitled, "Honoring JOE MARTIN," which appeared in the April 28 issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, because it truly summarizes the remarkable qualities that have made this great man a national institution in American political life, beloved by all.

The article follows:

HONORING JOE MARTIN

It was a distinguished gathering that honored Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr. of Massachusetts, at the unveiling of an oil painting of him, Wednesday at the Capitol Hill Club in Washington. He fully deserved the tributes which he received just as he has deserved similar tributes in the past.

JOE MARTIN is an institution. His Republicanism is of the militant brand. He is a party man, a firm upholder of party loyalty. He requires such loyalty from himself as well as from others. His faithfulness to Republican Presidents, to Republican party leaders, to Republican administrations, has ever been constant.

As a Member of the House, as minority leader, as Speaker, as chairman of the Republican National Committee, as chairman of the Republican congressional (campaign) committee, and as permanent chairman of four Republican national conventions, his service to his party has been outstanding.

But far more remarkable than all of that, is the respect and affection in which he is held by Democrats. His political opponents, over the years, have recognized his patriotism, his sincerity, his ability and they have responded to his genuine friendliness. He has no use for trifiers or shirkers. He does respect earnestness and honesty, regardless of party.

He likes politics, and he likes those who are in it with him—and they like him. His leadership is built on his personality, and on his character. Republicans and Democrats alike know that he is straightforward, and a man of his word.

Some History on Long Island's Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, not too much is known about the history of the Long Island Railroad and the following article by Alex Benson, which was published in the New York World-Telegram and Sun, on Saturday, May 21, 1955, reveals much that has not generally been familiar to us:

FIRST AND LAST, THE LIRR CAN BE PROUD—PIONEERED WITH WHISTLE, DIESEL, AND ALL-STEEL CAR

(By Alex Benson)

It has not always been vogue to make jokes about the Long Island Rail Road. Back in 1836, for instance, you would have been remiss if you did not join the railroading fraternity in taking off your hat to that pioneer line.

And in 1885 no critical commuter could have got away with a serious dig at the LIRR. Or in 1905 or 1927, for those years are milestones in the history of the American railroad.

The Long Island Rail Road, in fact, has a long and impressive record for firsts,. It goes back to the very infancy of railroading and should make the modern disparager pause lest he disparage a truly great name in the railroad hall of fame.

Who would dare take lightly, for example, the very first steam whistle on an American locomotive? The LIRR had it.

Who is to say it wasn't a stroke of genius to institute piggy-back hauling of loaded farm wagons? The LIRR was first with that idea.

THE FIRST DIESEL

And who can easily dismiss the railroad that was first to put an all-steel car in service, first to have an all-steel passenger fleet, first to put a diesel locomotive on the job, and first to begin extensive electrification?

The Long Island Rail Road, which probably has been more insulted than any other, was ahead in all of these.

It all began back in 1836 with Whistler's mother's husband. George Washington Whistler, father of the master painter James Abbot McNeill Whistler, was a United States Army engineer and inventor. He was also an authority on railroads and supervised the building of the line that liked the Russian cities of St. Petersburg and Moscow before St. Petersburg was erased as a place name and before the Russians started taking credit for firsts in everything.

It seems that Whistler's father, who is otherwise pretty generally unremembered, invented the first steam whistle in America, and the LIRR hastened to put it on a locomotive, in 1836—a first in the chronology of whistles.

WHISTLER WHISTLE

With the Whistler whistle the Long Island made a big noise in the railroad business

just 11 years after the very first passenger railroad in the world—the Manchester to Liverpool line in England—was opened. It followed in 1885 with another triumph of enterprise.

In that year the LIRR initiated piggy-back service, anticipating by 70 years the modern idea of hauling loaded road carriers by rail. The Long Island used flatcars to transport produce-laden farm wagons to market, sparing hundreds of farmers the ordeal of driving to town on almost impassable roads.

It was in 1905 that the LIRR put the first all-steel passenger car in commuter service, and by 1927 it could boast the first all-steel passenger fleet. The old wooden cars were sold to a small railroad in Georgia and are said to be rolling to this day.

In 1905, too, the Long Island began its large-scale conversion to electricity—before any other railroad. By 1910 the electrified lines ran under the East River to Pennsylvania station, and by 1934 the last electric stretch—from Mineola to East Williston in Nassau—was completed.

FIRST WITH THE BEST

The first diesel locomotive in the United States was introduced by the LIRR in 1925. The monster oil burner, nicknamed old 401, stayed on the job until a junk yard claimed it in 1951. In its time it pulled untold thousands of commuters and millions of tons in freight.

In its long history, then, the Long Island Railroad has made some spectacular showings. Going clear back to that day when Whistler's mother's son was only 2, the famous commuter line has often been first with the best.

It's still not doing badly—it was first to use electronic rail-scanning cars (1931) and first to install automatic speed control (1951–53). And is likely to come up with a new first any day. The Long Island commuter can reflect on that * * * next time he's late for work or late for dinner, or both.

Giant Corporations and Independent Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on May 11, 1955, and my letter to the editor of the New York Times in answer thereto, as printed on May 23, 1955:

NOT ALL GIANTS

The average American may be forgiven if he has gained the impression that in the United States of today, business and industry are in the hands of a comparatively small number of great corporations. He would be less than human if he were not convinced that the day had long since passed when a man with an idea or a special skill, and a little money, could start a business of his own—and start it with a reasonably good chance that he would make a go of it.

Richard Rutter, in an article published yesterday in this newspaper's financial pages, based largely on a study made by the Department of Commerce, offered some vital statistics on the business population that might well persuade Mr. Average American to reexamine these preconceptions. Mr. Rutter quoted from the Monthly Survey of Current Business to show that the business population in the United States, far from declining, has increased at a greater rate over the last half century than the human population.

At the turn of the century there were approximately 21 nonfarm business enterprises for each 1,000 persons; by the middle of the century the ratio had risen to 27 per 1,000.

What about those giant corporations which are supposed to have swallowed up most of the little businesses in the Nation? To begin with, although the proportion of corporate enterprises to the entire population has increased slightly since 1910, it still amounts to only 13 percent. (In the manufacturing industries the proportion is 32 percent; in the retail, service, and construction fields it is only 6 percent.) There are, needless to say, many corporations in that 13 percent which justify the term giant. Nevertheless, even among enterprises employing the corporate form, it remains true that nearly one-fourth have fewer than 5 employees and 75 percent fewer than 20. This refers to corporations only. When we turn to the figures on firms of all kinds we find that 75 percent of them are firms employing fewer than 5 persons and less than 2 percent employ 50 or more.

It is not our purpose to read into these statistics the suggestion that, for example, in terms of the proportion of total labor employed, the giant corporations haven't greatly increased in influence over the last half century. The point here is, and it is a very important one, that the day of the small-business man hasn't gone by, and there is no good reason to believe it is going to in the visible future.

STATUS OF SMALL BUSINESS—STATISTICS ON TRENDS IN BUSINESS POPULATION EXAMINED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

You quite correctly point out in your editorial of May 11 entitled "Not All Giants" that all of us need constantly to "reexamine our preconceptions," particularly when interpreting statistics. You ask, "What about those 'giant corporations' which are supposed to have swallowed up most of the little businesses in the Nation?" And by way of reassurance you cite as evidence that "at the turn of the century there were approximately 21 nonfarm business enterprises for each 1,000 persons; by the middle of the century the ratio had risen to 27 per 1,000."

Had you examined the excellent scientific articles in the Survey of Current Business on which ultimately your editorial (via Richard Rutter's news story) was based, you would have noted that their definition of a "nonfarm business enterprise" includes all enterprises in operation that have a separate legal existence even though they are wholly owned subsidiaries of other concerns.

In 1945, for example, there were 103 subsidies of the United States Steel Corp. (correctly) listing as nonfarm business enterprises," many employing labor and reporting income to the Bureau of Internal Revenue Service. There were 284 such subsidiaries of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

NUMBER OF ENTERPRISES

So long as the legal entities, whether for customer goodwill, tax, or other purposes remain consolidated or "merged," the statistical number of "nonfarm business enterprises" is not diminished even though their plants are demolished.

In passing, you are no doubt well aware of the fact that many corporations were formed in recent years with but a transient (frequently tax-generated) existence. Thus individual motion pictures have been incorporated to provide their producers and actors the legal benefits of the lower capital gains tax.

Corporate "spin-offs," partnerships that include babies 1 year of age, incorporated welfare funds of trade unions, churches, and the like have also tended to inflate somewhat the number of "nonfarm business enterprises." Standard Oil or other similarly operated filling stations, because they are legally owned by individuals, are likewise blithely included among the number of "free enterprises" although scores of them have recently flocked to Washington to testify bitterly about their conditions of leasehold.

Need I point further to the thousands of satellite suppliers in the automobile, electrical manufacturing, and other industries, and the scores of other methods whereby giants, via minority stock ownership, dealerships, and the like, cluster aggregates of small firms around them. Statistics, like loaded guns, should always be handled with care.

EMPLOYMENT IN AGRICULTURE

Finally, ought you not to ponder how the ratios you so heavily rely on are affected by the fact that agricultural enterprises are excluded? As you know, agriculture has declined in relative importance. The number of employed (including family workers) has gone down from over 13,500,000 in 1910 to a figure of 8,600,000 in 1953.

The farmer's share of the national income pie diminished from about 16 percent in 1910 to less than half that much in 1952. Furthermore, the number of business enterprises in an economy depends on the fraction of its goods that exchange for money. The larger the percent of goods that are bought and sold, the more enterprises.

Many services rendered in the home in 1900 are now done by bakers, dairies, soapmakers, canners, hairdressers, laundries, restaurants, and so on. In view of the substantial increase in the pecuniary, nonagricultural segment of the economy, does the shift in the ratio from 21 per 1,000 in 1900 to 27 per 1,000 inhabitants today mean what you think it does?

May I respectfully suggest that your answer clearly highlights the necessity to "examine one's preconceptions."

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary.

Washington, May 16, 1955.

[We agree with Representative CELLER that statistics should be handled carefully. That is why, in our editorial of May 11, we took pains to point out that too much should not be read into the overall figures of the Department of Commerce. We confined ourselves to a single general statement, namely, that "the day of the small-business man hasn't gone by, and there is no good reason to believe it is going to in the visible future." The fact that the service industries are assuming a steadily increasing importance in our national economy (which Mr. CELLER seems to regard as a deplorable development) is not only important as a measure of our industrial progress and our increasingly high living standard, but as assurance that small business is here to stay indefinitely.—Editor, the Times.]

Veto of the Postal Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, both Houses of Congress, while admitting that the cost of living to postal workers had

risen approximately 10 percent since the last salary raise, decided finally that 8.8 would be the right thing to do. The Senate had decided that a 10-percent raise was not too much and so voted. The House, however, voted 8.2, and the conference came back with an agreement at 8.8 percent, and both Houses again passed the bill. In the debate administration leaders of the House quoted the President as saying that he would veto anything over 7.6. That was used as an argument, but the House refused to be put in a straitjacket.

The administration leaders like JOE MARTIN, CHARLES HALLECK, and ED REES were right. The President did veto the bill.

The veto will be sent first to the Senate, which was the first body to pass the bill and the question will be, "Shall the bill be passed, the President's veto notwithstanding?" This must pass by a two-thirds vote and the veto will probably be sustained. Many Republicans who were willing for a 10 percent raise, and voted for it, will reverse themselves in order to support the President. If the veto is sustained in the Senate, the matter will not come before the House at all.

This muddled situation has all been caused by the representations made by Republican leaders that the President would veto the bill if it carried more than a raise of 7.6. Having told the leaders that this is what he would do, these leaders would be out on a political limb if the President signed the bill.

The fact remains that this is a poor way to legislate, because carrying this policy to the *n*th degree, the President can tell Congress what to do and, if perchance Congress does differently, down comes the veto with a slam. Isn't this a direct interference with the legislative branch?

If the veto is sustained, the administration will then rush a bill up to a congressional vote on a bill just as the President wants it. There is only 13 cents per day difference in the bill the President vetoed and the one he wants. All this talk about the difficulty of administering the vetoed bill is bologna hatched up by Postmaster General Summerfield. He has difficulty in administering the present law.

A bill must be put through—the Republicans in the next Congress can be easily counted if no raise is passed. The Republicans will move heaven and earth to pass the President's bill. Watch the scramble and see if I am right. No matter what is done, the postal workers will remember too much about this situation to be very enthusiastic about electing Republicans. In other words, I think the veto, involving only 13 cents per day, was a blunder regardless of politics. Can any President come within 13 cents of arriving at just pay for postal workers? No, it was not the 13 cents—it was because his leadership had been challenged. The President has done so many good things that my conclusion in this case is that he was poorly advised. He ought not to have been so determined—he should have permitted Congress to work its will.

As a Republican I have always tried to bring about a friendly feeling between organized labor and the Republican Party, for the reason that I knew laborers in many sections of the country were not too well sold on the Republican Party. This veto is not going to make this feeling any better, but probably worse. The way this matter has been maneuvered around ,it is doubtful now that the Republican Party will get the credit for any raise.

This issue has never been a Democrat or a Republican issue—it is an issue of justice. These workers are entitled to a raise and all sides know it. When there was such a trifle involved—13 cents per day for 500,000 workers—why was it necessary to arouse all this opposition? Congressmen, at the earliest solicitation of the President, received an increase of $20.50 per day, and here we are fighting a half-million workers who want 13 cents per day more than the President approves. That is not the way I would run the Republican Party if I had any part in directing it. And remember ,this extra 13 cents does not exceed in the aggregate enough to cover the full rise in the cost of living to these workers.

Robinson-Patman Act Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, I am told, are receiving a lot of letters about H. R. 11 and S. 11, which provides for an amendment to the Robinson-Patman Act.

This bill is now receiving consideration in the Judiciary Committees of both Houses. It is very important that this bill become law at the earliest possible date. Independent business and small businesses in particular need this bill enacted into law more than any other one time at this particular time. It will determine whether many of them stay in business or go out of business.

In the House the following Members are coauthors and cosponsors of the bill: Hon. CARL ALBERT, Oklahoma; Hon. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, New Jersey; Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Colorado; Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, West Virginia; Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota; Hon. RICHARD BOLLING, Missouri; Hon. OVERTON BROOKS, Louisiana; Hon. USHER BURDICK, North Dakota; Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia; Hon. CLIFFORD DAVIS, Tennessee; Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL, Michigan; Hon. THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut; Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, California; Hon. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Pennsylvania; Hon. JOE L. EVINS, Tennessee; Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania; Hon. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, Maryland; Hon. EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Maryland; Hon. DON HAYWORTH, Michigan; Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, California; Hon. LESTER JOHNSON, Wisconsin; Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH, New York; Hon. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Pennsylvania; Hon. CECIL R. KING, California; Hon. HENDERSON LANHAM, Georgia; Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, JR., Michigan; Hon. GEORGE S. LONG, Louisiana Hon. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Minnesota; Hon. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, Michigan; Hon. DON MAGNUSON, Washington; Hon. LEE METCALF, Montana; Hon. GEORGE MILLER, California; Hon. THOMAS E. MORGAN, Pennsylvania; Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, JR., California; Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, New York; Hon. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Illinois; Hon. JAMES G. POLK, Ohio; Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., New York; Hon. MELVIN PRICE, Illinois; Hon. HENRY S. REUSS, Wisconsin; Hon. GEORGE M. RHODES, Pennsylvania; Hon. KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Alabama; Hon. PETER W. RODINO, JR., New Jersey; Hon. BYRON G. ROGERS, Colorado; Hon. WALTER ROGERS, Texas; Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, California; Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California; Hon. BOB SIKES, Florida; Hon. B. F. SISK, California; Hon. T. A. THOMPSON, Louisiana; Hon. HOMER THORNBERRY, Texas; Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey; Hon. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, Mississippi; and Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin.

In addition, the following Members have introduced bills of their own, identical with H. R. 11: Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, California, H. R. 2850; Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., New Jersey, H. R. 2690; and Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, JR., Michigan, H. R. 2611.

It is my suggestion that any Member who desires to do so may become a coauthor of the bill by allowing his name to be used for that purpose or he may introduce a bill himself.

Alien Property Report of the American Legion 36th National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to make it known to my colleagues and my many national-minded constituents the stand which the American Legion has taken in regard to the return of alien property.

From August 30 through September 2 of 1954, the American Legion met in the city of Washington, D. C., at which time the Committee on Foreign Relations of the American Legion stated as follows, and I quote:

> Believing that the American veteran has a vested interest in enemy assets seized by the United States, and that such assets should continue to be devoted to the purpose provided by the Veterans' Claims Act, the American Legion opposes any effort to return these assets to their former owners or their governments.

This resolution as aforementioned was approved with no opposing vote whatsoever by the full Legion assembled. Not

only has the American Legion taken a stand in opposition to the return of alien property, but also the other numerous veterans organizations such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and so forth. I have noticed in the past few weeks that many of my colleagues in the House and the Senate have introduced numerous bills for the return of this vested property. I believe that we should all be cognizant of the stand that our leading veterans organizations have taken on this particular subject.

Price Discrimination Destructive to Small and Independent Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if a small merchant can buy right, he can meet any competition, big or little. The grocery business is about the most competitive business in the United States. If the local groceryman can buy under the same terms and conditions as his competitor across the street, regardless of how big the competitor is, he cannot only remain in business but he can make a good living and a good profit. It is only when the small man is discriminated against that he is injured.

The Robinson-Patman Act provides that a manufacturer or supplier of goods and merchandise to the retail merchant shall not discriminate in price between customers in competition with one another. In other words, a supplier, whether a wholesaler or manufacturer, does not have to select any particular person or firm to sell its goods. The law does not compel a supplier to sell to anyone.

The Robinson-Patman Act, however, provides that the supplier, after selecting two or more customers in an area to retail its products, must treat these customers—the retailers—fairly and not give special privileges to one and deny equal benefits to another.

If a supplier has 2 customers in a town—one is a big customer and the other a little one, being a big retail store and a little retail store—it is all right for the supplier to give the big man a more favorable price representing a difference only in the difference in the cost of manufacture, sale or delivery to the big man. This difference is so small that it is not enough to substantially injure the little man. This difference of cost is recognized in the Robinson-Patman Act, which may be given to the big one over the little one. No one objects to the little difference being given to the big man. That little difference does not injure the little man at all. The injury to the little man comes about by the supplier giving to its big customer a special price or a special discount, which represents a lower price to the big man than is justified by the differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery. All the Robinson-Patman Act does is to guarantee equality of opportunity among retailers. It guarantees to the little man the right to buy his goods at comparable prices paid by the big man, his competitor. It is a fair law. If properly enforced, it gives the little man and the independent merchant security. It does not take anything away from the big man that should not be taken away from him. No one can condone a rule, which permits a supplier to give a big customer an unfair advantage over its little customer.

I am inserting herewith an editorial from the Colorado Grocer, Denver, Colo., which appeared recently, concerning a speech delivered by Mrs. Marie Kiefer, secretary-manager of the National Association of Retail Grocers. It is as follows:

PRICE DISCRIMINATIONS

Harmful price discriminations in the food industry have reached an alarming state, requiring specific action to stop them before they plunge the industry into the same kind of chaotic and corrupt practices that prevailed in the early 1930's, according to Mrs. Marie Kiefer, secretary-manager of the National Association of Retail Grocers.

Mrs. Kiefer addressed the annual convention of the National Association of Food Brokers on Saturday, February 19, in the Palmer House, Chicago, on the subject of "The Robinson-Patman Act and Food Distribution."

"A few of you in this audience managed to live through those days (before the Robinson-Patman Anti-Discrimination Act was adopted in 1936)," Mrs. Kiefer said. "Those of us who saw the destruction, dishonesty, and discrimination that prevailed will never forget it."

NARGUS spokesman for the Nation's independent food retailers and one of the original and consistent supporters of the Robinson-Patman Act, has come out strongly in support of the "equality of opportunity" bill to strengthen the act for the effectual prevention of harmful price discriminations.

Mrs. Kiefer pointed out that many discriminations today are not direct price preferences. There are all types of promotion schemes which give one group of stores preference in both allowances and facilities over competing retailers," she said. "Free goods for store openings, manpower for stocking shelves, consignment sales, and so on, are very frequently offered on a preferential basis to buyers who have no scruples about making illegal demands on suppliers."

Although the Robinson-Patman Act prohibits discriminations in allowances and facilities, a number of people in the industry either do not know this or else chose to ignore it, Mrs. Kiefer said.

"Let us not underestimate the amount of money involved in discriminations of all kinds," she cautioned. "The public record shows that in 1 year a larger buyer received, in what the court termed 'headquarters allowances,' $6,400,000, which constituted 24.59 percent of their total profits from all operations in that year. These headquarters allowances were the largest single source of profit for that organization."

Mrs. Kiefer continued:

"The overwhelming majority of business people do not desire to stoop to injurious discriminatory and unfair practices, but if the willful few, who choose this way of doing business, are allowed to pursue their evil conduct then many will feel they must adopt similar tactics to meet unfair and unethical competition. If this is permitted, the ethical standards of the industry will sink to the lowest level followed by the most unscrupulous. Two decades of effort to wipe out discriminations and to preserve equality of opportunity for all are now threatened by a resurgence of this old enemy."

The Robinson-Patman Act is now structurally weaker than ever before in its history, Mrs. Kiefer said, citing instances in which the law is not being enforced or has been weakened by judicial and administrative opinion.

In urging support for the equality of opportunity bill, Mrs. Kiefer also stressed the importance of individual responsibility to foster fair competitive opportunities by refusing to countenance harmful practices known to be taking place. She suggested that brokers report known violations to the Federal Trade Commission.

Without brokers and the great advances they have made in expanding their sales volume, the situation in the industry today would be much worse, Mrs. Kiefer said. She asked the brokers to help lead a crusade to recapture the lost territory. "Food brokers can become the greatest constructive force for fair play there is in the industry," she declared.

The Carolina Food Dealer, in a recent editorial, discussed a letter written by the president of the National Association of Retail Grocers to Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana. It is as follows:

NARGUS PRESIDENT SEEKS ROBINSON-PATMAN SUPPORT

Large and small businesses alike have a stake in the battle to preserve the Robinson-Patman law for fair competitive practices, Alvin V. Hokanson, president of the National Association of Retail Grocers, declared in a letter directed to Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Business, without regard to size, has the important common interest to protect basic individual and economic freedoms, Hokanson said, "for if distribution ever becomes concentrated in the hands of a few powerful corporations, Government control of business will inevitably follow."

Hokanson, who comes from Porter, Ind., wrote to the senior Senator from his home State about his concern to keep open the door of opportunity for more than 350,000 independent food retailers under the free-enterprise system by preserving intact the Robinson-Patman antidiscrimination law.

In describing recurrent attacks upon the Robinson-Patman Act, the NARGUS president stated:

"For the past several years there has been a concerted drive to obtain legislation which would grant large business interests the right to strangle their competitors by getting unfair price discriminations regardless of the competitive effect. Those who are promoting this drive want to make it lawful for a manufacturer to sell the same goods, at the same time, and in the same quantity to a large favored distributor at a low price, while selling to competing smaller distributors at a higher price."

Pointing out that small business believes strongly in the necessity for keeping competition strong and vigorous, Hokanson said: "The competition small business believes in is fair competition as opposed to the 'anything goes' type of contest in which a smaller rival can be crushed without restraint, so long as so-called competitive methods are used to accomplish this purpose."

Since the Robinson-Patman Act was passed, in 1936, Hokanson wrote Senator CAPEHART, its purpose has been to protect competition by encouraging price cuts to small as well as large business. For this reason, he added, it is disturbing to independent distributors that those who are attacking the Robinson-Patman Act are attempting to stigmatize the act as preventing competition, although the act has never prohibited any-

one from competing or from meeting competition. "It does require, however, that when a price cut is given to a big mass distributor it also be given on equal terms to merchants who are competing with him," Hokanson said.

He asserted that, in view of the economic issues involved in the current assault on the Robinson-Patman Act, "it is clear that what is at stake is not freedom to compete but elemental justice and equality of opportunity for business, regardless of size. We have seen time and time again that a competitive balance between big business and small business is not possible unless both are on equal footing so that efficiency and not size or financial power will determine success or failure."

It has been fortunate for our economy, Hokanson continued, that the Robinson-Patman Act has helped to keep the field of food distribution open for small firms to enter, prosper and grow.

Resulting from the fact that equality of opportunity has prevailed since the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act in 1936, consumers have benefited from substantial progress in improved distribution techniques and other advancements, he said, notable among these being the modern self-service supermarket pioneered by independent food retailers.

"The retail food business is one segment of our economy where independent distributors have been given a fair chance to show what they can do and they have 'delivered the goods,'" the NARGUS president declared.

Warning of the threat of persistent efforts to amend the Robinson-Patman Act so as to legalize systematic price discriminations, Hokanson wrote: "If permitted, we will once again return to the two-price system under which a few very large distributors will get a low price from manufacturers while small distributors will be left with a serious competitive disadvantage from which they can never escape."

Hokanson requested Senator CAPEHART'S considered opinion on this grave problem. "It is my hope you will agree with me that efforts to legalize injurious price discrimination should be resisted by all who support free competitive enterprise in this country," he concluded.

Leisure—Will Americans Use It Wisely?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a very thought-provoking editorial on the subject of leisure, written by Mr. Myron M. Johnson, which appeared in the April 30 issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram.

The article follows:

MACHINES AND LEISURE—MORE RECREATION NEEDED

(By Myron M. Johnson)

Some speakers and writers are still blaming the labor-saving machines for man's problems. Dr. Charles A. Bucher, of New York University, predicts that automation will bring so much leisure that people will not know how to use it. He believes people should develop physical skills of various kinds, such as tennis, dancing, swimming.

Criticism of labor-saving devices is not new. Over 30 years ago there were articles in newspapers and magazines warning that the machine would create a new class of Americans, a class that would not know what to do with its leisure time.

MARCONI'S LAMENT

In 1937 the great Italian electrician and inventor Guglielmo Marconi, made some gloomy observations about mechanical progress. Shortly before his death he said that he was worried, because the scientific genius of the world was being used to create weapons of destruction.

In 1940 the late Dr. Ernest A. Hooton, professor of anthropology at Harvard, said machines had deprived millions of men of the opportunity to make a decent living.

In 1952 Walter H. Johnson, Jr., of New York, secretary of American Airlines, in an address to the Sales Executives Club of Worcester, said:

"Americans now have almost a third of their time available for leisure."

In 1953, Henry Dreyfuss, New York Industrial designer, said that labor-saving machines had given American workers 1,000 more leisure hours a year than their grandfathers had. But, he added, Americans have not learned how to use their leisure wisely.

THREE COMPLAINTS

Thus there are at least three complaints against the machine: That it is used to destroy, in war; that it takes away jobs; that it provides too much leisure.

Scientific progress has not brought peace. But neither has it caused war. Nations fight because they hate each other or run into disputes which they fail to settle peacefully. The machine is guiltless there.

It is easy to say that machines take away jobs. But machines add to the country's wealth, give people a chance to satisfy more needs and wishes, and so create a demand for more goods—all of which means more jobs, not less. That is the familiar, almost trite, argument. But it still holds.

RELAXED WORKERS

The machine does provide leisure. How can that leisure best be used? One answer is more recreation. Bowling, golf, and other sports make workers more relaxed, more contented, more efficient, according to surveys. But there are people who do not really like any of the existing sports or games.

So here is a challenge to inventors. Devise a game which will require some skill and some practice to excel in, but which can be played with respectable scores by practically all comers.

Such a game might combine some of the features of golf, bowling, and quoits. The equipment and implements would be few and simple, and the required space—outdoors or indoors—would not be large.

Such a game would not interfere with other sports, and would not lure the satisfied players or fans away from existing contests. It would simply fill a gap; reduce the number of duffers; give many more people, men and women, young and old, a chance to play and enjoy the playing.

Commissioner Slusser Answers National Association of Real Estate Boards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the address of Hon. Charles E. Slusser, Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration, on May 17, 1955, at the annual conference in Galveston, Tex., of the southwestern regional conference of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, as follows:

Having said that I want public housing to be a local enterprise, I must tell you that there are also occasions when the Public Housing Commissioner intends to exercise his prerogative to speak for all of you without sideline coaching or prompting. When this program is unjustly attacked, I intend to take the first public opportunity to answer.

To clear up any doubts that might exist in any minds, my remarks are occasioned by an editorial put out by the Washington office of the National Association of Real Estate Boards in their May 2 publication, Headlines, and signed by their president, Henry G. Waltemade.

Less than a year ago I spoke in Philadelphia at NAHRO's annual national convention. I discussed then the almost fanatical campaign directed against public housing by the National Association of Real Estate Boards, of which I am a member. I said I would not let distortion and fraud go unchallenged. Evidently NAREB does not take me at my word, because this newest editorial shows neither regard for facts nor an intelligent understanding of the program. There are methods of supporting a cause or a system. You can lead with the truth or you can mislead with unsupportable propaganda.

Valid, constructive criticism should never be rejected. But we have not had this from NAREB. Instead, behind a thin veneer of respectability, we have had the unlikeliest set of conclusions that were ever based on not wishful, but willful thinking.

I am not unaware that these offensives begin at the time our Congress considers new housing legislation. So be it. Let us examine the previously mentioned May 2, 1955, editorial.

First, they ask, "Does public housing take care of the needy?" Their answer is "Hardly ever. In Washington, D. C., the model of Federal experimentation, a study showed that only 47 of more than 4,000 families receiving welfare aid were permitted in public housing." The propaganda went on from there, but what are the facts? They need to be brought out.

NAREB tells you that there are only 47 Washington, D. C., families receiving relief being benefited by public housing. There are 399 such families in Washington's public housing. A dime local phone call to the National Capital Housing Authority would have established the facts. NAREB's Washington office could spare it.

I give NAREB its poor choice. It has used either faked or negligent statistics. In either case, it owes an abject apology to the National Capital Housing Authority, in particular and the public housing movement in general, and I for one haven't the time to wait for it.

There are more than faked statistics in this matter. Washington, D. C.'s welfare loan wasn't picked at random as an illustrative case. It was used in this instance because it is among the lowest in the country. Washington has only eight-tenths of a person out of a thousand on relief, while the national average is six and a half persons out of a thousand. Not satisfied to use an extreme case that completely distorts the national situation, the writer of this Washington, D. C., editorial had to give false figures, exaggerated by more than eight times.

In this same editorial of May 2, 1955, NAREB charges that "the mayor of Detroit was refused information by the public housing authority in his city." I have had the

honor of knowing Mayor Cobo. In addition, I know something, as Public Housing Commissioner, of the operation of public housing in that city and the State of Michigan, which requires all public housing authorities, or commissions as they are referred to there, to operate directly under the control of the city government. Given that as a fact, how could any public housing commission in Michigan refuse information to its mayor, let alone the Detroit Housing Commission, refuse Mayor Cobo?

Not content with the obvious falsity of this charge by NAREB, I have had my office contact that of Mayor Cobo, with regard to this statement. He authorized us to deny its veracity and to state that the Detroit Housing Commission has at no time denied him information, but quite the contrary, has always supplied it. On what figment of imagination NAREB has based this charge, I do not know. I do know, and Mayor Cobo knows, that it is false.

Like many national organizations, NAREB meets annually, and for the most part, much good accrues to the realtor and the real-estate industry from the interchange of ideas at these meetings. But unfortunately, through the years, public housing has become the whipping boy at these annual affairs. We run the gauntlet.

Periodically, all the old housing bogies are dragged out by NAREB for public display—the old chestnuts are refurbished.

Eight years ago NAREB was saying that public housing was a "fascistic, communistic, socialistic doctrine." Public housing, they said then, "is a danger to freedom, a danger to home ownership, and a danger to our form of government." In 1947, a NAREB spokesman told a Senate committee that public housing could destroy the country's entire private housing industry.

They have kept it up. Last year NAREB alleged from Washington, D. C., that public housing failed to house needy families; it was a special privilege and a political racket; it was a Russian custom; it herded families together into ghettos, and it is an unfair burden on homeowners.

In 1955, NAREB's tune is largely the same. The lyrics are but little different in the May 2 editorial. They said this year that public housing is a form of mental sickness. It does not eliminate crime and delinquency. It is not public. Who wants it? And has it done any good?

The passage of time has not had any visible effect on NAREB's public housing views.

Not much. NAREB asked the hackneyed question: Does public housing take care of the needy?" Earlier in my remarks we examined their statement concerning the National Capital Housing Authority. What is the national picture?

Our records show that during the first half of 1954, the recheck of over 142,000 families living in low-rent public housing showed an average annual income of $1,852 after allowable exemptions. For families admitted during that time, the figure was $1,810. We have no data yet on rechecks for the rest of 1954, but the 30,000 families moving in during October, November, and December 1954 had average annual incomes of only $1,803 after exemptions, $7 less than those admitted in the first half of the year.

These families then were existing on an income of $150 a month. I say they needed help from public housing. Further, 30 percent of the families admitted during the last quarter of 1954 were receiving public or private relief or some form of public benefit.

What is NAREB's definition of need? What are they doing about it? Beyond pious platitudes, have they any practical solution for getting these people out of slums into decent, livable housing?

Take a long look at NAREB's oft-repeated assertion that public housing means the extinction of the private home-building industry. A look at the figures leads me to question the plaintive note in the May 2 tirade, "Public housing strikes down a large element of the construction industry, always a main source of investment and jobs."

What is the record?

The housing census of 1950 showed there were 46 million dwelling units in the United States, a net gain since 1940 of almost 9 million units. Of the total number, 39 million were classified by the census as nonfarm units, with the balance classified as rural farm dwellings.

A large part of the increase in nonfarm housing was accounted for by 5.7 million new units constructed between 1940 and 1950.

How many federally aided low-rent public housing units were started in that decade? About 150,000. Who's being shoved into oblivion?

Now, let's take a look at housing starts for the past 5 years.

Private enterprise started construction on almost 6 million dwelling units in that period.

Local housing authorities started construction on a total of 204,000 low-rent units.

Elementary arithmetic will show low-rent public housing accounted for just about 3 percent of the total nonfarm housing starts. If this 3 percent is scaring 97 percent, it is the wonder of the age. The only people we're really scaring are the slum landlords.

Obviously, public housing is neither throttling private enterprise, nor dooming the private building industry to extinction—a charge trumpeted by NAREB.

NAREB's Washington editorial also asked "Does public housing eliminate crime and delinquency?" And it answered, "All the news we get is that both are on the increase everywhere in our cities, regardless of public housing."

Public housing will not solve every problem of the current age. Just as the police departments, the fire departments, and the welfare departments of your cities do not eliminate crime, fire, and disease entirely. But without any of these municipal agencies, you can conjecture with horror the state we would be in. We have not eliminated crime and juvenile delinquency, either, but we have bettered the record that was in existence before us. Certainly, there is less crime and juvenile delinquency in our projects than there were in the slums that we replaced.

There is also another side to the problem.

As you know, the Congress has been devoting considerable attention to the problems of juvenile delinquency.

The Senate Judiciary Committee selected a subcommittee to investigate juvenile delinquency in the United States. Earlier this year the committee released an interim report on its findings. I believe you will find the following of interest: "Although physically deteriorated and socially disorganized neighborhoods, usually termed slum areas contributed disproportionately to the delinquency caseloads of police and juvenile courts, economically well-to-do communities also produce many juvenile delinquents. As a matter of fact, certain forms of delinquent conduct appear more prevalent in the latter type of neighborhoods." It is not just our problem.

Public housing is not the sole panacea for the Nation's social and economic needs. But as a businessman, a realtor, a former mayor of a good-sized city, I can assure you that public housing is good business, both socially and economically.

You are all too familiar with the pros and cons of federally aided low-rent public housing for me to repeat them. You live with them 7 days a week. I only wish that those who seek to discredit and destroy public housing could spend a week, or at least a day, in a slum house. Or to spare them this mild horror, let them merely tour a slum area on a hot summer day. They'll find out soon enough whether families want to escape from their slum hovels into the decent public housing that NAREB has tagged a ghetto and the cornerstone of the socialistic state.

NAREB has tried through the years to make public housing a synonym for socialism, for communism, for something un-American. Tell me, is it un-American to want to live in decent homes? Do we force families from slums into clean, bright accommodations at rents within their means? Do we hold them in public housing against their will? I know of no pressure—political or otherwise—which binds an American family to a low-rent lease.

Basically, Americans of low income are the same as you and I. We all seek constantly to improve our station in life. We can go as high as our opportunities and our abilities permit us. That's the American way. We all want a decent home for our families.

By the way, the title of NAREB's editorial was "Let's Stop It Now." I agree wholeheartedly.

It'll Take More Than Big Four Meet for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "It'll Take More Than Big Four Meet for Peace" which appeared in the May 17, 1955, issue of the Owensboro Messenger of Owensboro, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

IT'LL TAKE MORE THAN BIG FOUR MEET FOR PEACE

It has been taken for granted for sometime that, barring difficulties imposed by the Kremlin, there will be a Big Four meeting in late spring or early summer to discuss an easing of world tensions. But this was not meant to include a face-to-face meeting of the heads of state.

Now President Eisenhower has given Secretary of State Dulles authority to arrange a so-called meeting at the summit, if it can be held in accord with certain conditions. Perhaps one may be permitted to voice doubt that such a conference would prove productive, even if the preconditions are met.

To begin with, a meeting at the summit is supposed to be a gathering of equals. That means men who head the party that got to the peak, and not some of the load bearers.

In this case, we evidently cannot arrange that kind of conference. For the Russian representative would be Marshal Nikolai Bulganin, Soviet premier in name but in fact considered to be under the thumb of Nikita Khrushchev, secretary of the Russian Communist Party.

Consequently, the high level meeting would find Mr. Eisenhower, Prime Minister Eden of Britain (if the Conservatives win the May 26 election), Premier Edgar Faure of France—all top men—meeting with a Russian who would look constantly to Moscow for signals.

No French premier these days can assume he is operating on more than a temporary pass. Therefore he brings little authority of a personal sort to any conference. As a

matter of fact, Faure may not even be the "man at the summit" by summertime.

In the heat of a great war, people tend to cluster around a handful of dominant leaders in the chief warring nations. Thus it was perhaps inevitable that in World War II big decisions fell to Soviet, British and American heads of state meeting in personal session.

But the history of these personal meetings, as we have seen, has been far from happy in terms of ultimate results. It would seem plain that heads of state possess no special magic that can guarantee the good faith of the participating countries.

In the light of the historical record, it is astounding that so many people today place such fanciful hope in the wonder-working of another top level conference. Only fear, presumably, could lead them to think so wishfully, could make them seek that "one great stroke" which would wash away all their troubles.

The Russians may indeed be in a mood to arrange some kind of deal with the West, in line with strategy which recognizes the West's augmented strength in Europe. But if they are, it will not take Eden, Faure, and Mr. Eisenhower to bring it off. Their agents, meeting with agents of the Kremlin, can do it.

Except possibly as a news photographers' showpiece, the meeting at the summit is today largely a discredited device of diplomacy. Pressures for it now may be politically irresistible in some places, but realistic men will not bank heavily on an outcome triumphant for freedom.

An Authoritative Tribute To Our Young People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include a very timely editorial, commenting upon the inaugural address of President Arthur B. Bronwell, of Worcester Polytechnic Institute, which apepared in the May 1 issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Sunday Telegram.

The article follows:

TECH INAUGURAL ADDRESS

In his inaugural address Saturday, President Arthur B. Bronwell, of Worcester Polytechnic Institute spoke earnestly of the many problems which educators face in these times.

One of the points which he stressed is the "geometrical growth of knowledge in virtually every field of human endeavor." The ever-mounting discoveries of new facts, the constantly accumulating mass of data, the working out of new theories—these add so swiftly to the world's information that man sometimes becomes confused and almost overwhelmed. As President Bronwell remarked, there is "no field of knowledge which has progressed more rapidly or had a more profound effect upon our national life than science and engineering." Moreover, there is no sign of a pause in this rapid advance. "Those who work close to the frontiers of knowledge," said President Bronwell, "assert that there are vast unexplored domains of knowledge which will yet change our culture and our industry."

It is no wonder that there are controversies in education.

Not all change is progress, but there certainly cannot be progress without change. Here youth makes its invaluable contribution. "The touchstone of civilization's progress has always been youths' restless urge to seek change," President Bronwell said.

But this is no mere curiosity or discontent. President Bronwell believes in the "integrity and promise of the youth of this country." He has been associated with college-age students for nearly 20 years, and during that time he has "observed no diminution of ideals, of motivation, of capamilities, and abilities."

That was a calm but strong tribute to the young people of today.

Roger Lowell Putnam—Advertising Club of Springfield, Mass., Honors Outstanding Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the William Pynchon medal is an award given by the Springfield Advertising Club to a Springfield citizen for distinguished service to his city. It is the most coveted of civic awards. I am happy to inform the Congress that this year's presentation went to one who is familiar to many Members of this House, Roger Lowell Putnam.

The Springfield Advertising Club is to be congratulated on its choice. There are few men who have served the city of Springfield, Mass., more conspicuously than Mr. Putnam. He has been a "good citizen" in the very best tradition of those words. Whether in peace or in war, he has answered the call of his Nation and his community. And no matter what level in which he served, he has given outstanding, noteworthy service. In a life that has been crammed with private executive functions, he has nonetheless found much time to devote to the public good. Indeed he has been and is an inspiring example not alone to his own city but to the Nation. The father of five children, a graduate magna cum laude from Harvard, studied at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, honorary degrees from Boston College and St. Anselm's College; vice president, president, and chairman of the board of Package Machinery Co.; director of Van Norman Co., American Bosch Corp., Third National Bank & Trust Co., Springfield Chamber of Commerce, New England Council; sole trustee, Lowell Observatory, Flagstaff, Ariz.; member of American Astronomical Association, Petersham, Mass., Memorial Library, Springfield, Mass., Library Association, Commission on Fine Arts and Music, Astronomical Society of the Pacific, Harvard Club of Boston and New York, Colony Club of Springfield, Delta Psi—all of these give testimony to his success in education and in business. Further achievements in behalf of his Nation and community are detailed in his service as an ensign and lieutenant, United States Navy in World War I; lieutenant commander, United States Naval Reserve, 1943; research and development on staff of Admiral Kirk, Deputy Director of Office of Contract Settlement, 1944-46; Economic Stabilization Administrator, 1952; and mayor of Springfield, Mass., 1937–41—the first three time mayor up to that time in the history of the city.

Roger Lowell Putnam received the William Pynchon Medal at the annual award dinner of the Advertising Club of Springfield on last Tuesday, May 17, 1955. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial titled "Pynchon Medal Award" that appeared in the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News on May 18, 1955.

PYNCHON MEDAL AWARD

Rogel Lowell Putnam last night became the 80th person to receive the William Pynchon Medal, awarded by the Springfield Advertising Club for distinguished service to the city.

The award, named for the founder of Springfield, was given to Mr. Putnam, a former mayor and chairman of the board of the Package Machinery Co., of East Longmeadow, for "his outstanding contributions in the field of humanics which have been dedicated to the betterment of mankind, for his voluntary acceptance of duty in local, national, and international affairs, his business and personal integrity, and his devotion to responsibilities, which have been reflected in higher standards of human values in the civic, industrial, and community life of the Springfield area."

Adm. Alan G. Kirk, former Ambassador to Russia, spoke at the dinner and lauded Mr. Putnam who served on Kirk's staff during two world wars.

There are many in Springfield who can testify to Mr. Putnam's ability and intelligence, who can cite his achievements, and can do honor to his devotion to public causes. However, we are pleased when the judgment of our community is endorsed by someone from another field of service who recognized Mr. Putnam's worth.

Mr. Putnam is honored with the Pynchon Medal, and he adds honor to the award as he joins the roll of distinguished citizens who have served Springfield well.

The Canadian Vaccine Story: No Snarls, No Doubts, No Delays as Government Runs the Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article which appeared in the New York Post of May 20, 1955, is deserving of our attention:

THE CANADIAN VACCINE STORY: NO SNARLS, NO DOUBTS, NO DELAYS AS GOVERNMENT RUNS THE PROGRAM

TORONTO, May 20.—Canada's polio immunization program moves along unhampered, unclouded by the shadows of doubt and free of bickering, accusations, and suspicion.

Through the cooperative efforts of the Dominion, provincial and municipal governments, the medical profession, and the nation's principal research facilities, 1,500,000 children will have been inoculated by July 1, and 5,400,000 a year later.

This represents free inoculations—at least two shots—for every boy and girl in Canada under 20 years of age by July 1956.

Already more than 1 million children have received their first shots.

The entire cost is being shared by the Federal and Provincial Governments. Every dose of vaccine for the free program is being produced in Canadian laboratories under Government contract.

As long ago as last year when the vaccine field tests were underway, Canada's Health Minister, Paul Martin, began to lay plans against the day when it would be pronounced a success.

Unlike his Washington counterpart, Welfare Secretary Hobby, Martin was ready with a program when the Francis report hailed the vaccine as safe and effective. He had plans worked out with the Provinces, both for distribution and for sharing the cost of the nonprofit vaccine on a 50–50 basis.

From the beginning the program in Canada has been remarkably free of controversy.

The inoculation blitz began in Ontario, Canada's largest and most populous dominion, on March 4, more than a month before the Salk vaccine was confirmed a success by the Francis commission. It has picked up speed continuously since, uninterrupted by fears of danger, failure, or doubt.

To date Canada has not had one post-inoculation case of polio.

There have been no charges of lack of precaution of insufficient testing or of governmental meddling in the field of medicine. In fact, the Canadian Medical Association has given its complete blessing to government control of the program and considers the Canadian system the ideal method of distribution.

All over Canada private practitioners are offering their assistance without fee to medical health officers to speed the program along.

They are not jealous of government intervention. Dr. A. D. Kelly, general secretary of the Canadian Medical Association, has said it was traditional in Canada that all biological products of this kind be made available by the government.

Behind the Canadian immunization program and most responsible for its fast start and success is one man—Dr. Robert D. DeFries, director of the University of Toronto School of Hygiene and the Connaught Medical Research Laboratories—where to date all of Canada's Salk vaccine has been made.

Research for a polio vaccine have been underway in Connaught Laboratories at the University of Toronto for many years before the Salk vaccine was developed. The work was financed by the Canadian Foundation for Poliomyelitis.

As a result of a Connaught discovery the lab supplied most of the culture medium and live virus used in the preparation of Salk vaccine for last year's tests in Canada and the United States.

In May 1954, at a meeting of the Dominion Council of Health, DeFries raised the question of Government financing of the program.

This was still long before the Salk vaccine had been proved a success. But DeFries had enough confidence in the Salk product to recommend that the Government not wait for proof but underwrite the cost of full-speed production of the vaccine.

The Provinces agreed to pay half the cost of producing 500,000 triple doses of vaccine to be distributed on a per capita basis to all districts. The Federal Health Department underwrote the other half.

Each triple dose cost $1.50.

Delivery was promised for April 1 of this year, but it came through even before and the immunization program began in Ontario on March 4. There has been a 90-percent response of those eligible for the first group, every Canadian child in the first three grades.

By July 1 children in those grades will have had two injections. They will get their third 7 months later. In Ontario this represents 375,000 children, more than 20 percent of all Ontario children under 20.

"We are very satisfied with our program," said Dr. John T. McPhair, Ontario's deputy minister of health. "We have had no criticism, no hitches, no protests. It has rolled on remarkably smoothly," he said.

Until now the vaccine has been available only to those decreed eligible by the Provinces. But it is now becoming available to private doctors from two pharmaceutical houses, Parke-Davis and Eli Lilly, who send it to Canada from the United States.

According to Dr. Kelly, however, the CMA presumes that as soon as Connaught (and the University of Montreal's Institute of Microbiology and Hygiene, which is also setting up manufacturing facilities under Government grant) catches up with the demand, vaccine will be made available to private doctors at Government expense as is the case with other biological products.

In the meantime, at the University of Toronto's laboratories (not a Government-owned institution) scientists continue to make the vaccine as fast as is safely possible. Every batch is checked twice—once at the lab and a second time by the Department of National Health and Welfare Laboratories in Ottawa.

Bill Introduced To Erect a Memorial to the Memory of Albert Einstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is not that we pay homage today to genius. Albert Einstein was that and more—much more. We pay homage to this gentle man, to this man of heart, conscience, and mind. He sought the answer that all of us, in an infinite variety of ways, seek—the underlying unity of the universe.

We weep that he is gone from us, and it is right that we do so. We rejoice that in him and through him we have witnessed the magnificence that human beings can reach, and it is right that we do so.

Albert Einstein was a shy man, at ease only with his music and the children who came his way. Yet he was a man unafraid. He did not keep silent when demagogs and self-seekers sought to shackle us into conformity and strip us of our natural heritage of restless, searching, intellectual curiosity. He feared, more than any one single thing, the mind imprisoned. There were many who for this reason called him foolish and soft and there were others who called him dangerous.

He lent his illustrious name to many causes because—and of this I am sure—he knew there are many ills, many woes, many injustices man-made which man can undo. Poverty, disease, prejudice, hatreds—these are common foes. And Albert Einstein, man of genius, of scientific achievement unmatched in this century, looked upon the people and loved them, all peoples, all creeds, all races.

I remember once receiving a letter. The envelope was the kind that you buy for a penny in a corner store. The address on the envelope was written in a small, almost childish hand. And inside was a letter, handwritten, in the same hand, on a penny sheet of stationery, requesting help on a private immigration case, and the signature, humbly and unpretentiously, was "Albert Einstein."

This was some 10 years ago, and the memory of this simple little letter stays with me, for it was a mark of the man's humility and greatness.

When I spoke with him, as I had the honor to do on a number of occasions, I was again struck by the simplicity of this man who had opened vistas of science that even today are remaking the world. Today we stand at the crossroads between fear and hope. There will be a meeting "at the summit" of four world leaders who, together, could unlock the doors to peace. The dread destruction unleashed by the Einstein formula may yet be the Einstein formula to release the world from the scourge of war. For the dread of this destruction has pushed the world toward the imperative of making peace.

Because of this and because of much more which is inexpressible in the human heart, I have offered a resolution to erect a memorial to the memory of Albert Einstein. The resolution I have introduced reads as follows:

Resolved, etc., That authority is hereby granted to any organization which may be organized for this purpose, to erect within 5 years from the date of approval of this resolution, a memorial testifying to the humanity and majestic scientific achievements of Albert Einstein, in the city of Washington on such grounds as may be designated by the Fine Arts Commission, subject to the approval of the Joint Committee on the Library. The model of the memorial so to be erected shall be first approved by the said Commission and by the Joint Committee on the Library, the same to be presented to the people of the United States without cost to the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That the cost of custodian maintenance of the edifice contemplated by this act will be borne perpetually by the organization undertaking its original construction.

Keep the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in offering for the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Thursday, May 19, 1955, issue of the Missouri Cash-Book, of Jackson, Mo., I would call attention to the fact that it appears that the Farm Bureau, through its Farm Bureau News, appears to be following the policy set by Secretary of Agriculture Benson in his apparent efforts to widen the breech between consumer and farm groups, is deliberately, purposefully, and maliciously misquoting the record.

In this particular instance I am referring to the misquoting of the distin-

guished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, who has been misquoted by those who would attempt to leave the impression that Representative COOLEY has said that Mr. Walter Reuther made the best speech that he had ever heard given before the House Committee on Agriculture, and the same people would, also by their misquotations attempt to leave the impression that Chairman COOLEY had said that Mr. Reuther had presented the farmers case better than it had been presented by any witness who had appeared before his committee. The Farm Bureau News, according to the reprint of its article in the Kansas City Daily Drovers Telegram, apparently has dealt in the use of the superlative to leave the impression that Chairman COOLEY was discrediting the testimony of many outstanding farm leaders who have appeared before his committee.

In my opinion nothing could be further from the truth. I attended the hearing at which Mr. Reuther testified, and I have been present at many other hearings during the time I have been a Member of Congress and during which I have been privileged to serve on this great committee which is working so hard in the face of dogged, determined and persistent opposition of the present Secretary of Agriculture. It was my first time to ever see, meet, or hear Mr. Reuther, and I must confess that before he began I was skeptical of any contribution which might be made by the president of any group of organized labor, even if he did represent an estimated 6 million members, all of whom naturally are consumers of farm products.

Following his talk I said that I concurred with the statement of Chairman COOLEY that Mr. Reuther had made one—and I repeat, one—of the best speeches dealing with the problems of agriculture that I had heard. Likewise, Chairman COOLEY did not say that Mr. Reuther had presented the farmers' case better or more effectively than it had been presented by any farm leader. What he did say, and I quote from the hearings, which I believe were correctly reported:

> We have had many farm leaders in this committee during the 20 years that I have served here on this committee and I want to say that not one of them has surpassed you in the presentation of the farmers' cause.

To those who have been critical of our chairman for inviting representatives of consumers groups to appear before our committee to discuss the proposed changes in the farm bill to restore 90 percent of parity to support prices on basic commodities, which has now been approved in the House, I would only remind them that every person in this Nation is affected either directly or indirectly by the prosperity of agriculture and the millions of farm families who derive their livelihood from the soil. Those consumers who have been led to believe that the high prices they are having to pay for food and fiber are caused by the fixed fair support prices which have been accorded the basic commodities, need to learn the truth. One of the best ways for them to get the true picture is to attend and participate in the hearings on legislation of this type. This is the opportune time to correct the wrong impressions they may have gained from reading propaganda put out by those who contend that they represent agriculture, but who at this very hour are attempting to destroy the agricultural program which we have been attempting to build for years.

It is for this reason that I commend to my colleagues for reading the editorial below, which was written by my good friend, Mr. C. C. Oliver, a contributing editor of the Cash-Book:

MAYBE THEY REMEMBERED

In last week's issue of our Farm Bureau News, there was a reprint in its editorial column from the Kansas City Daily Drovers Telegram in which Congressman HAROLD COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, was taken to task because he praised a talk made before his committee by Walter Reuther, head of the CIO, in behalf of farmers.

The article was headed "A Scratching of Backs?" Since our experience has been that the Farm Bureau News prints only opinions that meet with its editors' opinions, we assume that it agrees wholeheartedly with the article reproduced from the Drovers Telegram.

The D. T. says the thing that gave it a jolt (and we presume jolted the F. B. News) was Mr. COOLEY's statement that Mr. Reuther "actually made the best farm speech that I have heard in our committee room during the entire 20 years that I have served on the House Committee on Agriculture."

What is there in or about a statement like that to give the Drovers Telegram and in turn the Farm Bureau News, a jolt? Do they think Mr. COOLEY wasn't telling the truth or do they think he's just a poor judge of speeches on farming? If it's the latter view they take, We'd like to inform them that Mr. COOLEY wasn't alone in his appraisal of the speech as the best that he'd ever heard. Our Congressman from this district, PAUL C. JONES, wrote in his newsletter to the papers of this district, the first of last March, saying:

"One of the most impressive witnesses who has ever appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture which is presently considering a proposal to restore the 90 percent price-support program, was CIO President Walter Reuther, whose opening statement was that while he was not appearing as an authority on farm problems nor as an expert on farm policies, that speaking on behalf of the 6 million members of the CIO, he wanted to make it clear that 'American farmers who are making a tremendous contribution to the well-being and the economic progress of our great country ought to be given the kind of support and consideration that will enable farm families to get that measure of economic justice that parity reflects.'

"At the conclusion of Mr. Reuther's statement, made from notes and lasting about 45 minutes, I believe that without exception and regardless of politics or philosophy, the members of the committee concurred with Chairman COOLEY when he stated that in his opinion, Mr. Reuther had made one of the best speeches he had ever heard, and added, 'We have had many farm leaders in this committee during the 20 years that I have served here on this committee and I want to say that not one of them has surpassed you in the presentation of the farmer's cause'."

This appraisal and statement of Congressman JONES would seem to warrant the opinion that Chairman COOLEY expressed following Mr. Reuther's talk.

But quoting the D. T. further as reprinted in the Farm Bureau News it says: "But to say in effect that an outsider has been able to present the farmer's case more effectively than the farmer himself, obviously is to do an injustice to a great many intelligent farmers and conscientious farm leaders."

Where's the injustice? If we're trying to do a job and a fellow comes along who can do better than we can at it, we'd welcome his help instead of considering that he was doing us an injustice.

Doubtless Chairman COOLEY, Mr. JONES and other members of the committee have heard many intelligent farmers and conscientious farm leaders. But they might have been like Allen Kline, former national president of the organization, and H. E. Slusher, present president of the Missouri Farm Bureau, neither of whom in our opinion represent the rank and file of our membership. We've read some of their speeches and heard them talk and when they'd get in stride and go to talking to us about losing our freedom and security if we voted controls on our major crops and got as much as 90 percent of parity on them, it always seemed to us like they were long on verbiage and short on meat.

Maybe Mr. COOLEY, JONES, and the rest of the Committee on Agriculture recalled their kind of speeches when they were passing judgment on Mr. Reuther's talk.

What America and Freedom Has Meant to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD an excellent speech made by Mr. Alfred P. Adamo, of Detroit, before his friends who gathered on the occasion of his 50th year in the United States.

Mr. Adamo typifies the spirit of the hard-working Italian immigrant in his love and appreciation of America with its freedom and equal opportunity for all. He has developed a deep-rooted understanding of American principles which he zestfully and patriotically believes should be guarded with the utmost care.

Those of us who are native born in America and tend to take for granted our heritage might well heed the words of Alfred Adamo:

On May 4, 1905, then 17 years old, I immigrated to the United States of America from Italy. During these 50 years (which seems to me to be just yesterday) I have found that America is the land of opportunities and holds many promises for man, provided that he is able and willing to contribute his share of energy and to work for success.

Remember that freedom is precious to the man that appreciates it, and such freedom can never be purchased because it comes from the will of God and is delivered unto man and it is up to him to keep it close to his heart in order to make good use of it.

History tells us that the Italians (Romans) did a lot of good deeds for the world: They brought religion, civilization, art, music, literature, and laws, but when they became

careless, the empire of Rome fell, like leaves that fall in the fall. Italy is still the center of all Christendom and famous for the splendor of her architecture.

The very same thing could happen and may happen to America, if we continue to become careless and to accept those evil foreign powers' advice. We must bear in mind that America has been surrounded by unscrupulous friends, and citizens who have been jealous, prejudiced, and envious; and that is why America is not as it used to be. That is also why today we are in a state of regimentation and slave taxation, but there is still time to save America from further confusion if we all work together, have faith among ourselves, and trust each other.

Faith and freedom are just like a light in a dark room, if you and I are able to keep that light burning we must encourage faith, hope, charity in order to keep man close together. Freedom gives man the willpower to work and build and to cultivate the work he has done.

Freedom is a gift to man but often he loses it because he abuses it and becomes very careless and selfish.

Remember that life is only what you make of it, and you should never give up hope. It is not where you were born or what you are, it is what you make of yourself that counts.

America is the only country in the world that has given man justice, freedom, and equality. We should never neglect our duties of being good, loyal American citizens and we should never rely on others to accomplish what we are aiming at. We should always give an honest day's work whether we work for ourselves or others, in order to produce. Remember a house is to be built from the bottom and not from the top.

I personally have found that in order to get what you aim for, you have to work for it. No individual should depend on others, but should learn to depend on himself. No matter how little you may earn, you will enjoy it. At no time should an individual feel that the Government owes him a living, as the Government is sustained by the people. The only thing that a Government should promise to its citizens is a good social and constructive legislation.

When a citizen begins to depend on his Government for future security, the Nation stands still, and he becomes poor.

Many people do not understand America, and this is the reason why they have such a low and superficial conception of its power.

America is the melting pot of all races and creeds, and when we came here we all belonged to a minority group, but as Americans we should never feel that we belong to that group. It is my belief and contention that there is no minority group, which we have often heard about.

There are some of those unsatisfied groups which the more they received the more they wanted.

People came here from all over the globe. They brought with them civilization, religion, art, and laws and we all contributed so much, and that is why America has become so great in such a short time.

All of these years it has been my aim to contribute my share of work and to build for the growth and success of America. Even as of today, my working hours are never less than 12 daily; but I have enjoyed earning what I have and helping others as much as I could.

We have often heard that there is no second-class citizen or individual. This is a great error on the part of the spokesman because I believe there is a first- and second-class citizen. There always has been and always will be. We may be born and die equal but we never live and contribute equally.

I wish to tell you a secret that should be of interest to every citizen: Since I became a citizen I never missed a vote and you should do likewise because this is of vital interest to everyone.

I have anticipated this celebration, for many years, in appreciation of my adopted country, and it makes me so happy to thank each and every one for being with me and helping on this occasion; and may God bless you and keep America close to your heart.

In closing, I wish to pay tribute to my wife, Anna, who has constantly worked with me; my 3 children, Louis, Victor, and Victoria; my daughters-in-law, Daisy, Anna; my son-in-law, Clifford; and my 5 grandchildren, Marcia, Diana, Victor, Anna Marie, and Christine.

ALFRED P. ADAMO.

DETROIT, MICH.

Germany and the United States Are Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include the following excerpts from my remarks at the annual Founder's Day dinner of the Steuben Society of America at the Hotel Statler, New York, Saturday night, May 21:

The problem of the status of Germany today and its relations with the United States is of the deepest concern not only to members of the Steuben Society but to all Americans.

It is now 10 years since World War II, 10 years that have been as fateful for mankind as any decade in history. Ten years ago hopes for permanent peace were high. We have seen those hopes fade as the Communists made clear their intention to dominate the world. We have seen the advent of the atomic age, with its awesome potentialities for good or evil. We have seen whole societies in flux, as colonial regimes have yielded to pressure, and new states have been launched to fend for themselves. As the conquest of time and space has assumed fantastic proportions, we know, with a sense of utter finality, that geographic isolation is impossible. Thus we have seen our own America emerge as the acknowledged leader of the free world.

During this entire period a crucial problem in American foreign policy has been the problem of Germany. I might almost say the crucial problem—for the trained manpower and the huge industrial complex of Germany represent the greatest prize in the deadly game originated by the men in the Kremlin. In short, the future of Germany and of America are inextricably linked.

Once Soviet intentions toward Germany became clear, our present German policy began to evolve. In his famous speech in Stuttgart in 1946, Secretary of State James F. Byrnes declared that America would help Germany toward economic recovery and political stability.

We merged our occupation zone with that of the British, and when the Marshall plan was inaugurated we made help available to Germany in liberal amounts. That aid sparked the remarkable economic recovery of Germany, a recovery that has aroused the admiration of the world. Under Allied auspices, a constiution for a democratic Federal Government of Germany was drawn up, and that Government was launched in 1949. A few months before, our airlift had called the Soviet bluff designed to push freedom out of West Berlin. Then came the complex negotiations for the rearmament of Germany. They were rendered more urgent by the bold Communist attempt to seize South Korea, the lesson of which for Germany was all too clear. The current of pessimism which swept the free world at the defeat of the European Defense Community was fortunately replaced by the thrill of hope when the Western European Union became a reality. The salient fact, however, is that today, 10 years after the end of the war, Germany stands again a sovereign state, with democratic political parties, institutions, courts, and press.

This reforging of the bonds of German-American friendship is not solely a product of power politics. It did not arise simply because Russia covets Germany and we oppose Russia. Nor is it completely the result of our desire to keep German economic strength on our side, important as that factor may be. It is also a recognition of the intrinsic virtues of the German people, of their energy and their dedication. Above all, it is an appreciation of the effort by which Germany pulled itself up from the depths. Such a people obviously cannot be treated as a cipher in international politics; they cannot be a purely agricultural people; they cannot be left powerless, tempting prey to Soviet rapacity.

On the surface, then, our policy in Germany has been a success. But beneath the surafce are many boiling tensions which may yet defeat the policies on which we have labored so long. Occasionally it seems that we are in danger of converting those policies into ends in themselves, and those of losing the advantages in Germany and Europe which we now hold.

Lest this all seem cryptic, let me hasten to specify. It is no secret, for example, that not only the French but the other nations of continental Europe as well are lukewarm on German rearmament. They have accepted the idea, but only in the context of a complicated set of alliances in which we are the dominating partner. This attitude, perhaps, is only to be expected, in view of the long memories which war often breeds.

But the interesting thing is that considerable numbers of Germans and anti-Communist Germans at that, likewise oppose rearmament. Some oppose it because they fear renascent militarism. But even more widely held is the conviction that final alinement with the western bloc through rearmament closes the door on reunification of Germany for as long as those of us alive today can reasonably foresee.

What a trump card this situation gives to Soviet diplomacy. The Soviets have always had it in their power, of course, to bring about German unification. But they have always balked at genuinely free elections. Their ill-concealed desire to communize all of Germany has caused them to forfeit this diplomatic advantage. Not only would the western allies not accept unification of Germany on Communist terms, but Germany would not accept it either.

Now the Soviet Union is seeking to turn to central Europe the face of sweet reasonableness. After 10 years of blocking an Austrian treaty, it has suddenly agreed to conditions on which the West had not been able to win acceptance for years. The Russians have agreed to withdraw all troops. Austria, on its part, is not to join any military alliance, or permit military bases on its territory, and is to ask a guarantee from the Big Four against any future attempt by Germany at anschluss, or union. This week the bells of St. Stephen's in Vienna pealed out the glad news of Austria's freedom.

It is apparent, however, that the real object of this not too subtle maneuver is Germany. The Russians are quite plainly saying to Germany: Withdraw from the Western alliance, do not proceed with re-

armament, accept the status of neutrality, and we will see to it that you are happily reunited with your 18 million brethren in the East. In the offing are hints of increased trade with Eastern Europe. It is easy to see why this argument should make a powerful appeal to German opinion. It is equally easy to see why it should appeal to European opinion outside of Germany, which is only reluctantly reconciled to the idea of German rearmament. At one stroke the Russians have contrived to put pressure on the Western system of alliances and on the Adenauer government which supports them.

The Russian object still remains the same: to draw a "neutralized" Germany into the Communist orbit. This she intends to do by retaining her hold on Germany's enslaved neighbors in Eastern Europe, and by biding her time for the day when she can swing another Molotov-Ribbentrop pact with a remilitarized Germany.

Far be it from me to suggest that the Bonn Republic is about to leap into the arms of Moscow. The people of West Germany know that the United States is their proven friend. They do not look inward, but outward to a united Europe, and to a Western Union that spans the Atlantic. But they would be less than human if they were not sorely tempted by a Soviet offer of the character I have described.

This situation presents the United States with both a trial and an opportunity. I am afraid that if our policy becomes encased in rigid formulae, we are in for a time of trial. It is all well and good to insist that we favor German unity, as our State Department has done repeatedly; but this insistence must be coupled with a thorough examination of the means to achieve it. It is in just such an examination that our opportunity lies, for it may be possible, in cooperation with West Germany, to arrive at a solution for the problem of reunification that the Russians must either honor, or lose permanently the advantage of the diplomatic trump they now hold. What is required is some imagination, and an ability to take a long, clear look at our German policy, a look marked by detachment and devotion to the national interest, and uncluttered by political slogans. I cannot believe that our country lacks either the brains or the courage to do this.

Having said all this, it is with some trepidation that I offer a few of my own thoughts on this subject. It seems to me that perhaps one fruitful approach would be to do something like this: Let the President tell Western Europe in the clearest terms that Germany is being rearmed because Russia has left the West no alternative; that, however, if Western Europe will agree, and if Russia will withdraw to her historic borders, we would welcome a Germany that is unified in freedom, and a liberated Eastern Europe, all without the capacity to make aggressive war, but with their security guaranteed by the United Nations. I think that in this manner we would give a crystal-clear demonstration to those people of Western Europe who genuinely fear German rearmament that we are not ruthlessly overriding their point of view. At the same time, by dropping our insistence that Germany adhere to the Western bloc for military purposes, we might force Russia to consent to the unification of Germany under what, in the last analysis, would be Western auspices for every purpose other than military. Certainly if Russia refused her consent, on these terms, her diplomatic position in Germany would suffer a heavy blow. She could no longer pose as the champion of German unity.

But I feel this proposal can be pushed even further. It seems to me that a logical solution for Eastern Europe is at least a partial internationalization along the lines now being pursued in the western part of the Continent. Countries such as Poland, the Baltic States, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria might be free and independent, but linked in a Central and Eastern European community based on a respect for human rights. Who knows? Perhaps one day the Eastern European and the Western European federations could be merged in a real United Europe. And couldn't the vision of Charlemagne and the dream of Dante then become a reality?

Under such a proposal, the advantages that might accrue to Germany are considerable. The prospects for peace would be vastly greater. The partial internationalization of Eastern Europe offers a constructive opportunity for a just settlement, with German concurrence, of the trans-Oder-Neisse territory now administered by Poland. While no longer a member of the Western military alliance, Germany would not be required to forego membership in the European Coal and Steel Community, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the Council of Europe, even of a transatlantic economic and political NATO, nor of the United Nations. Germany would lack arms, but she would be free to form economic, political, and social ties with whom she wished—and I think she would wish them mainly with the West. Lying in the heart of Europe, she would be the natural center of trade within the continent. Her mighty economy would be devoted toward peace, not war. I refuse to believe that Germany can find greatness only in militarism, or that the prospect of using her economic might to benefit the free world in peacetime trade and aid does not hold out a higher inspiration to her people.

For ourselves and our NATO allies, the advantages of such a proposal are equally obvious. The worst sources of tension in Europe would be eliminated. True, Russia herself would still be our antagonist in the cold war. But NATO could and should continue its policy of strength. Certainly the NATO position would not be worsened by relinquishing 12 hypothetical German divisions for 60-plus existing satellite divisions. And if Russia means anything by her current disarmament gestures, progressive disarmament on both sides can go hand in hand with a European settlement.

Now I know that to expect Soviet Russia to withdraw to her historic borders is expecting a great deal, and it is easily conceivable that she would turn such a proposition down flat. But that should not deter us from trying, particularly at a time when signs of Soviet stress are beginning to show. If the Soviet Union, offered a meaningful guaranty of her security in Europe, chooses to stand before the world as the force preventing German unification, as the force imprisoning the satellites, as the force blocking the formation of a European federation dedicated to peace, then let her so stand. We at least will have done our share.

Now obviously I do not have the temerity to suggest that these proposals with respect to Germany and Central Europe are the only proposals, or the best proposals, or anything of the sort. I merely offer them because I am concerned, as I believe you are concerned, with the way our policy toward Germany seems to be stuck on dead center.

I think American policy toward Germany needs to assume a more affirmative character. We must not allow ourselves to be led by events. Rather, we must advance positive, constructive suggestions looking to the solution of this problem. To remain complacent is to court disaster.

When the four powers meet "at the summit" this summer, it would be well if the West had something positive to talk about. For unless we do, a massive Soviet propaganda victory is in prospect.

In the 10 years since the cessation of hostilities, American policy toward Germany, and indeed Germany itself, have come full circle. At first our policy was stern, specifically designed to destroy Germany's military power. The aggressive pursuit by the Soviet Union of its goal of world communism forced a reconsideration of our aims and methods, a reconsideration which led to their thorough overhaul.

But it was not only the activities of the Communists which forced this reconsideration. It was the growing realization, as well, that the spirit of Germany was not the spirit of Adolf Hitler, but rather the spirit of Goethe, of Schiller, of Beethoven. It was inspired by the manner in which Germany set to work to erect a new, democratic structure, on the ruins of the old.

On its part Germany, at the end of the war, was stunned and apathetic. But the will to live and grow was strong. Apathy was put aside, and by a great national effort, Germany lifted herself by her own bootstraps, restored her once flourishing economy, and earned the respect of the nations. Once again, she resumed her rightful place in world affairs.

Today Germany is our trusted friend. She looks to us to help her solve the economic and political problems with which she is still beset. We see her as our ally, working toward a peaceful world. It is to the mutual advantage of both nations that this happy relationship could continue.

In my home city of Milwaukee, a statue of Baron von Steuben stands near that of George Washington. It is fitting that these two heroes of freedom should thus be linked. Let the spirit of freedom which both men exemplify light the way for Germany and America, each united in freedom, to stand together against the despotism that threatens to engulf us.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Address Delivered by Hon. Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana, Before the 20th Annual Meeting of the Delta Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] before the 20th annual meeting of the Delta Council, at Cleveland, Miss., on May 12, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, OF LOUISIANA, BEFORE THE 20TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE DELTA COUNCIL, CLEVELAND, MISS., MAY 12, 1955

Ladies and gentlemen, I was highly pleased and greatly flattered when I received an invitation to address your annual meeting. It is always good for those of us who believe in farming as both a way of life and as the touchstone of our Nation's economy to meet, to exchange ideas, and to compare our experiences. I do not propose to exhaust your patience with a long speech today. I realize that most of you probably know more about the practical side of farming than I, for it has been much too long since I followed behind a plow and watched the shining steel cut into the rich soil of my own State.

I will attempt to review briefly with you today some of the factors which have made the great Mississippi Delta the thriving agricultural area which we know today. I would also like to share by thoughts with you as to what our agriculture must do in order to continue to flourish—in order to remain strong to meet future demands.

My philosophy, both as a farmer and as a United States Senator, is a simple philosophy. I like to treat it and regard it as basic. It is this: "A sound agriculture is the greatest single bulwark our Nation has against the tide of 'isms' which are lapping at our shores."

It has therefore given me considerable pain to note that selfish interests and unscrupulous politicians have sought to pin the red tag of socialism on our agriculture, on our price support program, and even on our individual farmers. Unfortunately, their efforts, aided and abetted by the trumpeting of nationwide propaganda devices, have gone far towards blackening the good name of American agriculture.

It is high time that these people, as well as the millions of men and women who are supported by the proucts of our soil, realized that the tar brush they have wielded is blackening our greatest single hope for the future.

By 1975, our Nation shall number its inhabitants not in the one-hundred-and odd millions, but in the two-hundred-and-odd millions. We shall have more mouths to feed, more bodies to clothe, than we ever dreamed of having only a decade ago. At the same time, we are going to have to produce the extra food and fiber required to meet these demands on even fewer acres of land than we now have. We will be compelled to use every form of American ingenuity in coaxing from our dwlindling stock of precious soil the cotton, the corn, the wheat, the vegetables and the hundreds of other commodities our population will need in order to eat as well in 1975 as we did in 1950 or even now.

To meet this task, our agriculture must remain strong. It must prosper. It must be made attractive.

As I stand before you today, I cannot honestly report that we are building the strength that we shall so urgently require in the years to come. On the contrary, American agriculture is bleeding to death. Farm income is falling. The waters of the great river which flow past our doorstep continue to carry down to the gulf 2 million tons of precious, irreplaceable topsoil every day. That is 730 million tons of soil a year; put another way, enough topsoil to cover a 40-acre farm to the depth of 6 inches is dumped into the Gulf of Mexico every 3 minutes.

And besides the Mississippi River, other great rivers—the Colorado and the Columbia—are doing their share in washing away the very source of agricultural abundance for generations as yet unborn.

Make of note of this waste, ladies and gentlemen, for it is problem No. 1 on our agricultural agenda.

Problem No. 2 is somewhat less tangible—but of infinitely great importance. That problem is the economic health of our American agriculture—of the men and women who till our soil.

Just a month ago, the Department of Agriculture reported that farm income has fallen 10 percent below last year. This downward spiral has not stopped, contrary to what the bright-eyed economists who sit behind the mahogany desks in Washington may say. Every day, more and more of our American small farmers take a look at their dwindling income and decide to abandon farming and seek employment in the city. Only 30 years ago, 1 out of every 8 Americans lived on a farm; today, 1 American out of every 19 lives on a farm.

This mass exodus from the farm has been caused primarily by declining prices and spiraling operating costs. In 1949, nearly 43 percent of our total gross farm income was retained in the form of profits; in 1954, only 37 percent of our farm income went into the farmer's pockets. In 1951, the average net income of our farm family workers was $2,120; in 1954 this had dropped to only a little more than $1,900. President Eisenhower reported to the Congress only a month ago that over a million and a half American farmers have cash incomes of under $1,000. During this same period, corporate profits increased. The wages and salaries paid to nonfarm workers skyrocketed from a total of $195 billion in 1952 to $207 billion in 1954. At the same time, farm income fell from $14 billion to $12 billion.

In the face of this disastrous trend, the Congress last year was presented with a most unattractive farm program—the so-called sliding scale, or flexible price support program. The objective of that program, as announced by President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson, was to achieve for our farmers "full parity in the market place." That laudable goal would be attained by discouraging production to the point where supply and demand would come into balance. Coupled with this laudable objective, however, came the most abusive description of the American farmer I have ever witnessed. The Secretary of Agriculture left no stone unturned in blackening our farmers and our farm program. The Senate Agriculture Committee, the Congress, the Nation as a whole was deluged with totally misleading estimates of what our farm price support program cost our Government. Our farmers were pictured as regimented robots, feeding at the Government trough and looking for their sustenance in the pockets of the American taxpayer. Never before had there been such a concentrated effort by so few to hurt so many, so much.

The Secretary of Agriculture himself told the Senate Agriculture Committee that our farm program had cost the American people since 1932 a grand total of $16 billion. Since the occasion of the Secretary's appearance before the committee was to present testimony on the price support program, the impression was left that price supports alone had cost our Government $16 billion. Many newspapers carried stories to that effect.

Secretary Benson could have determined the true facts; he could have stated specifically what the price support program had actually cost instead of presenting a "loaded" table to the committee. The Commodity Credit Corporation records plainly showed that the total cost of the price support program was not $16 billion, but only a little more than $1 billion over a 20-year-period—and that $1 billion covered losses on all commodities, including losses on milk, honey, and—last but not least—the potato program which accounted for almost 50 percent of the total loss. As for the basics, well, the total cost of price support operations for the basics had been only $21 million—or something more than $1 million a year. Under these circumstances, I was led to only one conclusion—that the Secretary of Agriculture was "out to get" our price support program.

But agriculture should not have to stand alone, and it does not stand alone, in receiving benefits from our Government. American business gets its share. According to figures in my files, our American businessmen have received nearly $26 billion in rapid tax amortization benefits since 1951. Yet, there has been no great hue and cry arising about this program. Only the farmers have been treated with scorn. Labor has its minimum wage, a floor placed on wages and, indirectly, a floor beneath prices charged for manufactured goods. There has been no cry for repeal of the minimum wage; to the contrary, the President has only recently recommended that the minimum wage be increased to 90 cents an hour. No one will argue that should wages be increased, the farmers income will not be affected. Only the farmer has his "minimum wage" program whittled away.

Ladies and gentlemen, we shall never build a sound agriculture, an agriculture able to meet the food and fiber demands tomorrow will bring, by laying the economic foundations of this great industry on the shifting sands of insidious propaganda and flexible price supports.

In the South, our agriculture is comprised of many small farmers. We shall not attain assurance of agricultural abundance by concentrating our lifeblood—food and fiber—in the hands of too few farmers. The gamble is too great.

This, then, is problem No. 2. We need a sound, forward-looking farm program upon which to build our agriculture for tomorrow, one that will make it attractive for more and more farmers to remain on the farm and encourage others who have left to come back to the farm.

But we need something more—we need more adequate agricultural research. It is time for us to give our scientists the tools they require in order to develop higher-yielding varieties, better farming equipment, improved methods of soil conservation.

As you have been told, I am chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; I am also a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee. I am chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which recommends funds for all flood control and navigation projects in our country.

Only a few months ago, we received a budget request from President Eisenhower to appropriate some $551 million for all flood control and navigation projects in the United States. This represents less than 1 percent of our total budget for the next fiscal year. We were also asked to appropriate $55 million for our soil conservation program, plus $250 million for the agricultural conservation program. Between all these programs, we have budgeted slightly over 1 percent of our total Federal budget for conserving our precious topsoil and for expanding our network of Federal waterways.

This, to my way of thinking, is folly. It is shortsightedness. We have seen, during the last 15 years, once-great nations submit to the yoke of world communism because their people were hungry and their agricultures weak. We face a similar danger in this country. Today, we curse surpluses and search for ways to dispose of them. We do not stop and consider that tomorrow these surpluses will dwindle. By 1975, they will be gone entirely and our scientists tell us that our farmers are going to be hardpressed to produce enough food and fiber to feed the 220 million mouths for which we shall then have to provide.

We are committing one fatal mistake; we are failing to keep our agriculture strong and prosperous. We are leaving the gate wide open to the entrance of the companion evils of dissatisfaction and ultimate destruction of our way of life. Let me tell you now that a lack of food and fiber breeds isms and the Red plague of communism is anxiously waiting at our doorstep for the day when hunger shall stalk this land.

We have found billions to spend in foreign lands, but we pinch our pennies here at home. Such a course must be halted and more attention given to our domestic requirements. American generosity to those nations less fortunate than our own has been hailed far and wide, but I wonder how many of our allies realize how niggardly we have been with our own people. I am certain that few, if any, of our friends across the seas know that our generous contribution to them has been borrowed money—every cent of it.

The time has come for us to look around at our own backyard. There are multitudes of things which we have too long neglected here at home. Our agriculture is one of them, and the most vital, if we are to survive as a free nation.

Before I am charged with preaching gloom and doom, let me tell you that I am proud of our farmers for the things they have already done, despite the odds against which they must toil. Here, in this rich delta, we have seen a transformation. Twenty-five years ago, one traveling by train from New Orleans to Memphis, could, for mile after mile, see the effects of poverty, of depression, of eroded lands along many stretches of the way, and human spirits swept by despair. Only 2 weeks ago I made the trip from Memphis to New Orleans and I witnessed signs of much progress. We have made tremendous headway, and we shall continue to go forward. Because our southern farmers have the "git up and go" to get things done, southern agriculture shall not stagnate. Cotton is still king here, but we have a few crown princes to help him. We have licked the cattle tick, and our beef and dairy herds are second to none. We have planted alfalfa, clover, soybeans, and kudzu among other crops and restored the fertility to thousands of worn acres.

You delta folks have linked arms with your county agents and gone out to attack the evils of the one-crop system. Working with your State legislatures, you have attracted industries from other parts of our country. No more must southern cotton be shipped to New England for spinning; the textile mills are locating next door to the cotton fields—where they should have been in the first place.

Just the other day, one of my colleagues referred to the "new South." This is not the new South; this is the same old South, with new ideas and without discriminatory freight rates.

It is a South that is beginning to flex its long-dormant economic muscles, to roll up its sleeves, and to gird itself for tomorrow's battles.

Winston Churchill told the world a decade ago that he had not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the dissolution of the British Empire. You and I know that the South has not become our Nation's most rapidly expanding region in order to witness the dissolution of the American way of life.

We are not going to be crushed—we are going to triumph. Folly and false economy, propaganda and twisted outlooks are not going to strip our Nation of its great agricultural heart land. But it is time for us to get to the task.

We need a sound price program, one which will keep our families on their farms, one which will fill our agricultural arsenals with the weapons of scientific research. We need an enlightened program of soil and water conservation, one which will halt the dissipation of our soil and restore the fertility of the lands we have.

I frankly do not feel that the enactment of rigid price supports this year would do our farmers any good, for the simple reason that because of the set-aside provisions in the present law, all basics except wheat are to be supported in 1955 at 90 percent of parity. But I am equally sure that adherence to the flexible price-support program—a program which lends itself to the concentration of our agriculture in the hands of the few—will lead us to ruin. It is my hope that in the early part of next year the Senate Agriculture Committee will have before it for presentation to the Senate a price-support program which is geared to tomorrow's needs. I wish to add that I am still a strong advocate of rigid price supports for our basics, and I shall continue to champion them until a better and more suitable program can be devised. I have named subcommittees to hold hearings on the proposed two-price plan for rice. I intend to work closely with our other southern Senators and Congressmen, and with all other members of all congressional delegations who have an interest in American agriculture, to the end that a program designed to prevent disastrous price fluctuations is achieved. I am convinced we can do this without so far depressing farm prices that only the wealthy can afford to stay in the farming business.

Your representatives in Congress are going to continue to wage an unrelenting fight to obtain enough soil and water conservation funds to halt the shameful waste of the very source of agricultural abundance—our precious topsoil.

We are going to do everything in our power to see that agricultural research is expanded; that new and more efficient farming methods are devised, that higher-yielding, disease-resistant crop varieties are developed and made available, and that expanded uses for our agricultural products are discovered and utilized. Last, but not least, a realistic approach in expanding our foreign markets is urgently required. We must devise ways and means of competing in world markets. American exporters of farm commodities must not continue to be placed in the position of having to consult and obtain permission from the State Department before they are able to sell our farm products abroad. Experience has shown us that our diplomats sometimes seen to have more concern for foreign farmers than for our own.

This effort will require the all-out assistance of every farmer and every farm organization in our country. It will require a tell-your-neighbor campaign in order to dispel the attitude of distrust which too many of our people display toward our American farmers. We must make sure that we give the lie to the theory that a reasonable farm price-support program carries with it high consumer prices. We must let the folks who live in the cities know that a shirt which costs $4 has in it but 1 pound of cotton worth whatever the current market price for cotton happens to be. They must understand that out of every dollar spent in the grocery store, slightly over 40 cents goes to the farmer. We must tell them that a loaf of bread has in it only 3 cents worth of wheat—even though the grocer must charge 17 cents for it in order to make a profit.

This is a time for counterattack, and I know that the leaders of our southern agriculture will be in the vanguard.

Missouri, Arkansas, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Alabama, Georgia, and the other agricultural States have embarked upon a farsighted program of balancing their agriculture with industry. We must also embark upon a program of combining realism with commonsense; we must be realistic about the future and utilize sound, commonsense methods of strengthening our agricultural industry.

One of the best ways we can achieve this end is by increasing our markets as I have just stated, and thus reduce the burdensome surpluses which have forced our farmers to accept drastic acreage reductions in order to remain eligible for price protection. We must expand markets, however, without destroying the abundance we need to supply those markets, both domestic and foreign. We have heard much about price, and I am in agreement that if we are to compete with synthetics here at home and foreign cotton abroad, we must price our cotton so that it will sell. But we must also price our cotton so that the farmer can make a decent living. As the Senate Agriculture Committee studies possible price programs, these two objectives will be first and foremost in our minds.

This year, our farmers' production belts are drawn tight. The result is hardship; of that I am well aware. But let us remember to take the good with the bad. As much as these acreage reductions hurt right now, they are not without their compensating factors. Our farmers, you folks who produce cotton in particular, have learned to make each acre of land yield its utmost. You are using new varieties, harvesting them with new means, and generally making each acre of land do what it required 2 acres to do only a decade ago. This increased efficiency is going to be our salvation 20 years hence. The things you have learned in producing more cotton

per acre of land are going to spell the difference in 1975 when 220 million Americans instead of 164 million are going to depend upon the fertile soil of the Mississippi Delta and other agricultural areas for their very livelihood—food and fiber. This year of tight acreage controls is a cloud on our national agricultural picture, but it is not without its silver lining.

In the dark days of this Republic's infancy, Thomas Jefferson wrote that the man who tilled the soil had a duty to his fellowmen to till it well. There is a corollary to that basic philosophy. It is this: Those of our people who wear the mantle of national leadership have a duty to safeguard the future interests, as well as the present interests, of all inhabitants of this land. I feel sure that the time will come, and come quickly, when the smokescreen of misrepresentation surrounding our industry will be blown away. It must be, for the future welfare of 220 million Americans hangs in the balance.

As farmers, as Americans vitally interested in a vigorous agriculture, you folks in the delta have been true to the trust imposed upon you. Those of us who have been chosen by you as your agents in the Congress will not let you stand alone. Working together, we can bring a sound program from out of the confusion into which our agriculture has been plunged.

And working together, we will.

Poland's Constitution of 1791

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in our continuing struggle against the forces of world communism, we must never forget those historical landmarks which show the development, over a period of several hundred years, of man's struggle for liberty and independence. The Polish Constitution of 1791 is such a milestone. It is altogether fitting, therefore, that free people everywhere, pause to commemorate the anniversary of this great document. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me, pertaining to Poland's Constitution of 1791.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION OF 1791

The year 1791 was a critical one in Europe's turbulent and revolutionary history. The political principles of the French Revolution were beginning to spread, and the sparks of "liberty, equality, and fraternity" were being scattered in all directions. Those peoples suffering under foreign or unrestrained and despotic monarchs of their own, were becoming restive, and nearly all of them were striving feverishly under enlightened and farsighted group leadership to free themselves from foreign oppression or from despotic tyranny at home. And, at the same time, they were working toward remodeling and revitalizing their governmental institutions with a definite view of widening the area of freedom within their own countries or of strengthening themselves against actual or potential foreign aggressions.

In 1791, Poland seemed to be at an ideological crossroads. She had already undergone a partition at the hands of her three powerful and greedy neighbors—Austria, Prussia, and Russia. In order to forestall any such steps in the future, certain liberal leaders of Poland, imbued with genuine democratic ideas, had been working on a new constitution. It is that document adopted in May of 1791 that we are commemorating.

This historic document seemed at the time a true bill of rights for the Polish nation. By that constitution, a government of limited monarchy was established with definite ministerial responsibility. The electorate of the Parliament was considerably enlarged, and numerous privileges formerly enjoyed by the small upper classes alone were, by this constitution, made available to other classes. Certain rights of the peasantry were restored and the peasants were brought under the protection of the law. And, above all, freedom of conscience was guaranteed and absolute religious toleration was established.

Today, so many years after that epochal event and after so many advances in all forms of democracy, this document may seem somewhat outdated, but nevertheless, it is regarded as a forerunner of later liberal constitutions, particularly in central and eastern Europe. In many respects it was a pioneering document and therein may be found its real significance.

Unfortunately, there was little chance to put its provisions into operation. Soon Poland was again partitioned by her three more powerful neighbors and was removed from the map of Europe as an independent country. Even so, all Poles regard this document as a landmark in their history, and I am glad to join them in the 164th anniversary of that memorable constitution. Let me express my wish that the principles of the 1791 constitution will give hope and boldness to the people of present-day Poland in their struggle against their Communist tyrants.

Address by Hon. Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri, on the Subject of Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by me at the Southwest Regional Conference, Child Welfare League, St. Louis, Mo., on March 28, 1955.

There being no objection, the text of the address was ordered to be printed in RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE LOOKS AT JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

(Address by Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., at Southwest Regional Conference, Child Welfare League, St. Louis, Mo., March 28, 1955)

Mayor Tucker, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a real privilege as well as a personal pleasure for me to participate in this Southwest Regional Conference of the Child Welfare League of America. The history of the league is a distinguished one, and I think it is no exaggeration to say that it is, in considerable measure, through your leadership that we have made such great progress as a Nation in improving services for children. From the early days of your organization in 1920 and under the leadership of Mr. C. C. Carstens, you have consistently focused national attention on the dangers and problems confronting our young citizens. You have been flexible in a field where flexibility is tremendously important, and your program has changed to meet the problems brought about by changes in the social, economic, and cultural conditions in the world.

That you have made a place on your program tonight for the subject of juvenile delinquency is continuing proof of your alertness to the problems of children and youth, and I must say I am honored that you should feel I can make a contribution to your distinguished group of professional men and women.

First of all, I want to make it clear that I do not proclaim myself an expert in the field of juvenile delinquency. I cannot help being suspicious of self-proclaimed experts in this field, as we are of self-proclaimed experts in other realms of knowledge. There is no need for me to tell you, who deal in the whole field of human relationships, that the causes of maladjustments—and delinquency is, in a broad sense, a maladjustment—are many and diverse, and that some partial answers to the problem must be found in many places. Out of my experience as a prosecutor and district attorney, and as a member of the Senate Committee on Federal Penitentiaries and the Senate Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, I have learned—as you have learned through your experiences in working with children and families—that the more we know about this problem, the more we realize that there are no easy answers to it and that there is a tremendous amount of work to be done—unspectacular, ofttimes, but none the less rewarding and productive.

Now, I don't need to tell you that when we deal with the science of human behavior, we are likely to be either misunderstood, abused, or ignored. Since we do not speak in the authoritative terms of the exact sciences, we are likely to be derided by our friends in those fields for our lack of precision, and because we do not accept many of the unqualified broad assumptions about social behavior, we are just as likely to be misunderstood by the general public. I might say that the professions of social work and politics share this problem in common. The profession of social work needs no defense before this audience, but I do want to say that you have reason to be proud of your goals, your methods, and of the fine dedicated men and women, like yourselves, who are giving of their lives for progress. Fortunately, the public is coming to a better understanding of your field, and you have the satisfaction of knowing that you are serving your fellow man in a manner that helps him to preserve his self respect and to fulfill his best opportunity for usefulness as a citizen.

Now, we think we know something about human behavior, but we have had considerable difficulty in translating what we know into terms of constructive programs. We know that every child needs certain physical conditions—he needs nourishing food, warm clothing, and shelter. Since these needs are universally understood and accepted, it has not been difficult to secure support and funds for institutions to care for dependent children. The equally pressing needs of the same child for individual attention, for love and understanding, and for a sense of worth and achievement are less apparent—less easily recognized. For this reason, adequate funds for the support of necessary case work services, for foster-home care for dependent children, and for training personnel in juvenile court and institutional work are much harder to come by.

Yet, it is true that many of the behavioral problems of young people stem directly from the failure to meet these emotional needs.

And it is also true that an adult who may be, for example, attacked and robbed by a juvenile, is not likely to react sympathetically or to understand that this violence is probably the result of early and perhaps prolonged parental neglect or other contributing factors beyond the control of the particular individual.

In the work of our Committee on Juvenile Delinquency over the past 2 years, I have been impressed over and over again by the appalling gap between what we know about delinquency and what we do about it. Our committee has had the opportunity to discuss this problem with police officers, psychiatrists, social workers, parents, teachers, representatives of Federal agencies, and juvenile offenders throughout the country. We have held extensive hearings in the District of Columbia, in New York and Philadelphia, in Chicago, El Paso, Denver, San Diego, Los Angeles, Bismarck, N. Dak., and other places. We have heard and questioned hundreds of witnesses. And we have received thousands of letters from judges, educators, recreational workers, and citizens in every walk of life from communities of every size. I shall not attempt to review the testimony here this evening. It is voluminous and I am sure that most of the details form a pattern all too well known to you.

I would like to say a word, however, about the size of the problem. Because of varying definitions and different methods of reporting from city to city and State to State, it is impossible to get absolutely accurate statistics. But taking into account all the figures that are available through local, State, and national agencies, it appears that at least a million and a quarter youngsters each year are getting into trouble with the police or law-enforcement agencies. While this represents only about 5 percent of all American boys and girls between the ages of 10 and 17, it is nonetheless an alarming figure, and it indicates that we have a tremendous problem, not only to rehabilitate boys and girls after they get into trouble, but to prevent their getting into trouble in the first place. From the mass of data compiled by our committee, I would like to make a few observations about the course of action which, in my opinion at least, will be required if we are to meet realistically the problem of young people in trouble—as I prefer to call it—and deal with it effectively.

We know that the seriously delinquent boy or girl is not what we are pleased to call a normal individual. We know that his delinquent behavior is usually rooted in the home in early deprivation and neglect—and by this I mean emotional and spiritual deprivation, as well as physical. I am not talking just about broken homes, nor about children of working mothers, although we know that in many instances these conditions have had damaging effects on children. I am talking about the homes where, irrespective of economic circumstances, the child does not feel the warmth of love and affection, does not feel that he is an integral part of the family unit and is wanted and understood. I am talking about the homes where the child is overindulged, which, of course, may be just a form of compensation for the parent who, consciously or unconsciously, rejects the child. I am talking about the homes—and there are many of them in this generation—where parents have swung to the school of thought that teaches that children should not be disciplined nor should they be made to assume responsibility. I think our recent experience is demonstrating that lack of discipline makes the child feel insecure and that lack of responsibility makes him feel that he really doesn't belong.

All of these are forms of neglect, and the child's reaction, is probably well known to the neighbors, perhaps to the police officer on the beat or to community agencies. Certainly it is known to his teachers, because it has undoubtedly found expression during his early school years in one or more symptoms, such as withdrawal, day-dreaming, lying or cheating, fighting, learning difficulties, or truancy. In other words, both the child's early family situation and his outward behavior in school and elsewhere provide clear and unmistakable evidence that here is a child who needs special help if future trouble is to be averted.

Yet, in the face of such an apparent and obvious need on the part of many children, what does our society provide in the way of help? The crucial role in child preservation is one that can be filled by skillful protective services geared to detecting and reaching neglected children and to working with parents while the family situation may yet be repaired and before a child is too severely damaged. Yet, on the basis of our committee's study, it is apparent that in the average American community today there is no service specially equipped to perform this crucial child-saving function—no service capable of detecting and giving special help to the child suffering from some form of neglect in his daily family life, his school or his community.

May I quote very briefly from our recent report on this aspect of the problem?

"The subcommittee is forced to conclude that such essential defenses against delinquency are today weak, inadequate to the task, poorly manned, and, in some measure, even totally lacking in every community in the Nation. This is not to say that the quality of homelife for the average American child is grossly inferior, nor that the average American community is lacking in decency, nor that educational standards in our schools are universally poor. It does mean, however, that services designed to support these institutions and to catch children falling through their chinks are not only weak but literally gaping with holes.

"A family deprived of its breadwinner may be broken up for lack of financial aid; mental health services are so scanty that a family member with a serious emotional problem may disrupt the whole fabric of family life for want of specialized treatment; schools spilling over with youngsters are undermanned by underpaid teachers; utterly no services exist in the average community which are designed to identify and provide early remedial treatment for the child exhibiting unusual problems at home, in the school, or elsewhere in the community."

The school is the one agency in the community which is in contact with virtually every child. The testimony before our committee amply supports the conclusion that the delinquent child, in the vast majority of cases, has been a problem child in school. In a few metropolitan areas, special programs have been inaugurated, but in the average school in the average American community, there are no special classes for children with specific learning disabilities; there are no specially trained remedial teachers; and there are no skilled social or welfare services working with the schools by means of which they may reach out and help families and children experiencing difficulties.

From the standpoint of prevention, we are particularly concerned about the plight of what we call the predelinquent youngster. Through his early experiences of neglect in the home, this child has come to believe that the world is a hostile environment peopled with aggressive fellow human beings, and so he deliberately isolates and insulates himself from the representatives of larger society. It is obvious that no playground or recreational center which shapes its program around boys and girls who conform to the rules, and that no ordinary younth service or school program designed to meet the needs of the cooperative, well-adjusted child, will successfully catch the disturbed child and help him to reshape his own feelings and reactions to the world about him. And I am sure you recognize as well as I do that the child will not be helped by a social agency which, for a variety of reasons, budgetary and otherwise, waits for him to knock at their door and request service.

Now, in making these statements, I am being rather critical, not only of social agencies, but of parents, teachers, law enforcement agencies, and offices of Federal, State, and local governments. I feel that I can speak frankly to you. You wouldn't need to have this conference if everything were rosy in the child welfare field, and you would not have asked me to talk about juvenile delinquency if all I could do would be to toss a few boquets your direction and say we're all doing a fine job. A conference such as this gives us an opportunity to share our information and our experience—it is truly democracy in action.

In the fields of social work, education, recreation, youth services and mental health, I think we are doing only part of the job—an important part, to be sure, but nonetheless one that leaves a large area of necessary service unfilled. Mainly, I think, we have failed in finding effective means of reaching out to the boy and girl who most needs our help. By this I do not mean that we should abandon all of the present methods or basic concepts underlying social welfare services. Rather, what I am suggesting is that we need to find and add new techniques, and it is largely up to you who are professionals in this field to find the ways of augmenting the tools of your trade and thereby enlarging the end results of your work.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, I have been particularly interested in some of these reaching-out techniques now being tested in various communities. Several cities, notably Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, Washington, D. C., and Baltimore, are successfully carrying on what is known as the detached-worker program. This program seems to me to afford an excellent example of how group work can reach out to boys and girls who fail to find their way into settlement houses and recreation centers, but instead, become part of a gang that expresses and supports their rebellion against society. In an effort to reach these youngsters, these cities have developed a program where the worker makes contact with and, in a sense, identifies himself with a gang. Though he may be regarded with suspicion and rejected at first, the quality of his personal relationship with the gang members has often been such that he has been able to influence gang behavior, direct the activities into more constructive channels, and help the individual members to secure jobs or vocational guidance or other services. The so-called aggressive casework program—which in some ways might better be called persistent than aggressive—is being tried out in New York and offers considerable promise as a means of carrying casework directly into the home of the child who needs help. The school social service and visiting teachers programs are being used in a few of our larger cities, but they need to be adopted much more widely and certainly with more and better trained personnel.

It is the responsibility of social work and social workers, in my opinion, to give enlarged leadership in the field of social engineering. We have made great strides in preventive medicine—but that, again, is dealing with a more exact science. We have not gone nearly so far in preventing social disorders. I maintain that rehabilitation is not the answer. It is necessary, of course, to repair the damage resulting from the rocks and reefs in family and community life, but how much better it would be to remove the obstructions, or to guide a safe course around them before the damage is done.

We know, of course, that not all delinquent youth are emotionally disturbed youngsters. And even the emotionally crippled child may manage to function within the law in a favorable community environment, while unwholesome factors in the community can seriously affect the normal child. Out of my work with the Senate committee, I have become convinced that many of us, including social workers, attach too little importance to demoralizing community influences.

During our hearings in a seemingly average American community, which I shall refer to as Community X, our committee was inquiring into the possible effects upon the children of that community of another community a short distance away—let's call it Community Y—which was a center of every form of vice. The evidence before our committee showed that many youngsters regularly went over to Community Y for their recreation and fun. We questioned the director of a social agency, a well-trained individual, about the possible damaging effects of this situation, and learned that he was not concerned about their proximity. The aim in his community, he told us, is to develop the kind of stable boys and girls who can go to Community Y, and come back unscathed. I, for one, cannot go along with such a thesis. Of course, I don't believe that boys and girls should be insulated completely against the realities of life, but I think we take a foolish and needless risk by exposing them, in their most impressionable years, to vice and crime, in the hope that they will be strong enough to resist it. Sound parent and child relationships, in my opinion, are scarcely enhanced by this kind of unnecessary strain, particularly when the bad community conditions could be controlled. I am not suggesting that crusade for decency is the panacea for juvenile delinquency, but I do believe that its dividends would be great and its cost little.

We expect children to develop a concept of morality and to learn to distinguish between right and wrong, but this is not a concept that comes easily because they are continually surrounded by confusing examples. What is the difference, they may wonder, in terms of moral standards, between the traffic policeman who accepts a $5 bribe, and robbery at the point of a gun. What is the difference between his mother's "white lie" when she invents some nonexistent excuse to avoid an engagement or responsibility and a child's own falsehood when confronted by his parents with some misdemeanor. What possible conclusion can a child draw when we are continually saying to him, in effect, public and private dishonesty is all right in some cases, all wrong in others?

And speaking of examples of crime, vice, and dishonesty, I would like to mention my concern about some of the materials and programs produced today by the so-called mass media of communications. Our committee made an extensive investigation into the subject matter, production, and distribution of the crime and horror comic books. Some of you may be familiar with these publications. Their title is certainly a misnomer, since they are not the simple crime stories or "whodunits" and they are far from comic. Rather, for the price of a thin dime, they offer children vividly illustrated lessons in almost every form of vice and degeneracy in the annals. Following our hearings, publishers of comic books established the Comics Magazine Association of America, adopted a code designed to eliminate objectionable material, and named former New York City Magistrate Charles F. Murphy as administrator. It is too early to determine whether the publishers' efforts to clean their own house will be effective, but it is at least a hopeful sign that 24 of the 27 publishers of comic books belong to the association.

Although distinctly superior to the crime comic, I am also concerned about the volume and frequently the kind of crime and violence shows presented on television. In terms of content, these programs do not begin to compare with the horror comic books. I do not believe that an essentially normal child will be transformed into a delinquent by these materials, but even the specialists tell us that they cannot, with confidence, estimate the effect upon either a normal or an emotionally disturbed child of witnessing several murders each evening in his own living room. To illustrate how little agreement there is on this particular point, I might mention that when I was in Europe last summer inspecting a number of penal institutions, I talked with an inspector at Scotland Yard who told me that, in his judgment, television was responsible for a sharp decrease in delinquency because it keeps young people off the street. The nature of the material presented by the BBC, of course, might have something to do with this. However, while I do not believe television as such produces delinquents, neither can I subscribe to the theory that these programs are harmless, provided that law and order prevails in the end. We recognize how difficult it is to make any precise measurement of cause and effect in this area. Yet, the testimony of psychiatrists and other experts in this field makes it clear that sensational presentations of materials, programs that invest crime and depravity with glamour, may well stimulate the gang or the individually hostile child to the point where his potential delinquency is "triggered" as a result.

Recently I had a most interesting letter from a man who was greatly concerned with the content of some television programs. He wrote: "It happens that I drive a school bus and I am constantly amazed at the conversations of some of the 10 and 12 year olds. Every morning they rehearse the programs of the previous night, complete with all the details of crime, vice, immorality and brutality." I think it is clear, therefore, that particularly where these programs are directed toward audiences of children and young people, we are taking, at minimum, a calculated risk that we can ill afford where human welfare is at stake.

There are other well-known delinquency-breeding conditions in our communities which are subject to control, providing we have both the wisdom and the determination to dedicate enough of ourselves and our resources to the task.

We have available to us, for example, studies of slum areas going back for more than half a century that reveal a consistently disproportionate rate of delinquency and crime on the part of slum inhabitants. This is not to say that delinquency is the result only of poor housing or lack of sanitation or outdoor plumbing, or that outstanding citizens cannot emerge from these conditions. Slums do, however, have a two-fold effect: on the one hand, they have a demoralizing effect on the quality and character of home life; on the other hand, they systematically expose young people from earliest childhood to every form of vice and crime. Indeed, in many slum areas, the neighborhood hoodlum or racketeer represents to the children the only known example of a local boy who made good.

I have referred to the major role which could be played by our schools in the fight against juvenile delinquency. I firmly believe that in this day and age, with our way of life seriously challenged in many parts of the world, we cannot afford, from any point of view, the overcrowded and understaffed schools that are the rule today in almost every American community, and which must inevitably shunt the problem child into a back seat in the classroom because there are no facilities for helping him. I am glad to be a sponsor of legislation—which I hope will be passed by this session of Congress—making Federal funds available to assist State and local communities to build additional school facilities. I am sure you know as well as I do that there has been no little opposition to the school construction bill. One of the loudest and most persistent arguments is that Federal funds inevitably mean Federal control. This, my friends, is nonsense. We have long made Federal funds available for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act, and the Federal Government does not control the hospitals. We have made Federal funds available to school districts in federally impacted areas, and it has not meant Federal control. This is just a strawman, set up with the aid and encouragement of Secretary Hobby, to avoid doing anything about the problem, in the interest—at least so it is claimed—of economy. The fact remains that the child who has problems now will not be helped by additional school facilities or teachers or services that will not become available for another 10 or 15 years—if then.

Now you may say—and rightly so—all of these things will cost money. You can't build schools and clear slums and train personnel just with good intentions. And my answer is, of course, they cost money—so does crime. The crime bill of our Nation is staggering. For the year 1954, my friends, it was no less than $20 billion. This was the appalling figure presented by J. Edgar Hoover when he testified before Congress on the Department of Justice budget. Just think how many schools we could build for $20 billion, how many families we could move out of deplorable slum areas into decent homes, how many people we could train and employ in preventive services. Of course, these things cost money, but that $20 billion will soon grow to 25, 30, and even more—all annually recurring expenses of adult crime—unless we strike at the roots of the problem and strike now.

With two of my colleagues on our committee, Senators KEFAUVER and LANGER, I have introduced legislation aimed at achieving just this end. Our bill, known as S. 728, or the Delinquent Children's Act of 1955, and presently pending before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, would, for a temporary period, make Federal funds available to the States for three purposes. First, it would make funds available for the organization of a representative body within each State to assess the needs of that State and assign priorities in developing a program of action to meet those needs. Second, funds would be available to enable agencies involved in the fight against juvenile delinquency to undertake new and extended services on a project basis—the projects to be approved by a coordinating body. And third, it would make funds available both to States and universities for the development of a real program for training personnel in the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency. We certainly do not feel that this proposed measure represents a total answer to the increasing problem of youthful crime, but we do believe that it is an indispensable step in the right direction.

The problem, of course, demands the coordinated effort of national, public and private organizations. A few months ago, at the request of our committee, representatives of 18 of the leading organizations in the field—of which the Child Welfare League was one—gathered to give the committee the benefit of their advice and counsel. Incredible as it may seem, this was the first time that all these organizations had met together. It is hard to understand why no such meeting had ever been held before, because the opportunity for the interchange of ideas and information is invaluable. The question now is, will such meetings con-

tinue as a basis for sharing ideas and for joint planning.

As representatives of a profession, and of agencies dedicated to the advancement of human welfare, I know that you most emphatically believe that it is both your duty and your privilege to provide leadership in the fight to conserve the greatest of our human resources, our youth. It is part of your job to needle the public conscience—and to keep on and on, without concern sometimes, for the easily ruffled feelings of the smug and complacent—and to keep the country's view fixed upon the whole of the problem, rather than upon small fragments of it.

Some years ago, a distinguished pioneer in the field of child welfare, Emma Lundberg, wrote a book entitled "To the Least of These." The least of these are, of course, those children in our midst who, for one reason or another, are deprived of the kind and quality of family and community life which they so urgently need if they are to have a fair chance in life. In the last analysis, the real test of our humility and humanity—even of our civilization itself—is not how we treat, nor the honors we extend to our well-known and distinguished citizens. Quite to the contrary. The real test is how, and how well, we meet the needs of the least of these.

The Philippines Led in Bandung

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take a few minutes of the time of the House to refer to the Bandung Conference which was held last month. Twenty-nine nations of Asia and Africa met and the end result of the meeting was an assertion of democracy and freedom against communism and totalitariansim.

The reason why I have decided to speak on this subject today is because the events in Asia of recent days have been misinterpreted by some as premonitory of more advances for communism. I do not share this view. Democracy is strong in Asia and we have seen that shown in Bandung.

And what makes that revelation all the more heartening to us is the fact that it was our close friend and ally, the Philippines, that took the leadership in that Conference and by its forthright and unswerving stand against communism, rallied other Asian and African nations around the standard of freedom.

It is for us in the United States now, after having seen the support that was shown democracy in Bandung, to live up to the trust of our friends. We must make it crystal clear to admit of no misunderstanding that we intend to fulfill all our commitments in Asia. We will not give up Formosa under any circumstance. We will defend Formosa as if it were a part of the American mainland. This we must announce without equivocation to avoid any miscalculation or misunderstanding.

The American people and the free world are entitled to know how the Philippines led in Bandung. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD some of the news dispatches that came from Bandung as published in the American press and some of the interpretative editorials. They were chosen at random out of many printed all over the United States.

[From the Washington Daily News of April 19, 1955]

THE PHONY LURE: GENERAL ROMULO'S ELOQUENT ATTACK ON REDS STOPS SHOW AT BANDUNG

BANDUNG, INDONESIA, April 19.—The Philippines' Gen. Carlos P. Romulo almost literally "stopped the show" today with a fiery warning to Asian and African nations to beware of the phony lure of communism.

Following Red China's Chou En-lai to the speaker's platform at the 29-nation parley here, General Romulo dramatically asked the assembled nations of free Asia and others in the shadow of the Iron Curtain:

"Has all your sacrifice, struggle, and devotion been for the purpose of replacing foreign tyranny with domestic tyranny?

"Do we fight to regain our manhood from the Western colonial rulers only to surrender it to the rulers among ourselves, who seize power to keep us enslaved?"

The gateway to communism, General Romulo said, "is strewn with sweet-smelling garlands of phrases and promises and high sentiment. But once you march through it, the gate clangs behind you. The policeman becomes the master and your duty thereafter is forever to obey.

"Even those who enjoy the role of mastery must know that this system devours its own.

"I don't think we have come to where we are, only to surrender blindly to a new super-barbarism, a new super-imperialism, a new super-power.

"We do not want leaderships in our countries subservient to foreign rulers—be they in London or Paris, Hague or Washington or Moscow."

Turning to the subject of racism, he said: "Our quarrel with racism is that it substitutes the accident of skin color for judgment of men as men. Counterracism would have us do the same; to lump white men by their supposed racial grouping and govern our acts and reactions accordingly. It is our task to rise above this noxious nonsense."

Looking squarely at Indian Prime Minister Nehru down front, Mr. Romulo said: "It was a major part of the greatness of India's immortal Gandhi that he devoted so much of his fruitful life of selflessness and sacrifice to the struggle against precisely this kind of thing in Indian life. Would that we all gave as much time to the mote in our own eye as we give to denouncing the beam in the eye of another."

General Romulo paid tribute to the good faith of the United States in promising the Philippines independence and fully redeeming that promise. His half-hour speech evoked the greatest applause of any so far. The Chinese Reds sat silent.

[From the New York World-Telegram and the Sun of April 25, 1955]

DEMOCRACY IS WINNER IN BATTLE OF ISMS AT BANDUNG—ROMULO ROUTS REDS BY GIVING LIE TO NEUTRALISM, COEXISTENCE

BANDUNG, INDONESIA, Arpil 25.—The Bandung Conference developed essentially into a struggle for prestige and power between the forces of democracy on one hand and those of communism and neutralism on the other.

Nations friendly to the West won this struggle.

India's Jawaharlal Nehru emphatically lost his fight to emerge as the Asia-Africa leader and steer hesitant nations into his dreamy half world of coexistence with communism.

And Red China's Chou En-lai fooled no one, not even with his offer to discuss a Formosa settlement with the United States. It was his last desperate try for recognition as a man of peace and reasonableness.

Few here take it for more than a dramatic propaganda effort calculated to embarrass America, and at the same time dress up his temporary role as a great moderator and conciliator.

Western democracy really won because its articulate and dynamic friends here matched oriental cunning with oriental cunning. The acknowledged leader of our side was the Philippines' Carlos P. Romulo, orator, negotiator, and champion of the free world's policies. Allied with him in a newly emboldened fraternity were outspoken leaders of Pakistan, Turkey, Iraq, Thailand, Ceylon, and others in varying degrees.

General Romulo came here for fight or frolic, whatever the other side chose. He would play it by ear, he announced on arrival. Right off, on the first day of the Conference, the fight started.

It started on the question of whether opening statements of the delegates should be delivered in person, orally or handed in typewritten. Nehru quickly sensed his side and Chou's would lose the first round if the more adept prodemocracy speakers got an opportunity to address the full sessions. So at the first delegates' meeting, Nehru forcefully demanded no speeches.

"Fine," said General Romulo. "That's a wonderful idea. It will save time and we can get on with the business."

This put Nehru off balance, for General Romulo was matching Chou in amiability and agreeableness. But General Romulo knew what he was doing. The no-speech rule was adopted to Nehru's satisfaction, but General Romulo noted that Pakistan's Mohammed Ali and seven other delegates were not present. When Mr. Ali arrived, General Romulo quickly told him how speeches had been blocked in an outward show of harmony, but suggested Mr. Ali quietly move for reconsideration at the next closed meeting on the ground he and others had been absent.

This was done, catching Nehru by surprise. The pandit hit the ceiling. General Romulo mildly insisted it was a valid protest by the absentees. Turkey's Fatin Rustu Zorlu joined and after a word battle with the nervous, fidgety Nehru, the delegates reversed their stand, voting for speeches before the open forum of the first general session.

This free-world victory in the opening skirmish may well have been the turning point of the conference. From then on Chou was on the defensive, tossing out peace garlands as he back-pedaled from the burning issue of the conference: whether these former victims of colonialism, now free, were prepared meekly to accept the new tyranny of international communism.

The force and unanimity of their speeches were so effective that Nehru didn't even take the stage, reserving his tirades for the closed sessions.

Saturday, General Romulo took on Nehru. In a free-swinging exchange, General Romulo answered the pandit point by point. He said, "I speak here as a representative of all small nations who, not strong like India, cannot stay out if the world blazes into war and will always need outside help if threatened with aggression."

He defended the Manila Treaty, challenging anyone to find the slightest element of aggression in it. He sailed into the falsity of coexistence and in razor-sharp words spelled out the threat of international communism. He concluded: "The empires of yesterday on which the sun never set are departing from Asia. What we have to fear

now are the new shadowy empires over which we know the sun never rises."

Chou and Nehru never entirely recovered from the effect of his speech. When Chou got the floor he was more conciliatory than ever, vowing China's undying peaceful intentions. That afternoon Chou played his trump card. He announced the Chinese Communists were willing to sit down and negotiate with the United States on relaxing Formosa tensions.

It was a well-contrived headline-stealing climax. But after the calculated sensation eased off, it was obvious that Chou was resorting to the old Red stratagem of using conferences as propaganda sounding boards.

None here honestly believes the Chinese Reds have any intention of calling off the was on relenting in their determination to "liberate" Formosa. And, in fact, Chou himself later admitted he had no intention of relinquishing his claim to Formosa.

[From the Woonsocket (R. I.) Call of April 21, 1955]

GENERAL ROMULO A BEACON AT BANDUNG

The one shining beacon that stands out on behalf of democracy at the 29-nation Asian-African Conference at Bandung is Brig. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, leader of the Philippine delegation, who is casting the light of truth and honesty where it should do some good. While critical of the United States at some points, General Romulo emphasized that the United States had "fully and honorably" redeemed its pledge of independence for the Philippines, something the colonial nations probably find difficult to believe.

And General Romulo told the conference he could say that his country was not in the least subservient to the United States. He criticized us for having, on some issues, "leaned heavily in favor of colonial powers" and for failing to make our actions dovetail with our ideas of equality and freedom.

Nevertheless, the Philippine delegate warned the participating nations against embracing communism as an alternative to Western colonialism. In describing the Communist type of subjection, General Romulo properly asked whether there is political freedom where only one party may rule, where dissent from the policy of the government means imprisonment or worse.

And, he pointed out, autocratic rule, control of the press, and a police state are exactly the worst features of some of the colonialist systems against which many of the participating nations are still fighting. But he gave full credit to the United States for its part in bringing about the independence of the Philippines. In this connection, he noted that the Philippines has thus directly experienced the basic good faith of the United States, "and we feel that the principles upon which it was based will ultimately prevail."

He emphasized, too, in commenting upon racism—which is a big issue with the Asian-African nations—that in almost all Western lands, and especially in the United States, the internal struggle against racism and all its manifestations has been going on steadily and victoriously.

General Romulo is carrying the story of truth about democracy to the 29 nations at the Asian-African Conference. Let us hope that his words are heard and that his truth is recognized.

[From San Luis Obispo County Telegram-Tribune, May 3, 1955]

ROMULO CHAMPIONS LIBERTY

Gen. Carlos P. Romulo is very much in the news these days as a result of the vital role he played in the recent Asia-Africa Conference at Bandung, Indonesia.

This is of special interest to members of the San Luis Obispo Executives Club who heard Romulo's stirring speech here last October. At that time he attracted a record audience of 430, and most of them were deeply impressed by Romulo's brilliant and eloquent presentation of the cause for true liberty and equality for freedom-loving Asian peoples.

A friend of the West and a champion of the Asians, Romulo is credited with having skillfully outmaneuvered Prime Minister Nehru of India, who wanted to keep critical talk out of the conference. He got the conference opened to all who wanted to talk critically of Russia and Red China. Many wanted to, and did so, as a result.

Romulo himself warned Asian and African delegates present not to shake off one colonial domination only to come under enslavement of a new tyranny.

"I do not think," he declared, "we have come to where we are only to surrender blindly to a new superbarbarism, a new superimperialism, a new superpower."

He told how the yearning for national independence can be exploited.

"It is perilously easy in this world for national independence to be more fiction than fact," he said. "Because it expresses the deepest desire of so many people in the world, it can be unscrupulously used as a shibboleth, as a facade, as an instrument for a new and different kind of subjection.

"It strikes me that autocratic rule, control of the press, and the police state are exactly the worst features of some colonialist systems against which we have fought all our lives and against which so many of us are still fighting."

As Thomas L. Stokes, a Washington correspondent of note, commented:

"This simple message is commonplace to us, but it is not to those to whom the Philippine delegate and his colleagues spoke in so large a part of the world.

"It could be the shot heard around that particular world."

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of April 30, 1955]

HAWAII HONORS CARLOS P. ROMULO

On Monday afternoon, the University of Hawaii will confer the honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters upon Carlos P. Romulo, journalist, soldier, and statesman.

It is a recognition that will win hearty approval, both because it honors a deserving recipient and because it recognizes a type of leadership all too rare in Asia, or anywhere else for that matter.

General Romulo's story is well known. As an editor and publisher he was one of the first to detect Japan's imperialist ambitions and to warn the world of them. As a soldier he fought bravely in the defense of the Philippines and their subsequent recapture.

And as a statesman and diplomat he has been a powerful figure in the United Nations and an ardent spokesman for freedom in Asia.

His most recent major address—to the delegates attending the Bandung Conference—enhances his standing as a man of perception and courage.

He did not hesitate to issue merited criticism of the colonial powers for past abuses, but he took pains to make it clear that these abuses were not representative and cited the American record in the Philippines as an example of altruism and good faith.

And he warned that the white man's racism could be equally dangerous and immoral in its opposite application. There is, he said, "no more dangerous or immoral or absurd idea than the idea of any kind of policy or grouping based on color or race as such."

He continued: "We have the responsibility to remain aware that this kind of racist attitude has been the practice of not all white men, but only of some, that it flies in the face of all their profoundest religious beliefs and political goals and aspirations, that in almost all Western lands, and especially in the United States, the internal struggle against racism and all is manifestations has been going on steadily and victoriously."

Having thus told the delegates what they wanted to hear about colonialism, he turned to the crux of his speech.

Without referring to communism by name, he described it as one of the roads that nations could follow in seeking their destiny. He described its claims, its methods of operation, and then uttered this pointed warning:

"The road (to communism) is opened before many of us. The gateway is strewn with sweet-smelling garlands of phrases and promises and high sentiment. But once you march through it, the gate clangs behind you. The policeman becomes master and your duty thereafter is forever to say aye."

Here is a clear statement by a man who has known totalitarianism at close hand, a man who is an Asian and who is appreciative that Communist imperialism is even more dangerous to the people of Asia than the onerous burdens of Western colonialism which have now been almost entirely thrown off.

With leaders such as this Asia can grow into its true destiny. Unhappily there are far too few of them in that confused and often confusing part of the world.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser of May 1, 1955]

HERE IS A MAN

Hawaii welcomes a friend as well as a distinguished visitor in the person of Gen. Carlos Romulo, soldier, diplomat, statesman, educator and newspaperman.

The general is a fluent champion of peaceful revolution by nations the people of which are not wholly free. He has fought for his ideals with both pen and sword; he is still fighting.

General Romulo represents the very best in the young Republic of the Philippines, a stanch ally of democracy. We wish we could see more of him but he is a man-about-the-world, and his visitations usually are brief.

He will not get away this time, however, without another honor—the degree of Doctor of Humane Letters conferred by the University of Hawaii.

[From the New York Times of April 24, 1955]

DEMOCRACY FINDS SUPPORT AMONG AFRO-ASIANS

BANDUNG, INDONESIA, April 23.— * * *.

DEMOCRACY IS DEFENDED

As might have been expected, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, chief delegate of the Philippines, was most outspoken in approving the United States' record and attitudes in Asia. In an opening conference speech, widely regarded as the wisest and most balanced of any delivered, General Romulo criticized the United States for waverings on the issue of colonialism and for leaning at times heavily in favor of colonial powers but emphasized that "uniquely among the colonial powers the United States in our case made a formal pledge of independence, fixed a date for it 10 years in advance and fully and honorably redeemed that pledge."

General Romulo paid tribute to the spirit of freedom and democracy that had marked the United States' relations with the Philippines and cited Britain as well for these characteristics in its policies towards colonies and ex-colonies. He pointed, on the other hand to "the way some of us view the position of certain other countries which from our own perspective we consider as subservient to other powers."

"I wonder if in such countries," General Romulo said, "you could read in the press

or hear in the public speeches of their spokesmen anything resembling the open attacks that were common fare in places like India and the Philippines even before independence."

[From the New York Times of April 24, 1955]

APPRAISING BANDUNG

If there was really a preconceived pattern for the discussions in the minds of any of the sponsors, it is quite apparent that the conference not merely departed from it but disregarded it completely. That the meetings did not get out of hand is tribute to the good sense of the participants. But they did get well off any well-lubricated rails that may have been laid for them. This, in turn, is a tribute to the individuality and courage of many of those who took part.

Naturally it is gratifying for democracy to hear a strong championship of liberty of thought and action. It is also gratifying to see the discrimination that rejects false prophets and false promises. It is especially important that the vital issue of colonialism be put into the right perspective, and brilliant speakers such as General Romulo, from the Philippines, and Premier Kotelawala, from Ceylon, did just that. They were able to make it plain that the issue of colonialism is fundamentally the issue of consent of the governed, and that any regime that denies such consent is unworthy of support.

In the long run an exchange of views such as that which has taken place must be healthy because the exchange is free of compulsions. If there had been a curb on free expression or a straitjacket upon thinking at Bandung, the results could have been damaging and dangerous. Many of those who gathered there have been in revolt against what they regarded as oppressive external authority. They are right o be equally in revolt against any new regimentation under the persuasive guise of deceptive slogans.

Free men have the right to think freely and to express themselves in honesty and candor. If that fact has been driven home by the Bandung discussions, an enormous advance will have been made. This advance, moreover, may be vastly more important than any specific resolution upon which those who conferred were able unanimously to agree.

[From the Indianapolis Star of April 21, 1955]

A NEW LEADER ARISES

Only one man in the world can match the fiery oratory, the brilliant eloquence, the vast and sweeping grasp of large problems of Winston Churchill. That man is Gen. Carlos Romulo, of the Philippines. We have had the honor to hear General Romulo speak here in Indianapolis on human freedom. He has a unique ability to marry passion with logic. This he did again on Tuesday when he spoke of Asian freedom and nationalism to his Asiatic neighbors at the Bandung Conference.

Romulo spoke of Asia, but he was speaking as well to America and to Europe. He cut cleanly through the maze of propaganda and confusion on both sides of the Iron Curtain to deal with the essential principles of liberty and national aspirations in simple, human terms. He laid before the cheering delegates no narrow program of anticommunism, anti-imperialism or racism, but a stirring plea for liberty, for human dignity, for self-government and for international brotherhood.

In his great speech General Romulo has driven straight to the essence of the problem faced by East and West, by white people and dark. For us in the United States the lesson is clear. We must again identify ourselves with the aspirations of all men for freedom and national independence. We must reject the expedient solutions pressed on us by colonial powers. We must accord to the people of Asia, as individuals and collectively, the same human dignity, the same respect for quality that we demand for ourselves. We must, in short, be true to our own American tradition of liberty, equality, justice, and human rights. If we do, we can regain the respect and honor and the place of leadership we once held among nations as the first successful revolutionists to, in great part, achieve these things.

In late years the United States has cynically associated itself with the colonial policies of our European friends. We have, in secret conferences, traded off the freedoms and independence of Asiatic and European people just as colonial powers did, to win a supposed advantage for ourselves. We have, however, some good deeds to record. We gave freedom to the Philippines and powerful and perhaps premature aid for Indonesian independence. We have helped save Iran from Communist imperialism. We have formed firm bonds of mutual aims with Egypt, Iran, Pakistan, the Philippines, South Korea, Nationalist China, and Thailand.

Once, before the 1952 political campaign, Secretary of State Dulles proposed that our Government proclaim a sort of new Declaration of Independence for the world. We should say to all people, said Dulles, that it is our aim to encourage, aid, and inspire the hopes of national independence and individual liberty for all people regardless of place, condition, color, or resources. And we should fit our actions to our words.

Let us do that now. For human liberty involves all men: white, yellow, brown, black, or red. As Lincoln once put it, "In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom for the free—honorable alike in what we give and what we preserve." For only when all men are free, can all men live in peace.

Thus our main goal as Americans, and as human beings, must lie in the direction of asserting and preserving and enlarging the God-given freedom that is man's most precious heritage. Thank God for leaders like General Romulo who understand this, and who so eloquently plead freedom's case.

United States Material Welfare and United States Spiritual Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York News of Sunday, May 22, 1955:

United States material welfare at this time is astonishing.

In the first 3 months of 1955, the Commerce Department reported the other day, American industry hit a record production rate of $370 billion worth of goods and services per year. This wasn't caused by a war, either. Much of that record production was due to enormous demand for two great peacetime assets—homes and automobiles.

Predictions now buzzing around about our material welfare in the future are even brighter than the actual facts and figures regarding the present good times.

At a recent get-together of the American Management Association, industrial relations specialist Hiram S. Hall ventured the startling prophecy that the auto industry this year will come around, without a strike, to a wage boost of 15 cents or 16 cents an hour and some sort of guaranteed annual wage.

Mr. Hall also expects substantial wage raises in the rubber and steel industries and in various mass production fields. All this, he thinks, will speed up automation—more and more machines to do more and more work. Automation, for its part, should increase the overall productivity of our industrial system by some 2.5 percent each year. If that keeps up, Hall says he foresees a general 32-hour workweek by 1980.

All this sounds lovely, and we hope it comes to pass. You'll excuse our crossing the fingers tightly, though, since we're among those who remember distinctly the prosperity that was going to be eternal in the 1920's before the great crash of 1929.

There are plenty of people who fear that in this department we aren't doing nearly as well as in the area of material welfare, and that we can come a serious cropper if we neglect the moral and spiritual side of life in the United States.

These worries were strikingly set forth recently by James A. Farley, in a speech at the Milwaukee convention of the Boys Clubs of America.

The United States, the onetime Postmaster General and longtime leading Catholic layman said in effect, has gotten rich and powerful in a comparatively short time. That's fine as far as it goes, but Jim Farley is afraid we haven't always given enough thought to the responsibilities which go with national wealth and power.

Are our average business standards high enough? Are too many of our politicians too cynical, too ambitious? Do enough of us try to practice in everyday life whatever religions we profess, or do too many of use keep religion in a special box marked "For Use on Sunday Only?"

These and kindred questions were raised by Mr. Farley, and he didn't find any overly reassuring answers.

He wasn't preaching, either—nor is this editorial. He was talking from a very practical and very hard fact.

That fact is noted in the Book of Proverbs (16:18), that pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall.

What that means, it seems to us, is that you're stupid and asking for trouble if you credit nobody but yourself for all the achievements you've racked up and the possessions you've gathered together.

Sure, your energy and initiative had a lot to do with it. But how about friends or relatives who helped you along the way, influential people who bave you a break now and then, luck that descended on you like manna from the Heaven? And speaking of Heaven, how about what all the religions except the perverted Communist religion revere as the power who made, runs and loves the universe and everything that's in it?

A recent humility grows from reflections of this kind; and a decent humility, plus a becoming gratitude for the pleasant things of life, makes for character, courage, charity, tolerance and fortitude, in a person or in a nation.

All of which is one of the things the worriers about our spiritual welfare are trying to tell us.

Our American Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, because of the extreme interest in the

development of a sound road program of national highways, I am enclosing an editorial which appeared in the April 25 issue of the Detroiter, a weekly publication of the Detroit Board of Commerce.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS ASKED TO SPEED HIGHWAY PROGRAM

(By Nick Kelley, Jr., Chrysler Corp.)

Try to visualize one car for every 700 feet of every lane, both directions, on all roads, streets, highways and superhighways of the Nation. We've got them now—58 million vehicles registered, and most of the miles rolled up by this gigantic fleet is done on main arteries in urban areas—turning most of them into expensive and hazardous bottlenecks. In short, the capacity of roads and streets has not kept pace with the expansion of traffic.

The President's Highway Advisory Committee, after a thorough study of the problem, recently reported that $101 billion must be spent by all levels of Government in the next 10 years to give this country the modern roads it needs. Under present programs, $47 billion will be spent by Federal, State, and local governments for roads within the next 10 years—but this program isn't big enough. According to the committee, another $54 billion must be added to the present planned expenditure to bring our highway system up to modern standards.

The President's committee is convinced that the usual pay-as-you-go program will not meet financial requirements of the huge road building job ahead. Therefore, it recommended that the Federal Government assume primary responsibility for financing the modernization of the interstate system (the 40,000 miles of major highways connecting larger cities and urban connecting roads) which will cost about $27 billion. To do this the committee suggested a bond-financing program (similar to the method used by Detroit to finance its expressways), which would be funded over the next 30 years by annual revenue from the existing Federal gasoline and oil taxes, or their equivalent.

The committee's solution is a bold plan. It has encountered some criticism as to its proposed bond procedure and other details which Congress may wish to change. However, no one has yet offered any suitable alternative to do the job which nearly all the experts agree should be done by a Federal highway program, namely: (1) to modernize, within next 10 years, the interstate system designed to fulfill our traffic needs 20 years hence; (2) to finance the program by a method which will insure its completion economically and on scheduled time; (3) to continue Federal aid to State and local governments at a level sufficient to modernize and maintain other roads and streets.

There are many reasons why a national-highway program should be undertaken. The need for the project is unchallenged. Our overall transportation system—of which highway transportation is a vital part—provides flexibility and could be the key to national survival. Putting aside every other reason for getting on with the job, military and civil defense authorities have testified that these reasons alone provide a real sense of urgency to the type of program which the President's Advisory Committee has recommended.

We could dwell on economic reasons for undertaking such a program, but we won't—because we think that every one realizes that highway transportation has had a vital part in our economic and social growth and is essential to our continuing development. Also, we are all aware that poor roads mean huge annual losses in damage and deaths from unnecessary traffic accidents. Modern highways should materially reduce such losses.

What can you do? You can let your Congressmen know how you feel about this problem. You will thus be taking a definite and positive step toward getting the highways you and your country deserve.

Economy Ax Butchering United States Patent System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, as the House takes up consideration of the Commerce Department appropriation for fiscal 1956, I should like to draw the attention of my colleagues to an excellent article on the grave situation in which we find the United States Patent Office.

This article was published in the Detroit News on Sunday, May 22, and is written by Mr. Robert S. Ball, a keen observer of the Washington scene.

This article points out in shocking but accurate language the grave consequences to a "too little, too late," policy with relation to appropriations for this vital Government service.

The article follows:

ECONOMY AX BUTCHERING UNITED STATES PATENT SYSTEM

(By Robert S. Ball)

WASHINGTON, May 21.—One of the worst messes in Washington in many a year is to be found in the United States Patent Office.

It is a mess involving the deliberate, calculated strangling of the American patent system in the interest of economy in Government.

It is a situation so critical and so vital to the future of American business and industry that the Senate has authorized a $50,000 investigation by a standing subcommittee of its Judiciary Committee.

It involves a crisis of such proportions that delegations from industry and the patent bar have come to Washington to plead with top administration officials to act before irreparable harm is done to the patent system—to no avail.

It is a mess the existence of which Secretary of Commerce Weeks has admitted to the House Appropriations Committee, but on which he has asked that remedial action be deferred until the budget is more nearly in balance.

INVENTORS MUST WAIT AT LEAST 4 YEARS

So anomalous is the situation that partisan charges to the effect that this is a big business administration, run by businessmen for the benefit of business, evoked hollow laughs for businessmen conversant with the Patent Office operation.

Here is why:

While the backlog of pending applications has soared, and the waiting time for processing of claims has stretched to an unbelievable 4 years or more, the Patent Office budget has been cut and its examining force reduced.

Instead of whittling away at the staggering backlog, the shrinking force of examiners helplessly watches the mountain of untouched work reach astronomical heights.

Cold, hard statistics tell the story.

New applications are coming into the Patent Office at the rate of 75,000 a year.

The backlog of applications now totals more than 216,000, and is growing.

The number of examiners working on applications has dropped from 720 in 1952 to only 610 at present.

Because of the mounting number of patents on file, and the growing complexity of patent applications the number of cases an examiner can process in a year is steadily decreasing.

PLEAS FAIL TO SURVIVE GANTLET OF ECONOMY

For 2 consecutive years Patent Commissioner Robert C. Watson has asked Secretary Weeks for additional funds and has been turned down. And even the pared requests Weeks has forwarded to the Budget Bureau have been further whittled.

But Congress must share the responsibility, for the Appropriations Committees have done little or nothing to provide more funds than were requested by the agency, and there has been no action on the floor to boost the committee recommendations.

The current budget request is up $500,000 this year (for the fiscal year starting July 1), but the additional money will be spent on printing already granted patents—an operation which was all but suspended last year.

All concerned feel that drastic action—costing far more than the current rate of $12 million, plus or minus a small fraction—must be taken to avoid a devastating collapse of the patent system.

It has been estimated that 75 percent of the jobs in this country today are due to inventions made within the past 50 years—witness the automotive, aeronautical, motion picture, electronic, communications, plastics, synthetic fibers, petroleum, ordnance, and atomic energy industries.

POTENTIAL DIVIDENDS FAR MORE THAN COST

A substantial portion of the income of the Federal Government is based on business which exists only as the result of invention.

"A single invention," says the New York Patent Law Association, "may directly save the Government more in a single year than the entire cost of the Patent Office for many years.

"Is it not absurd to starve the Patent Office?"

James P. Burns, president of the American Patent Law Association, says the crisis is discouraging inventors and causing small-business firms to decline to take the risk of developing new products.

He notes that Alexander Graham Bell was granted his telephone patent in only 3 weeks, and that Thomas Edison waited only 3 months for his patent on the incandescent lamp.

But recently one inventor waited more than 6 years for a patent on an artificial tooth, and another waited more than 5 years for one on a simple cleaning device.

Commissioner Watson, who until his appointment 2 years ago, was a prominent patent attorney here in Washington, is keenly aware of the crisis.

CRITICS FEAR STAGNATION OF NEW ENTERPRISE

"The public has a special interest in the prompt issuance of patents so that technological advancements and the founding of new industries will not be delayed or discouraged entirely because of uncertainty as to what degree of patent protection will be afforded," he says.

"Small-business enterprises and new business enterprises particularly need the protection provided by patents in order to compete with larger and longer established businesses. Establishment of many new businesses is necessary for the maintenance of a flexible and vigorous economy.

"With an oppressive accumulation of applications pending disposal, the Patent Office is able to satisfy only to a limited extent the public interest in prompt action in the granting of patents."

Recently, a special committee headed by Dr. Vannevar Bush, president of the Car-

negie Institute and one of the world's most eminent scientists, conducted a study of the Patent Office under a congressional mandate.

THREE MILLION DOLLARS NEEDED JUST TO HOLD OWN

"The United States patent system is at the crossroads today," reported Dr. Bush's Committee.

"The Patent Office, established to stimulate industrial progress, is now heavily overburdened by the products of the very inventive genius it has fostered and encouraged."

And the report noted that the number of United States patents, foreign patents, and technical articles in the examiners' files and which must be searched has grown from 1,200,000 in 1900 to about 7 million in 1955.

Over the same period the number of applications finally disposed of by the average examiner fell from 235 in 1900 to only 100 in 1954.

The Bush Committee came up with some specific proposals for alleviating the crisis. Members of Congress and Commissioner Watson have made some concrete proposals.

Outside, interested groups are demanding a minimum boost in appropriations of $3 million—just to keep the situation from worsening.

There is nothing wrong with the Patent Office that money and mechanization will not cure, and almost everyone agrees the time to act is now.

New Breeze Is Blowing Through Windy City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an editorial from the Chicago Daily Sun-Times in the issue of May 24, 1955.

The editorial is as follows:

NEW BREEZE IS BLOWING THROUGH WINDY CITY

The current issue of U. S. News & World Report gives Chicago a big bouquet. The national news magazine says:

"Things are looking up in Chicago. The big town is going places. You can feel a fresh breeze there; see Chicago hard at work. The city is expanding."

To readers of the Sun-Times this is nothing new, but it is gratifying that the Chicago story is beginning to attract national attention. There has been a real reawakening of civic pride here.

It must be especially gratifying to former Mayor Martin Kennelly to see Chicago getting the recognition it deserves. It was during his 8 years as mayor that Chicago began to make its big comeback.

Much of the credit for Chicago's new reputation must go to the businessmen of our community. They have pitched in and taken part in city activities and planning. Many companies have assigned officers to civic affairs because they know that unless Chicago develops into a cleaner, safer, busier city, their businesses will suffer.

Tangible evidence of this kind of activity is the Lake Meadows housing project on the near South Side. The Fort Dearborn project blueprinted for the area near the Merchandise Mart was conceived and is being pushed by businessmen. The business community gave important support to the development of downtown municipal parking garages and has contributed greatly to the solving of traffic problems.

Businessmen's faith in Chicago has resulted in a big construction boom here. Every Chicagoan is aware of new skyscrapers and apartment buildings that are changing the skyline. The Chicago area was first in the country in construction jobs last year.

Chicago has led all metropolitan areas in new factories in the last decade. Moreover, the boom is going on within the city limits as well as in the fast-growing suburban area. Last year there were 114 new plants put up in Chicago against 92 put up in the suburbs.

All of this didn't just happen. Chicago attracts industries because it has good rail and water facilities, its taxes are reasonable (let's keep them that way) and and it has a supply of semiskilled labor. (The growing Negro population has created some problems but it is one of the factors that attract industry here.)

A pat on the back is due the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry which long has sung Chicago's praises. It has produced a color movie about Chicago's attractions—from the stockyards to the Art Institute. We wish every theater would show the film as an added attraction. Like the U. S. News story, the film makes one proud of our city.

Statement in Support of a Proposal To Raise Personal Income Tax Exemptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, there is one act of simple justice that the 1st session of the 84th Congress should not leave undone before it adjourns for 1955. Earlier this year, those of us who believe that our income tax unfairly burdens the recipient of low income, suffered a defeat in the rejection of the $20 tax refund. This was most discouraging, but I am sure that we can turn this defeat into victory. We can do this if all supporters of higher personal income tax exemptions will rally around a bill that offers much delayed justice.

I have introduced a bill which I feel provides a very minimum of relief. It is my thought that the present $600 exemption is hopelessly inadequate for a single person, and $1,200 is just as hopelessly inadequate for a married couple. Certainly no one is prepared to argue that $600 will support a single person in accordance with any real concept of a true minimum standard of living. And how many married couples are there today who can live decently and healthfully in proper surroundings on $1,200 a year, or $23 a week? All studies show that it simply cannot be done. If the income tax is a tax based on ability to pay, it must be recognized that persons with incomes below a reasonable level have no tax-paying ability. If a tax is nevertheless exacted, then our tax law becomes an instrument of degradation. That is why I propose to raise the exemption for single persons to $1,000, and for married couples to $2,000.

It is also my thought that the added exemption of $600 allowed to the blind should be raised to $1,000, while the exemption for each dependent should be raised a minimum of $200 above the present $600 level.

Sound though my bill is on equitable grounds, it is just as sound economically and administratively.

It is sound economically because the little tax saving accruing to each of many millions of taxpayers will run into billions of dollars of increased consumer purchasing power. Every mother and father in this country fears the day when the wheels of industry are shut down and the family pay envelope ceases to exist. The wheels of industry will never be silent so long as there are consumers with dollars to spend on the necessities of life. That is why I feel it so important that we should take every opportunity to leave the low-income groups with a few extra dollars, because they will spend them. When they do spend them, that makes jobs for retailers and wholesalers and keeps men employed in the factories.

Finally, great administrative costs will be saved by the Internal Revenue Service because millions of recipients of low income will be dropped off the tax rolls. No longer will the Service be swamped with returns that yield only a few dollars in tax but which nevertheless must be received, recorded, and checked and filed. Not only will administrative expense be saved for the Government—which could, by the way, then apply itself to a more careful scrutiny of the larger returns where the real money is—but also the burden of computing and filing a return will no longer be the periodic headache it is for many with low incomes. And industry, too, will benefit in saving tax compliance costs. Industry has long been an unwilling tax collector for Uncle Sam, and my proposal will reduce some of its burden, too.

Just one last thought. In 1954 Congress provided tremendous tax savings for corporations and the well-to-do in the higher income brackets. Congress now should do something for those of small income. My bill shows the way.

The Need To Declare Fort Leonard Wood a Permanent Facility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to again bring to the attention of the proper authorities the need to declare Fort Leonard Wood, located in the Eighth Congressional District of Missouri, a permanent facility. I have inserted previously in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the resolution adopted by the Missouri House of Representatives calling for such a designation,

and I am happy to receive the support of 73 citizens of the city of Dixon, Mo., in this endeavor. I submit to the Defense authorities that a permanent declaration for Fort Leonard Wood would contribute materially to national defense and long-range Federal economy, and I include in the RECORD the letters I received from this group of citizens from Dixon, Mo., who are also interested in the adequate defense of their country at the least possible expense:

MAY 19, 1955.

Hon. A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned business people and citizens of the city of Dixon, Mo., in Pulaski County, 25 miles from Fort Leonard Wood, are asking that Fort Leonard Wood be made a permanent installation. We feel that since our Government is training these men and since Fort Leonard Wood is so ideally situated for the training of engineers and since all the buildings and other facilities are already there, and so much money has been spent there, that Missouri might as well have the benefit of a permanent military base at Fort Leonard Wood.

We hope that, as our Representative in Congress, you will strive very earnestly in our behalf.

Art Clard, Jeweler; Eugene Rollins, Garage Owner; Maudie Elkins; Mr. and Mrs. Walter Hale; G. B. Lucas, Lucas Drug Sundries; Millard G. Hauck, Bulk Oil Distributor; Chas. C. McMaster; Virginia Jones; R. Weber & Sons, Dixon, Mo.; Mrs. Claud Jones; Richard H. Brant; Evelyn Zepp, Dixie Beauty Shop; Elmer Nelson; Walter Dickens; Walter Miller; Ivan Vance; Mr. and Mrs. Bill Shackelford; Donna Parker; Billy M. Beydler; Chester D. Parker; Faye Pendleton; Bennett Pendleton; Rev. W. A. Fulbright; Wade Felkerson; Benny B. Hughes, WAAS; Chas. Howard; Erma Durtschi, Food Market; Herman Goodman; J. E. Barnett; John M. Carroll; Ross C. Goforth; Dewey Allen; Dr. and Mrs. A. M. Johnson; Grace Jennings; Goldie M. Geisler; Dean Peterson; Carrie Crismo; Herman Crismo; Paul Palmer; Ray Palmer; Earl Veasman; Kenneth Baker; Howard E. Wolf; C. D. Matlock; W. W. Eads; W. A. Geuipzzuski; Alma Slone; A. H. Anderson; Cora Miller; A. C. Dette; Eugene S. Elkins; Don E. Davis; Velma Hamilton; Heppie Dodds; McClary Cafe; Verlan Smoot.

MAY 19, 1955.

Hon. A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned business personnel of the city of Dixon, Mo., Pulaski County, located 25 miles northwest of Fort Leonard Wood, do hereby request that Fort Leonard Wood be made a permanent installation. We feel that since a number of our military leaders have voiced their opinion as to the natural terrain, location, and size being just what is needed in the training of the Corps of Engineers, a more ideal permanent location is not to be found.

Added to the above stated fact is even more emphasis on location. Missouri is located practically in the center of our Nation, which makes inland protection for our great army of men in training, an item of vital significance.

It is unquestionable that a great deal of the taxpayer's money is involved in Fort Leonard Wood. An uncalled for amount will be consumed in maintaining the fort as a long-term temporary post, whereas, permanent type structures, etc., would diminish the cost of maintenance unbelievably.

In summarizing the above stated facts, we would like to point out since ideal location is foremost in thought in selecting a permanent post, and naturally the economic viewpoint is vitally important at all times, we feel we have justified our request with concise information.

We sincerely believe, that as our representative in Congress, you will put forth your utmost efforts in establishing Fort Leonard Wood as a permanent station.

James D. Woody, Dixon Cafe; Fred H. Gilbert, Roy E. Hayes, Hazel G. Schierbaum, Dixon, Mo.; Winston W. Alexander, M. W. Creamer, Rockford Creamer, J. W. Gilbert, Triangle Hardware, Dixon, Mo.; Mr. and Mrs. Earl Jones, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Jones, Earl Crane, R. L. Scott, Julia Mitchell, Mitchell Cafe; Mac's Gro., Chas. McEntire, Harold's Snack Bar, C. H. Veasman.

In War There Can Be Only Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of every Member of Congress, a most penetrating article that appeared in the Washington Star, Friday, May 20, 1955, by the well-known columnist Dorothy Thompson. This thoughtful piece is a fine summing up of the situation facing the world today.

The article referred to follows:

IN WAR THERE CAN BE ONLY DEATH—POWER MUST BECOME DIVORCED FROM FORCE IF WE ARE EVER TO FIND PEACE

(By Dorothy Thompson)

During the cold war this column has held a few central theses:

1. Ideological crusades, waged by whatever means, never have resulted and never can result in clear-cut victories.

This is because there is no such thing as a fixed and permanent sociopolitical pattern. All ideological theories are compelled to adjust themselves to the problems of governing once they become incorporated in a state. A social order, to survive, must not only adequately meet human physical needs but must temper itself to conscious and unconscious physical forces growing out of history, tradition, cultural inheritances, the intuition of the soul, and the law of life itself, which is change.

A universal Communist social order on the present Russian pattern is no more possible to establish and maintain than a universal democratic order on the American pattern. And neither meets the requirements of the coming age.

The cold war assumes that there are two hostile social ideologies, orders, and systems, fixed forever in a frozen pattern and that one must give way if the other is to survive. This denies the law of life—that societies are at all times in a condition of evolution. A society that is not changing is dead. A society that is not changing for the better, morally as well as materially, is dying.

2. Tolerable and peaceful relations between States can only be established in recognition of the above law and on a basis of mutual interest and benefit. That interest and benefit is to escape war and escape deathly defeat without war.

Where two sides are alined against each other in positions of armed strength and in hostile deadlock, the deadlock can be broken only by war, or by mutual retreat under the saving force of a new idea.

The idea that they should separate themselves by an air cushion of independent, neutral states, recognized and protected by both, is the only way that tensions can be relaxed and new life forces given an opportunity to develop.

3. The very perfection of modern technological war as an instrument of universal destruction renders it useless as an instrument for anything else.

This, however, confronts world leadership with the most radical-revolutionary fact of all history.

For, as long as we have a record of human societies, war has entered into all their calculations including all their plans for enforcing peace.

War has been the last expression of political policies, whether for justice or injustice, conquest or defense. It has been invoked by oppressors and waged for liberty. It has been the weapon of the lawless and the shield against them.

Life in a warless world, therefore, presents problems cosmic in their significance and stretching far beyond such matters as economic production and distribution, the forms and institutions of states, and even institutionalized religious credos.

It demands new concepts and expressions of courage, a transmutation of the soldierly virtues, and a higher, more vigorous ethos, rooted in creative and self-abnegating altruism. It involves nothing less than the creation of a new type of man.

This development, decreed by history as the price of human survival, can occur within any contemporary society, provided only that there is a long period of freedom from war.

In this period power must become divorced from force. Power over the minds and souls of men has always been the ultimate power, a fact hitherto recognized only by those philosophical and religious geniuses who have tapped by unique insight the true intellectual and spiritual sources of real power.

In a warless world, power will emanate magnetically only from those states and societies that men least fear: Those that awaken the emotions of love, attract confidence, manifest protectiveness, and show willingness to make renunciations in the present for the sake of the future life of mankind.

There is no future life or power in war. There is only death. Power lies with those who sense the future.

Shall We Continue To Penalize Widowed Mothers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest American traditions is the concern which we have always shown for widows and children in the community. Yet our social-security law, through its principle of canceling benefits for outside earnings above a given amount, continues to work a terrific hardship on many of the widowed working mothers in our land. I, therefore, am today introducing a bill which would remove this penalty clause with regard to the benefits received by widows having dependent children in

their care. I am convinced that this so-called retirement test is a gross inequity as it applies to any social-security benefit, and I have introduced a bill to remove it entirely. But it seems to me to be an especially grievous penalty as it applies to working mothers who have been widowed.

We know that the working mother incurs additional expense because she must make some provision for the care of the children during her working hours. Yet if she earns more than a given amount existing law will deduct the benefit awarded to her, thus further reducing her income. The average mother's benefit today is only $38 a month. Surely, in this great and productive country of ours it is not necessary to pinch pennies in this respect. Surely it is not wise public policy to exact a penalty which is concerned with a widow's mite.

The costs to the social security system of making this change would be relatively minor. Currently the number of widowed mothers receiving social security benefits is around 270,000. As I have said, the average benefit they receive is only $38 per month. Can we, in good conscience, believe that we cannot make the change in our social-security system because of the amount of money which is involved? The answer is obvious.

But to the 270,000 mothers involved the regular monthly benefit is a very important item, even though its amount is so small. None of us need be told of what an additional $38 per month can mean in meeting the needs of a growing family. This amount may represent the difference between good medical care and inadequate care in some families. In others it could represent the difference between good nourishing food and just enough food.

Early this year, hundreds of mothers working for the Federal Government learned how important these benefits were to the family budget. For beginning January 1, 1955, the effect of the retirement test was extended to cover all earnings from any source. Previously mothers working in the Federal Government had received full benefits without penalty because they were not working in employment covered by social security. They are still not covered by social security, but they have lost the right to the "mother's benefit." My bill would restore to them the benefit which they formerly received, and extend the same privilege to other widowed mothers in similar circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we must consider the circumstances of these working mothers. At the death of their husbands too many of them are practically forced to go to work to provide adequately for their children. The very act of getting a job adds to their expense, for adequate care for the children must be provided, and this costs money. On their shoulders rests the full family responsibility for providing for the children's future. Is this the kind of situation in which we should be exacting penalties?

I believe that it is not. The Congress has recognized the particular problem of widowed working mothers, by providing tax relief for them because of their added expenses for child care. I believe this Congress should act, on the same grounds, to remove the existing penalty against these same mothers as it applies to social-security benefits.

I urge your support for my bill, which would amend the Social Security Act to provide that no deduction on account of outside earnings shall be made in the case of widows having dependent children in their care.

Government Pursuant to the Constitution or Government by Treaty?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of every Member of Congress who is interested in the question of law by treaty, a statement by the Honorable George A. Finch, a member of the bar of the District of Columbia and vice chairman of the committee on peace and law through United Nations of the American Bar Association. Mr. Finch presented this statement to the Senate subcommittee which is considering Senate Joint Resolution 1, called the Bricker amendment.

In this statement, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Finch answers many objections that the opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 have raised. The statement follows:

GOVERNMENT PURSUANT TO THE CONSTITUTION OR GOVERNMENT BY TREATY?

(Statement by George A. Finch, member of the bar of the District of Columbia; vice chairman of the committee on peace and law through United Nations of the American Bar Association, May 11, 1955)

The title I have given to this statement poses the question that this committee and the Senate of the United States are called upon to decide in considering Senate Joint Resolution 1. I am appearing in support of the resolution. I reject the argument that government by treaty is government pursuant to the Constitution. According to the Supreme Court, the Constitution does not require that treaties be made pursuant thereto. (*Missouri* v. *Holland,* 1920 (252 U. S. 416).)

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF TREATIES

Everybody admits that no treaty has ever been declared unconstitutional. In my opinion no treaty will ever be declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court because of its repeated holdings that the conduct of foreign relations is committed to the political departments of the Government "and the propriety of what may be done in the exercise of this political power is not subject to judicial inquiry or decision." (*Oetjen* v. *Central Leather Co.* (1918 (246 U. S. 297), and the earlier cases cited in Senate Report No. 412 made by the Senate Judiciary Committee on S. J. Res. 1 during the last session of Congress.) Accordingly, all statements by the Supreme Court that it is now the law that treaties may not violate the Constitution or do what it forbids have only the value of dicta. Senate Joint Resolution 1 will require the Supreme Court in future cases to give judicial sanction to what it has said on this point in the past.

In 1928, the then Chief Justice of the United States, Hon. Harlan F. Stone, warned the American Bar Association of the striking extension of Federal police power during the last 30 years through the exercise of the treatymaking power. (Address of Chief Justice Stone, report of the American Bar Association, 1928, vol. 53, p. 259.) This process had received great impetus from the decision of the Supreme Court in *Missouri* v. *Holland, supra.*

In the following year, former Secretary of State, Charles Evans Hughes, and a future Chief Justice of the United States, speaking before the American Society of International Law as its president, referred to the "new line of activity" which "may in the future give rise to new questions as to the extent of the treatymaking power." (Proceedings of the American Society of International Law, 1929, pp. 194–196.)

APPROPRIATE SUBJECTS OF INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT

There seems to be general acceptance of the view that treaties should only deal "with an appropriate subject of international agreement." (Report of the committee on amendments to the Federal Constitution of the New York State Bar Association, signed by the late lamented Hon. John W. Davis, former Solicitor General of the United States, and the Honorable William D. Mitchell, former Attorney General of the United States, and "which pertain to our external relations.") (Mr. Hughes cited supra.)

The report of the New York State Bar Association conceded that if a treaty dealt with a subject not "appropriate for international agreement" then "the rule announced in *Missouri* v. *Holland* would operate to give the Congress power to implement the treaty by legislation which it could not enact in the absence of treaty and thus enter a field heretofore reserved to the States." Mr. Davis, before his death, opposed Senate Joint Resolution 1. The only suggestion his committee made to limit government by treaty and restore government pursuant to the Constitution was that "Treaties outside the normal field of international agreements and which can be used as a device to enlarge the powers of the Federal Government and diminish those of the States should be opposed as not within the treaty power." This is the position taken by Secretary of State Dulles on May 2 during the present hearings. That is to say, every time a President of the United States decides that treaties of the character deplored by Mr. Davis' committee and Secretary Dulles should be a part of our foreign policy, you Senators will be required to choose between the Constitution and the administration for the time being in power. Senate Joint Resolution 1 is designed and intended to safeguard the fate of the Constitution from the vicissitudes of partisan politics.

Mr. Hughes did not live to take part in the present debate; but he left the following indication of his views:

"If we attempted to use the treaty-making power to deal with matters which did not pertain to our external relations but to control matters which normally and appropriately were within the local jurisdictions of the States * * * there might be ground for implying a limitation upon the treatymaking power that it is intended for the purpose of having treaties made relating to foreign affairs and not to make laws for the people of the United States in their internal concerns through the exercise of the asserted treatymaking power." (Cited supra.)

At the same time Mr. Hughes pointed out that the power to make treaties "is a power that has no express limitations attached to it," and he refused to "voice any opinion as

to an implied limitation." He added: "The Supreme Court has expressed a doubt whether there could be any such." Senate Joint Resolution 1 would resolve that doubt.

TREATIES AND DOMESTIC MATTERS

It is apparent from the foregoing that the crux of the problem involved in the present proposal for a constitutional amendment is the delimitation of a recognizable and acceptable line in treatymaking between subjects that are properly within the exercise of that power and subjects that are not. In the language of international and constitutional law the problem is expressed by the difference between matters regarded as "domestic" or "foreign," "internal" or "external," "interior" or "exterior." The difference is indicated in other countries by the official designations of their government departments charged with the conduct of international relations. There are departments of foreign affairs, departments of external affairs, and departments of exterior affairs. In the United States the ambiguous term Department of State is used.

The committee of the American Bar Association of which I am a member approached the drafting of a constitutional amendment by seeking a phraseology that would delimit the respective areas of domestic and foreign affairs in terms of the subject matter of treaties. That task is difficult because according to international law a domestic matter becomes foreign whenever a treaty is concluded on any subject. (Opinion of the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague in the Tunis-Morocco Nationality Question, 1923, Hudson, World Court Reports, vol. 1, p. 143.) That was the position taken by the Department of State during the last administration in justification of its participation in a series of treaties which would bypass the reservation embodied in the Charter of the United Nations that "Nothing contained in it shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state" (art. 2, par. 7). Our committee concluded that it would be futile to continue to seek distinction between domestic and foreign affairs in the subject matter of treaties, especially when we were confronted with an official publication of the Department of State, with a foreword by President Truman, which opened with the assertion "There is no longer any real difference between domestic and foreign affairs." (State Department Publication 3972, released September 1950.)

DOMESTIC MATTERS UNDER THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

Our committee then sought a delimitation, not in international law, but in the constitutional law of the United States. In our research we found that abuse of the treatymaking power, to which Mr. John Foster Dulles so forcefully called our attention in his address before the regional meeting of the American Bar Association at Louisville, Ky., on April 12, 1952 (see his speech quoted in S. Rept. No. 412, supra, p. 5), was among the sources of objections to the ratification of the Constitution of 1787. "To allay fears that the new National Government might seek to exercise powers not granted, and that the States might not be able to exercise freely their reserved powers," the tenth amendment was adopted. (*United States* v. *Darby*, 1941 (312 U. S. 100)). Thomas Jefferson, leading advocate of the Bill of Rights, held the view that if the treatymaking power were unlimited "then we have no Constitution." After the Constitution was ratified and the Bill of Rights adopted he wrote as follows in his Manual of Parliamentary Practice:

"By the general power to make treaties, the Constitution must have intended to comprehend only those objects which are usually regulated by treaty, and cannot be otherwise regulated. It must have meant to except out all those rights reserved to the States; for surely the President and Senate cannot do by treaty what the whole Government is interdicted from doing in any way."

This interpretation of Jefferson, shared by two former Chief Justices of the Supreme Court in the present century, was adopted by the Committee on Peace and Law of the American Bar Association as containing an appropriate line of demarcation between domestic and foreign matters for the purposes of the exercise of the treatymaking power under the Constitution of the United States. That view prevailed during the infant years of the Nation and for many years into more modern times. In 1836 the Supreme Court held that "Congress cannot by legislation enlarge the Federal jurisdiction nor can it be enlarged under the treatymaking power." (*New Orleans* v. *United States* (10 Peters 662, 736).) This holding was reversed by the Supreme Court in 1920 in the decision in *Missouri* v. *Holland*. Senate Joint Resolution 1 seeks to restore the treatymaking power to its rightful place in our Federal system.

In his decision in *Missouri* v. *Holland*, Mr. Justice Holmes stated that "The case before us must be considered in the light of our whole experience and not merely in that of what was said a hundred years ago." As a supporter of Senate Joint Resolution 1, I would bring Mr. Justice Holmes up to date and counter with the suggestion that the merits of that resolution should not be considered in the light of what Mr. Justice Holmes said 35 years ago.

RESERVATION OF DOMESTIC MATTERS BY THE SENATE

The interpretation of the Constiution by Jefferson has been confirmed by a long series of reservations appended to many treaties by the Senate before their approval by that body. For example, when the Senate gave its advice and consent to the ratification of the Charter of the Organization of American States on August 28, 1950, it did so subject to the reservation that "none of its provision shall be considered as enlarging the powers of the Federal Government of the United States or limiting the powers of the several States of the Federal Union with respect to any matters recognized under the Constitution as being written within the reserved powers of the several States." (S. Doc. No. 87, 83d Con., 2d sess., p. 177.)

U. N. CHARTER AND DOMESTIC QUESTIONS

No reservation was attached to the Charter of the United Nations because it had embodied in it the reservation of domestic matters I have already quoted. Without that integral reservation it is doubtful that the charter would have reecived the advice and consent of the Senate by the requisite two-thirds vote; but, as I have indicated, the two preceding Executives sought to bypass the reservation in the manner described. Senate Joint Resolution 1 will restore the true meaning and effect of article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter in the sense that its original sponsors intended.

A comparable provision in the League of Nations Covenant was a limitation only on the powers of the League Council, but at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco the sponsoring governments transferred the paragraph in revised form to its present position in the charter as "a governing principle for the whole organization and its members." The official explanation of this change was given to the Conference by Mr. John Foster Dulles, of the United States delegation, who said that it was required by the broadening of the scope of the organization's functions, particularly in respect to economic, social, and cultural matters. It was intended, in partciular, he said, to require the organization in carrying out its economic and social objectives to deal with governments, instead of allowing the organization to "penetrate directly into the domestic life and social economy of the member states." (U. N. Conference on International Organization, Documents, vol. VI, pp. 507–508.)

Friendly commentators on the charter of the United Nations have this to say on the meaning of paragraph 7 of article 2:

"There can be little question of the importance of the paragraph. It establishes the principle that certain matters are to be excluded from the competence of the United Nations to act, in much the same way that the 10th amendment of the Constitution of the United States together with the other provisions of the Constitution limit the sphere of action of the Federal Government." (Charter of the United Nations, by Prof. Leland M. Goodrich, of Brown University, then director of the World Peace Foundation, and Edvard Hambro, then registrar of the International Court of Justice of The Hague.)

Those authors proceeded in their interpretation as follows:

"The practice of the United Nations makes it clear, as indeed does the phraseology of article 2 (7), that the word 'intervention' as used in the paragraph is not to be given a narrow technical interpretation. While discussion does not amount to intervention, the creation of a commission of inquiry, the making of a recommendation of a procedural or substantive nature, or the taking of a binding decision constitutes intervention under the terms of this paragraph." (Ibid., p. 120.)

BYPASSING ARTICLE 2, PARAGRAPH 7 OF THE U. N. CHARTER

Compare this analysis of the true intent and meaning of this reservation of domestic affairs from the jurisdiction of the United Nations, with the actual program of the Economic and Social Council as described by the Director of the United Nations Division of Human Rights:

"What the United Nations is trying to do is revolutionary in character. Human rights are largely a matter of relationships between the state and individuals, and therefore a matter which has been traditionally regarded as being within the domestic jurisdiction of States. What is now being proposed is, in effect, the creation of some kind of supranational supervision in this relationship between the state and its citizens." (Mr. John P. Humphrey, in Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science, January 1948.)

The reason for a large segment of opposition to the proposed amendment was stated by the New York Times in an editorial of April 8, 1953, as follows:

"The resolution is dangerous because it forbids any treaty that would allow any foreign power or any international organization (meaning the U. N. or one of its agencies) to control the constitutional rights of American citizens within the United States 'or any other matter essentially within he domestic jurisdiction of the United States'."

At this point it will be enlightening to insert the opinion of another leading opponent of Senate Joint Resolution 1 on the constitutional position of the United States in the United Nations. I refer to Dr. Edward S. Corwin who maintains that—

"The question whether the United States should enter an international organization for the promotion of peace and of what pledges it should give with respect to the use of its constitutional powers to the same end, is one which the appropriate agencies of the National Government are free to decide on grounds of national interest, substantially unfettered by Constitutional Limitations of any kind." (The Constitution and World Organization, 1944, p. 30.)

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN THE UNITED STATES THROUGH THE TREATYMAKING POWER

When it was first proposed to substitute a treaty for constitutional amendment to enlarge the power of Congress for the protection of migratory birds, voices were raised in Congress against the future risks involved to our Constitution. On February 7, 1913, the Honorable Frank W. Mondell, of Wyoming, in opposing the first Federal Migratory Bird Act, said in the House of Representatives:

"Mr. Chairman, we live in the midst of revolution—revolution proposed and revolution threatened. It is true there are few open avowals of revolutionary intent; no armed forces hostile to our form of Government and to our institutions thunder at our gates or threaten our liberties. On the contrary, the forces of revolution, through they have among their leaders many supremely selfish and inordinately ambitious and some thoroughly irresponsible and conscienceless men, are in the main composed of entirely well-meaning people, who, carried away by their enthusiasm or by the claims and sophistries of others, fail utterly to realize that they are the advocates and supporters of a revolutionary cause.

"This is a Government we are sworn to uphold. The portion of the sovereignty of the people which they have surrendered, or, rather, agreed to exercise jointly under a National Government, is set out in the Constitution in language reasonably clear and explicit; and that is the instrument we are sworn to uphold and defend against all enemies, foreign and domestic, which includes well-meaning enemies as well as willfully wicked ones." (Reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 11, 1954, p. 1578.)

Today, with Western civilization in a struggle for survival with atheistic communism, the risks predicted by Mr. Mondell exist to a greater degree and extent than when he spoke some 30 years ago.

Prior to the establishment of the United Nations, treaty stipulations with respect to individuals were limited in scope to the rights of aliens, in consideration of mutual concessions of similar treatment of citizens residing or doing business abroad. After the United States became a member of that organization representatives appointed by the President actively participated in United Nations programs to expand the area of international negotiation beyond the rights of aliens so as to include as matters of international concern the rights of citizens vis-a-vis their own governments and within their own countries. (See, for example, the Genocide Convention signed and sent to the Senate for approval, and the Covenants on Human Rights awaiting final action.)

That program, so candidly described as revolutionary by the United Nations Director of Human Rights (Mr. Humphrey, previously quoted), was lauded by President Truman and his State Department as "one of the great revolutionary enterprises." (State Department Publication 3972, previously cited.)

We do not dissent from the official admissions of the revolutionary character of those United Nations activities. The extraordinary parallelism between the United Nations Covenants on Human Rights and the Soviet Constitution has been shown in some detail by Dr. Felix Morley, who asserts: "Actually, a large part of the Soviet Constitution was almost textually embodied in these U. N. Covenants." (Treaty Law and the Constitution, New York, pp. 36–37.)

Senate Joint Resolution 1 has been drafted and is being supported by those who are opposed to that kind of a revolution. We do not agree with Mr. Dulles that the raising and discussion of the question has reversed the dangerous trend in our ideological thinking and that no action need now be taken. We urge that this Trojan horse in our constitutional bulwarks now being removed against the time when the revolutionists will return to power and be in positions of authority to continue where they left off. The President and Secretary of State are not permanent officials of the Government. A constitutional amendment has been adopted to limit the President's tenure of office.

ATTEMPTED SEIZURE OF THE STEEL MILLS

An example of what Mr. Dulles meant when he said at Louisville that treaties might take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President was President Truman's attempt to seize the steel mills. His Executive order of April 8, 1952, was issued 4 days before Mr. Dulles made that statement. The President directed the seizure of that private property without due process of law, among other reasons "to fulfill our responsibilities in the efforts being made throughout the United Nations and otherwise to bring about a lasting peace," and because "America fightingmen and fightingmen of other nations of the United Nations are now engaged in deadly combat with the forces of aggression in Korea, and forces of the United States are stationed elsewhere overseas for the purpose of participating in the defense of the Atlantic community against aggression" (16 Federal Register, p. 3503). In other words, President Truman claimed and exercised this implied Executive power as flowing from the United Nations Charter, the NATO Treaty, and the war power, the last-mentioned being vested solely in Congress by the Constitution. The Supreme Court in a divided opinion on June 2, 1952, held 6 to 3, that the seizure was unconstitutional and without authority of law. (*Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. et al* v. *Sawyer* (343 U. S. 579).) A change of 2 votes in favor of the President's action would have reversed the Court's decision and made that Truman doctrine the law of the land.

Apologists for the minority opinion in the Steel Mills case deny that the case involved the treaties referred to. If that denial be true, why did the late Mr. Justice Jackson in his majority concurring opinion find it necessary to answer the President's foreign policy justification of his act, as follows:

"I cannot foresee all that might entail if the Court should endorse this argument. Nothing in our Constitution is plainer than that declaration of war is entrusted only to Congress. Of course a state of war may in fact exist without a formal declaration. But no doctrine that the Court could promulgate could seem to be more sinister and alarming than that a President whose conduct of foreign affairs is so largely uncontrolled, and often even unknown, can vastly enlarge his mastery over the internal affairs of the country by his own commitment of the Nation's Armed Forces to some foreign venture" (343 U. S., p. 642).

It is the purpose of the constitutional amendment now pending to remove the danger that a future Supreme Court will uphold a President's unconstitutional views of Executive power under treaties.

IN PURSUANCE OF THE CONSTITUTION—MISSOURI *v.* HOLLAND

The facts of this notorious case are so well known as not to require repetition. Mr. Justice Holmes' decision was doubtless in the mind of Mr. Dulles when he warned the American Bar Association at Louisville 4 years ago that treaties were liable to override the Constitution. Compare his statement with what Mr. Justice Holmes said: "No doubt the great body of private relations fall within the control of the State, but a treaty can override its power."

It was in *Missouri* v. *Holland* that Mr. Justice Holmes also relied upon the phraseology of the supremacy clause of article VI of the Constitution to distinguish between acts of Congress which "are the supreme law of the land only when made in pursuance of the Constitution, while treaties are declared to be so when made under the authority of the United States." This subcommittee is in possession of a letter, which I hope will be printed in full in the record of these hearings, containing the explanation of this variance in those descriptive words in article VI. The letter, dated April 27, 1955, is from Mr. Samuel B. Pettengill, of Evanston, Ill., who, I believe, was formerly a Member of Congress.

Mr. Pettengill calls attention to a rare law book entitled "A View of the Constitution of the United States," written by Mr. William Rawle, a distinguished lawyer of Philadelphia, and published in that city in 1829. Mr. Rawle explains that at the time of adopting the Constitution certain treaties existed which had been made by Congress under the Confederacy, and that the words "under the authority of the United States" were considered as extending equally to those previously made and to those which should subsequently be effected. But, Mr. Rawle continued, although the former could not be considered as made pursuant to a Constitution which was not then in existence, the latter would not be "under the authority of the United States," unless they are conformable to its Constitution. In short, since the ratification of the Constitution, the words "under the authority" and "in pursuance" mean the same things so far as treaties are concerned. As Mr. Pettengill says in his letter, "This point seems to have been completely overlooked by Justice Holmes when he wrote his opinion in the migratory bird case." Senate Joint Resolution 1 will remedy the learned Justice's oversight.

As stated by the Attorney General before this subcommittee on May 5, the "in pursuance" language was introduced into Senate Joint Resolution 1 in an amendment proposed by former Senator Homer Ferguson in the 83d Congress. When he introduced the present revised version of the resolution, Senator BRICKER stated that he desired to retain Senator Ferguson's language. In debate Senator Ferguson denied that the "in pursuance" clause was intended as a substitute for the so-called which clause. Since I agree with Senator Ferguson on that point, I am supporting the retention of the "which" clause as contained in section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1, now under consideration, but with an amendment I shall shortly suggest.

DEFINITION OF "TREATY"

Opponents have raised the question of the meaning of "internal law" as used in section 2. In his statement of May 2 before this subcommittee, Secretary Dulles said: "It might be construed to mean affecting the determination of issues in judicial or administrative proceedings." I shall be glad to answer that argument, but, first, I think it is more important to define the meaning of the word "treaty" as used in the Constitution, as well as in section 2.

In international usage, the word "treaty" is generically applied to a formal agreement between sovereign states. Other words are often used synonymously, as "convention," "agreement," "pact," "covenant," "protocol," "charter," and even "statute." The use of the word "treaty" is not confined exclusively to public-law transactions. In private law "treaty" signifies the discussion of terms which immediately precedes the conclusion of a contract or other transaction (Black's Law Dictionary).

No doubt exists as to the meaning of the word "treaty" as used by the framers of the Constitution. In defending the treaty-making power against objections to the ratification of the Constitution, Alexander Hamilton wrote in the Federalist (No. 75) that treaties "are contracts with foreign nations" and "agreements between sovereign and sovereign." He stated explicitly that "the power of making treaties relates neither to the execution of subsisting laws nor to

the enaction of new ones." The legal force of treaties, he added, is derived "from the obligations of good faith; they are not rules prescribed by the sovereign to the subject."

Hamilton's explanation removes what would otherwise be a conflict between two provisions of the Constitution relating to the exercise of the legislative power. Article I, section 1, provides that "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." No residuum of legislative power accordingly remains to be exercised by the President and Senate under their treatymaking power. The provision of article VI that treaties shall be the supreme law of the land must mean that treaties in their contractual sense are binding upon the States and enforceable in their courts.

In his testimony before this committee on May 2, 1955, Secretary of State Dulles repeated certain statements he made 2 years ago which are so strikingly similar to Hamilton's concept that I beg leave to quote him again in juxtaposition with Hamilton's statement in the Federalist. Mr. Dulles said:

"This administration is committed to the exercise of the treatymaking power only within traditional limits. By 'traditional' I do not mean to imply that the boundary between domestic and international concerns is rigid and fixed for all time. I do mean that treaties are contracts with foreign governments designed to promote the interests of our Nation by securing action by others in a way deemed advantageous to us. I do not believe that treaties should, or lawfully can, be used as a device to circumvent the constitutional procedures established in relation to what are essentially matters of domestic concern."

Mr. Dulles confirmed and reenforced his previous statement by adding:

"I believe that it reflects a pattern which will be followed by the executive branch of Government and enforced, if need be, by judicial determination that, under our system, treaties are contracts between nations in their corporate capacity, and not means for writing domestic law."

The Constitution denies to the States the power to enter into any agreement or compact with a foreign power without the consent of Congress (art. I, last paragraph). The power to make treaties, under the authority of the United States, in the nature of contracts as explained by Hamilton, and now accepted by Secretary Dulles, is an essential counterpart of the denial of that power to the States. As stated by Mr. Rawle, the treaty clause was never intended to validate treaties or agreements not made in pursuance of the Constitution. The President and Senate when making treaties, or the President alone when making other international agreements, are acting as the agents of the people and Government of the United States. Their powers as agents are stated in the Constitution. They have no more authority to exceed or violate those powers than has an agent to disregard the powers conferred upon him by his principal in the making of a private contract.

THE MEANING OF "INTERNAL LAW"

The expression "internal law" is used in contradistinction to "international law." The two terms denote the distribution of the supreme power, called sovereignty, by which a state is governed, and which may be exercised either internally or externally. According to Henry Wheaton:

"Internal sovereignty is that which is inherent in the people of any State, or vested in its ruler, by its municipal constitution or fundamental laws. This is the object of what has been called internal public law, droit public interne, but which may more properly be termed constitutional law." (Elements of International Law, 1836, Dana's ed. 1866, sec. 20.)

To complete the comparison with international law, I also quote Wheaton's explanation of the meaning of that term:

"External sovereignty consists in the independence of one political society, in respect to all other political societies. It is by the exercise of this branch of sovereignty that the international relations of one political society are maintained, in peace and in war, with all other political societies. The law by which it is regulated has, therefore, been called external public law, droit public externe, but may more properly be termed international law."

Henry Wheaton's Elements of International Law was the first complete treatise on international law written by an American. He was an eminent authority on that subject because of his ripe experience with the law of nations and in diplomacy. He was also well versed in our constitutional law, as for many years (1816–27) he was reporter of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. His Elements went through many English and American editions. It was translated and published in a number of foreign languages, including French, Italian, and Chinese.

MISSOURI *v.* HOLLAND RECONSIDERED

The Supreme Court in the case of *Geofrey* v. *Riggs*, 1890 (133 U. S. 258), declared "that the treaty power in the United States extends to all proper subjects of negotiations between our Government and the governments of other nations." No one supporting Senate Joint Resolution 1 denies the validity of that basic principle of both constitutional and international law.

Reviewing the migratory bird case in the light of what has been said regarding the meaning of the terms "in pursuance of," "under the authority of the United States," "treaty," and "internal law," and of the extent of the treaty power to all proper subjects of negotiation with foreign governments, subject to the limitations indicated by Messrs. Hamilton and Dulles, I submit that the same decision in that case might have been reached without striking down the 10th amendment and thus opening a Pandora's box of abuses nowhere better described than by Mr. Dulles at Louisville.[1]

In the Migratory Bird Case, Mr. Justice Holmes found that "here a national interest of very nearly the first magnitude is involved. It can be protected only by national action in concert with another power." That finding was adequate to bring the subject-matter within the first requirement of treaty making. Had he then forgotten his obsession as to the difference in meaning of the qualifying phrases "in pursuance of the Constitution," and "under the authority of the United States," and applied the correct concept of the meaning of the word "treaty" in the Constitution as in the nature of contract and not of legislation, the migratory birds would still be migrating and propagating without let or hindrance from the American Bar Association, Senator BRICKER, or any other supporters of Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Since the determination of issues in judicial or administrative proceedings does not fall within the category of legislative law, Mr. Dulles fears as to the effect of section 2 on such determinations are unfounded. The same assurance can be made concerning the fears expressed by opponents that section 2 would interfere with the daily conduct of the Government's minutiae of administration which do not rise to the dignity or importance of legislation under the Constitution. The validity of such transactions should be tested by the applicable laws of Congress enacted for that purpose.

The retention of section 2 of the resolution is now necessary if the Constitution is to be safeguarded in the future against the destructiveness of the Holmes principles foisted into that document by his decision in *Missouri* v. *Holland*.

OBJECTIONS TO SECTION 2 OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1—48 STATES' APPROVAL

Opponents have persistently circulated the propaganda that this section, if adopted, would require that all treaties be approved by the legislatures of all 48 States of the Union and thus return the Nation to its status under the Articles of Confederation. This propaganda is wholly untrue. The section would not require the approval of the legislature of any State of the Union to any treaty before it becomes effective. To put an end to this unjustified criticism, I now suggest that the text be amended by inserting the words "by Congress" between the words "legislation" and "valid" in line 6 of page 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1. These words were in the text approved by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association on February 26, 1952. (See report of the committee on peace and law through United Nations, Feb. 1, 1952, p. 3.)

THE WHICH CLAUSE

The insertion of the suggested amendment would make it imperative that the final clause of section 2, "valid in the absence of international agreement," be retained. Otherwise the amendment would confirm the worst feature of the Holmes principle in *Missouri* v. *Holland*, that is, that by a treaty the Government of the United States can confer upon itself legislative power which it does not have otherwise under the Constitution. If we substitute the word "contract" for the word "treaty" in the Holmes decision its real significance as a legal paradox becomes obvious.

The which clause has met with the most violent opposition on the ground that its adoption would cripple the President's powers in international negotiations and require the approval of all 48 States of the Union to future treaties. If opponents argument is sound, then we must conclude that the framers of our Constitution left this Nation in the position where it is dependent upon a foreign nation or nations by treaty to confer power upon Congress to legislate upon matters of vital concern to our citizens and Government. That is an utterly absurd dogma in either constitutional or international law. That ridiculous position of opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 was demolished years ago by the Supreme Court when it upheld the power of Congress to abrogate a treaty by law. The power of abrogation by Congress could not be derived from the power to make treaties vested in the President and Senate. Would opponents contend that Congress does not have the power to abrogate treaties since it is not among the expressly delegated powers? Here is the answer to that question given by the Supreme Court itself:

"The National Government is vested with power over the foreign relations of the country, war, peace, and negotiations and intercourse with foreign nations, all of which are forbidden to the State governments. It has jurisdiction of all those general subjects of legislation and sovereignty which affect the interests of the whole people, equally and alike, and which require uniformity of regulation and laws." (*Chinese Exclusion* case 1889, 130 U. S. 581.)

Opponents of the which clause who contend that its adoption would return our international negotiations and treatymaking to the days of the Articles of Confederation completely ignore the powers of the National Government in external affairs in the absence of treaty; although they contend that the powers delegated to Congress by the Constitution are inadequate without the additional powers they claim may be conferred upon Congress by treaties, they seldom mention the text of the Constitution delegating legislative powers to Congress. I

Footnotes at end of speech.

therefore ask that the complete text of Article I, section 8, be inserted as a part of my argument.

COMMERCIAL TREATIES

To those who contend that the adoption of the which clause would make it impossible for the Government to conclude commercial treaties without the approval of all 48 States of the Union, I answer that all the powers of the Continental Congress over commerce with foreign nations were transferred to the Congress of the United States by the power granted in section 8 of the Constitution "To regulate commerce with foreign nations." Treaties approved by the Continental Congress included the grant of reciprocal rights to aliens to inherit real property, to carry on business, to appoint consuls, and to do many other things,[2] all of which opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 contend that the United States Congress would be powerless to do in the absence of treaty. We deny that the treaty is a source of power—it is but a contract stipulating for reciprocal concessions. The question involved is one of power, not the means for exercising the power.

At the conclusion of his testimony here on May 2, Secretary of State Dulles laid before the subcommittee a list of hundreds of commercial treaties which he said would be impossible under the which clause, because they would not be valid in the absence of treaty. In my testimony on Senate Joint Resolution 1 last year I called attention to the series of revised treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation which the President had submitted to the Senate for approval. At the same time I quoted a statement by a representative of the State Department to a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in which he said: "Where the subject matter covers fields in which the States have a paramount interest, such as the formation and regulation of corporations and the ownership of property, the treaty provisions have been worked out with the same careful regard for the States' prerogatives and policies that has traditionally characterized agreements of this type." (Department of State Bulletin, vol. XXVI, No. 675, June 2, 1952, pp. 881–883; hearings on S. J. Res. 1, 1953, p. 1125.)

Which of these two conflicting statements of the policy of the State Department are we to rely upon? The policy declared in the statement of 1952 is exemplified in a number of treaties which make the reciprocal concessions to aliens on the part of the United States conformable to State laws, such as the Consular Convention with France of 1853, the Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation with China of 1946, the similar treaty with Italy of 1948, and 5 of the commercial treaties approved by the Senate in 1953, with Denmark, Ethiopia, Greece, Israel, and Japan. Types of such treaty provisions were inserted in my testimony in 1953 (hearings, pp. 1124–1125). Conflicts between treaties and State laws would never arise if such a policy were consistently followed, and all the untenable propaganda on this score against the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1 would vanish in thin air.

The argument that the adoption of the "which" clause might cause foreign nations to refuse to make commercial treaties with us is too absurd to merit serious consideration. The fact that many nations have already made with us treaties conformable to the "which" clause refutes the argument. Opponents have failed to meet the challenge to show that any of practically all the other nations of the world whose constitutional systems embody the principles of the "which" clause have any difficulty in concluding treaties for that reason; and, finally, the argument was brushed aside nearly a century ago by the Supreme Court when it stated "If the people of the United States were to repeal so much of their Constitution as makes treaties their municipal law, no foreign government with whom a treaty exists could justly complain, for it is not a matter with which he has any concern." The court did not deny the fundamental principle of international law that treaties are made to be observed—pacta sunt servanda, for it continued:

"The foreign sovereign between whom and the United States a treaty has been made has a right to expect and require its stipulations to be kept with scrupulous good faith; but through what internal arrangements this shall be done is exclusively for the consideration of the United States. Whether the treaty shall itself be the rule of action of the people as well as the government, whether the power to enforce and apply it shall reside in one department or another, neither the treaty itself nor any implication drawn from it gives him any right to inquire." (*Taylor* v. *Morton*, 1858 (2 Curtis 454, affirmed by the Supreme Court, 2 Black 481).)

EXTRADITION TREATIES

Time will permit only a brief refutation of some of the many other specious arguments that have been advanced against the adoption of this clause.

In my testimony in 1953 I gave a summary history of the practice of international extradition by the United States. (See S. Rept. 412, 83d Cong., 1st sess., reporting favorably on S. J. Res. 1 of that year.) The essence of my testimony is that extradition in this country is regulated either by treaty or congressional legislation. I cited the leading authority on the subject, John Bassett Moore, and several Supreme Court decisions, all of which have been distorted or ignored by opponents of the amendment.

CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The minority views on Senate Joint Resolution 1 of 1953 stated that "the proposed amendment would block our own Baruch plan for controlling atomic energy" (S. Doc. No. 412, p. 46). As I have pointed out previously, the Congress of the United States has already legislated on this subject without benefit of any treaty to vest it with additional power. That part of the Baruch plan that depended upon the exclusive ownership by an international authority of source materials, control of facilities for development, monopoly of the know-how, etc., has been abandoned in favor of the nationally safer plans of President Eisenhower. Should any attempt be made to revive those features of the Baruch plan dangerous to our security, they would run afoul of the Constitution in the absence of Senate Joint Resolution 1. The power of the Federal Government to enter into any agreement on this subject is derived from the power of Congress to provide for the common defense. That power in turn is controlled by the provision of section 8 of the Constitution vesting in Congress the exercise of exclusive legislation and authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings. If that provision can now be violated by some "invisible radiation," to use Mr. Justice Holmes' words regarding the 10th amendment, from the President's power under treaties or other international agreements, then Senate Joint Resolution 1 with the "which" clause is needed to maintain the Constitution as it was written.

DISARMAMENT

It seems incredible that any high official of the Government should argue that the Congress of the United States lacks the power, in the absence of treaty, to provide for the limitation of armaments or to participate in a world arrangement on that subject. Is not that power included within the power to provide for the common defense, or to raise and support armies, or to provide and maintain a navy or to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces? Without any treaty obligation to do so, Congress passed a joint resolution which the President approved on August 31, 1935, establishing a permanent National Munitions Control Board to regulate, by a licensing system the import and export of arms and munitions of war in the interest of the peace and security of the United States. How can the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1 take away a power of Congress it has already exercised in the absence of treaty?

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

It is suggested that Senate Joint Resolution 1 might interfere with the President's powers under NATO. That could happen only if the President claimed the power to make war in defense of foreign countries without authorization by the Congress. The same observation applies to all other mutual defense treaties cited by opponents as potential victims of Senate Joint Resolution 1. The inclusion in such treaties of the common phrase that they shall be ratified and their provisions carried out by the parties "in accordance with their respective constitutional processes" (NATO, art. 11)[3] should not be open to the interpretation that the treaties have taken the war power away from Congress and given it to the President or to some international body, as Mr. Dulles said at Louisville treaties might do. Senate Joint Resolution 1 will make certain that such abuse of the treatymaking power will not occur in the future.

In the statement read to this subcommittee on May 5, the Attorney General enumerated certain multilateral treaties dealing with the respective rights and duties of the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which treaties, the statement alleges it would have been impossible to conclude if Senate Joint Resolution 1 had been in effect, becauses they involve subjects on which Congress lacks the power of legislation in the absence of treaty. On the status of forces agreement I testified in 1953 in reply to canards circulated then and repeated this year by representatives of the bar of the association of the city of New York. Their testimony was to the effect that foreign forces in this country upon invitation would, under Senate Joint Resolution 1, be hampered in their operations by local, State, and Federal ordinances and laws, and that for the same reason Gen. George Washington would have been unable to make agreements with our French allies at Yorktown during the War of the Revolution. I pointed out that such fantastic results would be impossible under the rules of international law expounded by Chief Justice Marshall in the case of *Exchange* v. *McFaddon* (1812, 7 Cranch 116) which grants immunity to foreign troops in such cases from all territorial law, local, State, and Federal. I refer to my testimony in 1953 (hearings, pp. 1144–1145) in response to the revival of that criticism of Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Nations may, by treaty or other international agreement, in their national interest attach conditions to their permission for the entry of foreign troops and thus consent to the modification of their rights under international law. In the United States, to Congress is delegated the power "To make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces." The power extends to those forces wherever they may be located. Should it be necessary for the defense of the United States to station foreign troops in this country, Congress undoubtedly has the power to legislate on this phase under its power to provide for the common defense. If the Status of Forces Treaty conflicts with exist-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

ing congressional legislation, Senate Joint Resolution 1 would require additional implementation by Congress, not in conflict with any other provisions of the Constitution, including the Bill of Rights. The argument that the resolution would have made impossible the conclusion of the treaty because Congress would have lacked the power to legislate on the subject is untenable.

The statement read by the Attorney General on May 5 lists the Agreement Relating to the Status of NATO, signed September 20, 1951, and the Protocol on the Status of International Military Headquarters of NATO, signed August 28, 1952. In reply to this criticism, attention is respectfully invited to the statute extending privileges, exemption, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, enacted by Congress and approved by the President on December 29, 1945 (Public Law 291, 79th Cong.). That statute legislates on substantially all matters dealt with in the two treaties referred to. The act applies by its terms to any "public international organization in which the United States participates pursuant to any treaty or under the authority of any act of Congress authorizing such participation or making an appropriation for such participation, and which shall have been designated by the President through appropriate Executive order as being entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities herein provided." Two important international organizations in which the United States now participates under authority of an act of Congress are the International Labor Organization and the World Health Organization. According to the Attorney General's reasoning on the NATO treaties, our participation in the ILO and WHO in the absence of treaty is unconstitutional, or did he overlook the statute of Congress of December 29, 1945, when he made his argument that Senate Joint Resolution 1 would have made impossible the conclusion of the NATO treaties?

CONTROL OF NARCOTICS

The argument is repeated this year that the which clause would make it impossible to conclude treaties for narcotic control because Congress is said to lack power to pass legislation for the domestic control of the production and distribution of narcotic drugs in the absence of treaty. As I stated in my testimony in 1953, an act was passed by Congress in 1942 to discharge not only the international obligations of the Nation, but to "promote the public health and general welfare, to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in opium poppies, and to safeguard the revenue derived from taxation of opium and opium products" (56 Stat. 1045). By the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by the act of 1941 (52 Stat. 31), Congress had previously exercised authority to control the domestic production and distribution of wheat, and that act was held constitutional notwithstanding it regulates production even when not intended for commerce but wholly for consumption on the producer's farm. (*Wickard* v. *Filburn* (1942, 317 U. S. 111).) This legislation, upheld by the courts, effectively negates opponent's objection to the which clause on the ground that it would make it impossible to participate in the international control of narcotics due to lack of congressional power in internal law.

COLLECTION OF DEBTS

The objection that the which clause would prevent the United States from collecting foreign debts was also disposed of by citing the previous laws passed by Congress to collect such debts without resort to treaties (hearings, 1953, p. 1142).

The argument is now advanced that the which clause would make it impossible to carry out in the United States the provisions of the agreement between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany concerning the validation of German dollar bonds signed at Bonn on April 1, 1953. That agreement provides that the two governments establish jointly in New York City a Board for the Validation of German Bonds in the United States. The United States Government "consents to the said Board's conducting its operations within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States." From an explanatory discussion of the arrangements worked out by the two governments the reason for the agreement seems to have been the disappearance of uncalled German bearer bonds from Berlin after that city was captured by the Soviet forces. This situation impeded "the free and open trading in the United States of all German dollar bonds," and the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, to prevent the Soviet Government from introducing unlawfully-held bonds into our security markets, requested the securities exchanges in this country to suspend dealings in listed securities of German origin.

The Government of the United States recognizes in the agreement that the policy of Germany embodied in its validation law is in conformity with the policy of the United States, and that the procedure of validation prescribed in the German law is in the interest of an orderly and appropriate determination of the validity of claims of the United States and its nationals against German debtors.

The agreement provides that the holders of German dollar bonds that have not been duly validated cannot resort to courts in the United States for the purpose of enforcing their rights under such bonds. No reason has been advanced as to how Senate Joint Resolution 1 would interfere with the carrying out of the agreement in this country. If the Federal Securities and Exchange Commission had power to take action to prevent trading in the bonds, which it is assumed it had, the subject obviously falls within Federal and not State jurisdiction. It is, therefore, not clear how any court would hold the agreement unconstitutional under Senate Joint Resolution 1 due to lack of power in Congress to implement, if necessary, the policy of the Government expressed in regulations of the Commission as well as in the treaty. The necessary and proper clause of section 8 of the Constitution applies to all delegated powers of Congress as well as to the treatymaking power.

THE SENATE AND TREATYMAKING

It is urged that Senate Joint Resolution 1 is unnecessary because of the constitutional requirement that treaties be made by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and that Senators should be relied upon to refuse their approval of treaties that violate the Constitution. It is said that Senators when acting upon treaties are the representatives of their States and are thus in position to safeguard any State's rights that may be imperiled by the approval of treaties.

I yield to no one in my admiration of the abilities, industry, and patriotism of the Members of the United States Senate; but I would not place upon them responsibilities they are not in a position to fulfill. Most modern treaties are long, complicated documents. No Senator should be expected to read through one of them and then and there determine whether or not any of its provisions are in conflict with his State's constitution or laws. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations does not refer treaties to the constitutional authorities of the States for information of this kind. The Association of Attorneys General of the States has approved the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1 as have many State legislatures.

Many treaties become the object of intense propaganda by groups throughout the Nation with special interests such as the organized propaganda to force the Genocide Convention through the Senate before there was time to have it examined and analyzed by competent legal critics. Only the intervention of the American Bar Association acting through the committee of which I am a member, gained the time necessary for the proper consideration of that convention, resulting in its nonapproval up to the present time. The treaty has not, however, been withdrawn from the Senate, and it may be approved whenever its advocates gain sufficient control of the Senate.

President Wilson and the Treaty of Versailles

Senate Joint Resolution 1 is directed not only to treaties submitted to the Senate, but to forbid the bypassing of the Senate whenever the President doubts his ability to command the necessary votes in that body. Such an attempt was made by President Wilson at Paris in 1919. Here is that story as told in the diary of one of the President's principal legal advisers on the American Commission to Negotiate Peace:

"We [Dr. James Brown Scott and Mr. David Hunter Miller] went in to see Mr. Lansing and he said that the President had advanced the idea that afternoon (March 17, 1919) that the preliminary peace treaty need not be ratified by the Senate, and that he, Mr. Lansing, had been shocked at the idea and told him that it was impossible, and that the President had said to consult the legal advisers.

"Mr. Lansing asked me my opinion, and I said that I did not think that it was debatable; that the status of war could not be changed into the status of peace, as far as the United States was concerned, except by a treaty ratified by the Senate. Dr. Scott was entirely of the same opinion and cited several cases to that effect, including one in the war between Great Britain and us in 1813, one after the Mexican War, and one after the Spanish War.

"Mr. Lansing was in accord with these views and instructed Dr. Scott and myself to prepare a short opinion on the matter, which, after we went out, I asked Dr. Scott to write." (Miller, My Diary at the Conference of Paris, vol. 1, p. 73.)

I was one of the assistant legal advisers of the American Commission at Paris and was assigned to assist Dr. Scott. After the interview with Mr. Lansing by Messrs. Miller and Scott, as related in the former's diary, Dr. Scott called me into his office and told the incident to me. He added some details not given by Mr. Miller, namely, that President Wilson had first suggested his idea at the meeting of the Council of Four representing the Big Powers at the conference; that the President thought he could arrange terms of peace in accordance with his ideas without consulting the Senate, have the peace established according to those terms, and at some future date when the heat of political discussion had cooled off, have the status quo established by the preliminary peace treaty formally confirmed by a treaty quietly put through the Senate. Dr. Scott told me that the President's position was challenged by Mr. Lloyd-George, the British Premier, and it was he who had suggested to President Wilson that he consult his legal advisers. Since the opinion rendered by the legal advisers under those circumstances may have some bearing upon the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 1, I am attaching a copy of it to this statement.

The original draft of the opinion was prepared by me at Dr. Scott's request. It pointed out that as Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States the President had the authority to conclude an armistice and incorporate therein such terms of a military nature as the exigencies of the

situation may seem to him to require, but that the President had no power to terminate the war by treaty without the advice and consent of the Senate. Following this opinion, President Wilson abandoned his plan and submitted the Treaty of Versailles to the Senate, with the results that are now well known in history.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AND THE YALTA AGREEMENT

President Roosevelt was more successful at Yalta in avoiding the Senate's prerogatives of advising and consenting to treaties. I have stated elsewhere that the Yalta agreement is the blackest page in American diplomatic history. The reasons why I think so are given in an article entitled "How a President Made Law" published in the February 1955 issue of the National Republic, pages 5–6. I have produced this article for inclusion in the appendix of these hearings.

Secretary of State Dulles testified before the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1953 (hearings, pp. 873–874) that the President could not properly make the agreements at Yalta which had any long-range permanent effect unless and until they had been ratified by the Senate as treaties. His statement is in accordance with the rule of international law incorporated as part of our constitutional law by Chief Justice John Marshall speaking for the Supreme Court in 1828:

"The usage of the world is, if a nation is not entirely subdued, to consider the holding of conquered territory as a mere military occupation until its fate shall be determined at the treaty of peace. If it be ceded by the treaty, the acquisition is confirmed and the ceded territory becomes a part of the nation to which it is annexed, either on the terms stipulated in the treaty of cession or on such as its new master shall impose." (*American Insurance Co.* v. *Canter* (1 Peters, 611).)

The text of the Yalta agreement makes no mention of the necessity of ratification, but President Roosevelt stated that he intended to submit it to the Senate in the prepared text of his report to the joint session of Congress after his return from the Yalta Conference on March 1, 1945. (Department of State Bulletin, vol. 12, No. 297, p. 324.) For some unexplained reason, that sentence was omitted from the President's report as delivered. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 91, pt. 2, p. 1620.) The complete text of the secret Yalta agreement was not made public until nearly a year later, after President Roosevelt's death. When releasing the text on January 26, 1946, Secretary of State Byrnes stated that President Roosevelt always held the view that as to the cessions of territory at Yalta "it was a matter that had to be settled in the peace treaty." (Department of State Bulletin, Feb. 10, 1946, pp. 189–190.)

I do not maintain that the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1 will make it possible for a private citizen or even a Government official to go into court to compel a future President to submit his agreements to the Senate. The courts would probably decline to entertain such an action for various good and sufficient reasons. Senate Joint Resolution 1 would, however, make plain what is now lacking in the Constitution, namely, that the President does not have the power in his discretion to make executive agreements in lieu of treaties; and that an international agreement made without the advice and consent of the Senate does not have equal supremacy with treaties "from the very fact that complete power over international affairs is in the National Government." (Mr. Justice Douglas in the Pink case.)

THE PINK CASE

The facts and legal arguments which show that the decision may well mark one of the most far-reaching inroads upon the protection which it was supposed the fifth amendment accorded to private property (Dr. Jessup in the American Journal of International Law, vol. 36, 1942, p. 282) have been set forth many times by proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1. We shall confine our statement now to pointing out some confusions in the minds of those who disagree with our conclusions.

It is contended that because the claims of no American citizens were involved in the fund held by the State of New York and seized by the Government of the United States in reliance upon the Litvinoff assignment, the fifth amendment did not apply. This argument ignores a previous holding of the Supreme Court in another Russian case, speaking through Chief Justice Hughes, that "the petitioner was an alien friend, and as such was entitled to the protection of the fifth amendment of the Federal Constitution" (*Russian Volunteer Fleet* v. *United States*, 1931 (282 U. S. 481), and numerous cases there cited). In his opinion in the Pink case, Mr. Justice Douglas dismissed this aspect of the constitutional law question by stating "There is no constitutional reason why this Government need act as the collection agent for nationals of other countries when it takes steps to protect itself or its nationals on external debts." To which a commentator in the American Journal of International Law replied. "Whatever the United States constitutional question, most countries, contrary to the United States policy, allowed foreign creditors to have their share in the local Russian assets, and our creditors had the benefit of others acting as collecting agents for all creditors—incidentally the policy to which we adhere in bankruptcy" (Kurt H. Nadelmann, vol. 46, 1952, pp. 530–531, and authorities there cited).

To our charge that the Pink case is authority for the principle that the President may make law in the United States without reference to the prerogatives of the Senate in treatymaking or to the exclusive legislative powers of Congress, it is asserted that the joint resolution adopted August 4, 1939, authorizing the President to appoint a Commissioner to adjudicate the claims of American nationals against the U. S. S. R. (53 Stat. 1119), constituted a congressional ratification of his executive agreement known as the Litvinoff Assignment. A reading of the joint resolution fails to establish such a purpose. In law, there is no warrant for imputing such intention to Congress. "Acts of Congress are to be construed and applied in harmony with and not to thwart the purpose of the Constitution." (*Phelps* v. *United States* (274 U. S. 341), cited in *Russian Volunteer Fleet* v. *U. S., supra.*) Whether the aliens whose property was taken without due process of law and just compensation were personally present in New York, I do not know; but it appears from the decision that they had invoked the protection of the courts of New York by attachment proceedings, and thus were in this country at least by attorney.

It should be remembered that in the Pink case the Supreme Court was not dealing with enemy private property—we were not at war with Russia—but with the property of friends who had fled their country to avoid the confiscation of their property by their Communist masters. The effect of this aspect of the decision was illustrated shortly after it was rendered, as follows, by Dr. Jessup:

"The effect of the decision may be illustrated by imagining—a most improbable case—that in the settlement of the present war after the defeat of the Axis, the United States by executive agreement might take an assignment from the German Government of that Government's claim to the confiscated properties of their Jewish citizens and of the citizens of the occupied countries, including all choses in action in the United States and fines imposed upon persons physically present in this country. The purpose of the United States, let us assume, would be to provide a fund for pensions of disabled soldiers and sailors or merely to avoid the international disruption likely to follow the imposition of huge 'reparations' payments. Under the rationale of the Pink decision, the United States could, under such an assignment, take to itself all such private properties and no American court could protect the owners." (Ibid.)

RETROACTIVE EFFECT OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

In the course of these debates it has been argued that the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1 as part of the Constitution might have such retroactive effect as to disturb the stability of law settled since the beginning of our national existence. The sponsors of the resolution certainly have no such intention and would not oppose an amendment of the resolution that would make that clear. To meet that objection I would suggest that a new section be added reading as follows:

"SEC. 3. The provisions of section 1 and section 2 hereof shall apply only to treaties and other international agreements made after the approval of the charter of the United Nations by the Senate on July 28, 1945."

The amendment would thus restore to the charter the understanding of its provisions which was inherent in the Senate's approval of it. It would revive and maintain in full force and effect the reservation of domestic affairs from the operations of the United Nations embodied in article 2, paragraph 7. It would nullify any further efforts to declare judicially that articles 55 and 56 are self-executing and the supreme law of the land without legislative action, and make it impossible to contend that these articles have transferred power to the Federal Congress to legislate on all the subjects enumerated in them. The unlimited extent to which such Federal legislation might be enacted to regulate substantially every aspect of our daily lives has been explained in these hearings by Mr. Carl B. Rix, a former president of the American Bar Association and a former member of this committee of the association.

TREATIES FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF WAR AND THE PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

In reply to the specious allegations of opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 that its approval would prevent the United States Government from concluding treaties of this character, I repeat the answer I gave when these same objections were previously made. (Hearings, 1953, p. 174.)

Beginning with the Jay Treaty of 1794, the United States has occupied a position of leadership in promoting the substitution of law for force in the conduct of international relations. Of the many Congressional declarations of policy to that end, I shall mention only the Concurrent Resolution of 1890 which requested the President "to invite negotiations with any government with which the United States has or may have diplomatic relations, to the end that any differences which cannot be adjusted by diplomatic agency may be referred to arbitration and be peacefully adjusted by such means. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 51st Cong, 1st sess., vol. 21, pt. 3, p. 2986.)

Secretary of State John Hay proposed a plan for a permanent international tribunal to the First Peace Conference at The Hague in 1899. In his instructions to the American Delegation he used the following inspiring language:

"Nothing can secure for human government and for the authority of law which it represents so deep a respect and so firm a loyalty as the spectable of sovereign and independent States, whose duty it is to prescribe the rules of justice and impose pen-

alties upon the lawless, bowing with reverence before the august supremacy of those principles of right which give to law its eternal foundation."

I regard the continuance of that policy by our Government as vital to the maintenance of our civilization. I would like to see the present International Court of Justice at The Hague, established as one of the principal organs of the United Nations, given a place of increasing importance in the settlement of international disputes.

There is nothing in Senate Joint Resolution 1 that can have any effect upon the negotiation and ratification by the United States of treaties for the establishment of mixed claims commission, arbitral tribunals, conciliation commissions, boundary commissions, or international courts for the adjudication of disputes with foreign nations. Such international questions are not within the domestic jursdiction and cannot be regulated by internal law. The Supreme Court in denying any power in the States to deal with foreign nations over matters in dispute, expressly pointed to such power in the National Government:

"The National Government, by virtue of its control of our foreign relations, is entitled to employ the resources of diplomatic negotiations and to effect such an international settlement as may be found to be appropriate, through treaty, agreement, or arbitration, or otherwise." (Chief Justice Hughes in *Monaco* v. *Mississippi*, 1934 (292 U. S. 313).)

The power and duty of the Federal Government to enter into treaties for the submission of international controversies of all kinds to peaceful solution in lieu of resort to armed force should not be confused with the conclusion of treaties and agreements which would impose criminal and civil liability upon persons within the United States, or that would be destructive of the existing division of authority between the States and the Federal Government.

Witnesses have testified against Senate Joint Resolution 1 on the ground that it is being put forward as part of a campaign against the United Nations and to deter the United States from participation in all forms of international cooperation. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 1 is to restore the charter of the United Nations to its original meaning, and thus enable all our citizens to unite in confidence with whole-hearted support. I believe that the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1 is more vital to the continuance of American support of the United Nations than anything that might be accomplished in the proposed revision or review conference on the charter.

CONCLUSION

1. Following years of intensive study, examination of different texts, and critical analyses of the highest order in the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and in debates in the Senate, the committee on peace and law through United Nations of the American Bar Association has recommended a constitutional amendment which will safeguard the Constitution from the liability to the abuses of the treaty-making power of which the present Secretary of State gave us warning 4 years ago.

2. Although the Constitution does not require that the amendment meet with the approval of the President, we have gone as far as we should, without sacrificing fundamental principles, to meet his objections and those of his principal legal advisers, that the amendment might interfere with his Executive powers and impair his power to conduct the foreign relations of the Government.

3. The amendment obviates any sensible reason for the repetition of the untenable criticism that its adoption would require the approval of treaties by all the 48 States of the Union.

4. The amendment meets the criticism that its adoption might play havoc with the settled constitutional law of treaties.

5. The amendment would be a stop sign to any future overambitious President who might attempt, by avoiding constitutional processes, to take us down the road that leads to one-man government.

6. The amendment would strengthen our participation in the work for peace of the United Nations by assuring us that the charter means what its framers intended it to mean, and cannot be used as a Trojan horse by those who would continue the social and economic revolution in this country through extraconstitutional means.

7. The amendment would assure us that the United Nations will not be used as a stepping-stone toward any form of world government, as was suggested in the pamphlet published by the State Department, with the endorsement of President Truman, in September 1950. The purpose of that pamphlet was stated in it to be to explain to the American people that, although they began life with "a Declaration of Independence * * * today the foreign policy of the United States is a declaration of interdependence of men and nations" (p. 99). The pamphlet continued: "Where the experiment" of an international community which is "in fact, the substance of our foreign policy" will lead "nobody can predict. * * * It may lead eventually to a form of world government" (pp. 17–18).

Opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 use the same arguments that Alexander Hamilton used to prevent the adoption of the Bill of Rights, namely, that it is unnecessary and dangerous. The amendment is in the nature of a new bill of rights against the liability to abuse of the treatymaking power. To those who question its need and urge us to have confidence that future administrations will not abuse the power, we reply in the words of Thomas Jefferson: "In questions of power, let no more be said of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

DOCUMENT NO. 526

(By David Hunter Miller, My Diary at the Conference of Paris, vol. VI)

OPINION RE SENATE AND PRELIMINARY PEACE TREATIES

From David Hunter Miller and Maj. James Brown Scott.

To The Commissioners Plenipotentiary.

The question submitted to the technical advisers for their opinion is whether a preliminary treaty of peace negotiated by the President would bind the Government of the United States from the date of its signature or whether it would require the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, and only bind the Government upon and from the latter date.

In providing that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties" (art. 2, sec. 2), the Constitution makes no distinction between classes of treaties which are subject to the advice and consent of the Senate, and in determining whether an instrument is or is not a treaty within the constitutional provision the name given to it is not essential; it must be construed according to its purposes and objects.

As Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States, the President has the authority to conclude an armistice and incorporate therein such terms of a military nature as the exigencies of the situation may seem to him to require. Of such a nature was the "Protocol of agreement embodying the terms of a basis for the establishment of peace" between the United States and Spain signed on August 12, 1898, which was not submitted to the advice and consent of the Senate. This protocol suspended hostilities upon its signature, embodied a promise on the part of Spain to relinquish her sovereignty over Cuba and to cede Puerto Rico and certain other islands to the United States, and made provision for their evacuation by the Spanish troops. It provided for the occupation of Manila by American forces "pending the conclusion of a treaty of peace," and for the appointment of "commissioners to treaty of peace."

In the case of a preliminary treaty of peace between France and Germany signed at Versailles on February 26, 1871, ratification by both parties, namely, the Emperor of Germany and the French National Assembly, was expressly stipulated (art. X). The same is true of a number of other important preliminary peace treaties. (See Phillipson, Termination of War and Treaties of Peace, p. 99.)

The declaration of war by the United States Congress on April 6, 1917, created a status of war which may only be terminated by a treaty of peace equally as valid as the law of the land with the declaration of April 6, 1917, and "as in the case of other treaties, a treaty of peace is not definitely binding until the exchange of ratifications; and a state of war in the technical sense continues until the date of the exchange." (Crandall, Treaties, Their Making and Enforcement, p. 352, citing several decisions of the Supreme Court.)

The legal effect of the protocol between the United States and Spain of August 12, 1898, was judicially passed upon in the case of Hijo *v.* United States, in which the United States district court held that "the protocol and proclamation did not end the war. The protocol worked a mere truce. The President has not the power to terminate the war by treaty without the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States." In confirming this decision, Mr. Justice Harlan, speaking for the Supreme Court, declared that "a state of war did not in law cease until the ratification in April 1899, of the treaty of peace." (194 U. S., pp. 317, 323.)

It is therefore submitted that a preliminary agreement signed by the President, but not ratified by the Senate, can have no legal effect, so far as ending the war is concerned, and can operate only as a truce; and that if it is desired in the preliminary agreement, by whatever name it may be called, to effectuate the transition from the state of war to a state of peace, this may only be accomplished by submitting it to the Senate for its advice and consent according to the constitutional provision.

JAMES BROWN SCOTT,
DAVID HUNTER MILLER,
Technical Advisers,
American Commission To Negotiate Peace.
MARCH 18, 1919.

---

[1] The treatymaking power is an extraordinary power liable to abuse. Treaties make international law and also they make domestic law. Under our Constitution treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are indeed more supreme than ordinary laws, for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty law can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the States and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body, and they can cut across the rights given the people by their constitutional bill of rights. (Address at Louisville, Ky., Apr. 12, 1952, before the regional meeting of the American Bar Association.)

[2] (See the Treaty of Amity and Commerce with France, Feb. 6, 1778; and Consular

Convention with France Nov. 14, 1788; Commercial Treaty with the Netherlands, Oct. 8, 1782, and Treaty of Amity and Commerce with Sweden, Apr. 3, 1783. The texts of these treaties are published in Malloy, Treaties, etc., vol. 1, pp. 479, 490, 1233, and 1725.)

[2] During the course of the debate on the North Atlantic Treaty in the Senate on Feb. 7, 1952, Senator GEORGE said: "When we were writing the North Atlantic Treaty, it was upon my insistence as a member of the committee, that article 11 was inserted.

"The Secretary of State who was the spokesman for the administration interpreted the words 'constitutional processes' to mean congressional approval insofar as the declaration of war or employment of our troops in any foreign country was concerned, and that language was designedly inserted in the treaty. The only difficulty has arisen because of the failure of the Executive to follow a straightforward course and to act in accordance with the power delegated to him by the Congress or, in this case, by the Senate."

(See the colloquy between Senator WATKINS and Secretary Dulles in the 1953 hearings, pp. 875–881.)

Labor, Politics, and the Gompers Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I submit the address delivered on May 9, 1955, by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable DON HAYWORTH, the Representative from the Sixth District of Michigan, at a State convention of the Michigan Federation of Labor, held in Detroit, Mich.

Because of the able way in which he has dealt with the problem of the place of labor in the formation of the policies of our Government, I believe that his remarks are of general interest and are well worthy of consideration.

The address follows:

In this group I feel I'm a member of the family, not merely because I'm a brother member of the teachers' local at Michigan State University, but because I've been working hand in hand with many right in this room—both in campaigns and in legislation. The postal pay increase, for example, an extremely delicate series of negotiations, was piloted through the Senate, the House, and the conference committee with little, I think, to regret. The postal workers are to be complimented on having in Washington a level-headed, hard-working group of legislative representatives.

I'd like to tell you something connected so closely with the organization which brings us together today, that I think it's highly appropriate.

I was raised a farm boy out in Iowa, and two things were almost as rare in Mahaska County as Eskimos on the Sahara. One was a labor leader and the other a Democrat. If either one of those rare specimens had been found in my township we'd have locked him up and charged people to see him.

Well, I grew up, went to college, and became a teacher of public speaking. It happened that certain ambitious teachers in this field were working together on the biographies of outstanding American speakers. Their idea was to go into every field, like preaching, business, and law, and pick out the most outstanding speakers, whom they would then write up in this biographical series. In looking over their list of speakers I thought they'd overlooked a number of fields. I suspected, for example, that undoubtedly some effective speaking had been done in building the labor movement. Even in the twenties the labor movement was something to be respected. This led me to study the life of Samuel Gompers. I read not only his two-volume autobiography, but everything else about him I could lay my hands on. So I wrote an article about Gompers' speaking ability which apparently caused his biography to be included in the series.

I mention this experience because it was my first contact with the labor movement. It was a good first contact. I caught the idealism, the selflessness of America's first great labor leader—architect of the organization that brought us here today.

Another thing I learned from my study of Gompers was the fallacy of the idea that the American Federation of Labor has never been and should not be interested in politics. All though the administration of Samuel Gompers from 1886 to 1924, the A. F. of L. lived and breathed politics. From headline and housetop they shouted, "Reward your friends and punish your enemies," and that applied to parties as well as individuals. In 1908, Samuel Gompers presented both great political parties with the kind of labor plank the Federation thought was right. The Republicans turned them down, but at the Democratic convention, according to Gompers' own words, "we were received and the plank was placed in the Democratic platform." At that time, in 1908, 47 years ago, Gompers went on to say, "The Democratic Party showed us that it was our friend, and that is why we are in this campaign working for the success of the Democratic ticket."

The A. F. of L, officially endorsed William Jennings Bryan and right down the line through Woodrow Wilson in both 1912 and 1916, James Cox in 1920, and then, which wasn't a bad idea, supported LaFollette in 1924.

The Federation wasn't active in politics for a number of years, but George Meany said recently, "It took the harsh lessons of the 80th Congress elected in 1946 to shock the A. F. of L. convention into forming Labor's League for Political Education. We now have returned to the policy of Gompers."

And don't think for a moment this was against the wishes of William Green. In William Green's last years I heard him give a ringing denunciation of those enemies of labor who framed Taft-Hartley. He called for labor again to get into politics and meet reaction head on. He stated in no uncertain terms that a new situation had developed and that the only way of preserving the life of organized labor was through the ballot. Those of us who heard that speech felt we had witnessed one of the landmarks of labor history—perhaps of national history.

Here we may well say something that needs to be said about the leadership we have in the labor movement. In the last 30 years we've seen some divisive influences in labor. We've seen brother fight against brother. And when you get that sort of thing started it's always easier to keep on fighting than to sit down together in generous and broad-minded cooperation. But in the last year the wholesome and unusual thing has happened. The A. F. of L. and the CIO did get together toward making the workingmen of America full brothers instead of half brothers. That would never have happened unless the leadership of both organizations had been broadminded men—willing to submerge personal ambition to common good. I've never had the privilege of meeting George Meany. But I've seen him on television, read his speeches, and watched his action over the years on the national and world stage. And he serves well the fine tradition laid down by Gompers.

On the other side of the picture it happens that I have many times been close to the Reuther brothers—have talked with one or more of them personally and at length. All labor can be proud of them. They have the devotion to cause that Gompers had. They have the intelligence to meet on equal terms the best that management or government can put down at the table across from them. They have a willingness to set aside personal interest for the common welfare. If they did not have that breadth of vision, we would not have seen at this time a united labor movement. In the midst of the primary campaign for United States Senator from Michigan we saw both great labor groups of Michigan swing into action together. Only because they did this was it possible for this State to give the Nation a great, liberal, dedicated public servant, the Honorable PATRICK V. MCNAMARA.

If we're going to have a strong America we need both forward-looking industrial leadership in management, and also forward-looking leaders in labor. Strong men don't always have to struggle against each other. They can team up and work together for great purposes.

In America today, both labor and management have two great purposes. In the first place, much needs to be done to give our people a better life. We're proud of America, but, oh, how we fall short of what could be done. How many millions are afflicted needlessly from disease; how cruelly other millions suffer for the simple reason they aren't getting enough income to buy decent food, clothing and shelter. Responsible men of labor and responsible men of management should work together to give us and our children a life of abundance—a life of economic and social justice.

But, for the immediate present, something even more important demands that labor and management get together. We need to make America strong—strong enough to meet the greatest menace this civilization has ever faced. Across the ocean we have a powerful enemy—an enemy, incidentally, that doesn't have free, democratic labor unions. If we waste our strength, if we get careless, we could lose this battle with communism so fast we wouldn't know what had happened to us.

Some people are afraid labor will be too powerful in one big, national movement. But those people don't really know how labor feels. I, myself, never cease to be surprised at the broadmindedness of organized labor. Take this matter of minimum wage. Now, actually, there's no immediate reason why the carpenters or the plumbers or any other members of the A. F. of L. should concern themselves with a minimum wage. No minimum wage will raise their pay checks. But labor leaders have enough industrial statesmanship to see that we can't have a strong Nation unless there's widespread and universal well-being. They realize that if carpenters are to be busy the masses should be building houses. One thing's sure, nobody's going to build a house on the present minimum wage of 75 cents an hour. Too many industrial leaders shortsightedly believe that if they can saw lumber, and make nails and turn out roofing with low-priced labor then they'll be able to sell at a big profit and make a lot of money. They forget somebody has to buy that lumber, nails and roofing. Big sales are only achieved as a result of high purchasing power.

One fundamental fact the Democrats revealed way back in the thirties, but which the Republican Party has never quite understood, is that when the common people have purchasing power they use it. Of course, I like to look at a higher minimum wage as giving boys and girls better food, providing them with better shelter, guarding their

health. But, even those not interested in the human side, should realize that a minimum wage is one of the obvious ways of stimulating our national economy.

This brings me to one of my favorite complaints. That's the tremendous effort, made by all the apologists for things-as-they-are, to convince the Nation everything's all right with the economy. They don't compare economic activity of today with that of 1953. We're down today on almost all counts. They take great pains to show we're doing better than we did in the slump year of 1954. But still we're losing ground. We have five million more people than we had in 1953, but we're not producing or consuming as much as we did then. The productivity of the American worker is going up nearly 2½ percent a year. On that basis alone we should be producing 20 billions more than we did in 1953. But we actually are producing several billions less.

Here we are, face to face with an appalling Communist menace, and yet our defeatist industrial and political leadership is trying to make the country satisfied when it's falling billions upon billions of dollars short of what we could and should be producing. When organized labor is big enough to see, that for the good of all, unorganized labor needs a higher minimum wage they demonstrate that they have in mind the welfare of all the Nation—not merely of their own wage contracts.

The labor movement of this country has a magnificent heritage in such men as Gompers. You can be proud of leaders like George Meany and Walter Reuther. And I know, because I have mingled with them, that over this country from local to local are devoted men and women who measure up toward the national leadership.

But let's face the fact that, although many have tried, and much has been done, still labor hasn't done the political job it should. Throughout Michigan I know all labor hasn't been as close to liberal candidates as it should have been. And the precinct work generally over the State has been lamentable. In at least three-fourths of the precincts and townships of my district are large numbers of members of the A. F. of L. As members of this, the greatest labor organization in the world, they will serve well their common cause if they work steadily through the year, and especially during a campaign, to see that voters understand the issues involved. This ought not to be done merely for the issues involved in congressional legislation, but for local and State issues.

This picture I spread before you in outline form can't be painted in with depth of color and true perspective by a few resolutions in this convention. Although it's important to formulate your organization's policies and program, by resolutions, here in convention, you must carry out their meaning and intent by hard work. If you start the job right now and work at it every day until the opening of the campaign next year, and even if you have consecrated efforts in all your locals, still you won't achieve the goals that could be reached. We need to do more than whip or shame people into going to the polls. The soundest method of political effort is first to build good citizenship.

Those of us assembled here today couldn't have the glory of pioneering the American Federation of Labor. But the idealism of those early days is something we ought never forget. When the office of president of the federation was created, it was decided to allow the president a fulltime salary of a thousand dollars a year. Samuel Gompers didn't want it. He disliked taking money for a job that he considered a sacred responsibility. They offered it to another who didn't think a thousand dollars was enough. Then they came back to Gompers and he took it. In going from one city to another organizing unions he stayed in the cheapest hotels and traveled in cabooses with friendly conductors. No one expects that kind of self-denial today. But every member of every local and every city federation has a right to expect you to put your soul into your job. Your responsibility goes far beyond the bargaining table. The A. F. of L. membership should be proud of their craftmanship and should continue to develop their skills, thereby deserving the high wages you help them to get. You need to see that they and their unions take responsible places in the community. You need to deal wisely and honorably with other labor groups so that we have real team work. And, being in Government, I think especially of your obligation to help develop a more responsible citizenship.

Some time in the near future the two great labor organizations will be joined from top to bottom. My closing suggestion is that for the purposes of political activity in 1956 you join hands right now. It takes time and experience to deal effectively in politics. You can hear an occasional local group and some individuals here and there talk loudly about their achievements. But, if you look into the facts you'll find all this activity has been lamentably spotty and ineffective. There've been a dozen misses for every bull's-eye.

Unfortunately there hasn't been any moving force in the political field to bring all labor together in a well-knit, cooperative, fighting force. They have had some meeting of the leadership. But it never got to the place where any group sat down and said, "Now here's the second ward, precinct K. What can we do about it?" Nobody went that far, nobody tried to locate a person in every block—someone who commanded respect in the neighborhood, who could win over the wavering, and on election day get out to the polls those who knew the story.

I'm not dealing in generalities. I'm laying before you a program of specific action. It's a program I know you believe in. The problem is to take the first step. Only by organized political action at the precinct level, we can carry to success those great ambitions that Gompers had, not only for the bargaining table, but also for the ballot box.

Social Security's Retirement Test Should Be Removed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been protesting against that section of our Social Security Act which penalizes people for working. I refer, of course, to the so-called "retirement test" which cancels benefits when outside earnings exceed a given amount. All of us know of the effect on our senior citizens of the substantial increase in the cost of living of the past decade. We know, as well, that millions of these people are struggling along on a meager income. The average old-age benefit under social security is only $59 per month. But if they manage to find a job—and this is no easy matter if they are over 65 years of age—and then if they can manage to earn enough to bring that $59 monthly payment up to enough to provide a decent living, they lose the right to the social-security benefit.

I am aware of the fact that changes were made in this retirement test in connection with the 1954 amendments of the Social Security Act. These changes raised the amount of earnings allowed and removed the requirement entirely for people aged 72 and over. But this liberalization of the retirement test has, in many respects, only further complicated the situation, as far as I can see. For the new annual earnings test is exceedingly involved. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has issued an entire leaflet on this one subject alone, explaining all of its ramifications.

First, it seems, you let the Department know each year whether you expect to earn more than $1,200 in the coming year. If you start working during the year there is another blank to fill out. If you stop work there is another. At the end of the year, if your earnings have been more than $1,200 you fill out another blank—which also shows the months in which you earned $80 or more. All this information goes into the bill and then sometime during the following year—when you may be needing that benefit very desperately because you are not working then—the benefits are canceled in proportion to the amount of earnings in excess of $1,200 which you had in the previous year.

There is another gross inequity in this new retirement test. Until this year it applied only to earnings in covered employment. Now it applies to earnings from any source. Formerly, for example, it was possible to keep on getting your benefit if you had a job which was not covered by social security. Now, no matter where you are working, you lose your benefit. Moreover the law continues the gross inequity which cancels benefits only for earnings, but makes no cancellation whatever if the additional income is from unearned sources such as dividends, interest, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely unable to understand why we continue this reprehensible practice of penalizing people for working. It is a principle which cannot be improved because it is wrong in the first place. The only right and equitable solution is to remove the retirement test entirely.

To accomplish this purpose I am today introducing a bill which would amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder. I believe this is a matter which calls for our immediate action. I urge the support of every Member of this Congress in making this important improvement in our social security system.

National Reserve Plan

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5297) to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the danger of this amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina—and I highly respect his motives—is that it would have the effect of annihilating the unit readiness program, which, as I see it, is one of the most important parts of this bill and about which I have spoken before. There are several different alternatives in the bill as presented by the committee, and it has sought to present a balanced program, where there was a reasonable selectivity, but where there was not one road which, if selected, would allow a young man to get out of a large part of his service obligation.

Under this amendment, if a boy served in college for 4 years and then in the Standby Reserve for only 1 year, he could wipe out his entire obligation in the matter of 5 years without ever having been in a ready unit, which would undermine the whole program and negative much of the gains that might be had in the other phases of the bill.

That is why I think that when my colleague from Maryland referred to the amendment as vicious, I am sure he never had any thought but that the gentleman from North Carolina is a very gracious gentleman, but I do think the provision would torpedo one of the fundamental purposes of this act. Therefore, it should be defeated.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that it would completely destroy our ROTC program?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. It would seem to me it would. I am afraid that would be the effect. And it would tend to produce inequalities not only of class but it would greatly reduce those available in the younger rolls for these ready units.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. What about the young man who does not go to college, what is the burden going to be on his shoulders?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. He would be more disrupted than if he took 6 months at the outset.

One thing I think many do not pause to consider in evaluating the 6-month program is that a great deal of time is necessary to get a young man in physical condition. Years of experience has taught our Armed Forces that it takes about 20 to 24 weeks before a man is trained to the point where he is really ready for unit training where he can go into a larger organization and be of benefit to his country.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. I have noticed in the briefings we have had in the last 3 weeks that the Armed Forces provide for only 3 weeks of basic training and 8 weeks of advanced training before they make a paratrooper out of a man.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. It takes a good many weeks to make a paratrooper. You will find that the Armed Forces conduct a constant educational program almost from the time the recruit enters the service until he is discharged or retired after many years.

Sermon Entitled "Trial Before Pilate"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a sermon by the Reverend Ross Allen Weston, of Arlington, Va., entitled "The Trial Before Pilate."

There being no objection, the text of the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRIAL BEFORE PILATE

On this Sunday when millions of people throughout Christendom are waving palm branches and singing, "Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord," I propose that we examine together one of the most exciting events in the life of Jesus—namely, the trial scene before Pilate.

This scene in which Pilate plays the leading role is one of the supremely dramatic events in literature—second only to the trial of Socrates. And yet Pilate has little claim to greatness. If he did not exemplify those realities in human life with which we all have to deal, we would not be talking about him this morning. He was not even a good governor. But because he was procurator of Judea at one of the important turning points of history, we do know a good deal about him, thanks to the records of the non-Christian historians, particularly Josephus, Philo, and Eusebius.

While Pilate's origin is obscure, we know that he was a young man—about the same age as Jesus—full of political ambitions. He was a first-rate second-rater, proud, hot-tempered, capable of childish behavior when anything thwarted his will, and as militarily minded as his name suggests—"Pilatus"—which means "armed with a pike." Philo mentions his "corruptions, his acts of insolence, his rapine, his habits of insulting people, his cruelty, his murders, and his inhumanity."

Pilate was appointed the procurator of Judea in 26 A. D., 3 years before the death of Jesus, by his patron Sejanus, the anti-Semitic prime minister of Tiberius. His province included Samaria and Judea and extended south to Gaza and the Dead Sea. His official residence was in Caesarea, but the possibility of riots in Jerusalem at the time of the Passover, brought him to the capital. His rule over all in the province except Roman citizens was absolute. We can be sure that he was under orders to crush Jewish fanaticism. He had only recently, then, taken over the governorship, which was the crown of his ambition, and he was determined to show his mettle and keep the turbulent Jews in order.

Someone has said that one can never understand a politician without being aware of the character of his wife. So let us look briefly at Claudia Procula. Tradition has it that she was secretly a follower of Jesus, but there is absolutely no historical evidence for this. We know that she was the granddaughter of Caesar Augustus and the illegitimate daughter of Claudia, the third wife of Tiberius Caesar. She was a highly cultured woman, of royal blood, and she must have been sensitive to the religious and social movements of her day. It may well have been through her influence that Pilate was appointed to this coveted position.

The presence of Claudia in Judea presents us with a mystery, since the Roman law decreed that a procurator of Judea should not take his wife with him. Judea was the most dangerous province in the whole Roman Empire and it was certainly no place for a woman. But women have a way of evading rules—even the rules of state. Many wives would have preferred to have stayed in Rome. And many husbands, I am sure, would have preferred to have had them stay in Rome. But Claudia was an unusual woman, and so we find her at her husband's side in Judea. She makes but a brief appearance in the trial scene—only long enough to warn her husband not to condemn an innocent man.

Before we examine the record of the trial as it is presented to us in the Gospels, let us look at three episodes in Pilate's administration which will help us understand his motivations and his prejudices, especially toward the Jews and Jesus himself.

Pilate was an offensive governor from the outset. To begin with, he transferred the headquarters of the army from Caesarea to the Praetorium in Jerusalem. The Roman standards, surmounted by the images of their heathen gods, were brought into the Holy City. Pilate never made a greater blunder in his life. For the polytheistic Romans to bow down to an emperor turned into a god meant little; but to a monotheistic people like the Jews the order to worship an image of a man was an outrageous violation of the second commandment, and they refused to worship the Roman gods.

Pilate regarded this as defiance of his rule; so he ordered the images to be set up in the Tower of Anthony overlooking the temple enclosure. This was a shrewd move on his part. The Jews would not demonstrate within the temple area, since that was holy ground, and if they attacked the Tower of Anthony that would be an attack upon the Roman Empire itself which could be justly retaliated against.

But the Jews were far more cunning than Pilate. Several thousand of them clamored about his palace for 5 days. On the sixth day, Pilate admitted them to his judgment hall and threatened to massacre the lot of them unless they dispersed. But the Jews would not leave; instead, relying upon the principle of passive resistance, they bared their necks and waited. The order for the massacre was never given. Pilate knew well enough that if one of his first deeds as governor was to massacre thousands of unarmed Jews, it would not be long before he would be relieved of his duty. Finally, Pilate gave way, and, with rage and humiliation in his heart, ordered the removal of the obnoxious standards.

And so Pilate hated the Jews.

Pilate's second offense consisted in taking money from the sacred treasury of the Jews to construct an aqueduct, running from the pools of Solomon to the interior of the city of Jerusalem. The Jews were shocked by this deed; some 10,000 of them gathered before his tribunal and demonstrated against him. Pilate tried to meet this by sending soldiers disguised as civilians into the mob. Now listen to Josephus: "So he bade the Jews himself go away; but they boldly casting approaches upon him, he gave the soldiers that signal which had been beforehand agreed on; who laid upon them much greater blows than Pilate had commanded them, and equally punished those that were tumultous and those that were not, nor did they spare them in the least; and since the people were unarmed, and were caught by men prepared for what they were about, there were a great number of them slain by this means, and

others of them ran away wounded; and thus an end was put to this sedition." We can imagine what an uproar resulted from this merciless massacre.

And so Pilate hated the Jews.

Pilate's third offense against the Jewish people was committed when he was staying at Herod's palace in Jerusalem, as he did on festive occasions. This white palace set on a hill overlooking the Holy City, possessed a beauty that is hard to describe. Halls of marble contained pillars inlaid with gold and silver and adorned with precious stones. Three hundred guests could recline on couches and dine in one hall alone. The palace was surrounded with ornamental gardens with cascading waterfalls and beautiful fountains. Pilate, on one occasion, displayed a large number of shields bearing the images of heathen gods. The Jews appealed to Tiberius, who ordered Pilate to remove the offensive shields. Once more Pilate's will was thwarted and he had to give way.

And so Pilate hated the Jews.

In these three incidents we see the strange character of Pilate—a composite of fear and hatred—the fear that always hides behind hatred. We see a coarse, rough, loud-voiced demagog who is in reality a puny, fear-ridden coward of a man. We see a man who will use any means at his disposal to fulfill his own selfish desires. No wonder his ambition was his own undoing. For it was not long before the Emperor recalled him to Rome, where he was tried and, according to Malalas, beheaded.

With this picture of Pilate in our minds, we can turn now to the scene of the trial as it is recorded for us by the Synoptic writers. Jesus has been seized by the Roman police, who with their torches had invaded the shadowed silence of the Garden of Gethsemane, where He had gone after the celebration of the "Seder." He has been taken to the house of Caiaphas, the high priest, examined by the hastily summoned and excited Sanhedrin and condemned to death for what they considered blasphemy. This session of the Sanhedrin was illegally held, since, according to the law, capital cases could be tried only in the day. Jesus was never legally tried before the Jewish authorities, the whole proceedings being "railroaded" through in order that the execution might be over before the beginning of the Passover day. But any verdict of the Sanhedrin depended upon the consent of the Roman governor. Therefore, as soon as it is day, the priests, with a mob of people at their heels, take Jesus to Pilate. The Jews do not enter the palace—a pagan house—since they do not wish to defile themselves with the Passover almost upon them. So Pilate goes outside upon the balcony to meet them. With half-contemptuous hostility he surveys the turbulent crowd. This is just another instance, he thinks, of some fanatical excitement among these people whom he hates. Then he sees the prisoner in their midst and asks for a definite charge: "What accusation do you bring against this man?"

The priests endeavor evasively to get Pilate to recognize their decision without going into detail. Their condemnation of him as a false Messiah would carry no weight with Pilate. They must build their complaint on other grounds. They must force Pilate into thinking that Jesus is dangerous to the security of the state. "If He were not a criminal," they replied, "we would not have brought him to you."

This angers Pilate and he says: "If you have already judged him and have come to a verdict, then pass sentence on him according to your own law." There was veiled insult in his words. Stinging words, to be sure, but true.

Now the leaders of the Sanhedrin are forced to admit what they really want. They want the death penalty, and they will be satisfied with nothing less.

So Pilate leaves the crowd and goes back inside the praetorium where he may interrogate the prisoner in privacy. He looks with curiosity, and doubtless with some pity upon this strange man from Galilee who has somehow contrived to stir up such excitment in Jerusalem. "So you are a king," he says. "Are you a king?" The question drips with contempt.

Jesus asks him, "Do you say this of yourself, or did others tell you so?" It all depends upon how Pilate uses the term. If he is using it politically, then Jesus is not a king; but if he is using it religiously, then Jesus will accept the designation. Pilate is scornful. "Am I a Jew to be interested in such matters? Your own nation and chief priests have delivered you to me. What have you done?" "My kingdom does not belong to this world," Jesus answers, "and I make no claims that are dangerous to your government." "Are you a king then?" Pilate persists. Jesus says: "You say that I am a king. This is why I was born and this is why I came—I came into the world that I should bear testimony to the truth."

Pilate looks at him in bewilderment. What in the world is this man talking about? "A kingdom of truth," he laughs. "What is truth?"

Then, taking Jesus with him, he reappears again upon the balcony overlooking the crowd. He lifts his hand for silence. The tumult of the mob ceases, waiting for his decision. Pilate stands there, symbol of the tremendous might of Roman power. In all things his word is law, and no one who values his life had better question it. Whatever else this prisoner may be, he is not any political menace to Pilate's power. There is no king threatening revolution, but a harmless visionary. He can settle this whole affair in an instant. He can find the prisoner "not guilty," have his soldiers disperse the crowd, and he himself can forget about the entire episode. This Pilate can do if he cares at all about justice. But beneath this temptation to goodness, there is at work a dreadful fear. One can never trust these Jews, especially when they are stirred up into a passion. He hates them. And at the same time he knows that he must placate them. So it is the mob—the frenzy, crazy mob—against justice. As a politician protecting his own interest and power, Pilate cannot afford to take any chances with the mob.

Besides Pilate hates the Jews.

He points to Jesus. "I cannot find anything wrong about him," he says, hoping to conciliate the mob with a pretense of justice. But instantly the crowd breaks into angry protest. "He stirs up the people," they cry, "teaching throughout all Judea, from Galilee even to this place."

Ah, "From Galilee." Here is a possible avenue of escape. So Jesus is a Galilean. Herod is tetrarch of Galilee, and Herod is in Jerusalem for the Passover festival. So Pilate decides that he will send Jesus to Herod and be rid of this highly disturbing matter.

According to Luke, Herod welcomes the opportunity of questioning Jesus, but Jesus refuses to answer any questions. Herod treats him with mockery, wraps him in a scarlet robe, and sends him back to Pilate.

Once again, therefore, Pilate finds that it is impossible to escape the reality of the issue which confronts him. He thinks of another strategy—the strategy of compromise. He wants to release Jesus; but he does not wish to take the responsibility of doing so. "You have a custom," he says, "that I should release to you a prisoner at the time of the Passover. Is it your will that I release to you the king of the Jews?" There was a man in the Roman prison namer Barabbas, a bandit who had won the sympathy of the crowd because he expressed their hatred for all Romans. But the crowd was in no mood for compromise. "Not this man," they cry, "but Barabbas. Release unto us Barabbas."

See what is happening to Pilate now. He is being driven down one dead end street after another. Now that he has once exposed his vulnerability to the crowd, he finds that it is impossible for him to backtrack and make a positive decision on the basis of justice. So his next attempt is to try to persuade the Jews to be satisfied with something less than the death penalty. He hands Jesus over to the soldiers for the brutal punishment of scourging, and then he brings Jesus before the crowd again, wounded and bleeding, with a crown of thorns on his head which the soldiers have placed there in mockery. "Behold the man," says Pilate, hoping to convince them of his helplessness and harmlessness.

This only excites the people to greater hatred, and urged on by the chief priests they pursue their prey like a pack of wolves. "Crucify him, crucify him," they cry. Pilate replies that if they want his life they must take responsibility for it—his last attempt to extricate himself from the trap into which he has fallen. But the crowd has tasted blood. "If you let this man go, you are no friend of Caesar. Anyone who make himself a king is against Caesar," they cry. Here is a threat that strikes at the very heart of Pilate's fears—the charge of high treason. In the face of this, Pilate capitulates. With one defiant gesture, he closes the curtain on the trial scene. There on the balcony in sight of the mob, he dramatically washes his hands of the whole affair. "It is your problem," he says, "kill him if you wish, I am innocent of this man's blood."

But, Pilate, you are not innocent of the death of Jesus. You are as guilty of his death as the chief priests, the clamor of the mob, or the executioners themselves. You cannot walk innocently away from the tragic circumstance into which you trapped yourself. You cannot rewrite history by a basin of water. For the record shows, Pilate, that you could have saved Jesus if you had been brave enough. Sure! You did not will that Jesus should be killed, but you let him be killed, and your responsibility for that ignoble act cannot be disentangled by the mere washing of your hands.

So! The Pilate of history lives today as the everlasting symbol of that temptation from which no man—good or bad—can escape. It is the temptation to rewrite history, to rearrange the setting, in order to salve their conscience for some great moral failure which they are not courageous or true enough to acknowledge. We do not like to assume the responsibility for any failure, and the worse the results the greater our protest! We call for a basin of water and publicly wash our hands. We may not have done anything to precipitate the crisis, but what have we done to prevent it?

And this, Pilate, is in part an answer to your question: "What is truth?" That there is relentlessly operative in human life the ethical law of cause and effect by which common everyday decisions determine the outcome of some great moral crisis. How a man measures up to the supreme challenge of his life depends upon what he has been through the slow precedents of inconspicuous days.

And yet, we cannot condemn Pilate too harshly, can we? For he was doing what all of us in every age, and in every realm of life, are tempted to do: to take the common things of life—things which we often despise—for granted; to treat them as if they were meaningless and powerless to affect our lives. It is easy to let the common responsibilities of life blind us to the real meaning of life as a whole. It is easy to let "man's inhumanity to man" dull our sensitiveness

to the beauty of life. It is easy to lower ourselves to the level of the mob and laugh at the ideals of truth and justice. It is easy to cry, "Crucify him!" before we have heard all the evidence. It is easier to succumb, as Pilate did, to the crucifixions of honor and justice than it is to defend these virtues alone. Pilate never dreamed that his whole character would be tested in the frantic excitement of one flashing incident in his day's labor. But that is the way human life always works. If we could see today the great event of tomorrow which will challenge our mettle, then we could meet it magnificently. But life never gives us such a warning. Rather, a man must prepare himself day by day to be ready, or he will never be ready at all. He must learn to accept life with patience and consecration, digging deep beneath life's surface to find those values which give meaning to his existence. He must learn to transform his obligations into opportunities and his duties into privileges. He must be strong to perform, not great tasks mightily, but small tasks steadfastly. If he can learn to do these things, then when the hour of destiny strikes, when he must be loyal to the truth as he sees it, when he must defend at all personal costs some person who has been unjustly accused, when he must perform a great task mightily—if he has done these things in his ordinary life, then he will reveal the nobility, the dignity, the worthfulness of the human spirit—that quality of life which is beyond the comprehension of the mob.

So you see, Pilate, there really are two kinds of world. The only trouble is that you were blind to the real one. There is the world in which you lived and in which most men live, the world of pride and greed, the world of expediency and compromise, the world of intrigue and conspiracy, the world of wealth and power. That world always fades into the mists of history and its characters are remembered only for their moral cowardice. That is the world you knew, Pilate. But this other world of which Jesus spoke you did not know. "My kindgom is not of this world." No, it isn't. It is the world of the spirit, the world invisible, the world intangible. It is the world of truth and justice, of honor and love. It is a world which man knows only in his heart.

Let's Make the Savings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of May 23, 1955, entitled "Let's Make the Savings":

LET'S MAKE THE SAVINGS

It is exceedingly unfortunate if partisan political considerations or vested bureaucratic interests are going to be permitted to veto the broad series of Government reorganization proposals submitted by the second Hoover Commission. For while it is true that valid questions may be raised about some of the specific recommendations, the reports do represents the thoughtful judgment of a highly qualified group of men in public and private life. Certainly among the suggestions are many that could lead to greater efficiency and economy in operating the Federal establishment.

A rather dramatic evaluation of what acceptance of the recommendations could mean to the Federal budget, and to the tax load upon American citizens, has been presented by Clarence Francis, chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report and former chairman of General Foods Corp. By Mr. Francis' estimate, prompt adoption of the recommendations could "balance the budget overnight" and could mean an eventual reduction in the national tax burden by as much as 15 or 20 percent yearly. Tending to support Mr. Francis' calculations on potential savings was his balancing of the books on the adopted recommendations of the first Hoover Commission 5 years ag. Against a cost of $2 million for that study. Mr. Francis reports total savings of about $5 billion—or a continuing annual rate of about $1.2 billion. Mr. Francis points out that these savings have been obscured by the great increase of Federal spending during the Korean war and the cold war period since. Their value remains the same, however, in a fiscal situation that represents one of the major problems of Government today.

It is politically difficult, perhaps, at a time when the executive and legislative branches are controlled by opposing parties to reach agreement on Government reorganization. But Mr. Francis reports "a renewed groundswell of citizen interest in Federal efficiency and economy." This should encourage responsible leaders of both parties to give serious and constructive thought to eliminating some of the wasteful and unnecessary procedures in Government.

All-Out for "Toll TV"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of May 23, 1955:

ALL-OUT FOR "TOLL TV"—IT'S THE MOST SENSIBLE IDEA SINCE PROHIBITION

(By James O'Neill, Jr.)

People involved in entertainment are roaring about something called "toll TV," and this party, being reasonably interested and loaded with charm, is herewith stating he's all for pay-as-you-go television and a pox on the whiners.

I think the idea of a coin box nailed to the side of the old family Cyclops is probably the most sensible innovation since prohibition, and it definitely is in a class with such enlightened projects as the poll tax, infanticide, lynching bees, and hillbilly music.

Yes sir, I believe in progress. The forward look. Tippicanoe and Tyler, too. Fifty-four forty, or fight.

And now that we've got that settled, let us look at the price list, which will be pasted on the coin box, right above the six slots for coins ranging from silver dollars to Indianhead pennies.

LIBERANCE COMES HIGH

Liberance, that talented piano player who owns his own teeth and silver tuxedo, comes into your living room for $2 per each half hour. Prohibitive, you say? Not at all. You love Liberance, you should pay through the nose for his glorious talent. Two bucks is cheap enough for old chopsticks.

Commentators, barring such excellent reporters as Ed Murrow, Eric Severied, Louis Allen, and Mo Siegel, should come about eight for a dime. Quiz shows, Facts Forum, and such delightful things as This Is Your Life, and You're on Relief will be available for a nickle each of six for a quarter.

Those hideous commercials—"And now, an important message from our sponsor * * *" for second-hand cars, third-rate beer, detergents, deodorants, easy home loans (no collateral, no payments, no interest, no dough, no nothing), should cost about a dime each.

One channel will have nothing but commercials, which will tickle the dickens out of advertising agencies, and you'd be surprised how many illiterates look at commercials.

NO. 4 FOR FIGHTS

Prize fights—and most of the time the commercials are more exciting than the fights—will retail at four bucks or what you'd pay to actually see a fight of that caliber. Ball games, particularly those from Griffith Stadium, will cost but four bits. Per inning.

Now, as to budgeting your TV in the home. (Our budget book is labeled "Help Stamp Out TV," a slight rewrite of an old quote I had left over from World War II.) Got to have a budget.

I shall cut all allowances at Chez O'Neill, and each urchin shall have but a dime a week to fritter away as she chooses. If they pool their allowances, they get, roughly, half an hour of Hoppity-Skippity. Then the machine remains black and silent for the remainder of the week.

Should some fine bit of entertainment hit town and they're all broke, I shall advance modest amounts for the purchase of tickets to tent shows, faith healers, and church bazaars.

GOOD FOR MOVIES

Toll TV will be a great asset to the motion-picture industry, too. Most TV watchers don't realize they are going blind watching third-rate vaudeville and amateur theatrics at the moment, but just wait until they start paying for this televised junk and back to the neighborhood theaters they'll go.

Of course, the fellow who comes to our house to get the money out of the coin box had better bring some expense-account money with him. He won't get bus fare back to Washington if he's counting on my TV financing for support.

Antitrust Laws and Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by James M. Mead, Commissioner, Federal Trade Commission, setting forth some of his personal views on antitrust laws and agencies.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRENGTHENING OF THE CLAYTON ANTITRUST ACT

The basic purpose for which Congress established the Federal Trade Commission was to maintain a competitive economy and to prevent the growth of monopoly. The

first antitrust statute, the Sherman Act, was passed in 1890. Notwithstanding that very valuable statute, monopolies continued to grow after the turn of the century. In 1911 the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil case limited the effectiveness of the Sherman Act by adopting the so-called Rule of reason in interpreting that act.

In 1912 there was a demand by both political parties for Congress to take a new look at the problem of monopoly and unfair competitive practices and to adopt such legislation as would be necessary in the public interest. Congress in 1914 adopted the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act. Notwithstanding the enactment of these two statutes, we still have with us the problem of monopoly and unfair competitive practices.

The great American dream is twofold: (1) Political liberty, and (2) economic opportunity. Without economic opportunity there cannot really be effective political liberty. Economic opportunity in its simplest and basic terms means that the ordinary American—John Smith—has the opportunity to go into the legitimate business of his choice, and by hard work and common sense, grow and prosper and be able to enjoy for himself and his family the necessities and some of the luxuries of life. When that dream dims, the virility of our economy is impaired.

The prevention of monopolistic and other unfair trade practices depends on three factors: (1) effective legislation; (2) selection of competent administrators of the statutes; and (3) adequate appropriations.

This memorandum is addressed to the factor of effective legislation and more particularly to the Clayton Act. The basic principles of the Clayton Act are as sound today as they were in 1914. There are, however, certain points involving congressional intent and questions of procedure which merit consideration. They are as follows:

1. The good faith or equality of opportunity bill.

2. Prior submittal to the Federal Trade Commission of proposed mergers of larger corporations.

3. The finality of orders to cease and desist issued by the Commission under the Clayton Act.

THE GOOD FAITH OR EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY BILL

The Supreme Court in the recent Standard Oil case (340 U. S. 231) held in effect that the good faith meeting of a competitive lawful price is an absolute defense to a charge of price discrimination under section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act although the result of the discrimination may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. The Robinson-Patman Act is properly regarded by small and independent businessmen as their Magna Carta against the encroachments of monopolies and predatory business practices. In my opinion the discrimination section of the Robinson-Patman Act as interpreted by the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil case is now of limited effectiveness and is not in accord with the purpose for which it was enacted. In my opinion the Robinson-Patman Act should be amended so as to make it crystal clear that good faith is not a complete defense when the discrimination is of such severity and importance that the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

In the enforcement of the antitrust laws we must constantly remember that their ultimate objective is to preserve and promote competition. The intent with which business practices are used is certainly a factor to be considered, but the final test of whether or not those practices should be prohibited must be the result of their use and not the intent with which they are used. Our antitrust laws would be futile instruments of national policy, indeed, if they are to be construed to countenance the destruction of competition solely because such destruction is accomplished by "good men" acting in "good faith."

The right to discriminate in price and meet in good faith a competitive price is a private right subject to regulation by the State. The right to be free from monopolistic and other unfair trade practices is a public right also regulated by the State. When the private right to discriimnate in price conflicts with the public right to be free from monopolistic practices, the public right should prevail. That is the basic political and economic justification for enacting the Kefauver-Patman equality of opportunity bill.

PRIOR SUBMITTAL TO THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION OF PROPOSED MERGERS OF LARGER CORPORATIONS

The Federal Trade Commission now has some experience with the amended section 7 of the Clayton Act, which prohibits mergers when they have certain adverse competitive effects. In my opinion, this record of experience indicates the need of an "advance submittal" amendment to section 7 of the Clayton Act.

Under the present law, the Commission must inform itself as to proposed mergers. This necessitates a staff engaged in inspecting a variety of news and trade publications for information which the principals in these mergers could readily supply to the Commission. A large number of those news items suggest the possibility of illegality of proposed mergers, and the Commission then has the burden of collecting certain elementary facts about the companies involved in order to determine whether a full investigation should be made. The necessary information includes, for illustration, the assets of the companies, their principal products, their approximate sales, their competitive relationships, whether there has been a customer-supplier relationship between the merged companies and whether competing companies are likely to be cut off from essential supplies, whether important patents are involved, and other types of information. As a practical matter, the Commission must depend upon the companies involved to supply this information. When a great number of companies are merging and in view of the limited staff of the Commission, there must of necessity be numerous delays before the necessary information is obtained. This problem of unnecessary expense and delay would be largely corrected by an advance submittal requirement since such a requirement would give to firms wishing to merge the incentive of supplying the Commission with the necessary factual information as expeditiously and as completely as possible.

While the Commission has not yet had the occasion under the revised section 7 to order a divestiture of assets of illegally merged corporations, there is a real problem in attempting to "unscramble the eggs" after the assets of two corporations have been merged. Fiscal and other business properties are frequently such that they may be used in any one or several lines of commerce and there will be occasions where the Commission's order for divestiture will not assure that an effective competitor, once destroyed, will be re-created.

I do not believe that it would be either necessary or feasible to require all proposed mergers be cleared in advance with the Federal Trade Commission. It may be that any such "advance submittal" provision should be limited, for illustration, to situations where the combined assets would exceed $10 million. I am advised that there are approximately 1,000 corporations in the manufacturing industries which have total assets valued at more than $10 million. It is probable that there are no more than 1,000 additional such corporations in other fields which are under the jurisdiction of the Commission, these being largely the distributive and mining fields. Thus by this criterion, about three-tenths of 1 percent of approximately 650,000 corporations in the United States would be subject to the advance approval requirement.

One of two different procedures relative to this "advance submittal" might be adopted. They are as follows:

1. Require the proposed merging corporations to file with the Commission a notice of their intention of merging and also require the corporations to submit to the Commission any facts, data, etc. which the Commission would require. Within certain time limits the Commission would make a finding whether or not the proposed merger is in the public interest. This procedure might be limited to corporations above a certain size. The difficulty with this procedure is that it might place a very large administrative burden on the Commission and adequate staff would not be available to the Commission for such purpose. The difficulty is that the Commission would be required to give a definite yes or no answer within a limited period of time. If the Commission did not find against the merger, it is not likely that the law would permit the Commission to attack the merger at a later date;

2. Require the proposed merging corporations to submit to the Commission a notice of their intention to merge and also require such corporations to submit the facts and data requested by the Commission. Within a certain time limit the Commission could issue a regular complaint attacking the proposed merger. In the event that the Commission issued such complaint the law would provide that the proposed merger would be suspended pending the final disposition of the complaint. The issuance of the complaint would be in effect a stop order which some utility commissions are authorized to issue relative to proposed rate increases. The case could then be tried as a regular case but in the meantime the merger would not be consummated and the Commission would not have the very difficult task of trying to unscramble the eggs. The law could also provide as a safeguard that if the Commission did not issue the complaint within the time specified prior to the proposed merger that the Commission would also have the authority to issue a complaint after the merger as is provided in the present section 7. This procedure would not place on the staff of the Commission the great burden of deciding definitely (and finally) within a prescribed time limit whether or not the merger is in the public interest. The issuance of the complaint which would hold up the merger would not be a final decision. It would only constitute a reason to believe by the Commission.

THE FINALITY OF ORDERS TO CEASE AND DESIST ISSUED BY THE COMMISSION UNDER THE CLAYTON ACT

Orders to cease and desist issued by the Commission under the Federal Trade Commission Act become final and enforceable within 60 days after their issuance unless the respondent appeals to a United States court of appeals. After orders issued under the Trade Act become final the Commission may request the Department of Justice to have the appropriate United States district attorney sue for a violation of the order in a civil penalty proceeding. Violators are liable to a monetary penalty up to $5,000 for each day of violation. This provision makes Trade Act orders to cease and desist effective because they are readily enforceable.

It is suggested that section 11 of the Clayton Act be amended so as to provide for cease-and-desist orders under the Clayton Act to have the same degree of finality and the same penalty provisions as provided for orders issued under the Federal Trade Com-

mission Act. This amendment is needed to insure effective enforcement of the statutory prohibition against monopolistic mergers, competition-stifling, exclusive-dealing contracts, unjust discriminations in price, services, or facilities, and certain types of interlocking directorates. It is needed to eliminate the laborious, time-consuming, and expensive procedures now required before an order under the Clayton Act is fully effective.

Under the present Clayton Act the orders of the Commission have no force or effect without subsequent court enforcement. In addition the statute limits the right of the Commission to seek enforcement. In order for the Commission to secure enforcement by the court the Commission must prove that the respondent has failed to obey the order to cease and desist.

The long road which the Commission must travel in order to force compliance with Clayton Act orders to cease and desist is as follows:

(1) The Commission must prove that the respondent has violated the Clayton Act.

(2) If such proof is made, then the Commission issues its order to cease and desist.

(3) If the respondent does not appeal to the court from the Commission's order and if the respondent continues to violate the order, the Commission must prove to the satisfaction of the court that the respondent has violated the order of the Commission.

(4) If such proof is made to the satisfaction of the court, then the court may issue a decree making the order of the Commission the order of the court.

(5) If thereafter the respondent violates the decree of the court and the Commission is successful in proving such a violation to the court, then the court may punish the respondent for contempt of court.

Under the procedure now provided, the investiagtions and hearings may drag on for years before effective enforcement with Clayton Act orders to cease and desist is obtained. The resources and energies of the Commission are thus needlessly dissipated and the antimonopoly purpose of the Clayton Act is thwarted.

CONCLUSION

The above constitutes a modest but a very necessary program of proposed legislation designed toward making the Federal Trade Commission a more effective instrument of national antitrust policy.

Hurricane Warning Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that my bill, H. R. 5260, has been effective to the point where the Department of Commerce, and in particular the Weather Bureau, has received additional funds for the operation of a hurricane warning system for the protection of our coastal residents, although the sum adopted by amendment today is an increase, it still is not sufficient, in my estimation. However, I am pleased that my bill and work was not in vain.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following comments:

From the Chamber of Commerce, Greenwich, Conn.:

The board of directors agree with the proposal outlined in H. R. 5260.

We believe your proposal has real merit.

From the Union Reinsurance Co. of Zurich, Switzerland, the United States branch office:

Anything that will be done to reduce, as far as possible, the loss of our life and property has our wholehearted approval and support.

From the Acushnet Process Co., New Bedford, Mass.:

The city of New Bedford, Mass. was very badly hit in 1938, 1944, and by "Carol" in 1954. In 1938 we had 230 deaths in the greater New Bedford area, and in 1954 we had more than $50 million damage. There were 35 industries in New Bedford which were badly affected by flood and salt water and extremely high winds. Damage to these industries alone amounted to more than $10 million.

Surveys which we have run among the 35 industries indicate that probably one-half of the $10 million damage could have been spared if the plants had ample warning to move material and equipment to higher ground and bulwark their plants against the surge of the salt water flood. We recognize that in the long run it may be possible to get physical protection but we also realize we may be able to get relief from future hurricanes if we are able to get accurate forecasting as to the probable path of the hurricane and as to the time of arrival.

The New Bedford committee on hurricane damage and each of the industries it represents is wholeheartedly in favor of your program and would like to do anything we can to get speedy passage and prompt action.

From the Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., New Bedford Division, New Bedford, Mass.:

I think the bill is an excellent one. In a survey of the damage sustained it was noted that the direct cost of Hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel amounted to over $9 million. This did not include the loss of jobs, profits, and other tangible and intangible costs. In the instance of our own company, Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., we sustained a loss of $1,455,000. If we had had early warning on Hurricane Carol it is estimated that our loss would have been reduced by $300,000 to $500,000. I venture to say that the same is true of our waterfront firms in this area.

Including the industrial loss, New Bedford suffered a total loss of over $50 million in the series of hurricanes last year, a considerable amount of which could have been saved had the area had sufficient warning.

As you pointed out, along with the early warning we could expect a reduction in unnecessary fear and apprehension in the areas in or close by the expected paths of future hurricanes. This is a very important item with industrial plants, and it is best exemplified in this area by the fact that over $350,000 was expended by our 35 industrial firms in getting ready for Hurricanes Edna and Hazel, which did not cause any serious damage.

To sum it up, we are wholly in accord with your bill, H. R. 5260.

From the president of the Travelers Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.:

I am glad to tell you that I join with Dr. Malone, director of the Travelers Research Center, in endorsing your proposed bill.

From Mr. Thomas F. Malone, director, Travelers Weather Research Center, Travelers Weather Service, Hartford, Conn.:

Your active interest in a matter of deep concern to New England is much appreciated, and, as a meteorologist, I am happy to endorse your proposed bill.

The loss of life and property from hurricanes has been so great that a concerted program of research on this problem seems obviously justified.

From the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.:

I think there is no question but that the east coast is entitled to the additional protection that a better hurricane warning system might provide. I think in these days of needed reduction in budget, one should hesitate to ask for even a modest increase in appropriations, but this is a case where I have no hesitancy in recommending an enlargement of Government facilities.

From the president of the Bankers Fire Insurance Co., Birmingham, Ala.:

I think this bill is splendid and very worthwhile work and that it certainly should be approved.

From the vice president of the Northeastern Insurance Company of Hartford, Hardford, Conn.:

Your proposal, H. R. 5260, is to protect the lives and property of 2 million American citizens living in the immediate vicinity of newly menaced coastal zones, and we all here at this company readily concur in your proposal. We wish you complete success in this undertaking.

From the president of the Phoenix Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.:

I am in favor with the purposes of this bill and believe that, if passed, it will perform a very useful service to many millions of citizens and property owners in the Atlantic coastal area from Maine to Texas. The payout on claims by property insurance companies such as ours for the storms in 1954 was a rather devastating experience and naturally resulted in a substantial underwriting loss to our company. Anything that can help people to protect their property by being alerted in advance would be advantageous and interesting to our industry.

The advantages in being alerted to storms can accrue to insurance companies through loss prevention by protecting property when advices of an approaching storm are available. Closing shutters, securing doors, and moving contents, particularly from exposed property on the waterfront, can go a long way in keeping the ravages of wind from doing unnecessary damage.

Rest assured we are in favor of your bill.

From the Committee on American Steamship Lines:

Improved hurricane detection is desirable and your efforts to assure adequate provision for this purpose are very much in the public interest.

From the American Boat Builders & Repairers Association, Inc., 2382 Grand Concourse, New York, N. Y.:

We know that such a bill will be greatly appreciated by our members and we are accordingly advising them of it and requesting that they support it.

From the New England Council, Statler Building, Boston, Mass.:

In a recent survey of New Englanders' opinions of issues before Congress there seemed to be substantial support for the services proposed in your bill. Unlike many of the other issues on which opinion was solicited where there was a fairly equal division of opinion, the vote was more than 3 to 1 in favor of increasing the appropriation to the United States Weather Bureau for

more intensive study and reporting on hurricanes.

Congratulations on your preparation and submission of this bill. The New England Council intends to support it and we wish you the best of luck in gaining its passage in the House.

From the New Orleans Board of Trade, New Orleans, La.:

We are in favor of your proposal that an emergency hurricane warning system be improved to provide better protection.

From the Dixon Sintaloy Inc., Stamford, Conn.:

I am in complete agreement with the need for a satisfactory appropriation for hurricane warning service to the eastern seaboard.

Your bill, H. R. 5260, certainly should serve to provide the means for saving many times over the amount of the appropriation required.

From the PM Industries, Stamford, Conn.:

We support enthusiastically the legislation which you propose and hope that the necessary action will be taken to enact it.

The appropriation under consideration to enable the United States Weather Bureau to establish and operate an emergency hurricane warning system would be of benefit to the manufacturers in our area, and our company in particular.

From the New Haven Chamber of Commerce, New Haven, Conn.:

We shall be very happy to go along with you on anything that we can possibly do.

There is no question but what these hurricanes have done a terrific job in Connecticut. No one was prepared for hurricanes which we had not had in quite a number of years, but it is quite evident that we can look for many more of them and we should be better prepared than what we are.

From the Massachusetts Fisheries Association, Inc., Administration Building, Fish Pier, Boston, Mass.:

What happened in New England during the hurricane which visited us last fall indicated a willful lack of an adequate warning system.

The matter of preserving life and property as much as can be humanly expected should be of immediate concern to our Federal authorities.

The commercial fishing industry of New England is a hazardous occupation at best and a timely and adequate Federal weather forecasting system would aid immeasurably in reducing the perils of fishing during the season in which we are subject to sudden changes in the weather.

From the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.:

Members of this National Association of the Barge and Towing Vessel Industry, who operate on all of the inland waters of the Nation, suffered severe losses during hurricanes last year and thus, I am sure, will actively support the above-mentioned bill in the hope that much of these losses can be eliminated in the future.

From the Stamford-Greenwich Manufacturers Council, 308 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Conn.:

The matter of appropriating $5 million, in order that the United States Weather Bureau may be enabled to establish and operate an emergency hurricane warning system, was discussed with a number of manufacturers who are members of the Stamford-Greenwich Manufacturers' Council. This matter was also brought up at our executive committee meeting, and I was authorized to write to you in support of this bill.

I do not need to advise you on the extent of damage done by wind and high water in this area.

Certainly the appropriation you ask, which would serve the entire eastern seaboard, is well justified. We believe that effective and reliable warning service, provided by the United States Weather Bureau, is imperative.

From the president, American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc, 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

I should like to assure you of my personal support for your measure, which would seem to me to be of great advantage to the American merchant marine, as well as to others affected by weather and hurricane conditions.

From the Executive Director, Rhode Island Development Council, Providence, R. I.:

I believe that all New England Congressmen and Senators should use every effort to see that this type of legislation becomes a reality.

From universities.

From the head of the department of meteorology, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla.:

Since our department is in the forefront of research on the problem of hurricanes, we are keenly aware of the need for action on the part of the Congress.

We are urging our friends to support your bill or a similar proposal to achieve the same end, as well as any well-conceived proposal which will meet the urgent requirement for a hurricane research and development program.

Your active interest in the hurricane problem is a source of gratification to professional meteorologists and a great service not only to your constituents but to all the millions of Americans who live along the Atlantic seaboard and the gulf coast.

From a professor of meteorology at Blue Hill Observatory of Harvard University of Milton, Mass.:

I was much pleased to see a news dispatch that you had filed a $5 million independent appropriation bill to provide greatly expanded forecast facilities up and down the east coast.

A forecast's accuracy depends mostly on the adequacy of the information available. In my opinion, the greatest inadequacy affecting forecasting for New England is the lack of a complete and dependable surface and upper air station in the Atlantic Ocean a few hundred miles offshore.

I think your proposal is definitely worthwhile.

From the chairman of the department of meteorology and oceanography, College of Engineering, New York University, University Heights, New York, N. Y.:

My colleagues and I in this department are well aware of the importance of this bill for the welfare of the population in the affected area.

You have in preparing this bill, of course, been in touch with our Weather Bureau and know the excellent work which they are doing with inadequate financial means. Your bill will go far toward remedying this situation. It is very gratifying to know of this support for meteorology in Congress, and to find a realization of the contribution which meteorology can make to the welfare of the Nation.

The effects of this bill will be of great benefit to the people in the regions visited by hurricanes, including the people of New York State.

Your bill will go far toward alleviating the financial difficulties impeding the development of a really adequate warning service.

If ship station Hotel had been available in the fall of 1954 much property damage and many casualties could have been avoided.

From the president, American Meteorological Society, 3 Joy Street, Boston, Mass.:

It is most encouraging to learn that some of our representatives in Congress realize that the weather service in this country deserves more, not less, support. In the long run such support will, I feel sure, result in a net savings to the taxpayers through a more efficient weather service.

I believe the records will show that for last season, involving only Hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel, insurance companies paid some $276 million in claims (New York Times of December 26, 1954). I know there must have been many additional millions of dollars spent by individuals which do not appear on the record since several members of my own family in Rhode Island suffered uninsured damage as a result of last season's storms. Thus it seems to me that the expenditure of $5 million to improve the storm warning service for the protection of our citizens is a very modest outlay to accomplish the desired objectives.

We in the American Meteorological Society have for some time been concerned about the problem of severe storms of all types. The Council of the American Meteorological Society recently voted that the Council recognize deficiencies in the State of our knowledge of severe storms, particularly tornadoes and hurricanes, and strongly endorse an increased research effort in this area.

That in view of the great losses of life and property suffered by our citizens from the destructive action of tornadoes and hurricanes, the American Meteorological Society recommends that special funds be appropriated to enable the United States Weather Bureau, in cooperation with other public and private agencies, to conduct research projects on tornadoes and on hurricanes, along the lines of the successful thunderstorm project of several years ago.

From the head of the meteorology department, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.:

I was very pleased to learn of your interest in this important matter which affects the life and property of so many persons on the eastern and gulf coasts of this country.

You are to be commended for your active interest in these problems and for your realization that the Weather Bureau must have additional funds if real progress is to be achieved.

From the editor of Motor Boating magazine, 572 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.:

We are much interested in your bill which we hope will receive favorable action by Congress.

In addition to the above letters, I have received dozens of letters from Representatives, Senators, and governors of the Eastern States and the States in the Gulf of Mexico area, warmly endorsing my bill, H. R. 5260. They have not only written to me expressing their vital interest in the passage of this bill, but have frequently called me and have offered their support. In addition, I have received letters from private citizens who are not connected with any particular

company or organization who have wished me well in my efforts to secure congressional support for increased protection against the loss of life and property from hurricanes.

Some more excerpts from letters received:

From the executive vice president of the American Institute of Marine Underwriters, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.:

It is known that the various hurricanes which have visited the Northeast section of our country have done a great deal of damage to property insured by our members. Hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel, last fall, were particularly devastating.

The advance warning of approaching storms should give more opportunity for protection of property and possibilities for moving such property to safer locations. Accordingly, the marine insurance underwriters are definitely interested in any provisions and actions leading to adequate and timely warnings of hurricanes and severe windstorms.

We wish to express our appreciation of your foresight in presenting this legislation.

From the general manager of the Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.:

Surely, the Weather Bureau services are invaluable to the people of this country. If additional funds are needed in order to make the Bureau more useful, such funds should be made available within proper limits.

We appreciate fully the great damage which many of us suffered at the hands of hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel.

From the executive vice president of the Hartford Chamber of Commerce, Hartford, Conn.:

May I commend your alertness in watching out for the interest of southern New England in this peculiar climatic change which we are undergoing.

General manager of the Beaumont Chamber of Commerce, Beaumont, Tex.:

We have on many occasions suffered losses from hurricanes and we would like very much to have the Gulf of Mexico coast included in H. R. 5260.

Mr. Speaker, I also include the following:

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED SPECIAL AND IMMEDIATE HURRICANE-WARNING PROGRAM

1. To reduce unnecessary loss of life and property in all coastal States from future hurricanes.

2. To reduce unnecessary interruptions, costly protective action, and time-consuming precautionary measures of thousands of business firms and millions of citizens in fringe areas of expected hurricane paths.

3. To reduce unnecessary fear and apprehension in areas in or close by the expected paths of future hurricanes.

4. To increase the value of hurricane forecasts to the people of 19 coastal States who need better and more precise information as to expected wind speeds, water levels and times of hurricane occurrences.

5. To enable the Weather Bureau:

(a) to provide an improved hurricane-warning service immediately.

(b) to give locations, speeds, directions, and intensities of future hurricanes with more accuracy than has been possible for past hurricanes.

(c) to describe present and expected weather conditions in and surrounding future hurricanes more accurately than has been possible for past hurricanes.

(d) to provide alerts and warnings of future hurricanes 6 to 12 hours farther in advance than has been possible for past hurricanes.

(e) to distribute essential hurricanes reports and warnings with greater speed, efficiency, and certainty than has been possible for past hurricanes.

(f) to give complete and accurate forecasts of high-water levels for all occupied coastal areas subject to inundation.

HOW THE ABOVE OBJECTIVES CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED

(a) Secure appropriations to carry out a special and immediate hurricane-warning program of the United States Weather Bureau starting June 1, 1955 and as long thereafter as may be necessary to avoid unnecessary loss of life and property from hurricanes.

(b) Secure the above appropriations in addition to the funds contained in the budget estimates for the Department of Commerce Weather Bureau submitted to Congress in January 1955 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.

(c) Secure appropriations for both of the above programs, and also for a hurricane research and development program for fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958.

WAYS IN WHICH REQUESTED FUNDS ARE TO BE EXPENDED BY THE WEATHER BUREAU

1. To provide staff sufficient to keep Weather Bureau offices open 24 hours a day in 10 coastal cities from Maine to Texas where existing Weather Bureau offices are now open only part time.

2. To provide technically trained staff sufficient to reopen Weather Bureau offices in 5 coastal cities from Maine to Texas where formerly existing Weather Bureau offices have been closed.

3. To operate special teletypewriter, facsimile, telephone, and radio networks for the prompt relay of meteorological information used in forecasting hurricanes and major storms, and used for instantaneous distribution of hurricane warnings and alerts to all areas and citizens concerned.

4. To provide staff and observing equipment to operate 12 additional rawinsonde stations in the United States east of the 100th Meridian and in other selected land areas adjoining the Gulf of Mexico, Caribbean Sea and western Atlantic Ocean; and to provide staff and supplies at existing rawinsonde stations to take required upper air observations at 6-hourly intervals instead of at 12-hourly intervals during the hurricane season.

5. To provide additional weather observations during storm periods from merchant ships traversing the western Atlantic Ocean, Caribbean Sea, and Gulf of Mexico.

6. To provide additional forecasters, additional meteorological chartmen, and additional communicators to provide around-the-clock hurricane forecasting watches at each of the following six hurricane forecast centers: Boston, New York, Washington, Miami, New Orleans, and San Juan.

7. To establish an improved high water warning service to inform coastal areas of approaching high storm tides, damaging waves, and other coastal inundations from abnormal water levels and floods associated with hurricanes and heavy coastal rainstorms.

8. To provide meteorological staff and facilities for emergency hurricane warning centers and for mobile storm-warning squads to supplement the local Weather Bureau staffs during the intense activity accompanying the approach and passage of hurricanes and major storms; and afterward to survey and review (a) the quantity and quality of hurricane reports, alerts, and forecasts, (b) the times, places, and amounts of hurricane information distributed by all news media, (c) the protective action taken by all concerned, (d) and the types and amounts of hurricane damage incurred.

9. To reestablish the ocean weather ship station formerly located halfway between New York and Bermuda and maintained there by the United States Coast Guard for 12 years prior to its removal in June 1954.

10. To carry out a cooperative private and governmental Public Information Program involving important aspects of hurricane alerts, hurricane warnings, the changing characteristics of moving hurricanes, and the precautions that should be taken by citizens in the forecast path of future hurricanes to save lives and property.

The National Townsend Convention, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a group of Americans who, in my estimation, could properly be classed as the veterans of a half-century of productive output in America which is almost beyond belief. On May 2 of this year, representatives of this "veteran's" group met in St. Petersburg, Fla., where they had the opportunity of honoring their great patriarch, Dr. Francis Townsend. Since that day in September 1933, when this retired country doctor sat down and wrote a letter to a Long Beach newspaper, he has been carrying forward his great fight for security in declining years.

In the depths of a deep depression, Dr. Townsend dared to say two very important things. He demonstrated his faith in the American people by declaring that the way out of want and despair in years of retirement lay in increasing our productive power as a nation. Secondly, he dared to say that the aged members of our national community are entitled to a decent retirement income which will assure them of the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness rather than a mere pittance which barely keeps them alive.

The passing years have demonstrated that his faith in our country and its productive power was justified. His concept that assured retirement income, with no questions asked, is the right of American workers, was incorporated into the Social Security Act of 1935. In the years which followed the Townsend organization has been in the forefront of every movement for the improvement and extension of the social security system. They have continued to perform the function—so vital in a democracy—of keeping us all informed as to the weaknesses and inequities in the structure of our economy, which form the dangerous hazards on the road of our continuing quest for a better life for all Americans.

On the occasion of the recent Townsend Convention, I forwarded the following message to St. Petersburg:

On the occasion of the 15th national convention of your fine organization, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you for your outstanding progress in

the past and, I'm sure, for the tenacious and optimistic program which you have planned for the future. Since my first day in office as Representative of Pennsylvania's 11th Congressional District, I have been a staunch advocate of your commendable plan, one which most certainly should receive further consideration from the Congress of the United States. Your organization very definitely can count on me to assist you in your future endeavor to alleviate the chronic problems of old age. Again, permit me to extend my congraulations to you at this time and I trust that your program is a successful one. I will have the occasion of your national convention duly noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

From all over the land Americans assembled to mark the gains which the organization has made so far and to stake out goals for the future. The nature of these goals speak of the spirit of the Townsend movement. For today Townsendites are engaged in communities throughout the land in a crusade against the lien laws, which require recipients of old-age assistance in many States to sign over their homes before they can receive a penny of relief. They are campaigning against the shame lists which make the names of old-age assistance recipients in many States a matter of public record subject to inspection. They are appropriately concerned with the residence requirements which deny any relief at all to too many of our senior citizens.

The Townsend movement is broad in its scope and great in its goals. Its program is built upon a concept of the rights of Americans—the right to freedom from want; the right to a fair share of the community's recreational, educational, and medical resources; the right to decent housing; the right to the respect of the community based on service to the community; and the right to live with dignity as a free human being. I salute the spirit and purpose of the members of this great organization for the breadth of their vision and the courage and humanity in their hearts.

Fund Official Seeks Bentley Confrontation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the article in the Sunday Washington Post and Times Herald by Mr. Murrey Marder, May 22, 1955, entitled "Fund Official Seeks Bentley Confrontation," and subtitled "Miss Bentley Faces a Massive Challenge," is in itself a challenge to the Congress and, in my opinion, places a heavy responsibility upon each Member since it was a committee of this body that gave Miss Bentley an opportunity to air her charges of espionage under congressional immunity.

In his article Mr. Marder discusses the case of William Henry Taylor who for 8 years has silently withstood repeated attacks of the FBI, grand juries, and congressional committees based on the misleading testimony of Elizabeth Bentley. Now guided and counseled by a former Member of this House from my State, Byron N. Scott, Mr. Taylor has called for a public showdown with the hit-and-run accuser, Miss Bentley, and those who quote her under the immunity of their official offices.

I do not know Mr. Taylor and I do not know Miss Bentley, but I do know Byron Scott and have for almost 20 years. I think those of my colleagues who knew him as a Member of this body know that he would not associate himself with anything unless he believed wholeheartedly that his cause was just.

The Marder article calls attention to some instances of what Taylor and Scott call inconsistencies, contradictions, and impossibilities in the Bentley story. I have not read all of Miss Bentley's testimony, but the part that I have read showed no inclination on the part of the committee which heard her to subject her to any kind of cross-examination. That is what Taylor and Scott want. I, for one, think they should have it. I also think that it is the duty of this House to look further into her story and Taylor's challenge of her credibility. So that we may have the Marder article for future reference, I include it herewith in my remarks and under permission heretofore granted:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 22, 1955]

FUND OFFICIAL SEEKS BENTLEY CONFRONTATION

(By Murrey Marder)

In late May just 8 years ago, 2 FBI agents began questioning William Henry Taylor, then a 41-year-old economist who had left the Treasury Department to join the International Monetary Fund.

Taylor said he was puzzled by many of their questions. But the following year he got more than an inkling of what they were about. The inquiry was into a charge which is the acme of accusation in this cold-war era: Member of the Communist Party and participant in a Soviet espionage ring.

Today, Taylor is 49, and the charges and questions are still reechoing. His reply has been constant: Not guilty.

In the intervening years Taylor has become a unique figure of all those whose names were catapulted into public print by the famous 1948 hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

He alone, of the many accused, has continued to hold public office—in an international agency, where the United States is a member, not an employer.

GAMUT OF INVESTIGATION

Two Secretaries of the Treasury, one a Democrat, one a Republican, have urged the International Monetary Fund, which is supported in part by United States dollars, to detach Taylor from his longtime job as Assistant Director of Operations for the Latin America, Middle, and Far East Department.

Grand juries, FBI questioners, Senate and House investigators, and now the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board have put Taylor through their separate forms of interrogation. The charges recurred; so did the denials.

If Taylor is guilty of the charges against him, he has been engaged in a crafty gamble with a jail sentence. Each time he testifies under oath he was subject to perjury prosecution if his statements were to be proved false.

To date there has been no prosecution, no clearance. Taylor, maintaining his innocence, with his antagonists maintaining the charges, for 8 years has walked in what he calls "this evil mirage."

OUT INTO THE OPEN

Taylor was never one of the big names in the Communist espionage accusations, like Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Victor Perlo, and Nathan Gregory Silvermaster.

He was never called to testify in public. His formal denials, until recently, were invariably recorded privately, in closed sessions, or by affidavit.

Taylor suddenly broke that silence recently through his attorney, Byron N. Scott, former Democratic Congressman from California. He publicly challenged the reliability of Elizabeth T. Bentley, one of the FBI's most prominent informants.

Any careful examination of her hundreds of pages of testimony and writings, Taylor contended in a 107-page statement to the International Organization Employees Loyalty Board, which he made public, would show Miss Bentley's tables are studded with inconsistencies.

SUPPORTED BY HOOVER

It was Miss Bentley, on July 31, 1948, who publicly listed a William Taylor as one of the members of an espionage group. The Taylor of whom she spoke, she testified, was in the Treasury Department during the World War II years when she was a courier for a Communist spy network.

"He had a number of positions and he was also sent abroad at various times," she added; "I believe he went to China; I believe he was sent to Portugal at one time * * * by the Treasury. * * *"

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover told the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in November 1953:

"All information furnished by Miss Bentley, which was susceptible to check, has proven to be correct. She had been subjected to the most searching of cross-examinations; her testimony has been evaluated by juries and reviewed by the courts and has been found to be accurate."

That was as broad an endorsement as the head of the FBI would be likely to give any witness. It is just that kind of evaluation which Taylor is attacking, for he is challenging many pieces of her whole story and her general credibility.

SEEKS CONFRONTATION

Taylor's attorney is now making an exhaustive effort to bring about a Taylor-Bentley confrontation in a congressional hearing, where he can cross-examine Miss Bentley on these challenged points.

Scott already has been rebuffed by the Internal Security Subcommittee, which previously questioned Taylor in closed session. Chairman JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, Mississippi, said he would give Taylor a public hearing, but that precedent would preclude having him or his attorney cross-examine Miss Bentley.

Scott disputed Eastland on the precedents, citing several incidents, including the one where EASTLAND presided, where cross-examination was permitted.

Miss Bentley's testimony, as it stands on the public record of Congress, could give the reader the impression that she knew Taylor personally and dealt with him.

In 1951, before the Internal Security Subcommittee, she was asked about the material she collected from the group in which she said Harry Dexter White participated. "Who gave it to you, for instance?" she was asked.

Replied Miss Bentley:

"Well, in the early days, Lud Ullman, who was then working in the Treasury, used to bring it out. Sometimes Harry was leery about bringing it out himself. Sometimes it would be given to Bill Taylor."

"Who is William Taylor?" she was asked.

"He was another Communist Party member in the Treasury who paid his dues and

was a member of the Silvermaster group," she answered.

Miss Bentley was not asked, nor did she volunteer there, whether she knew Taylor.

In November 1953, Taylor was questioned in private before the Senate Investigations Subcommittee, headed by Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin. Scott said McCarthy so stressed Taylor's right to refuse to answer under the fifth amendment that it "was almost cajolery to try to get Mr. Taylor to take the fifth amendment—which he didn't do."

Later, said Scott, he asked McCarthy, "How about a public session, Senator? How about bringing Miss Bentley in for questioning?" Scott said McCarthy replied, "I don't think it will accomplish anything. Besides, she already has said she didn't know Mr. Taylor."

NOT FACE TO FACE

Last year, Scott did get a limited chance to question Miss Bentley under oath about Taylor. The occasion was a pretrial deposition for a libel suit which Taylor filed against the Washington Daily News.

Miss Bentley, at the first session in Louisiana, where she is a teacher of romance languages, was asked:

Question. "Between the period 1941 to 1944, did you know a William Henry Taylor personally?"

Answer. "You mean know him face to face as a person?"

Question."Yes."

Answer. "No."

At the second deposition, in Washington, Scott asked Miss Bentley who had first told her about Taylor, and when. Miss Bentley said it was Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, and "I imagine it was sometime in 1942, possibly."

In addition, she said, "I heard him mentioned by Mrs. Silvermaster and by Mr. Ludwig Ullmann—William Ullmann."

Question. "Did you ever make any attempt, Miss Bentley, to check up on what Mr. Silvermaster or Mrs. Silvermaster or Mr. Ullmann told you about this William Taylor?"

Answer. "I, personally?"

Question. "Yes."

Answer. "No; it was unnecessary; checking on subagents was not done by me."

Question. "I will ask the question and you can object—what did Mr. Silvermaster tell you about this William Taylor?"

That question was objected to on the grounds that it involved hearsay information and was unrelated to the libel suit.

That unsatisfactory point is where the essence of the direct Bentley-Taylor information in the public record comes to a halt.

Taylor was not the only person named by Miss Bentley in her charges whom she said she never met. She said she was never introduced, among others, to Harry Dexter White, who figures so prominently in her testimony, but whom Whittaker Chambers said he did know in his espionage days. Chambers, in the Alger Hiss case, produced documents which he said were slipped to him by White.

In its 1953 investigation, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee counsel referred to the William Henry Taylor case as "not one of the cases selected for particular scrutiny." Was this because Taylor had chosen not to invoke the fifth amendment but, instead, denied the charges against him? The charges against him, nevertheless, are cited in the same record.

The direct Bentley charges, however, are only part of the Taylor story. Who is the little-publicized Taylor, and what is his background?

Taylor is a naturalized American, born in Revelstoke, British Columbia, Canada, and educated in Canadian and American universities.

He received a doctor's degree in economics from the University of California at Berkeley, and later was an instructor at the University of British Columbia and the University of Hawaii.

In January 1941 Taylor joined the Treasury Department's Division of Monetary Research as an economic analyst. Harry Dexter White was then Chief of that Division. Out of his 6 years' work for the United States Government, Taylor spent nearly 4 years overseas, in various roles as an economics specialist.

The outbreak of World War II caught him in Hongkong, where he was interned for 9 months by the Japanese as a civilian prisoner of war. Released, he later served with United States forces in North Africa, France, and Greece. He said he was never in Portugal, which Miss Bentley mentioned about the Taylor she cited.

Taylor, in December 1945, resigned from the Treasury to join the newly formed International Monetary Fund. White meanwhile had reached the rank of Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, had been a leading advocate of the Fund, and in April 1946 had resigned from the Treasury to become the first United States Executive Director of the Fund.

That was the setting when Taylor's 8 years of questioning began—on May 29, 1947.

"Over the years," Taylor said, "I have been interrogated, or called for interrogation, on 19 occasions, and sometimes in a manner reminiscent of the inquisition."

That included appearances before Federal grand juries here and in New York in 1947, 1952, 1953, and last year, in addition to questioning by congressional committees.

"Not once," Taylor continued, "have I been confronted with an accuser or informer; not once have I been allowed to cross-examine. The charges against me have always been somewhat elusive in that they lack precision as to date, manner, form, and content. Furthermore, these charges have taken on different meanings as prosecutor has followed prosecutor."

The International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board was created in 1953, and in that year Taylor received a set of charges.

They alleged that he was a member of a Soviet espionage ring which operated in Washington, D. C., in the early 1940's; that he furnished oral and written information to Nathan Gregory Silvermaster for transmission to Soviet agents; that he was a member of the Communist Party in Honolulu and in Washington; that in the 1930's and 1940's he engaged in activities which indicated sympathy to Communist aims and objectives, all of which he denies.

Far from being a Communist or Communist sympathizer, Taylor says he is a thoroughly loyal American and a member of a God-loving and a church-going family.

In addition—and there are indications that it is this charge which raises the greatest obstacle for Taylor before the board—he is accused of having closely and sympathetically associated with various persons who have been reported to the Communists and Communist Party members.

Most of these are persons with whom Taylor worked in the Treasury and who were named by Miss Bentley or Whittaker Chambers, or both, as Communists. They include White, who is dead; Silvermaster, Ullmann, Victor Perlo, Solomon Adler, and Harold Glasser.

Taylor denied that they were persons he ever knew to be Communists. Silvermaster, he said, he met when they were graduate students at Berkeley, Calif., in 1929 or 1930, and he said he put down Silvermaster's name as a reference when he came to the Treasury. The others named here, he said, he knew in Treasury.

The fact that some of those accused invoked the fifth amendment when questioned about other persons charged with being Communists, including Taylor, obviously has not helped Taylor's position, although it is a matter over which he would have no control, guilty or innocent. Many witnesses, once they have started on the fifth-amendment approach, have taken it straight through on any names put to them.

Taylor was questioned in closed hearings before the international loyalty board in November and December, 1953. The hearing was halted, then reopened 14 months later, last February.

On March 28 of this year, Taylor read to the board his massive 107-page challenge of Miss Bentley's credibility. Some of its many contentions are highlighted below.

The claims include some alleged minor, and some major, challenges. Whether they are unanswerable discrepancies, as he argues, or whether they are matters which the FBI has resolved where they are significant, but cannot discuss publicly because of the secrecy of its operations, is not known, except for FBI Director Hoover's public statement that all of the Bentley information "susceptible to check has proven to be correct," and "her testimony has been found to be accurate."

Taylor charged:

That the Justice Department unjustifiably identified the "William Taylor" or "Bill Taylor" named by Miss Bentley as "William Henry Taylor." There "were and are other William Taylors in the United States Treasury Department," he said, and one William Taylor, a Negro, was named as onetime head of the Communist Party in Washington.

That Miss Bentley "has neither explained nor been asked publicly how she could have received documents from a man whom she had never seen or met."

That Miss Bentley said she collected dues from the Perlo ring and turned them over to her Communist lover and espionage mastermind, Jacob Golos, "during his lifetime"—but that her testimony shows that Golos died "4 to 5 months" before she met the Perlo group.

That Miss Bentley's testimony that William Ludwig Ullmann 4 days in advance, knew the date selected for D-day is "utter rot." Taylor said the records show that D-day "was a variable date," that the exact date was selected by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower "less than 24 hours in advance" and that the Russians were kept fully informed.

That there is conflict among Miss Bentley's various testimony, her book, Out of Bondage, and a published FBI memorandum about the date she first gave information to the FBI.

Miss Bentley testified that she first talked to the FBI in August 1945, and for several months thereafter, cooperated with the Bureau to try to maintain contact with the Communist underground. The famous November 1945 FBI memorandum on Silvermaster, White, Taylor, and others, states: "This case (of Nathan Gregory Silvermaster) first came to the attention of the Bureau on November 8, 1945, when Elizabeth Bentley * * * came into the New York office of the Bureau and stated that for the past 11 years she had been actively engaged in Communist activity and Soviet espionage * * *"

Yet it was the same day, November 8, 1945, Taylor noted, that the FBI letter cited by Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., was sent to President Truman to alert him about an "espionage" ring. This would indicate, Taylor contended, that "within 24 hours on extremely grave charges, everyone named is adjudged guilty * * *"

That Miss Bentley's story "carries with it the implication of an incredible degree of laxity and negligence or ineptitude on the part of Federal law enforcement officers."

The late Jacob Golos, said Taylor, was accused of espionage, was questioned by a Federal grand jury in 1939 and the following year pleaded guilty to failure to comply with the Foreign Agents Registration Act. Silvermaster, said Taylor, according to records now public, was the subject of 24 FBI reports between 1941 and 1946.

"Under these circumstances," asked Taylor, "how could Miss Bentley have escaped observation, suspicion, and detection? Where was the FBI for this 4-year period? Didn't it keep Golos under surveillance after his plea of guilty? Certainly Silvermaster and his residence in Washington must have been watched and his movements charted as a result of his many investigations * * *."

That one of the most incomprehensible pieces of Miss Bentley's story is her testimony that White secretly obtained for her, to be passed on to the Russians for counterfeiting, samples of Allied military mark currency.

A Senate subcommittee in 1953, headed by Senator KARL E. MUNDT (Republican, South Dakota), publicly investigated that affair and concluded that it was "a very clear-cut case" in which Miss Bentley's charges were fully substantiated. Taylor said that he was "the technician" in the handling of the marks, that he "testified freely and fully" about it in closed session "and in effect negated her story in general and in particular"—but that his contradictions were never made public.

There was no reason why the Russians would have any interest in counterfeiting the currency, because the money was theirs "for the asking," Taylor contended. More important, he said, the record of the time element involved showed that it would have been impossible for the subsequent official transfer of the money plates to have occurred as Miss Bentley described it—through maneuvering by White.

Taylor pointed to dozens of other instances in Miss Bentley's public testimony and writings which he claimed fail to hold together upon examination.

In concluding his 107-page presentation March 28 Taylor asked the International Loyalty Board to call Attorney General Brownell, "who bore witness against me before the Jenner committee of the United States Senate on November 17, 1953"; three Treasury officials, including Secretary George M Humphrey; and Miss Bentley.

The board heard that blanket request without acting favorably upon it, and Scott said the board indicated rejection of the request.

He said he previously and unsuccessfully asked for Miss Bentley to appear. Board officials stress that they endeavor to produce nonsecret informants for cross-examination, but note that they can only request—they have no subpena power.

Whatever conclusion the board reaches about Taylor's loyalty will be in the form of a "recommendation" to the International Monetary Fund.

By moving the case into the present arena of public attention, Taylor and his attorney have indicated that they believe it can only be fully resolved by a public showdown. Whether such showdown will ever occur, and whether it will resolve Taylor's guilt or innocence, is the untold part of this stranger-than-fiction chapter of the cold war.

Hearings on Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD two news stories by Marsh Clark, of the Washington bureau of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, dealing with our recent hearings on the possible effect of television as a contributing cause to juvenile delinquency.

Marsh Clark, as many Members of the Senate may know, is the son of our late distinguished and beloved colleague, Judge Bennett Champ Clark, and the grandson of our long-time Missouri Representative and Speaker of the House of Representatives, Champ Clark. In line with such a distinguished family tradition, and with the inspiration of such forebears whose courage and integrity earned for them lasting recognition among the great statesmen in our Nation's history, it is small wonder to find that Marsh likewise has dedicated himself to a career of public service as a member of the fourth estate.

Educated at St. Albans School here and at St. James School in Lydia, Md., Marsh went on to attend the University of Missouri and was graduated in 1950 from Washington and Lee University in Lexington, Va. He served as a reporter for the St. Joseph News-Press in St. Joseph, Mo., then joined the staff of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, where he has been for 2 years, the last several months with the Washington bureau. The many articles which have appeared under his byline are tribute to the fact that, though still a young man, he is already receiving recognition in his chosen field.

Marsh's twin brother, Kim, has also chosen the newspaper profession and is a reporter for the Kansas City Star, while his older brother, the third Champ Clark, writes for Time magazine. We shall be watching with great interest the careers of these three able young men. I know that they will carry on, for their generation, the outstanding record of the Clark family, and I am sure all of us join in wishing them success.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of April 7, 1955]

SENATE GROUP TAKES LOOK AT TV'S EFFECT ON CHILDREN

(By Marsh Clark)

WASHINGTON, April 6.—In a room made brilliant by television lights a Senate subcommittee today took a long look at television—and the effect "spook," cowboy and crime shows may have on children.

They got an earful from several witnesses, principally Commissioner Frieda B. Hennock of the Federal Communications Commission, who, after squinting for several seconds at the batter of lights for television movie-cameras, launched into a spirited statement on what she called a "profuse deluge of crime, brutality, sadism, and outright murder" on radio and television.

Commissioner Hennock told the Senators that the FCC should take "positive remedial steps" to wipe out crime and violence programs.

She urged that the FCC require stations to submit reports to the FCC of the number of acts and threats of crime and violence on its programs during a broadcast day.

"Moreover, the FCC should pursue a rigorous policy of refusing renewal of the licenses of offending stations which disregard their public service responsibilities by continuing to victimize immature audiences."

All witnesses and subcommittee members made it clear that there are on television a great many worthwhile programs for children and for adults and that the variety of these programs is a matter of constant attention and improvement.

The subcommittee, of which Senator HENNINGS, Democrat, Missouri, is a member, first started looking into the business of violence on television last year. This is the first such hearing this year, although the group has held numerous sessions recently on the general subject of juvenile delinquency.

Harold E. Fellows, president of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, told the committee that broadcasters are "anxious to do their part in cooperating with any soundly organized campaign to reduce delinquency." He submitted quotations from various experts and magazine articles saying that television cannot be singled out as the factor causing the increase in juvenile delinquency.

[From the St. Lewis Globe-Democrat of April 8, 1955]

SENATOR HENNINGS DEFENDS TV AGAINST VIOLENCE CHARGES

(By Marsh Clark)

WASHINGTON, April 7.—The big bad wolf, and Jack, of beanstalk fame, came unwittingly to the defense of television toughguys today.

The scene was a deep-carpeted, high-domed room at the Capitol, where Senate Members are endeavoring to find out what, if anything, crime programs on television have to do with the rise in juvenile delinquency.

READ FOR GENERATIONS

Bringing the children-story characters into the discussion was Senator HENNINGS, Democrat, Missouri. He did so by way of pointing out that scenes of violence are by no means restricted to television dramas. To the contrary, he said, violent scenes and implications can be found in many a child's story and fairy tale read and repeated for generations.

The Missouri Senator, acting as chairman of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, rattled off a long list of children's stories and said that between their covers can be found some pretty grim acts which, at least heretofore, haven't been the subject of senatorial or parental concern.

Of the witness testifying about television, HENNINGS inquired, "It is not your view, is it, that children should be removed entirely from the realm of reality?"

This general line of thinking was also evident in testimony of several other witnesses at today's concluding session of the subcommittee's hearing on the matter.

THESIS EXTENDED

One of them, a vice president of a large network, extended the Hennings thesis even further, mentioning the Greek classics, Old Testament, opera, and modern novel as containing an occasional bit of bloodshed.

He was Joseph V. Hefferman, of the National Broadcasting Co. He stated that programs that include crime and mystery are a proper and legitimate part of the broadcast schedule, emphasizing that is is recognized that special care should be taken in presenting such programs.

When properly presented, he added, crime and mystery shows can impress upon youthfulwatchers that law breaking is a sordid business in which the criminal cannot win.

"The problem of juvenile delinquency is properly a matter of concern to all Americans," Hefferman said. "The broadcasting industry," he asserted, "has shown an awareness of its responsibility to serve the public as an influence for good and to avoid material in bad taste which goes beyond other media for the presentation of ideas."

Hoover Suggestions Made Headlines But No Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of May 24, 1955:

NOT ONE RECOMMENDATION HAS BEEN CARRIED OUT—HOOVER SUGGESTIONS MADE HEADLINES BUT NO RESULTS

(By Albert M. Colegroce)

The new Hoover Commission's efforts to cut Government spending have produced headlines but small results, a checkup showed today.

Since February 14, the Hoover group has suggested 226 ways the Government might save money, be more efficient, and get out of activities that compete with private businesses.

None of the recommendations has been carried out.

The only results on the record so far:

Defense Secretary Charles Wilson wrote a letter to the Commission Chairman, ex-President Herbert Hoover, saying he and his helpers are looking into suggestions on the Defense Department.

Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, introduced a bill to carry out some Commission recommendations for better Government handling of its law cases. Nothing has come of it.

196 ADOPTED

The original Hoover Commission, operating from 1949 to 1953, mostly during the time Harry Truman was President, made 273 recommendations. A total of 196—that's 72 percent—were adopted by the Government.

Thus, some here are wise-cracking that Herbert Hoover got more cooperation from Democrat Harry Truman than he has from Republican Dwight Eisenhower.

Hoover Commission officials says that's not a fair way to look at it.

"Remember, the new Commission's recommendations have been made only in the past 3 months," Neil MacNeil, the Hoover group's editorial director, said today. "It takes time to get action."

However, the original Hoover Commission began making recommendations in February, 1949. Within 3 months, 20 percent of its suggestions already had been carried out, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report says.

IKE DEFENDED

Hoover Commission officials also contend it isn't quite accurate to give Mr. Truman so much credit and Mr. Eisenhower so much criticism.

After all, they say, Congress, not the President, voted to create the Hoover group. And it's Congress to whom the Commission reports. Furthermore, Congress has the power to put into effect more than half of the Hoover recommendations. (They diplomatically refrain from pointing out that Congress is run by the Democrats these days.)

Still, the White House has power to adopt many Commission suggestions.

On some, the President only has to order that the necessary actions be taken. On others, such as those concerning the Defense Department, he can tell the department chief to study the suggestions carefully—and can ride close herd on the studies.

Trouble is, Citizens Committee leaders are saying privately the President's time-consuming chain-of-command arrangements may delay White House decisions into 1956.

Also, they say, if Congress doesn't soon start considering possible legislation to put Hoover Commission recommendations into effect, it can't possibly do much about them this year.

And 1956 is a national election year.

Politicians and Presidents traditionally don't like to rock the boat in election years, they point out.

Aid to Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from A. William Loos, education secretary, the Church Peace Union, together with a copy of the resolution which he enclosed.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHURCH PEACE UNION,
New York, N. Y., April 4, 1955.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Church Peace Union board of trustees recently approved a resolution on aid to Asia. We think that you may be interested in seeing it, and a copy is enclosed for your information.

Sincerely yours,

A. WILLIAM LOOS,
Education Secretary.

RESOLUTION ON AID TO ASIA

The Afro-Asian Conference, to convene in April at Bandung, Indonesia, promises to be a widely representative gathering. Of the 25 invitees and the 5 sponsoring countries, 25 have already indicated that they will be represented, and the remaining 5 are expected to accept the invitation.

This meeting may prove to be the prelude to one of the most significant events of our time. For these 30 countries, including well over half of the human race, may be on the way to concerted action which will give voice and sanction to their determination to live no longer as second- or third-class citizens in the world.

The calling of this conference by the Colombo Powers—Burma, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, and Pakistan—serves to highlight the supreme importance of the free Asian nations within the current international situation. If large-scale war is averted, it is our understanding that there will be waged in Asia during the months and years ahead an intensive economic competition between the Western nations, on the one hand, and, on the other, the Soviet Union and Communist China.

In line with our traditional friendship with the Asian people and to assume that the free world shall not lose by default the economic struggle for the loyalty of the free Asian area, we, the trustees of the Church Peace Union, believe that the United States should immediately initiate two courses of action. We therefore earnestly urge our Government to give prompt attention to two issues:

1. To appropriate as quickly as possible the amount of approximately $1 billion, the obligational authority requested by the administration for these crucially important Asian programs.

2. To devise an efficient way to administer the disbursement of these funds, if the Foreign Operations Administration is allowed to go out of existence on June 30, 1955, as directed by Congress. We hope that the tenure of FOA will be extended, at least until an effective organization can be provided, adequate to handle the immense aid-to-Asia programs. It should be noted that unification of foreign-aid activities under FOA has to date saved both money and personnel.

The United States and its Western Allies must truly become good partners if they are to participate successfully in the economic competition already being waged in the Free Asia arc. More bases of mutual respect and mutual interest must be established. New areas of "agreed cooperation for mutual advantage" must be found. How we meet this immense problem will be of fateful importance, in both the short and long term, if we aim to widen the reaches of a genuinely free world in which an increasing number of stable, self-reliant, and independent nations are joined. The immediate contribution we can make toward this end is to appropriate adequate funds for the prospective Asian programs and to provide for their efficient administration.

RALPH W. SOCKMAN,
President,
HENRY A. ATKINSON,
General Secretary
(For the Board of Trustees, the Church Peace Union).

Opening of Sessions of United Nations Assembly With Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the Members the following letter from Mr. J. Richard Pellington, secretary of the Holy Name Society of Our Lady of All Souls Church in East Orange, N. J., urging that each day's session in the United Nations be opened with a prayer. Mr. Pellington ably expresses the sentiments of a great number of his fellow citizens, and I commend his letter to all of my colleagues for their consideration. I trust that early attention to the issue will be forthcoming by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Mr. Pellington's letter follows:

HOLY NAME SOCIETY,
OUR LADY OF ALL SOULS CHURCH,
East Orange, N. J., May 20, 1955.

Hon. HUGH ADDONIZIO,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is our understanding that there is a proposal before the Congress requesting that our delegation, as headed by the Honorable John Cabot Lodge, present to the members of the United Nations Assembly a resolution requesting that all future meetings of the Assembly be opened with a

prayer. The members of our society unanimously endorse this proposal and hope that you will lend your support for its ultimate passage.

Our country was founded under God. We believe that this is the time for us to reaffirm that foundation. As a Nation, we should stand up before the world and be counted on the side of God; for if God is for us, who can be against us.

God is the light and the truth. He entrusted our forefathers with the responsibility of building a Nation; He is entrusting us, you and me and all our fellow Americans, with the responsibility of preserving that Nation. We must not be the cause for scandal before brother nations who may be weak or vacillating. We must stand up and declare ourselves anew as one of God. It is the one and only way of meeting and solving the problems that plague us at home and abroad.

I trust that this urgent plea for this proposal will meet with your approval.

Most sincerely,

J. RICHARD PELLINGTON,
Secretary.

The Postal Pay Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have here an excellent editorial from the May 23 issue of the Indianapolis Star pertaining to the President's veto of postal pay legislation. I commend it to my colleagues and I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD:

THE POSTAL PAY VETO

In vetoing the latest postal pay raise bill President Eisenhower made it plain that if postal workers are going to get their raise, Congress is going to have to work with the President. Whatever pay boosts and upward reclassifications do come through are going to be the result of sober study, not vote-snatching politics.

There is not much disagreement over the desirability of an upward pay adjustment for postal workers. The President himself has expressed willingness to sign a pay raise aggregating an average of about 7.6 percent, compared to the 8.6 percent in the vetoed bill. But aside from this difference in the burden on taxpayers, the President pointed out other serious drawbacks in the bill. He said (1) that it discriminates against tens of thousands of rural letter carriers, special delivery messengers, supervisors, and postmasters; (2) that it would cost the taxpayers $180 million a year, exorbitant in terms of what is needed to bring postal pay into line with comparable rates in private industry or the Government; and (3) that the establishment of thousands of individual pay rates under the bill would gravely hamper administration and operations in the post office.

Although the President did not list it among his reasons for the veto, he did point out that the post office is now a costly deficit operation, and will remain so whether or not there is a pay raise, unless Congress jacks up postage rates by enough to make the service self-supporting. We recommend this fact to the attention of the Congressmen bucking the President in this matter.

Meanwhile Senator FRANK CARLSON is ready to introduce a bill carrying out the administration's views on a postal pay raise. There is no way Congress can responsibly approach this bill, or any other postal bill, without at the same time finding ways of getting the post office out of the red. But to do this, it will first be necessary to stop fighting Ike and start working with him on the issue.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, recently it was my privilege to address two conferences on the subject of juvenile delinquency. The first of these, held in St. Louis, was the Southwest regional conference on the Child Welfare League of America; the second was the University of Missouri conference on the control of juvenile delinquency. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat dealing with these two conferences on this exceedingly important problem—a problem on which our Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency has been working for a year and a half in an effort to achieve broader understanding and to offer constructive recommendations and necessary legislation.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of April 3, 1955]

CAUSE AND CURE

Senator THOMAS HENNINGS offered some sound advice in St. Louis the other day on the burning issue of teen-age crime. Senator HENNINGS addressed his remarks to the regional conference of the Child Welfare League holding a 3-day meeting here.

What he had to say, however, should be of interest to a far wider audience than the 600 delegates who heard him.

Senator HENNINGS was a member of the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, which has just wound up a 2-year study of that timely subject. The committee, he pointed out, held hearings in nearly a dozen American cities from coast to coast. It heard hundreds of witnesses and received thousands of letters from citizens in every walk of life.

Their testimony, he said, points clearly to the fact that the home is the biggest factor in determining whether our children turn out to be happy, well-adjusted citizens—or juvenile delinquents. He commented, in part:

"We know that the seriously delinquent boy or girl is not what we are pleased to call a 'normal' individual. We know that his delinquent behavior is usually rooted in the home in early deprivation and neglect—and by this I mean emotional and spiritual deprivation, as well as physical.

"I am not talking just about broken homes, nor about children of working mothers, although we know that in many instances these conditions have had damaging effects on children.

"I am talking about the homes where the child is over-indulged, which, of course, may be just a form of compensation for the parent who, consciously or unconsciously, rejects the child.

"I am talking about the homes—and there are many of them in this generation—where parents have swung to the school of thought that teaches that children should not be disciplined nor should they be made to assume responsibility. * * *

"All of these are forms of neglect, and the child's response are probably well known to the neighbors, perhaps to the police officer on the beat, or to community agencies. * * *"

What is the cure for the problem of juvenile delinquency? Here Senator HENNINGS accurately replies "there are no easy answers to it." Certainly one of the hopeful approaches, however, was mapped out by the committee on which he served.

It proposed, in a bill which Senator HENNINGS backs, a program of Federal aid and guidance to improve State and local efforts to combat juvenile delinquency. These, he suggests, should center around the factors in family life that can cause or cure delinquency. He also cites the need to weed out harmful conditions like slums that play a part in this problem.

But basically the fault lies where Senator HENNINGS bluntly put it—with all adult Americans who make up the society of which their children are largely the product.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of May 1, 1955]

MONSTROUS APATHY

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., speaking before a conference on youth problems last Friday at Missouri University, delivered a brutal indictment of society for its apathy over juvenile delinquency. It was particularly brutal because it is true. Mr. HENNINGS was a member of a Senate subcommittee which recently concluded a 2-year investigation of juvenile delinquency that compassed the length and breadth of the country.

The hard fact is we are losing the battle against juvenile crime and miscreancy. The Senator said the stream of children through the Nation's juvenile courts grew from 300,000 in 1948 to 435,000 in 1954. He added his committee found only 1 in 3 cases ever reaches courts.

We talk loudly about the rising incidence of juvenile trouble. We wring our hands publicly with appropriate horror. The Senator finds we do little to meet the problem. The American people are not alive to the danger that grows like a ravening canker. He charged apathy of local and Federal Government, of parents and churches and schools—not all of them, but too many.

He cited the growth of narcotics use among teen-agers, lack of adequate school facilities and teachers to care for maladjusted youths, sloth in wiping out slums which breed juvenile crime and vice. He noted the lack of adequate programs for rehabilitating youngsters, often lodged in jails with hardened criminals.

The Senator declared attack upon juvenile delinquency demands money, and until we provide funds for proper family welfare work, recreational facilities, education, psychiatric treatment, parole and juvenile court work, we cannot begin to tackle the problem. Most of these funds, he said, must be obtained and the fight made on local levels.

Aside from the vicious erosion of our children's moral and physical future, juvenile delinquency is a political drain on the country's resources. The Senator gave statistics showing that last year the crime bill for America was $20 billion—a cost of $495 for every family. For each dollar we spent on education, we spent $1.82 for crime. For every dollar we gave churches, we spent $10 on crime. Crime costs the public twice the total of all the Nation's contributions to charity.

Children are not born delinquent, he reminded. The delinquent family, the delinquent community breeds the delinquent

child. Senator HENNINGS' tough recital ought to contribute to the end he pleads: Less pious talk, more realistic action to halt delinquency among our children.

Message of Oregon Council of Churches' Convocation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a message of the Oregon Council of Churches' Convocation held in Eugene, Oreg., February 1 to 3, 1955.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE OF THE OREGON COUNCIL OF CHURCHES' CONVOCATION TO THE CHURCHES OF OREGON

We, the members of the State convocation of the Oregon Council of Churches, called to consider "Christ: The Hope of the World," are impelled to consider our hope in the context of the seething unrest of half the world and the deepening crises of the cold war. The Congress of the United States has granted our President awesome power to take action in Asia that could cast Asia-America, and at last the entire world, into the fiery furnace of war with atomic weapons and hydrogen bombs. One hydrogen bomb can destroy 10 million people. One hundred bombs, strategically placed can destroy most of life in the United States. We know that these weapons now in our hands are also in the hands of Russia, and assuredly in case of need are available to Communist China. It is vain to hope that combatants in a decisive war would refuse to use "such a decisive weapon either in hope of total victory or in the desperation of total defeat." (Rept. of sec. IV, Evanston.)

Our inescapable conclusion is that the age-old diplomacy which rested upon "the balance of power"—the appeal to force, is bankrupt. We of the atomic age need not look far down the course our world is on in its misplaced trust in arms, to discern the final plunge into catastrophe. We refuse to believe that our vocation in Christian hope is to be an agent of the world's destruction.

Therefore, we undertake to reexamine the implications of our responsibility as Christians for all the people of the world for whom Christ died and rose again and for whom He ever liveth to make intercession. Our purpose now is to quicken the Christian conscience and to come to a more perfect judgment concerning proposed solutions to the present crises. In order to do this we here set down our present thinking on a limited but most critical area of world affairs. We entreat our brethren in our homes and churches throughout the State to participate in the formation of a mature Christian judgment by searching out the facts and in the light of our Christian command to prove all things, holding fast that which is good; this study and action by our brethren at home is the decisive work which remains to be done.

We ask the Oregon Council of Churches to prepare a tentative agenda for discussion, covering the critical issues before us, and to include the report of the general assembly of the World Council of Churches at Evanston, in order that we, the people, may declare our own faith and initiate our action, under God, in these matters. We affirm, with the voice of Evanston that it is our desire "That all will be moved to give utterance to the Christian hope in their own words and with the ideas which their thought and prayer discover." The world waits for the voice of the people of God—the message of the church in word and deed.

The present crisis in world affairs forces our attention on Formosa and emphasizes the importance of the contribution of the Christian Church to this phase of world affairs. We are impressed with the essential place of the United Nations in moving to negotiate a cease-fire agreement. This further suggests the desirability of establishing the jurisdiction of the United Nations over Formosa until such time in the future when the final solution to the Formosan problem is possible by plebiscite, and that following such a decision the welfare of the dissenting group in such a plebiscite shall be protected by the United Nations.

The situation in Formosa leads directly to the question of the membership of Communist China in the United Nations. Now is the time to reexamine our national policy on this issue. The arguments in 1950 by our present Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, impress us with their validity even now.

"I have now come to believe that the United Nations will best serve the cause of peace if its Assembly is representative of what the world actually is, and not merely representative of the parts which we like. Therefore, we ought to be willing that all the nations should be members without attempting to appraise closely those which are good and those which are bad. Already that distinction is obliterated by the present membership of the United Nations.

"Some of the present member nations, and others that might become members, have governments that are not representative of the people. But if in fact they are governments—that is, if they govern—then they have a power which should be represented in any organization that purports to mirror world reality.

"If the Communist Government of China in fact proves its ability to govern China without serious domestic resistance, then it, too, should be admitted to the United Nations. However, a regime that claims to have become the government of a country through civil war should not be recognized until it has been tested over a reasonable period of time.

"If the United Nations membership were made substantially universal, that might end a preponderant voting superiority of the United States and its friends which, while pleasant, is somewhat fictitious.

"Communist governments today dominate more than 30 percent of the population of the world. We may not like that fact; indeed, we do not like it at all. But if we want to have a world organization, then it should be representative of the world as it is." (John Foster Dullcs, War or Peace, p. 190, MacMillan.)

The present crisis also indicates the necessity of changing the traditional policy of the great powers of making other powers insecure in order to attain their own security. This policy has guided the big powers even as members of the League of Nations and the United Nations. We pledge our support to a course of negotiated settlement in an effort to turn the conflict from the battlefield, to the constructive struggle of mind, heart, and resource to meet the desperate need of the world. To this end, we recognize the clear injunction of our Lord to give aid to those in need.

We perceive in the continuing conditions of famine and other material want a constant indictment of those of us who enjoy security of food and shelter and who utilize the incredible powers of production which God has given to us for our own material comfort. We recognize that the constant physical want in millions of our fellowmen living especially in Asia degrades their human dignity and shames our claims to Christian discipleship.

We, therefore, commit ourselves to a ceaseless effort to wipe out famine and to assure to all men the essentials of life before seeking the further improvement of our own comfort. To this end we urge that the United States Government at least double the allocation for technical assistance hitherto made to the United Nations. Among the many urgent issues facing us is the desperate need of 80 million refugees. We urge, also, that the United States adhere to the promises made in the United Nations Charter, chapter XI, article 73, with regard to the paramount interests of the natives in the nonselfgoverning territories.

These suggestions are offered in that they appeal to us as presenting an affirmative course in fulfillment of our faith. We do not presume to speak for the church, but we do, as a company of believers in Christ as Lord, ask our brethren to give serious study, discussion and prayer to these questions. The message of the church must come from the people making up the body of Christ. Our hope is that the people of faith accepting their inescapable responsibility will find wisdom and grace to follow the way of our Lord. We pray for and seek a new force of faith. To this end we call for representatives drawn from local study groups to assemble in convocation at such time determined by the board of the Oregon Council of Churches in light of the progress of local study (probably 1956) to witness to our faith in Christ as Lord and under the leadership of the Holy Spirit to declare our Christian witness in world affairs.

We direct the secretary of the Oregon Council of Churches to communicate to the President of the United States and his Secretary of State and to all Oregon Congressmen and to inform them of this action of the Oregon Council of Churches.

The American Exporter and the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at the 56th annual meeting of the Rice Millers Association held in Washington on May 12 and 13, my colleague, the Honorable T. A. THOMPSON of Louisiana, delivered a significant address which is worthy of the attention of every Member of Congress.

He and I have much in common besides the fact that we both bear the same name. We represent districts which are tremendous producers of rice. We also have deep-sea ports with their attendant problems of ocean shipping. Mr. THOMPSON is on the Merchant Marine Committee, where I served with a great deal of satisfaction for a number of years. I still retain my deep interest in our American Merchant Marine—a vital component of our national defense, and a mighty force in maintaining peaceful

commerce in the world of civilized nations.

I commend to each Member of Congress the address of Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana, which I insert in the RECORD herewith.

THE AMERICAN EXPORTER AND THE MERCHANT MARINE

(Address of Hon. T. A. THOMPSON, 56th annual meeting, the Rice Millers' Association, May 13, 1955)

Mr. Reid, members of the Rice Millers' Association, and distinguished guests, when your president, Mr. William M. Reid, asked me to address this group today, he requested that I talk on a topic that would be related to my committee work in Congress as well as to the interests of the rice marketing trade. He suggested that perhaps my work with the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee might provide a great deal of information of interest to rice millers and other segments of the rice industry, all of whom engage in or are affected by export business.

There are times when it takes a tremendous stretch of the imagination for a congressional speaker to relate his committee work to the particular interests of the group which he is called upon to address. That is certainly not so with me here today, and I am very happy to have this opportunity to talk with you briefly about two subjects which mean a great deal to me: the American merchant marine and the rice industry, both of which are of prime importance to the economy of my home State, Louisiana.

Prior to going into a discussion of current day rice problems and the merchant marine consideration in connection therewith, I would like to express at this time my sincere appreciation to the Honorable CLARK W. THOMPSON, chairman of the Rice Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture of the House, the members of the subcommittee, and all of my colleagues in the rice-growing areas for their extremely generous and active help in matters so important to us in Louisiana. If the remarks I have prepared for this meeting are repetitious in any manner, I only hope that they are not too far different from those stated by my cousin from Texas, as I feel sure that any statement made by him can be considered as authoritative.

I am sure the major problem confronting this covention is that of high rice production in the United States which, based on a report of the Department of Agriculture in December 1954, was expected to reach a total for 1954–55 of 50,106,000 hundredweight (rough basis). Of this amount, plus a 7.6 million hundredweight carryover from the 1953–54 crop, about 27 million hundredweight, it was estimated, would be domestic consumption and 26 million hundredweight exported, leaving a carryover of about 14 million hundredweight. However, because of political policies followed by the administration (unless the State Department changes its policy of interferring), our exports this year will amount to only about 20 million hundredweight, which will leave us with a carryover probably in excess of 20 million hundredweight. According to the Department of Agriculture, this carryover is an all-time record as compared with the 1948–52 average of 2.8 million hundredweight. We, therefore, find ourselves in a very unusual position when it is borne in mind that prior to World War II average rice exports were about 2¼ million hundredweight (milled) as against the average for the past 3 years of 16½ million hundredweight (milled rice). Thus, where export production prior to World War II was only 17.6 percent of the rice milled in the United States, now well over one-half of our production, or 55.7 percent, is dependent upon export markets.

Most of this increase has come about through the loss of production in the Asiatic countries in the chaotic period following the war, with a special upsurge of demand during and following hostilities in Korea. Today, however, there is beginning to be a return to high production in the Far East, with a consequent downward trend in the price of rice from the record levels of 1952–53. From recent reports which I have had an opportunity to examine, the subject is a very complicated one with many ramified economic aspects. Various proposals have been made, such as a two-price marketing plan, to enable the American industry to retain its present high level of production and efficiency, and yet compete in the world market, maintain or increase domestic consumption, and avoid the building up of wasteful surpluses.

In this connection several years ago representatives of the fishing industry of northeastern United States appeared before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to tell of their problems with regard to world competition. One witness, complaining of competition in the domestic market from foreign imports, indicated that the industry would be in sound condition if domestic consumption of New England fish could be increased. The suggestion was made by a committee member that perhaps this problem could be met if Lent could only be made a little longer. To date that suggestion has not been successfully put into effect. Similarly, talking off the top of my head, I might try to help by suggesting that increase in domestic rice consumption could be brought about by governmental action designed to encourage a greater number of marriages each year as a stimulus to the sale of rice supplies.

However, I believe I realize my limitations well enough to leave that problem to your domestic marketing experts who make a full time job of selling rice to the American consumer. I will confine my remarks to a matter I have given a great deal of thought during the past few years.

I think it is safe to say that during this past Congress the most important legislation considered by the Merchant Marine Committee was the proposal which, when enacted into law, became the Cargo Preference Act. This act, Public Law 664, provides, among other things, that at least 50 percent of all cargoes given away or sold for foreign currencies must be transported overseas on privately owned United States flag vessels, to the extent such vessels are available at fair and reasonable rates for United States flag commercial vessels. The Cargo Preference Act enacted into general law the principle which has been spelled out in every individual foreign-aid program since the war. It conforms with the spirit and intent of our national maritime policy which recognizes the need for an American merchant marine sufficient to transport a substantial portion of our waterborne commerce and to serve as military or naval auxiliary in time of war or national emergency. We hoped, with the enactment of this legislation, that Congress would not be confronted with irrelevant speechmaking in opposition to the 50–50 principle, diverting attention from the main issue every time proposals are brought up for consideration involving the disposal of surplus commodities to our friends and allies elsewhere in the free world. We thought, and I am convinced, that the provisions of this act are eminently fair and reasonable and, in fact, necessary in the national interest so long as vast Government-aid programs substitute for a large portion of our normal foreign trade. So did a majority of both Houses and the President, as attested by the approval of the Cargo Preference Act on August 26, 1954.

Notwithstanding the action of the Congress and the President on this legislation, the enemies of an American merchant marine and those of our own citizens who believed that the simple and obvious answer to the most economical transportation of our foreign trade is to withdraw all Government support and turn the business over to the merchant marines of other nations are still at work trying to undermine the Cargo Preference Act. No sooner had the 84th Congress convened then stories began appearing in the American press that the administration's program for sale of farm surpluses overseas is "running into a bottleneck because of a ship-American provision in Public Law 664." These stories would have had you believe that the law makes it mandatory that 50 percent of agricultural products must be shipped in American vessels, irrespective of the availability of tonnage or the reasonableness of rates. They would have had you believe that greedy American shipowners were using the law to gouge the American farmer and the American Government. The stories made no reference to the fact that under this law if American-flag vessels are not available at reasonable rates, then foreign-flag vessels may be freely used.

Our committee, which has made a close study of this problem in relation to the needs of the American merchant marine for a number of years, was very much disturbed at the untrue and unfair charges leveled at the Cargo Preference Act. It was even more disturbing and very significant to find that coincident with the publicity in the American press similar attacks were being made in the shipping journals of Europe.

In the course of hearings held on the administration of the Cargo Preference Act in February 1955, it seemed clear that much of the opposition to the act came from the efforts, direct or indirect, of foreign nationals to undermine the legislation. No matter how the opposition would state it, it is obvious that their goal is to compel the reduction of the American merchant marine so they may increase transportation for their own shipping at the same time they are saying it is discriminatory and wrong for us to want only 50 percent of the business which we are giving away.

To the best of my recollection, I have received no complaints from members of the rice industry in my area about the operations of our 50–50 policy in foreign-aid programs or any charges that the American merchant marine is an unnecessary burden on the taxpayer. Nevertheless, I feel that it is timely to raise the subject before you, because it has been the agricultural interests of the Nation which have been the misguided opponents to this important bulwark of our national transportation policy.

Perhaps I know why I have had no complaints from my gulf coast friends and constituents. They have seen and enjoyed the prosperity which has come to the gulf coincident with—and I believe attributable to—the upbuilding of modern American-flag ocean shipping services sailing from our ports. The American gulf coast now lined by flourishing port cities served by several leading American-flag cargo lines, with service to all parts of the world, was once wholly dependent for its export-import trade upon foreign-flag carriers which furnished a sporadic service or withdrew altogether except during the seasonal peak cargo movements of cotton, rice, and other products.

The danger of placing reliance upon imprudent or shortsighted policies of dependence on foreign-flag shipping was graphically emphasized by Mr. Solon B. Turman, president of Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., when, in an appearance before the southeastern area transportation conference of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in New Orleans on February 3, he discussed the predicament in which the American shipping industry found itself only 40 years ago. Mr. Turman said:

"This Nation had so neglected its merchant marine just before World War I that

our ships were carrying only 9 percent of our export-import trade. When war broke in Europe we were still a neutral Nation and found ourselves without ships even for our basic needs. Our foreign trade was paralyzed. Goods and materials piled up on the docks. As an example, in August 1913, we exported 257,000 bales of cotton. In August 1914, only a year later, this dropped to 21,000 bales. And because we did not have the ships to make deliveries, the price of cotton dropped from $62.50 a bale in July 1914, to $36.25 in December of the same year."

During that period much of the foreign-flag shipping, upon which we had been relying, was withdrawn because of the European hostilities. Thus, even before the heavy movement of munitions and due to the absence of sufficient American ships, ocean shipping rates went up 700 percent. When the war got going full blast, these rates skyrocketed to 2,000 percent. Contrast this with our experience in World War II, when we had providentially developed at least the beginning of a modern American flag merchant marine. Despite the vastly greater demands upon shipping, at no time during that period did American shipping rates rise higher than 70 percent. Therefore, I must agree with Mr. Truman when he said, "It seems incredible that the need for an American flag merchant marine can still remain a subject for debate." Yet there are, even today, many Americans, including some in high quarters, who have yet to learn that a reasonably powerful American merchant marine is more than our first line of defense. It is our advance line of action. It is our protection against the enemy on the economic front long before our first line of military defense is called into action.

Our experience in World War I should provide example enough to all Americans that our domestic economy cannot depend on foreign flag merchant marines to carry our export and import trade. But, lest anyone feel that things have changed in the past 35 or 40 years, let me refer to a clipping from a recent issue of the Financial Post, published at Toronto, Canada, which provides a current dramatic example of the effect of too few national flag merchant ships on a nation's economy. Within the past few years our good neighbor, Canada, decided it could not support an adequate merchant marine, with the result that most of its merchant fleet left the Canadian flag. Let me read briefly from this story:

"Swiftly climbing ship charter rates are causing a serious vessel shortage at both Canadian coasts, which is interfering with export orders.

"Because of a worldwide lack of available bottoms, shippers are having to pay almost 100 percent more for cargo space in Vancouver and about 60 percent more in Halifax than last summer. * * *

"With the high world demand for merchant ships, foreign-flag vessels have been diverted from servicing Canadian ports to the more profitable trans-Pacific and Mediterranean runs.

" 'This,' W. J. Fisher, general manager of the Canadian Shipowners Association, told the Post 'is one of the disadvantages of not having an adequate Canadian flag merchant fleet. Canadian ships must come home, because they have Canadian crews. A Canadian flag fleet would go a long way in eliminating the current shipping shortage.' "

Let me cite just one more example of our need for an American merchant marine supported by our Government and supported by our exporters and importers. I do not believe it is generally realized that better than 80 percent of all ocean transportation to Korea during the recent war was supplied by American ships. So, let's look at rice export statistics. For the period 1950–51, 271,000 bags of American rice were shipped to Korea; in 1951–52 shipments totaled 2,821,000 bags; and, in 1952–53 American rice exports to Korea consisted of 4,631,000 bags. I think it is fair to consider that wartime devastation and postwar rehabilitation were largely responsible for such heavy imports by a rice-producing nation. But, my point is that during their period of great need the American rice industry was able to supply the demand with almost full dependence upon American-flag shipping.

Naturally we cannot depend, nor do we have any desire to depend upon the misery and domestic dislocations of our friends abroad for the creation of our export markets. But, we can depend upon a strong American flag merchant marine to create new international trade through the operations of their trade development and promotion departments. Our home-based shipping industry is eager to assist American businessmen to develop new sales markets abroad.

American steamship companies have trade development offices located in every State in the Union, manned with trained specialists to work with industrialists, businessmen and financial people in developing new markets or locating new sources of supply. As a result of these combined trade development activities of American flag lines, over 2,000 domestic and foreign firms are personally contacted every working day of the year and offered the assistance of this vast international network of trade promotional facilities. Fifteen subsidized American steamship lines operate 113 domestic promotion offices, 143 foreign offices, and employ 900 foreign and domestic freight agencies. Through their membership in shipping conferences it costs no more to ship via an American cargo liner than aboard a foreign liner.

Let me mention 2 leading American shipping companies with their home port in New Orleans, and with operations of frequent, regular and dependable service all over the world. I refer to Mississippi Shipping Co. (Delta Line), and Lykes Bros. Steamship Co. The strength of the economy of the Gulf States means more to them than anything else in the world. They are dedicated to giving the gulf area rice exporters unfailing service. They are dedicated to giving that service to all American exporters and importers and to do everything within their power to increase the flow of trade through the gulf area. Their services will be available when foreign flag shipping disappears for whatever reason. The same, of course, is true of all of the companies in our American merchant marine but I could not resist an opportunity to put in a plug for these 2 great companies from home.

With the vastly higher standards of living in the United States as compared with those of competitive maritime nations, our merchant marine is naturally at a disadvantage because of the big spread between United States and foreign costs of ship construction and operation. The wage differential alone demonstrates the problem of operating American ships in competition with our foreign friends. The average monthly wage cost of operating an American-flag cargo vessel in 1952 was $24,500, as against $4,100 under Japanese registry, $5,100 under German registry, and $6,500 under British registry. Therefore, we must offset that differential in some way if we are to maintain the merchant marine which our commerce and security require. Our Government meets this problem by the granting of subsidies only sufficient to place the American-ship operator on a cost parity with his foreign competitor. In return, the operator agrees to have available at all times the equipment and the know-how to provide frequent, regular, and dependable service to the American businessmen and the vital logistic support required in times of war and national emergency.

The opportunity which has come to me during my 2½ years of service in the Congress and as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has given me the unshakable conviction that support of a strong American merchant marine is one of the cheapest forms of insurance which this Nation can have, and provides the greatest assurance that our foreign trade will develop and prosper. Your voluntary patronage of the American merchant marine will go a long way toward increasing your selling power in the markets of the world.

Asiatic Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram which was sent to the President of the United States by Eugene Carson Blake, president, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America; Ernest A. Gross, chairman, department of international affairs, National Council of Churches; and Walter W. Van Kirk, executive director, department of international affairs, National Council of Churches, concerning the crisis in Asia.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 30, 1955.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House, Washington, D. C.:

We the undersigned officers of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, appeal to you to take all honorable steps to the end that the crisis in Asia of which the Formosa Strait issue is a part, may be peaceably resolved. We look to you to resist the pressure of those who, however sincere, appear to advocate policies that could lead to a third world war. We would regard as extremely unfortunate any course of action in Asia that would imperil the good will and cooperation of our friends and allies.

It is our fervent desire that in this hour of national peril you will once again call upon the American people to exercise patience and restraint; that you will caution against the risks of unilateral action; that you will utilize to the fullest extent such facilities for negotiation as may be available through the United Nations or elsewhere.

The Chinese Communist regime is a force in being, even though we do not recognize it nor deal with it in the United Nations. At present there exists between that regime and our Government only a menacing stalemate. The security of our Nation, as well as our tradition of responsibility in world affairs, requires that every possible effort be made to resolve this problem. We believe negotiation is the most practicable means for seeking solutions consistent with principle. We reject the view that negotiation is appeasement. Appeasement lies in the surrender of principle.

It is true that experience with communism teaches that what passes for negotiation only too often is a cover for deceit. Yet this very fact can, by skillful diplomacy, be converted into a means of enlightening world opinion concerning the pitfalls on the way to peace. We are not competent to suggest what the most effective procedures for negotiation may be under the circumstances currently prevailing. We are convinced,

however, that there is no substitute for negotiation except the arbitrament of force, which creates vastly greater problems than it can ever solve.

EUGENE CARSON BLAKE,
President, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U. S. A.
ERNEST A. GROSS,
Chairman, Department of International Affairs, National Council of Churches.
WALTER W. VAN KIRK,
Executive Director, Department of International Affairs, National Council of Churches.

Proposal To Designate Fort Leonard Wood a Permanent Military Training Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, for more than 2 years now the status and fate of Fort Leonard Wood in the heart of the Ozarks has been hanging in the balance, and in the absence of any official designation as to the permanence of this military installation, the businessmen and civilian population of the surrounding area, as can well be appreciated, have been faced with a serious economic uncertainty with respect to the advisability of maintaining or curtailing the many facilities and services required to accommodate the demands of the military personnel of this post.

Rumors are eternally circulated—always from an allegedly reliable source, of course—that the Army is about to evacuate Fort Leonard Wood in the very near future, and the people of the adjacent area are continually alarmed over the impending abandonment of this installation.

I earnestly hope that the Department of Defense is mindful of the extreme economic displacement and the serious impact upon the prosperity and economic welfare of that whole area which the deactivation of Fort Leonard Wood would entail. I trust, too, that they are aware of the write-off loss to the defense establishment in terms of taxpayer dollars invested in the construction of roads, buildings and other necessary appurtenances that Fort Wood's liquidation would mean.

Accordingly my colleague [Mr. SYMINGTON] and I have repeatedly requested and I am again asking that the Department of the Army resolve this dilemma once and for all by declaring Fort Leonard Wood a permanent installation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution which was adopted by unanimous vote of the Missouri House of Representatives on May 3, 1955, urging that Fort Leonard Wood be designated a permanent military installation and operated as a permanent military training center, as well as two editorials which have been brought to my attention and which appeared recently in the Springfield (Mo.) News-Leader.

There being no objection, the resolution and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Resolution 123

Whereas Fort Leonard Wood has served as the training area for thousands of members of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas Fort Leonard Wood is strategically located in the heart of Missouri's rugged hill country and is climatically situated so that military personnel can be trained under all weather conditions and over a varied terrain which is recognized as one of the best training areas in the United States; and

Whereas the United States has spent great sums of money on Fort Leonard Wood and has one of the greatest concentrations of earth-moving equipment in the world at Fort Wood for the training of Army engineers; and

Whereas Fort Leonard Wood has been designated and is now operating as a temporary installation; and

Whereas Fort Leonard Wood is of great value to the Nation and to Missouri and the closing of Fort Wood would be harmful to the State and Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this house earnestly urge that Fort Leonard Wood be designated a permanent military installation and operated as a permanent military training center; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk send copies of this resolution to the Members of Congress from Missouri.

Adopted May 3, 1955.

[From the Springfield (Mo.) News-Leader]

MAKE FORT LEONARD WOOD PERMANENT

Large sums spent on Army post and its importance for training engineers would make it unsound to abandon installation, yet that threat exists as long as fort has temporary status, editorial says; Missouri should urge Pentagon to change classification.

The unestimable value of Fort Leonard Wood to the Government as a whole, and to Missouri and the Ozarks in particular, is taken for granted, but there's an alarming indication that it won't always be like this.

For Fort Leonard Wood, it has only recently been reemphasized, is still designated as a temporary installation by the Department of the Army and could conceivably be ordered closed sometime early in 1956.

The War Department Installation Board recommended that "temporary" designation for Fort Leonard Wood in 1946, and in March of that year the installation was inactivated.

In August 1950, the installation was reactivated as a training center to support the expansion of the Army brought about by the Korean action, and in 1952 the findings of the 1946 board were reiterated. Fort Wood was only a temporary setup.

Last month another survey of temporary Army camps was made and Fort Wood was retained in the "temporary" classification, but given an additional year's lease on life.

Army Secretary Robert T. Stevens has informed Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS that another study will be made late this year or possibly early in 1956. Transfer to a "permanent" designation for the Missouri installation ought to be sought by all influential groups in the State, not only from a standpoint of economics but because of the benefits that may one day be reaped for the Nation as a whole.

Just as Fort Benning is a permanent setup for the infantry and Fort Sill a permanent installation for the artillery, then Fort Wood is deserving of such a status on behalf of the engineers.

Fort Leonard Wood, located in some of Missouri's most rugged hill country, offers ideal terrain for the training of engineers. A great deal of money has been spent on the camp, and it is now said to house the greatest concentration of earth-moving equipment in the world.

It would seem unsound economically to abandon such facilities in the light of world conditions, and this threat will exist as long as the Department of the Army continues a policy of evaluating its so-called "temporary" installations on a year-to-year basis.

Congressman Dewey Short and Senators Hennings and Stuart Symington no doubt feel the urgency of having Fort Leonard Wood clasisfied as a permanent installation, but their activities on behalf of this may only be prodded by the opinions of their constituents.

[From the Springfield (Mo.) News-Leader of April 17, 1955]

WHY NOT PERMANENT STATUS FOR FORT LEONARD WOOD?

The unestimable value of Fort Leonard Wood to the Government as a whole, and to Missouri and the Ozarks in particular, is taken for granted, but there's an alarming indication that it won't always be like this.

For Fort Leonard Wood, it has only recently been reemphasized, is still designated as a temporary installation by the Department of the Army and could conceivably be ordered closed sometime early in 1956.

The War Department Installation Board recommended that "temporary" designation for Fort Leonard Wood in 1946, and in March of that year the installation was inactivated.

In August 1950, the installation was reactivated as a training center to support the expansion of the Army brought about by the Korean action, and in 1952 the findings of the 1946 board were reiterated—Fort Wood was only a temporary setup. Last month another survey of temporary Army camps was made and Fort Wood was retained in the temporary classification, but given an additional year's lease on life.

Army Secretary Robert T. Stevens has informed Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS that another study will be made late this year or early in 1956.

Transfer to permanent designation for the Missouri installation ought to be sought by all influential groups in the State, not only from a standpoint of economics but because of the benefits that may one day be reaped for the Nation as a whole.

Just as Fort Benning is a permanent setup for the infantry and Fort Sill a permanent installation for the artillery, then Fort Wood is deserving of such a status on behalf of the engineers.

Fort Leonard Wood, located in some of Missouri's most rugged hill country, offers ideal terrain for the training of engineers. A great deal of money has been spent on the camp, and it is now said to house the greatest concentration of earth-moving equipment in the world.

It would seem unsound economically to abandon such facilities in the light of world conditions, and this threat will exist as long as the Department of the Army continues a policy of evaluating its so-called temporary installations on a year-to-year basis.

Congressman DEWEY SHORT and Senators HENNINGS and STUART SYMINGTON no doubt feel the urgency of having Fort Leonard Wood classified as a permanent installation, but their activities on behalf of this may only be prodded by the opinions of their constituents.

Loss of Water Points Up Need for Dam at Waco, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, some 2 weeks ago I appeared with several citizens from Waco, Tex., before a Senate subcommittee to urge an appropriation to complete final plans for the building of Waco Dam and Reservoir, an authorized project on the Bosque River, in Texas.

Since then, various areas of my State have been blessed with heavy rainfall. And once again, as so often has happened in the past, a substantial percentage of the total rainfall has roared down into the Gulf of Mexico—lost to use in the cities and on the farms along the way.

A news story in the Waco News-Tribune for May 20 tells what happened with respect to Lake Waco when the rain came. This story so graphically points up the vital necessity of carrying forward these water conservation and flood-control projects that I commend it to the attention of all Senators.

I ask unanimous consent that the news story from the Waco News-Tribune be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Waco lost a 6-month supply of water Thursday because Lake Waco couldn't hold a drop of the new rainfall on the Bosque watersheds, and the loss was called a perfect illustration of why a new and larger dam on the Bosque is needed.

Bassett Watson, flood control committee chairman of Waco Chamber of Commerce, said sadly as he looked at a picture of the water roading out of Lake Waco.

DOWN TO GULF

"There it goes to the Gulf of Mexico. If the new dam were in place we could have caught and kept every drop of this week's rains. We would have enough water for Waco and plenty left over for the irrigation farmers down the Brazos."

Watson returned a week ago from Washington where he and other Wacoans asked Congress to start appropriating money for the new Waco Dam, $100,000 this year to complete final plans.

Lake Waco built to hold 39,000 acre-feet of water in 1929, now has rest of its reservoir being filled with silt.

BOSQUE RUNS FULL

The Bosque rivers and creeks tributary to them were running full Thursday afternoon following heavy rains early Thursday morning.

The early morning rains dumped 2.16 inches at the Weather Bureau at Waco Municipal Airport up to 1.6 inches elsewhere in town.

Gatesville area had more than 5 inches early Thursday, Erath 4.10, Gholson and China Spring 3.6, West 3.55, Rock Creek and Leroy 3.00 and other spots in the Waco area from an inch to 2 inches.

SHOWERS STILL FALLING

Late Thursday afternoon the Waco Weather Bureau reported showers in progress about 60 miles to the southwest and northwest of Waco. There was a possibility of showers in Waco before sunrise Friday.

Most Central Texas streams which overflowed their banks from heavy rains Wednesday night and early Thursday were falling Thursday night.

The Bosque River was still rising at Valley Mills and was expected to dump more water into Lake Waco Thursday night.

The Salk Antipolio Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the May 19 issue of that fine periodical, the Reporter magazine, contained a page of newsnotes concerning the unfortunate management of the Salk vaccine affair.

This report deals with the contrast between the way this vital business was handled in New York City, and the way it was handled in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that this column, entitled "The Reporter's Notes," from the Reporter magazine of May 19, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOLUNTARY ACTION

Back in the fall of last year the health authorities of the city of New York mobilized their energies to deal with what they knew might soon become the greatest opportunity in preventive medicine in our time—the Salk polio vaccine. While nationwide tests to prove its effectiveness were still under way, Dr. Leona Baumgartner, the city's health commissioner, told the New York Times on October 24, 1954, that her office was making plans to protect as many children as possible if the vaccine should prove effective, and had worked out priorities and allocations. After April 12 of this year, when the historic announcement of the vaccine's success was made at Ann Arbor, Mich., New York City's preparations were complete.

With the news out, we went to Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby's Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington to see whether it had similarly prepared itself for the great event. Unfortunately it seemed that it hadn't. The director of public relations (a portly white-haired man who wanted to be referred to as the "spokesman for the Department" but not by name) told us that aside from arranging photographic coverage of Secretary Hobby signing the licenses for vaccine manufacture, absolutely no plans had been made in advance. "How could we? We had to wait for a Presidential directive, which came 2 days after the announcement." And why didn't Mrs. Hobby ask for a directive in advance? "Mrs. Hobby is a member of the team," he bristled. "She doesn't go bursting in before she's invited."

It was not until 10 days after the April 12 announcement that Mrs. Hobby's Department held its first conference to deal with the urgent issues of vaccine distribution, allocation of priorities, Federal versus voluntary controls, and an incipient black market. By that time, something like a panic had spread across the country, caused by the news that the wonder drug was going to remain for some time in extremely short supply. Finally, on the first weekend in May, Mrs. Hobby got around to submitting her recommendations to the President—after four of the precious weeks between the original announcement and the end of the school year had elapsed.

"The Federal Government, the only authority capable of exercising national controls, made no serious effort, before the release of the report to anticipate its responsibilities," the New York Herald Tribune charged in a front-page editorial.

"But," protested the spokesman for the Department, "nobody told us anything. We thought the Polio Foundation was going to have enough vaccine to take care of all the children."

Why didn't they find out? "On what authority?" he asked smugly. "Mrs. Hobby can't interfere in a contractual arrangement between the Polio Foundation and private enterprise, the six firms that made the vaccine. They could have told her to go to hell." He granted that "rumors" of the vaccine's effectiveness were out a full month before the official report, but "the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare doesn't act on rumors. Why, if we had held a conference in advance, we could have been criticized for helping to spread the rumors."

So the Department did not act. To public-health authorities other than Mrs. Hobby's, the nationwide tests of the vaccine during 1954, involving nearly 2 million inoculations, were more than "rumors." When the Eisenhower administration set up a brand-new Department that for the first time in our history placed matters of national health on a Cabinet level and installed Mrs. Hobby in it, its intention was presumably to devote special governmental attention to health—not just to give a Cabinet position to Mrs. Hobby.

The Department seems to be interested, above all, in principles. "Wouldn't it be a wonderful thing," the spokesman asked us, "if Americans could prove to the world that voluntary controls will work?" We thought than an even more wonderful thing would be to eradicate polio.

"Is the Department going to crack down on the black market?" we asked the spokesman. "We have no information about that directly," he said. "People seem to give those stories to the newspapers instead of to us." Was the Department looking for violators? "Well," he answered, "our medical officers are supposed to report infractions, if they find any. But enforcement, of course, is up to the Department of Justice."

Nonsubsidized All-Cargo Air Service Across the Atlantic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD 2 editorials by the Chicago Daily Tribune, 1 by the New York Times, 2 by the Washington Post, 1 by the Washington Star, and a feature article by the Army-Navy-Air Force Register, all concerning the failure of the White House in the last 10 months yet to have approved the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board to certificate a nonsubsidized all-cargo air service across the Atlantic.

The recent action by the Congress in reducing the amount of public money to be devoted to subsidizing our international airlines emphasizes the fact that issuance of nonsubsidized airline certificates offers the President the best opportunity to insure the continuation of essential United States airline services abroad without flying in the face of the congressional action in reducing subsidies.

It is additionally disturbing, Mr. President, that while the American applicant has been held up, a British applicant has been given Presidential approval and is today advertising in our trade journals that this British company is the only scheduled all-cargo air service operating between our country and Europe. As the Civil Aeronautics Board itself noted—a year and a half ago—it would be thoroughly inconsistent for the United States Government to find—as it has found—that the public convenience and necessity requires a permit to be given to a British freight line, while at the same time denying a certificate to our American applicant.

I am sure the White House ought to, in all fairness, take the position that the American applicant should be given equal opportunity with the British line.

Delay in White House approval of this case is not only letting our British friends get the jump on us, but is also dangerously delaying the development of airlift needed by the military. As long ago as January 12, 1950, the then Deputy Secretary of Defense, the late Stephen Early, wrote the CAB that "the Department favors the certification of an all-cargo service in this area."

It was last June that the Civil Aeronautics Board submitted to the President its decision favoring certification of an American cargo line.

It is time for the President to act.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of March 14, 1955]

BRITAIN FIRST AGAIN

For 7 years a group of American irregular air-freight carriers have been trying to get permission to carry cargoes on regular schedules across the North Atlantic. All applications have been denied by the Civil Aeronautics Board, which for some mysterious reason is opposed to the development of scheduled all-cargo operations by American lines on international routes. Nevertheless, the Board has now ruled that a British line, Airwork, Ltd., may carry on such flights across the North Atlantic from American terminals.

The favored British line has neither the crews nor the aircraft needed to handle the business, and it has little experience in flying the route. The American companies which have been petitioning in vain are well-established freight carriers which have fleets of proved airplanes, much experience, and financial stability. For example, Seaboard & Western Airlines, the acknowledged leader of the group, has flown more than 3,500 Atlantic and Pacific crossings, most of them under military contracts.

The American operators contend that regularly scheduled flights, which would permit shippers to plan deliveries, are the only sound basis on which this business could be established. We do not understand why one or more of the American lines has not been permitted to start such operations long ago, and there is utterly no excuse for the CAB to continue the ban when a foreign operator is permitted to enter the field.

American military men have called the CAB's policy contradictory and shortsighted. Outrageous favoritism is a more accurate way to describe the policy. A congressional investigation to determine who is pulling the strings on the CAB against American interest seems to be overdue.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of May 4, 1954]

AMERICA LAST

Five American air freight operators have been trying in vain to get permission to carry cargoes on regularly scheduled flights across the North Atlantic and on other international routes. One of the companies, Seaboard & Western Airlines, filed its first application with the Civil Aeronautics Board 7 years ago.

This firm, operating under military contracts, has flown more than 3,500 Atlantic and Pacific crossings. It made a fine record for dependability in the air lifts to Berlin and Korea. The company's profits have been used to buy 9 four-engine freighter planes and it has 4 others on order.

This American firm with financial stability and much experience can't get CAB permission for scheduled air freight operations, but a few days ago the CAB ruled that a British airline could make such flights from American terminals. The favored British operator lacks experience on the North Atlantic routes, and at present it has neither crews nor airplanes to conduct the business.

No Government subsidies are involved here. The five petitioning American lines simply want permission to operate on regular schedules so that shippers can depend on regular deliveries and a steady business can be developed. The first companies to offer the service naturally will have a competitive advantage.

The CAB's decision in turning the business over to a British line has been called "contradictory and shortsighted" by American military men, who know the value of having fleets of commercial air carriers which could be converted at any time to military service.

If this discrimination against an American firm is allowed to stand, something is rotten in the CAB and a congressional investigation of its activities would be in order.

[From the New York Times of Mar. 14, 1955]

AIR POLICY DECISIONS

The transportation of overseas cargo by air is steadily increasing. The many American-flag and foreign-flag airlines that carry both passengers and cargo between New York and foreign airports welcomed a newcomer at Idlewild last week. It was the British-flag all-cargo carrier, Airwork Atlantic.

This country's aviation industry hopes that the inauguration of this regular service, welcome as it is, may serve as a reminder to the White House staff that there are a number of crucial air-route questions awaiting Presidential action. One of the oldest cases still undecided is the Trans-Atlantic Cargo Case which has been under consideration for more than 7 years and which has been at the White House since last summer.

Seaboard and Western Airlines filed its application for certification as an unsubsidized all-cargo carrier. It was denied once, and then reopened. Finally, with seventy-odd full days of hearings and a massive printed record of 8,600 pages behind it in this one case, the Civil Aeronautics Board last year accepted a trial examiner's recommendation for the certificate. The Board's recommendation was sent to the White House, where the President has the final word on air-route matters involving foreign services.

The airline meanwhile has been carrying on, under temporary authorization, its irregular but impressive services as an all-freight carrier across the Atlantic. But its operation must remain inadequate and its long-range planning must be held in abeyance so long as its right to fly is limited.

The long record in the case suffers by comparison with the speed with which the Airwork proposal was approved by United States authorities and was put into operation—all in 9 months, from the date of the initial application here to the moment the first plane touched the runway at Idlewild.

[From the Washington Post of September 13, 1954]

COMPETITION IN THE AIR

Some extremely significant decisions involving international air routes of American carriers are or shortly will be before the President for approval. These include the so-called Balboa case, on the interchange of planes on routes to South America; the petition for regular certificates by two irregular carriers, Seaboard & Western and Transocean; the renewal of Northwest Airlines' certificate to Tokyo; and the request of Trans-World Airlines to operate from India to Japan.

In only two of these cases is the recommendation of the Civil Aeronautics Board known. Reportedly the CAB has agreed, after 7 years, that Seaboard & Western should be certificated as an all-cargo carrier across the Atlantic. Reportedly, too, it has recommended renewal of Northwest's northern route to Japan. It is impossible to assess the other recommendations until they are made public. In recent weeks, however, the CAB has seemed to shy away from the chosen instrument, or single overseas airline, philosophy which Secretary of Commerce Weeks and Under Secretary Murray apparently have sought to force upon it. Thus it may be a correct assumption that the Board has voted to broaden rather than restrict the scope of international air operations, a welcome development if true. This newspaper has consistently held the view that, in the absence of overriding considerations, the President ought to accept the recommendations of regulatory agencies.

Particularly in the case of the two irregular carriers, certification seems overdue. Seaboard & Western has amply justified its plea for a nonsubsidized all-cargo operation across the Atlantic. The international freight potential has barely been tapped; and if an American company is willing to expend its own funds in order to develop such business, the administration ought to applaud it. Transocean also has demonstrated, as a nonscheduled operator, that it is a responsible carrier of both passengers and freight. If the trans-Pacific route pattern will not now permit another scheduled carrier, Transocean at least deserves some permanent recognition as an irregular carrier.

In all of these cases the principal opponent has been Pan American World Airways, which also has been the principal proponent of the chosen instrument. Pan American own operations are a valuable backbone of international air service. But experience has proved that competition both stimulates new traffic and is an incentive to more economical operation. It is impossible to apply to international traffic the same standards as those used to judge the more highly developed domestic route structure. There is no more justification now than there has ever been for the chosen instrument, and we hope the President will roundly reject the restrictive course being urged upon him. It would be strange indeed for an administration pledged to free business from unnecessary restraints to place itself in the position of decreeing a monopoly in aviation.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 5, 1955]

AVIATION IN A BOTTLE

In addition to the President's recent double reversal on the question of air routes to Hawaii, there is another international air maneuver in process at the White House. This is what may be termed action by inaction. Since last June the so-called transatlantic cargo case has been before the President for approval or disapproval, neither of which it has received.

Almost 7 years after the case was initiated the CAB voted 3–2 to certificate Seaboard & Western Airlines to operate a nonsubsidized all-cargo service from this country to Europe and the near East. Following the CAB recommendation the case went to the White House in accordance with the requirement of the Civil Aeronautics Act in international route decisions. There it has sat. The failure to act of course nullifies the CAB recommendation quite as effectively as if the President had openly overruled it.

The case is of interest because on Wednesday of this week a British all-cargo carrier, Airwork Atlantic, began service to New York. The air cargo potential across the Atlantic has barely been tapped, and the new service is to be welcomed as the reciprocal part of the bilateral treaty under which two American carriers now serve Britain. It is curious, however, that an American carrier has been kept out of the same service despite CAB and Defense Department approval and despite the fact that it would not be eligible for subsidy.

No doubt as a result of the flipflop over the Northwest Airlines route in the Pacific, Senator MAGNUSON has introduced an amendment to the Civil Aeronautics Act to limit presidential reversals of the CAB to matters directly affecting defense and foreign policy, and to require the President to explain his actions to Congress. This in our judgment would be an unfortunate usurpation of presidential prerogatives. Nevertheless, it ought to be a reminder to the President that he ought not to nullify the findings of regulatory agencies without compelling reason. Perhaps now that the CAB has a full complement of members the President may be induced to take a more critical look at some of the advice he has been receiving from the Department of Commerce on aviation matters.

[From the Evening Star of March 26, 1955]

AIRLINES AWAIT ANSWERS

The American airline industry is waiting for final answers by the Government to three major questions affecting the international operations and the economics of at least a half-dozen of our commercial carriers. Two of these cases call for presidential decisions. The third calls for Civil Aeronautics Board action and international negotiation at the governmental level.

One case, illustrating the harmful effects of delay, involves application by Seaboard and Western Airlines for permission to operate an all-cargo transatlantic service. The application was filed in 1947 and the line has been operating under so-called temporary authorization since that time. In 1954, the CAB recommended certification for S. & W. Since international operating rights require presidential approval, the recommendation was forwarded to the While House, but no action has been forthcoming. Meanwhile, Airwork, Ltd., a British carrier, has been certified and has begun cargo operations between the United States and England. S. & W., still unsure whether its right to fly will be affirmed, is handicapped in its long-range planning. And Pan American World Airways and Trans-World Airlines, opposing the S. & W. certification, remain unsure as to the permanent competitive pattern of transatlantic freight operations.

In a second case, Pan American is awaiting a White House ruling on whether it can compete with Northwest Airlines and several foreign carriers on the Great Circle route between our west coast and the Far East. Although Pan American pioneered this shorter route, it is now compelled to serve the Far East via a time-consuming and more costly island-hopping route through the mid-Pacific. Similarly, American Airlines is awaiting decision on whether it can fly nonstop from New York to Mexico City, a privilege already held by Air France. American is now required to stop at Dallas-Forth Worth, and claims that Air France during the past year has captured 85 percent of the New York-Mexico City traffic on a service likewise pioneered by the United States carrier. Intergovernment agreement is necessary for the American nonstop certification.

Final resolution of these problems is not simple, particularly when political pressures become intermixed with economic factors. There is clear need, however, for definitive rulings by which our own lines can know whether they are in business for more than temporary periods and under what competitive conditions.

[From the Army-Navy-Air Force Register of March 26, 1955]

CARGO AIRLIFT INADEQUATE FOR MILITARY FORCES

In theory, the military air transport will enlist immediately an important percentage of the aircraft in the civil air fleet. It's a nice theory, but the blunt fact is that the bulk of the aircraft in the American commercial air fleets are passenger aircraft. There has been blithe talk of modifying these planes to permit them to carry bulk cargo, but such talk ignores the obvious fact that at the moment they would be needed—that is, on the outbreak of war or the declaration of a national emergency—there would not be engineers, labor, or materials to convert passenger aircraft to freight carriers.

Nevertheless, the aircraft available from the civil airlines are cataloged, classified, and assigned, under the aegis of the Defense Air Transportation Administration in the Commerce Department, and when so classified and allocated are known as the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, or "CRAF."

It is significant that the Air Force and other potential military users of these planes count their capacity in "DC–4 equivalents"—that is, in terms of the cargo capacity of the long-since obsolete, but still used and usable, C–54's of World War II design.

There exists in CRAF, in fact, exactly 13 modern cargo aircraft—a modern cargo aircraft being defined as one that can lift 30,000 pounds or more for a distance of 2,500 miles or better. All 13 of these aircraft are DC–6A's—3 owned by American Airlines, 3 by Flying Tiger, 5 by Northwest Airlines, and 2 by Slick.

Sometime this year, probably within the next few weeks when DATA makes another allocation of planes to CRAF with the concurrence of the airlines involved, there will be added to CRAF four freight-built Super Constellations, owned by Seaboard & Western Airlines of New York. These are the only freight-built Super Connies operated by any airline in the world.

Seaboard & Western, an irregular or nonscheduled transatlantic carrier, has been trying for nearly 8 years to get a certificate to operate an unsubsidized, all-cargo air service between the east coast of the United States and points in Western Europe and the Middle East. The Civil Aeronautics Board recommended last May that it be granted a certificate, and the CAB recommendation has been lying in the White House since, awaiting the President's approval as required by law.

S. & W. CERTIFICATION OPPOSED

Pan American World Airways and Trans World Airlines have opposed its certification, or the certification of any all-cargo lines over the Atlantic, on the ground that any business obtained by such an operation would be at the cost of diverting traffic from the presently certificated combination lines—PanAm and TWA.

Seaboard & Western started from scratch in 1946—its first flight was in May 1947—but it has built up an impressive business despite the disadvantages inherent in the prohibition against regular schedules. At the same time, the cargo business of Pan-Am and TWA has increased impressively, as has the total cargo business of all transatlantic carriers—in fact, despite the absolute increase of tonnage carried by certificated American carriers during that period, the overall air-cargo business has mounted so steadily as a result of aggressive sales by foreign-flag carriers that the American share of the business has dropped from nearly 80 percent in 1947 to about 30 percent of the total now.

Nevertheless, and despite the Defense Department support of a certificate for an all-cargo carrier, the "chosen instrument" theory of the American airline business seems to be so deeply ingrained that Willis P. Lipscomb, PAA vice president for traffic and sales, could and did testify during hearings on the application of Seaboard & Western and several other lines before a CAB examiner that any business developed by another carrier would be a diversion from PAA, because if the other carrier were not certificated, the business probably would be obtained by PAA when it got to the point of providing the service.

President Eisenhower has had before him for 10 months the CAB recommendation that Seaboard & Western be granted a certificate, so that by scheduling regular flights, it can expand the phenomenal all-cargo business it has developed into something even more impressive—and without airmail contracts, or Federal subsidy.

The addition to CRAF of Seaboard & Western's four Super Constellation freight airplanes, or the addition of more modern aircraft which S & W may buy in the future, is not going to solve the strategic airlift problem of the military services. But it is going to help—the four Super Connies by a total of better than 70 tons of bulk cargo capacity.

And the state of existing and potential military airlift being what it is, a Government policy of permitting all-cargo airlines to risk their own money in developing airlift capability may have become more vital to the national interest than protecting the subsidized passenger lines in their route monopolies.

Editorial Opinion Concerning Reelection of President Eisenhower

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, we of Maine have in one of our communities one of the best editorial writers in the Nation. He has a rare knack of getting to the heart of a matter with a minimum of words. In fact, he makes his words work for him instead of working for words himself. His unusual ability to find and use the right words gives

him the greatest effective return per word on reader acceptance of his pungent logic.

I speak of Mr. Edward R. Stanley, managing editor of the Pittsfield (Maine) Advertiser. An example of his skill is a recent editorial he wrote about a speech I made. I say this not because the editorial is complimentary to me, but rather because of all editorial comment made on my speech about my impression that President Eisenhower wishes to retire after 1956 Mr. Stanley has most accurately interpreted the theme of my remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUND ADVICE

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, speaking before the Republican Women's National Conference in Washington on May 11, gave the women of her party some sound advice. Senator SMITH's speech has since been widely misquoted, particularly by the headline writers, whose goal so often seems to be to make sensation out of common sense.

The Senator's thesis was a simple one: That President Eisenhower might not seek reelection next year, and that if he did not, then the Republican Party would be facing an uphill fight to retain the White House. She did not say that the President would not seek reelection; she merely stated that she was not sure that he would, pointing out that her impression was that the President would prefer to retire after 1956. Journalists the Nation over seized upon this expression of opinion as grounds for bold headlines stating categorically that Senator SMITH had predicted the President would not run again. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

In the excitement over the misconstrued version of one small paragraph in the Senator's address, the real meat of her speech was largely ignored. It is unfortunate that this was so, for Senator SMITH had some very sound advise for Republicans—and not only for Republicans, but for all who believe in and cherish the two-party system in a democracy.

Senator SMITH warned her party against the folly of so depending on the personal popularity of the present Chief Executive as to ignore the necessity of developing not one but many qualified leaders to present to the people as candidates for high office in the land. Having seen at first hand the consequences to the Democratic Party of 20 years of virtual dependence on the personal popularity of the late President Roosevelt, Mrs. SMITH apparently does not wish to see the Republican Party make the same error.

Maine's senior Senator does not believe in the indispensable man. President Eisenhower himself is one of the most outspoken in his opposition to those who would base Republican success solidly on the thesis that the Nation needs Eisenhower. Indeed, it is difficult to see how anyone with real faith in democracy could subscribe to the theory that a great Nation like America must have the leadership of a single one of its 160 millions in order to prosper and flourish.

If Republicans will but heed Senator SMITH'S advice and cast about their party for good leaders, men with real qualifications for the presidency, they may well be surprised to find how many there are who would fill the bill. In any event, whether they find 2 or 20, they will be doing their party a real service and, more important, they will be rendering the Nation the tribute of faith in the democratic system.

Hells Canyon's New Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which is entitled "Hells Canyon's New Lock."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The results of a year's hearings are in, and they give Secretary McKay ample cause for an agonizing reappraisal of his duty at Hells Canyon.

This waterpower site on the Snake River, a tributary of the Columbia, on the Idaho-Oregon border, is one of the richest remaining undeveloped in the Nation. It is situated in a region which has been held back by inadequate supplies of electric power, and which needs its waterpower potential developed to the maximum.

A high dam at Hells Canyon to achieve maximum development there was planned by the Reclamation Bureau of the Department of the Interior until Mr. McKay became Secretary. He then announced that he was relinquishing the site in favor of the Idaho Power Co. That private utility had applied to build two low dams, Brownlee and Hells Canyon, along the same stretch of river, with the possibility of building a third, Oxbow, at some later date.

It is this three-dam system whose merits a Federal Power Commissioner examiner has gone into, and compared with the originally proposed Bureau of Reclamation project, in hearings extending over a year.

Examiner William J. Costello now concludes in effect that the Federal project would be preferable if it were going to be built, but that it is not going to be built and therefore the Idaho Power Dam project is preferable.

On this line of reasoning, Henry Ford's plan for private exploitation of Muscle Shoals would have been preferable to TVA. But is it the FPC's job to estimate the political prospects of controversial projects? The real question for the FPC to decide is whether this finding follows the mandate laid by Congress upon the FPC to issue licenses only for projects "best adapted to a comprehensive plan for improving or developing a waterway."

Of the three dams in the proposed Idaho Power system, the examiner recommends that the FPC license only Brownlee. FPC's legal staff had earlier recommended licensing of all three projects. Examiner Costello says the cost of producing power would be raised to more than 6 mills a kilowatt-hour if Oxbow and Hells Canyon were added to the Brownlee project. No market could reasonably be predicted for the power at so high a price, he says, and construction of the second and third dams is therefore clearly not in the public interest. This despite the fact that "there is a crying need for firmpower additions in the Northwest."

Secretary McKay himself 2 years ago observed that the Northwest was critically short of power. Arguing that the Idaho Power Co. project could begin overcoming that shortage sooner than the public project, he contended that the power generated at three low dams would be 87 percent of that generated at one high dam.

Now, however, Idaho Power's 3 low dams have shrunk to 1 low dam. And if only Brownlee Dam were built, in accordance with the examiner's recommendations, the amount of power realized from the Hells Canyon stretch of the Snake River would be only 40 percent of what 1 high public dam would supply. If Brownlee were built, moreover, it would forever foreclose the high dam, by standing in the area which the latter's reservoir would have to occupy.

Is the Pacific Northwest, is the Nation, going to be content with less than half-way development of the rich and much-needed power potential at Hells Canyon?

Now that the allegations of fact on which Secretary McKay sought to justify his relinquishment of the site no longer apply, will the Secretary reinstate the Federal project, or will he insist on an extravagant waste of over half the usefulness of this great natural resource?

Federal Control of Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAGE BELCHER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following letter from the mayor of the city of Tulsa, Okla., the Honorable L. C. Clark, to the mayor of Philadelphia, the Honorable Joseph S. Clark, Jr., with which I thoroughly concur:

CITY OF TULSA,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
May 16, 1955.

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK, Jr.,
Mayor of Philadelphia,
City Hall, Philadelphia, Pa.

MY DEAR MAYOR CLARK: This is in further response to your invitation to me to join in the mayor's committee instituted by yourself, Mayor Lawrence of Pittsburgh, and Mayor Wagner of New York, to oppose legislation now pending in the Congress to clarify the Natural Gas Act of 1938 so as to exempt local production and gathering of natural gas from Federal controls.

I reiterate my position that I regard such controls to be not only an infringement of States rights which would conflict with and destroy oil and gas conservation programs of all our producing States, but also wholly inconsistent with the public interest and with our American free enterprise system.

For the record, I want to say that I neither own nor have an interest in natural gas production. My interest is as mayor of a growing municipality whose residents are dependent virtually 100 percent on natural gas as a fuel. Anything which would discourage the continuous drilling for and development of natural gas is a threat not only to the consumers of Philadelphia, but to Tulsa. Controls over the natural gas producer would unquestionably discourage the search for, and reduce the supply, of gas.

In Tulsa, natural gas is a bargain. Our people use natural gas for cooking, heating, hot water heating, and refrigeration. For this service, the average Tulsa family paid last year, I am informed, a total of $61.33. I know of no other commodity which provides more comfort and convenience for a full year, for so little.

Claims have been made that northeastern area gas consumers have been faced with "continuous" gas rate increases. This may be true; I do not know. However, by contrast, I would point out that in Tulsa there have been only 5 natural gas consumer rate

adjustments since the year 1923, and 3 of these have been downward.

It is therefore obvious that if consumers of other areas have been "harassed" by rate increases, the normal producer price is not the cause. Tulsa is served from the same producing areas as many Northeastern municipalities. Our advantage is being close to supply. I question whether mere men, sitting in Washington, could juggle the natural economic laws so as to remove the disparity in price in all sections of our country.

I can only conclude that if natural-gas rates are unreasonable in Philadelphia or New York, or Boston, the cause lies in the cost of transportation and distribution from our great Southwest to such distant points. By any accepted standard, natural gas produced in the Southwest, at the well, is today the cheapest fuel at the source of production—on a heat-value basis—in the entire world.

I am profoundly disturbed by the growing misunderstanding of facts which to me seem obvious in this matter. I feel that someone in the business of promoting centralized bureaucracy in our beloved country must be working overtime to have planted so many seeds of mistrust against a basic American industry which is composed of average Americans, employs average Americans, and has so well served average Americans.

Historically, our country has established so-called rate controls as consumer protection only in instances involving utility or monopoly-franchise operations. Natural gas producing activities can by no yardstick be classified as a utility function. In Oklahoma hundreds of producers compete as gas producers in single fields, and sell their gas competitively to willing buyers at fair prices. The facts do not support your contention that "a small group of oil companies" control natural-gas production.

To give small, individual natural gas producers the status of Federal public utilities would be setting a dangerous precedent in America. If we do this in 1955, in 1956 it will be oil, then coal, then lumber, and cattle, and wheat. To lay the withering hand of Federal control on local community production is the first step toward state socialism. To me this would violate all concepts of our free-competitive system which has made our economy the most dynamic and productive in the history of mankind.

The natural-gas producer has never been controlled. When Congress wrote the Natural Gas Act it specified that he would be exempt from Federal regulation. In 17 years operating freely under the act, natural-gas producers continuously found and made available increasing supplies of natural gas. When supply of any commodity is adequate the consumer is protected. When shortage occurs, as it always does under OPA treatment, the consumer becomes the victim.

Natural-gas prices at the well were not even controlled in wartime. The thinking American needs but reflect on what happened to prices and availability of commodities which had controlled prices at the point of production, under OPA, to revolt at the thought of that type of treatment of any material, service, or commodity. Meat is a case in point. Under OPA meat became practically nonexistent, and our people could hardly afford the little that was available "under the counter."

I am sure the American housewife does not want to be deprived of natural gas because of short-sighted and unneeded control policies.

Evidence already presented in hearings befor the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which is considering the Harris amendment to restore natural-gas production to a competitive position in our economy, has fully acquited the gas producer of any unfair treatment of consumers.

For example, it was brought out that natural gas sold in New York at $2.42 per thousand cubic feet was purchased from southwestern producers for 8 cents per thousand cubic feet. Thus, the producer received only 3 cents of each dollar paid by the average New York consumer of natural gas. Is this a situation which demands OPA treatment?

If the price of $2.42 in New York is too high, this conclusively illustrates to me that either (1) New York utility regulatory authorities have not adequately safeguarded consumer interests, or (2) it is not economically practical to transport and distribute natural gas to such distant points. In either case, I fail to see how any fair American could seek to penalize the producer of gas with crippling bureaucratic controls.

I am informed that a Cabinet-level committee appointed by President Eisenhower has fully studied the natural-gas problem and has recommended that local production of gas be excluded from Federal regulation. Furthermore, the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, which agency would have the job of controlling gas production, testified before Congress that legislation exempting gas production from controls should have the approval of Congress.

The FPC Chairman spoke, in his testimony, for 4 of the 5 members of the Commission. These Commissioners supported corrective legislation to exempt gas producers from regulation, according to the Chairman's statement, because "we firmly believe that such legislation will in the long run result in the greatest good to the largest number of people in this country."

I believe the FPC Chairman was upholding a principle. His testimony expressed the position of public servants whose experience has been in the field of regulating the natural-gas industry. I can only concur in what these public officials have said.

I reaffirm that my position in this matter is dictated only by my belief in our competitive system. I have no confidence in controlism, when it is so utterly and obviously unnecessary as in this instance.

I wish to make one other point. It is the little fellows who find the gas used in Philadelphia, and throughout our Nation. Small, independent, risk-taking producers have found more than 75 percent of the oil and gas developed in America. In our southwestern press, many of these men have already served notice that they will not commit newly discovered gas to interstate use, unless the Natural Gas Act is clarified so as to reaffirm its original intent to exempt gas production from Federal control. If such a situation should develop, Philadelphia consumers cannot escape paying more money for less gas. As gas supplies dwindle, the pipeline companies and distributors will still get their fixed percentage of return on investment. When they are accorded the same percentage of return on a smaller volume of gas, only the consumer will pay the bill.

It is my hope that you, and others in responsible positions of public trust, will not be persuaded to continue fighting to make the gas producer a pawn of bureaucracy. Because of my strong conviction that the producers, the consumer and America will all be the losers, I am taking the liberty of sending this letter to all of those mayors who have expressed their intent to support controls of the natural-gas industry in the Congress.

You have my apologies for the length of this letter. However, I feel its length is justified by the importance of the subject.

With every confidence in your judgment in this most important issue, I am,

Very truly yours,

L. C. CLARK,
Mayor, City of Tulsa.

Retirement of Maj. Gen. Byron E. Gates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the News Gazette of Champaign-Urbana, Ill., which recites the military career of Gen. Byron E. Gates, who retired last week under Army regulations relating to age.

The vast throng which assembled at the retirement ceremonies at Chanute Field, Ill., on Sunday, May 23, was a fitting testimonial to the outstanding service rendered by General Gates and to the sweet and happy relationships which he maintained with the people in the State of Illinois, particularly in the area of Chanute Field.

The editorial not only expresses my feelings about his services, but also those of thousands and thousands of other people.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL GATES' RECORD SETS HIGH STANDARD FOR FUTURE

Seldom have civilians been able to join in military ceremonies with the respect and appreciation they will have for the honors to be accorded Maj. Gen. B. E. Gates at Chanute Air Force Base today.

General Gates does not officially end his 38-year military career until May 31, but his formal retirement ceremonies have been combined with Armed Forces Day—the weekend when the military forces traditionally report to the American people who maintain them. For General Gates, this is singularly appropriate because throughout his career he has sought to serve people rather than polish the brass. In doing so, he has established, at least to his own satisfaction, that there need be no conflict between the American way of life and a strong military force.

Had General Gates been interested in polishing military brass for his personal advantage, he would never have accomplished what he did at Chanute. Indeed, he would never have been there, for 5 years ago Chanute was one of the sorriest commands in the Air Force. Most of his predecessors did no wrong by the simple expedient of doing nothing except curry the favor of higher headquarters for a transfer.

By contrast General Gates asked for assignment to Chanute because he had believed since he was a lieutenant in 1921 that it had great possibilities. In 5 years he has justified his belief. The base he accepted as one of the worst now is recognized as one of the Air Force's best as he turns it over to his replacement.

But, even more beneficial than the physical improvements has been the basic philosophy by which they were accomplished. The general demonstrated through aggressive leadership that Americans can help themselves to a better way of life, be they military or civilians.

This typically Midwest area, which had seen military commanders come and go with little impression, first became aware of this general and his philosophy when he announced soon after his arrival that Chanute

would send no air police into civilian communities as long as he was in command. His men would become a part of the civilian community and act like it, asking only that they be treated with the respect they earned. His philosophy was soon justified as his men became a real credit to the community, rather than a group which required special policing.

General Gates figuratively "tore down the fence" that had divided them, and this area of Illinois and the Air Force came to understand one another. The community watched and then pitched in to help as the general planted trees on a barren base and vowed he would achieve decent living conditions for families of men on whom the Nation's air power depends.

His most frequent statement of "you can't get something for nothing" became the axiom of the base and its neighbors alike. While other bases looked to Washington in vain for such things as housing, recreation facilities, and family medical care, General Gates developed them at Chanute by leading men to improve their conditions by their own efforts.

The results of his leadership will be there for all to see Sunday when General Gates takes the final review of the troops he has served as well as commanded.

General Gates began his career with the Flying Jennies of World War I. It took him through World War II when the full potential of air power was demonstrated. As he steps down, he leaves behind him a great technical school where men can live in decent conditions while they learn to maintain the supersonic jets of the future.

But, even more important than any of the aviation developments in which he has had an active role, he leaves renewed faith that America can be kept strong militarily in these days of jets and hydrogen bombs by the same basic philosophy that guided his parents over the western plains in a covered wagon. That is an accomplishment that deserves civilian as well as military honors.

The Champaign-Urbana-Rantoul community is fortunate that General Gates has decided to live among us after he turns in his suit. So long as he is here, we will continue to benefit by his combination of leadership and service.

On Armed Forces Day, the military shows of its weapons and its manpower. We, in this community, who have seen the results he obtained, can only hope that the future leadership of the Armed Forces will continue the standard General Gates has set at Chanute Air Force Base.

Address by Dr. Robert M. Hutchins Before American Society of Newspaper Editors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, if it has not already been printed there, an address delivered by Dr. Robert M. Hutchins before the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF HUTCHINS SPEECH BEFORE SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS

Twenty-five years ago, almost to the day, I last had the honor of addressing this society. The quarter of a century between has been the longest in history. That was a different world, before the depression, before the New Deal, before the Newspaper Guild, before the suburbs, before they charged for newsprint, before the atom, before television. It was a world in which you were powerful and numerous. You are powerful still; but some 800 papers that were alive then are gone now. Twenty-five years hence, when I am 81, where will you be?

When I was here last, I said, "the greatest aggregation of educational foundations is the press itself. * * * If the American press does not need or cannot get the leadership of some endowed newspapers, we must fall back on the long process of education through educational institutions, hoping that in the long run we may produce a generation that will demand better things of you. This process will be tedious and difficult, because of the power of the press itself over the minds and habits of those whom the educational institutions produce."

You paid no attention. Well, I would merely remind you that a great many men who paid no attention then are not here now.

RECALLS 1947 REPORT

I joined in another effort in your behalf in 1947, when the report of the Commission on the Freedom of the Press appeared. The commission felt a little sad. It said, "the outstanding fact about the communications industry today is that the number of its units has declined." It expressed a high opinion of your role in life, for it said: "Freedom of speech and freedom of the press are moral rights which the State must not infringe." And again, "We must recognize that the agencies of mass communication are an educational instrument, perhaps the most powerful there is."

You were furious. Your president issued a statement in 6 paragraphs, in 3 of which he said that the members of the commission were "leftwing," and in all of which he stated his conviction that, since most of the members of the commission were professors without experience in the newspaper business, nothing they said could be of any importance, although it might be dangerous. At the meeting of this society in 1947, to which I had accepted to be invited to receive your congratulations, the only thing that saved me from condemnation was the expressed unwillingness of your committee to "dignify" me by such action.

All over the country you attacked the report. I hope you will read it sometime. But for fear you won't, I shall quote a passage from it that will give you the main idea: "If modern society requires great agencies of mass communication, if these concentrations become so powerful that they are a threat to democracy, if democracy cannot solve the problem simply by breaking them up—then those agencies must control themselves or be controlled by government. If they are controlled by government, we lose our chief safeguard against totalitarianism—and at the same time take a long step toward it."

BRITISH REPORT DISCUSSED

A kind of neurotic sensitivity is characteristic of the press throughout the English-speaking world. The British papers were outraged by the report of the Royal Commission of the Press, which was almost as mild as ours. I don't know what makes you feel this way. After all, in this country you have a special amendment to the Constitution, and the first one at that, protecting you. Perhaps it is this special dignity that sometimes leads you to confuse your private interests with those of the public. One of the most celebrated managing editors in the country told our commission that the only threat to the freedom of the press was the Newspaper Guild and that all we had to do was to adopt a resolution denouncing the Guild and go home. Most papers saw Marshall Field's suit against the A. P. (Associated Press) as the end of freedom of the press. All he wanted to do to the A. P. was to join it. About once a week you break out in exasperation against anybody who tries to keep anything from you, for reasons of state or for any reasan at all. You are the only uncriticized institution in the country. You will not criticize one another, and any suggestion that anybody else might do so sets you to muttering about the first amendment.

I know that lately life has been hard for you. And it may get even worse; for it may turn out that reading is an anachronism. When I was a boy, reading was the only established and available path to knowledge, information, or even entertainment. But the other day in Hollywood I met a man who was putting the great books on records. Everything else has already been put on records or films. One glance at the children making for the television set on their return from school is enough to show that this is a different world. The habit of reading, which my generation fell into, may have too much competition.

The competition may win, Gresham's law of culture is that easy stuff drives out hard. It is harder to read, even after Dr. Flesch has finished with the printed page, than it is to look and listen. I do not believe that newspapers can do what comic books, picture magazines, motion pictures, and television can do in glorious technicolor. Since they can do this kind of thing better, why should you do it at all?

You may say it is the only way to survive. John Cowles suggests it may be a way to die. In his Sigma Delta Chi speech he said newspapers have realized that complete and fair coverage builds circulation. With few exceptions, he said, those newspapers which "have had the heaviest circulation losses are not papers that regard full and fair news presentation as their primary function and reason for existence." If so good a businessman as Mr. Cowles can think there is any chance that sensationalism and entertainment are not good for business, a layman may perhaps be forgiven for being impressed.

Embolded by his example, I will say that newspapers should do as well as they can the things that they can do best, and they should leave to others the responsibility of entertaining the public. If you are worried about who is going to discharge that responsibility, read the March 21 issue of Newsweek, which says that television is abandoning John Hopkins Science Review, Princeton, 1955, and The Search. These programs have won many honors and audiences that look large to people who do not work in advertising agencies.

QUOTES HENRY LUCE

A couple of years ago Henry Luce was discussing the monopoly newspaper. He said the argument against it was that it deprived the community of differing presentations of news and opinions. He went on, "like so many high-brow discussions about newspapers (I notice that journalists invariably use the word 'high-brow' when referring to criticisms of the press, even when, as in this case, the truth of the criticism is self-evident to the merest moron) this one is fine, except that it ignores the actual nature of a newspaper. Does any one feel strongly that a city ought to have several newspapers in order to offer the community a greater variety of comic strips, breakfast menus, and

cheesecake?" If this is the actual nature of a newspaper, the fewer papers the better. Certainly the special constitutional protection thrown about them seems no more warranted than such protection would be for arobats, chefs, beauty parlor operators, and astrologers.

What the framers of the first amendment had in mind was debate, a great continuing debate, with the people hearing all sides and getting all the facts. If government could be kept from interfering with this debate, nothing could interfere with it; for a man who differed with the existing papers could start one of his own. The Founding Fathers did not foresee that 94 percent of American cities and 18 American States would be without competing papers. In the overwhelming majority of communities there can now be no debate among rival editors. The editor in a one-paper town has the only voice there is and the only one there is likely to be. The debate has become a soliloquy.

Talk about the virtues of monopoly is the flimsiest rationalization, as is shown by the poor quality of the papers in many monopoly towns. Monopoly cannot be a good thing. At its best it can be like a benevolent despotism, good while the benevolence lasts, but an accident in any case. Monopoly may in the present state of affairs be a necessary evil, but let us not pretend that it is not an evil.

PUBLISHER IN DRIVER'S SEAT

Rising costs have put the publisher in the driver's seat, where he has no business to be. The first amendment was not instituted to give a preferred position to people who were making money out of papers as against those who were making money out of other articles of commerce. The amendment was to protect the content of the press, not the cash return from it. The reason the publisher is in the driver's seat is that it costs so much money to own and operate a newspaper, and more all the time. If the soliloquy is that of one of the richest men in town, it is more than likely that it will sound the same political note as other soliloquies in other towns. Rendered by other rich men, this is the basis of the phrase, a one-party press.

Of course we have a one-party press in this country, and we shall have one as long as the press is big business, and as long as people with money continue to feel safer on the Republican side. For sheer psalm-singing sanctimoniousness no statement in recent years has surpassed that of Charles F. McCahill, president of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, when he was asked to comment on Adlai Stevenson's polite remarks on a one-party press. Mr. McCahill said, and I quote him: "It is the responsibility of the individual editor and publisher to decide what is printed in a particular newspaper. Fortunately, there is no power in this country to standardize the editorial views of any editor or publisher." Here in two sentences Mr. McCahill managed (1) to say what everybody knew already; (2) to be completely irrelevant; and (3) to prove Mr. Stevenson's point for him by making the partisan insinuation that Mr. Stevenson wanted the power to standardize editorial opinion. How you get along with these publishers is more than I can understand.

Lord Beaverbrook, when he was asked by the Royal Commission on the Press what his purpose in life was, replied under oath: "I run the paper purely for the purpose of making propaganda, and with no other motive." (There is apparently less cant among publishers in England than we are accustomed to here.) Lord Beaverbrook's propaganda collides wherever it goes with the counterpropaganda of numerous local and national voices. The popular press in Britain is the most sensational in the world, but an Englishman who doesn't want a sensational newspaper does not have to take the Mirror. Because of the geography of England he can get anywhere, inexpensively, and usually with his breakfast, a presentation of the news as fair as an edition can make it and as full as the restrictions of newsprint will allow, together with serious commentary upon it.

SEES NO INCREASE IN PAPERS

In the absence of some new technological revolution, the number of papers per community in this country seems unlikely to increase. Nothing suggests that costs will fall. Television and suburbanization are driving ahead as fast as they can go. As monopoly continues to spread, the ancient check of competition can, of course, no longer be relied on.

This should lead to the burial of that consoling reference to Jefferson's second inaugural, an ever-present refuge in time of criticism, which made its last formal appearance here in the report of the committee reporting on the report of the Commission on the Freedom of the Press. Jefferson said, in effect, that the people would make their views of a newspaper felt by refusing to read, believe, or buy it. The theory that the daily test of the market place is an expression of public criticism, and all that is needed, is reduced to absurdity when the public has no option, when it has to buy the newspaper that is offered or go without.

If we cannot look to competition to keep publishers from getting out of hand, what can we do to save their freedom from the consequences of their irresponsibility? My youthful suggestion of some endowed newspapers was designed to execute some publishers pour encourager les autres. The object was to set some standards that publishers of unendowed newspapers might be held to. I take this proposal less seriously than I did 25 years ago. The Christian Science Monitor undoubtedly has a good influence on the press of this country, but the conditions under which it operates, with its foundations in Heaven rather than on earth, are so different from the ordinary that any publisher has an adequate excuse for not following the Monitor's example. So I fear it would be with an endowed newspaper.

TRUSTS DISCUSSED

A trust such as that which controls the future of the Washington Post regulates the selection of stockholders, but gives the editor no explicit protection. The British trusts usually have the same object, that of preventing the ownership from falling into unsuitable hands. Although the British trusts reflect an attitude that an editor would find reassuring, no trust covering a daily newspaper leaves him formally any better off than he would be if there were no trust. The most that the Royal Commission was willing to say was, "A trust does not necessarily convert a newspaper from a commercial to a noncommercial concern or give it quality which it did not possess. * * * A trust can be, however, a valuable means of preserving quality where quality already exists. We, accordingly, welcome the action of public-spirited proprietors who have taken such steps as lie in their power to safeguard the character and independence of their papers; and we hope that the number of papers so protected will grow."

A publisher's willingness to establish a trust shows that he could be trusted without it; still it is a way of extending the benevolence of the benevolent despot beyond the limits of his own life. When you have a newspaper worth protecting, a trust will help you protect it; but a trust does not guarantee you a newspaper worth protecting.

The purpose of a newspaper, and the justification for the privilege of the press, is the enlightenment of the people about their current affairs. No other medium of communication can compete with the newspaper in the performance of this task. A newspaper that is doing this job well is a good newspaper, no matter how deficient it may be in astrology, menus, comics, cheesecake, crime, and Republican propaganda. A newspaper that is doing this job deserves protection against government, and it will certainly need it.

COMPARES PAPERS AND RADIO

A newspaper that is doing this job will have to bring before its readers points of view with which it disagrees and facts that it deplores. Otherwise in monopoly towns the people cannot expect to be enlightened; for television and radio are unlikely to be in the same class with a well-run newspaper in telling what is happening and what it means. Television and radio are, moreover, controlled by a governmental agency, and one that does not inspire much confidence today.

A good many newspapers take seriously their responsibility to enlighten the people about current affairs. It is generally agreed that the best American papers are as good as any in the world and that the average is high. Our question is how to maintain the good newspapers in the faith and how to convert the others.

I think you should reconsider your opposition to the principal recommendation of the Commission on the Freedom of the Press. That was that a new agency be established to appraise and report annually upon the performance of the press. The commission said, "It seems to us clear that some agency which reflects the ambitions of the American people for its press should exist for the purpose of comparing the accomplishments of the press with the aspirations which the people have for it. Such an agency would also educate the people as to the aspirations which they ought to have for the press." The commission suggested that this agency be independent of government and of the press; that it be created by gifts, and that it given a 10-year trial, at the end of which an audit of its achievement could determine anew the institutional form best adapted to its purposes. The fact that the British commission independently reached an identical recommendation seems to me highly significant.

SCORES BRITISH COUNCIL

Such an agency should contain representatives of the press; it should also contain laymen. My guess is that the weakness of the press council in Sweden results from the fact that it is composed entirely of representatives of the newspapers. I believe that the British Council will go the same way because the press rejected the recommendation of the Royal Commission that the council should have lay members and a lay chairman. If its first report is suggestive of its future, this group is likely to manifest its fearless and high-principled character by speaking sternly to newspapers on trivial subjects.

The Nieman reports, the press institute statements, A. J. Liebling's Wayward Press, Bob Lasch in the Progressive, occasional studies by schools of journalism, these are all we have in this country. They are too casual and limited, and, since most of them are directed at the press, they do not perform one function that the Commission on the Freedom of the Press regarded as essential: "They do not educate the people as to the aspirations which they ought to have for the press."

Your own efforts to act as a critical agency have come to nothing. You appointed a committee in 1949 to examine the desirability of sponsoring an appraisal of the self-improvement possibilities of American newspapers. The committee reported in 1950 as follows: "Our committee recognizes and reiterates that the American Society of Newspaper Editors is, itself, and must be, a continuing committee of the whole on self-examination and self-government. But, in addition, we urge the society to call upon its

board of directors to take whatever action may be necessary from time to time to clarify understanding of American newspapers by the public, and to keep editors alert to their responsibilities in fulfilling the public's right to an adequate, independent newspaper press."

That sounds as though it was written by a public relations man. In these sonorous sentences we hear the cadence of the Psalms.

The great issues of our time are peace and freedom. A new critical agency might appraise the performance of the newspapers in correcting, or contributing to, our vast confusion on these subjects. We know that the peoples of the earth are now equipped to turn one another into radioactive cinders. Can you say that you have given Americans the material they need to reach a conclusion on the course they should follow, on the choice between coexistence and no existence, the choice between seeking peace through purchase and intimidation and seeking it through total, enforceable disarmament, the choice between competing nationalisms and world law?

CITES EROSION OF FREEDOM

And what of freedom in the garrison state? Since most of you take the official line, that the only important fact of life is our imminent danger from the international conspiracy, most of you have watched the erosion of freedom without a twinge. When the official line permitted, you have sallied forth, as when you gallantly led the troops from the rear in a belated attack on Senator McCARTHY. You have filled the air with warnings of the sinister figures on the left, but have printed almost nothing about the fat cats on the right. You have allowed things to get to such a pass that some Government departments now have guidance clinics in which the employee is taught how not to look like a security risk. Look at the Passport Division, interfering with the travel of Americans on their lawful occasions; at the Attorney General's list, ruining the lives of thousands on the basis of hearsay; at the Post Office Department, saving us from Pravda and Aristophanes; at the State Department, adding the name of Corsi to those of Davies and Service and countless others. See the blacklist spreading in industry, merging with proposals that American Communists should be starved to death. Listen to the wiretapping, to the cry of fifth amendment Communists, to the kept witnesses roaming the land. The most distressing part of it is not that these things happen, but that the free press of this country appears to regard them as matters of routine.

You are educators, whether you like it or not. You make the views that people have of public affairs. No competition can shake you from that position. You will lose it only if you neglect or abandon it. As the number of papers per community declines, the responsibility of each one that remains increases. This is a responsibility that is discharged by being a newspaper, by giving the news. The editorial function is to make sure that it is given in such a way that it can be understood. The people must see the alternatives before them; otherwise they cannot be enlightened.

Enlightment means telling the people where they are in time and space. It means engaging in systematic criticism. The criticism of current affairs has to be made in the light of some standard. This must be something more than a set of partisan slogans. The standard by which the American press must judge current events is derived from an understanding of and sympathy with the deepest aspirations of the American people, those for peace and freedom. A press that serves its country in this way need have no concern about the future.

Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement of George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, during the hearings on the Small Business Administration held by the House Banking and Currency Committee, May 20, 1955:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

(Statement of George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, before the House Banking and Currency Committee, Friday, May 20, 1955)

I am George J. Burger, vice president in charge of legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. Our national headquarters are located in Burlingame, Calif. We also maintain division offices at New York City, Cincinnati, and Chicago.

It must be understood by Members of Congress that no officer or group of officers is permitted to speak for the federation as to its position on any legislative or economic problems unless so directed by a nationwide poll of our members. The entire membership is polled and the results of these polls give the executive officers the authority to act in behalf of the members.

The federation has a vital stake in the successful administration of the Small Business Administration Act. It will be found from the record of the hearings before the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees in May 1953, that the federation's position was in full support of the proposed legislation with only one exception. We recommend that full control of the agency rest with the Administrator and that he be subject only to control of the Congress of the United States. Our position today, through nationwide vote, remains the same as it was in May 1953.

The federation has in its employ approximately 200 field representatives who are calling on small businessmen every day of the business week and they are in a position to get first-hand information on the success or failure of the Small Business Administration in carrying out the will of Congress. Further, the federation, through its head offices at Burlingame, Calif., and its Washington office, receives considerable numbers of requests for information from our membership as to procedure under the Small Business Administration Act as to loans. In fact it can be safely said that better than 80 percent of the inquiries as they apply to SBA from all sections of the Nation rest on the needs for financial assistance. The Washington office alone, during the life of the act, has assisted many hundreds in giving them the necessary information on procedure to follow in their contacts with SBA. At the same time, we have kept the Members of Congress acquainted with information coming from their districts on such inquiries.

We have a very vital stake in the success of the Small Business Administration Act. We are not unmindful of the fact that if there are deficiencies in the administration of the act, it would act as a boomerang to the federation. Consequently, we are watching developments to bring about a successful administration of the act, and let it be understood for the record that the closest liaison and cooperation has existed between our office and the head office of SBA for a year or more.

Our interest in the act itself began shortly after its approval by Congress. As is my custom every year, I visited the head office at Burlingame, Calif., in September 1953, and made it my business to confer with the regional director of SBA in Los Angeles, and in October 1953 with the regional office at Kansas City, Mo. In both of these visits, to be certain we had the story correct, I insisted that a third party be present at the conference. At the completion of he conference, I directed the third party to make his report on the conference and then I made by own individual report. The comparison was then made. We found a wretched situation existing in the administration of the act which we believed was far from the intent of the Congress.

Upon my return to Washington, I immediately contacted the Administrator, Mr. Mitchell, and arranged for a conference, which took place in his office on October 23, 1953. His various assistants were present during the 2-hour conference and I believe the present Administrator, Mr. Barnes, who was then General Counsel, was also there.

I advised Mr. Mitchell of our findings, namely that the great majority of small-business institutions could not qualify for loans due to the regulations instituted by the policy board. The regulations provided for loans only for those institutions in essential war work or essential industries. We found that the formal application which was presented to the applicant for completion brought about a situation where the applicant would attempt to answer the questions in the form and would finally throw it up in disgust.

At the conference I put the question to Mr. Mitchell as to who was setting the loan policy and was any policy he proposed vetoed by Treasury or Commerce Department heads. He asked me to give him the privilege of reserving an answer until a later date.

His assistants urged, because of the importance of my findings, that a joint conference be arranged for with Treasury and Commerce officials and the SBA, at which time I could relate again the story I had told on October 23, 1953. This conference took place on the afternoon of October 26, 1953, in the office of Mr. Randolph Burgess, who, I believe, is Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury. I also believe that Mr. Lothair Teetor, of the Department of Commerce, was present at this conference. I brought out in this conference two particular cases, one of a small battery manufacturer in the State of Minnesota, and the other, a small furniture producer in the State of Georgia. In the first instance, applications for loans were denied because it was ruled they were not in essential business.

The outcome of these joint conferences was that a few days later a change was made in the management of SBA and then on November 16, 1953, the entire policy was changed to permit all small business to participate in financial aid through the Small Business Administration Act.

Shortly thereafter, Mr. Wendell Barnes was appointed Administrator and up to this very moment, we have had no reason to register any objections to the present policy being carried out by the Small Business Administration insofar as financial aid to small business is concerned. The federation makes no recommendations one way or the other on any application for a loan. The application must stand on its own merits.

I believe it was just about a year ago a subcommittee of the House Small Business

held hearings on the west coast, one in San Francisco and another in Los Angeles. In both instances, federation officials appeared and gave testimony, and at one of these hearings the committee questioned the Federation witness on the advisability of raising the SBA loan ceiling to a higher bracket than the $150,000 limit. Following up the committee's suggestion, we polled our nationwide membership and the vote was in the negative. Knowing of our obligation to our members as to a successful administration of the act, again in one of my annual visits to the head office, in 1954, I held conferences with the directors of the regional offices in Los Angeles and San Francisco. At the conference in these areas, federation President C. Wilson Harder accompanied me. I also conferred later with the regional director in Portland, Oreg. At that time, a federation man was also with me. Then again, before returning to Washington, I conferred with the regional office in Minneapolis.

In these recent conferences, not alone with the regional directors of SBA but also with small business people en route, we found two serious situations we hope have since been corrected. One was the reluctance of banks in certain areas to look with favor on the Small Business Administration Act. In some areas it was reported that correspondent banks were afraid to step in because they were fearful of antagonizing the larger banking institutions. It goes without saying that the merger trend in banking institutions which is sweeping the Nation is of considerable concern to small business of this Nation. Financial control in the hands of a few large banking institutions certainly doesn't tend to encourage small business of this Nation. The neighborhood banks in many areas of the Nation live with small business daily and when they cease to exist the impact on the future of small business will be most serious. We know from conversations with representatives of small banks of their alarm as to this merger trend. So it's more necessary than ever before that the Small Business Administration be continued as a permanent, independent agency.

The second was the failure of the regional offices of SBA to have enough available material such as Government specifications or blueprints of specifications. There was a limited number available and when they were gone, that was the end of it. In some areas, arrangements were made with the public libraries where these documents were available. However, it was most difficult sometimes for a small business institution to have to go down and look up copies and make analyses of them, etc.

It is our hope that the committee will make certain that all available information as to Government bids, forms, specifications, blueprints, and so on are available at all regional offices so that those small-business institutions who are interested in participating in Government contracts may have such information in advance to permit them to qualify.

It is significant and important to note that at recent hearings before the Small Business Committees of the Congress that the Treasury Department stated: "The Treasury believes that under the provisions of the act, and under existing policies, SBA has established an excellent record since its lending machinery went into operation. The Treasury believes that in the light of that record, the life of the agency should be extended for a further period of 2 years."

It is also to be noted that the small business adviser for the Department of Defense before the same hearings stated: "It is our view that the Small Business Administration is presently serving the best interests of the Nation in this way and that it can continue to do so. For these reasons, we recommend the continuation of the Small Business Administration beyond June 30, 1955."

As a result of the mail reaching our head office at Burlingame, Calif., or the mail directed to the Washington office from members of the federation, all independent businessmen, it can be said without a question of doubt that they desire this agency to stand on its own two feet—full control and management of the agency to rest with the agency itself, and not be made a part of any other agency of the Government or have any controls vested in any other agency of the Government as to the overall policy of the Small Business Administration. Control of the agency should rest with the Administrator and the Congress itself.

The position the federation is taking as to the continuance of the agency is ratified and confirmed by two recent nationwide polls of its entire membership. The results of the two polls are as follows:

Poll No. 1, 76 percent for, 22 percent against, 2 percent no vote.

Poll No. 2, 84 percent for, 11 percent against, 5 percent no vote.

It is to be noted, Mr. Chairman, that the first poll was made in or around October 1954 and the more recent poll was completed within the past 30 days.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the federation makes certain recommendations for the committee's consideration:

1. We believe that any and all top employees of SBA should have full and thorough knowledge of the basic problems of small business. They should have a human feeling for the problems facing small business. This should be a requisite before they go into a position.

2. The regional advisory boards appointed by the agency should meet more often with the regional directors so that the directors will have more direct information on what is going on in their areas.

3. We believe the committee should reexamine the appointments made to the National Advisory Board as it may be found that some of the members of that board are a long way from an understanding of small business or being representative of small business.

4. A more aggressive action on the part of SBA to secure a greater share of Government business, and particularly to exercise its right to take prime contracts where same can be channeled through groups of small business in the respective industries. We found in many areas that competent small engineering firms, for example, would be able to handle effectively prime contracts, singly or in groups, and possibly at lower cost to the Government. We urge special action by the committee in its direction to the agency on this.

5. We believe that the committee should explore the privilege extended to the regional offices in making loans up to $50,000 without consulting Washington. We would like to have the committee satisfy itself that in this permission there are no impediments and that it means just what it says.

6. Our final recommendation, and we believe a very important one, so that the constructive help of SBA is not impaired through no fault of its own, is that we urge your committee to give special consideration and attention in making known to the antitrust agencies that they institute a more vigorous, consistent enforcement of the antitrust laws as the failure to enforce these laws can result in not alone destruction to small business but to defeat the intent of Congress in financial aid to small business.

Mr. Chairman, it is to be noted that Mr. Barnes, SBA Administrator, recently advised a committee of the Congress, and I quote: "I recommend to the Congress that the statutory life of the agency be extended for an additional 2 years." It is our understanding that in the first instance, in the creation of the act by the Congress, the agency up to this moment has been on probation and I believe the record speaks for itself as to its overall value to small business, and the agency should now be made a permanent agency of the Government, with no statutory limitation as to expiration date as Congress can always take appropriate action to dissolve any agency of the Government that fails to continue its worth.

Thank you for the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to appear before your committee and express our views in behalf of small business of this Nation.

How Much Is He Worth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Milwaukee Review, of Milwaukee, Oreg., whose very able editor is Monroe Sweetland. The editorial is entitled "How Much Is He Worth?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MUCH IS HE WORTH?

"How much is a biochemist worth to America? How much should the American people pay for a nuclear physicist?"

These two questions were posed by Senator WAYNE MORSE when he spoke at West Linn Friday noon, and they set us thinking.

The conflict with world communism is far more likely to be won in the arena of science and practical know-how than around the diplomatic table or on the field of battle. The United States cannot compete with the Chinese and Russian Reds in numbers, for they are vastly greater. We can compete for now in military prowess, but a great question mark hangs over the future as the margin fades between us in numbers of trained soldiers and stores of equipment.

But we have one great advantage in which they are a generation behind us—the rich advantage we enjoy from the American school system. We take it all for granted as if it just naturally always was this way, and always would be. We excel most of all because of our educational system. Americans are made of the same stuff as our cousins in Europe and Africa and Asia from whence, not long ago, we or our forebears came. But the same stock comes out a very different set of men and women when they have gone through the American educational system. Therein lies our great advantage, and let's keep it that way.

One of these days before long, if we haven't already done it, we will produce some statesmen who excel, too, just as we Americans have already led the parade of mankind for a generation in the fields of science, medicine, nuclear research, and applied mechanics.

We don't know the answer to Senator MORSE's query. But we know that the cheapest and most important dollars we spend are spent in building up the best school system in the world. Out of this wellspring flows the life-giving, hope-giving stream of productive American minds. Whatever it costs, it's overwhelmingly worth the price.

Independent Natural Gas Producers Fail To Testify on Harris Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during the months of March and April, I attended most of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee hearings on the Harris bill and other related legislation to release the so-called independent producers of natural gas from Federal regulation. I will endeavor to summarize the statements before the House committee.

During some 21 days of hearings, the committee heard slightly over 100 witnesses from various groups. Among the witnesses who testified for the Harris bill were the chairman of the Federal Power Commission, Mr. Jerome K. Kuykendall; Mr. Ernest O. Thompson, of the Texas Railroad Commission; Mr. David T. Searles, of Houston, Tex., who represented some pipelines and some so-called independent producers; Dr. John W. Boatwright, of the Standard Oil Company of Indiana; Mr. R. G. Laughton, president of the Laughton Oil Corp.; Mr. Russell B. Brown, general counsel of the Independent Petroleum Association of America; Mr. Clarence T. Smith, member of the Illinois Oil and Gas Association; Mr. J. P. Jones, director of production of the Pengrade Crude Oil Association, of Pennsylvania; Mr. John F. Marion, president of the Independent Natural Gas Association of America and also president of the Northern Natural Gas Co., of Omaha, Nebr., also representing some interstate pipelines; Mr. William Jackman, president of the Investors League of New York City; Mr. Lloyd C. Halverson, self-styled economist; Mr. H. B. Fell of the Chamber of Commerce; Mr. J. Taylor of Amarillo, Tex., and president of the National American Cattlemen's Association; and Mr. Ray Willoughby, past president of the National Wool Growers Association.

The chairman of the Federal Power Commission testified for the Harris bill, and it is the first time I ever heard a public official in a so-called regulatory agency publicly ask the legislative body to give him less work to do and perhaps eliminate the necessity of the Commission itself.

I would hardly call the Standard Oil Company of Indiana an independent producer of either natural gas or oil. It would be difficult to believe that the Pennsylvania Pengrade Crude Oil Association is particularly interested in natural gas reaching northern homes at fair and reasonable prices. It would hardly be expected that the representatives of the interstate pipelines would be vitally concerned in the cost of gas to the homeowners of New York, Akron, or Chicago. It is not surprising to find the Investors League zealously interested in the Harris bill because through it the investors in oil and gas stocks stand a pretty good chance of a $5 billion windfall if the Harris bill becomes law.

The president of the cattlemen's association testified for the Harris bill—and I can well understand that. Some of the large oil and gas ranches raise cattle as a mere sideline. And I can understand the testimony of the former president of the Wool Growers Association. As gas becomes more expensive for the folks in the northern cities, they will have to keep their thermostats down and their blood pressures up and go back to wearing woolen underwear.

On the other hand, over 80 witnesses testified against the Harris bill, representing cities, consumer groups, public utility officials and distributing companies. The distribution companies are concerned with the possibility of issuing increasingly higher gas bills to the consumers and are therefore on the firing line.

Throughout the hearings, I tried to determine just how many independent producers of natural gas there were. The Federal Power Commission reported to me that they did not know how many there were prior to 1953 because they were not required to determine that under the law. However, they report that in 1953 there were 4,545. The Standard Oil Company of Indiana in a letter to its stockholders stated on March 16, 1955, that there were 5,000 independent producers of natural gas while its neighbor, the Standard Oil Company of Ohio told all of its stockholders in a publication supporting the Harris bill that there were more than 4,000 producers. During the committee hearings I heard some testimony to the effect that there may be 6,000 to 8,000 independent producers. How can the committee intelligently arrive at a solution of this problem without knowing how many independent producers of natural gas there really are and what percentage of the natural gas they produce?

It may be entirely coincidental but it is interesting to note that the powerful gas and oil lobby with its one million and a half dollar plush campaign fund forgot the elementary requisite of bringing a single so-called independent producer of natural gas to the cross-examination of committee members. The simple fact is that there was not a single person present at the House committee hearings who looked as though he had ever been covered with drill dust or oil spray—at least not for a long period of time.

From these hearings and from the record, it appears to me that the so-called independent producers of natural gas are ghost riders in the sky created and dancing to the music of the oil companies of America and groups of investors in oil stocks and natural gas pipelines whose fundamental interest, whose basic desire is profit—pure and selfish profit—free from Federal regulation, free from Federal scrutiny and free from public calculation. Their interest is certainly incompatible and contrary to that of the great body of consumers of natural gas who can make no selection as to the source of their gas supply and who have very little to say about the price they must pay for it. These so-called independent producers—these ghost riders in the sky—are ghost riding against the public interest in the Harris bill.

Kings Highway Board of Trade Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the 50th anniversary of the Kings Highway Board of Trade, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article, written by Carol Taylor, which appeared in the May 20, 1955, edition of the New York World Telegram and Sun:

FIFTY YEARS OF PROGRESS ARE MARKED

(By Carol Taylor)

Fifty years ago, the Kings Highway Board of Trade tossed a public entertainment at the Pabst Loop Hotel in Coney Island to support the Kings Highway Library, which it founded.

More than $100 was netted, the board's musty records recall * * * "this being sufficient to operate the library for over 18 months."

The library was then located in C. E. Kemble's drugstore, 1402 Kings Highway. There was a paid librarian and a circulation of about 150 books a month.

ORIGINAL PURPOSE

A few months ago, a magnificent $800,000 Kings Highway Library was dedicated at Kings Highway and Ocean Avenue and the street's board of trade paused for nostalgic reflection. It was to get a library for the neighborhood that the board was organized 50 years ago and, as it celebrates its golden anniversary this spring, it can well claim that its own growth illustrates the growth and development of Brooklyn.

Among other projects the board shouldered at the turn of the century were: a celebration to assure the first sane and safe Independence Day in Brooklyn; construction of schools, sidewalks, and the neighborhood's first firehouse; appointment of a gas lamp committee for installation of Welsbach Street lamps.

The New York Telephone Co. was petitioned to improve service on the party lines in the Coney Island district and to abolish "the old crank telephone system now in vogue."

THE SIDEWALKS

The board's sidewalk committee succeeded in having Kings Highway sidewalks spread with cinders which, alone, it was recorded at the time, "justifies the existence of the board of trade, as was aptly remarked by a man who walks the highway daily."

All of this serves to remind that, while times may have changed, the Kings Highway Board of Trade goes on much as it did half a century ago—as a local civic organization in the mold of the old New England town meeting. It flourishes to glorify and improve the neighborhood of the proud, polished street known as Kings Highway, which winds through Brooklyn from Gravesend to Brownsville.

The board now has 210 members—prominent merchants, professional men, and rep-

resentatives of financial institutions and utilities. Its president, Edmund G. Flowers, administrative officer of the Kings Highway Savings Bank, says community spirit still propels the board in crusades for better playgrounds, libraries, schools, and parks, in fact for all that goes to make the section a good place to live.

SPECIAL EVENTS

To celebrate its golden jubilee, many special events are planned to spotlight Kings Highway. Nat Morgenstern, executive director, announces that a beauty contest will be held in June to select Miss Kings Highway of 1955, and a sales jubilee will be held in the fall featuring 1905 prices.

The Kings Highway Board of Trade was organized on the evening of December 4, 1905, when about 16 citizens living in the vicinity of Kings Highway met at the law offices of Messrs. Netling, Raymond & Co., at East 15th Street, to perfect plans for the installation of a branch public library to serve the neighborhood.

The first annual report of the secretary commented: "Little did any one of these 16 men imagine that this was to be the beginning of a board of trade that, on its first birthday, would be able to show a membership roll of 75."

A CHAMPION

A permanent organization was set up, and from that time on Kings Highway was never without a champion for better schools, lighting, fire protection, or sewerage.

The board kept a finger in every community pie as well. It backed the exhibit by the committee on congestion of population in New York which was held at 174 Montague Street in April 1908 and was honored by a special day in its name.

Still in possession of the board is a handwritten letter of appreciation from the citizens' celebration for opening of Brooklyn subway. "The Citizens Central Committee," it reads, "acknowledges with thanks the rereceipt of $5 from the Kings Highway Board of Trade."

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The board pushed for construction of PS–153 and on another occasion a committee bearded Mayor William Gaynor "until the city gave us a fire company." Still later, the board's records show: "We stirred the commissioner of public works to install the numerous catch basins and lay the cinder crossing which have made Kings Highway and neighboring streets half-way passable."

Not all projects met with instant success. In 1907, the board was sadly informed by Thomas R. Farrell, superintendent of highways: "Replying to your letter of recent date regarding sprinkling of streets * * * I beg to advise all sprinkling has been discontinued owing to lack of funds to carry on this work."

The safe and sane July 4 celebrations became an annual event. In 1913, it was held in the grove and meadow of John Gerken at Kings Highway and Coney Island Avenue and featured a fat men's race, ladies' sack race, potato race for girls, band concert by Gartner's Military Band and fireworks by Pain—was not further explained.

THROUGH THE YEARS

So Kings Highway today reflects the careful nurturing it has received through the years from the board of trade that bears its name. It is a street of handsome apartment houses, one-family dwellings, of a fine, highly concentrated business district east of Ocean Parkway from East Eighth Street to Ocean Avenue. East from Ocean Avenue it becomes a beautiful boulevard.

It has proudly preserved the traditions of the historic old Kings Highway which swept in a majestic curve from the Narrows down to the backbone of the island. In the early days, Kings Highway was the highway from Long Island to Staten Island, New Jersey, and Philadelphia. It ran to a ferry between Fort Hamilton and Staten Island, called Deny's Ferry.

And, it is recorded, in the Revolutionary War, after the British troops had landed at Gravesend Bay, the flank movement of Lord Howe preceding the Battle of Long Island was made by marching through Kings Highway to New Lots.

Power in a Stall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Power in a Stall," published in the Washington Post of May 21, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER IN A STALL

With a good deal of justification there is mounting criticism of the administration's policy, or lack of policy, on the generation and distribution of electric power. This policy generally has been portrayed in theory as one of partnership with the States and private industry, with the Federal Government prepared to help develop resources when other groups could not do so economically. In practice the policy has proved to be one of retrenchment or at best inaction.

C. Girard Davidson, former Assistant Secretary of the Interior, testified before a House Government Operations Subcommittee the other day that in the power-hungry Northwest not a single new start or authorization has been made by the Federal Government under the present administration. Indeed, the emphasis of the Interior Department seems to have been on eliminating or frustrating the preferences enjoyed by municipalities and cooperatives under existing law by requiring consumer groups to build their own transmission lines.

A Federal Power Commission examiner has come up with a curious recommendation respecting the site of the controversial Hells Canyon Dam in Idaho. He says, in effect, that a high-level federally built dam would make the most economical use of the site; but since this is politically infeasible he recommends approval of one of the three low-level dams asked by the Idaho Power Co. (even though proponents of a Federal project say this would ruin the site for any broader development). In the well-established field of rural electrification there has been criticism of a do-nothing administration policy. Morris L. Cooke, former Rural Electrification Administrator, declined to attend ceremonies marking the 20th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Act, because "the drastic cutting down, really almost eliminating planning advice to cooperatives" seemed to him to threaten the very life of REA.

This newspaper does not share the feeling of some public-power enthusiasts that all private-power companies are selfish and greedy, nor does it believe that the Federal Government has a responsibility to build a powerplant every time someone asks it to. Private expansion in the power field ought to be encouraged wherever it is economical, makes constructive use of resources and is in keeping with the wishes of the people. Similarly, liquidation of some uneconomic or mismanaged rural co-ops may well be wise public policy.

But the fact remains that in large areas, particularly in the west, hydroelectric power is the most economical form of power, and the Federal Government has a direct responsibility to insure the wise development of water resources belonging to all the people. Furthermore, quite apart from the initiation of new projects, there is nothing un-American about the insistence that preferences to co-ops and municipalities on existing projects not be vitiated by someone's idea that this is the way to help private enterprise. One gets the impression that the administration is so taken in by the cries of socialism that it is largely insensitive to the power needs of an expanding economy.

The Challenge of Abundance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Commonweal of May 20. We as a nation have a grave responsibility. We have an abundance of wealth and yet we still permit people to live undernourished and impoverished. Our religions have taught us that the individual is only the custodian of wealth—not the owner. This applies, surely, to nations as well.

Therefore, it is a moral responsibility for us Americans, as a people, to see to it that starving humans are fed.

This is pointed out very precisely in the editorial and it is my fervent hope that it will strike home.

The editorial follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF ABUNDANCE

Day after day the evidence accumulates. Whether it be in terms of farm and factory production, corporation profits, or per-family national income, the world has never before beheld the abundance and nationwide prosperity today enjoyed by the United States. Being statistical, this evidence fails to reveal the millions of Americans who are not sharing in this extraordinary degree of material well-being, but the proportion of those who are is one of the most remarkable aspects of this enviable situation.

According to the latest findings of the Twentieth Century Fund, this country produces nearly half the factory-made goods in the world; with 6 percent of the world's population and 7 percent of the land, America produces and consumes a third of the world's goods. Department of Agriculture figures point to Government stocks amounting to $8½ billion worth of unsold farm surpluses. Simply to store these excess commodities we have produced costs the Nation's taxpayers a million dollars a day.

This overall abundance comes at a time when the world of men has become, in effect, smaller and smaller. To learn of human needs in the most distant sector of the globe is a matter of minutes; aid in the form of medicines, for example, can be flown to a stricken area in a few hours. At the same time there is great unrest in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and virtually the whole world

is caught up in the Communist struggle for world domination—a drive that skillfully capitalizes on past and present injustices and crying human needs. May it not well be that the United States with its abundance has, in the designs of divine providence, a special role set before it?

Totalitarian threat or no, are we not compelled in conscience to share our comparative abundance, which ultimately is truly God-given, with needy fellow men? And the term "abundance" in this case means far more than the produce itself of our prolific farms and factories. It also encompasses the requisite technical proficiency, economic and organizational know-how and the intricacies of sound corporate and State finance. Beyond, and as a result of all these there is the desire of peoples to produce, advance, and build for the future. Americans have these abilities and more—in the way of organizing, producing and governing in the common interest—to impart to vast numbers of their fellow men.

This is a basic conviction of the hundred Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant religious leaders whose statement on American Abundance and World Need was made public on May 4. They declare that the abundance which is ours and the potential productivity within our grasp are at once blessings to be enjoyed and a trust to be administered in the name of God and in the service of mankind. It is contrary to the will of God that islands of prosperity should persist amid oceans of poverty, hunger, and distress. Providence does appear to to have other designs for the United States, if we have the vision and courage to respond.

Wholehearted acceptance of this new role in the world will provide a great challenge for the American people. It will call upon the undivided attention of our best minds and an unrelenting national determination to thrust aside obstacles manned by various shortsighted domestic private interests and foreign foes. It demands a new and abiding concern on the part of Americans for the progress of other peoples. To bring this about, nothing would be more effective than a dramatic appeal to the Nation by President Eisenhower.

The practical difficulties are legion. The administration, for example, has for months been trying to dispose of a billion dollars worth of surplus farm products in needy foreign lands. To date but $33 million out of the proposed $700 million worth has actually been sold for foreign currencies. The problem of freight charges has greatly impeded the distribution of the amount of surpluses to be designated as gifts from the United States Government. Protocol and red tape have impeded the program all along the line. Without something like the direct intervention of the President the excess foodstuffs will never get to the needy.

Even if we embark wholeheartedly upon a program of imparting technological and organizational know-how on the scale currently needed in the world, the difficulties will be immense. Time and again the peoples most in need of the means of earning a real livelihood will manifest a diffidence compounded of malnutrition, disease, illiteracy, lethargy, and suspicion. The biggest job will be to get such programs actually started.

If a catalog of the practical difficulties would seem endless, that does not change the nature of the challenge. Moreover, Americans are particularly proficient in overcoming all sorts of practical difficulties. The means of achieving unparalleled abundance has been entrusted to us at a turning point in history. No doubt we could keep it largely in our own hands for a time, shoring up our comparatively lavish existence with high tariff walls, continued restrictive immigration and the latest weapons. We can, if we will, however, build toward a great and secure national future by taking up the challenge presented to our talents by the underproductive areas of the world. We have the tools to thrust endemic human want into the background and at the same time to deliver many peoples from the threat of a totalitarian fate.

Letter by Columbia Association to President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from Thomas B. Di Candia, president of the Grand Council Civil Service Columbia Associations, Inc., and the text of a letter addressed to President Eisenhower by the above organization in connection with the President's 1952 campaign pledge to revise the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

The Columbia Association, as it is known popularly, is an organization of more than 50,000 American citizens of Italian descent who are Federal, State, or municipal civil service employees. They are an intensely loyal and patriotic group whose activities are centered in the State of New York.

At this point, I should like to call to the attention of all my colleagues that on April 20 I initiated action on a discharge petition to bring out my bill, H. R. 501, to amend and revise the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. I urge all of you to sign this petition so that we can bring this bill to the House floor for early discussion and a vote on it.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert into the RECORD the letter from Mr. Di Candia to me and his letter to the President, which read as follows:

GRAND COUNCIL CIVIL SERVICE
COLUMBIA ASSOCIATIONS, INC.,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Hon. VICTOR ANFUSO,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANFUSO: Enclosed you will find a copy of the resolution that was sent to the President of the United States, in which we are reminding the President of his 1952 campaign pledge to amend and revise the Walter-McCarran Act.

We hope that you will do all in your power to help to rectify the injustices of the Walter-McCarran Act by bringing this issue on the floor of Congress.

Respectfully yours,
THOMAS B. DI CANDIA,
President.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President, United States of America,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Due to the furore recently sweeping the country over the Walter-McCarran Act and the 1953 Refugee Act, this association, composed of over 50,000 civil-service employees, all American citizens of Italian lineage, called a special meeting on the 26th day of April 1955 to intelligently study and discuss this matter. After hearing reports from a committee assigned to study the matter, the association adopted the following resolution:

"Be it—

"*Resolved*, That Dwight D. Eisenhower, the President of the United States of America, be apprised of this meeting.

"That the President be informed that his campaign pledge of 1952 with regard to revising, altering, or amending the Walter-McCarran Act was received favorably by this association, as we had long been active in the fight to endeavor to eliminate all laws on the National, State, and local level which discriminated against any minority group because of racial, religious, or national origin.

"That while we did not consider the Refugee Act of 1953 as adequate legislation, overcoming the slur and indignity on certain minority groups, we, nevertheless, felt that this was an honest effort on the part of this administration to adjust or ameliorate a shameful and intolerable situation with respect to immigration quotas.

"That we were shocked at the statements made by Mr. Corsi and Mr. McLeod that said act was so drawn that it cannot be properly administered. We were informed that of the 200,000 refugees to be admitted from January 1, 1954, to December 31, 1956, only a little over 1,000 have entered the United States after more than 15 months since the act became effective.

"We were amazed that Mr. Dulles does not consider Mr. Corsi a capable administrator; hence his dismissal. All this after it was reported in the press that Mr. Dulles considered Mr. Corsi the best-qualified person in the United States to administer the 1953 Refugee Act.

"That we, the members of this association, have had great faith in you and your administration and want to continue to feel the same way. However, in view of the circumstances, and in view of the fact that we have heard no word either in the press or on the air with regard to your views in this matter, and that we have no definite answer from you or your subordinates with respect to the 1953 Refugee Act, we are left with this question uppermost in our minds.

"Dear Mr. President, what are we to believe?"

Respectfully yours,
THOMAS B. DI CANDIA,
President.

German Assets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "German Assets," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of March 7, 1955. The editorial sets forth the problems and circumstances connected with the seizure and administration of these enemy assets during World War II.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMAN ASSETS

The State Department has offered a deal to West Germany whereby no German may recover more than $10,000 of assets seized

from him during World War II in the United States. It will restore copyrights and trademarks, as well as such cultural property as paintings, but it refuses to permit any restoration of confiscated German corporate assets.

The corporate seizures represent the juciest loot. Such properties as the $100 million General Aniline & Film Corp. are among them. While some political insiders profited by acquiring fat administrative jobs in such seized enterprises, one effect has been to put the American Government into private business on a scale never foreseen or intended by Congress.

We have previously said that the permanent retention of such properties is in violation of international law and of specific commitments assumed in the 1923 treaty of friendship and commerce with Germany. Morally, there is no justification for such Government sponsored robbery, legally there is less, and practically the policy is ill advised, when we are seeking to bring Germany into effective military alliance against Russia. We put ourselves on no better footing than the Russians, who looted German industrial plants after the end of the war and carted off the spoils to the Soviet Union.

Congress will have the last word on this subject and legislation pending there may rectify a substantial injustice. The Morgenthau plan was bad enough, without carrying on a similar spoliation of the defeated country here in our own land.

Call for Candor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as a parent I know I bespeak the sentiments of many others regarding the confusion that exists over the Nation's polio-vaccine situation. What are we to do, many of us ask? I believe that the following editorial which appeared in the May 21 issue of the Newark Star-Ledger entitled "Call for Candor" states the case pointedly and bluntly:

CALL FOR CANDOR

A pall of painful confusion has settled over the Nation's polio situation. It is even more confusing today than last week, and that is going some.

Last week, the hubbub was whether or not the vaccine would arrive on time. Dates were scheduled, dates were called off, mysterious messages went out that something was wrong with the way the vaccine was being tested, shipments were held up, some batches were released, others were not, statements were made that "everything is fine," but statements immediately followed saying "let's check the stuff over again, please."

New Jersey still has not received the word to inoculate our children. And now the dismal question has been raised whether or not our children will receive their second shots on time.

The biggest obstacle we have had to face in the polio situation thus far has been the lack of information. It is not enough to postpone carefully made plans with some mumbling about checking factors X and Y again.

After all the details that were released, including much scientific gobbledygook, about the vaccine itself, the American public is entitled to equal details about the current situation. We need candor. We want to know just what's going on, and why. Only this way can we make the proper evaluations and, therefore, the proper decisions. Let's designate someone in Washington who can report to the Nation, carefully, concisely, clearly, and honestly just what is going on. This report, incidentally, might include some words on why Canada seems to be able to inoculate its kids without any fuss whatever.

Pressure Groups and the Tax Laws—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, an eminent authority on taxation, Professor William L. Cary, of Northwestern University Law School, Evanston, Ill., has written a carefully documented study, Pressure Groups and the Revenue Code: A Requiem in Honor of the Departing Uniformity of the Tax Laws, in the March 1955 issue of the Harvard Law Review.

There follows the first part of this study:

PRESSURE GROUPS AND THE REVENUE CODE: A REQUIEM IN HONOR OF THE DEPARTING UNIFORMITY OF THE TAX LAWS

(By William L. Cary, professor of law, Northwestern University, A. B., Yale, 1931, LL. B., 1934; M. B. A., Harvard, 1938)

I. INTRODUCTION

The genesis of this paper is the casual remark of a Washington lawyer who asked, "What is the point of litigating a tax case when we can have the statute amended for the same outlay of time and money?" Probably his statement was inaccurate, and certainly it was extreme, but it comes as no surprise to sophisticated counsel daily studying the tax services to identify new patchwork stitched upon the internal revenue quilt. Pressure groups appear to be active, and effective, in the constant alteration of our tax laws. Whether their efforts take the form of new sections, or euphemistically called technical changes,[1] there is today an accelerating tendency away from uniformity and toward preferential treatment. The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 does not alter this trend.

Some very admirable counsel have commented that my concern should not be with pressure groups in principle but with the effectiveness of the wrong groups as distinguished from the right ones. They would examine each new amendment and ask whether it is good or bad. Their approach is, of course, subjective, depending upon one's views as to what is socially and economically desirable tax policy. It is probably true that no one can be completely objective and that some bias will be inevitable. Yet the attempt here is considerably broader. It is an attack, or rather, a modest foray, upon the whole movement toward preferential and specialized amendments, irrespective of what group is preferred.

The root of the evil is not easily identified. Neither capital nor labor, neither the Democratic nor the Republican Party, is alone at fault. It is unhappily true that the trend toward special treatment has not been arrested by the Eisenhower administration or its predecessors. In all probability the basic trouble lies in our political system as a whole and in Congress particularly. Perhaps, then, it is a futile pursuit to raise any doubt about current developments in tax legislation. Dr. T. S. Adams recognized years ago that modern taxation or tax-making in its most characteristic aspect is a group contest in which powerful interests vigorously endeavor to rid themselves of present or proposed tax burdens.[2] But one need not repudiate the democratic process to deplore certain abuses which creep into it.[3]

If this article sought to settle the basic issues of taxation, such as the selection of the rate structure and the choice between more excise, individual income, or corporate taxes, it would indeed be taking sides in what Dr. Adams referred to as "class politics."[4] For our purpose let us accept the existing structure of tax laws and focus upon the preferential treatment and inequities within them. Thus the topic has been narrowed substantially. Though it may still be argued that this paper is unrealistic—an effort to take politics out of politics—I venture that this introduction of a quixotic approach to revenue legislation is no more bizarre than the enactment of certain amendments to the code recently introduced and adopted by Congress.

We have reason to be concerned about the future of taxation and tax administration. One economist has argued that when tax revenue exceeds 25 percent of national income, the danger point has been reached.[5] Upon this assumption we already have approached the limits of taxable capacity. Probably the most distinguished writers on economics disagree.[6] There is, however, another limit upon taxable capacity, which is basically psychological and has been too long taken for granted despite its importance. Our fiscal system cannot survive unless the majority of the citizenry retain confidence in the equity and uniformity of our tax laws and their administration, and will not countenance tax evasion. Stated in other words, the tendency toward preferential treatment breeds disrespect for the tax laws, and without respect there will be no effort made to abide by them.

The initial objective of this paper will be to demonstrate specifically the trend toward special legislation in the revenue laws. Principal reliance will be placed upon the Revenue Acts of 1951[7] and 1954,[8] which afford an extraordinary range of examples illustrating the history of pressures upon tax legislation. As will become quite clear from their provisions, Congress has responded to pressures for the benefit of specific individuals, industries, and economic groups. Following the analysis of particular amendments, a comparison will be attempted of the forms of relief currently available under the code for some of the major economic classes in our society: investors, owners of businesses, corporate executives, organized labor, farmers, and professional persons.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] See, e. g., act of October 25, 1949, 63 Stat. 891, and Technical Changes Act of 1953, 67 Stat. 615.

[2] Adams, Ideals and Idealism in Taxation, 18 Am. Econ. Rev. I (1928).

[3] Inquiry may arise whether this paper is an ambitious crusade against subsidies of all kinds authorized by Congress, such as parity for the farmers, bonuses for veterans, and tariffs upon imported goods. The answer is clearly negative. True enough, there are pressure groups behind them, but at least the subsidies themselves are generally open and aboveboard. In contrast, preferential tax treatment is often hard to detect and becomes apparent only after careful scrutiny. Secondly, and more important, the main thrust of the tax laws must be to raise reve-

nue, and not to satisfy political pressures by indirect grants-in-aid fostering disuniformity and inequity. For analyses of pressure groups primarily outside the tax field, see Wirtz, Government by Private Groups, 13 La. L. Res. 440 (1953); Schriftgiesser, The Lobbyists; the Art and Business of Influencing Lawmakers (1951); Crawford, The Pressure Boys (1939).

[4] See note 2 supra.

[5] Clark, The Danger Point in Taxes, Harper's, Dec. 1950, p. 67.

[6] See, e. g., Pechman & Mayer, Mr. Colin Clark on the Limits of Taxation, 34 Rev. Econ. & Statis., 232 (1952).

[7] 65 Stat. 452.

[8] 68A Stat. 3.

Pressure Groups and the Tax Laws—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the next section of Prof. William Cary's thoughtful study of our tax system is entitled "Response to Pressures From Individuals and Special Groups," which explains how special relief provisions for individuals and groups have been firmly embedded in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954:

II. RESPONSE TO PRESSURES FROM INDIVIDUALS AND SPECIAL GROUPS

A. Retention of old relief provisions

Special relief provisions for individuals and private groups contained in the preceding law have been reenacted and are firmly embedded in the 1954 code. Probably the finest demonstration of legislative tenacity, and of human incapacity to weed out laws once on the books, is section 1240, popularly known as the Mayer provision, in honor of the alleged principal beneficiary under it.[9] Originally introduced in the Revenue Act of 1951,[10] the provision bears the deceptively general title of "Taxability to Employee of Termination Payments." As a general rule, except in the case of qualified pension and like plans,[11] any lump-sum distribution upon retirement is taxable to the employee and bunched in 1 year as ordinary income.[12] Yet to resolve this predicament in the case of one movie executive, the bill provided for capital gains treatment where the taxpayer had been employed for more than 20 years, had held his rights to future profits for 12 years during his term of employment, and had the right to receive a percentage of profits for life or for a period of at least 5 years after the termination of his employment. How many persons could such a restricted provision cover? Perhaps an averaging system is needed for bunched income generally, or for retiring employees,[13] but is there any sound basis for the relief of one executive through capital gains treatment? It is especially noteworthy that counsel did not even trouble to present this amendment, and another involving personal holding companies, to the House Ways and Means Committee, but took all the matters which he sponsored directly to the Senate Finance Committee. Apparently pressure upon Members of one House sufficed to insure enactment of both measures.[14] In 1954 the question arose as to how this provision should be treated in the new code. Presumably because of its narrow scope it was omitted in the House bill. However, in the hearings before the Senate committee the proponent pointed out that "No explanation of the omission is contained in the Ways and Means Committee report, and it is believed that the omission was inadvertent." [15] He urged not only that the bill should incorporate the existing provision but also that the provision should be extended to cover the few cases where the taxpayer has rendered personal services under an agency contract involving receipt of profits after its termination. The argument was made that so long as relief was available to corporate employees under the original statute there was no reason why it should not be amended to cover comparable agency situations. The plea was effective to achieve the reacceptance of the 1951 provision by the Senate,[16] though it did not succeed in expanding its coverage.

In this case, as in the case of the personal holding company amendment,[17] there may be nothing alarming about the particular relief which the taxpayer received. However, the result was that a few persons were allowed special treatment, while others undoubtedly have suffered from comparable restraints.

B. New relief provisions

The 1954 code has not only incorporated the special relief provisions contained in preceding acts, but has also added new ones. Perhaps the most amusing addition is section 6073 (b), where—thanks to prevailing pressures along the coastal areas—the extra time given farmers to file a declaration is stretched by the parenthetical phrase "(including oyster farming)." [18]

A new case of congressional generosity in the 1954 code seems tailored to the needs of certain commission merchants in the South. Whether by custom or rules of the trade, a few of them are required to do business as partnerships although for tax purposes their preference would be in favor of operating in the corporate form. Their problem was considered by the Treasury, and received serious attention in connection with the administration's stated policy of favoring small business. In his budget message of 1954 the President said that small firms should be able to operate under whatever form of organization is desirable without being influenced by tax considerations, and then recommended "that corporations with a small number of active stockholders be given the option to be taxed as partnerships and that certain partnerships be given the option to be taxed as corporations." [19]

Provisions implementing this recommendation did not appear in the 1954 House bill (H. R. 8300) but were incorporated in the later Senate version. Section 1351 of the latter provided that corporations could elect to have the tax status of partnerships under specified conditions, and section 1361 gave an option to partnerships where capital was a material income-producing factor to be taxed as corporations. The latter was described in the Senate report as "complementary to the similar option granted certain corporations." [20]

The first and more important section, section 1351, was eliminated in conference, but—though few were affected—the momentum behind section 1361 was enough to effect its retention, thus putting the cart before the horse. In other words, two provisions linked together by the President and Senate were separated, and only the minor one—benefiting a handful—was ultimately enacted. At this point it may be asked why these partners should not be permitted to be taxed as if incorporated when they are not allowed to operate in the corporate form. But if this is the case, should they be singled out or should the same relief be available to all the professions as well? They too are required to practice as partners. The facts are that the statute is carefully drafted to exclude lawyers, doctors, and all types of partnerships in which capital is not a material income-producing factor.[21]

A major example of largess in 1954 was in favor of inventors and persons financing them in section 1235. Under the preceding law the controversy whether the sale of a patent should receive capital-gains treatment involved two questions: Was the originator an amateur or a professional, and did he receive for his patent installment payments or royalties taxable as ordinary income? [22] To obviate existing uncertainty and "to provide an incentive to inventors to contribute to the welfare of the Nation," [23] these considerations were eliminated. The House bill restricted the relief to the "first and original" inventor [24] and to cases where the sales price was not dependent, for more than 5 years, upon the productivity, use or disposition of the patent in the hands of the buyer.[25] The Senate, however, concluding that the House bill had not "accomplished its objective of stimulating inventions," [26] extended preferred treatment to anyone not a close relative or employee of the inventor who purchased the rights or an undivided interest in the invention before it was reduced to actual practice, and removed the 5-year proviso.[27] It should be noted, however, that the wishes of the patent lobby have not been fully satisfied. In the 1953 hearings the president of the National Patent Council urged that patents receive percentage depletion on the ground that "The depletion allowance is based on the fact that the supply of oil or minerals in a given area will eventually be exhausted. However, not one penny is given to an inventor for depletion, although a patent can last only 17 years." [28]

The benefits conferred upon inventors and their financial angels should be contrasted with the treatment of artists, authors, and composers under the current tax law. While many groups within our society (including a single movie executive) have become beneficiaries of amendments converting income into capital gains, the Revenue Act of 1950 administered the coup de grace to literary, musical, or artistic compositions by expressly excluding them from the definition of capital assets subject to favorable treatment.[29] Why should the disposition of books and symphonies not enjoy capital-gains treatments, while the sale of patents, livestock, and coal and timber royalties do? Is it because America tends to favor material success at the expense of developing the arts? Surely it cannot be that our critics abroad speak the truth. Most of us believe that this is not a conscious policy of discrimination against nonmaterial values. On the narrow issue of the 1950 amendment, the favorable ruling and the unfavorable publicity received with respect to the sale of the Eisenhower book may have been responsible for congressional action.[30] In general, however, the reason why professional men and artists are not receiving favorable treatment is probably a pragmatic one. They are individualists, too scattered to represent an effective political force, and without a lobby dedicated solely to the cause of obtaining special tax advantages. For example, while 3 representatives of 2 separate patent organizations appeared before the Senate committee on the 1954 act,[31] only 1 representative of the Mystery Writers of America, Inc., was present.[32] Upon the conclusion of her testimony, the chairman asked, "Why shouldn't we give these people some relief?" and received the reply that "We looked into this, and it is just a question of how far we want to go in extending capital-gains treatment." [33]

Although the foregoing illustrate, without exhausting, the special relief provisions en-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

acted in 1954, brief reference should be made to the amendment of old estate tax section 811 (g). The 1954 Code excludes life-insurance proceeds from the gross estate, whether decedent paid some or all of the premiums, so long as he retained no "incidents of ownership." [34] Even before the new section was 6 months old, it was said that the administration might seek its modification: some Treasury officials have discovered that the life-insurance industry has been strenuously selling the new provision, telling clients that only through insurance policies can they completely escape tax liability.[35]

C. Special provisions for charities

Lest it be thought that the only persons seeking special treatment are individuals or groups having a profit motive, attention should be directed to provisions dealing with charitable donations and organizations. One of the earliest relief provisions, first enacted in 1924,[36] is the so-called "Philadelphia Nun" provision, which permitted unlimited deductions if contributions plus taxes during the 10 preceding taxable years equaled more than 90 percent of taxable income.[37] Because the provision appeared "unduly strict," [38] Congress provided in the 1954 Code that the 90 percent test must be met in only 8 of the 10 years.[39] Even with this new relaxation the section still appears to be tailored to the problem of only a handful of ascetics.

In the Revenue Act of 1951[40] a special statute was passed for the relief of Wesleyan University, which had purchased a publication for elementary school children, then earning a million dollars a year.[41] Under the 1950 act income of a charity over $1,000 derived from unrelated business became taxable; [42] the 1951 act provided a 3-year period of grace to tax-exempt organizations to readjust outside businesses which they had purchased—but relief was limited strictly to the publishing field. The proponent of the measure, Senator McMahon, indicated that Wesleyan planned to integrate the publication into the university; but since it was circulated in primary schools only, Senator KERR intimated that the real object must be to integrate the million dollars per year, as in the case of any other profitable investment.[43]

Under the 1954 Code an extra 10 percent charitable deduction is provided to individuals if the contribution is made to churches, schools, or hospitals,[44] while the regular 20 percent may be paid to the broad list of tax-exempt organizations.[45] Possibly the selection of these three classes of charities for special treatment may be justified on logical grounds. However, let us compare the selection with the provision denying tax exemption to institutions engaging in prohibited financial transactions: [46] there exceptions are made not only for churches, schools, and hospitals, but also for organizations engaged in medical education or research.[47] To increase the diversity, the junior Senator from Kansas pointed out on the Senate floor how appropriate it is that "research in the field of agriculture be placed in the same administrative position with respect to the Revenue Code as medical research," and no one objected.[48] Thus by a grant of special treatment to a few organizations, any possibility of maintaining some uniform pattern among the charitable provisions of the Code has been shattered without a moment's reflection.

D. Forthcoming legislation

Full comprehension of the pressure for preferential treatment cannot be conveyed without consideration of forthcoming tax legislation, in all probability by the Technical Changes Act of 1955. Even before the President had signed the 1954 act, another tax bill had been referred to the Senate Committee on Finance, and was reported favorably.[49] Congress adjourned before it could be passed. The amendments included by the Senate committee furnish examples of what may be proposed this year, and provide relief to one railroad (retroactive to 1941) [50] certain charitable organizations,[51] the estates of certain persons who died from 1948 through 1950 without releasing powers of appointment,[52] farmers selling livestock on account of drought,[53] and other random beneficiaries.

One of the amendments is an attempt to extend existing special legislation. During the war years there was a statute which freed the estates of veterans dying in action from income tax for the year of their death.[54] The self-evident purpose of the law was to lessen the burden upon families whose financial security might be impaired by the loss of the serviceman. When relief has become available, there is always a next step in the quest for special treatment: why tax the estate of a deceased serviceman who was the beneficiary of a trust under which income was accumulated for his benefit while he was in the service? In 1951 an amendment was adopted to have such trust income treated as if it had been distributed to the veteran in the year of his death and thereby render it wholly tax-exempt.[55] The proposal now has been made to accord the same treatment retroactively to trusts where refunds already were barred.[56] Thus relief, originally limited to the personal income of the veteran is to be stretched to cover the undistributed income of any irrevocable trust under which he was the beneficiary.

E. The excess profits tax

Perhaps at this point inquiry may be raised why no mention has yet been made of the excess profits tax provisions. Among them are numerous glaring examples of special relief plainly tailored to a single company or at the most for the benefit of a few.[57] Typical illustrations are provisions which to the best of the writer's knowledge were applicable to 1 or 2 television manufacturers [58] or to a single paper company.[59] One of the baldest instances of preferential legislation is a section of the 1951 revenue act, providing for an alternative average base period net income with respect to any taxpayer which was engaged primarily in the newspaper publishing business and which after the middle of its base period and prior to July 1, 1950, consolidated with another newspaper published in the same locality.[60] We may well ask how many newspapers of a size subject to excess profits tax possibly underwent a consolidation during the very brief period specified. Obviously one concern was singled out.

The fact is that relief from the excess-profits tax was almost inevitable. Both in theory and in practice, the problem of defining what are excess profits is insoluble.[61] It is, in fact, one of the main reasons why the tax itself has been so unpopular. With rates above 80 percent, there would be instances of oppressive hardship if an excess-profits tax law were enacted which afforded no possible escape. For this reason there was in World War II a so-called general-relief statute entitled section 722, and the Excess Profits Tax Council was established to administer it.[62] Because of congressional dissatisfaction with the handling of section 722, relief provisions were specifically written into the new Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950.[63] In effect, Congress took unto itself the role occupied by the Excess Profits Tax Council, and granted statutory relief almost upon a case-by-case basis.[64] Thus if the 1950 excess-profits tax law had still been in effect in 1954, provision allowing special relief might have been expected because no one can say with any certainty what profits are normal and what are excess. It is still true, however, that the taxpayers having the most effective lobbies received relief and the less fortunate did not.

F. Preliminary generalizations

Before analyzing further instances of congressional response to outside pressures, we should arrive at some preliminary generalizations from the preceding examples of relief to individual taxpayers and private groups. In each instance the character of the relief afforded is so technical as to make a simple explanation impossible. Being obscure or incomprehensible to the layman, it is not recognized as an outright favor to one individual or a highly selective group. Moreover, the relief is not palpably unwarranted. The case involving the retiring movie magnate demonstrates one of the basic weaknesses in the tax system, namely, the taxing of bunched income where no averaging system is available. But this inequity affects a multitude of taxpayers: Artists, writers, athletes, and all persons retiring under similar circumstances. The movie executive here is probably not injured as much as the actors who work for the same company. By the same token, the inventor has received favored treatment without any congressional notice of others engaged in creative work. In this respect charitable organizations are equally vulnerable. Perhaps all these cases warranted relief, but is it not true that the tax laws work hardship in an infinite number of transactions? Can relief be scattered sporadically among a few individuals—whose only common characteristic is access to Congress—without making a mockery of the revenue laws? For every person who successfully argues that he is discriminated against there are thousands of others, inarticulate or ineffective, who are suffering the same fate in silence.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[9] Internal Revenue Code of 1939, section 117 (p), added by 65 Stat. 504 (1951). See Miller, Capital Gains Taxation of the Fruits of Personal Effort: Before and Under the 1954 Code, 64 Yale L. J. 1, 13 (1954). Sections of the 1954 Code are hereinafter referred to simply by section number; sections of the 1939 Code, 53 Stat. 1, as they read immediately before repeal, are referred to by "old" section number.

[10] Sec. 329, 65 Stat. 504 (1952).

[11] Sec. 402 (a) (2).

[12] E. T. Sproull, 16 T. C. 244 (1951), aff'd per curiam, 194 F. 2d 541 (6th Cir. 1952); cf. Eliott C. Morse, 17 T. C. 1244 (1952), aff'd, 202 F. 2d 69 (2d Cir. 1953). But cf. Commissioner v Oates, 207 F. 2d 711 (7th Cir. 1953), 67 Harv. L. Rev. 1268 (1954); see Eisenstein, A Case of Deferred Compensation, 4 Tax L. Rev. 391 (1949).

[13] For suggestions with respect to averaging, see Blough, Averaging Income for Tax Purposes, 20 Acc. Rev. 85 (1945); Groves, Postwar Taxation and Economic Progress 223–36 (1946); Simons, Personal Income Taxation 40 (1950); Vickrey, Agenda for Progressive Taxation 164–97 (1947); Bravman, Equalization of Tax on all Individuals With the Same Aggregate Income Over Same Number of Years, 50 Colum. L. Rev. 1 (1950); Hearings Before the House Committee on Ways and Means on Forty Topics Pertaining to the General Revision of the Internal Revenue Code, 83d Cong., 1st sess., pt. 1, at 243–272 (1953).

[14] See Hearings Before the Senate Committee on Finance on H. R. 4473, 82d Cong., 2d sess., pt. 3, at 1478 (1951).

There is no imputation or implication of illegal or unethical activities on the part of the sponsors of this provision, or their counsel. It is the system which is subject to scrutiny, not those persons who operate with skill and effectiveness under it and can put their case before pivotal persons in Congress.

[15] Hearings before the Senate Committee on Finance on H. R. 8300, 83d Cong., 2d sess., pt. 4, at 2003 (1954).

[16] S. Rept. No. 1622, 83d Cong., 2d sess. 115, 444 (1954) (hereinafter cited as S. Rept. No. 1622). "Your committee agrees with the objective of removing this provision prospectively but took that action in such a way as not to affect individuals who prior to 1954 entered into employment contracts relying on the application of this provision." Id. at 115.

[17] Under sec. 349 of the Revenue Act of 1951, 65 Stat. 519, relief was granted in 1939 to a Canadian personal holding company which was subject to tax because it had been unable to distribute its net income without violating the Trading With the Enemy Act, 40 Stat. 411 (1917), as amended, 12 U. S. C. sec. 95a (1952). See Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, Summary of Provisions of the Revenue Act of 1951, at 41 (1951) (hereinafter cited as Summary 1951 Act). Apparently upon the theory that profits would have been distributed in the absence of such restraints, the statute provides for a deduction in computing the concern's undistributed net income to the extent of sums which it was prevented from disbursing. In this connection attention should be drawn to the fact that no corresponding section was enacted providing that the income deducted "as if" distributed should be taxed as constructively received by the stockholders in 1951 or at any other time.

[18] "Declarations of estimated tax required by sec. 6015 from individuals whose estimated gross income from farming (including oyster farming) for the taxable year * * * may * * * be filed at any time on or before January 15 of the succeeding taxable year." Sec. 6073 (b).

[19] New York Times, January 22, 1954, p. 14, col. 5.

[20] S. Rept. No. 1622, at 119.

[21] Also significant is sec. 404 (c), relating to the United Mine Workers welfare and retirement fund. To meet the exigency that payments to the fund made on a tonnage-mined basis were not deductible, since they were not pursuant to a qualified plan, the new provision states that contributions will be deductible as trade or business expenses if made under an employee benefit plan established as a result of an agreement during a period of Government operation, under seizure powers, of a major part of the industry's facilities. S. Rept. No. 1622, at 56, 292

[22] See generally S. Rept. No. 1622, at 113–114, 438–441.

[23] Id., at 439.

[24] Report of the House Committee on Ways and Means To Accompany H. R. 8300, H. Rept. No. 1337, 83d Cong., 2d sess., pt. 2, at A280 (1954).

[25] Id., at 82, A279–A282.

[26] S. Rept. No. 1622, at 114.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Hearings before the House Committee on Ways and Means on H. R. 8300, 83d Cong., 1st sess., pt. 2, at 1191 (1954).

[29] Sec. 210 (a) (1), 64 Stat. 933 (1950).

[30] General Eisenhower sold all the rights in his war memoirs for a lump sum of $635,000 and received a Treasury ruling that it was capital gain. See Surrey & Warren, Cases and Materials on Federal Income Taxation 579 (1953 ed.).

[31] See hearings before the Senate Committee on Finance on H. R. 8300, 83d Cong., 2d sess., pt. 3, at 1662, 1666, 1684 (1954).

[32] Id. at 1610.

[33] Id. at 1612.

[34] Sec. 2042. See S. Rept. No. 1622, at 124, 472.

[35] Wall Street Journal, November 17, 1954, p. 1, col. 5.

[36] Revenue Act of 1924, sec. 214 (10) (E), 43 Stat. 271.

[37] Old sec. 120.

[38] S. Rept. No. 1622, at 30.

[39] Sec. 170 (b) (1) (C).

[40] Sec. 347, 65 Stat. 518 (1951).

[41] 97 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 11700, 12359 (1951).

[42] Revenue Act of 1950, sec. 421, 64 Stat. 948.

[43] 97 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 11701 (1951).

[44] Secs. 170 (b) (1) (A), (B).

[45] Secs. 170 (b) (1) (B), (C).

[46] Sec. 503.

[47] Sec. 503 (b).

[48] 100 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9044 (daily edition, July 1, 1954).

[49] H. R. 6440, 83d Cong., 2d sess., passed the House on July 29, 1954, and was reported with substantial amendments by Senator MILLIKIN, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, on August 2, 1954. S. Rept. No. 2038, 83d Cong., 2d sess. (1954).

[50] H. R. 6440, 83d Cong., 2d sess., sec. 3 (1954).

[51] Id., sec. 4

[52] Id., sec. 5.

[53] Id., sec. 7.

[54] 57 Stat. 149 (1943). Individuals dying while in active service during World War II were forgiven their income tax with respect to the year of death, and also unpaid income taxes for prior years. Sec. 334 of the Revenue Act of 1951 provided similar treatment for members of the Armed Forces dying in combat zones during the Korean hostilities. 65 Stat. 507.

[55] Revenue Act of 1951, sec. 345, 65 Stat. 517.

[56] H. R. 6440, 83d Cong., 2d sess., sec. 1 (1954).

[57] See generally Oakes, the Revenue Act of 1951: Excess Profits Tax Amendments, 5 Nat'l Tax J. 53 (1952).

[58] See Revenue Act of 1951, sec. 516, 65 Stat. 553; Summary 1951, Act 54.

[59] See Revenue Act of 1951, sec. 511, 65 Stat. 551; Summary 1951, Act 52.

[60] Section 518, 65 Stat. 554 (1951); see Summary 1951, Act 55.

[61] See Rudick, The Controversy Over EPT, 6 Tax L. Rev. 121, 127–128 (1951).

[62] 54 Stat. 986 (1940), as amended, 56 Stat. 914 (1942); Mim. 6035, 1946–2 Cum. Bull., 97.

[63] Sec. 442–46, 64 Stat. 1163–72 (1951).

[64] Address by Gordon Grand, Jr., minority adviser, House Committee on Ways and Means, 82d Cong., before the 44th annual conference on taxation sponsored by the National Tax Association, Dallas, Tex., November 27, 1951.

Pressure Groups and the Tax Laws—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in part III of Professor Cary's study of the work of pressure groups on our tax structure, he takes up the manner in which industry groups have been granted special tax privileges:

The code has not only scattered largess among specific individuals and private groups who requested relief but has also shown some evidence of responding to pressures from several industry groups. In general, it appears that the extractive industries are the principal beneficiaries, and as a whole they are gaining an increasingly strong position in our tax structure.

Of this group, the oil industry has been the most frequently commented upon, principally by reason of the 27½ percent deduction allowed against gross income for depletion.[65] No attempt will be made here to repeat the criticisms leveled at the favored status which the oil group enjoys.[66] Only a handful of Senators venture to oppose it. In fact, one Senator urged his colleague, Senator DOUGLAS, to withdraw a controversial amendment by saying, "I am simply trying to keep [him] * * * from committing suicide."[67] The industry now regards percentage depletion as a sacrosanct, almost constitutional, prerogative, but still not enough. Other advantages have been sought. One already obtained is the privilege of writing off intangible drilling costs as expenses rather than capitalizing them and perhaps losing them as deductions.[68] In 1950 the oil industry also succeeded before the Senate committee in having inserted a new provision which would convert the assignment of so-called in-oil payments from an ordinary income transaction into capital gain. Although the conference committee rejected the change,[69] it should be recognized that a matter once raised is not finally disposed of, but will recur as an issue in hearings on subsequent revenue acts.

Several other extractive industries appear to have profited recently from effective lobbying: coal in 1951[70] and in the same year, sand, gravel, and stone.[71] With respect to coal, the percentage depletion deduction was increased from 5 to 10 percent on the ground, stated in the committee report of 1951, that the coal mining industry was peculiarly in need of more favorable tax treatment because of the inroads which alternative sources of energy, particularly oil and gas, had made on the potential markets for coal.[72] It is interesting to note the inconsistent theories upon which the percentage depletion deduction is granted. On the one hand, the intention is to stimulate development and wildcatting by awarding such a tax advantage to the oil industry.[73] On the other, it is to furnish relief to an industry which has suffered by reason of the increasing use of oil and gas. If percentage depletion has any function in our tax structure, should it be used to encourage development of one group and "bail out" another at the same time?

As a supplement to the additional percentage depletion upon coal, the 1951 act conferred preferential capital gains treatment upon royalties received by lessors.[74] The Senate committee report expressed solicitude for the industry and for the leases originally drawn on coal property. It pointed out that most of them are long term and call for royalty payments in cents per ton; hence the lessor does not receive the automatic adjustment for price changes which occurs when a royalty is expressed as a percentage of the value of the coal extracted. Further, the report stated, many of the existing coal leases were old and royalty payments therefore small.[75] But it should be noted that capital gains treatment was given to coal royalties on both past and future leases. Congress apparently decided to confer a subsidy on the coal industry through the revenue laws. Of course, the argument can be made that the 1951 provision[76] merely extends to the coal industry what the timber industry had already received.[77] The next question, then, will be why the coal industry should benefit if the oil industry does not, and why capital gains treatment should not be available with respect to oil or many other royalties in areas which might deserve positive encouragement instead of subsidies for their declining status.

It should be noted further that according to the Senate committee the lessor of a coal

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

property as a practical matter is not likely to benefit from the increased percentage depletion provided.[78] Thus since the latter allowance would be of material aid to only one group (the operators), another group (the lessors) must receive some compensating form of special treatment, such as capital gains. Once a policy of relief has been adopted, the consequence is that all participants, operators as well as lessors, must obtain a subsidy lest there be discrimination among them.

The iron-ore industry in 1954 sought and almost obtained the capital gains treatment now available to owners of timber and coal. By an amendment to the Senate bill, tax relief was expanded to include the disposal of iron ore,[79] but the amendment was subsequently eliminated in conference.[80] However, continuing pressure upon the Senate is strong enough that the possibility of capital gains treatment cannot be deemed a dead issue.

Iron ore is already receiving substantial benefits under the tax laws. Percentage depletion of 15 percent [81] has long been available to it, and the Revenue Act of 1951 permitted the expressing of all items incurred for the development of a mine or deposit.[82] Similar benefits are provided with respect to the write-off of mine exploration expenditures to the extent of $100,000 in the 1954 Code.[83] The reasons given in the Senate committee report for permitting both deductions are much the same. The report points out that where the depletion allowance is a percentage of the gross income of the property it is the same whether a large or small outlay is necessary to explore and develop the mine, with the result that mines having relatively large exploratory and developments costs are subject to unfair discrimination.[84] Thus it would appear that the largess of percentage depletion in turn generates an inequity which must then be remedied.

Another group which has been satisfied, after years of clamor over "discrimination," may be referred to loosely as the "sand and gravel lobby." In 1951 almost every known building material received a 5-percent allowance for depletion.[85] When Senator Douglas moved unsuccessfully to strike out clam and oyster shells on the ground that he did not regard them as necessary to the national defense, Senator Connally said in debate, "The Senator from Illinois is greatly concerned about clamshells. He does not have many in his district." [86] In 1954, allowances for granite, marble, slate, and other stone, when used as dimension or ornamental stone, were raised from 5 to 15 percent.[87] In order to draw some line, however remote, Congress in the new Code expressly stated that percentage depletion does not apply to soil and water, or minerals from sea water, air, or similar inexhaustible sources.[88]

One of the most troublesome issues in 1954 arose over limestone. The general policy of the statute appears to be that minerals used for road material, concrete, or similar purposes shall receive only a 5-percent allowance. However, two Senators on the Senate floor pointed out that this would give higher grade limestone unfair treatment when used or sold competitively with items such as rock asphalt, which under section 613 (b) (3) receives 15 percent even though used on roads.[89] The statute, therefore, was amended specially to provide 15-percent depletion where a mineral is sold "on bid in direct competition with a bona fide bid to sell a mineral" bearing the higher rate.[90] Thus the gates have been opened to permit even road-building materials to receive further tax relief.

The next step can be best visualized through the testimony of the chairman of the taxation committee of the National Sand and Gravel Association before the Senate Finance Committee in 1954. He pointed out that the House bill at the time proposed a 15-percent allowance for limestone for whatever purpose used, and expressed the hope that "the wisdom and justification of the proposal will be recognized by your committee." [91] He further testified that the same considerations which led to this decision by the House apply with equal force and logic to the sand and gravel producers, who are in competition with producers of crushed limestone all over the United States.

If the oil industry receives percentage depletion,[92] why should not other extractive industries? One theory advanced for percentage depletion, that the owner is losing his capital which should be valued at some figure approaching discovery value,[93] is applicable to all extractive industries. Probably the strongest argument made by the oil industry is that the predominant importance of oil in our economy, particularly in connection with any war effort, constitutes a justification for benefiting taxpayers risking their capital in discovering and developing new sources of supply.[94] The argument is particularly applicable to the independent oil wildcatters engaged in sinking holes which may be and often prove to be dry. Undeniably the risks they run are enormous. On the other hand, critics have noted that the chances taken by the major oil firms are within the range of normal business activity, and therefore query whether such largess is warranted.[95]

Even if we are willing to accept these arguments, it does not follow that percentage depletion at present rates is relief solely for the loss which the owner would otherwise suffer. When available to all substances save earth, air, and water, the depletion allowance quickly becomes an outright subsidy. The defense argument for percentage depletion in the oil industry may apply in the case of uranium, but it certainly does not exist in connection with sand, gravel, and like materials. Are there not in fact many other industries where further development should be encouraged? What accounts for legislation favoring sand and gravel firms is the continued political pressure of the firms affected and the argument that, as compared with the oil, coal, and timber industries, they are being discriminated against.

The foregoing illustrations of congressional responses to pressure from industry groups point toward the basis upon which tax relief has been granted. As already noted, the extractive industries have been the principal beneficiaries.[96] How have they succeeded so admirably, when in fact the coal industry's plea rests upon its depressed condition, while the oil industry bases its claim upon the importance of stimulating exploration and developing reserves? The formula in most cases appears to be the discrimination argument, the demand for tax equity. As one author has indicated, tax equity is achieved when the same load is placed on different persons who are in similar economic positions.[97] With respect to percentage depletion the coal industry sought to be placed in the same favorable position as the oil group, and the sand and gravel spokesmen felt they were being discriminated against if they did not receive treatment similar to that already available to the oil, coal, sulfur, and mining industries. And now that timber and coal royalties are afforded capital gains treatment, the lever of discrimination can again be used most effectively by the iron ore and oil men to claim similar advantages for royalties and "in-oil payments."

Footnotes at end of speech.

[65] Sec. 613 (b) (1).

[66] E. g., Baker & Griswold, Percentage Depletion—A Correspondence, 64 Harvard Law Review 361 (1951); Blum, How To Get All (But All) the Tax Advantages of Dabbling in Oil, 31 Taxes 343 (1953).

[67] 100 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 8864 (daily edition, June 30, 1954) (Senator NEELY).

[68] U. S. Treasury Regulation 118, sec. 39–23 (m)–16 (a) (1) (1953).

[69] H. R. Rept. 3124, 81st Cong., 2d sess. 28 (1950).

[70] Revenue Act of 1951, sec. 319 (a), 65 stat. 497.

[71] Ibid.

[72] S. Rept. 781, 82d Cong., 1st sess. 37 (1951).

[73] See Baker & Griswold, Percentage Depletion—A Correspondence, 64 Harvard Law Review, 361, 362 (1951); see also Blum, supra note 66.

[74] Old sec. 117 (k) (2), added by Revenue Act of 1951, sec. 325, 65 Stat. 501, retained in the new Code as sec. 631.

[75] S. Rept. 781, 82d Cong., 1st sess., 42 (1951).

[76] Revenue Act of 1951, secs. 325 (b), (c), 65 Stat. 501. The provision is retained in new sec. 631 (c).

[77] Sec. 631 (b); old sec. 117 (k) (2).

[78] S. Rept. 781, 82d Cong., 1st sess. 42 (1951).

[79] S. Rept. 1622, at 338–339.

[80] H. Rept. 2543, 83d Cong., 2d sess. 33 (1954).

[81] Sec. 613 (b) (3).

[82] Sec. 309 (a), 65 Stat. 486 (1951).

[83] Sec. 615 (a). It was only $75,000 under the Revenue Act of 1951. Sec. 342 (a), 65 Stat. 515.

[84] S. Rept. 781, 82d Cong., 1st sess. 44, 63 (1951).

[85] Revenue Act of 1951, sec. 319, 65 Stat. 497.

[86] 97 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 12355–12356 (1951).

[87] Sec. 613 (b) (6). See S. Rept. 1622, at 78–79, 331–332.

[88] Sec. 613 (b) (6) (A) (B).

[89] 100 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9043 (daily edition July 1, 1954) (both Senators were from Texas).

[90] Sec. 613 (b) (6).

[91] Hearings Before the Senate Committee on Finance on H. R. 8300, 83d Cong., 2d sess., pt. 3, at 1267 (1954).

[92] Secs. 611 (a), 613.

[93] Baker & Griswold, Percentage Depletion—A Correspondence, 64 Harv. L. Rev. 361, 378–79 (1951).

[94] Id. at 362; see statement of Gen. Ernest Thompson in Hearings Before the House Committee on Ways and Means on Forty Topics Pertaining to the General Revision of the Internal Revenue Code, 83d Cong., 1st sess., pt. 3, at 2001, 2003–04 (1953).

[95] Baker & Griswold, supra note 93, at 371, 377.

[96] See also Heller, Practical Limitations on the Federal Net Income Tax: Limitations of the Federal Individual Income Tax, 7 J. Finance 185, 197 (1952).

[97] Blough, The Federal Taxing Process 48 (1952).

Pressure Groups and the Tax Laws—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, part IV of Professor Cary's discussion of pressure groups and our tax system tells how investors, corporate executives, owners of family businesses, organized labor, farmers, and professional people have each enjoyed special tax privileges:

IV. RESPONSE TO PRESSURES FROM ECONOMIC GROUPS

In moving from the privileged tax treatment accorded to specific individuals and

industries, I next shall attempt a brief survey of some of the important economic groups in our society and how they are faring in the race for special benefits. To a large extent favored treatment is being conferred in a sporadic manner, without regard to what privileges are available to one class and withheld from another. Cases evoking sympathy and a desire to provide benefits are individually brought to the attention of Congress, and treated upon an ad hoc basis.

A. Investors

Those individuals who are well advised, or especially fitted by occupation, training, and background, are likely to be able to realize fully the opportunities for minimizing their tax burdens. Today the large investor probably constitutes the most important beneficiary of preferential treatment. A Harvard Business School study has reached the opinion that much of the income received by upper bracket individuals appears to avoid the full impact of the income tax.[98] One chart indicates that in 1946 there was little or no progression in effective tax rates beyond the $50,000 income level, and the maximum average tax rate was less than 50 percent, despite the fact that theoretical effective rates ranged as high as 85.5 percent.[99]

The difference in effective tax rates on individuals with large incomes can be attributed in major part to capital gains. There is undoubtedly a segment among the investor group whose whole attention is directed toward transactions which ultimately might yield return of a capital nature. Some of the available media are marketable common stocks, new ventures, real estate, oil properties, and closely held concerns. Since the war there has been considerable activity in the purchase and sale of appreciated property, sometimes following the acquisition of the stock and the liquidation of a family or close corporation. Another opportunity available to those in control of operating companies is to insure the retention of corporate earnings and continuous expansion until the owner can realize upon the correspondingly enhanced value of stock or assets at capital gains rates.[100] Furthermore, the area of capital gains has been growing to include timber royalties and, most recently, coal royalties.[101] But the capital gains rate of 25 percent seems to reduce the effective tax rates upon certain persons with large incomes without affecting taxability of others at all.[102] Thus there is created disuniformity in the rate structure even among wealthy investors. Pressure to expand the scope of capital gains, and to reduce the rate and required holding period, is a hardy perennial in congressional hearings, and cannot be discounted as a source of additional benefit to the high-bracket taxpayer in the future.

Another quite different way of reducing the effective rate of taxation is through the purchase of tax-exempt securities and of insurance.[103] Persons of wealth interested in capital preservation or security, as distinguished from capital appreciation, have bought substantial amounts of municipal and similar types of bonds. In this instance exemption is not due primarily to political pressure from the large investor. Its origin rests in the desire of States and municipalities to issue securities at a very low rate of interest.[104] Yet this tax-exemption feature represents at the present time a substantial inequity in favor of persons in high income-tax brackets. There has been also a tendency among the same group to invest in other low-risk investments having tax advantages, such as life-insurance policies. The freedom from income tax of the investment increment in life insurance is probably the major factor which renders life insurance attractive to the tax-conscious investor. The fact that the interest element is not subject to tax during the investor's life or a his death is but one of the special favors enjoyed by life insurance over other investment media.[105] For individuals in very high tax brackets the after-tax yields on common stock may be reduced below those available from tax-exempt securities and certain life-insurance policies, and conservative investors may not regard the higher income, if any, as adequate compensation for the risk of capital loss inherent in stock ownership.

Another grant available to the large investor, namely, percentage depletion, has already been discussed at length.[106] Investment in oil royalties from proven fields offers one means of utilizing this tax advantage.[107] Oil-drilling syndicates financed by persons of wealth have now become commonplace. They frequently invest a portion of their funds with the expectation of writing off intangible drilling costs immediately as an expense against high income and taking the additional 27½-percent deduction in the event that drilling is successful.[108]

Perhaps the most obvious benefit to the investor group is the new dividend-credit provision of the 1954 act.[109] Besides the argument of alleged double taxation, probably the major reason given for the relief is that the tax burden on distributed corporate earnings "has contributed to the impairment of investment incentives."[110] The Senate committee report pointed out that capital which would otherwise be invested in stocks is driven into channels involving less risk, restricting the ability of companies to raise equity capital and forcing them to rely too heavily on borrowed money.[111] Thus, in part, the credit for dividends can be described as an inducement to counteract the existing tax exemption of insurance and municipal bonds.

B. Corporate executives

Another group which has been substantially favored by the income-tax laws is the executives of established corporations. For some time, since the enactment of old section 165 (a), now section 401, this group has shared the advantages of pension and profit-sharing plans available to employees of such companies generally.[112] In order to qualify, such plans must be drawn in such a way as not to discriminate in favor of employees who are officers, shareholders, or supervisors.[113] At the same time the group covered can be severely limited under the 1954 code, and there is no objection to providing ultimately for substantial remuneration to top employees after retirement. The basic difference between executives and other employees is that the former benefit in a larger dollar amount.[114] The new code has taken an additional step favorable to employees having sizable estates by excluding from the estate tax any annuity or other payment receivable by a widow or other beneficiary under a qualified plan.[115]

Question might be raised as to the pressures which were responsible for the original enactment of pension and profit-sharing legislation. Here, as in the case of municipal bonds, the reason for enactment did not stem from the beneficiaries, the executives. It lies in a public policy favoring the assumption of responsibility by companies for their employees after retirement. In other words, the executive group is a byproduct beneficiary of a broad policy favoring employees as a class. Yet thanks in part to Federal tax policy the amounts received after the retiring age can be so bountiful that the time may come when the estate tax and income-tax benefits enjoyed by management will be subjected to congressional review.

One benefit available to corporate executives does not arise from a special provision in the code, but rather from a judicial definition of when income becomes taxable. Deferred compensation plans are common today, pursuant to which executives receive some of their increased compensation in the form of payments after retirement in return for acting as consultants.[116]

The trend in the direction of favoring corporate executives is perhaps demonstrated most clearly by the stock-option provision enacted in 1950.[117] It has been broadened in several respects under the 1954 code. Having the alleged objective of providing an incentive for executives to obtain a stake in the enterprise,[118] this provision nevertheless favors officers who are recipients of options, if they sell the shares they obtain more than 2 years after the grant of the option and more than 6 months after the transfer of the stock. Under these circumstances they are permitted to realize the profit upon their "stake" at capital-gains rates.[119] The corporation law cases which have arisen since the enactment of the stock-option provision indicate that a consideration in the form of services should be exacted for such options.[120] They also demonstrate that such options are basically for services rendered and therefore compensation, which in the case of other classes in our society is treated as ordinary income, not as capital gain.[121] An interesting facet of the stock-option law is that it rarely provides relief for employees of small businesses because of the 10-percent stock ownership limitation and the difficulty of ascertaining the value of the stock at the option date.[122] This result is directly in conflict with the incentive rationale underlying the stock-option law, for the efforts of the management of a small concern seem more likely to be reflected in its success and the value of its shares than the efforts of employees of public corporations, where the price rise may represent stock-market trends or extrinsic conditions such as the Korean war.

Though not related to special legislation, a further avenue for privileged treatment of corporate executives is through perquisites of office, which are becoming increasingly accepted among corporations. The allocation of automobiles to executives for personal use, an executive lunchroom with meals at cost, club memberships, entertainment, and expense accounts are probably the least objectionable of many benefits which today are available to many company officers.[123] Most of them are actually income to the person, but are difficult for the Internal Revenue Service to detect. In fact, any strict application of the principle of taxing all of them would undoubtedly be regarded as an attack on a customary method of doing business in this country.

C. Owners of family businesses

The owners of family businesses today are probably in a position even more favorable taxwise than that of corporate executives. This is especially true when they are operating through a corporation rather than a partnership. In general theirs are the same opportunities available to the large investor. Under the corporate method of doing business the owners are in a favorable position to build up the company by accumulating profits which may be realized at capital gains rates through ultimate sale or liquidation.[124] The cost involved is payment of the corporate tax and an ultimate capital gains tax upon earnings which, if distributed as dividends, would have been taxable to the owners as income. The accumulation of profits, on the other hand, is not readily available to the owners of family businesses operating in the partnership form, where earnings must be reported in the individual return. However, anyone operating a business as a partnership likewise has the ultimate advantage of disposing of his interest at capital gains rates under existing law.[125] Moreover, one of the most important tax advantages to the owners of family businesses today, whether in the

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

corporate or partnership form, is the facility to charge off substantial amounts of personal expenditures as business expenses.[126] And it should be noted that the proprietors of closely-held concerns have an extraordinary opportunity to benefit through a profit-sharing and pension plan in their capacity as employees of their own companies.[127] In these respects they can have many of the advantages available to the executives of public corporations, and yet do not lose any possible opportunities to realize on their profits through ultimate sale or liquidation at favorable rates.

The owner of a family business, like the large investor, can spread the total earned income of the business over the family group to obtain tax advantages. This may be done in the corporate field by the distribution of shares to members of the family or to trusts for their benefit. Largely because such a benefit was available to persons operating in the corporate form, the same kind of relief was made available in the Revenue Act of 1951 to family partnerships.[128] Passed after years of litigation, the act provided that for Federal income tax purposes a person must be recognized as a partner if he owns an interest in which capital is a material income-producing factor, whether the capital interest was acquired by purchase or gift. A gift of a share in a family partnership is henceforth to be respected regardless of the motives which actuated the transfer. Thus in the case of both corporate and partnership firms where capital plays some part, owners are able to spread among their family groups income derived in large measure from their own efforts.

D. Organized labor

The tax benefits derived by organized labor under the Internal Revenue Code are not yet on a par with those of the investor, corporate executives, or business owners. The capital gains provision, for example, is of less advantage to the average worker since his income is relatively low and consists of earnings exclusively. Also, no opportunity is afforded for taking generous deductions, since under the withholding process the employer furnishes a statement showing total wages and the tax withheld. As a consequence, it is not surprising to find that organized labor has opposed as "loopholes" many of the provisions which Congress has enacted favoring other economic groups: percentage depletion, capital gains, and the like.[129]

At the same time labor can scarcely be described as unrealistic. Tax considerations have played a part in the current shifting of bargaining from wages alone to payments in the event of retirement, accident, or sickness. Perhaps ultimately labor will resort to the same arguments that have been relied upon by business owners and executives. Already the tax position of organized employees in established firms is much more favorable than that of workers as a whole. The former may be said to receive preferential tax treatment through pension and profit-sharing plans, under which contributions are exempted from tax in the hands of the trust and until actually received by the employee.[130] The 1954 Code further provides that total distributions paid to the employee within 1 year on account of his death or other separation from service shall be considered capital gain.[131] The code has carried over, and in some cases broadened, previously enacted exclusions from income in the case of contributions by employers to health plans,[132] compensation for injury and sickness,[133] wages continued in such event,[134] and $5,000 of insurance paid by reason of the employee's death.[135]

A movement seems to be growing to bargain for broader fringe benefits, which might be treated as falling under a comprehensive definition of income. These benefits take innumerable forms, such as free meals, medical service, summer vacations, purchase discounts, and insurance. They have grown from $8.8 billion in 1952 to $9.6 billion in 1953.[136] One office equipment company has stated that its fringe benefits amount to about $550 per employee, or a total of over $7 million per year for its 14,000-person work force.[137] Yet there is some doubt whether it is administratively feasible to tax them.[138]

The political and economic bargaining power of strong unions raises the question whether, in the light of the growing demand for revenue from low-bracket taxpayers, it is not inevitable that the responsibilities of the employer will be expanded to include not only safer working but also better living conditions for the worker, and that pressure will be exerted to render such improved conditions, these fringe benefits, tax free. In essence the argument is that the Government cannot tax a clerk working in well-lighted, air-conditioned surroundings more than a steelworker earning the same salary. Hence taxes should not be imposed upon the perquisites furnished some elements of labor by reason of their stronger negotiating position. But then the problem is whether the perquisites available to management are any different in principle, though more elaborate in kind, from those enjoyed by labor. It is conceivable that in terms of taxation the objectives of management and of organized labor in bargaining with corporate organization today actually coincide, to the joint detriment of the Federal revenue.

Perhaps by reason of taxes our society is moving back to the status of a barter economy. As one author has said, "we are going through a development which is just the opposite of that which marked the end of the feudal period when wage payments were being commuted into money. Now many wages are being commuted into tax-free services. Perhaps the time will come when the individual unfortunate enough to receive all of his wages in money will have an impossible tax burden." [139]

E. Farmers

It is perhaps never fully appreciated that one class of persons profiting extensively from the present tax laws is the farmer. In general the benefits he receives do not flow from special legislation. Part of the farmer's tax advantage seems to stem from three facts: Farmers' lodging (like that of all homeowners) is not treated as income; none of the fuel or food, if the farm is self-supporting, is included in income; and there is much careless reporting, perhaps even deliberate omission.[140] As a practical matter, is there any real way of enabling the Government to realze upon any one of these sources of income? Much of the benefit farmers receive can be attributed to the impossibility of administering a tax law which could include, or even discover, all items that might in theory be treated as income in the farmer's hands.

At the same time it cannot be said that farmers as a class are resting on their existing favorable tax status. The Revenue Act of 1951 provided that income derived from disposition of livestock should have the benefits of capital gains treatment.[141] At one point in the history of the bill turkeys, but not chickens, were included.[142] Both were finally eliminated. But now that favorable treatment has been accorded to quadrupeds, the question may arise whether similar advantages should not be accorded to poultry, and ultimately to crops.

F. Professional people

One element in our society which may be regarded as orphaned under the Internal Revenue Code is the professional class. Although lawyers and doctors are said to enjoy their peak earnings during the 20-year span from the age of 40 to 60,[143] there is no opportunity to average that income throughout their working lives. It is true that lawyers, writers, and other professional men have the opportunity to spread an extraordinary amount received in any 1 year over a longer period if the services rendered cover more than 3 years, but the privilege is a limited one.[144] There is little tax relief and no pension plan available to professional people, though bills are now pending which may afford them the opportunity to deduct a portion of their income provided it is irrevocably set aside until their retirement.[145]

The status of actors, athletes, and artists is even worse. The span of their earning power frequently is a period of less than 10 years. They are probably the worst victims of the principle that income must be computed upon an annual basis and taxed in the year of receipt. Although authors, artists, and musicians share the privilege of spreading the income received from work involving prolonged effort, they too may fairly claim to be victims of discrimination. Why should not the disposition of books and symphonies enjoy the capital gains treatment that the sale of patents, livestock, and interests in coal and timber now receives? [146]

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[98] Butters, Thompson, and Bollinger, Effects of Taxation—Investments by Individuals 65, 84 (1953). Much of the material in subsection A is based upon this excellent book.

[99] Id., at 85–86.

[100] Butters, Lintner, and Cary, Effects of Taxation—Corporate Mergers 94 (1951); Cary, The Effect of Taxation on Selling Out a Corporate Business for Cash, 45 Ill. L. Rev. 423, 426 (1950).

[101] Sec. 631 (c).

[102] Butters, Thompson, and Bollinger, op. cit. supra note 98, at 84.

[103] Id., at 39.

[104] See, e. g., hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee on Revenue Revision of 1942, 77th Cong., 2d sess., pt. 2, at 1517 (1942). See also hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee on Revenue Revision of 1951, 82d Cong., 1st sess., pt. 2, at 903–1159 (1951).

[105] See Butters, Thompson, and Bollinger, Effects of Taxation—Investments by Individuals 316–317 (1953).

[106] See p. 757 supra.

[107] See Butters, Thompson, and Bollinger, op. cit. supra note 105, at 131.

[108] See p. 757 supra.

[109] Secs. 34, 116.

[110] S. Rept. No. 1622, at 6.

[111] Ibid.

[112] In general, the advantage to executives, i. e., employees, is that sums contributed by the corporation, while immediately deductible by the corporation, are not taxable to the recipient until their ultimate receipt.

[113] Sec. 401 (a) (3)–(5).

[114] The extensive use of such plans by established concerns is set forth in Hall, Effects of Taxation—Executive Compensation and Retirement Plans (1951). See also Lyon, Capital Gains Benefits Connected With Executive Retirement, N. Y. U., 12th Ann. Inst. Fed. Tax. 365 (1954).

[115] Sec. 2039 (c).

[116] Deferred compensation plans are discussed in Washington and Rothschild, Compensating the Corporate Executive 168–185 (1951).

[117] Revenue Act of 1950, secs. 218 (a), (b), 64 Stat. 942, added sec. 130A to the 1939 code; retained as sec. 421 of the new code.

[118] S. Rept. No. 1622, at 58.

[119] For early criticisms of the new stock-option provisions, see Lyon, Employee Stock Options Under the Revenue Act of 1950, 51 Colum. L. Rev. 1, 52–57 (1951); Griswold The Blessings of Taxation: Recent Trends in the Law of Federal Taxation, 36 A. B. A. J.

909, 1057 (1950); see generally Dean, Employee Stock Options, 66 Harv. L. Rev. 1403 (1953).

[120] *Kerbs* v. *California Eastern Airways, Inc.* (90 A. 2d 652, 656–657 (Del. 1952)); *Gottlieb* v. *Heyden Chemical Corp.* (90 A. 2d 660, 664 (Del. 1952)).

[121] For a demonstration of the potential profits ($21 million for the corporate officers participating in 26 stock-option plans), see Stryker, Do Stock Options Pay?, Fortune, December 1954, p. 118; see also Miller, Capital Gains Taxation of the Fruits of Personal Effort: Before and Under the 1954 Code, 64 Yale L. J. 1 (1954).

[122] Id. at 50.

[123] For lurid expositions of the growing use of expense accounts, see Havemann, Expense Account Aristocracy, Life, March 9, 1953, p. 140; F. Allen, The Big Change, 215–218 (1952).

[124] See Cary, The Effect of Taxation on Selling Out a Corporate Business for Cash, 45 Ill. L. Rev. 423 (1950).

[125] Sec. 741. Cf. *William* v. *McGowan* (152 F. 2d 570 (2d Cir. 1945)); *Swiren* v. *Commissioner* (183 F. 2d 656 (7th Cir. 1950)); *Hatch's Estate* v. *Commissioner* (198 F. 2d 26 (9th Cir. 1952)).

[126] See note 123 supra.

[127] For recommendations with respect to profit-sharing and pension plans for closely held firms, see 1 P–H Corp. Serv. Rep. Bull. No. 5 (1953).

[128] Sec. 340, 65 Stat. 511 (1951); see also Summary 1951 Act 41.

[129] See, e. g., the testimony of the Director of the Department of Education and Research of the CIO, in the Hearings on the Revenue Act of 1951 before the Senate Finance Committee, 82d Cong., 1st sess., pt. 2, at 932 (1951).

[130] Secs. 401–04.

[131] Sec. 402 (a) (2); cf. Revenue Act of 1951, sec. 335 (a), 65 Stat. 507.

[132] Sec. 106.

[133] Sec. 104.

[134] Sec. 105 (d).

[135] Sec. 101.

[136] New York Times, October 17, 1954, sec. 3, p. 1, col. 5.

[137] Ratchford, Practical Limitations to the Net Income Tax—General, 7 J. Finance 203, 211 (1952). "During 1949 these (fringe benefit) programs became the primary issue on the collective bargaining agenda of many unions. * * * This intensified drive * * * resulted in the extension of these plans to more than 7½ million workers by mid-1950." Id. at 210–211.

[138] See Guttentag, Leonard, & Rodewold, Federal Income Taxation of Fringe Benefits: A Specific Proposal, 6 Nat'l Tax J. 250 (1953).

[139] Ratchford, supra note 137, at 211.

[140] "For 1945 * * * the startling result is that 'only 36 percent of farm income was reported on tax returns * * * as against 87 percent of nonfarm entrepreneurial income'." Heller, Practical Limitations on the Federal Net Income Tax: Limitations of the Federal Individual Income Tax, 7 J. Finance 185, 198 (1952).

[141] Sec. 324, 65 Stat. 501.

[142] H. R. 4423, 82d Cong., 1st sess. sec. 1175 (1951). In the course of the Senate debate Senator GEORGE said, "I certainly cannot take the chicken amendment to conference. Turkeys were included somehow, I do not know how." 97 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 12336–12338 (1951).

[143] Postponement of Income Tax on Income Set Aside for Retirement, Hearings Before the House Committee on Ways and Means on H. R. 4371, 4373, 3456, 82d Cong., 2d Sess. 13, 14, 18 (1952); Silverson, Earned Income and Ability To Pay, 3 Tax L. Rev. 299 (1948).

[144] See sec. 1301.

[145] See, e. g., the Jenkins-Keogh bill, H. R. 10, 83d Cong., 1st sess. (1953); see generally Note, 66 Harv. L. Rev. 1105 (1953).

[146] See sec. 1221 (3); see p. 752 supra.

Pressure Groups and the Tax Laws—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the final part of Professor Cary's scholarly study of the work of pressure groups and our tax laws presents a number of suggestions for insulating Congress from the pleas of this group and that seeking favors during the enactment of tax legislation:

V. GENERALIZATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Perhaps the general conclusion can now be ventured that the tax laws represent a patchwork of special legislation awarded on a random basis. It may be too late for thoroughgoing reform, but there may yet be time for occasional improvements. At this point, therefore, let us attempt to restate some of the dangers arising out of these deepening inequities in the code. The United States has operated under a system of self-assessment of taxes, which of necessity assumes strict adherence by the great majority of people. As indicated at the outset, if the average taxpayer finds our tax laws more and more checkered with special legislation, the danger is that disrespect will spread and make enforcement impossible. Whatever may be the economic limit upon taxes, there is a practical and psychological limit which is probably short of it.

Part of the problem today is the general acceptance of a philosophy of taxation which attempts to justify a system of disuniformity. In the words of George O. May, the revenue process might be looked upon as a football game: "If you try to stop all the plays in the line, you won't have a game. You have to let someone get through the line and score a touchdown occasionally or you won't have a game."[147] This homely argument of a distinguished accountant in favor of capital gains is another way of saying that with rates as high as they are, holes in the code must be available so that someone can make money. But should these holes be drilled for the benefit of those who can exert the most pressure? And if many such escapes are provided, doesn't tax collection then become a process of "dipping deep with a sieve," to use a phrase of Henry Simons'?[148]

It may be said in rebuttal that virtually every provision in the code is preferential to some more than others—which no doubt is true. Yet within broad classifications there can still be some restraint upon special provisions and some effort to cling to uniformity. Otherwise the law, already hopelessly complicated, will soon approach the ridiculous.[149] It is also true that there are other objectives in the tax law than fairness. In some instances, as in the case of the imputed income of home and farm owners, it may not be administratively feasible to achieve absolute equity. Furthermore, if percentage depletion or capital gains were necessary for the purpose of maintaining incentive or in order to prevent the total disappearance of capital formation, there might be logical justification for some overall (as distinguished from ad hoc) modification of the tax structure. Nevertheless, each time an amendment is sought, Congress should go back to fundamentals: What, for example, is the function of capital gains? Is it to relieve against taxing bunched income in 1 year, or is it to provide a needed incentive, or both?

Footnotes at end of speech.

Without such restraint, it is difficult to see where the accelerating pattern of preferential treatment can stop. The likelihood of continuing special legislation is demonstrated by the number of pressure groups which appear in every hearing on revenue measures before Congress. According to 1 writer, at the 1947 hearings approximately 150 organized groups were represented, all but 12 of which clearly represented business, labor, agriculture, or professional interests.[150] The complexion of the hearings held in 1951 by the Ways and Means Committee is similar to that of those held in 1942. The four volumes of testimony preceding the latest general revision, from June to August 1953, demonstrate the current zeal of hundreds of interested groups and their representatives to be heard.

Many of the special provisions owe their existence to the discrimination argument. Perhaps the principal point made before Congress is that, since one group in our society has received a benefit, the complainant deserves like treatment. The more preferential the legislation written into the code, the greater the opportunity for others to claim they are being discriminated against. The difficulty lies in finding, first, some logical basis for drawing a line, and second, some political groups supporting the policy of drawing it. There are very few organizations before Congress opposing further extension of capital gains treatment. Perhaps we are gradually approaching the taxpayer's millenium, when all citizens have available the benefits of converting ordinary income into capital gains.[151] As one writer has indicated, the preferred political way of reducing inequities is to extend an existing privilege to new groups, instead of withdrawing it from the present holders.[152]

A final danger, already self-evident, is the increasing complexity of the tax laws. Only counsel spending the majority of his time in minute examination of the tax laws is competent to assure his client that he has taken full advantage of the existing benefits under it and avoided the pitfalls. "Every word added to the code for the benefit of some particular taxpayer may well prove a trap and a very costly one for some other unsuspecting taxpayers."[153] It is ironic to recall the statement which appeared in the minority report on the Revenue Act of 1943: "We should develop as soon as possible a long-range, integrated, well-balanced, equitable, and simplified scheme of taxation, and we of the Republican minority propose to do all in our power to bring about such a plan."[154]

The recitation of dangers arising out of preferential legislation poses the final question: What correctives are available in a political society? Frequently one hears the suggestion that the pressures exerted and special favors sought are all due to current tax rates, and there would not have to be relief provisions if the rate structure were not so high. As a rough generalization this is partially true, though there would still be persons seeking percentage depletion and other deductions, and even lower capital gains rates. At any rate it is undeniable that the intensity of the efforts to obtain special treatment would slacken if rates were lower. And if we could be sure that some reduction would satisfy existing pressure groups, it is certainly worth serious consideration on the part of Congress. But so long as international tension exists and the budget remains unbalanced, one obviously cannot expect revenue receipts to be reduced substantially. Politically, as well as economically, high taxes and some progression in rates appear to be a part of the facts of life.[155]

It may be asked whether the developing pattern of preferential legislation can be

Footnotes at end of speech.

arrested by the change of administration. Illustrations from the 1954 code demonstrate the contrary. Furthermore, such a transformation would be too much to expect from any President's office, whether Republican or Democratic. As a previous writer has indicated, the executive plays an important, but subordinate, role in the revenue field.[156] Developments of tax policy originate in proposals for change emanating from outside and backed by pressures which the lawmakers cannot ignore. In theory, legislation originates in the House, but in reality the Senate is engaged in developing, modifying and choosing among proposals brought before it. Probably the baldest examples of congressional politics in action involved the passage of tax legislation where the Ways and Means Committee was bypassed entirely. In these cases the proponent's counsel went directly to the Senate Finance Committee, before which they were in a better position to secure a favorable hearing and an amendment to the bill.[157]

Since they must seek reelection, it may be too much to expect Representatives to ignore the pressures exerted upon them. But lest our system of taxation break down, a presumption should exist in the mind of every Congressman against enacting tax legislation for the benefit of one individual or company or even of special groups. In each case the question should be raised whether the proposed bill will generate as much inequity as it is supposed to remedy. The decision before Congress on revenue bills differs radically from that on subsidies in general. In many instances the parties involved have first attempted to secure relief through the Internal Revenue Service or the courts, and failed. Under any circumstances, Congress should try to resolve tax issues in a judicious manner, determining whether relief is justified in view of the hardships inevitably imposed by a uniform revenue statute. For every one who obtains relief on the ground that he has been the victim of discrimination, there are thousands of others who are suffering the same fate in silence.

There are inequities in the tax law which warrant further study. The taxing of bunched income is among the foremost. It is one of the strong reasons for adopting a system of averaging or even conferring capital-gains treatment as a rough way of levelling off a lump sum receipt representing years of effort or capital accretion.[158] The essential question is why remedial legislation should be extended to one or two selected persons and not, for example, to athletes and artists, who suffer most from a brief period of spectacular earnings. In plain words, a systematic rather than hit-or-miss approach to relief must be the basis for future tax policy.[159]

In an attempt to apply the basic presumption against preferential treatment, several possible ways may be suggested to focus congressional attention upon proposed legislation. None of them, of course, is a remedy in itself, but they may serve to alleviate the problem. As a general rule, regardless of which party is in power, the views of the Treasury should receive more consideration from Congress on questions of uniformity and fairness in tax bills. Much of the special legislation which appears in the revenue acts represents congressional action taken against the advice of the Treasury. By and large it is in a stronger position than is Congress to represent the public interest because each Senator and Representative is subject to pressure from constituents and special groups.

The Treasury, however, can scarcely be vested with further authority if it maintains an uncompromising attitude against relief provisions. In general, from the Revenue Act of 1942 until 1954, it has appeared reluctant to initiate legislation even in cases of egregious hardship. Though its function is to protect the revenue, such a policy, whether or not theoretically sound, nevertheless seems politically unrealistic. If the Treasury had undertaken to sift out and submit certain justifiable grievances which came to its attention, as it did in 1942, there might have been a stronger basis for resistance on the part of Congress to pressures overwhelming it. Still, it seems improbable that the relief of a few would have sated the ardor of the many.

More information should be available to Congress itself, in the hope that it might act more responsibly. To reach individual Congressmen more effectively there might be separate technical staffs for the House Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committees, as well as the Joint Committee staff. For some years the latter has been directed by its able chief of staff, who, being the agent of both the Senate and the House, cannot always take a position strongly opposing provisions personally sponsored by leading Members of either. In view of the fact that Senators and Representatives have differing objections to legislation before them, it is possible that each committee's staff might screen bills proposed in the other House and keep Members advised of any evidences of special favor. Thus a system might ultimately become established for checkmating undesirable measures introduced by legislators overwhelmed by pressure from a constituent or an organized group in their districts.

A further suggestion stems from the fact that in congressional hearings there is practically no one, except perhaps the Treasury, available to represent the public. Perhaps the reason is that all of the pressure group proposals are of such character that no one of them would have a large adverse effect on the tax bill of any individual. Hence counterpressure groups seldom develop. One exception is the National Tax Equality Association, which opposes cooperatives and the tax advantages they are said to enjoy. A second reason why the public is not more frequently represented is the difficulty of forming pressure groups around general interests. The concentration of business organizations on appeals brought to Congress and the emphasis placed on specific and often very technical provisions make it difficult even for the members of the tax committees to secure a balanced view of what is in the general interest, what the public wants or, indeed, what the public would want if it were informed as to the facts.[160] In order to obtain such a balanced view, therefore, it is suggested that several leading tax experts throughout the country be invited and retained to make a presentation before the Ways and Means or Finance Committee. Because they may be restrained by loyalty to private clients, these lawyers could indicate the provisions in the bill on which they could not render an unbiased opinion. At the same time some of the craftsmen of the tax bar might, as a public service, be willing to call Congress' attention to particular provisions in which special legislation is creeping into a pending tax bill. Many of them have served willingly as advisers upon the American Law Institute project to revise the tax laws.

What is the responsibility of the bar in connection with pressure legislation? While the general trend in tax administration has been toward decentralization, many lawyers have suddenly become aware of the fact that important tax issues are not necessarily decided in the field or in the courts, but may finally be resolved in Washington by Congress. To most lawyers outside the District of Columbia this seems to be a regrettable development. There has been criticism of the tax section of the American Bar Association on the ground that it is being operated primarily as a pressure group seeking to further the interests of individual clients. This is an extreme view, to which I do not subscribe. However, it can be said that the bar as a whole has taken no position with respect to halting the trend away from uniformity in the tax laws. In their capacity as individual lawyers it may well be that tax experts should serve their clients' interests before Congress as vigorously as they do before the courts. But through our professional organizations, and as citizens, we have duties of a broader scope. Furthermore, as one writer has said, over a lifetime each practitioner has a greater interest in a fair and symmetrical body of tax laws than any group has in special legislation in any single year.[161] Why, for example, does not any bar association formally deplore the Mayer provision? This may not be a question of ethics, but at least it offers an unprecedented opportunity for service. And it is not too much for the public to expect of us. Today we are drawing many of the most brilliant graduates from law schools into the lucrative tax field and are developing the greatest masters of needlepoint in the history of the law. Unfortunately, however, we have become so engrossed in detail that we are unaware of the distorted pattern upon which we are jointly working. Technical skill, in other words, is being developed at the expense of breadth of understanding.

The late Justice Jackson pointed out that the United States has a system of taxation by confession, and "That a people so numerous, scattered, and individualistic annually assesses itself with a tax liability, often in highly burdensome amounts, is a reassuring sign of the stability and vitality of our system of self-government."[162] Let us safeguard the uniformity of our taxes lest this system become undermined and collapse."[163]

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[147] Tax Institute, Capital Gains Taxation 22 (1946).

[148] For a general discussion of Henry Simons' views on the subject of fairness, see Simons, Federal Tax Reform 8–12 (1950).

[149] See Blum & Johnson, 1913–2013, A Hundred Years of Income Taxation, 33 Taxes 41 (1955).

[150] Blough, The Federal Taxing Process 27 (1952).

[151] As described in Blum, The Decline and Fall of Capital Gains: 1921–57, 28 Taxes 838 (1950); see also Johnson, The Last Taxpayer, 30 Taxes 181 (1952).

[152] Heller, Practical Limitations on the Federal Net Income Tax: Limitations of the Federal Individual Income Tax, 7 J. Finance 185, 195 (1952).

[153] Miller, Ethical Problems in Lobbying for Legislation, 8 Tax L. Rev. 19, 22(1952).

[154] H. R. Rept. No. 871, 78th Cong., 1st sess., pt. 2, at 7 (1943).

[155] See Cary, The Income Tax Amendment: A Strait Jacket for Sound Fiscal Policy (39 A. B. A. J. 885, 886 (1953)).

[156] Blough, The Federal Taxing Process (93 (1952)).

[157] See p. 748, supra.

[158] See Dakin, The Capital Gains Treasure Chest: Rational Extension or Expedient Distortion? (14 La. L. Rev. 505, 507 (1954)).

[159] See also Butters, Thompson & Bollinger, Effects of Taxation—Investments by Individuals (ch. 3 (1953)).

[160] Blough, The Federal Taxing Process (41 (1952)).

[161] Miller, Ethical Problems in Lobbying for Legislation (8 Tax L. Rev. 19, 22 (1952)); see also Paul, Taxation in the United States (773 (1954)).

[162] *United States* v. *Kahriger* (345 U. S. 22, 36 (1953)) (concurring opinion).

[163] See Riehm, Federal Taxation: Perspective During the Fifth Decade (52 Mich. L. Rev. 941 (1954)).

Italian-American World War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution regarding S. 1724, providing for the recognition of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, which is an identical measure to H. R. 450, the bill I sponsored in the interest of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc.:

ITALIAN-AMERICAN WORLD WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES, INC., NATIONAL DEPARTMENT

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., was founded to preserve and uphold and to cherish our American principles of government and to further dedicate itself to the cause of assisting veterans and their dependents; and

Whereas over the past several years, and particularly since the close of World War II, the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., has grown in membership, strength, and enthusiasm to the extent that departments within the organization have been firmly established in the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Ohio, West Virginia, Florida, Illinois, California, Vermont, Arizona, and several other areas; and

Whereas the purpose, function, and proven accomplishments of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., both warrant and merit its recognition as a veterans' organization, particularly insofar as the Veterans' Administration is concerned; and

Whereas lack of such recognition of this organization by the VA, as well as by other agencies of the Government, has considerably impeded its progress especially with regard to its service and rehabilitation programs; and

Whereas the introduction in the Senate of the United States by the Honorable JOHN O. PASTORE, Senator from the State of Rhode Island, on April 19, 1955, of Senate bill 1724 would, if enacted, at long last confer and bestow upon this organization certain rights, benefits, privileges, and prerogatives now enjoyed by other major veterans' organizations; and

Whereas the introduction by Senator PASTORE of S. 1724, cited as the "Special Recognition Act of 1955," serves to convey to this organization an equitable and just recognition as a veterans' group which it has long sought: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., meeting in executive session at its quarterly national executive committee meeting in the city of New Haven, Conn., on May 21, 1955, do hereby unanimously endorse the passage of S. 1724; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be made available to Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, with the request that this document be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and to respective State department commanders of this organization.

ANTHONY J. TUCCI,
National Commander, Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

Attest:

VINCENT J. DORIA,
National Adjutant.

Three Hundredth Anniversary of the Jews in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon, May 15, I was present at a ceremony on the East Side of New York City, in the district that I represent in Congress, of so distinctive a character that I ask for leave to incorporate some material about it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The occasion was a tribute in the year of the 300th anniversary of the Jews in America. What gave it a special character that deserves to be called to world-wide attention as illustrative of the best in American life was that the ceremony was held by and at the St. Mark's Church In-the-Bowerie, one of the oldest and most historic religious edifices in the city.

In the words of the rector, the Reverend Richard E. McEvoy, the celebration was held for the following reason. The invitation by the rector in the vestry stated:

Partly because of the history of this church in the lower East Side, where Peter Stuyvesant is buried, and where many Jewish boys and girls have grown up to become prominent in American life—partly because we recognize the inescapable debt of Christianity to Judaism—partly because over the past three centuries the Jewish contribution to all areas of our common heritage has been distinguished and great-hearted—partly because we feel that in these critical days it is important that the world see witnesses to convictions in common ideals of democracy and faith in one God—and not least because of our affection for our neighbors—we would like to pay this timely tribute in this 300th anniversary year.

At the ceremony itself, a distinguished gathering assembled that represented a living embodiment of the concepts of mutual respect and cofidence and of the brotherly affection that is the pledge of the Judaeo-Christian heritage by which we aspire to live and which remains now as it has been, the world's hope.

The program was outstanding in many respects. There was reverence; there was the piety appropriate to the sacred grounds on which the meeting was held; there was the laudable patriotic animation of gratitude and appreciation for a country in which such an event could take place. There was fine music and there were excellent speakers. Everyone who spoke deserves to be quoted and his words remembered, and they included the highly respected rector himself, the Honorable Edgar J. Nathan, Jr., one of New York's leading citizens and a distinguished son of a family whose national services, dating back to the days of the Revolutionary War, are far too many to enumerate. Another speaker was Mr. Lee Thompson Smith, past president of the St. Nicholas Society of the City of New York, chairman of the executive committee of the Home Title Guarantee Co., and one of our great city's leading civic personalities.

Their addresses on that occasion were more than a tribute to the history of the 300 years of Jewish settlement in the United States. They were, in fact, a tribute to the spirit of our country and a clarion call to all within the sound of their voices and to all who could be reached by a reading of their text, to maintain and to carry further the American traditions and ideals that made possible this history, and that evoked this inspiring and beautiful ceremony.

The addresses follow:

ADDRESS BY LEE THOMPSON SMITH, PAST PRESIDENT, ST. NICHOLAS SOCIETY OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, AT THE HISTORICAL CEREMONY COMMEMORATING THE 300TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE JEWS IN AMERICA ST. MARK'S CHURCH IN THE BOUWERIE

It is a great privilege to be asked to speak on this unusual occasion. In this historic Christian church on New York's Lower East Side; we are met together to pay a tribute to our Jewish friends and fellow citizens in this 300th anniversary year of the coming of the first Jewish community to New York.

It is worth while stopping a moment to consider where we are. I do so because of a very real interest in this historic place and in its work. I know that the rector, the Reverend Mr. McEvoy, has a high regard for the unusually rich historical background of St. Mark's. He looks upon this shrine of our early history as a place which, in a sense, is more than the church of a denomination. He feels that it belongs to all Americans, and that those who are now charged with its direction have a responsibility to maintain its best traditions. More than that, he and his vestry believe that this church is here, not to be a museum, but to be of service in the neighborhood where it has been set for these generations. Over the years of his rectorship, that is the endeavor St. Mark's has been trying to carry out.

The church and neighborhood are indeed rich in our history. Beneath the right aisle of this church is buried Peter Stuyvesant, during whose governorship in 1654, the 23 members of the first Jewish community came to New Amsterdam, to receive from him, as we know, a not-too-cordial welcome. In the same vault was interred a British Governor, Henry Sloughter, and three centuries of the direct descendants of Peter are buried there. The churchyards on the east and west sides are lined with vaults, and resting in them are two presidents of Columbia University, Nathaniel Moore and William Harris, and a rector of old Trinity Parish, Dr. Berrien. Fifteen of the original members of our own St. Nicholas Society, founded by Washington Irving, are buried in these grounds, which gives our society a special interest here at St. Mark's. Here, too, were buried Philip Hone, well-known mayor of New York, Thomas Addis Emmet, the Irish patriot, Nicholas Fish and Nathaniel Prime, Revolutionary War patriots. Gen. Horatio Gates worshipped in pew 46, where a plaque has been placed in his memory. Daniel Tomp-

kins, Governor of the State of New York, 1807–17, and Vice President of the United States under Monroe 1817–25, is buried outside these walls, and we might name others well known in our State and city history, whose last resting place is here. This, then, is not an isolated spot honoring one American; it is a commentary on three centuries of our history.

Let us go a bit further afield into this historic neighborhood of the lower east side. At Cooper Union, a block away, Abraham Lincoln made his famous Cooper Union address, which won him the attention that led to his nomination as President. George Washington met his troops at Sixth Street and Third Avenue to march downtown to take over the city again after its long occupation by the British. Just a stone's throw from this old church is a building that thousands upon thousands pass by in ignorance. There we read the name "Haym Salomon Home for the Aged." The name of Haym Salomon is one that ought to be more widely known than it seems to be. He was one of those distinguished Jewish citizens of American life who have rendered conspicuous service to the cause of freedom. As soon as the Stamp Act was passed in 1765 every Jewish merchant in New York agreed not to import goods subject to the provisions of that law. In the same year, 1765, the Society of the Sons of Liberty was formed to aid in carrying out these nonimportation agreements, and one member of this society was Haym Salomon, born in Lisa, Poland, of Jewish ancestry, who came to this New World several years after agitation against Britain had begun in 1772. He was a friend of Kosciusko and Pulaski, Polish defenders of freedom, who aided our own War of the Revolution. Salomon became a friend of Alexander McDougall, Isaacs Sears, and John Lamb, leaders of the New York Sons of Liberty. While many patriotic and unselfish men assisted in the financing and management that led to a successful conclusion of the War of the Revolution, it has been said that Haym Salomon, almost single handed, kept up the credit of the bankrupt revolutionary government. He was twice arrested by the British on account of his activities. Upon the second occasion he was found guilty of treason and sentenced to be hanged, but by the next morning Salomon and his Hessian guard had escaped from the dreaded provost jail, presumably aided by some of the members of the Sons of Liberty. The notebook of Robert Morris shows not less than 75 transactions in which Salomon loaned or gave about $700,000 to the government for which he received no reimbursement. His record of unstinting service and generosity was not unusual. Wherever Jews lived throughout the colonies we find them in the forefront of the emerging Nation's problems, giving generously of leadership and financial assistance.

Within this church today we, too, bridge that gap of 300 years by having as our next speaker Judge Nathan, one of the descendants of that original Pilgrim group of 23—a distinguished jurist and a devoted member of the congregation Shearith Israel, which reaches back to 1654. Under the leadership of noted rabbis, including today's Dr. David de Sola Pool, it has made an invaluable contribution to the life of this city. It could be most interesting to know how many of those who are present today were brought up in this lower east side and remember it with affection. We know that it has produced and will continue to produce its fair share of distinguished Americans.

Now let us explore for a moment what has happened since a little group of 800 resided in New Amsterdam in 1653. A city that has grown to almost as large a population as the present Netherlands, with more Irish than Dublin, more Italians than Rome, more Jews than Tel Aviv and probably more of almost any country than one of its large cities.

The greatest city in the world with more firsts than any other city on this continent—the first President installed in office here, the first stock exchange established in America.

I could go on indefinitely about the growth of our great city but time does not allow me to do so. A city which has everything of which we can boast.

We cannot retell the history of our country today, or single out from an innumerable host the great army of those representatives of the Jewish faith who have contributed to our Nation's history—in religion, politics, the arts and sciences, in industry and philanthropy, in the social and educational sciences, in the wholesomeness of family life. They have performed these obligations because they are citizens of our American democracy and because they have been loyal to the religious tradition of Judaism, which, is inevitably a part of the tradition of every Christian, too, for doing what is their duty, they would neither want nor expect more thanks than any other responsible and loyal group of Americans.

What we might think about, more effectively and to the point today, is a matter more vital to our times and to the future of our country. We should remind ourselves on an occasion such as this, that the Jewish pilgrims who came to Nieuw Amsterdam, the Pilgrims who came to Massachusetts, the founders of Rhode Island, the settlers of Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and many another colony, came, in part, not only because this was a new frontier offering opportunity, but also because there was a new spirit in the air and a hope that greater freedoms and liberties were to be won in the New World. Wave after wave of immigration over the 18th, 19th, and 20th centuries brought to these shores peoples out of every nation, who were challenged by these twin dreams of opportunity and democracy.

It has worked. When we say that it has worked, we must not be unmindful of failures, of prejudices, of bigotries, of dark and unhappy events, which mar the pages of our story of democracy. They are there, and they must be acknowledged. But there have been, in every generation of our country's history, men and women of courage and sensitivity, who have called the people back to loyalty and to responsibility for these hopes. The course of history has led the Nation to a place of leadership in a world where those hopes, which we know can work, are still high. On the other hand, the course of history has brought us into a time where, in recent decades, these basic hopes and aspirations have been challenged.

We know these things. It is not necessary to enlarge upon the grave dangers which confront peoples concerned about freedom, equality of opportunity, and the search for truth. Nor is it necessary for us to remind ourselves in such gravely troubled times of the vital necessity for cooperation, wisdom, and patience toward those in high places charged with the delicate and sensitive task of working through to positive and just solutions.

It is, however, a time for responsibility, self-control, and understanding. Someone wrote recently: "Cynicism seems silly in an atomic age." There has never been a time when understanding of others, a love for our country, our city, and our homes, has been more important. Being a citizen, and not a preacher, that is the central thought I would like to leave with you. When our Nation has been at its best, it has been because its men and women and children, of whatever background or faith, have been responsible, steady, wise, and understanding. Along with their rights, as free people under God, they have recognized that there are duties and obligations which, as citizens, they must assume. It is because of this faith, this love of democracy, this sense of responsibility, that what we call our way of life has worked here, and can work wherever freedoms and responsibilities are kept balanced and controlled by a wise and informed citizenry and its leaders. The heritage of our country's past, in which peoples out of many races have made great contributions, is evidence of the capability of people to live together, work together, in understanding, and toward common goals that are positive and creative. It is fine, and certainly, I should think, in the best spirit of the Jewish and Christian faith, that we have such opportunities as this to meet together to give thanks to God for what has come down to us. Let us go away from this place with a new resolution in our hearts and minds—that we will be promoters of understanding, of cooperation, of continuing responsibility to the common and universal elements of our faiths that have brought us to this time.

ADDRESS BY EDGAR J. NATHAN, JR.

I am honored to have been invited to participate in this afternoon's celebration commemorating the 300th anniversary of the first Jewish settlement in this country. It is a beautiful tribute to our American way of life wherein all faiths join in perpetuating America's religious ideals.

It is indeed fitting that St. Mark's Church In-the-Bouwerie is the sponsor and host today, and it is particularly appropriate that the ceremonies are being held in its church for two very special reasons. In the first place, as you have heard, there lies buried here Peter Stuyvesant, the governor of Nieu Amsterdam in 1654. And in the second place (as many of you know) the Jews and other neighbors helped repair and rebuilt the four-faced clock in the belfry of this church as did the Jews and other neighbors of Trinity Church in the early 16th or 17th century help reconstruct the steeple on that church, then as now on Broadway at Wall Street.

I am delighted at this opportunity to talk about some of things our ancestors, and our contemporaries, have done—things that give evidence of a very precious freedom, the freedom to participate in the life of our country.

Coupled with this is another precious right—the right to be different from our neighbors, and their right to be different from us.

These are freedoms that make our Nation great, that enable a Jew to be both an American and a Jew, a Protestant to be an American and a Protestant and a Catholic to be an American and a Catholic. That makes it possible for American culture to benefit from the peculiarly individual contributions of the various groups of people that make up America.

In his letter to the Hebrew Congregation of Newport, R. I., George Washington summarized this significant greatness of America when he wrote in August 1790:

"The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy; a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that tolerance is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people, that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection, should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support."

Here, George Washington summed up for all time the essence of American freedom; the ideal for which all of us—Jews and non-Jews—have striven and are striving. These are the self-evident truths of man's equality

under democratic government, which guarantees his "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." These are the things the first Jewish settlers sought to gain when they came here in September 1654 and faced the despotic Gov. Peter Stuyvesant. These are the things summed up in the theme of the American-Jewish Tercentenary: "Man's Opportunities and Responsibilities Under Freedom."

The American Jewish tercentenary just concluding its year-long celebation will, it is hoped, inform every one of us in America, and possibly throughout the world, what history has recorded; that the freedoms we all cherish and enjoy in America came into being through the cooperation of all faiths. History establishes that it was not only one man, or one group, or one religion, that brought this about. It was accomplished by the religious groups of all faiths, and it was the spiritual values that stem from religion which gave the lifeblood to the determined fight which resulted in the establishment of the freedoms we now enjoy.

The history of these 300 years has certainly taught us the values of these freedoms. It has shown us that, by the exercise of understanding between people, they can achieve their ideals, their goals, and that war is not necessary. There have been wars before and during these 300 years, but they have been futile wars, all except our own war for independence. Going backward, the Second World War has not yet resulted in peace, indeed, if it is yet ended. The First World War led to the Second World War. Battles were won, but the goals for which the wars were fought were not achieved. The only times when there has been spiritual progress and peace in the world has been when there has been understanding among the people. An instance—perhaps the most significant one to us, at least—that is proof of this, is the birth of the United States. It was made possible, in the first instance, by the 23 Jews who landed here in 1654, who, with others, fought for their human rights and won them, not only for themselves but, in the words of Peter Stuyvesant, for the "Lutherans and Papists," as well. It was one of the great landmarks in the ancient Dutch tradition of religious freedom and human decency when, just 300 years ago last month, the Dutch West India Co., overruling the edict of Gov. Peter Stuyvesant, granted these first Jewish settlers permission to remain in the Dutch colony of New Amsterdam. By the time of the Revolution, 100 years or so later, these freedoms were firmly entrenched on American soil. The war was fought to preserve them and to establish what became the United States of America. That war was won; its goals were achieved; and the ideals, the preservation of which made that war necessary, were maintained and have survived unto this day. It is for us to keep them strong.

Last October, at the American Jewish national tercentenary opening dinner in this city, President Dwight D. Eisenhower said: "We have come together in memory of an inspiring moment in history—that moment, 300 years ago, when a small band of Jewish people arrived. * * * It was an event meaningful not only to the Jews of America but to all Americans—of all faiths, of all national origins."

He continued: "On that day there came to these shores 23 people whose distant ancestors had, through the Old Testament, given new dimensions of meaning to the concept of freedom and justice, mercy and righteousness, kindness and understanding—ideas and ideals which were to flower on this continent. They were of a people who had done much to give to Western civilization the principle of human dignity; they came to a land which would flourish—beyond all 17th century dreams—because it fostered that dignity among its citizens. Of all religious concepts," said the President of the United States, "this belief in the infinite worth of the individual is beyond doubt among the most important. On this faith our forefathers constructed the framework of our Republic."

Let us seriously ponder and long remember the words of this great leader. They may contain the key to the future for many of us in this land.

Remarks of Hon. Philip J. Philbin at DAV Installation of Officers, Southbridge, Mass., April 17, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an address I delivered on April 17, 1955, at the annual installation of officers of chapter 101, Disabled American Veterans, and its Auxiliary, in Southbridge, Mass.

The material follows:

Mr. Chairman, Senator Benoit, Representative Cournoyer, distinguished guests, and friends, it is a great privilege for me as well as a great pleasure to join you here this afternoon because I always enjoy coming to this beautiful town of Southbridge whose faithful people have been so cooperative, helpful, and loyal, and, as you know, I have unbounded admiration for all the members of this great American organization.

There has never been any question concerning the type of Americanism and the type of patriotism which the members of this organization have stood for throughout the years. Not only in war but in peace you have demonstrated in ways very definite, very explicit, and very clear to all your loyalty to the principles of this country and your willingness to serve it faithfully and zealously, however great the sacrifices involved.

I am proud and happy, therefore, on this occasion once again to offer you, your auxiliary and all your members my congratulations and expressions of warm gratitude and appreciation for the magnificent contributions which you have made in behalf of the Nation and in the interest of that exalted kind of citizenship based on unquestioned loyalty and devotion to the country which is so urgently needed in the crisis of the affairs of free men which confronts us today.

We all recognize, I am sure, that we are living in a world that is rapidly changing and that is rapidly taking on new shape and form. In the past decade since the end of World War II our own social and economic institutions have developed at an unprecedented rate. The productivity of our great economy has mounted and mounted until we are in the main and on the whole so far as the Nation is concerned, not only producing more than ever before of food and fiber, commodities and articles necessary to sustain life in this advanced age, but we have also achieved a standard of living for the rank and file of our people which would have been scarcely imaginable not to many years ago.

Of course, there are gaps, very unhappy gaps, in this fabric of prosperity and well-being that is spread over the country. There are certain areas including some right here in our own district, with which we are so intimately and so deeply concerned, where many of our fellow citizens are not able to obtain full-time employment, or indeed, are unable to find any employment at all. This is a very serious problem which must be attacked at every level and in every way possible, because neither a great democracy nor a great free private-enterprise system like our own can ever tolerate to have people unemployed and unable to find work properly to sustain themselves and their families. It is one of the great social challenges confronting us today speedily to correct these conditions so that the prosperity which the Nation is enjoying as a whole, can be spread into every section and part of the country and to every segment of the American people.

Notwithstanding these dislocations which beset us so grievously in some places, we nevertheless have reason to feel proud of the generally good health and marked strength of our great powerful economic system which has been built up on the basis of freedom as distinguished from the coercion and dictatorship and suppression which exist in other nations of the world.

It must be our purpose always not only to build and expand this great system of free activity to produce still higher standards of living, but it must be our unswerving purpose always and in every circumstance to protect that system and the free institutions that have made it possible from the attacks of those godless, conscienceless forces of communism and radical social reform which are working so tirelessly for the destruction of the values of free enterprise and freedom and the priceless institutions which have made possible the unequaled liberties and the unprecedented prosperity which this country and the American people enjoy in a measure greater than any nation or people in history.

The members of this organization know better perhaps than any other group the bloody sacrifices, the stern discipline, and the unselfish devotion that were required to defend our Nation in past wars, because you have never faltered, you have never hesitated, you have never been found wanting in the defense of freedom. On the other hand, you have realized the urgency of protecting this country against brutal dictatorships and against the vicious enemies of democracy which made unprovoked and unconscionable attacks upon this Nation. And you were willing to serve this great cause with your lives and your blood.

It is said that history repeats itself and this is an all too pitiful fact as we survey the situation that obtains in the world today. Instead of the peace which you and your comrades fought for, which the entire American people unselfishly worked for and sacrificed for, in spite of the bloodshed and suffering, despite all the glorious proclamations and promises and international charters, the world seems to be right back where it was prior to the last great war and is faced once again with a gigantic, widespread powerful conspiracy directed against democracy and freedom and aiming to destroy the free institutions which have been built up throughout the centuries at such great cost in treasure and in blood.

This situation would be extremely difficult and fraught with great danger at any time. But in this atomic and hydrogen age when modern science combining with military skill has produced weapons of such incredible power and destructiveness, it is all the more disturbing to the loyal citizens of America, as it is and must be to human beings everywhere.

But we have not flinched in the past in time of danger and we are not prepared to flinch now. World communism may rant and rave and hurl its invectives against our religious faith, against our democracy, and

against our great Government. It may conduct insidious conspiracy throughout the world calculated to weaken and destroy free governments, it may use every means at its disposal, as it is doing, to obstruct and prevent a true world peace. But the people of this Nation will never be discouraged, will never be terrorized, will never cease to defend their freedoms. To the contrary, we will resolve with increasing fervor and determination, come what may, to build up the kind of strength, military, economic, and spiritual, which is needed to preserve the national security and to deter wilful aggressors from carrying out their designs of infiltration, conquest ,and enslavement of the free world. This is no time for useless fears or for appeasement.

We have tremendous resources on our side in the form of the greatest productive system ever wrought by the hand of man, in the form of a most powerful striking military force equipped with all the latest weapons, including atomic and hydrogen substances in much greater quantities and of greater power than any other nation. These are important and necessary to be sure, and they may well give us a sense of security and a sense of confidence that any aggressor or combination of aggressors will be restrained from launching an attack upon this country, or provoking war against the free nations.

But we have other weapons, more powerful weapons, that are not available to the totalitarian dictators. We have the weapons of faith, of understanding, of tolerance, of justice, of unity among all our loyal people regardless of race, class, or creed, and the confidence and determination to sustain the integrity and the principles of this great Nation in any and every contingency that may arise. These are weapons that are not available to the potential enemy because they are based not on material strength alone but on the spiritual values of freedom and they cannot be matched by any Godless Communist state or any ruthless totalitarian dictatorship.

Just as we are pledged to the cause of our magnificent veterans, their dependents, and their families, just as we are devoted to the building of a greater and better Nation, just as we are dedicated to the principles of free enterprise and freedom, we must ever be resolved to defend, preserve, and protect the mighty and noble heritage of political, economic, and spiritual strength which has been the basis for all the things we are and which must be the enduring basis of our liberties in time to come.

Civilian or Military Leadership?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, May 21, 1955:

So many military men are being sent on special diplomatic missions and are serving in other civil positions in Government that we begin to wonder if they are not gaining too much influence in the determination of our foreign policy, and in their impact on American life.

If this trend continues, we could find ourselves living in a garrison state, even though we are not engaged in actual war.

This raises the question as to whether in checking the spread of communism we are relying too heavily upon military and economic factors.

Of course we need armed strength, because that alone prevents the Communists from conquering the world by force.

But it does not prevent Communist infiltration, and it does not win the allegiance of wavering nations who look for more positive and constructive signs of leadership.

Make no mistake about it, we have very competent military leaders who are unsurpassed in their field. God knows we need them. If we did not have a strong Military Establishment, led by skilled and experienced professionals for whom the Communists have a realistic respect, our situation would be desperate.

It is not my purpose to suggest that our military leaders are seeking supremacy over the civilian authorities. I simply raise the question: "Are we not taking the lazy and dangerous way of expecting too much from them? Are we not inviting military control and direction by failing to think out and decide upon other factors in the shaping of our foreign policy?"

Up until 1917 we had little to do with the rest of the world, busy as we were with the development of our own country. Yet even under these circumstances, and from the time the first settlers stepped ashore in the New World, we were determined that civilians should guide the destiny of the American people.

This principle assumes greater importance, now that we have become the champion of freedom versus communism. The tired nations of Europe that have been weakened by wars, and the young nations of Asia that still remember and resent the white man's domination of them, backed by military force, will not cooperate with us if we insist on material power to conquer all problems.

Our own Declaration of Independence, in registering its protests against the tyrannous acts of George III, pointed out that, and I quote: "He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies without the consent of our legislature. He has affected to render the military independent of, and superior to, the civil power." The Bill of Rights incorporated in the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780 echoed the now familiar refrain that "as, in time of peace, armies are dangerous to liberty, they ought not to be maintained without the consent of the legislature; and the military power shall always be held in an exact subordination to the civil authority and be governed by it."

As a result of the victories in the Revolution and in succeeding wars, in nearly all of which militiamen and volunteers bore the brunt of the initial fighting, the conviction of the American people that a formidable Regular Army was not a necessity became progressively stronger. It has only been in recent years as our responsibilities became worldwide that our traditional military policy has undergone public reexamination.

On the other hand, a gross slighting of defense forces can prove a tragically expensive luxury. Gen. Emory Upton, in his famed analysis of America's military policy from the Revolution through the first 2 years of the Civil War, observed that, and I quote: "Twenty thousand regular troops at Bull Run would have routed the insurgents, settled the question of military resistance and relieved us of the pain and expense of 4 years of war."

It is here that we must separate militarism, which dominated Germany under the Kaisers, which overthrows governments in South America today, and reaches for supreme power in Red Russia and Red China, from the military way with which democracies must defend themselves from actual or would-be aggressors.

Every war is fought and every army is maintained in a military way and in a militaristic way. The distinction is fundamental and fateful, according to Alfred Vagts. The military way is marked by a primary concentration of men and materials on winning specific objectives of power with the utmost efficiency, that is, with the least expenditure of blood and treasure. It is limited in scope, confined to one function, and scientific in its essential qualities. Militarism, on the other hand, presents a vast array of customs, interests, prestige, actions, and thought associated with armies and wars and yet transcending true military purposes. Indeed, militarism is so constituted that it may hamper and defeat the purposes of the military way. Its influence is unlimited in scope. It may permeate all society and become dominant over all industry and arts. Rejecting the scientific character of the military way, militarism displays the qualities of caste and cult, authority and belief.

Elihu Root, onetime Secretary of War, statesman and sage, in a testimonial to his country's men at arms, delivered in 1899, declared that:

"No one ever knew of the American Army seeking to make itself a political agent. No one ever knew of the American Army seeking to make itself a Pretorian guard to set up a president or an emperor. Whenever the enlarged Army of the United States finds the duty of the hour accomplished it melts back into the mass of the people unnoticed. When the Civil War was over, the million men under Grant's command took their way to their homes. The greatest military power which to that day had ever existed, never dreamed for a moment of threatening the institutions of our free Government."

After World War II, I might add, we also demobilized suddenly, this time with unfortunate consequences, leaving a vacuum into which communism moved.

Since the start of World War II the armed services have not only pervaded the public consciousness as never before but have also exercised an unprecedented influence on educational, economic, and political affairs.

Fully cognizant of their newly won power and prestige, military leaders have not hesitated to venture into other fields beyond their accustomed purview.

The censorship imposed in recent years by the services has been almost limitless. A great deal of information which probably should have become public property has been labeled "secret" and buried from civilian view. It is not the democratic way to misuse security requirements for the purpose of concealing blunders, waste, or political maneuvers.

The prominence in world affairs, political as well as military, attained by America's top military figures since the advent of World War II, and the high incidence of succession by our generals and admirals to major civil responsibility, have constituted one of the most important public developments of the postwar period. It would appear to Arthur Krock, keen editorial writer of the New York Times, that "If the world remains an armed camp, possibly aspirants to public life should investigate the curricula of (Americans) service academies."

Or as Quincy Wright observed as a result of the second global war that enlisted the active services of more Americans than ever before:

"It has left the American people with a greater disposition than at any previous time to trust professional military opinion and to employ the military method in foreign policy. It is clear that if armies increase in size, and if military experience extends to a larger and larger proportion of the population, the military mind is more likely to become characteristic of the national mind."

Objections to the use of the military in civil positions are impressive. The career soldier may be dictatorial and uncompromising, a natural result of lifelong discipline. He tends to ignore public opinion and, sometimes, even to slight civilian rights, and military methods of organization have been known to make for inefficiency when applied to civilian projects.

It has been urged in some quarters that soldiers be barred from doubling as diplomats, if only because the use of the military in key civil posts, especially in the Foreign Service, has led friendly observers abroad to wonder whether the United States has become imperialist-minded.

Most of us are certain that this is not so, but we cannot ignore this reaction among other people.

I am not going to mention the long list of professional officers who have served and are serving in sensitive civilian posts and as officials of our Government both here and abroad.

I refrain from doing this out of grateful respect for their military services.

However, in view of our Nation's traditional belief in the civil supremacy over the military, and in view of the disturbing trend toward the employment of military personnel in civilian posts, I believe that the American people should think hard about this contradiction and of the effects it may have upon American life and upon foreign policy if this emphasis gains strength.

I reiterate that under present world conditions we must have a modern and competent Military Establishment.

But the extension of that power and influence throughout the whole fabric and functioning of American life poses the serious question of the protector gradually assuming the role of master.

Unintentionally, perhaps, but pervasive.

The pressures of the cold war may test us for many years to come.

This is no excuse, however, for subordinating other strengths and value to a dependence upon economic and military factors.

The concentration on things military, and the selection of military men for civil positions in Government is a disturbing development.

Many Americans are dismayed by the successive retreats in our foreign policy regarding Asia. The "keep 'em guessing" strategy of the administration seems to be working on its authors. There is no other way to excuse the day-to-day confusion resulting from bold pronouncements, followed by ill-concealed diplomatic appeasements. Somewhere the rudder has been lost.

While this indicates lack of intellectual courage and moral stamina on the part of some civilian leaders, it is no reason why we should delegate all responsibility to the military mind.

From the great resources of the American people, their faith in God, their sense of justice, and their passion for freedom, we should draw the balanced strength to do what is right.

In the long run, that is our surest guide.

Statesmen and generals must never forget that they are servants of the American people and are duty bound to represent the best in our traditions.

Neither arrogant militarism nor cowardly compromises will see us through.

Instead of a manic-depressive foreign policy, we should build one that includes all the constructive values that are summed up in the basic integrity of a well-informed, generous, and courageous public opinion.

It is we the people who must lead.

Radioactive Fallout in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, as apprehension over radioactive fallout has been running rife since the AEC authorized publication of a typical diagram and description of so-called fallout patterns, I have thought it might contribute to a completely sobering effect if an article were to be prepared, officially, which would relate the actual facts concerning quantities of radioactive fallout that had occurred in the United States since our country and the U. S. S. R. started testing atomic weapons. Now appears the article following, which was prepared for the weekly publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science entitled "Science" of May 13, 1955, by two eminent staff members of the Atomic Energy Commission. I presume this is official enough to qualify, although for the lay reader it is a bit technical.

First, it must be understood by us all that every minute of our lives we are receiving radiation from natural sources—from the sun, from outer space, from radioactive isotopes in the earth's crust and atmosphere, and even from the minute quantities of radium in the luminous dials of our watches. That radiation is described as "background radiation." It has existed since time began and will continue. It varies a bit from place to place, depending much on the contents of the earth's crust at the particular place, but, generally speaking, the background radiation our ancestors and we and our descendants absorb constantly is on the order of 160 milliroentgen—0.160r—per year. The total amount laid down by all the atom-bomb tests up to now in the States of the heaviest fallout is the equivalent of scarcely half of that and on the average is not even 10 percent. Compare that small amount with the lethal dosage which is estimated to be on the order of 400,000 milliroentgen and you can see that the total fallout to date would have to be multiplied several thousand times to be dangerous to human life.

To better understand table 2, a person living, for example, in Georgia, which has received approximately 58 millicuries of mixed fission products per square mile from bomb-test fallout, receives 3 times as much radiation each year from natural background-radiation sources. The total radiation from both natural and fallout sources that a person in Georgia receives in a year is scarcely as much as is received by having one chest X-ray. It does not amount to anything.

This entire subject is under constant study and close observation by AEC scientists and we can rest assured that if any danger shows up we will be warned in plenty of time. To date there appears to be none.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Science of May 13, 1955, entitled "Radioactive Fallout in the United States," by Merril Eisenbud and John H. Harley, Health and Safety Laboratory, United States Atomic Energy Commission, New York:

This report summarizes the data accumulated up to the present time by the fallout monitoring network of the United States Atomic Energy Commission.[1] Having reviewed the information obtained through early 1952 in a previous article,[2] we now add the data obtained in more recent atomic tests, including the Pacific exercises in the fall of 1952 (Operation Ivy), the Nevada tests early in 1953 (Operation Upshort-Knothole), and the Pacific tests in the spring of 1954 (Operation Castle).

The data are representative of the entire area of the United States except that within 200 miles of the Nevada test site. This region is not covered by the monitoring system described here, but the radioactive fallout within this area has been reported in the semiannual reports from the AEC to the Congress.[3,4]

Description of monitoring system: When tests are under way in Nevada, the monitoring network consists of 89 sampling stations,[5] but at other times the number is reduced to 41, a reasonable distribution of sampling sites for the more diffuse radioactive debris that may originate from detonations beyond the continental limits.

Table 1 lists the stations that are operating during the Nevada tests this spring. These stations, with the exception of Cleveland, Ohio, Cape Hatteras, N. C., and Concord, N. H., were also in operation during the 1953 spring tests in Nevada (Upshot-Knothole); those marked with an asterisk were in operation during the Pacific tests conducted in the spring of 1954 (Castle).

The 1-ft^2 gummed surface previously described[2] continues to be used to collect samples. The adhesive is supported on an acetate film mounted horizontally on a frame about 3 feet above the ground. The coating retains its adhesive properties when it is wet, and dust particles that are entrapped in raindrops are collected. The gummed films are changed each day and are mailed to the AEC Health and Safety Laboratory in New York, where their radioactivity is assayed.

The samples are prepared for analysis by ashing at 550° to 600° C. This results in the loss of some volatile isotopes, such as those of iodine and ruthenium, but these comprise less than 10 percent of the total activity. This defect in procedure is justified by the simplicity of the operation.

The small amount of residual ash is transferred to plastic planchets that are sealed between two layers of vinyl tape for automatic beta counting ([6]). These counters have a background of 7 to 10 counts/min and efficiencies of the order of 10 percent. Samples are counted for 20 min, or for 640 counts if this occurs before 20 min have elasped. Blanks and standards are sealed into every tape. The counts are extrapolated using the $t^{-1.2}$ law to express decay.

This method of monitoring fallout is exceedingly sensitive. We have observed that a general rise in the gamma background of 10^{-4} r/hr is associated with fallout of approximately 10^6 disintegrations/min ft.^{2} The

Footnotes at end of speech.

counting procedures in routine use in this laboratory permit detection of a daily fallout of as little as 10 disintegrations/min ft.[2] It is thus possible for us to detect radioactivity that produces a general elevation of background of about 10^{-9} r/hr. The normal gamma background count, which is caused by cosmic rays, radiopotassium, radium, and other natural sources of radioactivity, is quite variable in the range of 5×10^{-6} to 5×10^{-5}r/hr. This method thus makes it possible to estimate minute amounts of radioactivity that are insufficient by far to affect measurably the general gamma radiation background of an area.

It is clear that no one sampling procedure provides the ideal method for estimating the deposition of radioactive dust under all conditions. The deposit on any given area will depend somewhat on the character of the surface presented. For example, when there is no rainfall, dry fallout may drift somewhat with other windblown dusts. In this situation the gummed filter technique may yield a high estimate of the average fallout, because it will tend to collect dust that is being redistributed laterally.

We have compared the collection characteristics of the gummed film (G) and a high-walled pot (P). During a 49-week period we found that the regression of P on G was 1.17 ± 0.19. That is a highly significant relationship that does not differ significantly from 1.

Methods of collection utilizing pots or pans for collection of total rainfall are disadvantageous in practice because of the need to transfer and handle the wet samples preparatory to shipping to a central radiochemical facility. The gummed-film method is uniquely simple—at the end of the sampling period the film is folded and placed with a data card in an envelope for mailing to the Health and Safety Laboratory, where it is processed in the manner described.

The routine operation of this network has been greatly facilitated by the cooperation of the United States Weather Bureau, at the stations of which our collectors are placed. Duplicate samples at all stations provide insurance against loss of samples and also give the advantage of replication.

We have discontinued the routine monitoring of air-borne (suspended) dust at all locations. We have previously reported[2] that the highest daily mean air-borne dust concentration recorded during the Nevada tests in the spring of 1952 was 23×10^{-8} $\mu\mu$c/cm^3 (equivalent to 53,000 disintegrations/min m^3) at Elko, Nev., on June 1. The estimated cumulative dose to the lungs of persons who breathed this concentration is 20 millirads[7], somewhat less than the dose from a chest X-ray. We now have the experience gained during a more recent Nevada series of tests, those conducted in the spring of 1953. We collected samples of air extensively during that series, but none was as high as this previously recorded maximum level.

Accumulation of radioactive fallout: Table 2 gives our estimates in millicuries per square mile of the total fission products deposited throughout the country since early 1951. These estimates are based on approximately 250,000 samples collected since 1951. The accumulation varies from 21 mc/mi^2 in Arizona to 120 in New Mexico. The mean of the reported value is 61 mc/mi^2. The spread is rather narrow in view of the many factors that affect the amount of fallout in any given place. Nevada is not included because gradations in the fallout patterns make it impractical to assign a single value for the State.

The manner in which each of the test series has contributed to the total fallout now estimated to be present in the northeastern United States is illustrated in Figure 2, [not shown] which continues the type of graphical presentation first used in our earlier report. In order to facilitate the presentation of these data, we have made the simplifying assumption that the debris from each of the detonations of a series of tests originated from a single burst occurring at the midpoint of the series. The total artificial radioactivity continues to be of a low order when it is compared with the radioactivity normally present in the earth's crust. The naturally occurring istotope Ra^{226} is present in amounts that vary between 100 and 1,000 mc/mi^2, considering only the upper few inches of the earth's crust.

Of the various long-lived constituents present in this radiactive debris, Sr^{90} is of most interest. This is because of its relatively long half-life (25 years) and the fact that its chemical similarity to calcium makes it possible that strontium can enter into biological systems along with calcium and ultimately be deposited in human bone. As is well known, this is also true of radium.

The estimated accumulation of strontium in the soil in northeastern United States is also shown in figure 2. The contribution from Sr^{89} is not shown because of its relatively short half-life (55 days). The ratio of Sr^{89} to Sr^{90} in the accumulated debris from all detonations is estimated to have been about 1.0 on January 1, 1955.

By September 1, 1954, the estimate of accumulated Sr^{90} was 1 mc/mi^2 This estimate is based on the assumption that Sr^{90} is present in the debris in an amount that can be predicted from the data of Hunter and Ballou.[8] The proportion of Sr^{90} of the debris may vary somewhat from theory, and more or less Sr^{90} may be present. This is consistent with the manner in which Sr^{90} is formed and the general dynamics of the fireball as we presently understand it. The Sr^{90} is derived from a radioactive parent Kr^{90}, which is an inert gas having a half-life of 25 sec. Thus, much of the Sr^{90} that is ultimately present in the debris is formed when the fireball is relatively old and has cooled considerably. This can result in the presence of a disproportionate fraction of Sr^{90} in a given particle of debris. A tentative assumption, supported by incomplete studies, is that the debris which falls out in the immediate vicinity of a detonation is depleted in Sr^{90}. Conversely, the debris that falls out at great distances is likely to be enriched in this nuclide. Recent unpublished analyses from our laboratory suggest that the use of the Hunter and Ballou curves to estimate the radiostrontium content of our samples may yield values that are about 30 percent of the true value. The same reasoning applies to Sr^{89}, which is also derived from a krypton isotope.

However, an upward adjustment, by a factor of 3, of our estimates of the Sr^{90} contribution to the earth's crust does not alter the conclusion that the fallout of long-lived radioactive constituents of the debris has been minute compared with the radioactivity that is normally present in the earth's crust. Bugher[9] recently estimated that the amount of strontium present would have to be increased by the order of 1 million times before the biological effects from this cause could be recognized.

In a few places relatively heavy fallout caused by a combination of metrorological coincidences resulted in elevations of the radiation background that were readily detectable with conventional radiation detection equipment. In each case the fallout was associated with precipitation coinciding with the transport of radioactive dust into the rain-forming levels of the atmosphere. The bulk of this radioactivity is eliminated by decay in the matter of hours or a few days after the fallout. At no place except in the immediate vicinity of the test site in Nevada is there a sustained elevation of the background sufficient to be demonstrable by direct measurement of the gamma background in the area. For example, the deposition of mixed fission products in New Mexico is estimated to have been approximately 120 mc/mi^2 on January 1, 1955. The gamma radiation from this deposition is of the order of 0.0010 mr/hr; the normal background of the United States varies from 0.005 to 0.05 mr/hr and in any one place may vary by as much as a factor of 5, primarily because of meteorological situations that inhibit the dispersion of the radioactive gas radon and its daughter products. It would be difficult, although possible, to measure the increase in dose rate caused by 100 mc/mi^2.

An example of relatively heavy fallout was the radioactive rain in Troy, N. Y., of April 1953. This instance was particularly well documented by Clark.[10] Although Troy is located at a great distance from the Nevada test site, the fallout on that city is to our knowledge the highest that has occurred except, as reported elsewhere,[4] for some of the communities located within 200 miles of the Nevada test site. Clark reported that the cumulative dose from Troy fallout was about 100 mr. It is apparent from this and previous descriptions of methods by which we document radioactive fallout at distances from the site of a detonation that the widespread dispersion of radioactive debris is readily demonstrable by rather simple techniques.

It is not surprising that at times anomalously high fallout at great distances from a detonation has been readily observed by conventional radiosensitive laboratory equipment. It will be recalled that fallout from the first atomic detonation in July 1945 was observed as a result of contamination of photographic packaging material.[11] A number of scientists have recently recorded their observations in systematic fashion and a number of excellent scientific publications have resulted. Unfortunately, the calm presentation of the facts, usually many months after the incident, does not erase from people's minds the more sensational statements that have appeared in the press as a result of either pure speculation or superficial and incomplete information.

TABLE 1. *Network of collection stations, February 1955*

(The stations in operation during Operation Castle, the Pacific tests conducted in the spring of 1954, are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mobile, Ala.	*Wichita, Kans.
Montgomery, Ala.	*Louisville, Ky.
Flagstaff, Ariz.	*New Orleans, La.
Phoenix, Ariz.	Caribou, Maine
*Tucson, Ariz.	Baltimore, Md.
Yuma, Ariz.	*Boston, Mass.
Fort Smith, Ark.	Alpena, Mich.
Eureka, Calif.	*Detroit, Mich.
Fresno, Calif.	Marquette, Mich.
*Los Angeles, Calif.	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Sacramento, Calif.	*Minneapolis, Minn.
San Diego, Calif.	Jackson, Miss.
*San Francisco, Calif.	*Kansas City, Mo.
Colorado Springs, Colo.	*St. Louis, Mo.
Denver, Colo.	*Billings, Mont.
*Grand Junction, Colo.	Helena, Mont.
Pueblo, Colo.	Kalispell, Mont.
*New Haven, Conn.	*Scottsbluff, Nebr.
*Washington, D. C. (Silver Hill, Md.)	Elko, Nev.
*Jacksonville, Fla.	Ely, Nev.
*Miami, Fla.	*Las Vegas, Nev.
*Atlanta, Ga.	Reno, Nev.
*Boise, Idaho	Winnimucca, Nev.
Pocatello, Idaho	*Concord, N. H.
*Chicago, Ill.	*Albuquerque, N. Mex.
*Des Moines, Iowa	Roswell, N. Mex.
Concordia, Kans.	Albany, N. Y.
Goodland, Kans.	*Binghamton, N. Y.
*Louisville, Ky.	*Buffalo, N. Y.
	*New York, N. Y. (LaGuardia)
	*Rochester, N. Y.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Syracuse, N. Y.	Abilene, Tex.
*Cape Hatteras, N. C.	Amarillo, Tex.
Fargo, N. Dak.	*Corpus Christi, Tex.
Williston, N. Dak.	*Dallas, Tex.
*Cleveland, Ohio	Del Rio, Tex.
*Medford, Oreg.	Port Arthur, Tex.
Portland, Oreg.	Milford, Utah
*Philadelphia, Pa.	*Salt Lake City, Utah
*Pittsburgh, Pa.	Lynchburg, Va.
Providence, R. I.	*Seattle, Wash.
Charleston, S. C.	Spokane, Wash.
Huron, S. Dak.	Green Bay, Wis.
*Rapid City, S. Dak.	Miuwaukee, Wis.
*Knoxville, Tenn.	Casper, Wyo.
Memphis, Tenn.	Cheyenne, Wyo.

TABLE 2.—*Cumulative radioactive fallout in the United States, by States, from the spring of 1951 to Jan. 1, 1955, in millicuries of mixed fission products per square mile (mc/mi²)*

Alabama	72
Arizona	21
Arkansas	86
California	29
Colorado	54
Connecticut	33
Delaware	37
Florida	75
Georgia	58
Idaho	90
Illinois	57
Indiana	55
Iowa	84
Kansas	85
Kentucky	53
Louisiana	96
Maine	33
Maryland	40
Massachusetts	33
Michigan	46
Minnesota	59
Mississippi	76
Missouri	84
Montana	35
Nebraska	94
Nevada	
New Hampshire	33
New Jersey	30
New Mexico	120
New York	41
North Carolina	69
North Dakota	56
Ohio	56
Oklahoma	89
Oregon	36
Pennsylvania	35
Rhode Island	33
South Carolina	51
South Dakota	53
Tennessee	72
Texas	110
Utah	96
Vermont	33
Virginia	39
Washington	55
West Virginia	41
Wisconsin	63
Wyoming	49

[1] The work summarized in this report was performed by many individuals on the staffs of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission and the U. S. Weather Bureau. We are particularly indebted to J. S. Alercio, A. E. Brandt, J. C. Bugher, N. Halden, H. D. LeVine, D. E. Lynch, and L. Machta.

[2] M. Eisenbud and J. H. Harley, Science 117, 141 (1953).

[3] U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, Thirteenth Semiannual Report (Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., January 1953).

[4] U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, Fourteenth Semiannual Report (Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., July 1953).

[5] Together with the stations operated within a distance of 200 miles from the test site, the total number of monitoring locations in the United States is more than 100.

[6] Radiation Safety for A-Weapons Test, Nucleonics 10, No. 5, 10 (1952).

[7] The rad is a unit of dose equivalent to an energy absorption of 100 ergs/g.

[8] H. F. Hunter and N. E. Ballou, Nucleonics 9, C–2 (1951).

[9] J. C. Bugher, Medical Effects of Atomic Blasts, paper presented at the Seventh Annual Industrial Health Conference, Houston, Tex., Sept. 23, 1954.

[10] H. M. Clark, Science 119, 619 (1954).

[11] J. H. Webb, Physics Revised 76, 375 (1949).

Significance of a Milestone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an excellent editorial which appeared in the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., under date of May 20, 1955:

SIGNIFICANCE OF A MILESTONE

Chelsea Jewry is now celebrating the 300th anniversary of Jewish settlement in this land. The American Jewish Tercentenary is being marked by national observances, special programs, and activities in cities and towns across the country. The theme of the tercentenary is "Man's Opportunities and Responsibilities Under Freedom."

The first Jewish community in North America was established by 23 Jews, who landed at the little Dutch settlement of New Amsterdam in September 1654, after a hazardous ocean journey. These Jews came here from the Dutch colony of Recife, Brazil, in the wage of Portuguese conquest.

Whether the 23 Jews who came here meant to reach New Amsterdam or Old Amsterdam, at they fled the threat of the Inquisition, is not known. However, after setting out from Recife, they were attacked and captured by pirates and subsequently rescued by a French barque, which brought them to what is now New York City.

Following the discovery of the Western Hemisphere, America was the goal of many noted explorers. First, there was Columbus. Then there were Vespucius, and Balboa. Magellan and the Cabots, Hudson and Drake and Verrazano. Then came Cortez and Pizarro and Coronado and Ponce de Leon and de Soto and de Vaca. They came in search of gold. They sought the fountain of youth. Theirs were dreams of adventures, of riches, and glory.

But the Jews who came to the New World—to the Americas—came only in search of one thing: Freedom. Nowhere in Europe could the 17th-century Jew publicly fight for his rights. In Europe, the Jew was experiencing one of the darkest periods of his history. Countless thousands fell victims in the bloody massacre of the Ukrainian rebel Bogdan Chmielnitzki. Thousands more were butchered in Poland by the Swedish and Russian armies. Elsewhere in the Old World, Jews were herded together in ghettos, ordered to identify themselves by wearing the yellow badge.

Things were quite different on this side of the Atlantic. Here, 23 Jews had come to New Amsterdam to fight for freedom in a land they believed was meant to be free. They, and those that followed them, helped to carve out of the American wilderness a Nation which in time was to become a symbol of democratic liberty in a world torn by conflicting ideologies.

The tercentenary is more than a birthday party to commemorate one date in history. history. It is an occasion for Jewry to give thoughtful consideration to questions which affect them as Jews and as Americans. It is is a time to reexamine and reevaluate their role in American life and to determine how they can best preserve democratic liberty within the framework of man's opportunities and responsibilities under freedom.

A section of today's Chelsea Record is dedicated to this observance and contains several interesting articles of the part played by Chelsea Jewry since their settlement in this city. Chelsea at one time had a population of 23,000 Jews, the largest of any city of its size. As far as can be ascertained, the first settlers of Jewish faith in this city were the families of Louis and Joseph Kaufman, in 1866.

The observance which has been in progress here all week, with a historical exhibit at the library, will be climaxed with a huge celebration at the high school Sunday night.

Congratulations to Chelsea Jewry for its part played in the life of the community.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting article which appeared in the Pilot, Boston, Mass., on May 14, 1955:

MEN OF MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

On last Sunday the Massachusetts Institute of Technology opened a new auditorium and religious center on the campus and gathered together for the occasion a very impressive array of faculty and guests. For the address of dedication the Institute invited the Honorable E. N. van Kleffens, Minister of State of the Netherlands, and it proved to be a very happy choice indced.

Speaking in what may be termed one of the vital centers of scientific learning in the world, the honorable speaker saw fit to point out with luminous clarity and incisive language certain dangers connected with the education of a scientist. "Technological education and research * * * may lead to an undue narrowing of belief and faith. A state of mind may be induced in which no place is left for belief except in what we see demonstrated in the test-tube. This is a grave and noxious error." Moreover there is a second danger where the achievements of science engender a state of mind in which nothing seems impossible to man. He thereby becomes a law unto himself. * * * In other words: one of the dangers of science is that it may make man fortgetful of divine and human law."

On both accounts the speaker suggested the importance of certain spiritual concepts.

There always remain the great verities which are taught by religion—incapable of scientific demonstration but nonetheless true. The difference between good and evil cannot be expressed in any scientific formula and yet all human beings * * * know its existence, a revealed fact of the first order. And on the second point we have the idea of the natural law, immutable and perennial, the foundation of what is meet and just, found in the human conscience and binding on all human beings, a law no human authority can change and from whose validity there is no escape.

With sentiments like these marking the occasion the authorities of MIT have boldly made plain their dedication to the education of the total person in training the scientist of tomorrow. While this gives us new confidence for the time ahead, it also provides a rewarding revelation of the wisdom of the scientists of today.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

Appendix

Extension of the Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement made by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, before the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency, considering the extension of the Small Business Administration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE J. BURGER, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS

Mr. BURGER. Thank you, Senator MORSE.

Senator MORSE. Will you identify yourself for the reporter?

Mr. BURGER. I am George J. Burger, vice president in charge of legislative activities of the National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. Our national headquarters are located in Burlingame, Calif. We also maintain division offices at New York City, Cincinnati, and Chicago.

It must be understood by Members of Congress that no officer or group of officers is permitted to speak for the federation as to its position on any legislative or economic problems unless so directed by a nationwide poll of our members. The entire membership is polled and the results of these polls give the executive officers the authority to act in behalf of the members.

The federation has a vital stake in the successful administration of the Small Business Administration Act. It will be found from the record of the hearings before the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees in May 1953, that the federation's position was in full support of the proposed legislation with only one exception. We recommend that full control of the agency rest with the Administrator and that he be subject only to control of the Congress of the United States. Our position today, through nationwide vote, remains the same as it was in May 1953.

The federation has in its employ approximately 200 field representatives who are calling on small-business men every day of the business week and they are in a position to get firsthand information on the success or failure of the Small Business Administration in carrying out the will of Congress. Further, the federation, through its head offices at Burlingame, Calif., and its Washington office, receives considerable numbers of requests for information from our membership as to procedure under the Small Business Administration Act as to loans. In fact, it can be safely said that better than 80 percent of the inquiries as they apply to SBA from all sections of the Nation rest on the needs for financial assistance. The Washington office alone, during the life of the act, has assisted many hundreds in giving them the necessary information on procedure to follow in their contacts with SBA. At the same time, we have kept the Members of Congress acquainted with information coming from their districts on such inquiries.

We have a very vital stake in the success of the Small Business Administration Act. We are not unmindful of the fact that if there are deficiencies in the administration of the act, it would act as a boomerang to the federation. Consequently, we are watching developments to bring about a successful administration of the act, and let it be understood for the record that the closest liaison and cooperation has existed between our office and the head office of SBA for a year or more.

Our interest in the act itself began shortly after its approval by Congress. As is my custom every year, I visited the head office at Burlingame, Calif., in September 1953, and made it my business to confer with the regional director of SBA in Los Angeles, and in October 1953, with the regional office at Kansas City, Mo. In both of these visits, to be certain, we had the story correct. I insisted that a third party be present at the conference. At the completion of the conference, I directed the third party to make his report on the conference and then I made my own individual report. The comparison was then made. We found a wretched situation existing in the administration of the act which we believed was far from the intent of the Congress.

Upon my return to Washington, I immediately contacted the administrator, Mr. Mitchell, and arranged for a conference, which took place in his office on October 23, 1953. His various assistants were present during the 2-hour conference and I believe the present administrator, Mr. Barnes, who was then general counsel, was also there.

I advised Mr. Mitchell of our findings, namely, that the great majority of small-business institutions could not qualify for loans due to the regulations instituted by the Policy Board. The regulations provided for loans only for those institutions in essential war work or essential industries. We found that the formal application which was presented to the applicant for completion brought about a situation where the applicant would attempt to answer the question in the form and would finally throw it up in disgust.

At the conference, I put the question to Mr. Mitchell as to who was setting the loan policy and was any policy he proposed vetoed by Treasury or Commerce Department heads. He asked me to give him the privilege of reserving an answer until a later date.

His assistants urged, because of the importance of my findings, that a joint conference be arranged for with Treasury and Commerce officials and the SBA, at which time I could relate again the story I had told on October 23, 1953. This conference took place on the afternoon of October 26, 1953, in the office of Mr. Randolph Burgess, who, I believe, is assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury. I also believe that Mr. Lothair Teetor of the Department of Commerce was present at this conference. I brought out in this conference two particular cases, one of a small battery manufacturer in the State of Minnesota, and the other, a small furniture producer in the State of Georgia. In the first instance, applications for loans were denied because it was ruled they were not in essential business.

The outcome of these joint conferences was that a few days later a change was made in the management of SBA and then on November 16, 1953, the entire policy was changed to permit all small business to participate in financial aid through the Small Business Administration.

Shortly thereafter, Mr. Wendell Barnes was appointed Administrator, and up to this very moment, we have had no reason to register any objections to the present policy being carried out by the Small Business Administration insofar as financial aid to small business is concerned. The federation makes no recommendations one way or the other on any application for a loan. The application must stand on its own merits.

I believe it was just about a year ago a subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee held hearings on the west coast, one in San Francisco, and another in Los Angeles. In both instances, federation officials appeared and gave testimony, and at one of these hearings the committee questioned the federation witness on the advisability of raising the SBA loan ceiling to a higher bracket than the $150,000 limit. Following up the committee's suggestion, we polled our nationwide membership and the vote was in the negative. Knowing of our obligation to our members as to a successful administration of the act, again in one of my annual visits to the head office, in 1954, I held conferences with the directors of the regional offices in Los Angeles and San Francisco. At the cnferences in these areas, Federation President C. Wilson Harder accompanied me. I also conferred later with the regional director in Portland, Oreg. At that time, a federation man was also with me. Then again, before returning to Washington, I conferred with the regional office in Minneapolis.

In these recent conferences, not alone with the regional directors of SBA but also with small business people en route, we found two serious situations we hope have since been corrected. One was the reluctance of banks in certain areas to look with favor on the Small Business Administration Act. In some areas it was reported that correspondent banks were afraid to step in because they were fearful of antagonizing the larger banking institutions. It goes without saying that the merger trend in banking institutions which is sweeping the Nation is of considerable concern to small business of this Nation. Financial control in the hands of a few large banking institutions certainly does not tend to encourage small business of this Nation. The neighborhood banks in many areas of the Nation live with small business daily and when they cease to exist the impact on the future of small business will be most serious. We know from conversations with representatives of small banks of their alarm as to this merger trend. So it is more necessary than ever before that the Small Business Admin-

istration be continued as a permanent, independent agency.

The second was the failure of the regional offices of SBA to have enough available material such as Government specifications or blueprints of specifications. There was a limited number available, and when they were gone that was the end of it. In some areas arrangements were made with the public libraries where these documents were available. However, it was most difficult sometimes for a small-business institution to have to go down and look up copies and make analyses of them, etc.

It is our hope that the committee will make certain that all available information as to Government bids, forms, specifications, blueprints, and so on, are available at all regional offices so that those small-business institutions who are interested in participating in Government contracts may have such information in advance to permit them to qualify.

It is significant and important to note that at recent hearings before the Small Business Committee of the Congress that the Treasury Department stated:

"The Treasury believes that under the provisions of the act, and under existing policies, SBA has established an excellent record since its lending machinery went into operation. The Treasury believes that in the light of that record the life of the Agency should be extended for a further period of 2 years."

It is also to be noted that the small-business adviser for the Department of Defense before the same hearing stated:

"It is our view that the Small Business Administration is presently serving the best interests of the Nation in this way and that it can continue to do so. For these reasons, we recommend the continuation of the Small Business Administration beyond June 30, 1955."

As a result of the mail reaching our head office at Burlingame, Calif., or the mail directed to the Washington office from members of the federation—all independent businessmen—it can be said without a question of doubt that they desire this agency to stand on its own two feet—full control and management of the agency to rest with the agency itself, and not be made a part of any other agency of the Government as to the overall policy of the Small Business Administration. Control of the agency should rest with the Administrator and the Congress itself.

The position the federation is taking as to the continuance of the agency is ratified and confirmed by two recent nationwide polls of its entire membership. The results of the two polls are as follows:

Poll No. 1: 76 percent for, 22 percent against, 2 percent no vote.

Pole No. 2: 84 percent for, 11 percent against, 5 percent no vote.

It is to be noted, Mr. Chairman, that the first poll was made in or around October 1954, and the more recent poll was completed within the past 30 days.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the federation makes certain recommendations for the committee's consideration:

1. We believe that any and all top employees of SBA should have full and thorough knowledge of the basic problems of small business. They should have a human feeling for the problems facing small business. This should be a requisite before they go into a position.

2. The regional advisory boards appointed by the agency should meet more often with the regional directors so that the directors will have more direct information on what is going on in their areas.

3. We believe the committee should reexamine the appointments made to the National Advisory Board as it may be found that some of the members of that Board are a long way from an understanding of small business or being representative of small business.

4. A more aggressive action on the part of SBA to secure a greater share of Government business, and particularly to exercise its right to take prime contracts where same can be channeled through groups of small business in the respective industries. We found in many areas that competent, small engineering firms, for example, would be able to handle effectively prime contracts, singly or in groups, and possibly at lower cost to the Government. We urge special action by the committee in its direction to the agency on this.

5. We believe that the committee should explore the privilege extended to the regional offices in making loans up to $50,000 without consulting Washington. We would like to have the committee satisfy itself that in this permission there are no impediments and that it means just what it says.

6. Our final recommendation, and we believe a very important one, so that the constructive help to SBA is not impaired through no fault of its own, is that we urge your committee to give special consideration and attention to making known to the antitrust agencies that they institute a more vigorous, consistent enforcement of the antitrust laws as the failure to enforce these laws can result in not alone destruction to small business, but to defeat the intent of Congress in financial aid to small business.

On that recommendation, I heard the remarks about the perils facing small business in this Nation. It is a good comment. However, we are quite alarmed to the perils facing small business.

Within the past week or 10 days a communication was received, addressed to me, in the Washington office, from Columbia, Miss., on the activities of leading milk and ice cream companies invading the State of Mississippi with lower prices for ice cream than they are giving in the neighboring State of Arkansas across the river.

Also, only yesterday we received a long, extensive telegram from Topeka, Kans., telling of the activities of leading bread companies going into Topeka and Bonneville, Mo., with prices for bread that no small producer can even start to meet.

Third, Senator PAYNE, your State has an ample amount of tire-rebuilding equipment, which did serve a very essential purpose in the war. It was in this room in 1942 that a group of the members of that industry laid before the Banking Committee a proposition which eventually served many millions of automobiles in essential transportation. I am talking about the tire-rebuilding industry which is exclusively in the hands of independents who pioneered that industry from its inception over 25 years ago.

What is happening now? In this industry involving tire dealers in your State of Maine and Senator MORSE's State, where there is extensive equipment for tire rebuilding, the big manufacturers are apparently disregarding the law and going in and trying to monopolize that business which the dealers built up.

It leads me to the conclusion that if the Small Business Administration loans are made to these small bread companies and the ice cream people in Mississippi and the tire dealers, those loans can be impaired, and seriously impaired, through no neglect on the part of the borrower, but by the damage to them through the violation of the antitrust laws.

I urge that your committee take that recommendation under consideration in the rewording of the Thye bill.

Pacific Northwest Power Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD articles by two thoughtful newspaper reporters on the Pacific Northwest power situation.

One is by A. Robert Smith, published in the Eugene Register-Guard of May 14, 1955, and the other by Malcolm Bauer, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of May 23, 1955.

Both these reporters, in my opinion, are men who write without bias or preconceived prejudices and, while I do not agree with all their conclusions, I commend their findings to the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of May 14, 1955]

HELLS CANYON DECISION DISAPPOINTMENT TO BOTH SIDES

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The Hells Canyon decision of Examiner William J. Costello came as a stunning surprise to both sides that have made the controversy over a high Federal dam versus three low private dams a hot political issue here and in the Pacific Northwest.

Costello's written opinion, 79 pages of fine print based on his summation of facts presented in the case during the FPC hearings that began nearly 2 years ago, contained two fundamental and distinctive findings:

An engineering finding that the high dam offers a superior plan for development of the water resources of the middle Snake River.

A political finding that the high dam can't be built in the foreseeable future due to heavy political opposition within Congress and the Eisenhower administration.

Costello concluded from these findings that Idaho Power Co. should be given a license for one dam without prejudice to later approval of the other two projects.

BOTH SIDES WRONG

This surprised Idaho Power officials who were confident of winning but expected to get licenses for all three dams instead of just the Brownlee project. It was equally surprising to National Hells Canyon Association attorneys, who assumed that if Costello agreed with their contention that the high dam was superior, he would reject the private utility plan and recommend the Federal dam to Congress.

Costello reached his engineering finding after 55 pages devoted mostly to analyzing both schemes as to cost of power, power benefits, effect on irrigation, flood control, and navigation—in short, all the technical aspects of the two plans that have been so bewildering to the laymen, if not to the politician.

In the process, Costello demolished favorite arguments of Idaho Power backers against the high dam. These arguments and Costello's findings were:

Argument No. 1: There isn't enough water in the Snake to fill the high dam reservoir

and allow for future irrigation needs in southern Idaho.

Costello's finding: "With ample allowance for all foreseeable upstream irrigation water uses, a dependable water supply can reasonably be expected for the efficient and economic operation of the high dam project during its (50-year) pay-out period."

Argument No. 2: The high dam would be so expensive that Bonneville power rates would be forced up or the Federal investment in Hells Canyon could never be repaid.

Costello's finding: "For the high dam project, the unit cost per kilowatt of salable firm power would be approximately $23.80 * * * this cost would not result in affecting the current Bonneville rate of $17.50, since all revenue and costs of the project would be pooled with the revenues and costs of the existing BPA system."

Argument No. 3: Because Idaho Power's dams could be built faster, they would supply a large block of surplus power to the power-starved States of Oregon and Washington.

Costello's finding: "The prospects, as reflected in this record, for the sale in the Northwest of the large amounts of excess power that would be available from the three projects at rates which would equal the cost of the power (6.6 mills) are so feeble as to be worthy of no consideration." (It was for this reason that Costello ordered only one dam built at a time, as its power output could be consumed in Idaho where power rates are higher than in the Bonneville-served area.)

Argument No. 4: The high dam would be a monument to Government stupidity, as Washington Gov. Arthur B. Langlie once put it, conceived by an empire-building bureaucracy.

Costello's finding: "The high dam project would stimulate throughout the Pacific Northwest (a) power-load development; (b) greater utilization of power in industry, agriculture, commerce, and community and service activities; (c) new business and employment opportunities; (d) expansion of production and productivity; (e) development of minerals and other materials important to the regional and national economy and to national security; (f) strengthening of the regional and national economy."

Having weighed each scheme to make his engineering finding, Costello reached the vital point of decision—whether to recommend theh high dam to Congress and reject the Idaho Power application, or to grant a license to the company and thereby preclude Federal construction of the high dam. He declared:

"I do not feel that this is a proper instance * * * (for recommending Federal development to Congress) even though the facts seem to point to the inescapable conclusion that with the marked and substantial advantage of the Government's credit, the high dam would be dollar for dollar the better investment and the more nearly ideal development of the middle Snake."

ROANOKE RAPIDS CASE

Why not?

Costello gave as his main reason the Roanoke Rapids case, a Federal versus private power dispute in Virginia in which the FPC granted a license on grounds there was little or no prospect of Federal development of the river. The Supreme Court upheld it.

Costello said the "similarity lies in the lack of likelihood of any foreseeable action by Congress on the high-dam proposal within any foreseeable time."

To support his evaluation of the current political climate which he implied is unfavorable to Federal power development. Costello cited the Eisenhower administration's insistence on the Dixon-Yates contract for private rather than Federal development of additional power in the TVA area. Other factors contributing to this climate are Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay's expressed opposition to the high dam and the possibility of a Presidential veto of high-dam legislation if Congress should pass it.

USELESS ACTION

Costello concluded that it would be a useless action to recommend the high dam, even though engineeringwise he found it superior, for in this political climate the recommendation "would serve only to freeze the middle Snake River for hydroelectric development for an indeterminate period in the future."

Since it would not be in the public interest to freeze the Snake in view of Idaho Power's need for more kilowatts, the examiner arrived at his decision to grant a license to the utility. He added—in what appeared to be an oblique challenge to congressional proponents of the high dam—that if Congress wishes to insist on Federal development of the Snake, it has the power to suspend the FPC's authority to issue a license to Idaho Power.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 23, 1955]

NORTHEAST POWER SHORTAGE SEEN AS NEW PROJECTS LAG

(By Malcolm Bauer)

PORTLAND, OREG.—The merchant in Walla Walla, the fisherman in Astoria, the logger in the mountains of southwest Oregon—each has a more personal stake in the Pacific Northwest's power production impassee than he may realize.

For two decades this far corner has been a sort of hydroelectric wonderland, challenged in the magnificence of of its concrete dams and miles of transmission lines and low power rates only by the celebrated Tennessee Valley Authority. Since 1951, the Northwest Power Pool has distributed more energy than any other single system in the Nation, including TVA. The Northwest is, therefore, the power capital of the country, and its residents have come to enjoy that distinction along with their low electricity bills.

It will come as a surprise to many of them to learn that this kilowatt paradise is not assured in perpetuity. For there is yet no power shortage in the Northwest (except at times of extraordinarily low water in the Columbia and its tributaries). And there is little probability of a real shortage, to be felt by the average consumer, within the next 5 years or so.

PROGRAM STALLS

But, beginning about 1960, unless there are immediate large-scale developments in the program of harnessing the Columbia River, this once power-rich land will experience a power famine so extreme as to be felt individually and personally by each one of the some 5 million residents or Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and western Montana.

This is so because the gigantic Federal dam-building program, which began in the 1930's with the construction of fabulous Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams and continued through the immediate postwar years with the raising of three more main-channel dams and a series of smaller structures on Columbia tributaries, is grinding to a halt. And there is as yet no economically and politically acceptable development program to take its place.

The reason that many ordinary men in the Northwest will have belated personal introduction to this crisis is that power production units now abuilding are keeping supply abreast of normal demand and will continue to do so for several years to come. McNary Dam only this month became the second biggest producer in the Columbia power system, surpassing relatively venerable Bonneville Dam.

BAD NEWS FOR INDUSTRY

Bonneville Dam has a rated capacity of 518,400 kilowatts for its total of 10 generators. The eighth generator, new on the line at McNary, raises the production there to 595,700 kilowatts. This third of the major dams to span the main channel will produce approximately 1 million kilowatts before the end of 1956.

Also on the way is hydro power from Chief Joseph (ultimately 1,152,000 kilowatts) and The Dalles (1,050,000 kilowatts) Dams, both well along in construction but many months short of initial production.

These structures, along with a number of smaller dams, will boost Northwest power production capacity to some 10 million kilowatts by 1960 or 1961, just about enough to take care of the new refrigerators and other appliances that will be in northwest homes by that time, but not enough to support any considerable amount of new industry. Then prospects are that expansion will stop, because The Dalles Dam, the last project underway, was started in 1951; and there has been no new start since that date.

Even if a new project (like Hells Canyon Dam or John Day Dam) were to begin this year, there would be a hiatus of power dearth; because a major dam takes nearly a full decade to complete.

Dr. William A. Pearl, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, painted a graphic picture of the Northwest's power needs the other day in a speech at Lewiston, Idaho. Over the past 20 years, he reminded his listeners, the Federal Government has spent approximately $2 billion on dams and transmission lines in the Columbia system. That has produced a plant now capable of producing 3½ million kilowatts, about half of all northwest production; and, by the time current projects are completed, it will be turning out 6 million kilowatts.

But in the next decade, he warned, the natural increase in demand in the Northwest is expected to reach a point that will require the expenditure (beginning now) of another $3½ billion in public or private funds. On a 10-year basis, that figures out at nearly $500,000 a day.

PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE

Such is the magnitude of the Northwest problem. The ordinary citizen hears of it currently only in the highly flavored terms of political debate. Advocates of public power, farm and labor organizations, and such articulate lawmakers as Oregon's Democratic Senators WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER plump for an immediate resumption of the Federal program, beginning, they hope, with the high Hells Canyon Dam.

The contrary position is that of the Eisenhower administration, which says that the Federal budget cannot stand such a drain as $500,000 a day for the development of a single region, and that private and local public investors should be invited in on major projects.

This is the position, too. of the private power companies which would like to build a private dam or dams in Hells Canyon on the Snake River and, on a partnership basis, the projected 1,105,000-kilowatt John Day Dam between The Dalles and McNary Dams on the Columbia mainstem. The "partnership" would be with the Federal Government, which would pay all costs not charged directly to power production.

One plank in the platform of each of these opposed parties is all-out opposition to the plan of the other. And, inasmuch as there has been no real progress made along any other course (proposals for an interstate compact and a regional development corporation to promote power production are both dormant) there is little reason to anticipate an early break in this granddaddy of all Pacific Northwest "log" jams.

ECONOMIC EFFECT

And how would the individual Northwest consumer feel the impact of a power famine? He would feel it not only in his electricity bills (higher prices are the answer to a shortage in any commodity), but he would feel it even more seriously in the direct social and economic effects of such an abrupt change in conditions in the region.

Memorial Address by Jacob L. Devers, General, United States Army, Retired, at the Annual Memorial Services of the Society of the 28th Division, Sunday, May 22, 1955, at Boalsburg, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, at Boalsburg, Pa., on Sunday, May 22, 1955, the Society of the 28th Division conducted its annual memorial service at the 28th Division Shrine. The following memorial address was delivered by Gen. Jacob L. Devers, United States Army, retired:

MEMORIAL ADDRESS BY JACOB L. DEVERS, GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED, AT ANNUAL MEMORIAL SERVICES OF THE SOCIETY OF THE 28TH DIVISION SUNDAY, MAY 22, 1955, AT BOALSBURG, PA.

Members of the Society of the 28th Division, fellow Pennsylvanians, fellow Americans, this is an occasion to stir men's hearts. Here in these monuments of metal and stone are represented the devotion and gratitude we feel for those courageous men and women who gave their lives for their countrymen.

Rather, if any of them—any one of those men whom we honor here today could stand here where I am—he would not say "grieve for us. Weep for us." I think, instead, he would say, "waste no precious time in aimless mourning. If you want to show devotion and gratitude to us who have died for freedom—then get on our team. The same spirit lives in you that lives in us. We died for freedom. You can live for it."

I shall speak to you today as I believe our honored dead would have me speak.

We feel the spirit of the honored dead of the 28th Division here today. If we could rend the veil for a few brief hours and have them here physically, in the persons that we knew and love, with the added wisdom of eternity that they now have—I imagine that they would not want us to grieve bitterly for them—to despair because of their supreme sacrifice. This would cast a pall of defeatism over all that they were and did. This would be no fitting recognition of their valor.

Let us look at some of the major conflicts in which we have engaged in our growth from a small frontier colony to the world's greatest power. How these conflicts have increased in scope and momentum.

We fought the Revoluntionary War to overthrow tyranny and for the right to govern ourselves. This was an armed struggle, limited in scope geographically as we think of war today.

The Civil War rent our country asunder—but only that that great jagged wound might be healed in such a manner as to create an indissoluble unity that could otherwise never have been.

Here we face the great mystery of life and death—here we face the issues that men consider important enough to live for and to die for. Issues that men have faced throughout the recorded history of humanity—issues that have suddenly had strong light focussed upon them—issues that have become, in this, the atomic age, stark and real to every human being.

Then came the war that men called World War I because its issues seemed to affect all the world so profoundly—and because our soldiers went overseas to fight for the cause of freedom. But even then the battlefields were relatively localized.

Then came World War II—and men gasped at the scope of it, for it was fought in the Atlantic and the Pacific, on battlefields in Europe and Africa, Hawaii, and the southwest Pacific and the Far East—and all the world was aflame with the scorching heat of it.

We engaged in the Korean war because might was attacking right—and we could not idly stand by and watch.

This shrine arouses vivid memories of the past. These memories can give rise to bitterness and despair—or they can fire us with courage and fill us with bright hope for the future.

There are those who will say that the men of the 28th Division who gave their lives in World War I gave them in vain—for 20 years after Armistice Day a greater conflagration was raging, started by the same nation and for the same basic reasons. Likewise, they will say that once again, in World War II, the lives that were sacrificed were given in vain—for today, only 10 years since V–E and V–J Days, the seething passion for power is threatening once again to boil over the edges of its earthen vessels.

Today, here at Boalsburg, in the heart of Pennsylvania, beloved State of all 28th Division soldiers—here at the shrine of these heroes whose valor and devotion we humbly and gratefully acknowledge—here and now let me say with all the emphasis of which I am capable: Not one of these lives was given in vain. Let us never say he lost his life in battle for his country and his fellowman. Let us say rather—he gave his life. True devotion to one's fellowman always entails sacrifice. And no sacrifice made for love of one's neighbor is ever made in vain—nor does it go unnoticed and unrecorded in the eternal annals.

Furthermore—let us never forget that our victory in each successful struggle has preserved for America our freedom. The rest of the world has not been so fortunate. Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, China, part of Korea, parts of Southeast Asia—all have become victims of a gigantic menace that has robbed them of their identity as self-governing nations.

Today the world is divided into two camps—each side possessing a working knowledge of the use of nuclear fission. One side is determined to conquer the world for itself—to make all men subservient to the state. The other side is dedicated to the proposition that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

We are today, as we Americans always have been, struggling for the rights of all men. I am reminded of a speech given in 1876 by George William Curtis entitled "The Puritan Principle: Liberty Under the Law": "Do you ask me, then, what is this puritan principle? Do you ask me whether it is as good for today as for yesterday; whether it is good for every national emergency; whether it is good for the situation of this hour? I think we need neither doubt nor fear. The puritan principle in its essence is simply individual freedom. From that spring religious liberty and political equality. The free state, the free church, the free school—these are the triple armor of American nationality, of American security. But the Pilgrims, while they have stood above all men for their idea of liberty, have always asserted liberty under law, and never separated it from law."

In that speech in 1876 Curtis was referring to the law as described 100 years before, in 1776, in the preamble to the Declaration of Independence, which says that to secure life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness "governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." This is what communism does not do. It does not derive its powers from the consent of the governed, nor are those powers as exercised by Communist leaders in any way "just." Communism is might attempting to throttle right.

Although at this particular time there is no tremendous open war actively raging on the ground, on the sea, or in the air between or among any major political powers, a vast global struggle is going on. In his 1955 state of the Union message, President Eisenhower pointed out that this struggle is not merely a clash of economic theories, or of forms of government, or of military power. He said—and I quote: "At issue is the true nature of man. Either man is the creature whom the psalmist described as 'a little lower than the angels,' crowned with glory and honor, holding 'dominion over the works' of his Creator; or man is a soulless, animated machine to be enslaved, used, and consumed by the state for its own glorification. It is, therefore, a struggle which goes to the roots of the human spirit, and its shadow falls across the long sweep of man's destiny."

The results of this struggle will affect every human being. For this reason, as many people as possible should be made aware of its full implications. This is a gigantic task. It would be a task of staggering proportions were it undertaken without hindrance or obstruction. But with communism working tirelessly, 24 hours a day with a fanaticism and energy that we scarcely imagine and do not even make an effort to comprehend—with communism spreading its propaganda, making its never-to-be-fulfilled promises—washing away with relentless erosion the props that support men's freedom—the task of spreading the truth and strengthening the bulwarks of freedom should find an alert, willing, earnest volunteer in every earnest American. We need untiring heroes who give their lives to the cause in the battle for men's minds—men like Dr. Frank Laubach who is responsible for having taught over 60 million people to read. His book, Wake Up or Blow Up, is full of profound truth. It is also full of suggestions of what you and I can do in a constructive way to spread the truth.

It behooves each of us to know the differing facts of this titanic struggle and to add our individual and corporate efforts where they are the most productive of positive results.

If, as our President says, this global struggle goes to the roots of the human spirit—then each one of us must, with bedrock earnestness, without procrastination, without careless laziness, examine himself squarely—clarify his convictions—shoulder his responsibility. How great is your concern?

We must be aware—and alert—and active. Our responsibility may be in person-to-person contacts, it may be in writing, it may be in speaking, it may be in teaching, at work, in the office, at home. What do we talk about at dinner? What do our children learn from us of gratitude for the blessings of freedom? What do they learn of wariness against subtle, creeping, insidious communism? How true and alive is the picture our children have of the world in which they live? What is their attitude, learned from us, toward service in the Armed Forces of our Nation? Do they know, do you know, the

established policy of the United States concerning the use of military force? What is it? This is it: "We will never commit aggression, but we must always be ready to defeat it."

Does the young lad who comes under your sphere of influence groan when he thinks of his military service, or is he anxious to add to his Nation's power for peace? If he has an intelligent understanding of the world situation he will never begrudge the time he devotes to the protection of what his country stands for.

The threat to world peace and freedom takes many forms. The Soviet Communists have proved themselves adroit at subversion, infiltration, intrigue, conspiracy, and at economic and political warfare. Somewhere in the struggle against this threat, every free man, woman, and youth has a spot to fill and a duty to perform to protect, and preserve freedom.

Our first objective in defense of our continent must be to maintain the capability to deter an enemy from attack and to blunt that attack if it comes. We must also recognize the possibility that there will be local wars along the periphery of the Communist bloc or elsewhere on the globe.

The United States Army is endeavoring to make maximum use of science and technology in order to be able to minimize the numbers of men in our military formations.

Increased mobility, flexibility, and firepower, combined with improved communications and intelligence will fit us to cope with great superiority in numbers of the enemy, and with battles that might occur any place in the world or simultaneously at many places.

At various stages, from the drawing board to field tests, are such innovations as a transportable atomic energic plant for use in outpost areas. An improved nike for better continental defense; an integrated system of electronic (including tactical TV), seismic and infrared devices which are expected to give the battlefield commander instantaneous, all-weather intelligence of all that is transpiring in his area; communications systems which will be needed on tomorrow's dispersed field of battle, cold-weather gear designed to withstand polar bitterness; foodstuffs preserved by atomic radiation; a family of vehicles which will negotiate almost any kind of terrain; all these and a thousand more projects are underway.

All branches of the armed services are moving in these same directions, with the same purposes and the same foresightedness.

Our Government has not overlooked the importance of industrial mobilization. The materiel production capacity to meet mobilization requirements is maintained largely by keeping essential war industries in business with reduced orders and by mothballing, under contract with the ultimate producer, the machinery needed to support an all-out effort.

We must remember that we in the United States do not stand alone in this struggle. Men, the world over, except for the relatively few who either have distorted notions of what is best for mankind or who are crazed with the lust for power—men outside and inside the Iron Curtain—instinctively love freedom. We have strong friends and allies among the free countries, we have NATO and the Manila Pact.

When I think of our friends around the world I am reminded of my visit to Colmar on the occasion of the celebration of the 10th anniversary of its liberation.

Our hopes for peace are not futile.

In the middle of 1942 we had suffered defeat at Pearl Harbor, the Japanese were overrunning the Pacific, Rommel was driving the British out of Egypt, and things looked completely hopeless. But we had only started our all-out effort to attain the power necessary to win the war.

We must now attain the power necessary to maintain the peace. This is no futile hope.

The men of the 28th Division whom we honor here today had the spirit that generated the power to win World War I and World War II. Let us sustain the results of their victory. Let us, not just for today—not just for tomorrow—but for all time, prevent world war III. We can do it. We must do it.

With the spirit of the men of the 28th, let us generate power for peace.

Why Reenlistment Is Dragging Its Feet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD a letter I received from the wife of a serviceman whose original intention it was to make a career out of the military service of this country, and which describes quite vividly the complaints a serviceman can justifiably make and one of the many reasons why reenlistments are falling off.

I believe it deserves the attention of every Member of this body, because of its frank discussion of what career service personnel are up against in their struggle to retain personal dignity and the honor of wearing the American uniform.

The security and protection of America depends to a great extent on the morale and spirit of our career men and their families.

This letter certainly brings into focus one of the many salient reasons why enlistments today are at such a low ebb.

For obvious reasons, I have deleted the name and address of the writer of this interesting, yet justifiable criticism.

The letter is as follows:

Mr. A. W. CRETELLA,
Representative from Connecticut,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CRETELLA: The Hoover Commission report, summarized in the newspapers this week, has in certain of its aspects dismayed and depressed me. I would like to bring to your attention, for your examination and for whatever answer you may be able to give, the problem of commissaries and local merchants.

My husband is completing the final months of a year and a half overseas. When he returns, we shall have another 18 months before this 4-year enlistment ends at last in discharge. Perhaps we might have planned a career in the service, to build that "professional core" that one hears so much about now, when the President and sundry others cry out that there are fewer and fewer reenlistments. And they also say what a fine life it would make for a young man (and I presume they must. or ought to, include that young woman, his wife). This letter is rather involved with some of our reasons for not staying in, and the type of pressuring revealed in the Hoover report is a part of them—a part I have been long expecting, ever since I lived in my first base town.

First of all, let us agree that a man and a wife ought to be together. From some sources I have heard it expressed that living with one's wife is a privilege conferred on the married serviceman by the military. A privilege that can be revoked at any time. I had naively believed only God could sunder the married.

Secondly, if you have ever been an enlisted man, or someone close to you has, you will not disagree when I say that an enlisted man has few rights and fewer privileges. He is a serial number to the military and a pariah to the civilians. I believe I have a quorum among service-experienced husbands and wives of my acquaintance, who agree with me in the following: Every man in uniform is considered by the civilians as a potential rapist. Or a drunk. Or a property destroyer. Visit a base town if you don't agree. A man in uniform is arrogant, doesn't pay his bills, is dishonest, is a threat to decent society. In reality of course the serviceman is not any of these (or proportionally any more of these than the local populace is) but that is the way civilians in base towns act, even as they send off native sons to other camps in praise and affection. We, the transplanted service people, come from another region, and hence we are looked on with a jaundiced eye.

In some towns, notably Belleville, Ill., active work has been done on both sides to great improvement, but in a hundred other towns, life is a living hell for the single serviceman, and much more than that for married service couples. Apartments are high priced and hard to get. Service wives are denied jobs for which they are often very well qualified, and insulted as they apply.

But the most taxing pressure met in base towns comes from the local merchants. Every town we have been in, the married service people have lived under the constant yammering of highly wrought up chamber of commerce members, agitating to close the commissary.

Let's really look at it. Our total income, including allotment, pay, and separate rations, averages out to $44.07 per week. It is not possible to feed and house two adults on that amount of money. (Remember how hard it is for the service wives to get jobs.) With children, though the pay is trivially higher the task is more than impossible. The commissaries are a godsend to us, the enlisted couples. With the commissary, where good food is sold at a fair price, we can afford to maintain a decent standard of living. If the commissaries are sacrificed to the avarice of the local merchants, separate rations pay will have to be increased twice and three times its present amount.

There was little money base towns before the base came. The merchants have become rather too fond of ready military cash. It is never enough that we buy daily milk, fresh meat, fresh fruits and vegetables, cars, clothes, toys, shoes, furniture, books, records appliances, yard goods, light, power, gasoline, and cooking gas from the town. They want more. They want the rest of our pitiful allowance of food money. It is not enough that we patronize the local entertainments, support local churches, go to local doctors. They want our entire food dollar.

It is easy for merchants to pressure. They have money for campaigns, and they vote. The serviceman is often too young to vote, or failed to register because he was away from home when he came of age, or he is careless about getting his absentee ballot, or absentee ballots are made just too difficult to come by. And the service couples are, for the most part, rather young, rather gullible and naive, not very sophisticated, politically or socially. They don't know how to make

their gripes heard. Or they are afraid. Chain of command, you know. Chain of communication.

The only way service people can express their disaffection with the whole military is by not reenlisting. And they are not, in droves. We are not staying in the service—because of housing, civilian and military attitudes, jobs for me, children, uncertain medical service for dependents—and as long as there is any threat to the commissaries, we certainly wouldn't be eager to stay. There are others, who, from lack of interest in civilian jobs or a desire for security, had planned to stay in the service. There will be fewer of these however, if the commissaries go.

It seems to me no threat to Pinkerton's business that the Government is training armed men. Pinkerton has not filed a petition that he take over his rightful place as trainer of the Army. Why should merchants be permitted to pressure the Government on this, forcing us to buy at their places of business. The commissary is in business to serve us, in lieu of standard wages to us.

Pardon me if I have seemed rather violent in this letter in spots, but the service with all its little presures rather galls me. Somewhere, somehow, if we are to have a career core to the service, people must agree to compensate the serviceman for the many real things he is sacrificing on leaving civilian life. Things that civilians take for granted because they never experience the deprivation.

MSTS Competes With Private Industry in Ship Repair Shops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have called the attention of the House to the critical situation in which the Nation's shipbuilding and ship repair industry finds itself because of insufficient work, and to the vital importance of this industry to our national security. The shops in the industry, big and little, are limping along or folding up because there is practically no new construction of merchant vessels and very little repair work to spread among them. The existing facilities are largely idle, no expansion of the industry is taking place, and the skilled employees so essential to our mobilization preparedness are being dispersed and dying off with no replacements trained to take their places.

In the face of this situation our Government should be bending every effort to ward off possible disaster to the shipbuilding and repair industry and to keep it alive. Instead of that, it is my painful duty to report, the Military Sea Transportation Service of the United States Navy, which is by far the largest single cargo and passenger enterprise in this country, is now operating maintenance and repair shops for its vessels and by so doing is helping to drive private industry further in the red and out of the ship repair business. Certainly the Navy must operate and maintain yards and shops to construct and overhaul its warcraft. However, it is equally certain that MSTS has no excuse for setting up a chain of repair shops for commercial type vessels when more than adequate facilities exist in private industry right next door to the shops MSTS has set up.

Three of these repair shops are now being operated—1 in San Francisco, 1 in Seattle, and 1 in New York. These 3 are 3 too many since no one can contend that in either of those areas private industry cannot do the job. The industry is, in fact, crying for it as I well know from the protests of shops in my district in San Francisco. Moreover, on the basis of MSTS' tactics in expanding its shipping empire beyond the actual need and in competition with private shipping, it would not surprise me to see an equally rapid expansion of their repair branch if action is not taken to nip it in the bud.

Mr. Speaker, I present for the RECORD at this point a copy of a resolution adopted at a joint conference of the Pacific Coast Shipbuilders Conference and the Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council, AFL, on May 13 of this year in Long Beach, Calif. The two organizations jointly represent the major segments of the ship repair industry and the shipyard employees on the entire Pacific coast. Their resolution points to the threat this MSTS operation poses to their industry and demands the elimination of MSTS repair shops as an unnecessary extension of the Service's basic function. I fully agree with the resolution and urge that Congress go into the matter fully.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT CONFERENCE BETWEEN PACIFIC COAST SHIPBUILDERS AND REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PACIFIC COAST DISTRICT METAL TRADES COUNCIL, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, AT WILTON HOTEL, LONG BEACH, CALIF., MAY 13, 1955

Whereas the Military Sea Transportation Service is set up to provide under one authority, control, operation, and administration of ocean transportation of personnel, materiel and other cargoes for all agencies of the Department of Defense of the United States; and

Whereas in the performance of the basic function for which it has been set up the Military Sea Transportation Service has extended its operations to include the operation of maintenance and repair shops in the ports on the Pacific coast; and

Whereas the private shipbuilding plant facilities and skilled personenl employed therein constitute a vital link in an integrated national defense system, and are adequate and sufficient for current needs in the ports in question in servicing the vessels operated by the Military Sea Transportation Service; and

Whereas the continued operation by the Military Sea Transportation Service of maintenance and repair shops is a serious encroachment on the private shipbuilding industry, and poses a serious economic threat to the industry and the workers employed therein. From a governmental standpoint the operation of the repair shops in the ports in question is uneconomical and unnecessary; and

Whereas representatives of the Seattle Metal Trades Council and the San Francisco Bay Cities Metal Trades Council have on numerous occasions protested to the naval authorities in the port cities in question against these operations, and their continued expansion, and further carried their protests to the commander, Military Sea Transportation Service, Vice Adm. Francis C. Denebrink, and these protests were continuously ignored: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That representatives of the Pacific Coast shipbuilding and ship repair industry and representatives of the unions affiliated with the Pacific Coast Metal Trades Council, American Federation of Labor, meeting in conference at the Wilton Hotel in Long Beach, Calif., May 13, 1955, join in requesting our representatives in the Congress to demand that the Military Sea Transportation Service eliminate the operation of maintenance and repair shops in the ports on the Pacific Coast, and adhere strictly to the basic functions for which it is set up.

WILLIAM H. WAY,
Chairman, Pacific Coast Shipbuilding Conference.
THOMAS A. ROTELL,
Executive Secretary, Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council, Corte Madera, Calif.
JAMES C. VAN DYKE,
Conference Secretary, Employers.
A. F. BARTHOLOMEW,
Conference Secretary, Labor.

The Last Old Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the Memorial Day order of Gen. John A. Logan, commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, which appears in the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes, Thursday, May 26, 1955:

Of the nearly two and one-quarter million men who fought in the Union Armies during the Civil War of 1861–65, only one remains. He is Albert Woolson, of Duluth, Minn., who recently marked his 108th birthday. Next week thoughtful Americans will celebrate Memorial Day, proclaimed by Gen. John A. Logan on May 5, 1868, when he was commander in chief of the then powerful Grand Army of the Republic.

We have been unable to find the exact date of publication, but probably far more than 50 years ago there appeared in the Tribune a tribute to "the Last Old Soldier," written by one of our Civil War leaders. The lines have been sent to us by one of our faithful readers from California and, although it has long been policy to not print verse in this newspaper, we feel that an exception can be made in this column and we are happy to meet the request to reprint, as a tribute to the last surviving Civil War veteran, the following lines which were written by R. M. Ratuff, of Middletown, Ohio:

"Say, boys, have you heard what the newspapers say?
One hundred and fifty old soldiers a day,
Footsore and weary, have dropped at last,
Back on the road where the column has passed.

"Every week—seven days—keep the number in mind—
Another full regiment lagging behind.
We bid them goodby with a tear and a song,
And the column keeps steadily marching along.

"Every three weeks another brigade
Back in the quiet old churchyard is laid;
One look at the spot where they peacefully sleep,
And each at his place in the column must keep.

"Sixty days—a division forever at rest,
No pickets thrown out, no foe will molest.
And let it be morning, at noon, or at night,
The column moves onward—is soon out of sight.

"Every six months a full army corps
Goes into camp on the furthermost shore;
No break in the column—the evening is damp;
But never mind, boys, we'll soon be in camp.

"An army each year, and weary, I ween,
Sleeps 'neath the sod with the grass growing green.
An army complete, Fifty Thousand Strong,
And the column is still moving slowly along.

"Soon there will be but an invalid corps
Of an army that numbered two millions or more.
A division, a brigade, then a regiment small,
Too feeble to note when a comrade shall fall.

"At last but a company, then a platoon,
A few stragglers left; then soon, oh, too soon,
We will read this small item: 'The news comes today
That the last old soldier has just passed away.'"

Merry-Go-Round on the Niagara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Buffalo Evening News carries the headline "MILLER Calls Democratic Bills on Falls Power Socialistic," and the article which follows goes on to explain how my colleague, Congressman MILLER, of Lockport, feels that two Democratic-sponsored measures for development of power at Niagara Falls by the New York State Power Authority are "varying degrees of socialism." On the very next page of the same issue appears another interesting headline on the same subject "Private Power Couldn't Profit in St. Lawrence," Moses says, and below that in subheadline type, "That's Why Five Concerns Gave Up on That Project and Now Seek Falls Development. He Charges." In the article which follows, Chairman Robert Moses, of State power authority, fires a return salvo at the sponsors of private-power development. But examining still another and earlier issue of the News, we see that even the "two Democratic-sponsored measures are not in agreement," as we read the headline "LEHMAN Denounces Niagara Power Bill—Will Submit His Own." In other words, the Senator from New York State is displeased, to say the least, with the bill sponsored by the New York State Power Authority.

We see three different viewpoints, each one sincere, each one has its points, and all are in complete disagreement. But there is one thing they all say together, as one man, even though you have to read between the lines to see it. They say, "Here is concrete evidence that the stalemate on Niagara power which has now continued for 5 long years, at a cost of $300 million in lost power, will continue for some time yet." They reflect the fact that with a Republican administration in Washington and a Democratic Congress, and a Republican New York State Legislature, and a Democratic Governor, it would be little short of a miracle if the controversy which has raged over the Niagara for 5 long years were settled overnight.

All of this controversy points up more eloquently than anything I could say, the need for immediate passage of H. R. 5377 which I introduced last March 30. It simply calls for immediate construction of power development works on the Niagara by a nonpartisan, nonpolitical construction agency, so that construction can proceed while these divergent interests are settling their differences. In that way, the project will be finished and not just beginning when those differences are settled, as they some day must be.

A recent editorial in the Buffalo Evening News accurately captures the spirit in which I introduced this bill. It recognizes the disastrous stalemate which has imposed a stranglehold on this essential project for 5 years, and which threatens to continue indefintely into the future. It realistically appraises the chances of complete settlement of the whole Niagara problem at this session of Congress, and it finds them not very good. It observes the nonpartisan character of my bill for immediate construction, and the fact that it is not inconsistent with any final solution which is ultimately adopted, whether now, or 4 or 5 years from now, because construction started today, will not be completed for that length of time. It notes that Canada, which can use our share of the power until we are in position to use it, has now completed its project, not 1 year ahead of us, as originally feared, but 5 years ahead of us if we started today. It recognizes that passage of the Radwan bill would itself act as a spur to the setlement of the differences which plague the Niagara, and that other pending bills are natural extensions of my bill for immediate, nonpartisan construction, and not inconsistent with it. It repeats the sober statistics that the value of the American share of this power, which has flowed over the falls since the 1950 treaty authorized us to develop it, is $300 million; that if we started today, $300 million worth would run over the falls before we finished.

Almost $10 million worth of power has run over the falls since I introduced my bill, and while it has languished in committee. Meanwhile, Buffalo and the Niagara frontier are denied power which they need for their industries, and to attract new industries; and the State and the Nation are denied their full power potential at a time when we need all we can get to meet the growing power behind the Iron Curtain. A recent editorial in the Washington Evening Star points out that the need for more electrical power in this country is doubled every 10 years.

As I stated to the chairman of the Public Works Committee in a recent letter urging him to report out this bill, I have no pride of authorship in it. If anyone has any ideas which will improve it and speed its passage, I will be pleased to consider its amendment, so long as I can preserve its basic intent. But who can, in good conscience, oppose its basic intent? This is one situation where we can only lose, not gain, by the passage of time.

National Sanitation Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Sanitarians is an organization of registered sanitarians who through their national organization strive to educate the people of the United States concerning the need for proper sanitation practices. One of their great aims is to awaken the people of America to the importance of cleanliness and sanitation so as to attain better health in all of our communities.

The president of this fine national organization, Floyd M. Miller, is from my own hometown, Shreveport, La. As a result of his untiring and unrelenting efforts to obtain recognition for the registered sanitarians of the United States, the great work they are doing is now receiving appropriate attention. Mr. Miller, a qualified and capable sanitarian himself, has for many years led the uphill struggle to establish a law in Louisiana requiring sanitarians to possess definite qualifications and be registered by the State. I am happy to say he has been successful in this battle. The efforts of Mr. Miller, however, have not been confined to Louisiana; they are national in scope. As president of the National Association of Sanitarians he has shown the great progress sanitarians have made in obtaining recognition of their splendid work. I quote from a recent letter from Mr. Miller:

The sanitarians of this country have grown in knowledge and ability and have now reached a very high level of professionalism in public health. Great strides have been made in the educational qualifications of the sanitarian and today most States and cities require their sanitarian trainee to be educated in the basic sciences and in most cases they are required to have additional training so as to equip them to give better service in our sanitation problems. In the State of Louisiana, for instance, qualifications of a man to be employed as a sanitarian have reached the level that we now have a registration act set up by the State legislature in 1954, which establishes the sanitarian as a registered sanitarian and in 1959 the person employed as a sanitarian trainee will necessarily have to have a degree in sanitarian science. There are five other States that have such acts and there

are many more that are working toward establishing such acts in their States.

"The National Association of Sanitarians has about 1,800 members, 31 States and Hawaii and Panama Canal affiliated. The purpose and meaning of the organization of the National Association of Sanitarians was to raise the standards of the sanitarian personnel throughout the United States and we feel that we are gradually reaching the goal of professional status."

To further promote the great aims of this splendid organization and to greatly benefit millions of Americans, the association has recommended that a National Sanitation Week be established. During this week, the association would present a concentrated educational program to alert all of the people of the United States to the need for sanitary practices at home, at work, and at play.

Should such a week be so designated, "the beacon light of public health" will brighter glow. I endorse the idea and commend it to the consideration of this Congress.

Who's Aiding Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, it cannot be said too often that money which the States get from the Federal Government is the same money that the people of the States pay to the Federal Government in taxes. Washington has no independent source of money except what is collected from the people. Again briefly and sharply pointing to the truth of this is a recent editorial which appeared in the Pleasantville Press, Want Federal Aid? Who's Aiding Whom?

With the permission of the House, it is herewith appended:

WANT FEDERAL AID? WHO'S AIDING WHOM?

Most of us have thought, some of us have urged our Representatives to get Federal aid for this and that.

The brochure published by the New Jersey Taxpayers Association, the High Cost of Federal Aid, or Who's Aiding Whom? makes good sense. For every dollar our State and local governments receive in Federal aid, New Jersey taxpayers are paying $2.19 to the Federal Government for support of the grants-in-aid system nationally. Putting it another way, in 1953 Federal-aid payments into New Jersey amounted to $45,400. But in taxes to support that year's total national grants-in-program of $2,758,700,000, New Jersey taxpayers contributed $99,300,000,

We may think we are getting something for nothing, but, as the association pointedly puts it, "The only place the Federal Government can get money for Federal aid is from you."

It's the taxpayers, in every locality all over America, who actually contribute the money to Washington which Washington then doles back in Federal aid—money which has shrunk during the process because of the administrative and debt-service costs.

Can New Jersey afford more aid from the Federal Government?

It's a question that every State must face realistically for their own financial solvency.

Realism on Postal Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Tampa Morning Tribune of May 24, 1955:

REALISM ON POSTAL PAY

Determination might well be considered as another middle name for President Dwight D. Eisenhower, at least as far as the postal pay increase bill is concerned.

Certainly the President was resolute in vetoing the measure designed to boost the pay of 500,000 faithful postal workers by an average of 8.8 percent.

All along the White House made clear its firm opposition to a raise greater than 7.6 percent. So the presidential action, determined as it was, really came as no surprise.

No doubt thousands of post office employees are bitter. Perhaps one of their union spokesmen spoke their minds when he termed the veto "ill-advised, unfair and discriminatory."

We also suspect many Democratic Members of Congress are more than a little miffed that a Republican administration has thus thrown down a challenge. The real test of strength will come when the Senate, probably on Tuesday, votes whether or not to override the veto.

But before tempers fly out the window, it would be well for everybody—Members of Congress, postal workers and the general public—to look at all angles of this important issue.

We can start from an agreed point that postal workers are undoubtedly entitled to higher pay because most, if not all, of them are loyal and conscientious public servants. We would add, however, that the administration's budgeting authorities were entitled to indicate how high, within the range of sound economics and firm budget policy, those raises should go.

President Eisenhower, as indicated above, recommended a pay increase of approximately 7.6 percent. Congress boosted the increase to 8.8 percent. Had there been no other considerations, this comparatively slight difference would not alone have justified a veto.

But the bill as passed by Congress makes unsound distribution of the increases within that average, so that some workers are boosted 9 percent and some doing the same work as little as 7 percent. Obviously this would be detrimental to employee morale.

The bill also would remove some of the incentive for better work, because of discriminations against the most responsible officials. And because the bill does not go far enough in reclassification of jobs, as Mr. Eisenhower pointed out, it would force "awkward and unfair administrative practices in a Government department whose operations affect every person, every enterprise, and every community in the country."

Postal workers have long sought a pay raise. In the circumstances, the tendency may be to center their fire on the Eisenhower administration.

But they cannot in good conscience overlook the plain facts that the bill Congress approved is political in origin, discriminatory in effect, and does not face up to the fiscal realities.

It is our hope, now that the bill has been vetoed, that the Senate will sustain the President's action and Congress will get to work at once on a realistic bill without such partisan flavor. Postal employees were denied an increase last year because of congressional jockeying for political favors. They deserve better treatment this time.

Planning Solves School Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the New York Times, April 22, 1955. This article gives an account of the splendid progress made by the citizens of Decatur, Ala., in providing better school facilities and salary increases for teachers:

PLANNING SOLVES SCHOOL PROBLEM—DEDICATION DAY IN DECATUR, ALA., WILL MARK SUCCESS OF 8-YEAR PROGRAM—ALL FINANCED BY CITY—SPECIAL TAXES, BOND ISSUES HAVE PROVIDED BUILDINGS, RAISED TEACHERS' PAY

(By John N. Popham)

DECATUR, ALA., April 21.—A public-school-improvement program that has provided modern, functional, and uncrowded classrooms for all Decatur pupils will be celebrated in special ceremonies here tomorrow.

Dedication day marks the result of 8 years of planning and cooperation. Decatur's citizens overwhelmingly voted to assume local tax levies to meet bond issues of $3,500,000 for school-building construction and teacher-salary increases, with no outside fiscal assistance.

Community enthusiasm has been so widespread that in four election contests the school-improvement proponents have carried every voting box in the city. Fathers now account for about 40 percent of attendance at Parent-Teachers Association meetings.

The better buildings and better trained teachers have resulted in an increase in high-school attendance and college admissions. There have been a broadening of participation in community cultural activities. An in-service training program for teachers has attracted national interest.

VARIED PROGRAMS ARRANGED

Decatur has invited representatives of school systems and teacher institutions throughout the country to visit school buildings and observe classroom work.

There will be recreation programs in school yards, a barbecue luncheon in one of the city parks and a concert by the 115-piece Decatur High School Band. In the evening Dr. Walter Cocking, of New York City, editor of School Executive magazine, will speak.

This city of 25,000 population, including 4,500 elementary and high-school pupils, hugs the banks of the Tennessee River in North Alabama. Diversified agriculture and waterborne commerce has attracted many new industries in recent years.

In January 1947, the voters approved a proposal, 601 to 201, to levy a 1-mill tax for school-building purposes. Encouraged by this showing, the board of education called for a 7.5-millage-tax vote in May.

Walter M. Jackson, superintendent of schools, arranged a parade of all school pupils through Decatur's downtown streets on election eve.

The 3,300 pupils and 95 teachers marched through the heart of the city. Children carried placards of their own design and word-

ing. The most popular slogan read, "Daddy, don't relax—vote for the tax."

The parade idea had caught on and the police and fire departments asked permission to participate as leadoff members. The transportation company fell in at the rear with four brandnew buses.

HIGH TAX VOTED, 1,062 TO 234

The tax measure was carried by a vote of 1,062 to 234. Two bond issues, one for $1,500,000 in 1948, and the other for $2 million in 1953, were approved at the polls.

Decatur now has 2 new high schools, 2 new elementary schools, and 2 additions to elementary schools. Three large elementary schools have been completely renovated. Five permanent and two temporary school buildings have been abandoned as unsafe.

About 700 Negro pupils are in the school system. The new Negro high school, opened last January 24, is on a 17-acre tract. It can accommodate almost double its present enrollment.

Teachers' pay has about doubled in the 8-year expansion period. Among the white teachers, 93 percent are college graduates, as compared to 63 percent in 1946. Every Negro teacher is a college graduate.

The teacher inservice training program features workshops in art, courses in ceramics, a 3-year course in child growth and development under the direction of the University of Maryland, a 1-year course in reading problems and an elementary science course under the direction of the State Teachers College at Florence.

In 1950, 25 high school graduates entered college. Last year, 60 graduates entered college.

Digging for Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an editorial from the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette of May 17 entitled "Digging for Issues." The editorial follows:

DIGGING FOR ISSUES

When a party is out of power, as the Democrats now are at the White House, the leadership naturally grasps at every straw which may turn out to be a salable issue at the polls.

The task can be especially frustrating when the party in power has a very popular President, as is the case right now. The outs inevitably are torn over the question whether or not to attack him personally. And even if they do, they have not assurance they will hurt him materially.

Often they are exasperated to find that a popular President can ride out blunder after blunder without important loss of stature. The Democrats at the moment are busy cataloging what they believe are some of Mr. Eisenhower's errors in office. But a few of these go well back into 1953, and the public-opinion polls measuring the President's popularity suggest these things didn't upset many people.

Politicians close to events frequently magnify in their own minds the impact these developments will have on the public at large. They get all stirred up in Washington over matters that won't cause a ripple 200 miles away.

Some of them then proceed to bemoan the indifference of voters. No doubt there's plenty of that, but it's certainly not the whole story in Mr. Eisenhower's case.

It's been said before and it can be said again: Most Americans trust him deeply. They believe he is sincerely concerned for their welfare and safety. They believe he is qualified to keep them out of war. The very political ineptitude his critics allege actually helps convince many voters Mr. Eisenhower is above politics.

When this is the case, it isn't going to hurt him much to point out that he doesn't know the name of the head of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Or to charge him with cruelty to the squirrels on the White House lawn. A few critics did seriously suggest these little things could help do him in.

As a matter of fact, there is evidence that Mr. Eisenhower can even commit bobbles in the very field he is considered most able to deal with—foreign and military affairs—and not suffer unduly.

Cabinet and Commission Would End Federal Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL CHUDOFF
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works and Resources of the Committee on Government Operations, I feel it is my duty to keep the House informed as to the program of the present administration in its policy to curtail the REA. I believe that the following article, which appeared in the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin of May 22, tells the entire story, and I feel it is the duty of every Member of Congress to know exactly what is going on under the present administration's public-power policy, more particularly the policy concerning the Rural Electrification Administration:

CABINET AND COMMISSIONS WOULD END FEDERAL POWER

(By Ralph W. Page)

Critics of the administration reiterate that it is controlled and operates in the interest of big business and corporate management.

There is no question that the President's official family and most of his intimates and advisers represent this class of citizens. Even so, they may not act exclusively for their own advantage.

But in one aspect of Government they present a solid front. The Cabinet, the study commissions, and all their affiliates to date are behind the drive of the power companies to liquidate Federal power projects and turn the entire distribution of electricity from Federal dams into the hands of the electric power corporations.

The President apparently doesn't know this. He keeps saying that he has no intention of damaging the TVA, and that he is a firm supporter of the rural electrification program.

At the same time, in his last press conference he paid high tribute to the latest Hoover Commission report. And this advocates the liquidation of the TVA power projects, and foreclosure of the Rural Electrification Administration. The idea is that henceforth the rural electrification cooperatives should get their money in the bankers' market.

Now no reasonable man has any prejudice against the power companies. They have done, and we are doing, a superb job of expanding our power facilities, and are serving the public in a wholly cooperative spirit. Also they are exceedingly prosperous, as they should be. Just why they feel it necessary to undermine the rural cooperatives and sabotage the Federal power program is not too plain. It obviously is doing them no damage.

Consider the record of the rural electrification cooperatives.

When the REA was established only 11 percent of the farms in the country had electricity. Today 93 percent are serviced. The co-ops have increased rural consumers from 775,000 to nearly 5 million. Rates have gone down from 7 cents to about 2½ cents. Individual consumption has increased from 37 kilowatt hours to 209 kilowatt hours. Incidentally, of course, farm production and income have been enormously increased and farm living enriched by the process. These co-ops have created a market of $4 billion for electric supplies, and established processing industries adding materially to Federal taxes.

Meantime, they have borrowed $3 billion from the REA. But they are ahead of schedule in their payments, and less than one-tenth of 1 percent of these loans are in default.

It must be observed that these co-ops are strictly private business ventures. There is nothing socialistic about them. They have proved that they can run this business as well as any Delaware corporation.

All this is made possible by two assists from the Government. The REA lends these co-ops money at a cheap rate—not at a loss, but much below what they would have to pay private investors. And they are given first choice for power at Federal dams, at the cheap rate the Government charges for power.

In neither case is there any loss to the Government or the taxpayers. The whole drive is not to save the Goverment any money. It is so make the private power companies middlemen between the Government and the cooperatives, and to compel the co-ops to pay more for their money, and so raise their rates.

It is to run them out of business. This in spite of the fact that the Republican platform endorsed them in toto. Presumably the President doesn't know what this is all about.

Veterans' Organization Opposes Return of Former Enemy Assets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the House the fact that one the Nation's great veterans' organizations, the American Legion, has gone on record at its most recent convention against the return of enemy assets seized by the United States to their former owners or governments. I am glad to present their views. The resolution which appears on page 94 of the proceedings of the 36th national convention of the American Legion issued as House Document No. 54, 84th Congress, 1st session, follows:

Believing that the American veteran has a vested interest in enemy assets seized by the United States and that such assets should continue to be devoted to the purposes provided by the War Claims Act, the American Legion opposes any effort to return these assets to their former owners or their governments.

Entangling Foreign Alliances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the fact that I am a citizen of the United States. I have no wish to owe allegiance to any other country or group of countries. Nothing disturbs me more than the various moves to make the United States a party to entangling foreign alliances that would divest us of our sovereignty.

I have just read John O'Donnell's column Capitol Stuff, dated May 23, which appears in today's edition of the New York Daily News, and I think it should be read by every citizen of the United States. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the aforementioned column:

CAPITOL STUFF
(By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON, May 23.—A few days back, F. D. R.'s Chief of Staff for World War II, five-star Gen. George Catlett Marshall, announced that he was all out for us Americans joining up and promptly with an outfit called Atlantic Union Now.

The objectives of General Marshall's Atlantic Union Now idea were placed on the record before the Senate Judiciary Committee a few months ago with this declaration: "To drive the United States into a political union with a number of European and other foreign countries with a common citizenship, common foreign policy and defense establishment, unified currency, economic integration, and unrestricted immigration."

The perfect answer to Marshall's Union Now plea—this surrender of the sovereignty of our republic—can be plucked from the words of Marshall's own military superior (before the New Deal), Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

What General Marshall has to urge, and what his protege General Eisenhower may yet do, still rests on the uneasy lap of the Kremlin gods. But on the main proposition, MacArthur came up with a few basic statements only last January at Los Angeles. What he said there and what Marshall has said here is worthy of serious study and thinking. Marshall urged that we should doff American flag and uniforms and go into some sort of an alliance with foreign tribes—chiefly in Europe.

MacArthur said:

"I do not know the dignity of their birth, but I do know the glory of their death, and I am sure a merciful God has taken them unto Himself (the war dead).

"In these troublesome days of confused and bewildered international sophistication let no man misunderstand why they did that which they did. These were patriots, pure and plain.

"No complex philosophies of world intrigue and conspiracy dominated their thoughts. No elaboration or extravagance of propaganda dimmed their sensibilities."

THE DEVOTED DOCTRINE OF DECATUR

"Just the simple fact—their country called them; just the devoted doctrine of Stephen Decatur when he said, 'My country, may she always be right; but, right or wrong, my country.'

"Be not deceived by strange voices heard across the land decrying this old and proven concept of patriotism.

"Seductive murmurs are arising that we are provincial and immature or reactionary and stupid when we idealize our own Nation;

"That there is a higher destiny for us under another and more general flag;

"That no longer when we send our sons and daughters to the battlefield should be see them through all the way to victory;

"That we can call upon them to fight and even to die in some half-hearted and indecisive effort;

"That we can plunge them recklessly into war and then suddenly decide that it is a wrong war, or in a wrong place, or at a wrong time, or even that we can call it not a war at all but by some more euphonious or gentler name;

"That we can treat them as expendables although they are our own flesh and blood;

"That we, the most powerful Nation in the world, have suddenly become dependent upon others for our security and even our welfare."

REPUDIATE THEM BY WORD AND DEED

"Listen not to these voices, be they from the one political party or the other; be they from the high and the mighty or the lowly and the forgotten. Heed them not. Visit upon them a righteous scorn born of the past sacrifices of your fighting sons and daughters. Repudiate them by word and deed, in the market place or the platform, from the pulpit. Those that are our friends will understand; those that are not we can pass by.

"Be proud to be called patriot or nationalist or what you will, if it means you love your country above all else and will place your life, if need be, at the service of your flag."

Bear in mind these wise and patriotic words of MacArthur. They are worth rereading and oft remembering.

Compounding the Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to an editorial which appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger on May 17. I do not believe any further comment is required from me:

COMPOUNDING THE CONFUSION

Our attractive Secretary of Health, Welfare, and Education, Oveta Culp Hobby, did not exactly choose the best words yesterday when she said that confusion over the Salk vaccine resulted because "no one could have foreseen the public demand."

This sounds a little naive. Doesn't everybody want protection against death and disease?

This sounds somewhat as silly as the British economist who once said that the reason for all the unemployment during depression was that so many people were out of work.

The reason for all the Salk vaccine confusion is that we all used our hearts on this one, not our heads. We assumed that the O. K. given the vaccine meant that inoculations could start at once. "We" means all of us—fathers, mothers, heads of school boards, mayors of cities, even Congressmen.

The United States authorities were caught up in the fever too.

Instead of announcing, immediately, that it would take some time to prepare the vaccine, and test it, United States authorities said nothing. Their silence was taken to indicate that all was well and our enthusiasm was well founded.

It wasn't. And the distribution of some vaccine that apparently wasn't tested enough woke us up to the harsh realities.

The United States Government is now getting around to some action. Congress has been asked to appropriate $28 million to buy vaccine for children whose families couldn't afford to buy it for them.

Another $2 million will be asked to test the vaccine and to prevent black-marketeering.

It's too bad that these Federal steps weren't taken right after the Salk vaccine approval was announced. It would have prevented so much unnecessary agitation.

Salk Vaccine—What Are the Facts?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that much of the confusion which has beclouded the success of Dr. Salk and his fellow scientists has resulted from a failure to distinguish the issues involved. This confusion, beginning at the very outset on April 12, has mushroomed and, feeding on itself, has created more and more confusion. The result is plain for all to see. Due to fear and scant information, over 30 percent of the children in New York City scheduled to receive vaccinations have failed to appear. How many of these boys and girls may die or be crippled as a result of not receiving the vaccine I do not know, but the thought that one of them may contract polio unnecessarily is horrifying, and I am sick at heart at the prospect.

If I may, I would like to separate the problems involved and perhaps thereby help in some measure to contribute to the solution of this dangerous situation.

There are four basic problems, which I mention in the order of their importance:

First. The safety of the vaccine.

Second. Distribution of the vaccine to all children regardless of ability to pay for it.

Third. The need for a distribution program.

Fourth. Conduct of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare before April 12.

The people of the United States are entitled to have all the facts concerning each of these four points. They are vitally concerned and their very lives are at stake in the solution of them. Let us consider the four points individually and see if we can shed just a little bit of light.

First, the safety of the vaccine. The Public Health Service Act provides for the licensing of manufacturers of bio-

logics such as the Salk vaccine; preliminary and regular testing by the Public Health Service of the product and plant of such a manufacturer to insure purity, potency, and safety of these biologics is required by the law. That such testing is being done now by the Public Health Service is quite clear. In general this appears to be a fairly effective part of the Federal program although even President Eisenhower tentatively suggested that something had gone wrong when he said there may have been a little "short cutting." In any event, the safety of the vaccine, except for that manufactured by one firm, Cutter, seems well established and is once again being reelased by the Surgeon General in limited and exhaustively tested batches. The Cutter vaccine is still being examined. However, it would seem that there can be no further doubt that any vaccine made available by Surgeon General Leonard A. Scheele, who has labored manfully under what may be more than merely scientific problems, is entirely safe.

Second, distribution of the vaccine to all children, regardless of ability to pay. Concern over this subject arouses interest only because there initially appeared some question as to whether the vaccine would be available to all or only to those able to pay for it. The President has helped set this portion of the record straight. By so doing, however, he highlighted the failure of his Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to consider that phase. Mrs. Hobby's May 16 report to the President contained a section devoted to this subject which adopted Mr. Eisenhower's direction. Implementing legislation is now under consideration and speedy passage is, of course, assured. That the question ever arose is amazing. This regrettable neglect on the part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has contributed not only to the confusion, but also to the criticism leveled at that agency. The vaccine should, in fact, be distributed without charge to all our children, from 1 to 19. Only by so doing can further and unnecessary delay based on testing to establish "need" be avoided.

Third, and more controversial, is the heated debate surrounding the administration's insistence that control over the distribution of the vaccine be voluntary. As I have said before, I strongly favor immediate enactment of legislation to give President Eisenhower standby power to control the price and distribution of the vaccine. I have introduced such a bill as have several other Representatives. Under its provisions, the President would be given standby power to not only insure equitable and full distribution of the vaccine, but to guarantee a full series of inoculations to all children. In addition, under the provisions of my bill the President would have power to establish ceiling prices for the vaccine and would be given certain specific authorization to require reports concerning distribution and sale of the vaccine.

Utilization of any of these provisions is left to the President, he may apply them all, or he may apply any, as he sees fit. The necessity for such standby control is obvious. Any further delay in taking such action would be irresponsible. I am frank to say that I cannot understand the reluctance on the part of Secretary Hobby to agree to such a standby program. The Assistant Secretary, Mr. Perkins, after much astute questioning by Senator HILL, said he could see no harm in enacting such legislation. Yet the Department of Health, Welfare, and Education not only hesitates, it opposes such legislation on the specious ground that it is not necessary now. Well, I disagree. I think it is needed now. And what about the future? There is clearly a shortage of the vaccine; it will remain in short supply for some time. When the peak of the polio season hits us, may not the demand then be so great as to set in operation a full-scale black market? Will the voluntary system be able to insure equitable distribution of the scarce vaccine when every mother in the Nation will be clamoring for her child to have it?

There is now in operation a halting, uncoordinated, and makeshift program for distribution of the vaccine. Enactment of standby legislation now will give the administrative agencies the opportunity to set up their plans and to instantly put them in operation if the President so directs. There should be no additional delay. I sincerely hope and pray that such legislation will be adopted at once.

Finally, we come to the fourth problem. Why did the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have no program at all ready for use on April 12? The only plausible answer to this question is that rigid adherence to a misguided philosophy of government so warped the thinking of the responsible officials in that Department that they refused to make any plans. As evidence of this state of mind we may look to Mrs. Hobby's own words. To justify her inaction and mismanagement, she stated before a Senate committee that no one could have foreseen before April 12 the great demand or acclaim for this life-preserving vaccine.

While admitting that the Public Health Service took an active part for 2 years in the development and testing of the vaccine, Mrs. Hobby tells us that the demand for it could not have been foreseen. Why, then, have we had a March of Dimes so long? Why, then, do parents worry? Why was Canada ready on April 12 with a national plan? Why was the New York City Department of Health ready? Why was the announcement made with so much publicity? Why indeed was no plan made by Mrs. Hobby? She tells us she could not foresee the demand. Well, Mr. Speaker, if Mrs. Hobby could not foresee the acclaim which would greet Dr. Salk's discovery,, if she could not foresee a great and immediate national demand for this vacsine, if she could not foresee these inescapable conclusions to the long, costly, and painful work of so many scientists and volunteers, then she is blind to reality, immune to feeling, and so lacking in judgment as to belie her previous record of accomplishment. As the New York Times pointed out, "If the Public Health Service knew what was to come, it may well be charged with a dereliction of duty." That the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare did know the facts is no longer denied.

Mr. Speaker, that is the story as I see it. The task ahead is to promptly provide President Eisenhower with standby authority to control distribution of this vaccine and to pray that the failure in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not cause too many heartbreaking situations. We are much blessed in having men like Dr. Salk and his associates. They have given us their discoveries. It is now up to us to make the best possible use of them for the benefit of all.

Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very informative and illuminating editorial written by the staff of the National Tribune-Stars and Stripes, which I recommend for the attention of all of the Members of the Congress:

A SACRED CHARGE

Monday is Memorial Day, established 87 years ago to be devoted to the memory of soldier and sailor dead, and in thousands of cemeteries throughout the world our people as well as others who have reason to be grateful for the sacrificial services rendered to their countries by American arms in times of war will remember with reverence our heroes who have passed on to their eternal reward.

Although it is accepted as historic fact that the genesis of marking the graves of soldier deceased is found in the deep South where some ladies who had given allegiance to the Confederacy placed early spring flowers upon the graves of northern and southern servicemen alike, Memorial Day as such was established on May 5, 1868, when Gen. John A. Logan, then commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, issued his famous general orders No. 11 which set aside May 30 to keep the trust with the fallen, to "gather around their sacred remains and garland the passionless mounds above them with the choicest flowers of springtime," and to ever remember that by selfless service these war dead had saved the Nation.

This day of memory has since become one in which all thoughtful persons assume the obligation of decorating the last resting places of their loved ones, and especially those of men and women who have served in uniform during times of national stress. There is but one survivor of the North who fought to preserve the Union in the war of 1861–65, one lone member of the once politically mighty Grand Army. He is Albert Woolson, of Duluth, Minn., who put in 9 months with a heavy artillery regiment and is now 103 years of age. There are left 3 who are said to have upheld the honor of the South, ranging in age from 106 to 108, but 1 served admittedly only with the home guard, another without uniform dug saltpeter for the manufacture of gunpowder,

and the third actually fought with a cavalry unit for a brief period of time. The rest have joined the legions of the past.

We commend to our readers a close review of General Logan's Memorial Day order. It is printed elsewhere in this issue of the Tribune and reflects the thinking of a patriotic veterans' organization that by 1890 had enlisted in membership fully 20 percent of its surviving eligibles, a record that was exceeded only once in history during the heyday of the United Spanish War Veterans. In it also will be found all of the passion of patriotic fervor felt by men who aided in maintaining the integrity and the supremacy of the National Government during a 4-year rebellion against its existence. It represented a group that was held in high esteem by its countrymen, and in the 94 years that have passed since President Abraham Lincoln first issued his call to arms, our Congress has never failed to recognize the services rendered to the Nation by its members.

It is worthy of note that of those who served in the great Civil War, 25 were 10 years of age or younger and that of 2,213,365 enlistees in the Armies of the North, 1,151,438 were 18 or less, an interesting set of statistics to be remembered by those opponents of universal military training today because fully one-seventh of those who served died for want of sufficient experience with a rifle and bayonet. Youth won the victory for the Union in 1865.

Four wars and 26 million veterans later, 21 million of them under sustained attack because some are having to be maintained by the Government they have saved and others of whom might require assistance, the veterans of this country compose a class that is now considered in terms far different from those who preserved the Union of States. Because Americans are threatened from abroad in a cold war and because many billions of dollars are being expended overseas in search of an elusive peace, those who are responsible on this Memorial Day for the safety of our people appear to be following a systematic course that rather than build up and sustain the fervor which prompted youth to serve the colors in days forever gone by, would, indeed, destroy that zest for patriotic endeavor that has resulted in winning our wars. Money, rather than respectful and grateful thanks, seems to be the motivating factor in the conduct of government. A leveling off of benefits as between veteran and nonveteran is the order of the day, the argument being advanced that the man who builds planes or ships in wartime sacrifices equally with him who wears a uniform and bares his breast to the enemy. Nothing, in our estimation, can sooner make of the United States a victim of its own folly.

Our only measurable foe is represented in the leadership of world communism. In its sneaky, underhanded conspiracy, the Kremlin is attempting to appeal to youth because the Reds see in the communistic theory all of the glamor of the forbidden, and they entertain the belief that they can remake the world order if they can plant their ideas in the boys and girls they have not yet been able to control. Regardless of the fact that so many well-meaning people in this country have entertained the idea that communism appeals only to the hungry, and irrespective of the appeal so many have seen in a world government that seeks to divide American substance with all other nations in looking for permanent peace, that fancy has long since been explored. Red Russia has analyzed carefully all it knows of human nature and it has determined that an appeal to the secretive and the development of it as an attraction to the youthful mind can do more than anything else to win the revolution on which it is inevitably bent. Youth, then, is the principal target for survival.

"A nation is strong only as its youth is strong," a United States Senator reminded the other day. "It survives only as its youth survives. It conquers or is conquered by its youth," and education is the greatest bulwark against any foreign ideology. No nation can ever remain strong if it permits its younger people to witness any relaxing of proper care for those who have borne the battle when it suffered in the throes of danger. Three things are essential to the development of patriotism and loyalty to country—a worthy government, a proper knowledge of that government and a knowledge of other forms of government for comparative purposes. Instead of searching for new means to distribute our wealth among all peoples of the earth and instead of seeking to wipe out distinctions as between citizens who have performed varying degrees of service in times of danger, American leadership should look for a protection for its youth and demonstrate to it that sacrifices made in war will never be forgotten. There is imminent danger, in the many investigations of the rights of veterans now being conducted, that the patriotism and loyalty of American youth will be sacrificed.

As times passes, each year diminishes grief. We can do little more than set aside a day of memory for those who are gone but we can care tenderly and respectfully for the maimed and the aged among veterans and their dependents or we shall strip Memorial Day of its meaning. For the sake of the future of this beloved land, we would do well to follow the admonition of the day's founder, General Logan, to "in this solemn presence renew our pledges to aid and assist those whom we have left among us as sacred charges upon the Nation's gratitude."

Can We Live With Russian Nationalism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article which appeared in the Ukrainian Bulletin of last April which calls attention to the fact that Secreary of State, John Foster Dulles, has been ill advised when at that time he appealed to so-called Russian nationalism.

The article follows:

DULLES' ILL-ADVISED APPEAL TO RUSSIAN NATIONALISM

In his speech to the Foreign Policy Association on February 16, 1955, Secretary of State Dulles made, in our opinion, a major psychological blunder in appealing to the "Russians of stature" to oppose what he termed "international communism" in the present struggle for power among the Kremlin despots.

Unfortunately for Mr. Dulles, and for our country, as well, he has accepted the thesis, well publicized by Russian refugee "experts" in the United States, that the Soviet Union and whatever nefarious acts it commits in international affairs is inspired by a sinister, invisible and undefinable international communism. Such pushes the U. S. S. R. to constant aggressions and international crimes against the best interests of national Russia.

Specifically, Mr Dulles thought he was speaking to such a "Russian of stature" in the Kremlin in Georgi Malenkov, whom our Secretary of State saw subjected to public humiliation, as well as in Marshal Georgi Zhukov, present Defense Minister of the U. S. S. R. These are apparently considered victims of international communism of Khrushchev and Bulganin and potential defectors to the cause of freedom.

COMMUNISM AND RUSSIAN NATIONALISM BLENDED TOGETHER

Regrettably, we are witnessing in this year of 1955 an appalling ignorance of Soviet affairs—almost as tragic in its implications as in 1945 when our statesmen were totally hoodwinked and laid themselves open to Soviet chicanery.

What prompted Mr. Dulles, an avowed anti-Communist statesman and friend of the oppressed people, to make such an ill-advised and ill-timed appeal to Russian nationalism at a time when Russian imperialism and nationalism, disguised in Communist cloak, is making such fantastic inroads among the nations of the free world? Can he fail to recognize that Russian nationalism and communism have long blended together into a powerful and aggressive Communist totalitarianism?

Our dismay at Mr. Dulles' uncritical utterance can be only greater upon recalling that his predecessor, Dean Acheson, clearly defined the nature of Russian imperialism on June 26, 1951, when he testified before the House Armed Services Committee. Mr. Acheson pointed out that for the past 500 years Russia grew from the Duchy of Muscovy into a great totalitarian empire through conquests and aggressions against its weaker neighbors.

Former Under Secretary of State, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, who served as United States Ambassador to Moscow, wrote a very penetrating analysis of the Soviet Union, in which he, too, strongly underscored the strange amalgamation — Russian imperialism and communism—which presents a dire threat to the free world. Mr. Dulles, it would seem, has hardly assimilated these views, born of bitter experience, that are entertained by such prominent American statesmen.

ARE THERE RUSSIANS OF STATURE?

We understand all too well Mr. Dulles' ardent desire to see the threat of an all-out war removed. In this he certainly will find millions of patriotic Americans behind him. But was he justified in appealing to the nationalistic pride of the Kremlin rulers? Are they not already too nationalistic without being goaded into remembering they have the interest of "holy mother Russia" to maintain? Where were Mr. Dulles' advisers that they failed to impress upon him the folly of Russification of Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, and the satellite countries?

The long, demonstrative record of Soviet Russian aggressions and conquests of non-Russian lands both in Europe and Asia after World War II ought to convince anyone that Moscow is inspired by its traditional lust for foreign conquests rather than by Communist ideology. Soviet conquests and achievements are of such magnitude and intensity that they have surpassed even the wildest dreams of the Czars. This is so why so many anti-Communist Russians, at the end of World War II, chose voluntary repatriation: They believed Stalin to be the greatest Russian nationalist in that he united and incorporated so many non-Russian lands into the U. S. S. R., a feat beyond the boldest of the Czars.

DIVIDE ET IMPERA TECHNIQUE

Apparently, Mr. Dulles thought it worthwhile to take a crack at Moscow's own technique of divide et impera (divide and conquer) and thus to sow confusion in the enemy camp. This approach would undoubtedly have been effective had Mr. Dulles known where and when to apply it!

To appeal to the arrogant Russian generals and marshals—the very people who had been

instrumental in preparing Soviet aggressions against often defenseless nations (Finland, South Korea, Indochina)—is to confess a deplorable lack of psychological acumen in such an important area as is the Soviet Union.

Because the nature of the Soviet leadership, both party and state, is pathologically dedicated to conquest and aggrandizement of "Holy Mother Russia," it is pure folly to hope that any of the Soviet Russian leaders can be dissociated from the entire ruling clique of the Kremlin. Malenkov may follow Beria into the cellars of MVD, but this does not remotely mean that Zhukov will renounce Moscow's claims to world domination.

Certainly, it should have occurred to Mr. Dulles that the device of "divide and conquer" is to be applied not to the Moscow clique of tyrants, but with respect to their victims—the enslaved non-Russian peoples. Here the tactic becomes meaningful and, executed properly, assured of success.

The final report of the Kersten Committee (Select Committee on Communist Aggression) is potentially of the greatest value to those charged with formulating our foreign policy. This report compiles the testimony of some 500 voluntary witnesses, all victims of Russian tyranny: Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Georgians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Poles, Armenians, Rumanians, Azerbaijanians, Hungarians, and others. They have vividly depicted the terror which the Russians brought to their countries: the arrests, deportations, and executions on a large scale, and the systematic genocide of each nation; the methodical destruction of the culture and national entities of their peoples, and the enforced and brutal Russification, the inevitable corollary of the Communist revolution.

To appeal to these victims of Russian imperialism, and not to its authors and chief masters, would seem an obvious step to be taken by the Secretary of State of the United States.

We wish to believe that Mr. Dulles' faux pas was a slip of the tongue rather than the result of a premeditated policy. That we might be correct in our assumption is the reference in the New York Times' article by Elie Abel (Sunday, Feb. 20, 1955) that an unnamed adviser of Mr. Dulles stated that in his appeal to "Russians of stature" nothing was further from Dulles' mind than to exclude high-minded Uzbeks, Georgians, Khazakes, or Ukrainians.

If, on the other hand, Mr. Dulles is readying a thought-out policy, then we might as well be prepared for a new wave of shameless appeasement.

We want to believe that Mr. Dulles has not forgotten his own words of last year: "It took us time to learn that the world 'peace' means [to the Soviet] * * * a world of conformity with a pattern prescribed by Moscow."

Money, Mechanization Only Cure for Patent Ills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD another searching article on the United States Patent Office. This is written by Robert S. Ball and appeared in the Detroit News of Monday, May 23, 1955. The article follows:

MONEY, MECHANIZATION ONLY CURE FOR PATENT ILLS

(By Robert S. Ball)

WASHINGTON, May 23.—There is nothing wrong with the United States Patent Office today that money and mechanization cannot cure.

The sickness which besets this vital Government agency is not new, but never has it been so critical.

The American patent system is bogging down under a backlog of nearly 220,000 unprocessed patent applications, delays of 4 years and longer in the granting of patents, and the urgent necessity of reclassifying more than 2 million patents already on file.

Annual appropriations of between $11 million and $12 million have been woefully inadequate. The backlog of claims is growing at the rate of more than 15,000 a year. Classification of new material is barely holding its own, and the long overdue reclassification project is not even well under way.

BUSH HEADS STUDY

Citizens complaints grew to such vehemence and volume that last year the Senate Appropriations Committee directed the parent Commerce Department to investigate means of modernizing Patent Office operations.

A committee of scientists and patent experts under the chairmanship of Dr. Vannevar Bush, of the Carnegie Institute, was named by Secretary Weeks to make the study.

URGE BUDGET BOOST

In summary, here is what is proposed to make over this 160-year-old agency into a 20th-century operation:

1. Immediately increase the Patent Office appropriation by $3 million (25 percent over the Budget Bureau request) and start the hiring and training of 300 additional patent examiners. With this additional force, says Patent Commissioner Robert C. Watson, the backlog of applications can be whittled down to a workable load of about 100,000 in about 7 years.

Watson has asked for this additional money for 2 years in a row and has been overruled by his superiors.

2. Earmark an additional $1 million a year for the next 6 years to eliminate the classification backlog.

SEVEN MILLION ON FILE

The ability of the individual examiner to dispose of applications has been slowly decreasing in direct proportion to the ever growing number of previously issued patents to be searched, reports the Bush committee. There are now more than 7 million American foreign patents and technical publications in Patent Office files.

The patent collections, as they grow, must be reorganized from time to time to reduce the number of patents which must be studied in the search, says the report.

FORMIDABLY COMPLEX

3. Mechanization of the search process is the principal long-range recommendation and by far the most difficult of achievement.

The Bush committee found that the classification system of the Patent Office includes thousands of search notes, based on hundreds of thousands of searches, which provide associative trails to obscure or distantly related groups of patents.

"The search problem," says the report, "is so severe that conventional means offer little hope for adequate improvement. Fortunately new developments in automatic information processing machines encourage a new approach."

But the committee felt that while experimental code mechanization might be applied at once to selected search operations, a more intensified study should be made before a broad and expensive program is undertaken.

WORK MUST GO ON

"The problem of search in the Patent Office is not one problem but several," the group concluded. "The creation of a classification and indexing system so that machinery can be effectively used for searching is an intellectual problem of formidable proportions because it involves a diversity of complex subject-matter fields."

Meanwhile, the report emphasizes, the regular work of the office must go forward simultaneously with experimentation and development. "The Department of Commerce must now take positive action."

It appears that the mess which has developed at the Patent Office over a period of years can be cleaned up, but it will take money and ingenuity, and emergence from the stepchild role in the Commerce Department of recent years.

Rock Island Arsenal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when the defense appropriation bill for 1956 was recently presented it contained a provision that—

No part of the funds appropriated in the act could be used for the disposal or transfer by contract or otherwise of work traditionally preformed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense unless it has been justified before the appropriate committees of Congress that the disposal is economically sound and that the related services can be performed by a contractor without danger to national security.

The object of the provision was to protect the work performed by civilian personnel in the Defense Department from being given to private contractors unless such disposal or transfer could be justified before the appropriate committees of Congress. In other words, it was designed to protect the continuation of work done in our arsenals, navy yards, and so forth.

An attempt was made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] to strike this provision out of the bill.

I have consistently supported various proposals to get the Government out of business as I felt the Government should not compete with private business when the work can be done just as economically outside. I believe the Government should not take over functions which can properly be justified by private industry; and if it has done so, I believe it should withdraw and not be a competitor of free enterprise.

On the other hand, proper functions of the Government should be retained by the Government. I believe the work at our arsenals is such a proper function and should not be turned over to private industry. The arsenal at Rock Island is such an example. Besides repair work on arms and other ammunition of war

as laid out by Congress in 1862, it carries on research development for the Ordnance Corps, manufactures and assembles material as required for the effective accomplishment of assigned missions, and performs functions of maintenance and supply.

There are hundreds of skilled workers who have been especially trained for these jobs. Some families have devoted themselves to these skills for generations. The arsenal at Rock Island has as fine or finer machine tools than any private manufacturing plant I know of. To turn this work over to private industry is not in the best interest of economy.

I voted against the Vinson amendment because I did not want to take any chances of eliminating the work at the Rock Island Arsenal by having it assigned to private industry in other parts of the country. Not only have I tried in this instance to protect the fine work being done at this arsenal but I have made every attempt to get additional work allocated there in an effort to increase the workload and avoid unemployment.

Indian Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the treatment afforded the American Indian by our ancestors in their drive across the prairies to the west coast. We are all familiar with the manner in which we forced the Indians to retreat from the lands of their heritage. In many, many instances this page in history does little or no credit to our ancestors.

We had our famous generals who achieved fame through subjegating these same Indians. The Indians, who were just as honest and just as forthright repelled these advances as best they could and according to one old Indian, "the red man had heroes, too."

I would like to insert at this point an editorial from the Detroit Times which shows one man's efforts to memorialize these heroes of the red man. I commend it to the reading of the Members of Congress.

The editorial follows:

ONE ETERNAL INDIAN

Memories of the North American Indian will live for centuries in a majestic monument in the Black Hills, if a joint resolution now before Congress is adopted.

The resolution would establish support to finish carving a statue of Chief Crazy Horse from the granite of Thunderhead Mountain near Custer, S. Dak.

The statue is 20 miles from the Washington-Jefferson-Lincoln-Roosevelt Monument on Mount Rushmore. The heads of those great Presidents are in bas-relief, but Crazy Horse will ride his stallion in full relief, to be seen from any direction.

His figure, hewn from a single peak, will dwarf Rushmore, Washington Monument, and the greatest of the great pyramids.

Among Indians, Crazy Horse is an immortal hero. A fighting chief, he sought peace, and rose in battle only in defense. American cavalrymen rated him the Indians' greatest tactician, and Chief Standing Bear, speaking for today's Indians, says:

"Carve us a mountain so the white man will know that the red man had heroes, too."

An American sculptor of Polish ancestry, Korczak Ziolkowski, is carving the statue, presently roughing it out with dynamite. He worked with Gutzon Borglum on Mount Rushmore, then at the request of the Indians dedicated the rest of his life—and his own money—to this project.

He has spent 7 years without pay and has put in $180,000 of his own and meager private contributions to blast away 600,000 tons of granite, with an estimated 5,400,000 to go.

The resolution calls for relatively little Federal money, and envisions ultimately a research hospital, a museum, and a university devoted entirely to the American Indian of all tribes.

This would be a fitting memorial for America to erect for the original Americans and one long overdue.

Italian Political Panorama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Il Progresso-Italo-Americano under date of May 22, 1955:

ITALIAN POLITICAL PANORAMA

In our editorial of last Friday we expressed the conviction that Prime Minister Mario Scelba's address to the mass meeting of the Christian Democratic farmers was much more than a superfluous assurance that Italy would remain faithful to her alliances. It was an authoritative and courageous warning to the Demo-Christian Party prodding it into assuming a dutiful sense of responsibility which will place it in a position to comply with the legitimate expectations of the great majority of the voters.

It is therefore profoundly gratifying to find that our views coincide with those of the most authoritative Italian dailies.

Unfortunately, there have been marked differences of opinion, among Demo-Christians, which have caused the party to lose its erstwhile liberty of action. There are no indications which would lead us to believe that there are fundamental cleavages in the policy which has permitted the party to register the marked successes it has to its credit at home and abroad. There is no evidence to indicate that radical revisions are being sought in the program which has had such overwhelming popular approval.

Apparently the differences are more formal than real particularly when they are entirely the result of personal whims, frustrated ambitions, and petty disappointments.

THE DUTY OF CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY

In view of this undeniable state of internal nervousness, the majority party finds itself in a paradoxical position of helplessness which renders precarious the life of the present Government and of any other Government which might be called to succeed it.

Unfortunately, the present composition of the two branches of Parliament will not permit the Christian Democratic Party to govern alone. In order to maintain the majority which it needs, it must form alliances which, for obvious reasons, must be made with kindred minor parties. But these minor parties, regardless of their color or numerical strength, cannot impose conditions for the coalition. It is the Christian Democratic Party which remains absolute arbiter of the choice of allies and which must shape its line of conduct so as to make the coalition it prefers.

In order to preserve its functions as a majority party, Christian Democracy must, however, restore its unity, smooth over its differences, and eliminate internal dissension. If this goal is not achieved, the Christian Democratic Party will be reduced to a truly sickly state.

THE SITUATION IS UNCHANGED

It is now axiomatic to declare that there are no reasons to suspect that the Italian people have undergone a complete reversal of views which require a radical change of direction in the internal and foreign policy it has heretofore followed. One cannot even imagine that the currents of opposition in the Chamber of Deputies and in the Senate have been swollen by new tributaries.

The parliamentary situation in Italy is today exactly the same as it was yesterday, or a month ago, or even a year ago. The two extremes have not changed their positions and there are no indications which might lead us to assume that they are inclined to change it.

In view of this state of affairs, there are no forces in Italy today, outside of Parliament, which might force upon the Christian Democrats alliances and coalitions which they do not favor. The Christian Democratic Party still remains master of its own decisions. It might freely reconstitute, along new lines, the four-party government which has been functioning up to now or it might even extend its hand to the right or to the left as long as either right or left shows a willingness to accept its program in principle.

If the present Government is destined to survive the ides of June, Italian policy will not undergo any radical upset. There may be a change of leadership, but not in direction, for no government could remain in power a week if it were in contrast with public opinion, which has set its goal and is resolutely determined to reach it at all cost.

We Must Win the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America, has done this country a great service in proposing creation of a Government strategy board to coordinate efforts to win the cold war.

General Sarnoff's views are similar to those advanced by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, in a great speech before the National Press Club on February 26, this year. Mr. Hearst said at that time that—

Our reliance upon armed strength alone as our primary concern is permitting communism to take long strides forward in those fields which we have largely neglected.

The San Francisco Examiner said editorially on May 12 that—

To our thinking the battle for competitive coexistence has entered a new phase that calls for quietly aggressive presentation of all the good things America has to offer and stands for.

By this we mean by word, by picture, by exhibit, by traveling delegations ("Porgy and Bess," the New York Philharmonic, sports teams, for instance) to spread the story that this is indeed a land of plenty in industry, culture, sports * * * for are not these, after all, products of freedom?

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON has called for the "greatest political offensive in history" to win the cold war. Senator JOHNSON spoke at a meeting honoring General Sarnoff which was held only the other day in New York City. Senator JOHNSON urged support of Mr. Sarnoff's thesis that an all-out cold war with communism was not a "preliminary bout but the decisive contest."

One of the Members of the present Congress who not only was one of the first to recognize the importance of the new phase of the cold-war period which we are in but has taken the leadership in developing legislation which would effectuate the most important of the proposals advanced by Mr. Hearst and General Sarnoff is Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey's Fourth District.

I include here an editorial from the Trenton Sunday Times-Advertiser regarding the proposals advanced by my colleague, as well as articles from the San Francisco Examiner, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, and the New York Times which set forth various aspects of the important proposals made by General Sarnoff, Mr. Hearst, and Representative Frank Thompson, Jr.:

[From the San Francisco Examiner of May 12, 1955]

WE MUST WIN

Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, board chairman of the Radio Corporation of America, has done this country a vigorous good service in proposing creation of a Government strategy board to coordinate efforts to win the cold war.

He has summed up his feeling on how vital it is to win in the following concentrated capsule of thought linking defeat in a cold war or a hot atomic war as twin disasters: "We can freeze to death as well as burn to death." The capsule could be the medicine for avoiding both.

The Hearst newspapers go all the way with General Sarnoff in his approach to the problem. In fact, his views are strikingly and happily similar to those advanced by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of our papers, in his speech last January 28 to the National Press Club in Washington.

Mr. Hearst emphasized the enormous importance of winning the battle of competitive coexistence, and urged the establishment of a national planning board to direct such efforts.

We have since come to think of such a board by the name of Competitive Coexistence Council. We like the name because it is simple, it tells the story, and it can be condensed into the alphabetical symbol CCC.

There are some differences of detail and emphasis between General Sarnoff's proposal and Mr. Hearst's.

General Sarnoff suggests the head of the board should have Cabinet status and include representatives of the State and Defense Departments, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the United States Information Service. The Hearst proposal also would give high authority to the head of the board, but would include, besides Government representatives, the highest skilled and experienced civilian personnel that could be found.

Also, if we read General Sarnoff's views correctly, a great deal of stress is placed on massive psychological bombardment of ideas. To our thinking the battle of competitive coexistence has entered a new phase that calls for quietly aggressive presentation of all the good things America has to offer and stands for.

By this we mean by word, by picture, by exhibit, by traveling delegations ("Porgy and Bess," the New York Philharmonic, sports teams, for instance) to spread the story that this is indeed a land of plenty in industry, culture, sports * * * for are not these, after all, products of freedom?

But to General Sarnoff's objective, and the patriotic vigor of his interest, we offer a loud bravo.

And now we would like to make our latest contribution to this battle.

We propose General Sarnoff as chairman of the strategy board.

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of April 29, 1955]

HEARST CULTURAL PLAN IN CONGRESS

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, April 28.—Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat of New Jersey, today urged consideration of congressional measures to promote American culture and sports events in line with the program for competitive coexistence with Red Russia advocated by W. R. Hearst, Jr.

Concurrently, the House District of Columbia Committee favorably reported out THOMPSON'S first bill on the subject, providing for the creation of a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium. The latter would include an Inaugural Hall of Presidents, and a music, drama, fine arts, and mass-communications center.

THOMPSON asked the House to heed warnings by the editor in chief of the Hearst Newspapers and Olympics Committee President Avery Brundage that this country is in danger of losing its supremacy at the international games.

NATIONAL IN SCOPE

THOMPSON said his legislation is specifically designed to put into effect the proposals made by Hearst upon his return from behind the Iron Curtain where he interviewed the four top leaders of Communist Russia.

The measure would create a national advisory committee under the Welfare Secretary to develop a program with the States that would make the public more sports and culture conscious.

Six million dollars in Federal funds would be used to match money raised by the States to promote the work.

CALLED INSUFFICIENT

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Hobby has approved a bill, introduced by Representative WAINWRIGHT, Republican, of New York, for establishment of a Federal Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes.

However, Representative THOMPSON and his Democratic colleagues do not think this administration bill goes far enough in activating a dynamic competitive coexistence blueprint.

THOMPSON called attention of Congress to both the warning of Hearst and Olympic Committee President Brundage on the sports challenge from the Soviet Union.

He referred to a current magazine article by Brundage warning that Russia is building "the greatest mass army of athletes the world has ever known."

EVERYONE TRAINS

Brundage said the Russians are almost certain to dominate the 1956 Olympic Games unless "there is a sudden reawakening in this country."

"The huge Russian sports program is based on a broad and comprehensive system of physical training for everyone in the U. S. S. R. regardless of age or sex," Thompson said.

"Undoubtedly one of the results of this system which was started more than 20 years ago was a very substantial contribution to the success of the Soviet armies during World War II. No country is stronger than its people.

"In his recent speech at Washington's National Press Club, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., after his Russian trips, said that sports are a front in which the commissars are moving ahead full speed.

"America, he said, has dominated the Olympic Games since their inception. It has been a source of prestige throughout the world. Especially with sport-conscious young people.

"Mr. Hearst asked: 'How will the youth of the world feel, especially in doubtful areas, if the Russian team ends America's long sway at Melbourne in 1956?'

"Mr. Hearst advocates the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence with the Communists."

Thompson added that the legislation introduced by himself, Representative ROOSEVELT, Democrat of California, and Representative REUSS, Democrat of Wisconsin, was designed to carry out "the excellent proposals and timely warnings of Mr. Hearst."

[From the Trenton Sunday Times-Advertiser of May 22, 1955]

ACCENT ON ART

With passage by the House of a bill creating a commission to study plans for a civic auditorium and fine arts center in Washington, Congress has advanced in some measure toward fulfillment a project sponsored by Representatives from New Jersey's Fourth District.

During his service in Congress, Charles R. Howell, now Commissioner of Banking and Insurance, initiated the project of a cultural center in Washington and it has since received vigorous support from his successor, Representative FRANK THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON'S bill provides for the creation of an Arts Commission, also for the construction of an auditorium and an art center in the Nation's Capital. The need for such a center has long been recognized and the idea has received strong endorsement from President Eisenhower and Secretary Hobby of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In his state of the Union message the President said that "in the advancement of the various activities that will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities."

It is the expressed conviction of Mrs. Hobby that "encouragement of the arts is a demonstration to itself and to others of a nation's belief in its spiritual resources and creative destiny."

In this respect the United States can learn a great deal from the older nations, particularly of Europe, which from their earliest histories were preoccupied with artistic achievement. In consequence, every large city abounds in masterpieces of architectural design and building construction, and in priceless treasures, produced by the masters over the centuries.

It is unfortunate that in the course of our progress as a Nation the heavy emphasis has been on material development, to the neglect of a great deal that is important to the attainment of true greatness. The proposed fine arts center in Washington would meet a vital need.

[From the New York Times of May 16, 1955]

SARNOFF BACKED IN COLD WAR PLEA—AT DINNER FOR RADIO LEADER, JOHNSON CALLS FOR GREATEST POLITICAL OFFENSIVE

LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, Democratic leader of the Senate, called last night for the "greatest political offensive in history" to win the cold war.

He said that somewhere along the line the fundamental principle that power rests ultimately with the people had been forgotten.

"Unless we win them to our side," he added, "we are lost."

Senator JOHNSON spoke at a dinner honoring David Sarnoff at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. Mr. Sarnoff received the 1955 Gold Medal Achievement Award of the Williamsburg Settlement. The agency is in its thirtieth year of service to the Williamsburg community in Brooklyn.

The Senator's speech was in the nature of a furtherance of Mr. Sarnoff's thesis that an all-out cold war with communism was not a preliminary bout but the decisive contest. In waging it, Mr. Sarnoff held, the United States should be willing to accept the same costs and casualties as a hot war would involve.

SARNOFF PLAN ENDORSED

At his press interview last Wednesday, President Eisenhower approved a memorandum which the chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America had submitted to him on April 5. The memorandum, made public on May 9, embodied the all-out cold war thesis.

Senator JOHNSON said that while prepared for hot war, we had failed to grasp the essential nature of the cold war and to form the strategy to conduct it, the method of cold war was political aggression, he went on, and in this field he said atomic bombs and jet planes were scant protection.

"Atomic bombs did not shield the free Republic of Korea," the Texan continued. "Hydrogen warfare did not save Northern Vietnam [Viet Minh] and may not save the balance of Southeast Asia. And all the powers of nuclear physics will not recover for freedom the vast territory of China."

It took the recent Asian-African Conference at Bandung, Indonesia, to teach us that the ultimate decision would be made by the people themselves, Senator Johnson asserted.

"We discovered that freedom in Asia had friends," he continued, "and able, forceful leaders. It is to our discredit that we did not know this earlier. It will be to our destruction if we fail to move on their side."

We would be "soft-minded," Senator JOHNSON cautioned, to accept at face value recent Soviet moves to ease some of the tensions building up to World War III.

TRIBUTE TO SARNOFF

The first step in the cold war formation of a general staff that would have the same role in the political drive that the Joint Chiefs of Staff would play in a military drive.

Such a staff, Senator JOHNSON asserted, could coordinate the weapons of cold war—diplomatic, economic and propaganda.

"It could advise the President directly on the many questions upon which he now receives a bewildering number of estimates," he continued. "It could help him decide whether Matsu and Quemoy are worth the risk of losing our Allies."

Senator JOHNSON concluded with a direct tribute to Mr. Sarnoff's idea.

"If David Sarnoff has provided us with a clue to the answer," he said, "and I believe he has—he will have demonstrated once again that free men can always conquer tryanny."

The award to Mr. Sarnoff was made by Bernard M. Baruch, who received the medal in 1949. In a world of vast physical power and mechanical miracles, Mr. Sarnoff said, a balance must be provided by a "robust sense of moral responsibility."

Juvenile delinquents are a minority that make headlines, Mr. Sarnoff said, adding:

"They are not naturally and irrevocably bad but the victims of undirected or misdirected energy and ambition.

"That is why the work you are doing at Williamsburg Settlement is at the very heart of the problem of our day and age. Your concept is correct. Help young people to form the habit of doing wholesome, constructive things, and they will carry the habit into maturity."

Herbert Bayard Swope was toastmaster. The 1,000 guests included Dr. Ralph Bunche, Nobel peace prize winner, and Domestic Relations Justice Nathaniel Kaplan, president of the New York City Youth Board. The Williamsburg Settlement is under the sponsorship of the Brooklyn Philanthropic League, a local organization affiliated with the national United Order True Sisters.

A message of congratulations from President Eisenhower said:

"Please convey my congratulations to David Sarnoff on his receipt of the Gold Metal Award of the Williamsburg Settlement.

"He has displayed in his career the opportunities America offers. A contributor to the development of communications, he has repeatedly insisted that technology must be used to further human welfare.

"My best wishes go to all who honor him."

The invocation was by the Rev. Dr. Julius Mark, senior rabbi of Temple Emanu-El.

A Greater Air Service for Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, last summer Pan American-World Airways, which has pioneered in air service all around the world, instituted a new pioneer effort which brought Detroit and all of Michigan in closer contact with our European friends. Pan American began flying from Detroit to London and beyond.

This year, that service has been expanded to a daily basis and we in Michigan are grateful to Pan American for bringing us direct service to London, Paris, Berlin, and Rome—all the colorful and picturesque capitals of the Old World.

I am concerned, therefore, over the difficulty Pan American is facing in being allowed to fly competitively with another American line and two foreign carriers over the Great Circle Route to the Orient.

Certainly the discrimination which Pan American is now facing is something that should be brought to this body's attention. At at time when the Congress is doing such commendable work in reducing subsidy payments to air carriers, it should consider carefully a route situation which is costing taxpayers additional hundreds of thousands of dollars annually.

The Detroit Times of May 18 has gone directly to the meat of the case in a hard-hitting editorial which should be read by every Member.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include the Detroit Times editorial in the RECORD:

[From the Detroit Times of May 18, 1955]

GREAT CIRCLE ROUTE

President Eisenhower has in his lap a problem of vital concern to the future of Detroit, and he alone must make the decision.

It results from application of Pan American-World Airways for permission to fly the short Great Circle Route from the United States to the Orient, a route pioneered for that company by Col. Charles Lindbergh prior to World War II.

A competing company now has exclusive rights among American airlines to use this route. Pan American is being compelled by the Government to detour 1,897 miles farther by way of San Francisco, Honolulu, and Wake.

Pan American serves Detroit with daily flights direct to Europe. But as long as the Great Circle Route is closed to all but one airline, Pan Am cannot carry out the Pacific service it contemplated when it employed Colonel Lindbergh to establish the short-cut trail.

The restriction denies to this city and to the Nation the benefits of a truly competitive service to the Orient. Furthermore, as long as airlines are subsidized by the Government, the long detour by way of Honolulu and Wake is costing the taxpayers $220,000 per weekly round trip per year.

Those who contend that passenger business across the Pacific does not warrant more than one American line on the route are as shortsighted as the Government officials of the 1920's who thought plane service to Europe was a preposterous dream.

While this Nation hesitates, and bureaucrats argue, foreign lines are rapidly capturing control. A Japanese airline and the Canadian Pacific already are operating over the northern track, and a Scandinavian line is ready to start service this spring.

This newspaper hopes President Eisenhower will disregard the politics back of this fight and look to the future.

While all factors are studied, it appears that the discrimination against Pan American is unfair to the public and to the company.

Mayor David L. Lawrence Honored for Distinguished Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VERA BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday of last week Mayor David L. Lawrence of Pittsburgh was awarded the United States Conference of Mayors' award for distinguished public service.

Mayor Lawrence is the first mayor to receive the award. The only other such award was made to Gen. George C. Marshall several years ago.

In making the presentation Mayor Elmer E. Robinson, of San Francisco, chairman of the conference, said:

Active in the affairs of the Conference of Mayors since he first assumed the office of mayor, past president of the conference and now serving his third 4-year term as mayor, Mr. Lawrence is beloved, admired and respected by all of us.

Mr. Robinson said that Mayor Lawrence was the crystallizing force in bringing about a complete transformation of Pittsburgh.

For the outstanding contribution he has made in Pittsburgh and on the national level—

He said—

I now present the United States conference of mayors' award for public service to David L. Lawrence.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of May 24 entitled "Local Boy Makes Good." As the editorial points out, this award comes as no surprise to us of the Pittsburgh area who have long known of Mayor Lawrence's great contributions and unceasing devotion to the public interest.

The editorial follows:

LOCAL BOY MAKES GOOD

It came as a surprise to him—but it shouldn't have to his fellow Pittsburghers—that Mayor Lawrence was signally honored at the closing session of the annual United States conference of mayors in New York City. He became the first mayor ever to receive the conference's annual award for distinguished public service and only the second person ever so honored, the first having been Gen. George C. Marshall.

Mayor Lawrence was honored for his outstanding contribution both in Pittsburgh and on the national level. In particular, the award was a tribute to the mayor as the crystallizing force behind this city's postwar redevelopment program.

It has long been rightly argued that credit for Pittsburgh's amazing transformation can't be attributed to any one individual or group. It represents the concerted efforts of a great many farsighted and determined citizens.

There can be no doubt, however, that the mayor has played a tremendous role as the governmental expediter who permitted no political roadblocks to obstruct the program and who delivered the needed legislation. Much of the drive and imagination that have sparked the redevelopment efforts of the last 9 years can be traced to the mayor's office. His fellow citizens should applaud a well-deserved tribute.

Thomas F. Dugan Family, of Osceola Mills, Pa., Selected as the Outstanding Catholic Family of 1955 in the Archdiocese of Erie, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, at the annual Vocation Day ceremonies on May 19, 1955, in St. Peter's Cathedral, Erie, Pa., Mr. and Mrs. Thomas F. Dugan, of Osceola Mills, Pa., received the Archbishop Gannon award for 1955 as the outstanding Catholic family in the archdiocese of Erie.

Archbishop John Mark Gannon presented the award from the throne in St. Peter's Cathedral and personally congratulated Mr. and Mrs. Dugan upon being selected as the diocesan family of the year by the archdiocesan board of judges convened for that purpose.

For many years the name Dugan has been a highly respected and honored family name in Clearfield County, Pa., and the 1955 honor of being selected as the diocesan family of the year is one more laurel garnered by members of the various pioneer Dugan families from generation to generation.

The remarkable family of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas F. Dugan is the subject of the following newspaper article appearing in the May 19, 1955, issue of the Osceola Leader, Osceola Mills, Pa.:

THOMAS F. DUGAN FAMILY WINS 1955 ARCHBISHOP GANNON'S AWARD

Mr. and Mrs. Thomas F. Dugan, parents of seven, members of the Immaculate Conception Parish, Osceola Mills, and scions of the eminent Dugan family of northwestern Pennsylvania, are recipients of the 1955 Archbishop Gannon annual award to the outstanding diocesan Catholic family.

The award will be personally presented by the Erie archbishop from the throne at the annual vocation day ceremonies in St. Peter's Cathedral on Ascension Thursday, May 19, beginning with a procession at 9:30 a. m. The 1955 award not only spotlights rich in the highest Catholic tradition and raised by parents of moderate means, but also adds luster to the record of service to God and country of the well-known Dugan family that prides itself in the papal-honored Rt. Rev. Msgr. G. Gerald Dugan, pastor of St. Anthonys, Erie, a brother of Mr. Dugan; the Reverend Raymond F. Dugan, pastor of St. Mary's, Reynoldsville, his cousin.

The Reverend Maurice P. Salmon, pastor of the local Immaculate Conception Church, in commending the family, states, "Into the rearing of this exemplary family have been lovingly poured all those strong influences for good which can be wielded only by God-loving parents wholly dedicated to their noble partnership with God.

"Each boy, with his tenderest years, was a faithful server at the altar and as a child of Mary each girl placed herself under the pure guidance of the Mother of God. The growing-up years of each of their lives revolved about their parish and with that spirit of self sacrifice to which they had been bred, they wholeheartedly lent their talents and zeal to every parish activity.

"The character-building powers of constant parental example of Christian virtue, daily family prayer, frequent attendance at mass, and weekly reception of the sacraments have unfolded the Dugan children from their infancy into fair blossoms of a truly Christian home."

The Diocesan Family Award was instituted by Archbishop Gannon in 1944 to help counter wartime collapsing family life. Its chief aim is public edification through the challenging lives of parents who rear outstanding families despite adverse external influences. Principal attributes sought in families nominated for this coveted honor are sacrifice in providing a full Catholic education for their children, a family life spiritualized by regular Catholic devotions and practices, a strong drive for social betterment, and extraordinary service to God and country.

FATHER AND MOTHER

Thomas Frederick Dugan, 65; and Lucy Agnes Mellon, 63, parents of 7, including a Franciscan priest and 3 Sisters of St. Joseph, were married on March 5, 1912, in Immaculate Conception Church, Osceola Mills, with the late Reverend Michael Desmond officiating.

Mr. Dugan, 1 of 12 children of Thomas Dugan and Ann Jane Campbell, was born April 8, 1890, in Osceola Mills and has been a lifelong resident of the Clearfield County community in a coal-mining area. He provided his family with every necessary advantage for a useful life from his income, derived from the tonsorial trade.

Mrs. Dugan, 1 of 11 children of James Mellon and Mathilda Cunningham, of Patton, Cambria County, was born June 23, 1891. The management of a big household has not prevented her from aiding innumerable outside charities. Both father and mother are enjoying good health, have a zest for the finer things of life, and derive great stimulus from following the vigorous careers of their children.

FRANCISCAN PRIEST

Thomas Dugan, 41, in religion the Rev. Gerald Dugan, member of the Third Order of St. Francis (T. O. R.), was born November 21, 1913. After early education in Osceola Mills grade and high schools, he entered the Sacred Heart Novitiate of the Fransciscan Order of Loretta, Pa., on September 4, 1932. He made his religious profession in 1938 and on May 2, 1940, he was ordained in Blessed Sacrament Cathedral in Altoona by Bishop Richard T. Guilfoyle, former Chancellor of the Erie Diocese. At his first solemn mass in Immaculate Conception Church in Osceola Mills, his youngest brother, Bernard, received his first holy communion. A teacher during the major part of his priesthood, Father Dugan is now a professor of English at St. Francis' Prep School, Spring Grove.

HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER

Gerald Mellon Dugan, 40, is a teacher of English and speech at Falconer High School, Falconer, N. Y., and was born on February 11, 1915. After grade-school education at Osceola Mills, he enrolled at Cathedral Prep in Erie in 1928, residing at St. Mark's Hall. After graduation in 1932 he entered St. Bonaventure's University, from which he earned his bachelor and master of arts degrees. In August 1949, he married Rose Mary Schettig, of Ebensburg, and is now the father of 3 children.

PAROCHIAL SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

Rita Dugan, 38, in religion Sister Rita Claire, principal of the St. Ann Grade School, Erie, was born November 6, 1916. After grade and high-school education in Osceola Mills schools, she became a postulate in the Erie community of St. Joseph Sisters at Villa Maria in the fall of 1935. On the Feast of the Assumption, August 15, 1936, she was invested in the habit of the sisterhood. She made her profession of religious vows on August 15, 1941. Previous to her St. Ann principalship, she taught at the Holy Rosary School, Johnsonburg, and the St. Andrew School, Erie.

CHILDREN'S HOME DIRECTOR

Marietta Dugan, 37, director of senior girls at St. Joseph's Home for Children, Erie, was born February 25, 1918. After grade school education at Osceola Mills, in 1932, she became a resident student at Villa Maria Academy in Erie and in her senior year, beginning in September 1935, studied as a postulant in the Erie community of the St. Joseph Sisters. After her investiture in the garb of the order, she pronounced her final religious vows on August 15, 1941. Her teaching assignments previous to her present executive included St. John's Grade School, Erie; St. Patrick's School in Erie; and St. Bernard's School in Bradford.

PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHER

Annie Jane Dugan, 35, in religion Sister Anne Jane, first-grade teacher at St. Peter's Cathedral School, Erie, was born on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, December 8, 1919. After grade-school comple-

tion at Osceola Mills, she became a resident at Villa Maria, Erie, being graduated in June 1938. On August 15, 1938, she was invested in the garb of the Erie St. Joseph Sisters. On August 15 of 1944, she pronounced her final vows in religion. Since then, up through her present post at the Cathedral School, were teaching assignments at Villa Maria Grade School, Erie; St. Bernard's Grade School in Bradford; and Maryvale Preschool, West Lake Road, Erie.

EX-TEACHER MOTHER OF FIVE

Helen Dugan, 32, former teacher at Shinglehouse High School, Shinglehouse, N. Y., was born October 17, 1922. After Osceola Mills' grade schooling, she became a resident at Villa Maria Academy, Erie, being graduated in 1938. She continued as a resident collegian at Villa Maria College and in 1942 was conferred by Archbishop Gannon her bachelor degree in secondary education from the Erie college. Following this she taught for 3 years at Shinglehouse High School, Shinglehouse, N. Y. But on June 10, 1946, she married Vincent Howard, terminating her teaching career. Their union has been blessed with five children. The couple reside in Colden, N. Y.

DISTRICT MANAGER

Bernard Dugan, 21, is a commercial executive. He was born November 23, 1933. After graduation from Osceola Mills High School with high honors he advanced fast in commercial endeavor until he has achieved position as district manager for the Union Wire Rope Co., requiring residence at Syracuse, N. Y.

Award judges were the Rt. Rev. Monsignor James M. Powers, LL. D.; the Rt. Rev. Alfred M. Watson, M. A.; Dr. Michael J. Relihan, Mrs. Bertha Winter Mahoney, Litt. D.; and Mrs. Clarence L. Colvin.

Yorty Says Reds Block Peace—Israel-Arab Unrest Communist Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an article entitled "Israel-Arab Unrest Communist Strategy." This article was written by former Congressman Sam Yorty and published in the Los Angeles Herald and Express of Thursday, May 5, 1955.

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Herald and Express of May 5, 1955]

YORTY SAYS REDS BLOCK PEACE—ISRAEL-ARAB UNREST COMMUNIST STRATEGY

(By Samuel William Yorty)

At Bandung, the Chinese Communists again spotlighted international communism's hostility to Israel by strongly supporting an anti-Israel resolution backed by the Arab nations. In so alining themselves with the Arabs against Israel at the Asian-African conference the Chinese Reds were obediently adhering to the party line charted for them by Moscow at meetings of the United Nations.

STIR TROUBLE

The Communists have consistently sought to inflame Arab emotions against Israel, and perpetuate trouble and turmoil throughout the Middle East. They have slyly infiltrated the Arab refugee camps in the Arab countries. Inside Israel, they have constantly connived to stir up unrest among the Arabs and to thwart Israeli efforts to integrate the Arabs into the life of the dynamic new nation so as to encourage loyalty and a feeling of belonging.

Recently Maki, the small but vocal Israel Communist Party, denounced Arab youths for succumbing to Jewish nationalism and assimilation because they accepted invitations to take part in Israeli economic development programs.

The Communists like "to fish in troubled waters." Middle East disunity and resulting vulnerability fits in with their program of keeping the non-Communist world weak and divided.

INFLAME ARABS

The Communists well know that a sound Middle East defense system must include Israel. By inflaming the Arabs against the Israelis they are able to "throw a monkey wrench" into all efforts to end the smoldering Arab-Israel war and establish a meaningful areawide defense against Communist aggression.

Also prolongation of the uneasy truce without real peace prevents reestablishment of mutually beneficial economic relationships, retards progress toward higher living standards, and tends to make the impoverished Arab masses more susceptible to cynical Communist blandishments.

PARTY LINE—SAME

No matter where the Communist international conspiracy rears its ugly head; no matter which partner or satellite occupies the stage; the "party line" is the same. Whether it is Russia at the United Nations or Communist China at the African-Asian conference, identical sordid strategy is clearly visible. Without regard for right or wrong, Communist world encompassing power politics and subversion demand friction between Israel and the Arab nations which nearly encircle her. The recent action of the Chinese Communists at Bandung was just one more outcropping of the Moscow scheme for fostering Middle East discord.

Tyranny by Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the constitutional rights of American servicemen on duty in certain foreign countries are being violated by implementation of the NATO Status of Forces Treaty and a similar agreement entered into by the United States with Japan.

Under both agreements, American service personnel can and have been brought to trial in foreign civil courts before foreign judges and incarcerated in foreign prisons.

It is unthinkable that either of these agreements were entered into, and as long as they remain in force the Constitution of the United States has been rendered meaningless as far as many of our servicemen are concerned.

Both agreements should be denounced as soon as possible and jurisdiction returned to our own military authorities in cases where American soldiers, sailors, and marines commit offenses in foreign countries.

Certainly we at least owe this much to the young men of America who will be called upon, if necessary, to fight and die to defend the Constitution of this Republic.

One of the most excellent and illuminating articles which I have had the privilege of reading on the subject of the Status of Forces Treaty has been submitted for publication in the June issue of the Judge Advocate's Journal, put out by the Judge Advocate's Association with headquarters in Washington, D. C.

The coauthors, Brig. Gen. Oliver P. Bennett, retired, and Col. Rolla C. Van Kirk, retired, are both lawyers and well qualified to write on the subject of military law. General Bennett served with the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Iowa National Guard and Colonel Van Kirk served in a similar capacity with the Nebrska National Guard.

I commend to the attention of all Members this excellent, hard-hitting article entitled "Tyranny by Treaty":

One hundred and seventy-nine years ago our country proclaimed the independence of the United States of America and all her citizens. Foreign potentates and the barratorious empires of Europe were put on notice that Americans would no longer tolerate the evil practices of laws over which they had no control. To protect our people from the wretched canons of remote kingdoms our ancestors fought and died in a war called the "Revolution." To protect our ships and sailors and soldiers from the humilities imposed upon them by foreign monarchs our ancestors fought and died in a war called the "War of 1812." In both of these wars the men of the National Guard made the ultimate sacrifice.

In 1951, 175 years after our people secured their independence and were protected by the Bill of Rights, our Department of State negotiated for the surrender of the birth rights of those who wear the uniform of the United States. On July 15, 1953, the Senate of the United States ratified a vicious treaty which defamed and disparaged the rights of freeborn men who happen to be in the service of this formerly sovereign country.

Yes, it is true that American soldiers and Guardsmen abroad are subject to trial under foreign law and denied the constitutional protections for which many generations of military men have gallantly laid down their lives. Yes, you GI's and guardsmen are now subject to the injustices that are handed down by magistrates and juries in those foreign lands where the people write "Yankee Go Home" on every wall and building. Yes, it is true that the kangaroo and Star Chamber court procedures; local police brutalities; and in some instances Communist judges and juries are the rewards that our men in uniform earn by serving under the flag of the United States in Europe and Japan. Yes, it is indeed a sad travesty on Justice to deprive American troops overseas of the protection of the Government and Constitution for which they must give their very lives to defend. Above all it should not be forgotten that our boys in uniform are not abroad by choice but rather they are ordered overseas. And it is not inaccurate to state that every American serviceman abroad is a potential victim of the same horrible fates which befell Harry Oatis and Bob Vogeler.

UNCONSTITUTIONALITY

Every lawyer educated in this country knows well the two following principles of American constitutional jurisprudence:

1. That when a treaty conflicts or contravenes the United States Constitution the treaty becomes null and void, and of no effect.

2. That all powers delegated to one branch of the National Government cannot be redelegated, but must be performed by that constitutionally appointed body. This second principle is significant in that if Congress is given certain powers and jurisdiction, Congress cannot transfer, grant, or convey to any other organ of the Government, or any other government, the power given exclusively to it.

Every lawyer knows that article I of our Constitution sets forth the powers of Congress, in the following manner: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States." Further, article I, section 8, of our Constitution states, "The Congress shall have power to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces. To provide for organizing, arming and discipling the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States."

Article II, section 2 provides: "The President shall be the commander in chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States."

When the Bill of Rights was made a part of the Constitution, the militia was protected against abolition by the second amendment which states, "A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

The fifth amendment provides, "No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces or in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger, nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeojardy of life or limb." Thus, with the aforesaid quotations from the Constitution clearly in mind it can be seen that Congress and Congress alone can make and prescribe the rules and regulations under which our men in uniform or the National Guard, when on active duty, must abide.

Every lawyer knows that the President makes treaties and that the Senate ratifies these treaties by giving their advice and consent. Thus, the NATO Status of Forces Treaty was made by the executive branch of our Government and ratified by the United States Senate. Article VII of the aforementioned treaty grants to the NATO countries and Japan "exclusive jurisdiction over members of a force or civilian component and their dependents with respect to offenses relating to the security of that state, punishabl by its law, but not by the law of the sending state." Furthermore a subsequent portion of the treaty gives the receiving states primary jurisdiction over certain other offences. Thus under the agreements made by this treaty our servicemen overseas are made subject to the effects of foreign laws and the bizarre procedures of alien tribunals. Our soldiers must therefore abide by the rules and regulations made for them by Congress, and then they must also abide by the grotesque and anomalous laws of whatever country in which they happen to be stationed, because if a violation of a foreign law occurs the alien courts have jurisdiction. Consequently, our servicemen abroad are not at this time exclusively under the rules and regulations of Congress as the afore-quoted mandate of the United States Constitution prescribed. It was the President and the Senate that made this treaty, not the Congress. It was and is, alien kingdoms and foreign potentates that are making the regulations under which our boys overseas must endure, not the Congress as the Constitution exclusively authorized. Yet while this situation continues it is also in express violation and contravention of the United States Supreme Court doctrine laid down in *Geofroy v. Riggs* (133 U. S. 258), which case held that—

"The treaty power, as expressed in the Constitution, is in its terms unlimited except by those restraints which are found in that instrument against the action of the Government or of its departments, and those arising from the nature of the Government itself and that of the States. It would not be contended that it extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids."

Therefore, after an inspection of our Constitution, every rational man is compelled to conclude that executive agreements and treaties which surrender American G. I.'s to the local star chambers of the NATO countries and Japan, are in direct violation of the exclusive congressional exercise of power to make the rules for the regulation of the land and naval forces.

EFFECT ON THE NATIONAL GUARD AND AIR NATIONAL GUARD

You may ask, why the interest in the welfare of the National Guard and Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia by two old National Guard lawyers now retired? We will tell you. We are not going to be ordered overseas again, as we have been in two wars, but our sons and nephews who are in the National Guard may be so ordered. We not only have their welfare and protection in mind, but the welfare of the entire National Guard which we have served faithfully for a total of over 60 years and, naturally, have acquired a deep affection for it through the years.

Who is the National Guard? This question can be answered far more eloquently by quoting an article written by the National Guard Bureau and published by the National Guard Association, the Nation's National Guard, which reads as follows:

"Civilian in peace, soldier in war, of security and honor, for three centuries I have been the custodian, I am the guard.

"I was with Washington in the dim forests, fought the wily warrior, and watched the dark night bow to the morning. At Concord's bridge, I fired the fateful shot heard 'round the world.' I bled on Bunker Hill. My footprints marked the snows at Valley Forge. I pulled a muffled oar on the barge that bridged the icy Delaware. I stood with Washington on the sundrenched heights of Yorktown. I saw the sword surrendered. I am the guard. I pulled the trigger that loosed the long rifle's havoc at New Orleans. These things I knew—I was there. I saw both sides of the War between the States—I was there. The hill at San Juan felt the fury of my charge. The far plains and mountains of the Philippines echoed to my shout. On the Mexican border I stood. I am the guard. The dark forest of the Argonne blazed with my barrage. Chateau Thierry crumbled to my cannonade. Under the arches of victory I marched in legion—I was there. I am the guard. I bowed briefly on the grim Corregidor, then saw the light of liberation shine on the faces of my comrades. Through the jungle and on the beaches, I fought the enemy, beat, battered, and broke him. I raised our banner to the serene air on Okinawa. I scrambled over Normandy's beaches. I was there. I am the guard. Across the 38th parallel I made my stand. I flew MIG Alley. I was there. I am the guard.

"Soldier in war, civilian in peace, I am the guard.

"I was at Johnstown, where the raging waters boomed down the valley. I cradled the crying child in my arms and saw the terror leave her eyes. I moved through smoke and flame at Texas City. The stricken knew the comfort of my skill. I dropped the food that fed the starving beast on the frozen fields of the West and through the towering drifts I ploughed to rescue the marooned. I have faced forward to the tornado, the typhoon, and the horror of the hurricane and flood—these things I know—I was there. I am the guard. I have brought a more abundant, a fuller, a finer life to our youth. Wherever a strong arm and valiant spirit must defend the Nation, in peace or war, wherever a child cries, or a woman weeps in time of disaster, there I stand. I am the guard. For three centuries a soldier in war, a civilian in peace—of security and honor—I am the custodian, now and forever. I am the guard."

We cannot believe that our Founding Fathers, when they were so careful to guard the rights of our National Guardsmen as to their State status and would only give Congress authority to govern them while in the service of the United States that they ever intended that the President could call or order these lads into the service of the United States and make them subject to be governed by some foreign power.

Section 58, National Defense Act, as amended, provides that a young man, 17 years of age, may be enrolled in the National Guard or the federally recognized organized Militia of the several States, Territories, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. As a result of this age provision, the National Guard and Air National Guard are composed of thousands of young men who have not reached their majority and are not eligible for the draft; yet our Senate of the United States made these youthful guardsmen, while on active duty, and others in the military service, subject to trial by foreign judges and courts with no constitutional rights guaranteed to them.

ROBBERY OF THE RIGHTS OF OUR SERVICEMEN

Every minute of every day a swelling crescendo of parents, wives, and families are asking the question, "Why were our boys robbed of their rights?" The international heroes who drafted and approved this treacherous NATO Status-of-Forces Treaty have only one answer to give, that "Appeasement is Cooperation." Therefore an examination must be conducted to determine exactly what rights were stolen from our boys in an effort to appease and cooperate with our so-called allies. The following is an incomplete list of some of the birthrights and safeguards which our men in uniform unwillingly forfeit when they are ordered overseas:

1. No presumption of innocence, but a presumption of guilt before trial.
2. No provision for bail.
3. No right to trial by jury.
4. No burden of proof for the prosecution to overcome.
5. Not necessary to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.
6. No guaranty of a public or speedy trial.
7. No right of pardon or executive clemency.
8. No privilege against self incrimination.
9. No provisions for due process of law.
10. No privilege of appeal.
11. No provisions against cruel and unusual punishment.
12. No writs of habeas corpus available.
13. No protection against double jeopardy (G. I. Joe can be tried, acquitted and at least in Japan, retired as many times as the authorities desire or remain unsatisfied with a finding of not guilty). Under this unholy Status-of-Forces Treaty our boys are denied the constitutional rights to which they are entitled in proceedings under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and which rights

their ancestors fought and died to preserve. From the time of the Revolutionary War and the beginning of our Republic in 1789, until that deadly day of July 15, 1953, no American soldier, sailor, marine or National Guardsman was ever surrendered to any foreign tribunal.

STARE DECISIS ET NON QUIETA MOVERE

Many of the objections to article VII of the unprecedented Status-of-Force Treaty can be discovered by a concise search of the relevant statutory, case, and treatise law.

Schooner Exchange v. *McFaddon* (11 U. S. 116) is the first decision that warrants our examination. That action concerned a libel in admiralty in the United States District Court for Pennsylvania against the *Exchange*, in which the libelants, merchants of Baltimore, alleged that the ship had been wrongfully taken from their captain and agent on the high seas by persons acting under orders of Napoleon, Emperor of France, and was at the date of libel, August 24, 1811, at Philadelphia; that she had not been condemned by a court of competent jurisdiction; and praying that she be restored to the plaintiffs, her rightful owners. The United States attorney filed a suggestion that the ship libeled was a public vessel of the French Emperor, which, having encountered stress of weather, was obliged to put into Philadelphia for repairs; that, if the ship ever belonged to the libelants, their property had been divested and became vested in the Emperor within a port of his empire according to the laws of France. The United States attorney submitted whether the attachment ought not to be quashed and the libel dismissed.

The case went on appeal to the United States Supreme Court, where Chief Justice John Marshall delivered one of his foremost opinions. In that opinion Marshall discussed three types of instances whereby every sovereign is understood to waive the exercise of a part of that exclusive territorial jurisdiction which has been stated to be the attribute of every nation. The third classification noted by Marshall is at this time pertinent:

"A third case in which a sovereign is understood to cede a portion of his territorial jurisdiction is where he allows the troops of a foreign prince to pass through his dominions.

"In such case, without any express declaration waiving jurisdiction over the army to which this right of passage has been granted, the sovereign who should attempt to exercise it would certainly be considered as violating his faith. By exercising it, the purpose for which the free passage was granted would be defeated, and a portion of the military force of a foreign independent nation would be diverted from those national objects and duties to which it was applicable, and would be withdrawn from the control of the sovereign whose power and whose safety might greatly depend on retaining the exclusive command and disposition of this force. The grant of a free passage therefore implies a waiver of all jurisdiction over the troops during their passage, and permits the foreign general to use that discipline, and to inflict those punishments which the government of his army may require."

The aforementioned remarks of the renowned Justice are not mere dicta, but rather they indicate the logical reasoning by which his decision was made. It is an inescapable fact that the essence of the Exchange decision is that any public armed force which enters the territory of another nation with the latter's permission enjoys an extraterritorial status.

After the Civil War the Supreme Court of the United States was again petitioned for a decision in a controversy similar to the Exchange case. Thus in *Coleman* v. *Tennessee* (97 U. S. 509), the Court reaffirmed Marshall's famous exchange decision and went on to state that:

"It is well settled that a foreign army, permitted to march through a friendly country or to be stationed in it, by permission of its government or sovereign, is exempt from the civil and criminal jurisdiction of the place. The sovereign is understood * * * to cede a portion of his territorial jurisdiction when he allows the troops of a foreign prince to pass through his dominions."

The foregoing decisions of the highest judicial body in our Government, plus the decision in the case of *Dow* v. *Johnson* (100 U. S. 158) illustrate beyond a doubt that the invitation or permission of the host country to enter its territories carries with it, at least unless clearly denied, an implied exemption or immunity of the personnel of visiting forces from the jurisdiction of the local courts and a consent to the functioning of the courts-martial system of such forces. In other words, the permission to enter carriers with it an implied but nonetheless clear and definite consent to the exclusive jurisdiction over such forces of their own courts-martial authority.

After the aforesaid survey of the settled law no intelligent person would doubt that our boys in uniform and stationed overseas are or should be solely accountable to our own courts-martial and military law. Yet there are some do gooders and one world lawyers who fail to see the plainly printed law. It is also this group who fail to see the distinction between drafting an 18-year-old boy, or a 17-year-old guardsman and ordering them overseas, and then abandoning them to the caprices of some foreign potentate; and the wealthy Americon tourist who leaves his home voluntarily, goes to Europe or Japan voluntarily, and voluntarily subjects himself to alien jurisdictions. Is it not obvious that in the first instance there is no choice as to whether or not the chance of landing in a foreign dungeon should be assumed, whereas in the case of the tourist he voluntarily assumed the risk? And it is this same caliber of feebleminded one worlders who absolutely insist upon full and complete immunity from foreign prosecution for the employees of the State Department, who can quit and come home whenever the going gets too rough. Why should some friendless and poorly paid G. I. who is overseas and away from his home against his will be forsaken when he is expected to lay down his life to defend the foreign peoples who are permitted by this treaty to persecute him. And compare the G. I. whose constitutional rights have been snatched away, with the high living, high paid individuals of the State Department who face only the dangers of a hangover and yet are completely enfolded in the protecting embraces of our Constitution and flag.

Nothwithstanding the aforementioned Supreme Court decision there is additional ammunition on the side of our servicemen. Wheaton says,[1] "A foreign army or fleet, marching through, sailing over, or stationed in the territory of another state, with whom the foreign sovereign to whom they belong is in amity, are also, in like manner, exempt from the civil and criminal jurisdiction of the place." Birkhimer says,[2] "It is well settled that a foreign army permitted to march through a friendly country, or be stationed in it, by permission of its government or sovereign, is exempt from the civil and criminal jurisdiction of the place." Oppenheim says,[3] "Whenever armed forces are on foreign territory in the service of their home state, they are considered extraterritorial and remain, therefore, under is jurisdiction. A crime committed on foreign territory by a member of these forces cannot be punished by the local civil or military authorities, but only by the commanding officer of the forces or by other authorities of their home state."

Without exception the foregoing authorities and citations vividly demonstrate the fundamental rule of international law pleaded by this article, namely, that when the armed troops of one nation enter or remain on the soil of another nation by permission, such permission carries with it extraterritoriality for the armed troops, and said troops are exempt from the civil and criminal jurisdiction of the courts of the host country.

In 1951, Congress after much research, effort and laborious study enacted the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and a worthy Manual for Courts Martial, United States was effected. Suffice to say, the manual and its included code were supposed to be the last word, final authority, and prime source of all military law under which every serviceman would be governed and the National Guard when in the Federal service, no matter how remote his foreign duty station, And to quote Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio:

"The Uniform Code of Military Justice permits any offense against the law of the country where troops are stationed to be treated as an offense against the code. Article 5 of the code provides that it shall be applicable in all places. What stronger evidence could there be of Congress' intent to make the code applicable to every American serviceman wherever stationed."

Furthermore, extended investigation into the contents of the manual reveals the following:

"Under international law, jurisdiction over members of the Armed Forces of the United States or other sovereign who commit offenses in the territory of a friendly foreign state in which the visiting armed force is by consent quartered or in passage, remains in the visiting sovereign."

In light of the foregoing quotation can it be denied that there has been a rape and pilferage of the constitutional rights of the American soldier, sailor, or marine overseas? And in this connection it should be remembered that the code, the law under which every serviceman lives, is read, interpreted, and illustrated to every GI not only upon his entrance into the service but also every 6 months thereafter. Our servicemen know the law under which they should be governed for it is explained to them by competent Judge Advocate General Corps officers, but how many attorneys are capable of unraveling the intricacies of the Criminal Code of Japan, or the Islamic Code of Turkey, or the Mohammedan law of Morocco where GI Joe can get his hand cut off for stealing an apple or walking out of a restaurant while forgetting to pay his bill. It is submitted that few, if any, American JAG officers are capable of the herculean task of explaining the aforesaid foreign laws which all will agree is the very minimum that ought to be done in behalf of our servicemen.

The Omaha World-Herald, the most widely read and quoted daily newspaper in our part of the United States, declared in an editorial under date of January 26, 1955, titled "It's a Bad Treaty," that—

"The treaty is morally wrong and goes against the grain of patriotic American citizens. It should be denounced, and jurisdiction in such cases should be returned to American military authorities."

The question has been asked, repeatedly, How can this wrong be righted? The harm already done can never be undone, but some Senators and Congressmen, who did and do oppose this treaty, have suggested that the selective-service extension or the Ready Reserve bills now pending in the Congress can be amended to provide that no troops shall be ordered by the Department of Defense into those countries where this agreement

Footnotes at end of speech.

is effective unless such countries agree to waive the jurisdiction they now hold over our troops. Congress could at least adopt House Joint Resolution 236, now pending in the 84th Congress and introduced by Mr. GROSS, of Iowa, which provides that before any member of the Armed Forces is sent overseas the JAG officers concerned are required to notify such member and his relatives that the American Constitution no longer protects him. If either the amendment or the Gross resolution is adopted, the Department of State should then appreciate how far astray they have led us in their one-world thinking.

In connection with the committee hearings now being conducted on the Bricker amendment, both President Eisenhower and his Secretary of State Dulles have stated that for the purpose of clarity they would be willing to approve an amendment to the Constitution which would provide that no treaty or executive agreement in conflict with it would have any force or effect. It appears, therefore, that this is an admission that the constitutional rights of our soldiers overseas to be tried by American officers and enlisted men have been and are being violated by the implementation of this treaty. Our Supreme Court has recently avoided two opportunities to rule on this question.

In any event, to Dick Keefe and Tony Scaletti the NATO Status-of-Forces Treaty is no hypothetical problem. These boys have felt the lash of the international whip which plays the tune to which American servicemen must jump. Some dark day those boys will have to know that while they got 5 years in solitary in Le Maison de Correction at Orleans, France, for a joy-ride, another French Star Chamber gave 5 years to a Frenchman who murdered James Wilkins, late of the United States Army. Justice where art thou?

CONCLUSION

The Status-of-Forces Treaty, unprecedented in the annals of international law and contrary to the settled doctrines of American constitutional law, reflects a callous disregard for the rights of American Armed Forces personnel. The time has arrived when tyranny by treaty is upon us. And as Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio, said: "Reasonable and honest men may differ in regard to the number of dollars Congress may give away with safety. But to give away the rights of Americans serving in the uniform of their country is unthinkable."

The fact is, our flag follows our soldiers; then we submit that our Constitution must continue to follow the flag as it has in all of our historic endeavors. The American serviceman who must if necessary die to protect the flag and the Constitution, deserves to have at least the unfettered protection of our two most valuable national assets.

[1] Elements of International Law, sec. 95.
[2] Military Government and Martial Law, sec. 114.
[3] International Law (4th edition) vol. 1, sec. 445.

Polio Serum Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat for May 20, 1955:

POLIO SERUM MESS

The muddling indecision of the Federal Public Health Service in supervision of Salk vaccine production has seriously hampered the national inoculation program and left the people with a conviction of official incompetence. If all the facts were known, this might not be altogether a fair conclusion. But the facts have not been divulged, and whatever the explanation the program has been culpably delayed.

Again the Public Health Service has barred further release of the vaccine. The only excuse offered is so authorities can take another look at this whole and very confusing picture.

The public does not know whether the reason is that some of the manufacturers' serum is dangerous, perhaps insufficiently tested by the factories, or whether the Health Service still has not developed adequate inspection procedures.

They do know somebody has blundered. They logically ask why the Public Health Service did not prepare in advance for competent supervision of the serum release. It was known for a year the Salk discovery was being widely tested, and prospect was it would prove successful.

Surgeon General Scheele simply announced on Wednesday no more serum would be approved for several days. This order, he said, should not be inferred as "a reflection in any way on the vaccine of the companies whose manufacturing and testing processes are under study." If that is so, he virtually indicts his own Department for inability to handle the inspection job with proper dispatch.

It is understood Health Service rarely can do more than spot check drug and serum products. Possibly it considered that sufficient for Salk manufacturers, then found the normal procedure inadequate. Dr. Scheele and his staff unquestionably ought to hold up vaccine distribution if he has any reason to doubt its safety. This is a matter of life and death. He should follow such practice as often as he finds it necessary. But that does not sufficiently explain the delays and lack of information about the official slowdown in this program. Withholding properly manufactured supplies may also be a matter of life and death for hundreds of children.

Somewhere there has been bungling. It ought to be stopped and the polio serum made available—safely and quickly.

Government of, by, and for the Moneylenders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the May 21 issue of the Capital Times, of Madison, Wis.

The editorial, which I commend to my colleagues, contains some very interesting observations about the administration's hard-money policy. The editorial also includes comments on the recent action of the Senate Agriculture Committee to reverse the Secretary of Agriculture's policy on disaster loans.

The full text of the editorial follows:

GOVERNMENT OF, BY, AND FOR THE MONEYLENDERS

The United States Senate Committee on Agriculture has unanimously voted to reverse the action of Secretary of Agriculture Benson by which the interest rate to farmers receiving disaster loans from the Federal Government was raised from 3 to 5 percent.

The decision to raise these interest rates was made by Secretary of Agriculture Benson last January, but no public announcement of the increase was made until recently. Benson explained that it was made to discourage farmers from asking the Government for disaster loans and to force them to borrow from private lending interests.

The unanimity with which the Senate committee reversed Benson's action indicates that even the Republican Members of Congress are growing apprehensive about the administration's program of payoffs to the big moneylenders who have been financing Republican campaigns. Forcing the farmers to pay higher interest rates is only part of that program.

The first thing the Eisenhower administration did when it got into office was to inaugurate the tight money policy by increasing interest rates. The policy was reversed when it became apparent that it was heading the country into a depression. But it wasn't stopped before it had cost the taxpayers of the Nation $475 million in increased interest and added to the national debt.

The highway program which the Eisenhower administration recommended would cost the American people about $11.5 billion in accumulated interest before the debt was paid off. The Eisenhower school program seems not to be aimed at helping education so much as it is to give the big moneylenders a windfall.

No wonder the Republicans in Congress are getting apprehensive about Government of, by, and for the moneylenders.

Contribution of Franklin Delano Roosevelt to the Fight Against Polio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to offer a comment at this time on a matter that has received a great deal of attention from the people of the United States and to remark on one part of the matter that has received no notice.

As a parent of 3 children, I have followed carefully and with interest the news stories and other reports on the development and handling of the Salk vaccine for polio. When the announcement was first made about the effectiveness of this new weapon against the disease that has inflicted its terrible toll upon man, I felt very happy for all the children and adults throughout the world who would reap the benefits of this wonderful vaccine.

I rise on this occasion to speak, not about the mismanagement and bungling of the present administration's Depart-

ment of Health, Education, and Welfare in handling the program, if indeed it is a program, of distributing the Salk vaccine, but to comment on the vagaries of human memory. Much credit has been given to Dr. Salk, whose final formula was the one that was proven to be effective; to Dr. Francis, of the University of Michigan, who evaluated the results of the tests of the vaccine; to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, which financed the research. Credit is also given to all the wonderful men, women, and children in the United States who gave so generously of their dimes to help fight polio. And I do not intend to detract anything from the fine work all of these men have done; they deserve every word of praise and every honor that is being accorded them.

But I wonder about one thing. We hear that the entire program of developing, testing, and proving the effectiveness of the Salk vaccine has been financed by the March of Dimes. In vain I have listened and have looked for one word about the man who was so great an inspiration in inaugurating the March of Dimes, the man who himself suffered from polio, who rose above his disability to become one of the greatest leaders our country has had, who in 1938 called upon the American people to assist by giving their dimes to fight polio.

I speak of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and I wish at this time to call to your attention the fact that he has not been given even an acknowledgment for his efforts in inspiring the March of Dimes. This past Sunday I heard a news broadcast on which the newscaster stated that it was only coincidence that the announcement of the effectiveness of the vaccine was made on Roosevelt's birthday; that an overeager information officer in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare caused the news of the vaccine to be released 3 months too soon. So F. D. R. is denied even this small nod of recognition.

Shakespeare, in his play, Julius Caesar, said: "The evil that men do lives after them; the good is oft interred with their bones." How true. In these days we hear shouts of treason, of sell-out at Yalta; and a hundred and one other terms of censure about one of our greatest Presidents. And how often do we hear from the farmers about how during President Roosevelt's administration they got rural electrification, how often do we hear the people give thanks for the emergency relief measures during the height of the depression, how often do we hear about the good things the Americans received during the 20 years that the Democrats had charge of the affairs of the country. Not too often, do we? But we do indeed hear a lot about the "evil," the faults, the errors. Well, I know of only one man who lived on the face of this earth who was without fault; and He died on the Cross of Calvary.

I would at this time like to give due recognition to just one of the bits of good—among the many—that Franklin Delano Roosevelt did and to give him credit for the part he played in the fight against polio. I want to give an expression of thanks on behalf of my children and all the others who will not have to fear the scourge of polio to the man whose inspiring leadership contributed so much to the success of the March of Dimes, thereby giving our medical forces the means by which to array themselves effectively against a dread enemy of man.

Relief for the American Bicycle Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of every Member of Congress a statement by the American bicycle industry concerning the present status of its efforts to preserve this industry which is an important part of the economy of my congressional district:

The American bicycle industry, which had been banking heavily on Presidential approval of tariff relief to assure its survival, is deeply disappointed over President Eisenhower's delay in reaching a decision last week. But bike leaders feel confident of ultimate favorable action which would solve the industry's pressing problems.

Action on the recommendations of the United States Tariff Commission for a higher tariff on imported bicycles was held in abeyance by the President who called on the Commission to provide additional information on the bike case by not later than July 15. The Commission's recommendations were made under the escape-clause provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Representatives of the domestic bike industry, who held a series of weekend conferences in Washington, were highly gratified with the substantial 4-to-1 majority vote of the Tariff Commission that an actual and serious injury existed. In its report, which was publicly revealed for the first time by the President's announcement, the Commission recommended increased tariff protection for American bike producers.

The Commission's decisive action, bike leaders pointed out, upheld the industry's long maintained position that it had suffered serious injury at the hands of cheaply produced imports. They hailed the decision, which was made after a 9-month study, as one of the highest majority by the Commission in recent years.

American bike manufacturers were also heartened by the President's remarks in his letter to the Commission. They pointed to his comment that the domestic bike industry is beset by genuine difficulties as a good omen and an affirmation of the position taken by the Commission and held by the industry itself in its application for relief. In the light of the Tariff Commission's long and comprehensive examination of the facts and its almost unanimous decision, industry leaders were puzzled as to what new facts the President desires that could further illuminate the considerable injury the Commission found now existed in the domestic bike industry.

Despite its initial reaction of natural resentment at what appears to the industry as an unnecessary delay in providing tariff protection, bike leaders offered their prompt and complete cooperation to Government authorities in furnishing whatever information and data the President requires to reach a fair determination of the case.

At the same time, bike representatives expressed the hope that the entire matter would be speedily resolved. Emphasizing that first-quarter bike imports in 1955 showed a substantial increase over the previous year, they contended that the delay in reaching a decision would only mean greater loss of job opportunities and continuation of insupportable losses for the industry.

The industry heads expressed fear of the activities of numerous foreign interests which have made strong representations against helping the domestic manufacturers. The American bike tariff, they held, is by far the lowest among the major trading nations. The British rate, for example, is 300 percent higher and the German and French rates considerably higher than those in this country.

Against its own fears, however, the bike industry is placing confidence in President Eisenhower's oft-repeated sentiment that he will not allow any American industry to be sacrificed in behalf of international trade. They cited the President's April 14 message to Congress in which he said: "The right of this country to protect the legitimate interest of its industries and labor is clearly provided for."

American bike makers indicated that dismay was felt at first by many legislators, labor leaders, and public benefactors who gave the domestic industry massive support in their fight for relief. But upon reflection these elements were confident the industry would eventually receive the relief it so sorely needs to continue on an equal competitive basis with imports sold in the American market.

Optimism With Caution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, while writing the remarks for my special order for today, I received the May 20 copy of the Middletown (Conn.) Bulletin. The editorial in this fine newspaper published every Friday coincides very much with the thoughts that I had been preparing and which I will express later today when recognized for the purpose. Under leave to extend my remarks, the editorial follows:

OPTIMISM WITH CAUTION

Recent events in Europe have tended to cause a wave of optimism to spread in many of the countries of Western Europe and even in official circles within our own Government.

The most recent of many trips made by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles which involved the signing of the Austrian Peace Treaty and a general discussion of the European situation has been heralded in many quarters as a most successful mission and even the White House has shown enthusiasm for the results.

We believe that there has been no basic change in Russian policy, but that there has been a change in strategy, and that the people in the Kremlin have simply shifted from a strategy of implacable and bitter dispute over every issue to one in which they

are at least willing to discuss some issues. * * * However, they will discuss such issues where they may derive some benefit from such discussion.

The Austrian state treaty is the first of many examples which we can expect in the future. For many years our diplomats have attempted to get Russia to agree to an Austrian treaty, but the Russians under one pretext or another have always managed to stall off any final decision. Now, when they were ready and in order to create grave doubts in the minds of the neighboring German people, they moved swiftly and with much fanfare to make that treaty a reality. By so doing, they have completely neutralized Austria and have created a difficult situation for Chancellor Konrad Adenauer in West Germany, where many persons, including members of the Chancellor's own party, definitely believe in one Germany, even at the cost of being neutralized.

Another sudden and unexpected move has been made in Yugoslavia, where many key officials of the Kremlin will soon meet with Marshal Tito to discuss a program of rapprochement with that country.

The obvious intent of the Kremlin is to win for itself with honey, a wide security belt composed of nations neutralized by fear of war. This belt will run from the Baltic to the Aegean Sea if the Russian plans work according to the way that they have been conceived.

While the nations composing this belt would be neutralized, it must also be assumed by us that extensive penetrations would be made by the Communists in those areas so that if trouble should develop, they would be in a position to immediately take appropriate action.

If we agree with the proposals being put forth—as both Britain and France are pressuring us to do—we are likely to wake up one of these days to find that we have been completely hoodwinked and that the time, trouble, and money which we have expended in creating NATO and its kindred organizations has been completely lost.

We hope that if there is to be a meeting at the top level, that adequate guarantees will be obtained from our own allies on a mutual stand on many of the primary issues, and that unless such guarantees are worked out before the meeting, that we will have enough sense to participate.

Address at Keesler Air Force Base at Armed Forces Day Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to have been the guest of honor at the Armed Forces Day celebration at Keesler Air Force Base in Biloxi, Miss., located in the district represented by our distinguished colleague, WILLIAM COLMER. Keesler is commanded by Gen. James Davies. It was also my honor and privilege to make the principal address on that occasion.

For whatever value it is worth I here present the address which I made on that occasion:

It is a good thing for Americans to set aside a day when their full attention is given to the armed services; and it is even better when their reflections occur in surroundings so capably manned and so well supplied with every advanced weapon in the art of warfare as is this base.

The air arm does not, of course, have the exclusive responsibility of the defense of this country; but it is no reflection on the other arms to say that the Air Force has a most difficult mission in both strategy and tactics, the spearhead—if you please—should trouble come to our shores.

I will not add more confusion to the current rash of censorship on our weapons program, by discussing our advances in technical design and the improved capability of personnel to use the things that science and technocracy have placed at their disposal. I do not intend this to be a statistical compilation of our capabilities and capacities. I leave that for the propagandists and mathematicians. But every American is entitled to know something of our strength; something of our ability to defend ourselves; and from these to draw assurance and confidence in our international dealings. The line between censorship and caution is one that should be drawn in calm deliberation rather than panic and confusion.

What I am thinking of, however, today, is not a tally of our armed might. But I would like to dwell for a moment of reflection on our posture in the world in which we live, whose horizons and distances are constantly contracting. Neither ocean, nor air, nor the vast expanse of land mass any longer furnishes a barrier of defense. The frightening advance in the use of fissionable material for both the hydrogen and atomic bombs and their lesser uses as tactical weapons, has given everyone pause.

America and the world is frightened at the horror and the havoc which science can produce. While in one sense it may be said that we have won the battle of technical progress and hold the keys to peace—these weapons and that progress are only a complement, if you please, in the ideological warfare.

Our armed might is our aid. It must not ever become our master in this struggle for existence. Man's destiny, whatever be the form of government under which he lives, is not irretrievably committed to warfare as a necessity.

The natural law, as we have come to believe, since the earliest religious concept down through the Christian era, has had a firm belief that our destiny is something else than obliteration and extinction of the species—the scorching of earth and the waste of its resources, in futile and useless contests. But it is equally true to say that some forms of government existing today are not conducive to that end. We must recognize the fact that there are ideological and insoluble differences between governments. What we address ourselves to on Armed Forces Day is the consideration of our posture in that kind of world. Atheistic communism is pitted against a world believing in a God and in the dignity of His creatures.

A short time ago, at Bandung, the lines were clearly and firmly drawn. We have learned and communism has learned, by clear definition and public exhibition, that the contest for men's minds does not succeed upon racial distinctions. We have come a long way from colonialism, exploitation, suppression, subjugation: from the days of the victor and the vanquished. Asiatic powers have joined with Occidental powers and stood up to the silent truth that atheistic communism is not only an ideological concept, but it is also a thinly disguised plan for world conquest—a new and deadly form of colonialism. It has finally been unmasked. Its goal is subjugation and its creed is extermination.

For the first time we are within reach of having allies. In this delicate balance there is no place for cynical political motives, no place for the glamorous phrases of Madison Avenue hucksters. "Massive retaliation" may be a catchword, but it leaves our friends in stone. A dynamic foreign policy does not mean one of fits and starts, of changes and shifts, of bold words and feeble deeds, of bluff, bluster, and blunder, of lofty speech and retreat. Fumbling and bumbling with dynamite is not a dynamic foreign policy. Playing and guessing with the lives and fortunes of men and nations is foolhardiness and all the world knows it. A dynamic foreign policy means one that has a goal that keeps our friendships, that expresses in concrete form the hopes of our friends in the world. It means a policy that will attract to us the minds of men. Our way of life and our hope for ourselves in the world lies in attracting to our side the hundreds of millions of all races in all parts of the world who would live out their lives and work out the destiny of themselves and their children in freedom and in the enjoyment of the natural resources of the earth which are rightfully theirs.

Thus, while I stand for the full development of our armed might in all of the services (and emphatically in the Air Force), I would not confuse our desire and determination to be strong with our more important determination, not only to win any conflict, but to draw to us and to live in harmony with the minds of free people everywhere.

We must learn to welcome the right to freely disagree even as we do within our own boundaries; to be foresighted in maintaining our ability to defend ourselves so long as there are bandits at large; to continue to place our greatest emphasis upon our willingness to live in harmony with the peoples of the world; and to that end, to leave no conference unattended, no weapon unexplored which will further that cause.

We must act from strength—strength of arms and strength of our convictions. While we would leave no opportunity pass which would afford a means of peaceful resolution of differences, in our own interests and in the interests of our friends and allies, neither we nor they can afford to curtail their ability to defend their positions by armed might if need be. In short, our weapons must be ready and the weapons of our friends and allies must be ready for our adversary knows only the might of arms; and our adversary maintains his position only by force of arms and suppression. Those who would leave the orbit of communistic influence must be assured that they are going to a position where they will be protected in their right to live.

In the presence of the awful horrors and the havoc which could be wrought by our weapons, we are no longer privileged to win wars on the battlefield and lose the peace. We must reverse the procedure and seek the peace, with battle as the last resort. We must seek out every ray and follow every hopeful sign of peace. But most of all we must firm up our own philosophy of living in the world which has a right to differ but which need not divide. Right must be the full partner of might in our struggle to win to our side the hearts and hopes of all men of good will wherever they live upon the earth.

Powerland, U. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article by Mr. Louis R. Huber in the May 6, 1955, issue of the Christian Science Monitor on the hydroelectric development

program in the Puget Sound-Cascade Mountain region of the State of Washington, as follows:

JOINT HYDRO PROGRAM SET FOR PUGET REGION

(By Louis R. Huber)

Private and public power agencies in this region are about to move forward jointly on an 8-year, $670 million hydroelectric development program.

This will more than double, and possibly triple, the electric-power supply of the Puget Sound-Cascade Mountains region by 1963.

The sharp increase of electric energy will be needed to serve this fast-growing region. As this program is carried out, it will eliminate the pinch of power shortages that have been felt in recent years.

Presently 1.6 million kilowatts in peak resources are available here; at the end of 8 years, 3.3 million kilowatts will be available.

CONTAINS 1.5 MILLION PERSONS

The area served is the northwesternmost corner of the United States—a patch about 150 miles square and containing some 18,000 square miles—in which 1,553,000 persons live.

This is "Powerland, U. S. A.," where electricity is as much a crop as corn in Iowa or cotton in Mississippi. The aim is to develop this crop so it, in turn, will stimulate the regional economy of forests, wood products, fisheries, farming, trade with the Orient and Alaska, aircraft manufacture, shipbuilding and repair, and miscellaneous manufactures.

It is significant that the principal participants in this scheme have been in business here more than 50 years. They are Puget Sound Power & Light Co., a private corporation, and the municipally owned and operated Seattle City Light & Tacoma City Light.

These three large concerns, along with the smaller public utility districts of Snohomish and Chelan Counties, make up the Puget Sound Utilities Council—the association under which this development will occur.

FEW IF'S IN PLAN

The council's program has been spelled out by Jack D. Stevens, consulting engineer, in a report which is regarded as one of the most comprehensive studies ever made of the resources, projected population growth, economic opportunities, and industrial potential of this region.

There are very few if's in the council's plan: It is going to be carried out, bold as it is, as a matter of course. The 5 council members have agreed on 8 hydroelectric projects and have committed themselves to build them—some as group projects, others as individual developments.

Federal Power Commission permits or licenses have been obtained, and engineering studies, contracts, and so on are in process now for most of the work.

Financing will be a minor problem: individually and collectively the five utilities are in a strong position. With a few exceptions the only impediment between the eight proposals and their realization is time.

GIGANTIC PARADOX

In one respect this is all a gigantic paradox, because until a few years ago, this area was the scene of bitter rivalry between private and public power. Today that rivalry is past. It ended formally April 13, 1954, when the Puget Sound Utilities Council was formed.

The declaration of objectives of the council is a sort of magna carta of the power industry—at least for this area.

"These utilities recognize the mutual advantage, savings, and benefits which will result from joint planning and comprehensive, coordinated development of power resources, and from the maximum economic use of facilities and will accordingly plan and work together so that the area's electric power requirements will be provided at the lowest possible cost," says the declaration.

So well developed is the council's plan of cooperation, in fact, that some marking of time may have to occur before some associated groups—the Federal Government, for example—catch up.

The council not only takes full cognizance of the partnership power concept of the Eisenhower administration, and its shift from Federal to local levels, but it has one proposal that puts this concept to work.

KEY DAM PROJECT

It is the Mica Creek storage-dam project.

To understand this—indeed, to understand hydroelectric power in the Pacific Northwest at all—one must bear in mind that low-cost power in this region stems almost entirely from the Columbia River or its tributaries, and that the upper reaches of the Columbia lie in Canada.

The 8 current projects of the council concern the Columbia, and 1 of them lies in Canada, at Mica Creek. The council proposes that it pay for the construction of a dam there, and give it to the Canadians.

This dam would store a large quantity of water, caught during spring and summer when flow is ample, and release it in winter when the flow is lean.

This would mean a greater useful flow through federally owned dams south of the border at Grand Coulee, Chief Joseph, McNary, the Dalles, and Bonneville. It would add 1,100,000 kilowatts of prime energy.

CANADA TO BENEFIT

Canada will benefit by 800,000 kilowatts of new energy to be generated at Mica Creek, plus 800,000 kilowatts more at 2 plants down river in Canada from Mica Creek.

The cog that isn't working in this scheme is the Federal Government, which hasn't decided what to charge the council for running the improved waterflow through its generators—which is where the "partnership" occurs.

Another laggard in this scheme is Canada, which has had a firm policy against exporting electric energy if it can be used in Canada. But a measure—the International Rivers Act—is being considered now in the Canadian Parliament: it will permit such obviously mutually beneficial projects as Mica Creek.

The council and its members are not relying on hydroelectric power alone for energy, however. Steam-driven generating plants already have their place in this region, and studies for their greater use are underway.

The council also has contracted with the Atomic Energy Commission for establishment of a technical group to study the use of nuclear reactors in powerplants.

"Before many years all of the low-cost hydroelectric energy will be developed, and the nuclear powerplant may then be the major new source of power," observes the Stevens report.

Review of Our Air Strength Is Essential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the current discussion over the relative strength of our Air Force and Russia's obscures one important fact. The Russians have upset the timetable again, and have achieved air strength faster than we expected them to. With defensive strength achieved, they are now building an offensive, long-range bomber force to deliver the nuclear weapons that they also achieved ahead of the schedule we had set for them.

We are fortunate to have as Chief of Staff of our Air Force a man who understands the implications of what Russia is doing. Last year General Twining warned that the Russians had a bigger air force than ours. This year he has stated frankly that they are pushing us for superiority. The Soviet long-range jet heavy bomber gives us real reason for concern, and General Twining says so. Our problem is to stay ahead of the Russians and hold the technological lead that has been ours up to now.

If this means a review of our own air strength, then let us make it quickly. American industry is capable of expansion to any capacity required. The tremendous effort of World War II can be repeated, and exceeded. There is no other choice for us than to make the effort the struggle for peace requires. We have the men, the technology, the industrial potential, and, thank God, the leaders.

Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I extend my remarks and insert in the RECORD the address in which Gen. Nathan F. Twining, on Armed Forces Day, called on the American people to face up to the facts confronting them. It was made in Los Angeles, and is as follows:

REMARKS BY GEN. NATHAN F. TWINING, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, BEFORE THE LOS ANGELES ROTARY CLUB ON ARMED FORCES DAY, MAY 20, 1955

I am very happy to return to Los Angeles. We in the Air Force have many reasons to be grateful to you. Everybody realizes the major contributions west-coast industry has made to aircraft production. You can rest assured that we will do all we can to insure that this contribution is recognized and continued.

The theme of this Armed Forces Day is power for peace. This means power in all our Armed Forces—Army, Navy, and Air Force. It is no coincidence tht power for peace was the theme last year and the year before. Nor is this repetition merely because we could not devise a new slogan.

Continuation of this theme is evidence that power remains the key to peace in these trying times. Power and peace are like links in a chain—a chain that cannot be broken if our Nation is to survive.

Because power is so important it is necessary that we understand it. It is not military power alone that can prevent world conflict. Nor is it only a matter of weapons. It is a combination of strength and determination. Within this combination military strength plays a large part. It is our military strength, particularly our power in the air, that has prevented a third world war.

Our Armed Forces must bear a great burden in the task of keeping us secure and free. Because our freedom is something that each of us enjoy and all of us share, we must all know the nature of the power we must have to insure these vital possessions.

The last decade has brought tremendous changes in military weapons. In earlier times when weapons improved on the order of 1 or 2 times in effectiveness, it was enough to change the face of nations and readjust geography. Today we have weapons that have improved in power a million times. The very existence of these weapons makes a great change in world relations. The fact

that we were the first to develop these weapons has kept the Western World free.

Although we have used these weapons only twice in combat, there can be no doubt that these weapons are respected by the Communists. Our nuclear weapons and the ability of the United States Air Force to deliver them have put the damper on their visions of world domination.

The Communists are doing everything they can to counter this power of ours. They are building weapons of their own plus a great bomber force to deliver them.

Short of war, which we will never start, there is nothing we can do to prevent the Reds from producing nuclear weapons and building a great air force. We can improve our defenses and build a better Air Force of our own. These provide protection. But there is no practical way to stop them from building planes and producing weapons.

We can keep our guard up until their sincerity is proven beyond doubt, and until their deeds lend proof to words. This we can do and this we must do.

It is our nuclear airpower and the unity of our alliances that forced them to talk of peace and cutting arms, and it is nuclear airpower and our alliances that have been the target of their propaganda and their political efforts.

If we relinquish these arms, if we falter in attempting to hold the lead over them—or if we lose the strength of unity among our allies—then we throw away our best insurance for peace. For these reasons we must understand the power we have, and the power they have.

No matter how much the people of the world may dislike it, nuclear weapons are here to stay. They are a part of our existence. They are a product of progress. Nucleonics brought not only weapons, but a new horizon for civilization. It can create industrial revolution all over the globe. The air age is sharing the stage with the nucleonic age.

This fact, and the emergence of atomic industries, does not give cause for fear. Nor does the existence of atomic weapons threaten our security. What does threaten us is this: These weapons are in the hands of immoral leaders bent on world domination—and they are building the means to deliver these weapons anywhere against the free world.

This ability to deliver these weapons is the decisive point. We have had new evidence of this in recent days. Weather interfered with the May Day show in Moscow and they paraded only ground forces and new tanks. But in the many rehearsals over Red Square before May Day and before this year's anniversary of V–E Day, the Soviets gave evidence of their growing might in the air.

The models and numbers of modern jet bombers were impressive. The Reds displayed a new supersonic day fighter in operational numbers and a new all-weather fighter also in operational numbers. Both of these are significant developments in a defensive force.

But more important, there was evidence that they are developing and producing the planes for a mighty bomber force, an offensive force that could strike us.

Last year they showed a completely new medium bomber. We had expected that they might develop such an aircraft. They showed us enough of them to make us realize that they had not only developed this bomber, they were already producing it in numbers.

This year they showed us something new again. The Soviets turned out an aircraft powered with turboprops. From its appearance it could be a bomber, a refueling tanker, or a long-range reconnaissance plane. Its appearance is additional proof of the growing ability of the Soviet aircraft industry.

The airplane that gives us real reason for concern here in the United States is the Soviet long-range jet heavy bomber. Last year they showed us one. This year, in the rehearsals for May Day, there were flights of more of these new long-range jets, enough that we have to accept a rate of production.

These observations establish a new basis of our estimate of Soviet production of the heavy jet bomber and the medium jet bomber. This knowledge is evidence of the modern technology of the Soviet aircraft industry and the advances which are being made by them. We must continue to be on the alert and maintain our own forces to insure the lead over the Soviets that we have.

We are producing a heavy jet bomber of our own, the B–52. We have a lot of experience in building big bombers, but it looks as though the Soviets are improving in production. However, we have an expanding production platform here in the United States.

This isn't the first time the Soviets have upset the timetable. For example, we thought they could not duplicate our B–29 in less than 6 or 7 years. They duplicated it in 2 years.

We thought they would have difficulty in making a good copy of the British jet engine. They produced a better one in less than a year.

Some experts thought they could not produce an atomic bomb in less than 6 to 10 years, if at all. They rocked the world with a surprise explosion in about 3 years. This was about the same time it took the United States to produce the first atomic weapon.

They do have the ability to produce nuclear weapons and first-class aircraft to carry them.

On our side we have large stocks of weapons and a first-rate Air Force. What happens when the Soviets reach the stage when they have enough bombs to create great destruction in the United States and the remainder of the free world?

There have been many theories. One theory that has become popular is that when the Soviets have a certain number of weapons and aircraft we arrive at a condition of stalemate. Nuclear stalemate or atomic stalemate have been the terms used to describe this situation.

Before anyone accepts this stalemate theory he should consider some facts of history. For many years there has been enough TNT in the world to kill everybody in it. For hundreds of years there have been sufficient weapons for each side to completely destroy the other. And if any war had been fought endlessly, that is what would have happened.

It is also a fact of history that no nation has ever endured the destruction that our Air Force can deliver in a matter of days. No nation in history has ever taken one-tenth as much without surrendering.

There is nothing in history to indicate that stalemate is possible. When great stocks of weapons are achieved the ability to deliver them effectively then becomes the decisive factor. The offensive ability and the defensive capacity of both sides come into the picture. These are changing constantly. In a changing situation like this, how can stalemate occur?

Under these conditions our problem is to stay ahead—to keep the lead.

How much of a lead do we need?

Of course that depends upon our objective. It is not the objective of our national policy only to defeat an enemy if he attacks us. This means our lead must be so substantial that it reaches the minds of men in the Kremlin—and convinces even those power-hungry leaders that it would be futile to resort to war.

I recognize that superior power is no all-embracing solution. Many factors, including spiritual and moral factors, are essential to peace. But so far, we have discovered no reliable way to do away with the need for physical strength—to disarm—and still be able to preserve our freedom.

As a result of recent Soviet proposals, disarmament has become a prominent topic. It is not the function of a military leader to render national decisions on this latest Soviet plan to disarm.

It is important, however, to recall the record of proposals and agreements made by the Communists in the past. The Soviets have been talking loudly about disarmament since 1948. This date is significant for it also marks the beginning of current growth of Soviet air power. As their talk becomes louder, their air force grows faster and larger.

We should all recognize that the Soviet plan is aimed at the keystones of our strength. It seeks to abolish military bases on foreign territory and it seeks to dismantle the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It purports to ban nuclear weapons.

The Soviet plan argues that armies, navies, and air forces must be gathered in large assembly areas before they can attack. With the weapons of today, and more important, with the weapons of tomorrow, this is not the case.

We devoutly hope that disarmament, in some practical form, can be achieved. But until talk of disarmament matures into some enforceable plan we must continue to build our strength. We must not allow talk of disarmament to lead us into disarming ourselves—psychologically or physically, while our enemies continue to build their military power.

Many people talk about disarmament. But the practical problems of enforcing it are most difficult. Even the latest Soviet proposal realizes that stores of nuclear weapons can be hidden beyond detection.

The Soviets have long argued for a ban on nuclear weapons. This is understandable for our nuclear air power has been the main obstacle to Communist aims. We must all understand what such a ban would mean, it would give the Communists tremendous advantage. It would mean complete reorganization of our Armed Forces and a great increase in men and money required to offset the power the Reds have today.

To give up our nuclear weapons, unless all arms were truly banned, would mean victory for the Communists. Conservatively, it would mean that we would have to substantially increase our land forces, and our tactical air and naval forces. We would have to triple, and to be reasonably safe guadruple, our Strategic Air Command. This would require a defense budget of billions larger than it is now, and I doubt that we could achieve it without some form of mobilization. Even then the security of important areas of Europe and Asia could not be assured.

Nuclear air power is the vital element of modern military power, and it is vital to our security here in the United States. However, great the appeal of a ban on nuclear weapons, without them we would be relatively weakened. Even with nuclear air power on both sides, the dangers we face are not as great.

This is the condition we face today. The military task of war prevention and protection is a vast one. We must maintain our power, particularly nuclear air power in such quantity and quality that the Communists will be unable to gain their aims by military force. We must be able to prevent him from knocking out our striking force and weapons with a surprise attack.

This does not mean we have to be a nation armed to the teeth. Our present program was a sound one under the conditions that existed when it was made. I am confident we are ahead today.

However, these new Soviet advances in air power must be taken into account in the

continuous review of our air strength. Our production base for additional effort is available and our output can be stepped up if required.

Unless we have enough forces in being ready for modern war, we invite Communist attack. In a war with today's weapons we must be ready because the opening battle for the air could decide the outcome of the whole war.

We cannot depend on men brought in and weapons to be produced after war starts. Mobilization after D-Day is not good enough. Industrial potential to be used after war begins has lost significance.

The ties of power and peace give us but one choice. We must stay ahead to remain free. This requires us to be ahead in the development, production, and delivery of the most powerful weapons, by the most rapid and effective means.

There is no other choice we can make. We have been pushed into this struggle by Communist effort. There is no turning back. We must have power for peace.

Air Force Mixup Over Russ Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD Drew Pearson's article for May 24.

The reason I am inserting Mr. Pearson's article in the RECORD is that only a few days ago the House passed the defense appropriations bill. During the course of debate much was said about the importance of air power in the event of another war. It was even said that the next war—with atomic and nuclear weapons—might be a very short war, lasting only a few days.

I am not a military expert, but I am concerned about our defense preparations and the ability to defend ourselves. That is why I read with interest and grave concern Mr. Pearson's article on conflicting views of Russian air strength. I recommend the article to my colleagues, the full text of which follows:

Here is the amazing inside story of the Air Force mixup over whether we are ahead of Russia or Russia is ahead of us in airpower.

Called before a closed-door Senate committee meeting, Gen. Nathan Twining, Chief of Staff for Air, and Gen. Woodbury Burgess, Chief of Air Force Intelligence, both denied that Russia was ahead of the United States.

However, here is what happened before they walked in to face the Senators.

Earlier, General Twining had prepared a speech to be delivered in Los Angeles on Armed Forces Day, May 21, giving a solemn warning that Russia had made terrific progress and might be forging ahead of the United States in airpower.

On the same day, Secretary of the Air Force Harold Talbott also planned to deliver a blockbuster speech warning the American people that we were falling behind Russia.

However, he was called off by President Eisenhower and Secretary of Defense Wilson. Both had recently denied that the United States was falling behind Russia, and Talbott was told that a speech by him to the contrary would not be politic.

SPEECHES ARE SCRAPPED

Talbott meanwhile had heard of Twining's proposed speech at Los Angeles and called the Air Force Chief in. He did not order Twining to change his speech. But he did say he'd got word from Secretary Wilson not to alarm the public, and that, accordingly, he, Talbott, had rewritten his speech. He also pointed out that he and Twining would be in the embarrassing position of giving opposite speeches on the same day unless Twining also rewrote his speech.

It was further recalled that Senator SYMINGTON, the Missouri Democrat and Secretary for Air in the Truman administration, had publicly charged that the United States was falling behind Russia. For General Twining to side with SYMINGTON, therefore, would be highly embarrassing to the Eisenhower administration.

So General Twining tore up his Los Angeles speech and wrote a new one.

While this was going on in Washington, General Burgess, Intelligence Chief of the Continental Air Defense Command, made his now famous speech in Detroit stating in effect that Russia air might be ahead of the United States.

JETS OVER MOSCOW

Burgess and Symington, together with Twining and Talbott, had based their worry on the jet bombers United States observers had seen in Russia. This column first reported on April 26 that "the power pendulum is swinging over toward Soviet Russia as far as air strength is concerned. * * * This May Day the Russians will have 15 giant type 37 jets. In contrast we had 2 B–52 jet bombers of the same size a year ago. Today we have only three. In other words, the Russians are outproducting us 14 to 1."

Ten days later this was confirmed by a Defense Department spokesman. On May 18, however, Eisenhower said just the opposite.

"It is just not true," he told a press conference, that we "have lost in a twinkling" all our great technical advantages.

General Burgess, however, is an intelligence officer who knew what the intelligence reports were from Moscow. He also knew that the Russian pilots had flown their new jets right over the American Embassy 13 times, virtually thumbing their noses at the American Ambassador. So he gave an unvarnished speech before the American Legion in Detroit.

Actually his facts were correct and his conclusions were correct. But he got an immediate call from General Twining in Washington.

"If you'd said it 2 weeks ago, or if you'd said it 2 weeks later, it might have been all right," the Air Force Chief said. "But coming at this time, you've got us into trouble."

WHAT DID BURGESS SAY?

General Burgess then went with General Twining and Secretary Talbott to face the Senate Armed Services Committee where in secret session he claimed the Associated Press had misquoted him. This column is able to reveal what he told the Senators he had said in Detroit.

"The Russians are not 12 feet tall with an A-bomb in both hands," General Burgess said he said. "They are also not 3 feet tall. Actually they're 5 feet 10 inches tall and weigh 175 pounds. We should neither overestimate nor underestimate them. They're just as smart as we are and maybe smarter."

Those present at the Detroit meeting claim Burgess further stated:

"They have an air force just as good as ours or maybe better."

Rescue the Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial that appeared in the Washington Post on Wednesday, May 25, 1955, entitled "Rescue the Reserves":

RESCUE THE RESERVES

The Armed Forces Reserve bill must be rescued if future American military strength is not to suffer a damaging blow. The bill is now stalled in the House after the Powell antisegregation amendments gave a field day to those who wanted to destroy the measure anyhow. Hope that the Senate will extricate the House from its dilemma by tacking the Reserve bill onto the draft extension now seems remote. In the circumstances the House must do its own repair work if this essential move to backstop the Regular Armed Forces is to become law.

Perhaps Mr. POWELL himself was surprised to see the antisegregation amendments adopted so easily. The explanation, of course, is they offered a convenient weapon to those who do not believe in a compulsory Reserve. To accomplish a perfectly laudable purpose—avoidance of the use of Federal authority to compel reservists to train in racially segregated units—the Powell efforts unhappily injected a civil rights and States rights issue into a military bill. State control of the National Guard in peacetime, rightly or wrongly, is a jealously guarded prerogative, and the amendments make the bill unpalatable to a number of southerners. Ironically, the amendments are superfluous from the standpoint of the Defense Department's existing integration policy. Meanwhile, the isolationist Bow amendment adopted simultaneously would prohibit the sending of men conscripted or inducted to countries where local governments may try American soldiers for civil crimes. This would place the Armed Forces under an impossible handicap.

Chairman VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee, is an able legislative strategist, and perhaps he has a plan up his sleeve. Two steps are necessary, it seems to us, in order to unsnarl the bill. The first is for the House to set aside the Powell amendments and the Bow amendment. The second is for the Defense Department to give firm and unequivocal assurance that it will not compel reservists to serve in segregated units. Stronger emphasis will be required on this point than Secretary Wilson gave yesterday.

These difficulties will not be easy to rectify. But it ought to be obvious to everyone sincerely concerned with the civil-rights aspect that an antisegregation move which resulted in defeat of the bill would be a Pyrrhic victory. The great need now is for House Members to rise above personal political concerns and look at the broader objective. If the bill were to be smothered, this would not lessen the necessary reliance on the Reserves in an emergency. The result would be merely to place the burden on men who have already served and send them forth anew untrained. If legislators can be persuaded of the enormous injustice in this kind of gamble, we are confident that they will rally to pass the Reserve bill unhampered.

Ancient Fort Stands at Cusseta, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, Hon. P. O. Davis, of Auburn, Ala., has sent to me a most interesting article, which appeared in the Columbus Ledger under date of January 5, 1930, and written by Fred G. Storey, about an ancient fort built in the days of the Revolutionary War at Cusseta, in Chambers County, Ala. Those who are interested in the history of our country will enjoy reading this story:

[From the Columbus Ledger of January 5, 1930]

ANCIENT FORT STANDS AT CUSSETA, ALA.

(By Fred G. Storey)

(It is known to have been in existence about 1800, but history would indicate its construction probably in Revolutionary days, something about the early days of Cusseta.)

A grim relic of early and stirring days in western Alabama stands at Cusseta, Ala. While many stories are told of how it served the people of a once busy settlement no one seems to know the year in which it was constructed.

Its age is believed to extend beyond the days of the American Revolution. A citizen of Cusseta who died 30 years ago was 94 years old at the time of his death. He could remember the same building being there since he was a little child. This would make the fort at least 110 years old. But since it seems to have existed before this it must be considerably older.

This history of this part of Alabama would seem to furnish need for the fort as early as 1764 when there was considerable trouble with Indians.

What is now Alabama was severely pinched between the British province of Illinois and West Florida. Spain was weakening in North America and Florida was ceded by the Spaniards to the British. The King of England decreed that the northern line of west Florida should reach to latitude 32 degrees north. This brought it to a point between Columbus and Old Fort Mitchell and lines ran from there south to Apalachicola and west to the Mississippi. The province of Illinois came southward overlapping what is now north Alabama.

Indians were numerous in all three territories. The redskins were furnished arms and encouraged to attack the settlers in what is now known as Alabama, before the Revolutionary War.

Western Alabama was a rich territory and Cusseta, a center destined to become one of no mean importance. It was natural the people of the community should maintain the law "to have and to hold" and that they should fortify themselves for protection against raids and raiders.

Here it can be conjectured the Cusseta fort was built. Its construction was no haphazard or hurry job. It was built to endure, showing that the people of the community expected to need defense for a long, long time. It was not a hurry job because every piece of pine timber in it was carefully and smoothly handmade. There is scarcely the mark of the axe on the timbers which are about 6 inches thick, and laid one upon the other like dressed stone. Inside the fort was walled and ceiled. Of course there were port holes all around it through which the defenders could kill, or drive back the enemy. There was also an upstairs to it. Here women and children were placed for protection. Since the old days it has been weatherboarded, and at some time windows cut in it.

One can imagine some of the tension and fear among women and children during these raids. They were huddled in the attic of the fort while the men in grim determination fought off murderous attacks by Indians. The Indian's lands had been virtually taken away from him and he was bent on making the whites pay the highest price for them in blood and massacre.

Cusseta was in line with the most stirring of the Indian troubles. It was in the Tennessee to Florida path of Jackson's war on the redskins. The different tribes further north became more desperate as they were driven south and their numbers added to by rebels gathered along the retreat.

The hustling community had need to build a strong fort, because, from the probable date of its construction, many years of danger lay ahead. The city had its full share of troubles when the Indians were being forced to move west of the Mississippi.

How well the fort was built is shown today by an examination of its stout timbers. It resisted attempts to set fire to it as well as every other aggressive attack.

The fort was not used when the Union Army came through. Cusseta was then a place of considerable size. It was larger than Opelika. It was the trading center for a radius of many miles. Lafayette merchants and planters hauled freight and wares from Cusseta. The city had 7 drygoods stores, 7 or 8 bars, 2 large hotels, 2 livery stables. It had a large and prosperous population. Also a daily stage coach to Lafayette, a city which long ago outstripped it in commerce, population, and importance.

The city had two academies, a female academy on the south side of the city in charge of Rev. Dr. Williams, a Baptist minister, and a male academy on the north side of the city, conducted by Prof. T. L. Scott. These thrived up until the War Between the States.

The settlement was surrounded by many rich plantations and the owners sent their boys and girls to these academies. The young men came to school on horseback, and many of the girls came in carriages driven by ebony servants. These schools lent much gaiety and grandeur to life in Cusseta. They brought prosperity to the stores, which were up to the minute of their times for such a community. The commencements of the schools crowded the city with life—youthful happiness and aged pride.

An interesting incident, or rather the end, is told of the male academy during the War Between the States. A troop of Union cavalry was marching into Cusseto apparently not bent on any serious destruction. The horses had the swing of tired animals while the riders were quiet as after a long ride. The male academy was on a hill to their right. Suddenly a shot rang out, coming from the direction of the male academy. An uncle of Mr. T. T. Meadows had resented the invasion. From a corner of the academy he put his musket to his shoulder and fired into the invading cavalrymen. Although the bullet was not felt it was plainly heard by the blue warriors.

Instantly the tired horses jumped to the spur and the whole troop wheeled and raced up the hill, surrounded the academy, believing they had the sniper in a ring. The cavalry officers demanded that he surrender. There was no doubt that the Unionists intended to make an example of the rebel.

The ambusher had carefully planned his attack and safe retreat. After giving him a reasonable time to surrender, the cavalrymen put a torch to the building and it was soon smoldering ashes.

The sniper lived to tell of his exploit long afterward. The cavalrymen, as a good measure of punishment for the assault, also burned the depot at Cusseta.

The Federal Government afterward paid Scott for the damage at the academy, Scott, it is said, having claimed to be a Union sympathizer.

Another famous place at Cusseta was Black's store. It was situated on the northern edge of the city. It was a great trading place for the Indians. They had much to offer in the way of skins and other products of the chase, and Black became quite wealthy by this trade. He was more than friendly with the Indians, a feeling which they are said to have reciprocated. This was in the latter days of the Indians' presence in this section of Alabama. Through this influence, Black is believed to have saved the people of Cusseta some Indian troubles they might otherwise have had. The Black store also did a big business with planters, and the building stood on the hill for many years after its owner had passed away.

Indian names abound around Cusseta, itself named for the tribe that lived in its locality. The creeks and landmarks in the vicinity bear Indian names such as Osinippa Creek, Wild Cow Creek, and others. The Indians gave the name to the latter stream because of the many wild cows they encountered there. These animals of domestic ownership had been allowed to roam so long and so far way from their corrals they were as ready to attack an intruder as to take flight.

For many years after the war of the sixties Cusseta held commercial and social prominence, but the freeing of the slaves reduced the operation of plantations far from anything like the prewar scale. The men who had been masters of these estates were neither fitted physically nor by training to carry on the former work. The young likewise were unfitted for such work, not that they were unwilling to do it, but they were unequal to it. The destructive war had doubled the great effort to produce from the land a simple living. The young people drifted away from the land to remold their lives to other locations and callings.

But this was not all that caused the shrinking of Cusseta. Part of it came later when the Atlanta and West Point Railroad was built. While the railroad passed through Cusseta, it also touched Opelika and made the latter place the important shipping point it has become. Much of the trade that had formerly come to Cusseta now went to Opelika.

It is said that Oak Bowery, near Cusseta, was on the original railroad survey. In fact, some grading toward the former place is still in eixstence as the truth of the statement. However, the people of Oak Bowery, which was also a thriving community, objected to the road coming into it. Then it was that the road was changed to pass through Opelika, and from which the latter city has greatly prospered.

Cusseta is today a city of some 250 inhabitants, who seem happy and contented. They have much history to be proud of and find pleasure in reminisances of former days of grandeur and prosperity. How old the city is this writer did not learn, because no one we could find knew the age of the old fort, and the city must have had a considerable period of existence before the defense was built.

Resolution Opposing Pay TV Passed by CBS Television Primary Affiliates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I

would like to have printed a resolution opposing pay TV passed at the first general conference of CBS Television Affiliates on Thursday, May 19, 1955, at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York City:

Whereas in less than a decade American free home television has developed from infancy to the greatest medium of mass communication ever created, providing a nationwide service to 97 percent of the American people;

Whereas under the American system of free television service, the American public has been brought the world's outstanding entertainment along with great public events as they occur, as well as news, discussions, and public affairs;

Whereas the American people have placed their unmistakable stamp of approval on this system by investing $13½ billion for some 37 million television receivers and by watching, on an average, over 5 hours a day per family;

Whereas these purchases were made by the American people in the unchallenged expectation that the present method would be continued and that no further expenditure would be required by them in order to see the programs broadcast in each area;

Whereas a free system is basic to the American method of broadcasting and has unquestionably proven its success and its public acceptance;

Whereas any system which would require the public to pay for programs broadcast over the air would be wholly inconsistent with the history of American broadcasting, would divide the American people by barring programs to those who could not afford them, would use the channels of free air which are currently broadcasting free programs to the public and would inevitably subtract from, if not fatally injure, present free service: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the CBS television affiliates oppose the proposals to authorize the use of the spectrum for pay-as-you-see television, and urge CBS to assume leadership for the preservation of the present American system of free home service.

H. R. 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to send out reprints of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 5, 1955. These reprints will not be printed at Government expense and will include excerpts of the debate on the Laird amendment to H. R. 12.

In adition to the remarks which were made by me, I have been given permission to include remarks of the following Members of Congress who participated in the debate on the Laird dairy amendment:

Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES, Republican, Member of Congress from the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin. Representative BYRNES is a member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Hon. VICTOR A. KNOX, Republican, Member of Congress from the 11th Congressional District of Michigan. Representative KNOX is a member of the Government Operations Committee.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, Member of Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of North Carolina. Representative COOLEY is the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Hon. W. R. POAGE, Democrat, Member of Congress from the 11th Congressional District of Texas. Representative POAGE is vice chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Hon. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Democrat, Member of Congress from the First Congressional District of Mississippi. Representative ABERNETHY is a member of the House Agriculture Committee and chairman of the Dairy Subcommittee.

A Word of Praise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, generally speaking, veterans are very critical of the benefits received from the Veterans' Administration. It is indeed refreshing to occasionally receive a word of praise for the personnel who dispense these benefits. In that connection, I am very pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following letter I have received from Mr. Sidney Contess, a veteran constituent of mine, who has been undergoing treatment in the Veterans' Administration hospital at Sunmount, N. Y.:

SUNMOUNT, N. J., *May 23, 1955.*

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: First of all, let it be understood that I ask for no favors or special consideration for myself or anyone else.

I am a patient at the Veterans' Administration hospital at Sunmount, N. Y., and have been here for some 14 months because of a service-connected disability incurred during World War II.

This letter wasn't prompted or suggested by anyone, except the dictates of my own conscience. I wish to express my gratitude to a group of people at this hospital, and feel the best way to do so is in this manner.

I want to thank the educational therapy department and Mrs. F. Glogan in particular for trying to put me back on the right path to a more useful life through a better education. My thanks also to Dr. M. Lambie, my ward doctor, Miss G. Lynch, ward nurse, and to Mrs. A. Jacobsen, of the occupational therapy department for bringing out a dormant talent in the manual arts. My appreciation also goes to the special services department, Mr. J. Birmingham, and Mr. L. Davis, who had enough patience to show me how to operate the hospital radio station.

There are a group of people who I think come into a special category. They are the volunteer organizations, such as the VFW, American Legion, DAV, Masons, Rotary Club, Jewish Welfare Board, and many others. As for the individual volunteer who has done a great amount of work for the patients over the years, my warm thanks to Mrs. M. Ginsberg, of Tupper Lake, N. Y.

I could probably go on like this for a long time. There are so many people whose names I don't even know, but who have made my recovery a lot easier than it would have been otherwise.

As I said before, these are a good bunch of people, and I think the taxpayers are getting a good value for their dollar here at Sunmount Veterans' Hospital.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY CONTESS.

Statement by Hon. Norris Poulson, Mayor of the City of Los Angeles, to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, March 24, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I want to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following statement made to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by the Honorable Norris Poulson, mayor of the great city of Los Angeles.

For many years Mayor Poulson served in Congress as the Representative from the same district which I now have the honor to represent. He also served in the State legislature, and now that he has become the chief executive officer of the third largest city in the country, he is adding experience in municipal government to his already extensive training in the field of State and Federal affairs.

Mayor Poulson is therefore eminently qualified to discuss Federal legislation, such as the proposed amendment of the Natural Gas Act, which will have a vital effect upon the people of our city and State.

Mr. Speaker, in his statement, Mayor Poulson makes a point which is of great concern to all of us who have constituents in California. He points out that our State is now dependent on other States for more than half of its natural gas supply, even though we are the fourth greatest gas producing State. He warns that our dependency on an out-of-State supply will continue to increase as our population grows and our gas production declines.

No one can successfully challenge his statement that it is essential to California's welfare that legislation be enacted which will continue to encourage the flow of natural gas in interstate commerce at a price that has proven to be fair.

I commend his statement to all the Members of this House and particularly to my colleagues from California.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. NORRIS POULSON, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, MARCH 24, 1955

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Norris Poulson and I am mayor of the city of Los Angeles. I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear before you and because I served for several years as a Member of the House of

Representatives, you may be sure that I will respect your wish that my testimony be as brief as possible. I know from experience how limited your time is.

I am here to testify in support of the Fulbright bill (S. 1853) to amend the Natural Gas Act and I do so because I am convinced that legislation of the type proposed by Senator FULBRIGHT—and by my former colleagues in the House, Oren Harris and Carl Hinshaw—is essential if the gas consumers in the city which I represent are to be assured of a dependable supply at a price that will continue to be fair.

But before I dwell on the importance of this legislation with respect to the specific situation in California, I want first to endorse it on grounds of general principle in the strongest language I can command.

Federal regulation—in peacetime—of the production price of any commodity is wrong. This Nation became strong and great without it and can only be weakened drastically by the application of it to our present free economy. Now, however, the seed which will produce this unwelcome growth has been planted by the Supreme Court decision in the Phillips case; and if we permit that seed to sprout, we will one day reap a bitter and fatal fruit.

In my judgment, the only safe answer to this threat is to enact legislation which meets the objectives of the Fulbright-Harris-Hinshaw bill.

The people of my city are very genuinely concerned about the fate of this legislation because, while California is one of the larger gas-producing States, for the purposes of this legislation it is very much a gas-consuming State. We are now dependent upon other States for about half of our natural-gas supply and our dependence on out-of-State sources will become greater very quickly because of our tremendous population growth and because natural-gas production in California is on the decline.

I feel that your record should include the following statistics relating to the natural-gas industry in California. This information was supplied to me by industry sources at my request:

1. Imports of natural gas from other States went from nothing in 1946 to 357 billion cubic feet in 1953. That is about 40 percent of the State's total consumption. For 1954 it is estimated to be 49.7 percent.

2. Total consumption in California jumped from 487 billion cubic feet in 1946 to 888 billion cubic feet in 1953.

3. Marketed production from California wells has increased by only 44 billion cubic feet—from 487 billion cubic feet in 1946 to 531 billion cubic feet in 1953.

4. In 1946, California discovered 803 billion cubic feet of natural gas; in 1953, discoveries totaled only 50 billion cubic feet.

5. Reserves declined from about 11 trillion cubic feet at the end of 1946 to about 9 trillion cubic feet at the close of 1953.

Price controls at the production level, in addition to being wrong in principle, would have serious effects upon the supply situation in California, where the number of gas customers has increased 50 percent between 1946 and 1953. Such controls would shrink the total supply of natural gas because it would destroy the incentive which gas producers have found necessary to the continuous exploration and development which must go on to keep supply ahead of demand.

We in California know that any shrinkage of the total supply will mean an even sharper reduction in the supply available to us, because we are no longer self-sufficient. We can understand that producers may prefer to market their remaining reserves locally, where they will be free from Federal control. We can understand why many industries which need a cheap fuel supply may find it advantageous to move to States where their supply of natural gas will not be restricted by Federal price fixing.

Furthermore, if the supply available for interstate markets is reduced, that means that the unit cost of sending the remaining supply into interstate commerce inevitably will increase. And at least part of the increase will have to be passed on to the consumers of my State.

The importance of this situation is such that, in my judgment, every public official in California has the duty to urge you and the other Members of this Congress to create, by legislative action, an economic climate in which the natural-gas industry can continue to operate in the public interest.

A moment ago I spoke of my deep devotion to the principle of nonregulation by the Federal Government. I might wish, as does Senator FULBRIGHT, that the legislation before you could be limited to a straightforward prohibition on the Federal control of natural-gas prices at the wellhead. However, the practicalities of the situation are that the President's Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy has recommended otherwise and it therefore seems to be the better part of wisdom to follow the legislative path which this White House report has marked out.

In following this report, this legislation—as I read it—does exempt the producers of natural gas from direct price controls by the Federal Power Commission. But other sections of the bill—if I understand them correctly—impose a new set of terms and conditions under which the pipeline companies may do business with the producers and these conditions provide very effective indirect controls upon the producer's price. Again, I understand, these new terms and conditions follow precisely the recommendations of the President's committee.

Now, if that is the correct analysis of this bill it appears to me that this bill is not being accurately described when it is called—as it almost always is—simply a bill to exempt the independent producers of natural gas from Federal regulation.

In my judgment, it comes closer to being a "consumer amendment" than a "producer amendment." For, while it does relieve the producer from the kind of direct utility type regulation which eventually would strangle the interstate movement of natural gas which is so important to California, at the same time it provides the consumer with a "4 ply" protection which would far surpass anything that he has heretofore enjoyed. Here are the consumer's safeguards, as I see them, in this legislation:

(1) The continued regulation, by State or local agencies, of the gas-distributing companies.

(2) The continued regulation of the interstate pipeline companies by the Federal Power Commission.

(3) A return to the extremely effective protection of a competitive market at the production level which for 17 years prior to the Phillips case decision kept field prices of natural gas at a low level while the overall cost of living was going up sharply.

(4) The new terms and conditions of section 2 of the Fulbright-Harris-Hinshaw bill which will provide the definite brake against runaway prices.

Mr. Chairman, part of my purpose in coming here today was to do whatever I could to dispel any impression to the effect that all of the mayors of the larger cities are opposed to this legislation. I have just been to New York for the annual meeting of the United States Conference of Mayors and my observation is that not even most—much less all—of the mayors there wanted to see the natural gas industry placed in Federal chains.

While I will not presume to speak for my colleagues who are on the same side as I—or against those who differ with me—I would urge those who have not been heard to tell you how they feel. In California alone, the governments of more than 20 of our larger cities already are on record in support of the Fulbright-Harris-Hinshaw bill, either by action of the city council or the mayor—or both. While I am not authorized to speak for these governments, I do feel free to leave with you this list of cities where such action has been taken:

Anaheim, Alhambra, Compton, Glendale, Huntington Beach, Pomona, Riverside, Santa Ana, Santa Barbara, South Gate, San Mateo, Stockton, San Diego, San Bernardino, and Ventura.

Mr. Chairman, again I thank you and the members of this committee for giving me your time and attention.

United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Massachusetts State Council

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter and copy of the resolution that was unanimously adopted at the 57th annual convention of the Massachusetts State Council, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, at Springfield, Mass.

MASSACHUSETTS STATE COUNCIL,
UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS,
AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
Boston, Mass., May 23, 1955.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed please find copy of resolution that was unanimously adopted at our 57th annual convention held in Springfield, Mass., April 16 and 17, 1955.

It is our sincere hope that you will help in furthering this cause.

We feel that decent housing is a vital necessity for the morale of the citizens of this great Commonwealth.

Thanking you for the cooperation we have received from you in the past and for the future, I am

Very truly yours,
HAROLD CARDARETT,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION 4

Whereas the acute shortage of housing has become so alarming that the people of our country are in a state of grave concern about their means of adequate shelter in the present and the immediate future in Massachusetts and other parts of our Nation; and

Whereas private industry is unable or unwilling to meet this shortage of housing in a way that will provide the necessary facilities for the people in the various age and financial brackets, particularly the aging whose means of finance are limited to the old age assistance income that is available to them in a meager amount, and

Whereas there seems to be an unwillingness on the part of the authorities to properly meet the housing emergency regionally and nationally: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this convention of carpenters assembled in Springfield, Mass., record themselves in favor of a stepped-up housing program that will adequately meet the needs of our people; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution will be sent to the proper authorities, federally and locally, as may be required to implement these provisions into practical and immediate operations.

Addresses at Ground-Breaking Ceremonies for the Harry S. Truman Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, on May 8 it was my pleasure to be present at two fine events which took place in Jackson County, Mo. On that Mother's Day Sunday afternoon in Slover Park, Independence, Mo., were held the ground-breaking ceremonies for the Harry S. Truman Library.

That evening in the Muehlebach Hotel in Kansas City, Mo., hundreds of former President Truman's friends met at a dinner honoring him on the occasion of his 71st birthday.

In the afternoon the principal speaker was Dr. Elmer Ellis, president of the University of Missouri. In the evening the principal speaker was Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, chancellor of the University of Kansas. Both speeches were unusually fine and I include them herewith:

REMARKS OF ELMER ELLIS, PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE TRUMAN LIBRARY, MAY 8, 1955

We are met here today to break ground for a new scholarly and patriotic institution, dedicated to the use of the public. Here in Independence, where Missouri's President made his home and which has been associated in every way with his career, we are today beginning a foundation that at once will be a memorial to a distinguished statesman, a museum of great value in public education and a library of enormous usefulness to scholars of American and world history and politics.

Here will be collections of the arts, mementos of official and private life, replicas of a national shrine, the executive office in Washington, all intimately fonnected with the destiny that brought the man from Independence to the position of leadership in the greatest of nations at a gigantic crisis in the world's history. The man from Independence, his personality, his work and his fame will all be enshrined here in an American institution combining a museum with a great research library. Fortunately it will contain the complete set of his papers. This set will not be destroyed by unwise descendants as one President's was. Or by fire as were another's. Nor will they be permanently damaged by the separation of the so-called personal from the official papers as were Thomas Jefferson's by an unwise Congress. Nor will these treasures be kept hidden from historians for many years as have been still others.

One cannot overestimate the importance for scholarship of a collection of papers, complete as to the leader and extensive as to the times. Some years ago President Truman placed his senatorial papers in the western historical manuscript collections of the University of Missouri. There they remained until this location was selected as the depository for the presidential papers. While he had a clear legal right to the repossession of the senatorial papers, Mr. Truman insisted that he had given them to the University of Missouri, and they were the university's to do with as it pleased. To keep them would have given great prestige to the university because of their value for history. But I am proud to say that when I polled our historians, political scientists, and librarians they were unanimous in declaring that the senatorial papers belonged with the presidential papers, where they are today.

Today marks an important milestone in the building of this great memorial. But it is not enough, nor are we through. The Nation has a responsibility here that Independence and Missouri share. This is to complete and round out this entire project, not only as planned, but even on a larger scale.

There should be a continuing program looking toward expanding the museum aspects of the collection. In the next 100 years many items will come to light that will bear in important ways on President Truman's career. Most of these will be donated by owners, if properly approached; some will have to be purchased, for which funds will have to be kept available. Provisions must be made for this development in exhibit space in this building.

Some day there will center in this building a project for the publication of the letters of President Truman, much as we have recently completed or started the publication of the papers of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt. These are great, scholarly enterprises that put copies of the most essential manuscripts in every scholar's study. These publications are expensive, and are heavily underwritten by the Government or by private philanthropy. Questions of security and good taste will prevent a complete publication of letters until considerable time has passed, but in the meantime there will be small collections of selected papers edited and published.

Then there are grants to aid and encourage research in this period of American leadership. We can probably depend upon the great scholarly foundations to promote this objective, providing we do our part in making research here convenient and providing we set up an organization capable of administering such grants.

Most important of all is the great library supplementary to the Truman papers and personal library that must be created here if this is to become the great center of research and study that this notable collection of papers deserves. That collection should include everything available that relates to the period of the Second World War and the cold-war periods. It must include these:

1. Papers of as many Cabinet members and other close associates of Mr. Truman as it is possible to bring together. This is not something that is brought about by merely willing it. It takes difficult labor on the part of several people to get this done, and I have no doubt that we will be adding papers in this category although at a much reduced rate, 100 years from now.

2. Sets of the documents of all the governments of the world for the years 1935 to 1960, and with such others published subsequently that throw light upon the Truman period.

3. Microfilms of original files of the principal newspapers of the world for the same period.

4. Copies of histories and memoirs written in all languages, now and later, that deal in an important way with the Truman years.

5. Microfilms of unpublished research studies in university and government libraries which deal in an important manner with these same developments.

6. While these are the most important needs, we must also remember that historical study is not exclusively by periods. It is in a significant way also topical and cumulative. To study and understand the exercise of executive power from 1945 to 1953 we need to have extensive information on its exercise under previous Chief Executives of the United States, for in a real sense Harry S. Truman was the descendant of all the Presidents who had occupied that office before him, and what they did as history and precedent, had important relationships, both positive and negative, to what he did. Thus the library of all studies relating to the Presidency of the United States is an essential for completing this library.

In summary, what we need is first to complete our original plan in terms of building both library and museum.

After that, we must have a smaller continuing program of acquisitions both to the museum and the library, that will assist the national Archives and go beyond what it is apt or able to undertake. This will call for a permanent organization devoted to the growth and expansion of this institution to make it and keep it a dignified and useful memorial to Missouri's contribution to world statesmanship—a program that will insure a library that will grow in usefulness to scholars and indeed to all mankind, a benefactor of all research and scholarship.

Let us not set our sights low. Here is a cause and a project that offers the possibility of growing in importance with time. This occasion calls for dedication to the tasks remaining rather than merely congratulations on a start well made.

SPEECH BY FRANKLIN D. MURPHY, CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS, ON THE OCCASION OF A DINNER CELEBRATING THE 71ST BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF HARRY S. TRUMAN, MAY 8, 1955

The privilege of representing one's fellow citizens at this birthday dinner would be great enough honor for a Missourian,, but to ask a Kansan to come jayhawking over to Missouri on such a peaceful mission transcends all historical logic and must be due only to Mr. Truman's well-known tolerance and his determination to extinguish once and for all any residual embers of the border unpleasantness of the 1860's. I suppose still another reason for my participation, and that of my academic colleagues as well, relate to the feeling on the part of some that a library bears a relationship to a university, perhaps even as much a football team.

Whatever the reasons, however, I am delighted to be present to pay my respects to our distinguished neighbor, and particularly on the day of the start of the project so near to his heart.

This afternoon the turning of a spade full of earth set in motion a chain of events which will culminate in the opening of a great repository of material crucial to the understanding of our times—the Truman papers. For this accomplishment, the American people have many to thank—the thousands who by their contributions, large and small, made possible the construction of the building, the city of Independence, the National Archives, close friends and coworkers of Mr. Truman, and most important of all the well-developed sense of history which he possesses. From the beginning, I am sure that he more than anyone else has been able to visualize the stream of historians, political scientists, and just plain citizens, to whom the library will become a sine qua non in any effort to measure, put into perspective, and assess this complex part of a complex century. Appropriately located here on the Midwestern soil from which he sprang, of which he has always been properly prideful, this library represents a significant addi-

tion to the cultural and scholarly resources of mid-America as well as the Nation.

However, the library will have a symbolic function, a bit more difficult to define but perhaps even more important than its literal and practical usage. It will tell the story of the farm boy who became the freely elected President of the United States and thereby restate eloquently and by example the concept of opportunity for all our youth, regardless of position or economic status.

In the letters, papers, and documents, is to be found a complete and detailed case history of American political processes, never the most efficient, frequently cumbersome, often misunderstood, but, wondrous to behold, effectively serving the eternal objective of a free people—enlightened self government.

The American people will no doubt in future tense and troubled times, as now, require the vigorous reminder that free expression and the right of dissent within the basic ground rules of decency, fair play, and the Constitution, are absolutely crucial to the vitality of our democracy. The famous statement of Voltaire, "I may not agree with what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it," has never been translated into pure Americanese more effectively than by the acts and words of Mr. Truman.

Only he who consciously or subconsciously questions the validity of a system fears constant examination of that system. Mr. Truman's simple but dedicated faith in our American political systems has made it possible for him, along with Milton, not to worry about the outcome when truth and falsehood are pitted against each other. He has only been concerned that the ground rules in such a conflict be fair ones.

At a time when effective leadership of the free world means moral leadership, Mr. Truman's blunt insistence that man be measured by performance rather than prejudice was never more significant. All around this fermenting globe, proud and ancient peoples reach for their place in the human spectrum. They, of all colors, races and creeds, along with ourselves, have one basic common denominator—we are all God's children, and as such have the dignity of human beings. Mr. Truman's intolerance of bigotry in whatever form, religious, racial, or political, stems from his intuitive knowledge that a nation or a world can not achieve real freedom so long as second-class citizens exist for any reason. He has not fallen into the intellectual trap of feeling that mere material progress is the road to peace and security.

For me, and I believe for millions of others, this library and the man whose papers it will house, symbolize that which Jefferson called the genius of the people—all the people—with their human imperfections, their basic decency, their kindliness, their loyalties, their sense of fair play, their generosity, their faith, their capacity to govern themselves, and their sense of outrage at efforts by misguided or evil men to destroy their freedom and individuality or that of their neighbors.

Mr. President, I think the record is clear that political life sometimes leads to controversy, and I believe that a study of your life would not lead us to alter that view. I further suggest that there is every reason to believe that you are simply not constitutionally capable of just fading away but will continue to comment on public affairs, thus further enriching the stacks of the library with your characteristic brand of pure Americana.

From childhood, one of my special heroes has been that wise and intuitive American, Benjamin Franklin. In the 18th century, in a letter to one of his friends, the great chemist, Joseph Priestley, he penned some thoughts that you have been voicing to a 20th-century America, often too preoccupied with gadgets, bombs, motorcars, and home permanents to listen. The sagacious old Franklin, with uncanny prescience, wrote: "The rapid progress true science now makes, occasions my regretting sometimes that I was born so soon. It is impossible to imagine the height to which may be carried, in a thousand years, the power of man over matter. We may perhaps learn to deprive large masses of their gravity, and give them absolute levity, for the sake of easy transport. Agriculture may diminish its labor and double its produce; and all diseases may by sure means be prevented or cured, not excepting even that of old age, and our lives lengthened at pleasure, beyond even the antediluvian standard. O that moral science were in as fair a way of improvement, that men would cease to be wolves to one another, and that human beings would at length learn what they now improperly call humanity."

I take the liberty of not only wishing you happy birthday, but also presume to express our collective gratitude for the gift of your papers to our country. They will forever stand as a permanent and meaningful example of your notable efforts to have men cease to be wolves to one another so that humanity may be given even fresher and fuller meaning. Many happy returns of the day sir—71 to to be exact.

Ohio Business Firm Assists in Salk Vaccination Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from one of my constituents is an excellent example of the manner in which business enterprises might assist in the Salk vaccination of schoolchildren. I am pleased to place it in the RECORD so that it may have widespread publication in the hope that their plan might be followed by other private organizations in other communities:

THE NATIONAL MACHINERY CO.,
Tiffin, Ohio, May 10, 1955.

Hon. JACKSON E. BETTS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BETTS: We call your attention to the attached memorandum which has been posted on our plant bulletin board in connection with antipolio vaccine.

In the National Machinery family there are 1,000 children in line for antipolio inoculations and we deem it a privilege to underwrite the entire cost. Without even being invited, several local doctors have volunteered to work with us on a no-charge basis.

This may strike you as a rather unusual way of going about an all-important problem, but here is our procedure. We learned it through having the bloodmobile visit our plant in the same fashion—everyone pitches in and the result is 197 pints of blood in 6 hours. This is an Ohio record.

We plan to have our 1,000 children inoculated in the National Machinery recreation rooms during regular working hours. The mothers will bring the children to the plant and the father will leave his work and have his hand on his child's shoulder while it receives an inoculation which may save its life.

The polio vaccine program has hit our people with tremendous impact. Our way of handling the program has quieted everyone, and the dollar problem has been entirely removed.

As freemen, the employees and our company go hand in hand, get big things done, and go places together.

We thought you'd like to know of our efforts. Perhaps it may be the birth of an idea that could work nationwide.

Respectfully,
THE NATIONAL MACHINERY CO.,
J. H. FRIEDMAN, *President.*

REA's Odd Birthday Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following editorial, which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on May 20, 1955:

The Rural Electrification Administration celebrates its 20th anniversary under strange circumstances. Because it has been so brilliant a success, it is now engaged in a fight for its life.

Those shortsighted citizens who saw no need for REA 20 years ago see no need for it to continue now that 92 percent of the Nation's farms are connected to powerlines. They affect not to realize that the surface has barely been scratched in the use of electricity on farms for more productive, more profitable farming, and more pleasant living. They dismiss as only a small statistic the more than 400,000 farms that still lack electricity entirely.

So, the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government announces that REA's job is finished. It proposes to return the financing of rural electrification to private lenders, whose failure to do anything about it—along with the majority of private power companies—was what caused REA to be created.

In the Eisenhower administration, as well as in the Hoover Commission, the battle to kill REA is on. Loans for new generating facilities and transmission lines are virtually nonexistent. Public power systems are told by the Interior Department to seek the increased power supplies they need, and its transmission, from privately owned power companies—"to negotiate with a gun at their heads," as Senator MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, puts it. The preference clause, which enables public systems to get any publicly produced power at all—the private companies still get the bulk of it—is under attack in the administration.

Here in our own part of the country, five cooperatives in Missouri and Oklahoma which generate and transmit power in the area of the Southwestern Power Administration are in danger of being bankrupted, with $75 million invested, by the Administration's breach of their contract for exchange of power with SPA.

This is the dark picture the shortsighted like to see. The picture of the future which the longer sighted have in mind is better to look at. American farm homes are expected to double their consumption in the next 10 years and triple it in the next 20. For every dollar spent in bringing power to the farm, three or four dollars will be spent by the farmer for wiring, plumbing, and electric appliances.

While it is estimated that between nine and twelve billion dollars has been spent for these purposes on electrified farms so far, the bulk of the stimulation to the appliance market is still to come. There are more than

400 farm uses for electricity and at least 250 of them increase production or make farming more profitable; while as yet two-thirds of farm homes lack inside bathrooms because they must first be equipped with electric pumping systems.

Farm homes can be supplied with telephone service over the same lines that bring them electricity, and by the same organization. Yet only about 40 percent of the farms in the United States have telephone service. Here in this subsidiary activity alone is a tremendous job for REA in the years ahead—and a healthful stimulation for business concerns which will sell the materials and equipment.

REA finished? Hardly. The American farmer, having come into the light of the industrial revolution at almost incredibly long last, is not going to welcome being invited back into the kerosene age.

Nor will retrogression in rural electrification be acceptable to the industrialists and commercial concerns whose prosperity has gone hand in hand with the modernization of the farm.

To REA at 20 we say: Many more years of increasingly useful life serving the American farmer and, through him, all the American people.

To Protect the Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of every Member of Congress who is interested in protecting the consumer from unnecessary expenditure of millions and millions of dollars yearly, an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Press on Monday, May 23, and which I insert in the RECORD under leave previously obtained:

TO PROTECT THE CONSUMER

Cleveland enjoys excellent natural gas service, an adequate supply and rates that compare favorably with any in the country.

Quite understandably, for these reasons many Clevelanders have switched to gas over competing fuels.

These consumers, both residential and industrial, have invested millions of dollars in equipment to use gas.

If the price of natural gas were to soar, they would be in a bad way.

They couldn't just buy another brand. Gas is a monopoly.

Nor could they change their gas furnaces, stoves, ranges, and industrial ovens to some other fuel overnight.

In other words, Clevelands gas consumers must have the protection of some public price control.

There are such protections today.

The price to consumers here is regulated and the price of transporting the gas from the wells, mostly in southwestern States, also is regulated.

And, by Federal law, the price of the gas at the wells also can be regulated.

But a number of producers of gas—and that includes many of the Nation's big oil companies—want to end price regulation at the wells.

Pending in both House and Senate today are bills to accomplish these ends.

There are two main arguments given in favor of eliminating control at the wells.

One is that there are more than 4,000 producers, most of them small, who would quit looking for gas if they didn't have the incentive of a free market.

(Actually, a few major producers have a virtual monopoly on natural gas production. The small producer is not a significant factor.

(It also seems unlikely that producers are suddenly going to quit in view of the tremendous demand and profitable markets they now possess.)

The other argument is that no other product is regulated at the source and that there is danger of extending these controls to the rest of the oil industry since oil and gas occur together.

(It is true that no other product is regulated at the source. Unfortunately, however, this is the only logical place to regulate natural gas since it goes direct into a pipeine at the well and emerges in the consumer's premises.

(All other regulation would be meaningless if the original price at the well skyrocketed.

(The other part of the argument—that there is a danger of extending control to the rest of the oil industry—is a legitimate concern. There must be safeguards to prevent any such arbitrary controls.)

To remove the Federal Power Commission's authority to control natural gas prices at the wells could be disastrous to millions of consumers, large and small.

The bills now before Congress to end or seriously weaken such controls should be defeated in the public interest.

Resolution of Dorn-Tell Post, No. 7429, of the VFW, of Milwaukee, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of Congress the following resolution adopted by the Dorn-Tell Post, No. 7429, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Milwaukee, pertaining to my bill, H. R. 600, which would authorize the construction of a new general medical-surgical hospital at the Veterans' Administration center, Wood, Wis., and for other purposes. I hope that this bill will receive early and favorable consideration by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and by the House:

"Whereas H. R. 600 has been introduced in the House of Representatives, having to do with the construction of a new hospital at Wood, Wis.; and

"Whereas this hospital is very badly needed due to the crowded conditions at Wood, Wis.; and

"Whereas many of the buildings at the present Wood, Wis., veterans' hospital are so old and dilapidated that they are a fire hazard, and should have been replaced years ago, and

"Whereas we feel this bill warrants passage: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Dorn-Tell Post No. 7429, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars requests your every effort in the passage of this bill, H. R. 600."

Passed unanimously in regular meeting of the Dorn-Tell Post, No. 7429, Veterans of Foreign Wars, this 5th day of May 1955.

ROBERT W. HUGO, *Commander.*
ROBERT H. DAMUTH, *Adjutant.*

Let Freedom Ring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Let Freedom Ring," by H. L. Hunt, which appeared in the Facts Forum magazine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET FREEDOM RING

(By H. L. Hunt)

A nation cannot long endure without patriotism, and the best means we have to keep patriotism bright and glowing, and to turn back the ugly tide of communism, may be so natural and so simple that it has been overlooked.

The Golden Rule, time-honored, accepted, and its merit so well known that it is unquestioned, may be the deep and powerful force which, if applied for the noble purpose, would save America's opportunity system from the skillful design of its enemies who in their bright, distorted minds, plan its destruction.

"Do unto others as you would have others do unto you"—recognize their love of country, and share their pride in it as you would like them to take note of your loyalty to the land you love, and share with you your pride in loyalty. Seek out patriots—they are not hard to find—and give them a pat on the back, just as you silently yearn for a kind word about your own devotion to America. Let them again feel that it is not old fashioned nor unfashionable to be patriotic, not even unprofitable. You would like for your love of your land to be a constant joy to brighten your day. You may be sure they would like the same. As you do unto others, see that their loyalty to country shall not brand them as a crank, or result in any other hardship, but become a healthful, prideful, pleasure. Here you can meet on common ground.

It is natural—it is usual—to appreciate others of like mind. Find them—they are all around you—you will find them, some timidly, plugging for freedom, perhaps fearful of attracting notice which will start the smear artists working—find some adding patriotism (to their) ads, or some commending and encouraging those who are advertising for America as well as for sales. All need your help. And when you find them, let them know you understand and appreciate them. Your approval can mean much to them in this strange atmosphere where a display of loyalty to our country can start a raising of eyebrows. Their approval will in turn give you a renewed confidence, and a new hope for the future—hope for your children—hope for freedom in a free world—hope for America.

Patriots are overwhelmingly in the majority, and when you and your kind by the millions begin standing up to be counted, become vocal, and let your convictions be

known, an awakening and quickening of commonsense about public affairs in America will afford the traitors meager feeding ground—a barren field for infiltration. Communists do not fancy facing the hot flame of freedom.

Again, you may tingle with the thought let freedom ring, and you may unexpectedly find yourself humming the tune—or voicing the words. The flag—our country's flag—and the Star-Spangled Banner again may stir your blood, and you will feel as grateful as the title implies when you remember, or sing, God Bless America.

When this comes to pass, with you and with your friends—it will be without sacrifice, hardship or travail, for the most natural thing in all the world has taken place. The sending and the receiving of a force as potent as love of liberty—loyalty—pride in loyalty, reinstates true value. It will halt appeasements, end betrayals, and when it reaches a national scale, will restore national pride.

Let freedom ring—with millions tingling the joyous bells. Each and every person taking part in this crusade should watch out for other participants, large or small, to boost them on their way. The plan for patriotism in ads is not an avenue for personal aggrandizement, and cannot be centered around any one person. It must grow and expand far beyond any individual, or his ideas. It is for our country and those who love liberty devotedly.

There are no dues to pay. In sharing in add patriotism to ads you will have become part and parcel of a national existence which is a joy unto you. Wholly on your own you will have become a vital link in an unbroken chain of integrity, loyalty, and pride in loyalty which must be held intact to keep America's opportunity system functioning.

Your cost is nil. If you advertise and frequently include patriotic plugs in your ads, more than twice as many people will read them as would otherwise, and you will have shown the best of reasons for patronage. To all patriots: The only cost to you is to find, recognize, understand, approve, and encourage the patriots who are all around you, probably neglected and lonely, and knowing of their pride in their patriotism "do unto them as you would have them do unto you." Let freedom ring.

NACA Goes Atomic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave obtained, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Press May 24 relative to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics in Cleveland, entitled "NACA Goes Atomic":

NACA GOES ATOMIC

There is a portent of great things to come in the Washington dispatch reporting President Eisenhower's signature of the bill appropriating $8,760,000 for expansion of NACA's Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory at Cleveland Hopkins Airport.

Most of the money will be used to construct a new facility for the development of atomic powered aircraft engines.

Thus, Cleveland, one of the birthplaces of aviation, is assured a major role in the new era of atomic flight.

Although they don't often get credit for it, the skilled engineers and technicians of NACA are entitled to take a bow for the vast strides taken in the past few decades by American commercial and military flying. The safety of airline passengers—and the security of the Nation—are largely products of their inquiring minds and experiments.

May NACA speed the day of atomic flight.

Freedom for Man—A World Safe for Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Freedom for Man—A World Safe for Mankind." The address was delivered today by Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, at the Woodrow Wilson House, at the meeting to announce the plans for the Woodrow Wilson centennial anniversary during 1956. The address is to be broadcast this evening, from 10:30 to 11 p. m., over the Columbia Broadcasting System network.

Mr. President, the address by Mr. Baruch deserves careful reading by every Member of Congress. It is an address about one of our truly great liberal Presidents, by a man who knew him and served him well. I certainly commend a reading of the address to every Member of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM FOR MAN—A WORLD SAFE FOR MANKIND

(Address by Bernard M. Baruch at Woodrow Wilson House at meeting to announce plans for Woodrow Wilson Centennial Anniversary during 1956)

As one of the dwindling group who knew Woodrow Wilson, who worked with him and who were privileged to call him friend, I am pleased at this opportunity to pay tribute to him. No more fitting theme could have been chosen for the centennial anniversary of his birth next year than the one proposed by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation: "Freedom for man—A world safe for mankind." That theme sums up not only the ideals of Woodrow Wilson and the goals for which he labored but the deepest yearning of mankind and the crucial question of our time.

I have never known a man more richly endowed in mind and spirit—a man with character more noble than Woodrow Wilson. He was a rare human being and a complex one, this aristocratic man of the people, scholar-statesman, practical idealist, religious-humanist. In him there was a purity of purpose which power could not corrupt. He stands in the forefront of those who have struggled to introduce ethical considerations into the conduct of world affairs. Confronted by a choice between the right as he saw it and the expedient, he invariably chose the right.

It is not easy to understand men such as he. They appear too infrequently. Perhaps we may say of him what he said of Lincoln, that "natures deep as his and various almost to the point of contradiction can be sounded only by the judgment of like sort, if such there be." But whether or not we can grasp the complexity of the man, the world recognizes in him one of the giants, not only of his time, but of all time. The years have neither tarnished his ideals nor invalidated his principles. They never will.

Woodrow Wilson came to the world of politics from the quite different world of scholarship. These academic years were years of preparation for leadership. His studies were devoted not to the theory but to the practice of government, not to doctrine but to affairs. He came to know the meaning of freedom—its privileges and responsibilities, the nature of democracy, its potentialities and problems, and the real working of the American political system with all its strengths and weaknesses. And it should be added he understood human nature, now wise, now foolish, now noble, now base.

He was a natural leader who could capture public opinion as by wireless. His own words on the gift of leadership sum up his capacity for it. "A great nation," he wrote, "is led by a man who speaks not the rumors of the street, but a new principles of a new age; a man in whose ears the voices of the nation do not sound like the accidental and discordant notes that come from the voice of the mob but concurrent and concordant, like the united voices of a chorus, whose many meanings unite in his understanding in a single meaning and reveal to him a single vision, so that he can spak what no man else knows, the common meaning of the common voice. Such is the man who leads a great, free democratic nation." Such a man was Wilson.

He led America and the world toward the goal of international peace and freedom. If we are ever to attain that goal, if we are to make the world safe for mankind, we would do well to learn from Wilson. If we are to preserve liberty against the ruthless challenge which confronts it today, we must understand it as he did.

Most men cherish liberty. Few understand it. Wilson did.

Liberty, he knew, was the source of America's greatness and its most priceless possession. "This is not America because it is rich," he said. "This is not America because it has set up for a great population great opportunities of material prosperity. America is a name which sounds in the ears of men everywhere as a synonym with individual opportunity because it is a synonym of individual liberty." Individual liberty—the words are inseparable. The individual is "the first fact of liberty." There can be "no corporate liberty," Wilson insisted. "Liberty belongs to the individual or it does not exist."

Yet liberty, indispensable as it is, is not the only ingredient of democratic government. Democracy requires not only a free citizenry, free to dissent, but an enlightened and self-disciplined one, which explains why it is the most difficult of all forms of government, as nations newly independent are discovering. "Liberty," Wilson wrote, "is not itself government. In the wrong hands—in hands unpracticed, undisciplined, it is incompatible with government." Democracy, he was saying, is organized self-restraint. In these days when it is under seige, self-discipline is the first imperative of its defense. In the last analysis, our only freedom in these times is the freedom to discipline ourselves. If we fail we shall be compelled to submit to the discipline which others will impose upon us.

Liberty is never secure. The threat to it may come in many forms—in naked aggression, in stealthy subversion, in the slogans and blandishments with which tyrants mask their designs on people hungry for a

better life. It would be bitterly ironic if those nations of the world which have recently gained their independence and those struggling for it should be seduced by the false promises of an oppressor worse than any they have ever known. It is a tribute to many of them that they are alive to the danger and that they are not deceived by the empty promise of neutralism.

Liberty requires not only unceasing vigilance, but unceasing work. "Liberty," as Wilson said, "is not something to be laid away in a document, a completed work. It is an organic principle of life—renewing and being renewed. Democratic institutions are never done—they are, like the living tissue, always amaking."

He knew that democratic institutions require periodic reform. He also knew that the world could not be remade in one sitting, that progress comes in slow states. His vision was as broad, his idealism as pure as any man's. But he had no patience with Utopians. He once remarked that it would be a sad day for society when sentimentalists attempted to cure all the ills of their fellowmen. And as for the new order of the Communists, he said of its prophet, Karl Marx, "I know of no man who has more corrupted the thinking of the world * * *."

In the years between the Civil War and Wilson's emergence as a political leader, great forces had been let loose in America and great changes had taken place. We had grown rich and powerful—and careless. Injustice and inequity were permitted to mar the face of America. Under Wilson's new freedom, America returned to the task of perfecting democracy. A vigorous attack was launched against special privilege, monopoly, the mastery of the many by the few. The door of economic opportunity was opened wide again, social wrongs redressed, political abuses corrected. A new wave of energy and confidence swept across America—a wave of energy and confidence which, with the outbreak of the war, was diverted from the task of improving democracy to the infinitely more difficult task of defending it.

No man abhorred war more than Woodrow Wilson. Yet when he was compelled at last to lead America into the conflict he was prepared to fight without stint. His administration of the war was expert and businesslike. And yet it was not for military victory alone that he fought. He fought for a just and lasting peace, which we have come to learn is something quite apart from the triumph of arms. On that fateful day when America assumed the leadership of the world, it was to make the world safe for democracy—which is to say, safe for mankind. That has remained our only purpose.

That the task remains to be done is not Wilson's fault. He expressed the "common meaning of the common voice" in his peace proposals. But that voice was drowned in the discordant chorus of vengeance, ignorance, and selfishness. In his insistence on international cooperation in a world in which nations could no longer live apart, he spoke a new principle for a new age. In the League he offered men an instrument of good will. The failure of the League lay in that he could not provide the good will.

Wilson's critics have contended that his refusal to compromise in the fight over the League permitted its enemies to defeat it. This characterization of Wilson as uncompromising is inaccurate and unjust. He was willing to accept reservations to the treaty of peace provided they did not impair article X. On it he stood fast, for it was the heart of the League. It bound the signatories to the treaty to "respect and preserve" against external aggression the territorial integrity and political independence of all members of the League." To compromise on it would have been to surrender the cardinal principle he sought to establish. The League was the "indispensable instrumentality of peace." It was necessary to guarantee the peace. Article X was the guaranty.

As Wilson stood fast in his determination to provide a guaranty for peace, so must we now. Attention is presently being directed to discussions of disarmament and to peace proposals. It is the hope of the world, of course, that the threat of war will be lifted, that the fear of atomic devastation will be dispelled, that the burden of armament will be lightened. But we must not be beguiled by wishful thinking. Every plan for disarmament deserves careful consideration but none can be adopted which fails to provide direct, effective, and certain guaranties for enforcement of its terms. International disarmament of both conventional and atomic weapons requires an international authority with power to inspect, control, and impose punishment, swift, sure, and condign, against any transgressor. Any agreement which does not establish the authority to enforce it would be incalculably dangerous. To permit any nation the right to veto the decisions of the control agency, or actions taken against violators would be to make the plan meaningless. As Woodrow Wilson refused to compromise on the heart of the League, we must refuse to compromise on the heart of effective disarmament.

One may read in Wilson's life a story of personal triumphs and tragedy. But his is not the story of one man, but of mankind. His victories were victories for all men. His defeat was defeat for all humanity. That defeat doomed the world—as Wilson predicted it would—to a generation of sorrow and pain unequaled in history. And the end is not yet. Freedom today stands in greater jeopardy than it has ever known. And men now have the power not only to extinguish liberty from the earth, but life itself.

Tragic as has been the history of the world since the death of Wilson, and menacing as are the times in which we live, the world's doom is not foreordained. In the strength of America and her allies we have the means for preventing war. In the United Nations and in other agencies of international cooperation, imperfect as they may be, we have the means for reconciling differences between nations amicably and fairly. We have it in our power to preserve freedom, to attain peace. We need only the will, the courage, the self-discipline to do what the task requires.

"It is great to have the strength of a giant," Wilson said, paraphrasing Shakespeare. It is tyrannous to use it like a giant. We must muster the strength of America—physical and spiritual—and use it wisely, generously, firmly, in the cause of peace and freedom. We must make of the centennial occasion not one which marks the passage of a hundred years since the birth of a great man, but one which marks the beginning of a new effort to attain freedom for all men in a world safe for mankind.

Illinois General Assembly Approves Proposed Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed a preamble and senate resolution adopted by the 69th General Assembly, State of Illinois, on May 12, 1955:

Senate Resolution 52

Whereas President Eisenhower recently submitted a national highway program to spend $101 billion on the construction and development of highways; and

Whereas the need for the development of America's highway network and the improvement of existing highways is, in Governor Stratton's words, "the most important domestic issue before the Congress"; and

Whereas the President's program is broad enough and properly planned, involving a financial outlay that every State could afford, so that we can foresee a probable solution to America's highway problem: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 69th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we add our approval to the endorsement of President Eisenhower's proposed highway program by Governor Stratton; and that we respectfully urge all the United States Senators and Representatives from the State of Illinois to favorably support this program; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be requested to forward copies of this preamble and resolution to each United States Senator and Representative from Illinois.

Essex County Carpenters and Millwrights Commend House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

NEWARK, N. J., *May 21, 1955.*

Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman, House Un-American Activities Committee,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

At the meeting of the Essex County and vicinity District Council of Carpenters and Millwrights held on Thursday, May 19, a motion was passed commending your committee for the fine job done in the recent hearings in Newark, N. J., in investigating subversive groups.

JOHN J. WALSACK,
Secretary-Treasurer, Essex County and vicinity District Council of Carpenters and Millwrights.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

The Heritage of Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on May 15, the Williamsburg settlement in New York City awarded a medal to Gen. David L. Sarnoff, one of our country's outstanding citizens. The decoration was in recognition of the splendid service he has rendered the people of his community for so many years.

Upon that occasion, General Sarnoff delivered an address which was inspiring, and was truly revealing of the heart of America. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HERITAGE OF YOUTH

(Address by Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corporation of America, in acceptance of the Williamsburg settlement gold medal award, New York, N. Y., May 15, 1955)

My fellow guests of the Williamsburg settlement, I deeply appreciate the compliment you pay me by your presence here. I am touched and embarrassed by the remarks of the distinguished speakers who have preceded me but feel confident you will credit any exaggeration to their generosity and their friendship. I thank each of them from my heart.

The medal you have bestowed upon me I shall always treasure. Its intrinsic value is raised to a higher dimension by the eminence of the medal winners before me. And I join their select company with a deep sense of pride.

Over a period of 30 years the Williamsburg Settlement as done a magnificent job of helping conserve the most precious of America's resources: its youth.

More than half a century ago, an immigrant boy was tossed into the bewildering whirlpool of a metropolitan slum area, to sink or swim. That bay was myself, 9 years old. I learned the hard way what a helping hand, a sympathetic word, a reasonable opportunity, can mean in giving direction to a young life.

Consequently I bring an intimate understanding to efforts like those to which your settlement is dedicated. I recall gratefully, and with a touch of nostalgia, what another such settlement, in another such crowded and polyglot section of this city, did for me. Many of the happiest and most rewarding hours in my boyhood were spent in the educational alliance, on the lower East Side of Manhattan. They helped me to pick a path through the jungle of city life and gave me my first appreciations of American values and ideals.

Many years have passed since I was a youngster selling papers on the sidewalks of New York. Yet I remember as if it were yesterday, the thoughts and emotions that moved me then. I remember, in the first place, the tremendous inner pressures of sheer vitality demanding outlets. Secondly, there was the surge of youthful ambition—the hunger to occomplish something outstanding that would make my family and neifihbors proud of me

I was in no way exceptional. Vitality and ambition are the normal drives of healthy youth, shared by the children in our area then, as in Williamsburg today. When constructively channeled and disciplined, these twin forces produce men and women who are useful to themselves and to the community. But when thwarted and misdirected, they can become tragically destructive. In too many instances, the energy erupts in violence like a volcano, the ambition finds anti-social and even criminal expression.

That is why the role of the social settlement is so crucial. It is the agency which helps determine the direction of a child's striving, which sets the pattern of bchavior for all the years ahead. We know from grim headlines in the daily press that today, more than ever before, its contribution is important and for many a youth decisive.

All of us have ample reason to be thankful to Mayor Wagner and his deputy, Henry Epstein, who are bringing both wisdom and determination to the pressing challenge represented by delinquent young people in our great city. We, their fellow citizens, realize the magnitude and the difficulties of their program of human salvage and will back them to the limit. In the context of their urgent task, a gathering such as this tonight has special significance.

There is an interesting parallel, it seems to me, between the forces in a boy's makeup and the larger forces in nature itself. In both cases the determining factor is how those forces are guided and applied.

We know that matter and energy are in themselves neither good nor evil. It is the use to which we put them that makes them beneficent or harmful. All of my adult life I have been associated with the world of science. I have watched, and in my small measure participated in, the development of one great invention or discovery after another. The basic lesson I learned is that intelligent channeling determines whether a given power or machine shall help or hurt mankind.

That lesson is especially relevant to the dilemma of the human race at the present juncture in history. We are bewildered and frightened by the miracles of science we have ourselves brought forth. We wonder whether the genius of man, having harnessed nature, will be equal to the greater task of harnessing man himself. Far from being elated by the dramatic scientific progress of our time, we are filled with doubts and misgivings.

The more we ponder this paradox, the more we are driven to the realization that the real tests of this period are not in the deserts of Arizona or on the islands of the Pacific—but in the spirit of man. The element in the equation that will tell the story is not material but spiritual.

Science is not an end in itself but a means to achievement. Its triumphs will be hollow victories unless they are utilized to make better people, living fuller, nobler, more satisfying lives.

Every scientific advance holds menace, but also promise and opportunity. Will the promise be fulfilled? Will the opportunity bear fruit? Will peace and abundance be assured for our time and for unborn generations? The answers depend entirely on whether the Divine prevails over the mortal in man.

If we are to become the masters of science, not its slaves, we must learn to use its immense powers to good purpose. The machine itself has neither mind nor soul nor moral sense. Only man has been endowed with these Godlike attributes. Every age has its destined duty—ours is to nurture an awareness of those Divine attributes and a sense of responsibility in giving them expression.

Within the last 10 years there has been a great transformation of the world we live in. Almost overnight man has acquired new knowledge and developed new instrumentalities that can either destroy civilization or give it undreamed of dimensions of grandeur.

The change has come so fast that few have as yet adjusted themselves psychologically to its implications. We have been like travelers on a train rushing at such headlong speed that the passing landscape is blurred. To appreciate it we must go back and examine that landscape at leisure.

The rate of change has been too rapid to permit us to digest its meaning. We have to pause for contemplation and understanding, or we shall be overwhelmed by the forces we have unleashed. Unless we learn to use the new powers at our disposal for beneficent purposes, we shall find ourselves trapped by our own genius. That is the fundamental challenge to man today if he is to survive, not merely in the physical but in the spiritual sense.

Science offers us wonderful tools for helping to create the brotherhood of man on earth. But the mortar of brotherhood does not come from any laboratory. It must come from the heart and mind. Precisely because the forces in our hands are so great, we dare not fumble. Our capacity for monumental mischief is so vast that moral values have ceased to be merely desirable. They have become imperative—their conscious cultivation has become indispensable to the very survival of the race.

As we wrest more and more secrets from nature and transmute them in services for mankind, the logic and rhythm of life take on more meaning. The myriad suns of which our own is as a single grain of sand in the Sahara, the majestic cycles of the celestial movements, the precise operations of natural laws—these could not be regarded as mere accidents.

Their harmonious relationship and their effects upon life on this minor planet cannot be comprehended by our limited mortal mentality. But an intuition beyond mere reason informs us that they are manifestations of a divine intelligence and supreme architect of the universe. Science provides no substitutes for the lessons of universal harmony, embodied for mankind in religious teachings and moral precepts. On the contrary, it makes clear that material progress is a delusion unless it is put at the service of eternal spiritual values.

This irreducible truth must be conveyed to our youth today. Their heritage of unprecedented physical power and mechanical miracles will be not only worthless but a source of danger if it is not balanced by a robust sense of moral responsibility. The revival of religious faith which we are witnessing is an instinctive recognition of this need.

Since the young are to inherit this earth, it is our sacred obligation to do our utmost to guide them, especially during their early formative years. In the nature of the case, the young delinquents make the headlines. But even at worst these are a minority. They are not naturally and irrevocably bad, but the victims of undirected or misdirected energy and ambition. Those who labor in social settlements like this one know that it is possible, in all but a few cases, to instill in young people an appreciation of order and a reverence for beauty.

We must channel the vital forces in youth along constructive paths. At an age when they are pliable and receptive, our boys and girls must be taught that life without high purpose will be barren for them. They must be equipped with religious and moral standards, provided with heroes worth emulating, inspired with a sense of the importance and the satisfaction of developing the potential for usefulness and good that is within them.

These are basic tenets of ethical conduct, proven by endless generations of trial and error to be the most desirable guide for man's life on earth. By their light man has proceeded slowly, painfully but on the whole successfully on his journey from the jungle. As history recokons time, we are only on the first leg of that journey; we need that guidance more urgently than ever in the past.

That is why the work you are doing at Williamsburg Settlement is at the very heart of the problem of our day and age. Your concept is correct. Help young people to form the habit of doing wholesome, constructive things and they will carry the habit into maturity.

The boys and girls you have already trained stand as a living monument not only to your civic-mindedness but to your practical wisdom. I commend you for your zeal in helping youth to grow into useful men and women in their own communities, good citizens of our Nation, and above all, good human beings. By your efforts you help keep our blessed America strong and free.

On Omitting Flowers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, as reprinted from the Washington Star in the official directory of the National Capital Flower and Garden Show.

Dr. Harris has written many beautiful articles. This one reaches the heart of all flower lovers, as he tells the wonderful message of the flowers, particularly to those who walk in the valley of the shadow.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT

(By Frederick Brown Harris)

ON OMITTING FLOWERS

"Please omit flowers" is a request often issued when arrangements are announced for what usually is called a funeral service. In life's darkest hours, when hearts are torn by poignant grief, when it seems as a dear one goes from our sight and side that life has tumbled in, a strange new directive puts a taboo on the Creator's petaled masterpieces which can say nameless things that no human lips can utter.

Whence comes this incongruous suggestion? Omit flowers—In the Valley of the Shadow when every yearling impulse is struggling vainly to express feelings that are too deep for words. Then it is that flowers offer wings to affection, appreciation and consolation, to wistful memories and assurances of sympathy. Of course, carping cirtics of any custom may suspect the aroma of commercialism in the slogan admittedly coined by vendors of blooms: "Say it with flowers." But, alas, for the one who in so fragrant a phrase detects only the ring of the florist's cash register. In "Say it with flowers" there stretch enchanting vistas of sacramental beauty like the glory of a garden or the shimmer of moonlight on a silvery sea.

A choice friend, here no more, whose spiritual apprehensions found radiant kinship in flowers as he pondered a posey's secret for entering the sacristy of another's felicity or pain, left us this verbal bouquet: "The enterprising florist does not attempt to suggest what you shall say. That is your part of the enterprise. His to supply the vocabulary, so to speak; yours to select the particular words required for your message. Indeed, your floral gift can say things of exquisite delicacy and tender meaning for the expression of which a dictionary leaves you impotent. Heart-meanings conveyed by flowers become prismatic, whose white light breaks into a perfect shower of crimson, violet and gold." Yet it is boldly proposed to blow out all the floral candles on the high altar of grief—to bar all that glory from the place of mourning and remembrance—when the daughters of music are brought low. "No trespassing" signs are set up against the consoling presence of the splendor which had captured the very being of Oliver Wendell Holmes, when he declared: "The amen of nature is always a flower." Some unnamed constable dares to forbid the entry of the gay loveliness which banished his gloom, as Emerson gratefully remarks, "Earth laughs in flowers."

In a poet's rapture Walt Whitman cries: "A morning glory at my window satisfies me more than the metaphysics of books." And it was Tennyson, with a tiny bloom held in his hand, who soliloquized that if man could tell all that is mirrored there he'd know what God and man are. In his Hymn to the Flowers, Horace Smith points to their inspiring ministry in unforgettable lines:

"Were I, O God, in churchless lands remaining
Far from all voice of teachers or divines,
My soul would find in flowers of Thy ordaining
Priests, sermons, shrines."

In the midst of such a hallelujah chorus, lifting to the highest heaven a paean of gratitude for the tint of the tiniest flower, how impertinent appears a banner with this strange device: "Please omit flowers"—Omit "priests, sermons, shrines." What! Bring no symbols of the white flowers of immortality which bloom around the solitude of the grave? Omit flowers when gathered friends come to hear the triumphal assurance that death is but a portal to another room in the Father's many mansioned house? No flowers as emblems whispering of the virtues and graces that made the earthly life of the one who has finished the course even as a garden of the Lord?

How bleak and bare the last rites can be when there is no loft from which comes the solace of a multicolored, surpliced, flower choir in the chapel of death? Oh, to be sure, like any other hallowed ritual, defiling hands may turn it all into a vulgar display of pagan extravagance. But there is an old proverb warning against letting out the baby with the bath. A remedy for excesses which prescribes that flowers be eliminated when and where they are needed most savors of the ruthless iconoclast.

But listen, says one with a cold gleam in his eye: Why not give the money spent for flowers to some humanitarian cause? How piously realistic. But the undertones of that proposition are suspiciously like the snarling suggestion of Judas when Mary poured the precious ointment, perfumed like English violets, on the feet of the Master she adored. The miserly instincts of the one who was to betray the Galilean tried to measure the sunbeam of this fragrant deed with a monetary yardstick: Why this waste? This could have been sold and the proceeds given to the Jerusalem community chest. But Jesus, who cared supremely for the poor, said: "Let her alone. She hath done it for my burial." He was not in favor of omitting flowers.

If the injunction of Judas, omit ointment, had prevailed it would not have been used as balm for the wounds of the poor. And those who have looked fairly percentagewise into the situation today report that omitting flowers where their potent ministry is needed most benefits the needy scarcely at all.

But funerals and memorial services are not the only occasions when the sign "Omit flowers" needs to be carefully inspected and appraised. Gruff Thomas Carlyle sobbed bitterly as he bowed at the grave of his wife. He felt that across the years he had omitted the flowers of praise and affection. The sin of omission was now like a sword through his soul. With a gnawing regret, he muttered: "O Mary, I loved you all the while. If I had only told you." Alas, for flowers that never arrive until after the undertaker has been summoned.

If we would practice the simple rule of being a little kinder, a little more thoughtful than necessary, we would escape the prickling regret of the searching lines:

"It isn't the thing you do, dear,
It's the thing you leave undone
That brings you a bit of a heartache
At the setting of the sun."

Every week we rub elbows with fellow pilgrims whose hearts are famished, hungering unwittingly, perhaps for a crust of encouragement. Some "Well done," some gracious word from us might come with the beauty and fragrance of a flower. But too often we do not say it.

What a calling—to be florists in the realm of praise and of fragrant words that keep men on their feet. Remember Tolstoy's beggar who, in the thrill of a salutation that lifted him to the level of brotherhood, forgot even his empty stomach. And never forget, at your peril, that Jesus declared that the final condemnation would be reserved for those who forgot the flowers of mercy and help.

The meanest kind of a miser is one who omits the flowers of generous speech. Felicia Hemans has penned a verse which well might be entitled, "Please Do Not Omit Flowers":

"They speak of hope to the fainting heart,
With a voice of promise they come and part;
They sleep in dust through the wintry hours,
They break forth in glory—
Bring flowers, bright flowers!"

The Merchant Marine Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, among the best-informed Americans with respect to the objectives and problems of our merchant marine of today is Francis T. Greene, recently elected president of the American Merchant Marine Institute. Before joining the Institute in 1953 as its executive vice president, Mr. Green was General Counsel to the Federal Maritime Board, and previously had been counsel to the Office of Military Assistance in the Department of Defense. During World War II he served in the Navy, leaving with the rank of commander.

Mr. Greene delivered a forceful address before the Propeller Club of the port of Baltimore on May 23, commemorating Maritime Day. The meeting was attended by civic and industrial leaders of the metropolitan Baltimore area. Because of the comprehensive analysis of the condition of our merchant marine today and the well-considered and worthy suggestions for solution of some of its problems, I ask that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for reading by the American public.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR MERCHANT MARINE TODAY

(Address by Francis T. Greene, president, American Merchant Marine Institute, before the Propeller Club, port of Baltimore, May 23, 1955)

I consider myself singularly honored in being asked to address you, and especially fortunate in the location and timing of our talk. There is no more fitting place for a discussion of the American merchant marine than Baltimore. Here was born the Baltimore Clipper, ancestor of the whole breed of American clipper ships. Here have flourished some of the most famous lines in our shipping history: the Baltimore Mail, the Merchants & Miners, and the Old Bay Line, America's senior water-transportation concern. Many of the steamship companies belonging to the association which I represent are regular users of your magnificent harbor, a fact which makes me feel all the more at home here.

There is no more appropriate week in the year than this to talk about American ships. Just 136 years ago today, a little vessel with a crooked smokestack, paddlewheels mounted on the principle of the outboard motor, and plenty of precautionary sails, was standing out from Savannah on a daring adventure. She was flying the stars and stripes, and was on her way to becoming the first steamship in history to cross an ocean. Named *Savannah*, she had left her namesake port on May 22, a date we now observe as National Maritime Day to honor her and all American merchant shipping.

What is this merchant marine to which, by act of Congress and presidential proclamation, we assemble once a year to do honor? To many who watch the street parades and water pageants, I fear it is simply a fleet of gallant ghosts: the *Savannahs, Flying Clouds,* and *Baltics,* hull down on the horizon of the past. More than once in the last hundred years it has been literally not much more than this, at least so far as oceangoing ships were concerned.

Your group, of course, does not need to be told that what we honor today is much more than the nautical achievements of our ancestors. You know what our merchant marine has been, is, and should be. You know, moreover, the mistakes we have made in the past, and the bitter and repeated lessons we have had to be given before we learned that they were mistakes. Some of you can remember the paralytic shock which struck Baltimore and our other ports 40 years ago, when war suddenly took away the European ships to which we had been entrusting more than 90 percent of our foreign trade, and left our piers and rails choked with immobilized goods. Everyone here can still recall, I think, the chilling dread which was in the air in 1942, when ships of our again-depleted merchant fleet were going down in flames off the Virginia capes and no one was quite sure that our shipyards could keep up with the casualty rate, much less supply the additional tonnage we and our allies needed.

Thus, neglect of our merchant marine has twice brought us within inches of commercial and military disaster. Whatever virtue enabled us to weather these crises and finally emerge in 1945 with the largest merchant fleet in American or world history, it was not the virtue of foresight.

Have we really learned our lesson at last? For a time it seemed that perhaps we had. carefully thought-out legislation averted wholesale scrapping of our war-built fleet such as followed the first war, made the best units available for commercial and military needs, and insured that the large balance of Government-owned vessels should not compete ruinously with private enterprise by placing them in reserve fleets, for possible future emergencies. A very promising postwar liner-replacement program gave us the *United States, Constitution,* and *Independence.* Peacetime developments in the petroleum industry led for a time to active construction of tankers.

But Americans have a great capacity to forget, especially where things maritime are concerned. Even in cities like this, vitally dependent on ships and trade, it is easy to take things for granted, easy to assume that a commercial lead or a tonnage advantage is self-perpetuating, easy to yield to the economic urge of the moment and the short-range gain. If this is true on the seaboard, how much better the climate for forgetfulness in the four-fifths of our country where an oceangoing ship is never seen, and where nothing but unobstrusive statistics remind the man in the street how closely his living standards are tied to world trade and American ships. There are grave signs that the lesson twice learned already in this century is not being retained. While you are already conversant with some of them, perhaps you do not realize how ominously these separate developments have been taking on a familiar pattern, a pattern which has the smell not of 1929 but of 1914.

Let me point out a few of the elements which make this pattern so distressingly familiar. Do you know that 1 out of every 10 privately owned merchant ships which flew our flag on April 1, 1954, had dropped out of the merchant marine by April 1, 1955? I only wish I could add a reassuring "April fool" to that statement.

Do you know that, apart from artificial and temporary upswings, the total employment on privately owned American ships has gone steadily downward since V–J Day, and that between January 1, 1953, and October 1, 1954, 1 out of every 4 men employed on such a ship lost his job?

In a shipbuilding center like Baltimore, you probably do know that new merchant tonnage under contract last January 1 was less than one-third that of the previous New Year, and that 1 out of every 5 shipyard workers dropped out of the picture during the same period.

Do you know that, for every 3 passenger ships which flew the American flag in 1939, we have 1 today—or that our coastwise and intercoastal fleet, for a century the backbone of our merchant marine and the readiest source of tonnage in national emergency, has now been all but wiped out?

A strong clue to the condition of our shipping is the percentage of export-import trade that moves in privately owned United States ships. In 1946 these ships were carrying 65 percent of our trade. The latest figure available is 24.9 percent. In less than a decade, therefore, we have fallen back more than two-thirds of the distance to the all-time low of 1914.

These are a few of the major symptoms. What do they add up to? Not doom, certainly, as yet. Not even gloom, necessarily. But, on this National Maritime Day, I think it is incumbent on us here and on all Americans to take a careful look at these trends, to decide whether they should go unchecked any longer, and to assess the means of checking them.

The first step is to learn what has happened and why. Latest reports show that the active privately owned merchant marine, which numbered 1,258 ships in 1952, has been reduced to 1,053—a loss of 205 ships employing about 7,000 men. This includes 54 ships presently laid up for lack of business. Even if these are added, the total private fleet under the American flag numbers only 1,107 vessels of 13,933,441 deadweight tons. Just a year ago we had 1,230 ships, of 15,208,941 tons. Since newly added bottoms nearly balanced the ships removed, it is substantially correct to say that this 10 percent drop may be charged to one cause: transfer of ships to foreign flags.

While one-tenth of a nation's shipping is lopped off in 1 year for 1 reason, it is surely not unreasonable to feel some concern. Even the country with the second-largest private fleet in the world cannot afford such a loss.

The causes which underlie this pellmell rush to foreign registries are not obscure or new. All American shipping, as you know, is vastly more expensive to those who conduct it than shipping under any other flag. On certain conditions, berth lines are eligible for some relief in the form of Government subsidies, or parity payments. But shippers in the tramp and bulk trades have had no such public shield against towering costs which could cave in on them at any shift in economic conditions.

Such a shift has lately been taking place, as the other shipping countries repaired their war losses, restored interrupted services, and once more began playing for keeps in a game where they held the top trumps—low construction costs and low operating costs. By early 1954, there seemed only three ways out: permanent layup, transfer to foreign registries, or public assistance such as is already given other groups which without it would fall victims to the high standard of living enjoyed by the country as a whole.

The first alternative was sterile defeatism; the third, unlikely at any date early enough to save the imperiled trades. Flag change remained. It had obvious disadvantages, some of which the Maritime Administration attempted to mitigate. With respect to Liberty ships, it prescribed that each owner mut retain 1 under United States registry for every 1 transferred. Transfers were furthermore to be made under binding commitments that the vessels would remain available for recall by the United States in an emergency.

The new flight from the flag is, therefore, understandable; and in view of the Government's restrictions on transfers, the situa-

tion is not as bad as it might be. If unchecked, however, it could become very dangerous. Some of its worst features are obvious. It makes the ships no longer subject to our standards of living and safety at sea—the highest in the world, and a source of pride to every American. It entails heavy inroads on the skilled maritime labor force. To the Nation at large this means a permanent reduction in the merchant marine counterpart to the Army, Naval, and Air Reserves. To maritime labor it means, on the basis of 1954 and the first third of 1955 alone, the permanent loss of about $32,200,000 in annual earnings.

It is in view of this heavy loss, together with the known fact that labor (including longshore) costs are the principal item in the high operating expenses which are forcing American ships off the seas, that our group of Atlantic and gulf coast companies have proposed to the unions that they reappraise and, where possible, eliminate from their contracts the obsolete and conflicting penalty and overtime provisions, many of which have been carried over from the era of the 56-hour week. We feel that reduction of operating costs is essential if fleet shrinkage is to be arrested, and that labor is losing, and will lose, fully as much as anyone else by such shrinkage.

The experience of Canada, our neighbor in both geography and operating costs, suggests that, in the long run, flag transfer will be no solution of our problem. Like the United States, Canada in 1946 had the largest merchant fleet in her history, but had to operate at a crushing cost disadvantage. Hence, she pursued for several years a wholesale program of transfer, preferably to the British flag, until a mere handful of ships remained under the Canadian.

The plan was not the cure-all it was expected to be. The difference between Canadian and foreign labor costs has not been a clear saving, as anticipated. The added demand on foreign labor pools has necessitated employment of "bottom-of-the-barrel" crewmen, with consequent inefficient operation and increased maintenance costs. Meanwhile, in the words of the Canadian Shipowners Association, "The skilled group of Canadian seamen and ships' officers, painfully built up during and after the Second World War, is being dispersed. No new men are learning the business. British crews will not be available to Canada in an emergency, even though the aging ships may be recalled to Canadian registry."

In the upshot, many Canadians are now demanding a restoration of their merchant marine to their own flag, with whatever degree of government aid is necessary to guarantee its continuance. Their reasoning is of interest here, because it grows out of actual experience with the problem confronting us. They say:

"It is not a case of Canada deciding to do something for herself, regardless of cost and regardless of the ability of other people to do it for her. It is a case of protecting herself against the refusal or inability of other people to do the job in situations which, everyone knows, have arisen in the past and are likely to arise again."

In this country, during the past year, some legislative measures have been taken, and others initiated, which I hope will remove the causes for flag-changes. Most important of these is the Cargo Preference Act, of which your senior Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, was cosponsor, and in the enactment of which he rendered conspicuous service.

Under this legislation, at least half of all cargo owned, donated, or financed in any degree by the United States Government, and destined to be shipped in foreign trade, must be transported in American-flag ships. The act, then, merely gives general and permanent application to a provision which Congress has previously written into each separate piece of "aid" legislation.

It has already brought measurable relief particularly to those segments of the industry which receive no other Government support and so are most prone to seek foreign registry. It is, however, being attacked in a number of countries as flag discrimination—which it most emphatically is not, in the usual acceptation of that term. It does not interfere with freedom of commercial trade. The special cargo to which it applies is almost universally conceded to be within the control of government. And its chief objective is beneficial not only to this country but to all the free world: the preservation of a merchant marine without which that world could not have survived either of its 20th-century ordeals.

The act has also encountered some criticism here at home, chiefly in connection with the increase it would supposedly entail in the cost of the agricultural surplus disposal program. A careful cost study shows that the entire additional cost of including a 50–50 provision in this program will total one-quarter of one percent of the $630 million of commodities in the basic disposal program itself, a small premium to insure that American shipping services will be available on the day when foreign services are for any reason withdrawn.

These are points which cannot be stressed too strongly or too often by the friends of the merchant marine when they are called upon to explain and defend this salutary law.

Another hindrance which has kept American operators from devoting their full energy to meeting foreign competition is competition from their own Government. Since the war, the Navy's Military Sea Transportation Service has kept a large fleet of merchant-type vessels in worldwide operation. Though a military activity, it has come to handle, in the opinion of many people in and out of shipping, a large volume of what should be purely commercial traffic. Transfer of this business to private ships would materially improve the general health of our maritime commerce.

While Congress has taken no action on MSTS as yet, a strong recommendation of such action has lately come from the Hoover Commission. I quote its major conclusion:

"There cannot be two American merchant marines, 1 military and 1 civilian, operating independently and at times in competition with each other. Cooperation from the Secretaries of Defense and Commerce, assisted by American ship operators and the Congress, is needed to end this situation."

Implementation of this conclusion, together with resolute backing and enforcement of the 50–50 law, will remove a good part of the incentive to foreign transfer. Whether it will obviate the need for broadening the parity concept of the Merchant Marine Act to cover nonliner services, only time will show. The question should be among those examined in the hearings on maritime subsidy now being conducted by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

I have spoken of resolute backing of the 50–50 law. If I may make the suggestion, I would say that I can think of few more worthwhile and patriotic purposes in the marine field to which a group like yours can dedicate itself today than the explaining and supporting of this legislation and its underlying policy on all occasions. The health of the merchant marine is a matter of serious concern, I know, to you all, and acute hardship in any one segment of it is bound to affect the whole.

While I am in the suggesting vein, may I venture one more observation without offense? It would be presumptuous for me to tell Baltimoreans how they can derive greater benefits from the natural advantages they enjoy in the port. But it is, I am sure, permissible to state the obvious. Baltimore can be assured that greater dividends will be received by its citizens if it takes steps immediately to retain its coveted position as leading import center and if it maintains and operates its loading facilities so as to attract increased cargoes. In stressing the advantages here, it is significant that the labor situation in Baltimore has been eminently satisfactory, a fact which constitutes a tribute both to your patriotic laboring group and to your public-spirited industrial leaders.

Possibility of Women Ministers in the Presbyterian Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am one of the men in public life who believe we should have more women in positions of trust and responsibility—in Government, in education, in business and industry, in the trade-union movement, and elsewhere. I commend the 167th general assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States for taking a step which, in time, may lead to the ordaining of women as full-fledged ministers. I believe this is a step of great spiritual and religious significance.

I ask that an article from the New York Times of May 24, 1955, describing this action, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOVE FOR WOMEN AS PASTORS GAINS—PRESBYTERIAN ASSEMBLY VOTES TO PUT PROPOSAL TO CHURCH'S LOCAL UNITS FOR APPROVAL

(By George Dugan)

LOS ANGELES, May 23.—The 167th general assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. opened the door today for the eventual ordination of women as full-fledged ministers.

By a standing vote that appeared to be overwhelming, the 900 commissioners, or delegates, agreed to put the proposition up to the church's 256 Presbyteries, or local units, for ratification during the coming year. If a majority of the Presbyteries go along with the assembly, Presbyterian women will have as free a hand in accepting a pulpit as Presbyterian men.

Earlier, without a dissenting vote, the assembly approved a long statement deploring the increasing emphasis of the Roman Catholic Church on the role of the Virgin Mary.

The statement was written by the Rev. John A. Mackay, president of Princeton (N. J.) Theological Seminary and a former moderator of the church. It came before the assembly as an official presentation of the body's permanent commission on interchurch relations.

THREE PIVOTAL POINTS

The theologian also is president of the Presbyterian World Alliance. He told the assembly that the commission considered the trend within Roman Catholicism to exalt the Virgin Mary as a copartner with Jesus Christ as a challenge of the first magnitude.

He asked the commissioners to pay particular heed to what he described as the three pivotal points in the document. Dr. Mackay listed these as follows:

"1. The development of the Marian cult has widened the breach between the Roman Catholic Church and all other Christian communions.

"2. Honors bestowed upon the Virgin Mary in the course of Christian history have closely paralleled, and in some instances, duplicated honors paid to Jesus Christ.

"3. The festivals in honor of the Virgin Mary which marked the Marian year of 1954 set in bold relief the status now accorded to the Mother of our Lord in the Roman communion. In the celebration of that year the progressive trend to exact the figure of the Virgin Mother to the office of associate partner in the work of redemption reached its culminating point. Mary of Nazareth has become coredemptrix with her Son."

The proposal to sanction the ordination of women was presented to the assembly by the Reverend C. Vin White of Lincoln, Nebr., chairman of a special committee aappointed in 1953 to study the matter.

NOW ORDAINED AS DEACONS

He underscored these committee findings:

Women now are ordained as deacons and elders.

There is an increasing cooperation between men and women in government, and various professions.

The Bible teaches that "in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female."

There is no theological ground for denying ordination to women simply because they are women.

Spirited debate came immediately on the heels of the committee's presentation. Those favoring women as full members of the clergy echoed the committee viewpoint. They emphasized that ordination would enable the church to give "status" to women now serving the church and also would encourage others to undertake the work of the ministry.

Commissioners opposed to the move insisted that the question involved authority rather than superiority. One delegate observed that God gave man authority and woman "the place of honor."

The last time a proposal to ordain women as ministers was introduced was at the general assembly of 1946. This was defeated in the Presbyteries by a vote of 128 to 100, with 8 recommending no action. A similar proposal, initiated in 1929, was defeated by a vote of 170 to 108, with 7 presbyteries recording no action.

The current proposal, in the opinion of observers, stands a better than even chance of ratification.

5,791 ORDAINED AT PRESENT

According to the latest church figures, there are at least 5,791 ordained or licensed women ministers in the United States. The Federal population census for 1950 puts the total even higher: 6,777 women members of the clergy, or 4.1 percent of the Nation's clergy.

Denominational reports to the 1951 Yearbook of American Churches lists only 2,896 pastors out of the total number of ordained or licensed clergywomen. Of these, 966 are in non-Protestant groups, 850 of them in the Christ Unity Spiritual Science Church.

Two-thirds of the Protestant women ministers are in 4 bodies: the Church of God, the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, the Volunteers of America, and the Methodist Church.

In the case of the Methodist Church, women are ordained as local elders but are not admitted to membership in conference. The woman local elder who is assigned to a pastorate can do everything the male minister does but has no claim to a church.

The Struggle for Peace—Outstanding Interview by Edward F. Woods, of Post-Dispatch, With Harry S. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I was impressed, and deeply moved, by an article which I have just read from Tuesday's St. Louis Post-Dispatch, "The Struggle for Peace—Truman Says Man's Hope for Peace Depends on Supporting U. N. and Making Charter Principles Work."

This article was the result of an interview by Edward F. Woods, of the Washington staff of the Post-Dispatch, with former President Harry S. Truman, at Mr. Truman's office in Kansas City. When an outstanding reporter like Ed Woods interviews a man with the tremendous background in world-shaking events like Mr. Truman, for a paper like the Post-Dispatch, the result is bound to be an unusual, remarkable, and exciting piece of journalism.

This article, Mr. Speaker, belongs in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where it can be read by all Members of Congress. Mr. Truman's work in carrying through the establishment of the United Nations, and his efforts as President, and since leaving office, in helping to make the United Nations work as an instrument for world peace, are well known to all of us. Out of this background and experience comes a statement of principles that I think is an inspiration to all of us.

The article is as follows:

THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE—TRUMAN SAYS MAN'S HOPE FOR PEACE DEPENDS ON SUPPORTING U. N. AND MAKING CHARTER PRINCIPLES WORK—EX-PRESIDENT DECLARES MILLIONS WILL BE DESTROYED IF FREE WORLD LEADERS FAIL TO DO THIS—POLICY RESTS ON GOOD WILL OF PEOPLE—POVERTY TURNS MASSES TO FALSE DOCTRINE OF REDS—PEACE WITH FREEDOM AND JUSTICE CANNOT BE BOUGHT CHEAPLY—NO SINGLE NATION HAS ALL THE ANSWERS—IT CAN BE ASSURED ONLY BY THE COMBINED EFFORTS OF PEOPLE THROUGHOUT THE WORLD WHO WANT TO SECURE PEACE

(By Edward F. Woods)

Mankind's hope for enduring peace in this atomic age lies in the support of the United Nations Charter by the free world, and if the leaders of the free world fail to make the charter function, millions of us will be destroyed, former President Harry S. Truman told the Post-Dispatch today.

Discussing in an interview here the aspirations of men of good will everywhere for a free and happy life, the former Chief Executive recalled what he had told the San Francisco conference which drafted the U. N. charter nearly 10 years ago. At that time he said:

"If we had had this charter a few years ago—and above all, the will to use it—millions now dead would be alive. If we should falter in the future in our will to use it, millions now living will surely die."

BASES OF WAR AND PEACE

Drawing on his rich experience in 18 years as Senator, Vice President and President, Mr. Truman said he does not believe that just and lasting peace can be accomplished by diplomats or by military combines. Agreements made by diplomats and military men have to be based upon the wholehearted support of the people for whom they are made, he said.

History, he continued, is rampant with evidence that wars grow from seeds of economic hostility and social injustice, and the U. N. charter is aimed directly at eliminating these evils. In the success or failure of this instrument, then, lies the key to lasting peace, he said.

The charter, he added, is dedicated to the achievement of, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the best efforts of statesmen cannot bring about lasting peace and security unless these objectives are attained for all men and women without consideration of race, creed, or color.

Sixty nations, he noted, now make up the United Nations and all but a handful are free to practice international cooperation in the interest of helping to correct the economic and social causes for war.

A firm economic base for democratic aspiration of citizens of underprivileged countries must be established, Mr. Truman went on. The U. N. could do even more to strengthen itself in this area as an instrument of economic and social progress than by debating of differences among nations and through police action against aggressors.

POVERTY GREATEST CHALLENGE

As he has contended frequently, Mr. Truman stated that the grinding poverty and the lack of economic opportunity for many millions of people in the economically underdeveloped parts of Africa, the Near East, the Far East and certain regions of Central and South America present the greatest challenge to the world.

Nevertheless the spread of industrial civilization, a better understanding of the concepts of modern government and the impact of two world wars have stirred these people to great expectations, he said.

Frustration and disappointment could cause them to turn to false doctrines, which preach that progress can be achieved only at the price of tyranny.

The United States and the other free countries of the U. N. should do everything possible through technical assistance and advice to bring the underdeveloped countries close to the free community in terms of friendship and commerce, he said.

If that is not done, Mr. Truman warned, the unsettled state of the world could only be prolonged indefinitely and the achievement of permanent peace frustrated.

ESSENTIAL BULWARK OF PEACE

The preamble to the U. N. Charter, he pointed out, recognizes that the economic and social advancement of all people is an essential bulwark of peace and under article 56 of the charter this Nation is pledged to taking separate action or to act jointly with other nations in promoting higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development.

It is important in the face of Communist propaganda, he went on, that the development of the poorer nations take place under international cooperation. Communist propagandists might well exploit exclusive American operations within a nation as colonization and so frighten away the beneficiaries. This would not occur if several nations were associated in the project.

He stressed the importance of the fact that the world's leaders, if they are to save their people from holocaust, must continually resort to the negotiations tables for talks directed toward peace rather than war.

Leaders of the free world must never by word, deed or act leave suffering and uncertain people anywhere in the world with the impression that they must one day in

the long run fight with the free world or against it.

He added that discussion and exchanges of opinion and viewpoints must be maintained within flexible bounds. Then the masses of people around the world, if the truth reaches them, will readily recognize the forces of peace as compared to forces which would brutishly subject them to conflict, he said.

Whether at the negotiating table or in an international political arena, the free world must show itself through its leaders as dedicated to the ideal that political problems can be solved by men of good will through discussion and without devastating war, he added.

In this connection, Mr. Truman said, he is opposed to expulsion of the Soviet Union from the United Nations despite the obstructionist tactics employed by that nation and its satellites.

ADVANTAGES OF RUSSIA IN U. N.

It is his belief that through the medium of open debate the Soviet Union may be held up to the mirror of world opinion in a fashion not conceivably possible outside of the U. N. Thus the U. N. can serve as the conscience for mankind when it chooses between the free world and those hostile to human freedoms, between the warlike and those who have demonstrated by the peaceful approach that their goal is international friendship among people and that freedom to them means common freedom.

Soviet membership in the United Nations has been advantageous to the cause of peace because the peoples of the world have been able to compare the Soviets' conduct to the standards of international peace laid down in the charter and to determine that it is the Soviets who violated the basic ideals of mankind, he said.

This basic comparison has more than once enabled the free world to keep the peace where it was seriously threatened, as it did in Iran and Indonesia, Mr. Truman said; and in 1950, when the aggressor broke the peace of the world in Korea, the United Nations met the challenge and for the first time an international organization organized effective resistance to armed aggression

The former President said he very much favored regional security arrangements such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the South East Asia Treaty Organization, but he emphasized that they are temporary devices to deter aggressors and do not in themselves serve to secure the lasting peace.

They are necessary to national safety so long as the potential aggressor is building strength, just as are a large standing army and a stockpile of nuclear weapons.

Disarmament, as a move toward peace, has been discussed for generations, Mr. Truman said, and he would like to see it take place. If a disarmament plan is to be worked out, it will have to be through the U. N., he said, and it will have to include not only nuclear weapons, but all other weapons as well, and manpower.

AGAINST "GO-IT-ALONEISM"

He expressed dismay at suggestions that the United States should withdraw from the U. N. and go it alone. He described the U. N. as the "baby" of the United States and said that if the United States should leave the world body this country might just as well make up its mind to get into the third world war.

This third world war, the former President stressed, would spell the end of civilization.

Emphasizing again his convictions that permanent world peace is hinged to the free nations making friends, he said that more than half the people in the world are living in conditions approaching misery, the victims of disease and participants in an economic life which is primitive and stagnant.

It is the manner with which the free nations deal with those people as human beings, he said, whether they shall become our friends or the friends of those who are not bent on achieving peace, as we are.

He said that for the first time in history, humanity possesses the knowledge and the skill to relieve the suffering of these people. The United States, he went on, is preeminent among the free nations in the development of industrial and scientific techniques; and while there is a limit to the material resources which we can afford to use for the assistance of other peoples, our technological knowledge and skills are virtually inexhaustible.

Mr. Truman said that he believed that the United States and the United Nations should make available to all peace-loving peoples the benefit of our store of technological knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a better life.

We should, he said, in cooperation with other nations, foster capital investment in these areas for their development.

Our purpose, he continued, should be to help the free peoples of the world, through their own efforts, to produce more clothing, more materials for housing and more mechanical power to lighten their burden. He added that we must insist on and encourage other countries of the free world to pool their technological resources in this undertaking.

This has to be a cooperative enterprise, he said, in which all the free nations will work, it has to be a worldwide effort for plenty and freedom and, therefore, peace.

Business, private capital, agriculture, and labor in this country must cooperate in this program to greatly increase the industrial activity in other nations and raise substantially their standard of living, Mr. Truman said.

KEY TO PROSPERITY, PEACE

Greater production is the key to prosperity and peace, he said, and the key to greater production is a wider and more vigorous application of modern scientific and technological knowledge.

These new economic developments will have to be devised and controlled to benefit the people in the area in which they are being established, he said.

He said also that the old imperialism, which he interpreted as exploitation for foreign profits, is out of step with modern civilization. What he said he had in mind was a program of development based on the principle of fair dealing.

Only by helping the least fortunate of its members to help themselves can the human family achieve the decent satisfying life that is the right of all people, he said.

"Peace with freedom and justice cannot be bought cheaply," Mr. Truman said. "No single nation has all the answers. It can be assured only by the combined efforts of people throughout the world who want to secure peace. They are our friends and we must keep them our friends."

Problems for the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Macon (Ga.) News:

The first anniversary of the United States Supreme Court's decision that segregation in the public schools is unconstitutional, finds Georgia and three other Southern States (South Carolina, Mississippi, and Louisiana) officially unprepared to accept or follow the decree.

Nine Southern States are awaiting Court instructions and seven border States are moving toward integration.

The Supreme Court is expected to soon say how its ruling on what is the law shall be enforced. It appears to have three broad alternatives:

1. To set a deadline of September 1955 or September 1956 for integration as urged by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

2. To remand the cases to lower courts, permitting the judges in individual Federal districts to gage community sentiment and weigh local problems without a time limit in requiring adjustment to the decree, as was generally recommended by attorneys representing the States.

3. To allow district courts discretion, but with guaranties that such discretion would not encourage delay in integration, as suggested by the Department of Justice.

In our view, the Court, which took nearly 60 years to make up its own mind and decide that the "separate but equal" concept handed down in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was wrong and segregation per se was illegal, cannot possibly expect such a far-reaching decision to be implemented until the people who will have to implement it are ready to do so.

TURNING THE CLOCK AHEAD?

The Court, in its decision of May 17, 1954, said the clock could not be turned back. Neither can it be pushed forward and until the white people of the South who pay the taxes, administer the schools, and make the State and local laws, change their opposition to mixing the races in the public schools, the clock will not be pushed forward.

Justice Frankfurter, in the April hearings, said: "There are certain unalterable facts of life that cannot be changed even by this Court. I am not talking about the feelings of the people, I am talking about districting, the accommodations, the arrangement of personnel, and all the complexities that go with the administering of schools."

True, the administrative complexities of a transition from segregated to integrated schools would be enormous, and perhaps even beyond the imagination of a non-Southerner, but Justice Frankfurter is disturbing when he mentions "unalterable facts of life that cannot be changed even by this Court" and then so casually dismisses "the feelings of the people."

The attitude of the Southern public, not the administrative difficulties of transition, is what will prevent integration in this State and others at this time or in the near future.

The South, to those who were not born and have not lived here, is a neat and understandable kingdom of the mind.

Its 50 million people and 11 million schoolchildren are referred to glibly by those who are attempting to change rights, mores, customs, and modes of life, with little understanding of what such changes involve.

The Court has said that public education is the most important function of local government. Few will disagree.

Yet the Court, which assigns the responsibility for public education to State and local government, is unwilling to give the necessary accompanying authority for the administration of public education to that same State and local government.

THE ISSUE IS NOT STATISTICS

For many years, State and local governments have fulfilled the function of providing schools in the South. But 1 year ago, the Court said that such governments were performing these functions illegally.

Do not these State and local governments, which govern with the consent of the governed, have a right to ask postponement of a suicidal policy which would only infuriate their people?

Human relationships in the South or elsewhere, cannot be reduced to the cold figures of a stack of statistics.

The ease and intimacy which exists between Southern white and Southern Negro, and is tolerable because the taboos are tacitly understood on both sides, cannot be uprooted overnight, leaving only a vacuum of fear for both races.

The taboos, the selective segregation which permits a Negro woman to nurse a child and prohibits the same child from having a Negro schoolmate, have existed in a society of privileged inequality for hundreds of years.

Will the Southern Negro really profit if this system is destroyed and replaced by the same society of underprivileged equality which exists in the desegregated regions of America?

What the Supreme Court is up against, what the Nation is up against, is that Southern whites are unwilling at the present time to permit forced mixing of the races in the public schools.

The only wise move the Court can make in this situation is to turn the segregation problem over to the Federal district courts, leaving it up to the individual Federal judges to decide when the attitude of the people is such that integration can be permitted.

Effects of Major Senate Amendment to Reciprocal Trade Agreements Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Sunday, May 15, edition of the New York Times carried an article by Mr. J. H. Carmical on the effects of the major Senate amendment to the reciprocal trade agreements bill. As it sums up the situation very well, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL COMPROMISE SUITS BOTH SIDES—NO IMPORT QUOTAS ADOPTED, BUT PRESIDENTIAL POWERS BACK VOLUNTARY CURBS

(By J. H. Carmical)

The bitter fight for Federal legislation to restrict oil imports has ended with a compromise amendment to the reciprocal trade bill. And, curiously enough, the oil industry, both importers and domestic producers, and the coal interests are generally pleased with the outcome.

The amendment, as passed by the Senate, does not mention oil imports. However, it grants to the President authority to take whatever action he deems necessary to adjust imports of commodities should they threaten to impair the national-defense industries.

In view of the fight being waged by domestic oil producers and the coal industry for some restriction on oil imports, the consensus is that it was pressure from these groups that led the Senate to adopt that amendment. It is understood that the amendment had the support of the administration and consequently likely will be approved by the House-Senate conference that is scheduled this week.

If the amendment remains unchanged in the reciprocal trade bill, the President will have the implicit power to restrict oil imports should they be in excess of the ratio to domestic production that existed in 1954. That would mean that crude oil imports would be restricted to around 10 percent of domestic production.

Senator FRANK CARLSON, Kansas, Republican, said in the debate on the amendment that there was no doubt in his mind that the intent of the Senate Finance Committee was to limit oil imports to the average daily rate of 1954, based on the report of the President's Commission on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy.

"I can assure the Senate that I would not have agreed to the amendment dealing with imports of commodities which are of national defense interest, had I not been assured that it would be the policy of those who administer the act to follow the intent of those who participated in preparing the report of the (President's) Advisory Committee."

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, said the Finance Committee, believed the amendment "will provide a means for assistance to the various national-defense industries which would have been affected by the individual amendments presented."

"Congress can initiate and adopt such legislation as it might deem advisable," he said, "should the action needed to protect these essential industries not be taken."

PRODUCERS YIELD

The Independent Petroleum Association of America, which spearheaded the drive of the domestic producers for direct legislation restricting oil imports, said the Senate had fully recognized the problem involved and "it deferred legislative limitations only on the assurance of similar limitations through administrative action."

"While we believe the 1954 levels of oil imports to be too high," the association statement continued, "we must reconcile ourselves that, if the Senate provision becomes the law, imports can be held to that and, in the meantime, we can in good faith try to live within those levels and observe the effects. If it works, well and good; if it does not we must try again for more definite relief."

The consensus in the industry is that the plan will work. Already, the five major American oil companies operating abroad have gone on record to the effect that they will hold imports in line with that suggested by the President's Committee. In fact before the amendment was passed by the Senate, the heads of each of these companies individually announced that they had or would put such restraint on imports into effect.

Actually what the amendment seeks is to give the President authority to restrict oil imports should they exceed significantly the 1954 level. Without such amendment, there is some doubt that the imposition of restrictions could be put into effect if the companies were unwilling to do so voluntarily.

COAL GROUP SEES A GAIN

Following the passage of the reciprocal trade bill by the Senate, the National Coal Association noted that the amendment by Senator MATTHEW M. NEELY, Democrat, of West Virginia, to restrict imports of oil to 10 percent of domestic consumption had been rejected by a standing vote of about 3 to 1. However, the association said:

"Although Senator NEELY's amendment failed to be accepted either by the committee or on the floor, the compromise which was substituted in its stead can be hailed as victory for those who have fought so long to protect coal and other United States industries from unfair foreign competition.

"As the bill waited for conference action, there was every reason to believe the compromise section on limitation of damaging imports could prove workable in halting such commodity deliveries. It was said that assurances had been given that its provisions would be used to limit oil imports to 1954 levels in relation to United States production. Only the administration pledge made acceptance of the compromise possible."

After the passage of the trade bill by the Senate, Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay had occasion to address the National Petroleum Council, a body consisting of the heads of oil companies. Secretary McKay told the council that the industry must limit imports by voluntary, individual action to the 1954 level as had been recommended by the President's Commission, or that Government action would become necessary.

Previously, the National Petroleum Council had adopted a report submitted by Hines H. Baker, president of the Humble Oil and Refining Co. and vice chairman of the council's committee on petroleum imports to the effect that "fair and equitable relationship should obtain at all times between total imports of crude oil and its products and total demand for oil in the United States."

In its conclusion, the council's committee noted that the recent report of the President's Commission on Fuel Resources had recognized the problem of oil imports and had specific suggestions for dealing with the problem, and said that the report was worthy of careful study and consideration.

TEN PERCENT RATIO LIKELY IN 1955

With all interests involved in oil imports now in agreement that they should be limited to about the 1954 level with respect to domestic production, the consensus is that the importing companies will keep deliveries from foreign sources at that level.

Early this year, when it was thought likely that direct legislation limiting imports might be enacted, there was a sharp increase in foreign oil shipments here. In 1 week, such deliveries, including oil products, exceeded 1,500,000 barrels, compared with an average of 1,052,000 in 1954.

With the report of the President's Commission, the companies voluntarily started to restrict imports. In the week ended on April 22, they dropped to slightly below 1 million barrels a day. Currently, they are running about 1,100,000 barrels a day, but further cuts have been scheduled by some companies. The consensus is that the major importing companies will restrain their imports for the balance of 1955 at a level that will match the 1954 ratio for the full year.

The Dean Grew Out of Striped Pants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Washington Post and Times Herald carried an article on a grand old man. I enjoyed his visit to the Midwest last year, and want to pay tribute to his lengthy years of service. Under leave to extend remarks, I include this article on the dean of Norway's diplomatic corps, Ambassador Morgenstierne, Ambassador to the United States:

THE DEAN GREW OUT OF STRIPED PANTS

(By Jean White)

On Thursday Wilhelm Thorleif Munthe Morgenstierne, Norwegian Ambassador to the United States, will begin his 46th year in the diplomatic service of his country.

And, if it may be revealed without breaching the protocol that governs international relations, the Ambassador will enter his 46th year as a diplomat without a single pair of striped trousers in his wardrobe.

The absence of the striped pants is symbolic of some of the changes in the ways of the world and diplomacy since Ambassador Morgenstierne decided on the foreign service as a life's career.

His first post was in Washington, as an attaché to the Norwegian Legation. Then he was 22, ruddy-cheeked, blond, a young man just graduated from the University of Norway in Oslo. His diplomatic wardrobe included a pair of striped pants.

Today he is 67, still ruddy-cheeked, but now grayhaired, the distinguished dean of the diplomatic corps in the diplomatic center of the world. And he is without a pair of striped pants.

On Thursday the Ambassador will look at the calendar in his book-lined office at the Norwegian Embassy, which holds a commanding height on Massachusetts Avenue's Embassy Row across from the Naval Observatory. There he will find a notation for at least one luncheon and dinner engagement.

"It will be a light day if nothing else turns up," the veteran diplomat said yesterday as he glanced ahead to the date of his 45th anniversary.

As the elder statesman in service of 77 chiefs of missions here, the tall, diffident Norwegian has a busy social calendar both as host and guest. There are visiting dignitaries from the home country to entertain (the chief of the Norwegian Navy is here this week). There are receptions, parties, dinners, the independence days of other countries, the constitution days, liberation days.

Amid protocol and cultivated courtesies, Ambassador Morgenstierne brings a slow, engaging smile, a gentle sense of humor, and a warmth that overcomes his natural shyness.

"I enjoy the parties," the Ambassador admits with the slightest trace of a smile. "I like meeting people."

The Ambassador's smile is a slow, shy one that frequently breaks through the dignity benefitting the dean of the Diplomatic Corps. It thaws his Scandinavian self-restraint and shyness. Then his blue-gray eyes—about the color of the lakes of Norway—gleam for a moment behind his shell-rimmed glasses.

To keep in condition after his round of social responsibilities, the Ambassador takes an hour-long walking jaunt almost every afternoon for some 3 miles.

"It's a fine daily habit," he advocates. "I used to take long walks."

Like any Norwegian worthy of the name, Morgenstierne was an excellent skier "a long time ago," and tried his art in Rock Creek Park his first winters here. Now he settles for the short afternoon walks.

When the future Ambassador first came to Washington, in 1910, he found the duties of an attaché varied.

His first assignment in the realm of foreign diplomacy?

"Probably putting stamps on letters," the Ambassador replies, and the smile comes slowly. "There were no stenographers or typists then. We did everything—opening mail, keeping books, writing letters in long hand, and then typing them."

Just a little more than a month after his arrival here the Minister died unexpectedly, and Morgenstierne arrived at his diplomatic majority as his country's chief representative for 3 months. He still had the task of putting stamps on letters, however.

Another diplomatic assignment took Morgenstierne from Washington in 1913. He came back for 5 years in 1917 as commercial counselor to the Legation here. From 1929 to 1934, he was Norway's consul general in New York.

The year 1934 saw his appointment as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary from Norway. He has been his country's representative to the United States ever since and became its first Ambassador when the Legation was raised to an Embassy in 1942.

He became an Ambassador as an envoy in exile during the Nazi occupation of Norway. It was Morgenstierne who radioed Norwegian ship captains after the invasion to take their vessels to allied or neutral ports. More than 1,000 vessels were saved to help the allies and the fight for liberation.

Two weeks ago, at the 10th anniversary of the liberation of Norway, the Norwegian Ambassador told a group of compatriots to remember that vigilance is the price of liberty and to be on guard against quislings from within and totalitarian aggressors from without.

For vigilance, he signed the United Nations Charter in 1945 and NATO Pacts in 1949 for his country.

Morgenstierne has spent more of his 67 years in the United States than any other country, even his homeland. But he still longs for the towering mountains and fjords of Norway and returns to his homeland each summer. This year he hopes to get away from his desk (where a whale tooth serves as a paperweight) in August.

He and his Canadian-born wife have two daughters. The younger, Solveig, will be graduated from Holton-Arms this year. There is also a sturdy, 3-year-old grandson, John Wilhelm Coleman.

For new diplomats, the dean has this advice:

"Be natural, friendly, and absolutely sincere. Remember you are in a foreign country as a representative of your own."

And then he added: "Be sure to have a double set of studs."

With diplomatic tact, the Ambassador smiled slowly and decided it might not be wise to tell the story behind the last admonition. He would only explain that a reserve set is handy in case you should lose one set while dressing for an official dinner.

Welcome Back, Senator John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join with the membership of both Houses of the Congress in welcoming back to Washington, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY. His return to the Senate was acclaimed by his colleagues and the press. All wish him well and express the hope that his health will continue to improve.

Under unanimous consent, I insert an editorial from the Springfield Daily News to be printed in the RECORD:

WELCOME BACK, SENATOR

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, the popular and hard-working Senator from Massachusetts, is back at his Washington desk after a 7-month recuperation following complicated surgery.

The young Senator had been troubled with a recurring back ailment since a spinal injury he received during World War II while on Navy service. On October 21, after the regular 1954 session of Congress, he underwent a 4-hour operation at the Hospital for Special Surgery in New York. Traveling on a stretcher, he was flown to Florida to spend Christmas at the winter home of his parents, former Ambassador and Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy.

On February 10 he was back in the hospital at New York where surgeons removed a metal plate that was slowing his recovery. It was then hoped he could return to his duties in March. His recuperation was slower than had been expected, and only yesterday was he able to go to his Washington office.

However, the energetic Senator was not idle during his convalescence. While writing a magazine article on the services of little-known Senators in our history, he decided that a more complete story should be recorded. So, he wrote a book which will soon be published.

Meanwhile, the Senator maintained daily telephone contact with his office, conferred frequently in Florida with his legislative and administrative staff and otherwise kept abreast of current legislation and activities in the Nation's Capital.

Senator KENNEDY never takes the easy way. He served on PT boats in the Pacific during the war, and had one of the little craft literally cut out from under him by a Japanese cruiser. When he decided to run for the Senate, he opposed Henry Cabot Lodge who had quarterbacked the nomination drive of General Eisenhower. The general was so popular in Massachusetts that he carried the State by 200,000 votes, the first Republican to win the States electoral votes since the days of Calvin Coolidge. However, JACK KENNEDY bucked the tide to beat Eisenhower's champion by a 68,000 margin.

Senator KENNEDY knows Massachusetts and her problems. He can write with authority and speak with conviction about the problems of the port of Boston, the railroad rate structure, wool importation, domestic fisheries, industrial relocation and localized unemployment. He speaks for New England, yet his words are so well reasoned that he has won the warm commendation of legislators and editors from all parts of the Union, including the South.

However, his greatest service to the State and the Nation may be in the field of international relations. The very injury which has kept him from Washington for months is a harsh reminder of war and its price. He has an even more painful memory in the death of his heroic brother. Senator KENNEDY'S political acumen and statesmanship are dedicated not only to the assistance of this State, but also to the service of this country and all nations.

All those whom he serves, not only the hundreds of thousands in Massachusetts who elected him, are pleased that he is back at working, still following his own statement of philosophy: "We can only pray that man's political skill can keep abreast of his scientific skill. If not, we may yet live to see world war III."

Social Security Coverage for Lawyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the 1955 midyear meeting of the house of delegates of the American Bar Association was held at the Edgewater Beach Hotel, in Chicago, Ill., on February 21 and 22.

At the second session, the house of delegates went on record in favor of vol-

untary coverage of lawyers under the social-security plan, thus reversing its previous opposition to social security for lawyers.

I wish to include the statement that appeared in the April 1955 American Bar Association Journal in reference to the debate on the social-security item at the house of delegates, second session, on Monday, February 21. Chairman John D. Randall presided.

The article follows:

The house then began consideration of the question of voluntary inclusion of lawyers under the social-security system, one of the most controversial and most important questions decided at the midyear meeting.

Social security for lawyers was extensively debated at the last annual meeting in Chicago, and the question was referred to the conference of bar presidents with a request to poll their membership to determine the sentiment of the State and local associations. Archibald M. Mull, of California, chairman of the conference, reported on the results of a questionnaire sent to 1,445 State and local bar associations. In summary, 607 presidents of these associations, asked their personal opinion, voted 490 in favor to 117 against inclusion. Some 366 associations had polled their members; 264 said that their members favored social security, 45 were opposed. Some 293 assoications that had not taken a poll expressed the consensus of their presidents or executive committee as to the opinion of members in their associations; these results indicated that 222 were for, and 71 against, inclusion of lawyers in the program.

Joseph F. O'Connell, of Boston, Mass., delegate of the Judge Advocates Association, declared that that association had taken a poll and was in favor of inclusion. "I do not personally feel that it is a good law," he said. "I have been instructed by my board to report the figures to you * * * out of 174 replies, 97 were for voluntary inclusion, 25 for either, 37 were for compulsory, and 15 against."

Secretary Stecher, speaking for the board of governors, moved that the house place the association on record in favor of a voluntary coverage for lawyers and other professional groups under the Social Security Act. This motion was a substitute for a proposal of the committee on unemployment and social security, submitted at the annual meeting, which would have reaffirmed the association's previous opposition to the program. The committee's report was unfinished business from the last meeting.

Clifford W. Gardner, of Minnesota, said that the younger lawyers in his State were in favor of the program. These young men, he said, believed that the association had influenced Congress not to include lawyers and have been very frank in stating that they will not support the coming regional meeting because of the association's view. "Minnesota voted overwhelmingly to favor Social Security on a voluntary basis and this organization should not stand in the way of their being voluntarily covered if they so wish" he declared.

Franklin Riter, of Utah, agreed with Mr. Gardner. The young men favor social security, he said, and while they are misled on some of the features of the law, "the fact remains that the younger element of our profession are 80 percent in favor of the plan and I therefore endorse this movement, although fundamentally on the problem, I am adverse to the whole thing."

Karl C. Williams, of Illinois, was strongly opposed to the Board's proposal. A pole of Illinois lawyers showed overwhelming opposition to mandatory coverage and opposition, although not so overwhelming, to voluntary coverage, he said. "Ours is a profession as distinguished from a vocation or calling," he declared. "It is not only that; it is a regulated profession * * * if we take this step, we are taking a step for the first time in the history of our profession in America towards regulation from without, because it will be inevitable that when we become partners with the Government in a form of security * * * we will yield in time to some other kind of regulation."

Frank W. Grinnell, of Massachusetts, announced that he was instructed to say that the Massachusetts Bar Association was in favor of the voluntary plan.

Telford B. Orbison, of Indiana, said that he had been instructed to report that the house of delegates of the Indiana State Bar Association had voted overwhelmingly in favor of coverage.

Floyd E. Thompson, of Illinois, made perhaps the shortest speech on the question: "I'm against making Socialists out of lawyers."

Osmer C. Fitts, of Vermont, said that the grassroots sentiment was for the program. "If the people in the grassroots, the men who belong to our associations, such as in the Vermont association, vote 5 to 1 for inclusion, I think it is the responsibility of the spokesmen for the 56,000 members of the American Bar Association to bury their personal desires, to bury the political differences that some of you have, the same as I do, and to support the men who need it, whether they are under 36 or over 36."

Edwin M. Otterbourg, of New York, said that the New York County Lawyers Association, with more than 8,000 members, had voted overwhelmingly in favor of inclusion.

Willard G. Woelper, of New Jersey, said that his State bar association had voted unanimously in favor. "Lawyers ofttimes leave widows who need social security," he declared, and despite the $1,200 limit on earnings under the program, it is still a good one.

The house then voted to accept the board's recommendation favoring inclusion of professional men in the social-security program.

Federal Aid for Highway Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting for consideration the following significant letter on the important subject of Federal aid for road construction:

THE PHILIP LESLY CO.,
Chicago, Ill., May 19, 1955.

Hon. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. CHURCH: The editorial from the Perrysburg (Ohio) Journal about which I wrote you referred to the current proposals before Congress involving the appropriation of new funds for highways, which would supplement existing Federal-aid funds. This would mean, of course, no change in the present plan of proportioned distribution of existing funds, but would involve a new look at any distribution of additional funds that may be appropriated.

As pointed out by the Commissioner, the Federal-Aid Highway Act in 1954 authorized for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957, $315 million for improvements on the Federal-aid primary system and $210 million for the secondary system plus $175 million for the Federal-aid primary system in urban areas. The National Safety Council has pointed out that the urban streets problem is primarily one of expediting traffic rather than of saving lives. Only one-fourth of the 1954 traffic deaths occurred in cities and towns of more than 2,500 population; three-fourths were in rural areas, including small towns under 2,500. The rural problem, therefore, is outstandingly one of safety, as well as of economy and convenience.

For this reason, primary and secondary systems become of primary importance in any consideration of new Federal-aid funds. There are 182,341 miles of Federal-aid primary system highways in addition to the interstate highway system that is receiving so much attention. As explained by the Commissioner, these roads are getting $315 million each year. Federal-aid secondary system totals 482,972 miles, and has been allotted $210 million a year. The interstate highway system totals only 37,600 miles, including the 4,346 miles located in urban areas.

Most traffic authorities agree that there is a need for spending money on the interstate highway system. Many, however, are now making a new evaluation of the proportions to be allotted to the various systems, remembering that the primary highways are the main State trunkline roads and the secondary highways are the farm-to-market roads, the important feeder roads acting as the lifeline between farms and distribution points, and between factories and the smaller communities of the Nation. These are the roads that bring food into market. Because of their present inadequate and unsafe condition they have contributed to increased food prices. Best estimates are that 76 percent of all the meat delivered to stockyards is brought in by truck, as well as 99.7 percent of the poultry and 98 percent of the shell eggs. Altogether, 89 percent of all of the food and farm products reach their first market by trucks traveling over these outdated and unsafe roads.

Now, let us consider the above situation in relation to the currently proposed highway bills before Congress. The Clay bill calls for expenditure of $27 billion on the interstate highway system and an additional $29.03 billion to be spent on Federal-aid primary roads in addition to the interstate system. However, only $15 billion would be spent on Federal-aid secondary roads. These figures represent a projection at exactly present ratios of expenditures on primary and secondary roads, while attention and new funds are unduly concentrated on improving and extending the interstate highway system.

In contrast, Senator GORE'S highway bill provides for an increase in the appropriation for the primary system from $315 million a year to $500 million and an increase in the secondary system funds from $210 million to $325 million a year, as well as a sizable increase in funds to be expended on the interstate highway system.

This was the background for the editorial that questioned the advisability of concentrating so much attention on interstate highways while neglecting the roads that must serve local residents who are paying for their inadequacy, in loss of lives and in higher costs of operating their vehicles and of transporting products to the consumer market. These are the roads that represent the major share of the $3 billion annual direct financial loss to individuals that is calculated by the Automobile Manufacturers Association. This represents a loss of $71 per family in the United States. Added to this figure must be the $4,350 million loss in 1954 (as calculated by the National Safety Council) resulting from automobile accidents on the roads and streets of the Nation. In consid-

ering this figure, it is important again to remember that three-quarters of our automotive fatalities occur on rural roads.

There is ample evidence that such accidents can be greatly reduced by expanding attention to the primary and secondary roads. The State of Connecticut conducted a study that showed that 7,700 accidents might have been avoided during a 4-year period, if all the rural State highways had been improved to accepted design standards, including adequate signs and markings.

The interstate highway system is the glamorous "star" of the highway program, but the much greater network of existing secondary and primary roads is carrying the bulk of the load and requires the bulk of attention.

Sincerely,

PHILIP LESLY.

"Just a Teacher" Isn't Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks into the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Leavenworth Times on Thursday, April 21, 1955.

With much interest in Federal aid to schools for improvement of physical facilities, I think it is important that we do not overlook the fact that highly trained teachers are equally as important as the physical plant for a good school system. Although I do not agree in every detail with the thought set out in this editorial, I do think it points up a matter that we might be inclined to overlook in our concentration on expanding our school system. Certainly the ability, personality, and the moral character of our teachers are just as important as the physical characteristics of the classroom in which the students assemble. This field is mostly guided and directed by standards set on the State level, but I feel, nevertheless, that it is an integral part of the overall picture on education, and we as Members of Congress should feel some responsibility to that end.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Leavenworth Times of April 21, 1955]

"JUST A TEACHER" ISN'T ENOUGH

It is possible that Leavenworth, and many other towns, will build the classrooms which wil be needed to meet the bigger enrollments ahead in our public schools, only to find there will be no teachers to move into them. Or what will be almost as bad, only inadequately trained teachers will be available.

While most of Leavenworth is interested in the building program for our schools, the board of education and its administrators are equally concerned about a shortage of topnotch young teachers. It is a problem which demands the interest of every ctizen.

"For without teachers, we will have a second-rate school system. And with an inferior school program, we will have a second-rate democratic society. Good public schools and good colleges are essential to the democratic way of life." The author of those words is Benjamin Fine, educational editor of the New York Times. Fine, in an article in the Key Reporter of Phi Beta Kappa, comments on four areas where citizens can work to improve the outlook for teachers.

The first, of course, is salary. "The ugly truth," says Fine, "is that teachers are the lowest paid of any of the professions." He notes the average teachers' salary today is $3,500 a year, and that after 30 years of teaching, a competent man or woman, in most communities, will end up with a salary less than $5,000.

"Realistic terms" are urged by Fine. He suggests minimums at $5,000 and maximums at $10,000. And he would let teachers reach the upper figure within 10 years. He admits he knows of no system in the country with that kind of a schedule today.

"I would expect highly trained, well qualified teachers, having a minimum of 5 years of college work and a maximum of personality and love of children," the educational editor adds.

A second field where he sees chances for improvement is in the teacher's status in the community. Citing the overwhelming majority of teachers as conscientious, hard-working, loyal American citizens, he says too often we refer indifferently to a person as being "just a teacher." Until the community elevates the status of the teachers and gives young men and women entering the profession a feeling they are going into a field that has meaning, Fine believes we will continue to have less than 5 percent of our superior graduates selecting teaching as their life work.

Too many teachers lack security, the third of Fine's areas for improvement. He says in many communities teachers are afraid to talk up, to participate in public debates, to be a first-class citizen. Lack of tenure, yearly basis for contracts, is blamed by Fine for part of the lack of security by teachers.

He would give teachers a feeling of security, buttressed by a sound tenure policy, so that they can concentrate on doing the best possible job in the classroom.

The satisfactions to be gained from teching are Fine's fourth area. Teaching offers an intangible something that money cannot buy, he says, but too often we make master teachers into second-grade clerks; we tie them down with paperwork, with lunchroom assignments, with yard duties. He also criticizes the failure to bring the classroom teacher into the curriculum, the teching programs, the new school patterns. They are too often expected to follow orders with no questions asked. That is no way, states Fine, to invite superior minds into the teaching profession.

The four areas cited are not the only reasons, as Fine points out, for the teacher shortage. However, they will do as starting points and are worthy of consideration by each citizen, for all the classrooms we can build—whether campus style or conventional, whether economical or plush—will be of little value without well-trained, dedicated teachers in them.

Postal Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, from my observations most of the Members of the House are worn out by the politics which have been played in the enactment of the postal-pay increase.

For over a year the postal employees have been denied a deserved pay increase by a group who would rather embarrass the administration than put the additional money in the pockets of the employees.

This political approach to what should be a business problem is offensive enough if it only effected the 500,000 postal workers; but the sham battle is doubly offensive when you consider that 1,500,000 classified civil-service employees have had to stand by with hat in hand waiting all this time for the last drop of political advantage to be squeezed out of the postal-pay situation before they can receive consideration.

Fortunately at the grassroots the Government employees are beginning to see through this thinly veiled political trick which has used them as decoys. Not only will no political advantage accrue to the leadership which has perpetrated this hoax on the employees, but there is already developing a ground swell of resentment both from the employees and the citizens against the practice of playing politics with so vital a subject.

This reaction is well illustrated by two editorials representing sentiment on each coast of our country. One is from the Evening Star of Washington, dated May 25, and the other from the San Francisco News of May 20, which I ask to be inserted with these remarks:

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 25, 1955]

GETTING DOWN TO BUSINESS

Now that the last bit of political advantage has been squeezed out of the postal-pay issue, the Congress should—and probably will—get down to the serious business of passing a pay bill acceptable to the administration. A lot of time has been wasted in pushing through a measure that was doomed to be vetoed and in the futile effort to override the veto. But the political opportunists do not regard the time as wasted, of course. They had a wonderful opportunity to spread on the record their criticisms of the administration and their professed concern for the welfare of postal employees. Senator NEELY, Democrat, of West Virginia, keynoted the debate with a warning to Republican Senators up for reelection next year that they would dig a "funereal political hole" if they voted to uphold the President's veto.

Politics now can be shoved aside and the real welfare of the postal and other Government workers given primary consideration. Legislation that the President would be willing to sign and that will reconcile employees' needs with postal reclassification and budgetary limitations already has been introduced. Prompt passage will assure all Federal workers of raises that they would have been received last year but for previous congressional politicking.

[From the San Francisco News of May 20, 1955]

POSTAL PAY

Hardly anyone would deny our postal employees deserve a pay raise. The controversy is over the size of the raise and whether postal job classifications should be changed at the same time to distribute the salary raises fairly.

President Eisenhower has vetoed the postal pay bill. Next Tuesday the Senate will vote on whether to override the veto. A

two-thirds vote of both Houses is required to enact the bill into law.

The President had no choice but to say, "No," in our opinion, and he has explained his reasons clearly.

He recommended a postal pay raise months ago, and stands willing to approve an increase of reasonable size which does not discriminate against some of the postal workers.

As he phrased it in his veto message, he favors "equal pay for equal work and more pay for more difficult and responsible work."

That policy is common in private enterprise and should be common in Government. It is ridiculous to expect men of administrative ability to carry the burden of supervisory responsibility—or even to seek it—if their pay is not only a little more than the men they supervise.

Yet that narrow differential seems to be the goal of the postal employee unions which represent the rank and file and seem to have influence on Capitol Hill far out of proportion to the size of their memberships.

Their attitude is understandable, for union leaders hold power only by "taking care" of their members.

But the Post Office Department is not a coal mine or a steel mill.

It is a public service for which the American people pay, directly in the form of postage and indirectly in the form of taxes to make up the postal deficit.

They deserve the most efficient organization the Government can provide.

Congress should cooperate with the President by passing a reasonable pay and reclassification bill.

It also should raise the postage rates to pay for it.

The Atom and a New Moral Maturity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith remarks by the Honorable Thomas E. Murray, Commissioner of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, delivered at the annual national convention of the Catholic Press Association in Buffalo, N. Y., held today May 26.

Mr. Murray's address, entitled "The Atom and a New Moral Maturity," follows:

THE ATOM AND A NEW MORAL MATURITY

A little over a month ago, on April 18, one of the greatest scientists of all time passed from the scene of this earth. And once again all of us were led to ponder on the final liability of all men to the law of physical dissolution and death. But this reflection on the mortality of man was doubtless accompanied in many minds by another thought. The world which Albert Einstein left in 1955 is not the world to which in 1905 he addressed his first great scientific papers. In that year he began his monumental work of delivering to the waiting minds of men the knowledge that most of the energy of the universe is locked up in the nucleus of the atom. Thus he inaugurated, perhaps more than any other single man, the most spectacular era of scientific creativity in the history of the world. Other men of genius, building on the foundations he established, have found the scientific and technological means of unlocking the hidden energies of the atom. And the release of this elemental force has quite literally changed the relationship between man and the world in which he lives.

The world of 50 years ago was relatively simple, relatively stable, relatively serene. Today, however, we live in a world of complexity and conflict, of tension and anxiety. Our age has two characteristics. It is an age in which man has at his command almost unlimited atomic force. And it is likewise the age of a great schism within humanity. The schism creates the possibility of war. And atomic force creates the possibility of mutual annihilation by the parties in conflict. The threat of dissolution and death, to which Albert Einstein had personally to succumb, now hangs more heavily than ever over the collective life of mankind.

This much is fact. Yet, beyond fact there is question—question as to the mood in which man is prepared to face the realities of the present.

This question thus easily phrased, is not easily answered. For various moods have fallen upon various men. There is the mood of guilt which derives from the notion that contributing to the development of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons is essentially evil. There is the mood of unrelieved fear, which has contributed powerfully to the phenomenon of neutralism. Thus seized by fear, great groups of men seek in vain to stand aside from today's possible conflict, in fear of its possible furies and in the hope of avoiding them. There is the mood of futility, which makes many men say: "There is nothing I can do about it all; therefore, I shall not even think about it." There is the mood of fatalism, which looks upon a world conflict on a full atomic scale as inevitable. Finally, there is the equally crippling mood of sheer bewilderment and confusion, wakened in those who once made an idol of scientific and technological progress. That idol today seems to have turned into a Moloch, a god of destruction, who threatens to claim human sacrifices from his devotees. The consequences of these moods are many and dangerous, and never more so than when they cause men to espouse reckless doctrines like preventive war in an aggressive sense.

I maintain that none of these moods is the Christian mood. All of them are condemned by one or other tenet of Christian faith and morality—indeed, by one or other precept of human rationality. The question then is to define the mood in which the Christian man must face the realities of the atomic age. This Christian mood is not bred of illusions; nor is it escapist. It can only be defined in terms of truth. And it is to the task of discovering the relevant truths that the Christian must address himself.

These truths have been effectively stated by our Holy Father Pius XII, out of a luminous vision of the achievements of man as they are seen in the light of the purposes of God. In his Christmas message at the close of 1953 the Pope said: "It is undeniable that technological progress comes from God; and it can and ought to lead to God." This is a brief and confident statement of the truth that gives to our Christian thinking its fundamental orientation. In this truth the Christian finds his first reason for facing with confidence and energy the problems of our technological age. He is not tempted to cry out, as some have done, "Destroy the machines." He knows that he is not doomed by what is, after all, only machinery. He feels within himself the spiritual resources—the resources of intelligence and freedom and divine grace—whereby he can ally himself with the divine purpose inherent in all human progress, and decide that technology too will be made to serve his salvation, as it can and ought.

This same note of fearless welcome to our age of science was again struck by Pius XII when in 1951 he made this statement: "She [the church] has indeed good reason to know that every truth, every new scientific discovery, must be welcomed as one more trace, as it were, of the divine intelligence and one more token of the power of God." Every scientific achievement is a manifestation of man's share in the creative power of the divine intelligence. This is the fact, whether men recognize it or not. But if they do recognize it there is no reason why they should be overtaken by a mood of fear or futility when they contemplate their own creations. Man never has anything to fear in God's material creation. His only reason for fear is, not with things, but with himself. Man does not need to fear his own intelligence, whereby he is enabled to create.

What man must indeed fear is the prideful or imprudent use of this divine faculty. But he will be rescued from pride and imprudence if he is mindful of his duty of gratitude, which requires that he should honor God by offering to Him and to His service the achievements of his human science and industry. When this is done, man's achievements become gifts which are acceptable to God. Such offerings are—in the words of the Pope—"like presenting to God the work which He himself once commanded and which is now being effected, though it has not yet reached its term. 'Inhabit the earth and subdue it' (Genesis 1: 28), said God to man as He handed creation over to him in temporary heritage. It has been a hard and long road from then to the present day, when men can at last say that they have in some measure fulfilled the divine command."

Perhaps here is the central truth that dictates the Christian mood. Certainly the harnessing of atomic energy is the high point in man's century-long effort to subdue the earth. What we need to remember is that man has reached this high point in virtue of a divine command spoken to him, and indeed planted in his very nature. There is then no need for cherishing feelings of guilt, as if some divine law had been violated by this conquest of nature. Such feelings must rather be recognized as having been cast up by consciences untutored in the principles of traditional morality.

The truths stated by Pius XII do not of course solve the grave problems of our age. But they do, I think, clear away the fog of false moods; and they help to establish us in the right mood to face our problems. In fact, they help us to see the primary issue, as God intends that we see it. And that is the need to do all in our power to eliminate the causes that make for strife and violence. To establish plenty where there is now want; to bring health where there is now disease. In summary, to direct our every effort to the eventual realization of a world in which the forces given us by God will be used exclusively for the purposes of peace.

This is the ultimate problem before us. But the stubborn facts of today do not permit us to give it a complete answer. We are, indeed, setting afoot programs for peaceful uses of atomic energy. But not yet, to my mind, on a scale which its promise warrants and the needs of the world require. I say this fully recognizing that it is not possible today to devote nuclear energy exclusively to the purposes of peace. For today, there is no real peace. "The community of peoples," Pius XII has said, "must reckon with conscienceless criminals who would not hesitate to unleash a total war in order to realize their ambitious designs. This is why, if other peoples wish to protect their existence and their most precious goods, and if they are unwilling to leave their flanks open to international malefactors, they have no other course but to prepare themselves

for the day on which they may have to defend themselves. This right of maintaining a posture of defense cannot be refused, even today, to any state."

Under present-day world conditions, while conscienceless criminals are still abroad, the United States has the right and duty of adding the full panoply of atomic weapons to its arsenals of defense. Any other course of action would be irresponsible and wrong.

Moreover, we can and do cherish the hope that in choosing this path of full military strength we are choosing the path to peace, not to war. One reason for this hope lies in the fact that the essential condition of peace today is in our possession of the power to forbid success to armed aggression.

Our enemy is an aggressor. Aggression is in the very makeup of the Moscow-directed international politico-military bloc. Nevertheless, we ought to utilize all the resources of intelligent and patient diplomacy in order to persuade the enemy, if we can, to abandon his aggressive course. Moreover, we must be certain that such negotiations are undertaken with the assurance that the enemy understands the full import of a nuclear conflict. Then, too, our necessary efforts at negotiation will depend for their effectiveness upon our maintenance of an imposing posture of military defense. Only by maintaining such strength can we instill the fear that will deter aggression.

Admittedly, no one wants to pin his hopes for peace—and for survival—on the value of fear as a deterrent to a possible criminal use of force. But today there is no other choice. And we can at least be grateful that, at a moment in history when the free world needed force with which to counter the threatened assaults on its freedom, the requisite force was providentially put into its hands. It is, indeed, a grim sort of safety that we now enjoy—the safety that is, in Sir Winston Churchill's phrase, "the sturdy child of terror." But if the parent is strange, we can at least be glad that the child is sturdy.

Moreover, there is hope that our safety will grow sturdier as time goes on. The "process of sublime irony" to which Sir Winston pointed has not come to a stop. It will go on with the never-ending developments in the field of nuclear weapons. And one development, which I would almost venture to predict, will heighten the irony of the process by which the world is moving toward safety.

It is, I think, almost predictable that the day will come, perhaps not long hence, when the present monopoly of atomic weapons by the two great opposed powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, will come to an end. Other nations, even small nations, will come to possess atomic armaments, if they so desire them. And what nation will not desire them?

We shall then witness a dispersal of atomic power, and with it a certain leveling of the nations. There will no longer be great and strong, small and weak. For in what sense could a nation be called small and weak, when it is capable of inflicting an atomic wound, and therefore a crippling wound, upon another nation however strong and great?

If and when this development takes place, the first result would be to widen the reign of terror. But again by an extension of the "process of sublime irony," the further result would be to strengthen the basis of the common safety. This basis would still be fear, at least initially. But fear is not the final basis for a truly human type of security. Fear is never final; it is never the end of anything. However, it can be the beginning. It can be the beginning of wisdom. And this is the further hope, that the fear-inspiring force let loose in the atomic age will impel men to reflect anew upon the meaning and value of war and by this manner of reflection come to true wisdom with regard to the right use of force.

It would be idle to suppose that the discovery of atomic energy will abolish all war. The power to make war—that is, to make reasonable use of force in defense and vindication of the order of justice—is an inherent necessity of human social life. For man's sinful condition inclines him to violations of the order of justice; and these violations must be prevented, or if committed, they must be punished. This can, at times and under due conditions, mean making war.

But what we now see with new clarity is the fact that war today can only be conceived as a necessary means of enforcing law and justice. We have long outgrown the age of religious wars. We have now outgrown the age of political wars—dynastic wars, wars directed at a redress of the balance of power, wars undertaken in the interest of national expansion. Whatever may have been the case in the past, resorting to wars between nations for purely selfish reasons in the future would appear, paradoxically, as worse than wrong. They would be useless.

In an all-out atomic war victory and defeat are words without meaning when even the victor may be mortally injured in the hour of his seeming triumph.

Therefore, we now realize that the only cause which can justify war is the high cause of justice itself. Justice is an international cause. As Pius XII has expressed it, war is only justified by "the absolute necessity of defending oneself against a very grave injustice which affects the community (that is, the international community) when this injustice cannot be prevented by other means, and yet must be prevented on pain of leaving a free field in international relations to brutal violence and lack of conscience."

The discovery of atomic energy should make men see the essentially moral nature of war as a necessary method of enforcing the supreme law of international justice always under stringent conditions. If atomic energy has this effect, then the atomic age will have helped mankind to a new moral maturity.

Perhaps this is one lesson that God wants men to learn from the fact that they now possess a new kind of force. History is the record of man's selfish and irresponsible uses of force. But now man cannot afford to be selfish or irresponsible in his use of force; for the result would be his own destruction.

Having had over 5 years of intimate association with nuclear-weapon developments, I can assure you I do not overstate the case. One cannot reflect on these developments and fail to recognize the threat of universal destruction. Nor can one witness megaton thermonuclear explosions, as I have in the far Pacific, and not see the specter of ever-increasing gigantic weapons looming large beyond.

Today, therefore, man has no alternative but to acquire a mature moral viewpoint on the use of atomic force if he is to survive. Force, especially in this new atomic era, is rational and responsible only when it is subordinate to the purpose of law, which is justice. Believing this, we will understand with Pope Pius XII the need for the creation of a lawful community of nations. For in his words, "We are confident that the international community can banish every danger of war and establish peace, and as far as the church is concerned can guarantee to her freedom of action everywhere." This is a confidence that all of us must share; otherwise we shall have no confidence at all.

True enough, the construction of the international community and its order of justice, for which the Pope asked, is at the moment a task fraught with enormous difficulty. An international "outlaw," the Communist regime in its various forms, blocks our path to the goal. Nevertheless the goal itself remains valid; for it is established by God for mankind in virtue of man's own nature. And this goal in the atomic age is absolutely imperative; for apart from the establishment of a genuine order of international justice there can be no ultimate guaranty of international peace.

Even at the moment many things can be done toward the gradual practical achievement of this goal. Certainly, if the lessons of atomic energy are learned, one thing needs to be done. I have said that war—at least the possibility of making war—is a permanent factor in human affairs. But it is presently clear beyond doubt that the word "war" cannot cover a conflict in which large-scale use would be made of the nuclear weapons now possessed by the United States and by the Soviet Union. Whatever else such a conflict would be, it would not be war in any intelligible sense, in any intelligent sense.

Even a criminal conspiracy, like the Communist conspiracy, which does not understand the meaning of justice, must at least retain an elemental understanding of the meaning of war, of the purposes to which force can today be put. The criminal who has lost his moral conscience still retains his instinct for self-preservation. Therefore, he might well be disposed to agree that neither his own purposes nor any other intelligible purposes could possibly be served by unleashing total warfare with nuclear weapons. His views of the nature of man and of the essential purposes of man upon this earth differ totally from our Christian view. But his view of war cannot be thus totally different. There is therefore the serious possibility that he would honestly agree to some kind of disarmament.

What form disarmament would take, it is not my purpose here to discuss. The complex issues involved in disarmament are such as to require continued, most careful, and sincere study by all those agencies of government on whose shoulders rests this grave responsibility. Certainly the paramount consideration would always be that the security of this Nation remain unimpaired.

The possibilities of disarmament ought not to go unregarded. The compacts that might be entered into ought not to be dismissed as being of no value, on the ground that they are based solely on grounds of mutual self-interest. For the "interest" here is total; it concerns survival or annihilation.

Moreover, if we take the longest possible view, we cannot discard the possibility that these imperfect agreements might lead, in God's good time, to genuine moral compacts, supported by a moral conscience—a conscience that has been newly awakened to the fact that international lawlessness is immoral and criminal because it delivers the community of nations over to the rule of force. And for men or nations today to be ruled by force alone means in effect that they are risking destruction by force, by atomic force.

Here again fear may be the beginning of wisdom. Men and nations have good reason to fear the force latent in the energies of the atom. Consequently, they have reason to fear the manner of coexistence that is supported only by fear. And out of the depths of this fear men may some day come to look up to a higher force as the bond of international community and the basis of peace—the moral force of law.

My reflections on this most serious and difficult subject may be briefly summed up. I have suggested that man ought to approach the atomic age in a realistic mood. He should reckon with the fact that atomic energy today serves almost entirely as weapon, a weapon that is deterrent of immoral aggression against freedom, justice, and peace. This situation cannot be permanent. He must look forward to the day when

atomic energy will exclusively serve the purposes of peace.

Man should also appreciate that beyond the value of atomic energy as a deterrent to immoral aggression there stands its value as a stimulant to a new moral maturity. The fear of this force, which could destroy life on our planet, must serve to impress upon the conscience of the world the need of law as the utimate barrier to immorality in international relations. I see the final significance of the release of atomic energy in the fact that it is a God-given means for the moral education of mankind.

Problems of the Merchant Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the distinguished maritime editor of the Baltimore Sun, Miss Helen Delich, has prepared another very incisive analysis of the problems of the merchant fleet.

This excellent article appeared in the May 24 issue of the Baltimore Sun, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEMS OF THE MERCHANT FLEET

(By Helen Delich)

As the United States observes the 136th anniversary of the crossing of the Atlantic by the first steamboat, the S. S. *Savannah*, the American merchant marine finds itself in an ironic position.

On one hand, within the last month, the construction of atomic-powered merchant ships has become an immediate probability with President Eisenhower and Congress supporting programs that will result in two such ships emerging in the near future. Nuclear propulsion of commercial ships is further off, however.

But at the same time, unless Congress takes steps to clarify and make more flexible the administration of the already existing law governing the merchant fleet, the Stars and Stripes might disappear from the foreign trade lanes altogether as far as independent lines are concerned.

The law provides for two kinds of subsidies: One to help meet the higher (than foreign lines) operating costs of steamship companies on specific essential trade routes; the other to help meet the higher (than foreign yards) construction costs for any ship engaged in foreign trade. Domestic ship operators have no help whatsoever.

In hearings before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, 15 of the 16 steamship companies now having subsidy contracts with the Government have told committee members that they are not seeking any additional funds or any changes in the 1936 Merchant Marine Act. They simply want more liberal administration of the law as it stands by both the Maritime Administration and other agencies or they will not be able to continue to operate.

At the same time, they point out that the four commercial carriers engaged in foreign trade without operating subsidies have entered requests for such subsidies. And those already receiving operating aid would provide $3 billion worth of work to American shipyards in the next several years in replacing their ships as is required under the law if they are to continue receiving financial assistance.

Briefly, this is the dilemma of the American merchant marine today, point by point:

1. American ships are twice as expensive to operate as foreign ships on the same runs because of the higher standard of living in this country. In order to keep vessels moving on sea lanes considered vital to this country, Government subsidy is necessary with most of it going into wages which are five times as high as foreign rates.

2. The 1936 Merchant Marine Act says that any subsidized line cannot operate ships over 20 years of age, and 75 percent of those under the subsidy program will be 20 between the years 1963–66. Also, nonsubsidized ships are approaching that age limit, so that 85 percent of the entire fleet will become obsolete within the next 10 years.

3. The 1936 act is considered a good act by the industry and contains subsidy provisions which would make it easy for steamship operators to replace their vessels without too much difficulty and continue to operate them under the American flag.

4. But Congress has been slow—in some instances payments back to 1947 are still due—in appropriating the funds under the contracts signed. The General Accounting Office has changed figures after contracts have been signed, and now the administration wants all construction privately financed even though the act allows for financing of new ships through Government loans.

Too, the Maritime Administration has withheld making 20-year operating-subsidy contracts with the ship operators as is permitted by the act.

5. Now, when the subsidized ships reach the 20-year age limit, or the contracts expire, the owners do not have to replace the vessels unless they are going to continue to be subsidized by the Government to make up the difference between American and foreign costs.

In fact, after the subsidy contracts expire, the owners have three choices:

A. Operate the ships without Government aid under the American flag, which is highly unlikely.

B. Lease them to foreign interests for their own operation.

C. Sell them to foreign interests at the going price.

Or, of course, to continue with operating-differential support.

6. Because the operating subsidy has been increasing every year—in fact, it is estimated at about $180 million for the 1956 fiscal year—Congress has been prone to cut back the amounts asked for in the budget. Some of the requests for 1955 have been back payments, even to 1947 as has been mentioned. At the same time, unless Congress brings the subsidy payments up to date—for example, so that the 1955 payments will all be paid in 1955 and not as late as 1959—the amount requested each year has to be higher than it should be. If Congress once would appropriate sufficient sums to pay up all of the back payments, the anual request could be held to what was needed for the operations for that particular year.

The steamship lines say they want to keep operating under the Stars and Stripes, but it is up to Congress, the Maritime Administration and the General Accounting Office to make it more feasible.

In other words, it is up to Washington leaders whether this country is to continue having an American-flag fleet.

Here are some of the things the steamship executives have asked so the operations will be simpler:

1. The establishment of a firm rule on the basic principles of parity with foreign competition, so that interpretations will not be changed from year to year after the ships have been operating under other principles than those the Administration finally adopts.

2. Long-term operating-subsidy contracts and which would cover the life of the ship.

3. Payment of operating-subsidy money on time.

4. The guaranty by the Government of the full amount of the mortgage money the steamship operators must borrow from private interests; or the loans to be made by the Government as is provided under the law.

5. Basing the prices of new vessels on foreign construction costs rather than having the construction-differential subsidy considered as a percentage of the domestic construction cost. The differential should be the difference of the cost of a ship built abroad and the cost in the United States.

6. A standard manual of procedures should be developed outlining the steps to be taken in determining construction-differential subsidies.

7. The selling prices of all vessels should be approved in advance by the General Accounting Office so that contracts between shipowners and the Government may be final in that respect.

8. If the Government is going to insist that ship construction must be distributed among yards and not given to the lowest bidder, the Government should pay all of the difference.

9. Permit the American shipowners equality of opportunity with foreign shipowners on trade-in values.

10. Establish a construction revolving fund, like the one which was dissolved by Congress in recent years, so new construction will come easier and will not require special appropriations by Congress.

11. Extend technical research in all fields, particularly in that of cargo handling and the standardization of packaging of cargoes.

And another important recommendation, although it doesn't fall directly under the 1936 act, calls for the elimination of the Military Sea Transportation Service from operating in competition with privately owned lines. This also has been cited by the Hoover Commission.

The 1936 act directs the Congress to foster and promote and strengthen the American merchant marine. The steamship industry now says "it's up to the Federal agencies properly to administer the law laid down if they want us to continue operating."

Mayor Clark and Members of His Mayors' Committee Assert No Natural Gas Legislation Needed at This Time to Assure Fair Treatment for Both Producer and Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now considering the Harris bill and other measures to exempt the price of natural gas in the field from Federal regulation, it has been my conviction that no legislation is presently necessary to assure fair treatment for the producer.

The law, as interpreted by the Supreme Court in the Phillips case, is that the Federal Power Commission has jurisdiction over the field price of gas sold to the interstate pipelines. This does not, of course, mean that the producer must give his gas away or sell it at an unreasonably low price. Under the law he is entitled to a fair and reasonable return. Yet the drive to exempt the producers from regulation seems to be based on a conviction that Federal regulation which would protect the consumer would have to mean unfair and unreasonably low prices for the producers.

I do not agree with that. I believe any law must be administered in a fair manner to all concerned. And, of course, the natural-gas producers must, by law, be treated fairly.

Therefore, I do not think any legislation is necessary at this time to assure fair treatment to the producers. This is also the position taken by Mayor Joseph S. Clark, Jr., of my city of Philadelphia, Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York, Mayor David L. Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, and the other mayors participating in the committee organized by Mayors Clark, Wagner, and Lawrence to fight the consumer battle on natural-gas legislation.

This group recently issued a policy statement declaring that the so-called compromises now being put forward by oil and gas industry spokesmen would not protect the consumer interest in this matter because they would take away direct Federal jurisdiction over field prices.

The mayors said all of the compromising would be in favor of the producers and against the consumers, and, they added, they reject such compromises.

In his testimony before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the Fulbright bill, which is a companion measure to the Harris bill, Mayor Clark went into the basic issues involved in this proposed legislation in a most thorough and understandable manner. His excellent statement will be interesting to every Member of Congress, and so I include it as part of my remarks, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR., MAYOR OF PHILADELPHIA AND CHAIRMAN OF THE MAYORS' COMMITTEE IN OPPOSITION TO LEGISLATION LIMITING THE JURISDICTION OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION OVER SALES OF NATURAL GAS BY PRODUCERS TO PIPELINE COMPANIES FOR RESALE IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE, 84TH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

I am Joseph S. Clark, Jr., mayor of Philadelphia, and I am testifying before you today both on behalf of the citizens of Philadelphia and on behalf of the Mayors' Committee formed to oppose legislation which you are now considering. When word of this or similar legislation reached the major consuming centers, there was a spontaneous movement among city officials to join together to protect the interests of the consumers. Mayor Robert Wagner, of New York, and Mayor David Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, joined with me to form a committee for this purpose. Some 50 mayors, representing cities with a combined population of more than 30 million people, are now members of this committee. The names of these mayors and the cities they represent are filed herewith with your committee.

Membership on the committee is country-wide in coverage. From Oregon to Alabama, from California to Massachusetts, the mayors of an overwhelming majority of the large consumer cities have joined the committee. It can be said without dispute that they represent a majority of the consumers of natural gas. A number of them will speak to you during the next few days and many others have prepared statements which will be presented to you either in writing or by their designated representatives. We are agreed that the millions of natural gas consumers whom we represent have a tremendous stake in the issue now before you and are determined that the interests of these consumers be made clear to you, confident in the belief that if this is done, you will see that these interests are protected. Specifically, we stand on the premise that Federal Power Commission jurisdiction over the field price of natural gas sold for resale in interstate commerce must remain effective if the consumers' interest is to be adequately protected.

The price at which natural gas is sold by distributing company to householder or industry is presently regulated by local utility commissions. The price at which natural gas is sold by interstate pipeline to local distributing company is presently regulated under the Natural Gas Act of 1938 by the Federal Power Commission. The Supreme Court of the United States in the Phillips case ruled last June that the Federal Power Commission should also regulate the price at which natural gas producers sell their product to the interstate pipelines. The purpose of much of the legislation now before your honorable body is to drive a hole through this dike of consumer protection by freeing the initial sale from producer to pipeline from regulation by the Federal Power Commission and thus eliminate the present requirement that such sales must be at a just and reasonable price. The inevitable result would be to destroy the dike and drown the consumer in the flood of high prices.

No one has stated our position more clearly than the distinguished Senator from my home State of Pennsylvania, the Honorable JAMES H. DUFF, who said on page 57 of the RECORD: "Where you have regulation at one end, where it comes to selling to the public, and you have an open end at the other, it is very difficult from that point of view to see how the public interest is going to be served if the distributing companies have their prices regulated by the commissions of the various States. * * * you have an anomolous situation there where you have an open end at one end and you have a fixed end at the other, depending on the public service commission."

May I say at the outset that the argument in favor of this legislation must be positive and forceful if you are to give it your serious consideration. Failing this, this Congress has already declared, in a measure approved by this very committee, that the interstate sale of natural gas is affected with the public interest and that effective regulation is necessary in that interest. With this declaration of policy, no watering-down of that regulation should be permitted by you unless for very good cause.

What cause, then, is suggested to you as a reason for the Federal Government withdrawing from this field? Certainly not economic, for though you have had voluminous testimony of a hortatory nature, there are no facts in this record which bear evidence that complete freedom from regulation will produce either greater supplies or supplies at a lower cost. There is no evidence in this record that the prices that have now been approved by the Federal Power Commission during the time it has exercised active jurisdiction are in any way confiscatory or even deter any drilling efforts by those who seek to discover oil and gas.

This record is as yet barren of evidence showing the trend of overall drilling activity in the postwar years. The distinguished chairman of the Texas Railway Commission, Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, makes this significant admission on page 78 of the record: "But as far as drilling for gas is concerned, hardly anybody drills for gas. They get gas accidentally when they are looking for oil." And again: "If we do not find a great deal of new oil, we shall be short of gas. Nearly all the gas discoveries in my experience have been found incident to the search for oil. Encourage oil exploration if you want to find gas." So far as I know it is not presently contended that the Federal Government should attempt to regulate the price at which oil is sold. So far as I know the oil industry is entirely satisfied with State regulatory and conservation measures so far as the oil industry is concerned. Why then all the excitement about continuing the present law in the interests of consumer protection so far as gas is concerned?

The argument is philosophical and has been ably stated by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the Honorable J. W. FULBRIGHT, in testimony before your committee. I should like to restate the argument and call to your attention the countervailing arguments of consumer interests.

First, it is said that if Federal controls are applied to natural gas it will be legally, technically, and physically impossible to exempt oil from the influence of such controls. No data is offered in support of this assertion and I would urge strongly upon your committee that there is no evidence whatever to indicate that anybody in this country at the present time has any interest in Federal regulation of the oil industry or, as Senator Fulbright indicated, "the virtual federalization of oil." I cannot conceive of the possibility of the Federal Government attempting to dictate or control the governmental finances of those States in which oil is produced through regulation of that industry. All we are asking from the Federal Government is the continuance of the presently existing control over the price of natural gas in the consumer interest. We are not concerned in any way with the price or methods of production of oil.

Next it is said that under such Federal control independent gas producers could be literally forced to give away their gas. Such an assertion must of necessity be founded on the proposition that members of the Federal Power Commission, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate after recommendation of this very Senate committee, will be faithless to their legal duty. They are presently charged with approving natural gas prices which are "just and reasonable." Should they fail in that duty the producers have a remedy in the courts. With all due deference, I can give little weight to this particular argument of the producer interests. As Senator FULBRIGHT himself said, at page 21 of the RECORD: "In making legislation, I think we must always assume that reasonable people administer the law." And as Senator PASTORE said, at page 33 of the RECORD: "I do not see that just because you have Federal supervision of anything that means the people are going to lose money. I think people in the natural gas producing business perhaps are making a lot of money, and I do not resent it. But merely because it is going to be controlled by the Federal Power Commission does not mean you are going to put these people out of business because if that is true, then we fail as a Government."

Next, it is urged that gas as a commodity is no different from coal or oil or any other natural resource and, therefore, should not be regulated. It is pointed out that, unlike electricity, gas producers do not have the

right of eminent domain. The argument is accordingly made that the sale of gas in interstate commerce should not be subject to Federal regulation.

We would like to point out, in the words again of Senator DUFF, on page 56 of the RECORD: "I feel that while a producer of gas does not enjoy the right of eminent domain, I think it is true, however, that without using the facilities of eminent domain, he could not take to market the thing he has to sell." And again, on page 59 of the RECORD: "* * * you have got to bear in mind that the vast number of people who use this are unprotected unless they do have some regulatory agency."

I suggest that in our modern American civilization government will always step in to protect the consumer interest when threatened with unreasonable profiteering. In essence our purpose before your committee is to continue regulation as presently required under existing law in the interest of protecting the consumers against profiteering.

I find a far greater analogy to the protection of the consumer and producer interests in the case of milk, where both Federal and State regulatory agencies occupy the field, than in the case of any of the other commodities which have heretofore been discussed before your committee.

Next, it is asserted that natural gas is a luxury and not a necessity. I submit that as American civilization progresses things that were luxuries some years ago have moved over into the category of necessities. How many of us today would feel that American citizens should be satisfied with the old horse and buggy; and that an automobile is a luxury? My father, who is still alive, can remember the day when the telephone was something confined to a few wealthy people and big corporations. The same is true for a number of other modern conveniences. Moreover, as I shall point out in a few minutes in greater detail, the cost to the consumer of shifting from a home presently equipped to use gas to one using coal or oil is so heavy as to be prohibitive to those of modest incomes.

Finally, it is urged that Federal regulation at the wellhead will not benefit the consumer; and that the Natural Gas Act prior to the Phillips decision, has protected the consumer without "torturing our free-enterprise system." This, I think, is really the principal argument advanced on behalf of the producers. I should like to answer it rather fully.

The fallacy of this argument, in my judgment, is in the premise that the law of supply and demand will give us a price of natural gas on a sale by producer to pipeline which will protect the consumer interest.

But the two elements that are essential where natural forces of supply and demand result in a reasonable price, without regulation, are absent. The first element is that there is no inexhaustible supply to produce competition between sellers. This immediately singles out gas from among the many commodities important to the consumer and puts it in a special place. It has been testified to you that the gradually growing market for gas, as this country expands, calls for greater supplies; and further, that the ratio of years of supply to demand is decreasing. You have been told that pipelines are not put together unless they have a hard core of tremendous reserves to make up the base of their supply. You have been told further that these large-volume reserves are controlled by a very small number of the Nation's large oil companies. You may examine the records which the Federal Power Commission can make available to you in vain for any bidding among suppliers, which has had the effect of knocking down the price of gas. It is clear, therefore, that this element, a free supply of the commodity, is missing.

The second element which is lacking is the freedom of choice on the part of the buyer, the ultimate consumer. If he does not like the price of eggs at the American Store, he can go across the street to the A. & P., or indeed, if he likes the price of neither place, he may eat cereal for breakfast. If he does not like the price or style of a Ford, he may buy a Plymouth or Chevrolet—or use public transportation. He is not bound except by his wish and convenience to make either of these choices. But if he is a householder in Philadelphia or elsewhere in the country, presently using gas for cooking, house heating, and water heating, he must lose the $1,000 or more which he has invested in these appliances to turn to any substitute. Indeed, in many of the modern homes, the builders, in order to save space and reduce the cost of the home, have so constructed it that it would be impossible without prohibitive cost to make a change. It is idle comfort to a householder to say: "If you do not like the price of gas, go buy something else." He is committed by his investment to this fuel.

It is important to recall the process by which this has come about. In the late thirties and again after World War II, those in possession of large reserves of gas in the Southwest could find no suitable market for their gas in that region, and they organized one after another of the large pipelines, in some cases by direct ownership and in other cases through the formation of legally independent companies. These pipelines went to the market places throughout the country and said to the local distributing companies: "We have large blocks of gas which can be had at 20 cents or 25 cents. We will agree to provide you with this gas for a 20-year period at these prices. The price may change as taxes are imposed or if there is a marked increase in the general commodity index; but substantially our business is under the regulation of the Federal Power Commission and the reasonableness of our rates will be determined by the Commission." The distributing companies calculated whether or not these prices were satisfactory and would justify the expenditure of millions of dollars to ready their systems for the use of natural gas. In almost all cases, the answers were in the affirmative. The Federal Power Commission ruled the projects were economically feasible and certificated the pipelines. The lines were built and the gas turned on. Often rates to the ultimate consumers were reduced as the result of the coming of natural gas. Millions of customers were attracted by the advantages of gas and the rates which made it economical, or in some cases less costly, to use; and they spent hundreds of millions of dollars on equipment to heat their homes with gas. The process was complete. Those in control of the reserves had found their market; and an unbreakable chain had been welded which irretrievably ties the fortunes of the consumers to the producer in the Southwest. Few house-heating consumers indeed can afford to jeopardize the thousand dollars or more which they have in gas appliances. Faced with an increase in gas rates, their hands are tied by this investment; in the market place of fuels, they cannot choose as they will.

The consumers in Philadelphia are no exception. Regulatory bodies in Philadelphia and Pennsylvania cannot protect us. They must approve reasonably compensatory rates to local utilities. Local distributing companies are helpless. To get natural gas at all they have to agree to purchase from the pipeline companies for 20 years at rates considered reasonable by the Federal Power Commission. They have no authority under their contracts to reject new and higher prices. Indeed until the Phillips case the Federal Power Commission considered itself helpless and reluctantly passed on hundreds of millions of dollars in field price increases in the form of higher transmission rates to distributing companies.

Nor is it significant to raise the issue that all we are talking about is a few more cents a day per consumer. This is an attractive way of describing a bill which to the Nation as a whole will run into hundreds of millions of dollars and not pennies. For every penny added to the field price of natural gas adds $2 million to the value of the present reserves owned by the producers and millions of dollars to the annual bills of our Nation's gas customers.

Let me tell you what this has meant to Philadelphia. When natural gas first came to Philadelphia, in 1948, the price averaged 30 cents per thousand cubic feet. It was relatively constant for the next several years, and then suddenly just in the last few years, and most steeply in 1953 and 1954, the pipeline companies have secured rate increases so that in 1955 we are paying 39 cents per thousand cubic feet, or an increase of nearly one-third. Since we are buying 40 billion cubic feet of natural gas annually from our 2 pipeline suppliers, these increases in the rates charged our municipal gas works means that the city of Philadelphia is paying $3,500,000 more for its natural gas than it would have at the rates which prevailed when we were first induced to purchase this gas. And the basic reason for most of this increase has been an increase in the field price of gas. When the Texas Eastern Transmission Corp. put together its supply of gas in 1947 and 1948, the prevailing price of new pipeline supplies was in the order of 6 cents per thousand cubic feet. This company is now paying more than double the initial price, by reason of various escalation clauses in its purchase contracts. Our other supplier purchased gas initially in the order of 7 cents, a year or so later, and is now paying 11 cents, with all of its new contracts being entered into at 16 cents a thousand. And bear this in mind, too. Some of the same gas which is ow being purchased at 16 cents was being sold at 9 cents only a year ago. This brings up a point which is particularly important for you to consider. The proponents of this legislation have been careful in most instances to terminate their statistics in the year 1953. It is now well into 1955. Spot figures are available for this year. Series figures are available for 1954. The omission of the last 2 years is significant in that had these years been included, they would show the very marked and steep price increases, the result of the escalation clauses about which you have heard, and against which size of increase we are now protesting.

It is true that the rates for gas have not increased in Philadelphia during this time, although they are going up in many other parts of the country. We have an arrangement here whereby a public utility corporation, the United Gas Improvement Co., operates the Philadelphia Municipal Gas Works on a fixed fee basis. Income must equal outgo, which includes the rental payment to the city and the cost of gas works improvement and modernization. However, the combination of increase in business, including 100,000 new house heating customers since 1948, and efficient management, have enabled us to absorb this large price increase without a change in rates. The significant point is, though, that we are paying here $3,500,000 more a year, mostly to producers in Texas and Louisiana. If we did not have to do this, rates could be lowered by this amount; or in the alternative, less would have to be borrowed to replace and improve the plant. It is hard cash which we are paying out. Do not be misled by this few cents a day argument, however attractive it may be.

To summarize, the real issue raised by this legislation, which we oppose, is whether a group of producers, the fulcrum of whose power rests in the hands of the large oil companies in this country, should be permitted to determine the price of a commodity passing in interstate commerce and affected by the public interest, unilaterally and without policing in the consumer interest by a Federal regulatory body: the Federal Power Commission. If we can fasten our attention on that issue, I would hope it would be a relatively simple decision to reject any legislation on this subject on the ground that the public interest requires regulation of natural gas prices at the point where the gas reaches the pipeline as well as after. Indeed it seems almost incredible that we all should admit not only the right but the duty of Government to regulate the price at which pipeline companies may sell gas to distributors and the price at which distributing companies, be they municipally owned or not, may sell gas to the consumer, while leaving wide open and without regulation the price at which the gas is sold by the producer to the pipeline.

I cannot take seriously the claim of proponents of this bill that if the duty of the Federal Power Commission to regulate these prices is continued there will be in effect a sitdown strike which will result in an even shorter supply of natural gas. That the oil companies will continue to drill for oil, I would think, is obvious. That a great deal of gas will be discovered in conjunction with newly discovered oil is certainly the history of the industry today. That private capital not controlled by oil companies will continue to drill for gas found not in conjunction with oil, the record now before you seems to make clear. That despite all this the product appears to be in short supply by reason of constantly increasing demand from our cities would seem to prove the need for Federal regulation.

Nor can I take seriously the argument that this problem is so complicated that the Federal Power Commission cannot arrive at a satisfactory solution. This Commission, established by Congress under the general jurisdiction of this very committee, and whose members are confirmed by this committee, surely with such help as you may give it, can act as reasonable and intelligent men, properly weighing in the balance the claims of the producers of natural gas and the rights of the consumers of this product, and can arrive at a solution which is in the public interest. No bill which would tie the hands of this Commission and prevent it regulating adequately the price of the very product which all admit needs a substantial measure of regulation can contribute to this discharge of what you have declared to be a Federal responsibility.

The clear conclusion I submit is that this bill should not pass and that the Federal Power Commission should continue to exercise the authority given to it by the Natural Gas Act of 1938, as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States. If the consumer interest is to be protected, this regulation must include adequate control of the prices paid by producers to pipelines which carry the gas to distributing companies and to the ultimate consumer.

MEMBERS OF MAYORS' COMMITTEE TO OPPOSE S. 1853 AND SIMILAR EXEMPTION BILLS (CITIES WITH POPULATIONS OVER 100,000)

Philadelphia, Pa., Joseph S. Clark, Jr.; Pittsburgh, Pa., David L. Lawrence; New York, N. Y., Robert F. Wagner; Akron, Ohio, Leo Berg; Baltimore, Md., Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr.; Birmingham, Ala., J. W. Morgan; Boston, Mass., John B. Hynes; Bridgeport, Conn., Jasper McLevy; Buffalo, N. Y., Steven Pankow; Cambridge, Mass., John J. Foley; Camden, N. J., George E. Brunner; Chicago, Ill., Richard J. Daley; Cincinnati, Ohio, Carl W. Rich; Cleveland, Ohio, Anthony J. Celebrezze; Columbus Ohio, Maynard E. Sensenbrenner; Denver, Colo., Quigg Newton; Detroit, Mich., Albert E. Cobo; Duluth, Minn., George D. Johnson; Elizabeth, N. J., Nicholas Sylvester LaCorte; Erie, Pa., Arthur J. Gardner; Fall River, Mass., John F. Kane; Flint, Mich., George M. Algoe; Gary, Ind., Peter Mandich; Grand Rapids, Mich., George W. Welsh (city manager); Jersey City, N. J., Bernard Berry; Kansas City, Kans., Paul F. Mitchum; Knoxville, Tenn., George R. Dempster; Louisville, Ky., Andrew Broaddus; Milwaukee, Wis., Frank P. Zeidler; Minneapolis, Minn., Eric G. Hoyer; Montgomery, Ala., W. A. Gayle; Nashville, Tenn., Ben West; Newark, N. J., Leo P. Carlin; New Bedford, Mass., Arthur N. Harriman; New Haven, Conn., Richard C. Lee; Paterson, N. J., Lester F. Titus; Portland, Oreg., Fred L. Peterson; Providence, R. I., Walter H. Reynolds; Richmond, Va., Thomas P. Bryan; Sacramento, Calif., H. H. Hendren; Springfield, Mass., Daniel Brunton; St. Louis, Mo., Raymond R. Tucker; St. Paul, Minn., Joseph E. Dillon; Syracuse, N. Y., Donald H. Mead; Toledo, Ohio, Ollie Czelusta; Utica, N. Y., Boyd E. Golder; Waterbury, Conn., Raymond E. Snyder; Yonkers, N. Y., Kristen Kristensen; Youngstown, Ohio, Frank X. Kryzan.

Strength Out of Adversity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, fluid milk for many years has been one of the greatest headaches of the Department of Agriculture. The several States have controls on this commodity but interstate movement of the product necessitates Federal intervention and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to regulate the milk industry through so-called Federal marketing orders of which there are many. For some reason the marketing orders have never proven entirely satisfactory and someone is constantly complaining with the result that another complicated hearing is set up which usually covers a period of several months. It is generally conceded that this procedure with all its faults is the best that has been devised to date to regulate the industry.

In the New York milkshed which takes in portions of all the States adjacent to the metropolitan area, the producing dairy farmers, thousands in number, have felt the pinch of the high cost of dairy rations which in turn is directly attributable to high price supports and the Government purchase and storage of feed grains. These people have large investments in their farms and equipment and when their income falls to less than 50 cents per hour as it has recently, it is high time to investigate the price spread and see just what is becoming of the consumer's dollar.

Editor William F. Berghold of the Rural New Yorker and a long-time friend of the dairy farmer has recently published a very enlightening editorial on on the subject which I wish to include in the RECORD:

STRENGTH OUT OF ADVERSITY

As was anticipated because of much lower prices paid to producers of milk and well-sustained prices paid by consumers, the two major milk companies enjoyed unprecedentedly profitable operations during 1954. Their annual reports, just recently released, furnish ample statistics to prove the point conclusively.

In the case of National Dairy Products Corp., for example, while dollar sales were slightly lower—$1,210,328,000 as against $1,232,126,000—net profit, after taxes and depreciation, was the highest in the company's history—$37,393,012. Total profit, before taxes and depreciation, amounted to $112,508,012, as against $116,108,169 in 1953.

Borden's dollar sales were also slightly below those of the previous year—$776,838,791. But, just as in the case of National Dairy, Borden was able to establish an all-time high in profit, on less sales—$22,724,336. Profit, before taxes and depreciation, amounted to $68,014,566, compared to $65,501,155 in 1953.

The net profit of these two companies for the past 3 years, after taxes ($52,333,000 for National Dairy and $31,529,000 (estimated in the absence of usual information) for Borden) and depreciation ($22,782,000 for National Dairy and $13,761,179 for Borden) is as follows:

	National Dairy Products Corp.	*The Borden Co.*
1954	$37,393,012	$22,724,336
1953	30,837,169	20,264,156
1952	27,799,252	17,667,137

The companies' dividend records were equally impressive. With earnings at $2.77 a share in 1954, up 46 cents a share, National Dairy declared a 100 percent stock dividend last August, paid a $3.05 cash dividend against $3 in the previous year, and has now placed its new stock on a $1.60 annual dividend basis, equal to $3.20 a share on the old stock. While Borden's earnings jumped 37 cents a share to $2.93, it was not quite as generous, declaring only a 10 percent stock dividend, worth approximately $7 a share at time of declaration. The $2.80 a share dividend remains the same.

Even more significant than the companies' profit and loss statements are what the companies' presidents have to say about the dairy outlook, as viewed from the dealer's angle. Quoting from the remarks by Mr. E. E. Stewart, National Dairy president, we find that—

"For National Dairy, 1954 was a year of change and growth. Unit sales were at a new high; earnings after taxes were at their peak, and our dividends reached a record level. * * * Despite many pessimistic predictions at the beginning of 1954, the national economy proved its vigor and stability. Consumer income, the mainstay of food sales, remain high, and tax relief increased industrial purchasing power. * * * Our net profit rose for the third successive year. * * * We look with confidence to the year ahead."

Borden President Montague was equally forthright:

"We have just completed the best year in the history of the company. * * * The Government took the first steps necessary to reestablish the economy of the dairy industry on a sound basis. * * * Prospects for the future are indeed bright."

Dairy farmers can with good reason question the accuracy of several of these statements. They do not believe that the national economy has proved its vigor and stability in connection with the producing end of the milk business; nor that the prospects, at least for the immediate future, are indeed bright for the dairyman.

Fortunately, a great many farmers realize they cannot afford to content themselves merely with disagreement. It will get them nowhere. They appreciate the futility of such an attitude and, more and more, are they

coming to place greater value on a few of the basic principles: that charity begins at home, that he who travels alone travels fastest, and that he who does not help himself will not be helped by anyone else either.

That the milk dealers—and middlemen generally—see this farm awakening as the handwriting on their wall is evident from the offensive now being mapped out. They are aware of farmers' restiveness. They are aware, too, of the recent congressional reports on food price spreads. And, most assuredly, they know all about their own mounting profits. So the Grocery Manufacturers Association is launching a public relations campaign in an attempt to take the edge off the price spreads and the profits. Here in New York the Metropolitan Milk Dealers Association and the Dairymen's League have together retained a firm of accountants to prepare data on production, handling and selling costs. This traditionally congenial little pair will no doubt come up with some eloquent reasons why the dealers cannot afford to pay higher prices, and why the league, more than any other dealer, must continue to pay the lowest price of all to fluid-approved dairy farmers.

All this points up only too clearly the need to draw the line sharply between the men and the boys. It is true that right now the darkness is on the side of producers. Yet there is the reassuring thought that strength grows more healthfully out of adversity than prosperity. This may well be the time, then, when the strength of men will develop from the softness of youth—a strength that comes from within itself to place the farmer where he rightfully belongs in the scheme of things.

The W. W. Sebald Self-Reliance Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, bigness and success are words with many connotations because they can mean many things.

Successful businessmen, scientists, public officials, and others are sometimes the brunt of many uncomplimentary remarks because of their achievements and also because they must make decisions from time to time that affect the lives and living of many people.

On rare occasion we see a person who has driven to success by ruthlessly walking over the backs of others, so to speak, to gain his objective. These are completely selfish motives to get ahead personally regardless of the effects on one's fellowmen. Whatever modicum of success such a person achieves it is always an uneasy one because it lacks the very necessary stability of properness and soundness. This type of person is bound to be unhappy because of his fears and consequently whatever financial or other success he achieves gives him little real and solid pleasure. Fortunately, this type of person is very much in the minority.

The very big majority of really successful people gain their wealth and position because they are completely and humbly considerate of others. These people always have great personal ability to be sure, they constantly apply themselves and they drive themselves always harder than they do their associates. But they are also always considerate of others, they are deeply dedicated to their fellowmen, their community, and their Nation, and they have the courage to do what they know must be done for the good of all.

The Third District of Ohio is blessed to an unusual degree by the presence of a very large number of really "big" men and women in many lines of human endeavor. Because of this huge number it is always difficult to pick out persons who deserve special recognition for their contributions to our everyday life. Mr. Dwight Young, publisher of the Dayton Journal Herald, and past president of the ASNE has always been deeply interested in the Human Side of the News and on occasion he writes in his column about a citizen of our Great Miami Valley, who, he feels, has made a significant contribution. He wrote in his Talking It Over column recently about a gentleman, Mr. W. W. Sebald, of Middletown, Ohio.

Armco Steel Corp. is a great firm which has served and is serving in a substantial way to people all over the world. It has provided jobs for many thousands of workers and has had unusually good employee relationship. The management of Armco Steel includes some of the very top-flight executives of the business world. Mr. Charles Hook, Sr., is chairman of the board, and his contributions to the betterment of the Nation and our own National Government are well known. Mr. Hook, Sr., and Mr. Sebald have been associated together for many years, and their ability and teamwork with their fellow associates are largely responsible for the great success of Armco, along with many contributions of service for civic and human betterment.

Dwight Young has written of another phase of the deep-rooted civic service of Mr. Sebald in his contributions of encouragement to high-school students. Mr. Sebald believes that the future of our great Nation lies in developing self-reliance in young manhood and young womanhood, because it is these young people upon whom the future of the world must depend.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I ask that the story written by Dwight Young about W. W. Sebald be included as part of these remarks because it is a story of dedicated public service.

TALKING IT OVER
(By Dwight Young)

This department proposes a toast to W. W. Sebald, president of Middletown's Armco Steel Corp.

The suggestion has nothing whatever to do with Armco, although it is an exceptionally well-managed and outstanding industry of the valley and Ohio, and is extraordinarily active in the community life of Middletown. No; Armco is purely incidental to this salutation to its civic-minded president.

And so it is that this morning's piece tells something of Mr. Sebald's civic-mindedness in one particular field and the successful development of one community idea—the W. W. Sebald self-reliance awards.

The awards program was inaugurated last year with the understanding it would be given a 3 years' trial. The first banquet at which the initial awards were announced, was held in the Manchester Hotel in May 1954.

I was an invited guest and deeply interested spectator at the second banquet last Thursday night. Based on what I observed and heard, my confident guess is that this program has already attained permanent status in Middletown, and there is every reason to believe similar programs will be launched soon in other areas,

Indeed, one already has been started in Ashland, Ky., patterned exactly on the Middletown plan.

The basic principle of the awards is the ferreting out of teen-ager self-reliance and giving it proper recognition, as an encouragement to other teen-agers to go thou and do likewise.

Mr. Sebald had observed that the high schools quite properly give primary consideration to scholastic attainments. Without decrying this traditional phrase of graduation day, he felt the less brilliant senior, who has "done the most he can with the best he has" and in doing so has displayed a spirit of self-reliance, also is entitled to recognition.

Accordingly he conceived the awards, in which $1,500 is distributed annually among the eight most self-reliant members of the three Middletown high school graduating classes as follows: $400 each to the boy and girl adjudged the most self-reliant; $200 to the second boy and girl; $100 to the third, and $50 to the fourth. Sixteen others, including an equal number of girls and boys, received certificates. Mr. Sebald personally contributes the $1,500 and pays all expenses.

An infiite amount of detailed work is involved in making these selections. This is a job the junior chamber of commerce cheerfully accepted and is performing in a most commendable manner. It devoted more than 1,000 man-hours to the program this year.

Here is the way it works: Application blanks are distributed among all of the senior classes. Students who feel their records for self-reliance may be worthy of community recognition, fill out the blanks and return them to their home-room teachers.

The special committee of the Jaycees then goes to work in earnest. Entrants are interviewed individually. So are their friends, their families, the neighbors, their ministers, their teachers as well as their employers and fellow workers if they have part-time jobs.

It is a genuinely searching study. All told there are 28 selectees—28 whose records are good enough, the committee feels, to entitle them to consideration in the final judging to pick the eight winners.

The names of the chosen 8 are kept a closely guarded secret until they are announced at the banquet, at which the parents of all 28 selectees are guests. Thus far there have been no leaks. I am sure of that because last Thursday night I sat at a table with the publisher and general manager of the Middletown Journal and their wives, and I observed they were as much in the dark in identifying the winners as was anybody else.

At the dinner the presentations were made by honorary life members of the Jaycees. A synopsis of the winner's record was read aloud. Then the winner was invited to the platform for official greeting and handshaking and given a seat of honor in a corner of the ballroom.

I was especially interested to note that 3 of the 8 winners are Negroes—2 boys and a girl; and that the highest male honor ($400) went to 1 of the 3—W. N. (Willie Napoleon) Clements, of Fenwick High School.

Would you like to know something of this young colored boy's self-reliance record? Briefly, it is this: He is the oldest of 9 children and began supporting himself when he

was 8 years old by delivering newspapers. As he grew older he took other jobs to supplement his income.

At one time in 1953 he had 3 jobs that required 52 hours of work a week. All the time he was regularly attending school. Last year he played on the Fenwick football and track teams, took part in school plays, maintained a position in the upper third of his class, and was elected to the National Honor Society. In his spare time he does the family washing.

Congratulations to Mr. Sebald and the junior chamber of commerce. Together, they are making history in Middletown by demonstrating that today's crop of teen-agers is every whit as good and sound and dependable as the youngsters were back in the days when mother and father and grandma and grandpa were kids.

All Steamed Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, apropos of the attempt of the ICC to preside over the obsequies of the steam engine, there is an editorial in the Greensburg Morning Review which sums it up very well. With your permission I am including this in the RECORD:

ALL STEAMED UP

For those of you who thought "burying alive" went out with Edgar Allen Poe—take another look. The Interstate Commerce Commission is branching out into the funeral business—and there just ain't no death certificates on file for what the ICC plans to bury.

It seems that down in Washington on Thursday, the Commission is planning a ceremony to dedicate a memorial to steam locomotives. "In memory of the steam locomotives that served so long and so well," is the way the inscription on the monument will read. Past tense, that is.

But the only trouble is, somebody on the ICC "goofed." Nobody told the Norfolk & Western Railway, which last year moved near record tonnage and compiled one of the best operating ratios in the Nation—solely, completely, and entirely with steam locomotives. And nobody told the mighty Pennsy, which has just started a program to reassign half a hundred old steamers to active duty. Nobody told a lot of people, including the Union Pacific, New York Central, Illinois Central, Chesapeake & Ohio—must we go on? We could.

And last but not least, nobody told a host of rail fans, to whom a diesel is no more than a fish-peddler's horn mounted on a bathtub.

But then again, this isn't the first time the ICC has fumbled and stumbled; and unfortunately, it probably won't be the last. The railroads will probably go on taking the short end of the deal, while their competition grows fat at taxpayers' expense.

It might be better if the honorable commissioners spent a little more time in honest analysis of the Nation's transportation problems. It might be better if they did a lot of things before taking a holiday to bury the old steamers—alive.

In fact, we might even go along with the ceremony they've planned—provided that was the only point about which they were caught off base. Unfortunately, it isn't—and consequently, this burial service they are running is the lump of coal that explodes this old steam-lover's boiler.

Let's Regain the Initiative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the one thing that disturbs me most deeply about foreign policy is the manner in which we have allowed the initiative in world affairs to pass to the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communists.

We stood aside at the Geneva Conference last year while France and the Communists worked out a deal for the partition of Indochina. It is doubtful whether free Vietnam can be saved from the Communists, but Secretary Dulles seemed pleased on his return from Geneva because he had skillfully avoided having any direct negotiations with the Chinese Reds.

The State Department and the White House itself made a wretched bobble at the time of the Bandung Conference, when they first said they would not even talk to the Chinese Reds about a cease-fire in the Formosa Straits and then announced that, of course, they would talk about it. This confusion looked like a sign of panic, an uncertainty in our own minds, which gave the Chinese Reds a major propaganda victory.

Now we have negotiated an Austrian State Treaty, with the Soviet Union taking the lead in making certain demands as the price of a treaty the Russians had inexcusably delayed for 10 years. I am not saying that the terms of this treaty are intolerable, that they are inexcusable, but they certainly raise a question about the skill and determination of our own negotiators. They raise a question as to whether in this area, as well, the initiative went to the Soviets. There is a question, whether, in the reluctant approach of the White House to a Big Four meeting at the summit," the initiative is not possessed by the Soviets.

It is not enough for us to act wisely in foreign affairs. We also need to act with timeliness, with a clear idea of where we are going and what will be the effects of certain actions. We should not fight merely losing actions, but take the initiative in asserting our diplomatic leadership.

In this connection, I offer the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News, a Scripps-Howard newspaper:

LEGALIZED LOOTING

For 10 years Soviet Russia systematically has looted Austria—to the extent of more than $1 billion.

The Austrian Treaty, signed in Vienna Sunday, legalizes that looting and gives its blessing to more—to extremely high Austrian ransom payments to the Kremlin for another 10 years.

It may be this treaty was the best to be had, that it is less onerous than previous demands, that it is a cheap price to pay for getting the Red army out of Austria.

But let us not kid ourselves that the Austrian Treaty is a bargain—for Austria or the rest of the free world.

If Austria cannot meet the future ransom payments, she undoubtedly will turn to the United States for help. So the Senate should take a long, careful look at the complicated economic clauses of the Austrian Treaty when it is called to ratify the signature of John Foster Dulles.

The first question for the Senate to ask is: Why are the original Soviet economic demands still included in the treaty text if the so-called Soviet concessions made to Austria at Moscow are sincere? There is in the treaty only a backhanded reference to the concessions.

The second question is: Why, after 10 years of Soviet looting of Austria, must that small, poor country pay more to the Reds? That makes meaningless the 1943 Moscow pledge, and the preamble of the treaty itself, which classify Austria as a "liberated" victim of nazism rather than a former enemy.

Even if the Kremlin lives up to its economic concessions to Austia—the ones not spelled out in the treaty—it is a long, hard road ahead for a country that primarily is only a mountainous tourist attraction.

Austria agrees—with American, British, and French approval—to pay the Kremlin:

Seventy-two million barrels of crude oil in the next 10 years. That's worth about $200 million. The Soviets already have taken more than that out of Austria since 1945 and, in the process, ruined some of her best fields by rapid stripping.

Two million dollars to get back the Danubian Steamship Co. which—after 10 years in Red hands—is unlikely to be worth much. Russia still holds the assets of that company in the other satellite countries.

Payment in Austrian goods totaling $150 million in the next 6 years for some 300 industrial firms the Soviets seized in 1945 as "German assets" and have been operating—and ruining—for 10 years. The catch here is that the Soviets alone will decide what goods they will accept.

The Red Army stole these firms in 1945 under the guise of "German assets." Now the treaty makes it mandatory on Austria to buy back these stolen properties. And our reading of the treaty indicates that if the Kremlin is not satisfied with the payments it can go back to its original demands—confiscation of the properties.

Before the Senate ratifies this treaty, it carefully should ponder whether this country should put its name to a document which perhaps had some validity when drafted 7 or 8 years ago, but today seems a contradiction of the principles for which we stand.

Since the war the United States has given Austria nearly $1 billion in economic aid. Soviet Russia has taken at least that much out of the other end. It doesn't take much of a mathematician to figure out who has been paying the Kremlin's bill.

Who is going to pay it during the next 10 years?

Fort Leonard Wood as a Permanent Training Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I asked the Missouri congressional delegation to join me in urging Secretary of Defense, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, to declare Fort Leonard Wood a permanent training center. The letter which follows, signed by all 13 members of the delegation, was sent to the Secretary today. Fort Leonard Wood, located in the Eighth Congressional District of

Missouri, has for several years been recognized as one of the best engineering training installations in the Nation. The overall economic stability of the area would be greatly strengthened by a designation of permanency. Such stabilization would improve the local environment for the men who train there. Permanent status for the fort would also result in a saving of money for the Federal Government by making possible a more economic administration than is possible in operating the facility on a temporary and indefinite basis. It is a very definite opinion of the Missouri delegation that the confusion and insecurity in regard to this excellent training center should be definitely settled by declaring the fort permanent.

The letter from the Missouri delegation to the Secretary of Defense follows:

MAY 25, 1955.

CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is to urge that Fort Leonard Wood be designated as a permanent installation. It is one of the best equipped Army camps in the United States, yet for the want of a permanent designation this installation is operating on a costly short-time basis. A more ideal locaton cannot be found for a permant facility to train engineers as has been stated on many occasions by our military leaders. A permanent declaration would provide for the proper business climate that is beneficial to the soldier. The Missouri delegation in Congress submits that in the interest of realistic national defense and long-range Federal economy, Fort Wood be declared permanent, and we urge that immediate and serious consideration be given to this proposal which we can assure you has enthusiastic support.

Sincerely yours,

STUART SYMINGTON, CLARENCE CANNON, LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, RICHARD BOLLING, W. R. HULL, Jr., PAUL JONES, GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER, THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., DEWEY SHORT, THOMAS B. CURTIS, FRANK M. KARSTEN, MORGAN M. MOULDER, A. S. J. CARNAHAN.

Owen J. Roberts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, Owen J. Roberts early became a member of the American Law Institute and served as a member of the council from 1924 to 1936. His death on May 17, 1955, ended a career which had been as useful as it was comprehensive in its scope. As advocate, teacher, and judge, he attained eminence in each of these branches of our profession.

As an advocate he was perhaps at his best. His was an imposing presence and his manner of speaking immediately arrested attention and invited assent. Courts and juries quickly realized that his seeming sincerity was not a mere trick of advocacy but a manifestation of his inner self. He was as thorough in preparation as he was effective in delivery. His translation to the bench deprived the bar of one of its brightest ornaments.

As a teacher he combined clarity of statement with a capacity to elicit from the student the best that was in him. He is gratefully remembered by those who sat under him for his contagious enthusiasm and for the intellectual stimulus which he supplied.

As a judge he was openminded and just. His was not a subtle mind. His intellectual processes were simple and direct and the clarity of his thinking was reflected in his written opinions. His approach to constitutional and social problems underwent changes as case after case of capital importance came before the Supreme Court. Classified by some as a liberal when appointed, he was regarded by others as a conservative. The truth is that he could not fairly be regarded as an extremist in either direction. He dealt with each case on its merits as he conceived them to be. In the closing years of his term of service he seemed to find himself out of sympathy with the views of a majority of his colleagues and his ultimate retirement was popularly regarded as attributable to this circumstance. However this may be, he reflected the thinking of a great section of the American public, and when he quitted the bench a substantial segment of his fellow citizens lost an able and fearless representative.

Roberts was a man of spotless character and blameless life. His ideals were high and he sought to express them in conduct. Not only the members of the institute but a great company of loyal friends everywhere will unite in acclaiming him as a citizen of whom the Republic may well be proud.

United States Job Is a Privilege

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAGE BELCHER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial entitled "United States Job Is a Privilege" as it appeared in the Tulsa Tribune, Tuesday, May 17, 1955:

UNITED STATES JOB IS A PRIVILEGE

The United States Supreme Court is now considering a case in which an argument seems to have been made that a Government job is a right, not a privilege. If the Court so holds it will be difficult to see how the American people can protect themselves from keeping people on the Government payroll who may be trying to undermine our free institutions.

The case involves Dr. John Punnett Peters, Yale professor, who was dismissed from a Government post as part-time consultant to the Surgeon General.

Dr. Peters has been allied with a long list of Communist fronts. He was affiliated with three organizations boosting the Spanish Loyalists. These organizations were later declared subversive by the House Un-American Activities Committee. He was national sponsor of the American League for Peace and Democracy. During the period of the Hitler-Stalin truce the league was all for peace. When Hitler attacked Russia the league shouted for war.

He was a signer of a letter in the magazine, Soviet Russia Today, that stated, "The Soviet Union continues as always to be a consistent bulwark against war and aggression, and works unceasingly for the goal of a peaceful international order."

Dr. Peters championed the cause of Earl Browder and William Z. Foster, Communist leaders. He was on the national committee of something called the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom which sought to have the House Un-American Activities Committee disbanded. He fought against the deportation of Harry Bridges, and condemned the shameful persecution of Gerhart Eisler, the Communist who later jumped his bail, fled behind the Iron Curtain, and eventually became propaganda chief for East Germany.

These are just samples of a long list.

That a man with Dr. Peters' record should ever be employed by the Surgeon General is incredible. But once he got on Uncle Sam's payroll, do the people have a right to take him off?

Emphatically, we think they do. The doctor claims that he was never confronted by his accusers. He says the Constitution was thus violated.

If Dr. Peters were being sentenced to jail he would be right. But he is not being sentenced or fined for any crime at all. He is merely being separated from a Government job—a separation that would have been justified if he had spent too much time at the water cooler.

The FBI has many informants inside the the Communist conspiracy. Communists would like nothing better than to force the FBI to reveal such informants. But if proof can be established without requiring the testimony of the persons who tipped the FBI off why should the proof not stand on its own feet?

Every effort is already being made to ease the departures of those who are regarded as poor loyalty risks. Many of them, perhaps including Dr. Peters, are innocent dupes, who would not consciously hurt the United States. So the Government publishes no charges. A man can quietly return to his civilian job or his professorship with no one the wiser.

But Dr. Peters has chosen to make a fight out of it. We hope he gets licked. There is not going to be much left of security if the only people the American people can fire are those who admit membership in the Communist Party and openly boast of the part they intend to play in the destruction of our country.

Our Heritage—The American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the recent anniversary of the evacuation of Boston that took place in South Boston, Mass., on March 17, there were conducted historical exercises the Sunday before at South Boston

High School, at which exercises Senator MCNAMARA, of Michigan, made an outstanding address, which I have previously inserted in the RECORD. At the historical exercises a very fine young man, 13 years of age, who lives in my district, Francis S. Grant, a pupil of the Gate of Heaven High School, in South Boston, thrilled the audience with a masterly delivery of patriotic oratory.

I am pleased to include in my extension of remarks the splendid address that this young man made on that occasion. With young men of this kind throughout the country, we can look to the future with confidence for sound leadership.

The address follows:

OUR HERITAGE—THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

"Life lived in peace, contented and free. This is the heritage forever to be."

The eve of evacuation day, 1955—and youth looks at America and the precious heritage which is theirs. Youth looks to America as well—for hope, for inspiration, and for encouragement. The present generation hunger for their share in our national heritage, and eagerly seek to imbibe the basic principles and fundamental ideals of our American way of life. They yearn for fields of endeavor in which to increase their zeal for American democracy. And how can this be accomplished better than from good example and training? Yet, from mediums through which this could best be done—from radio and rostrum, from newsreel and newspaper, from magazine and microphone, by telephone and television—youth is being warned of the subtle dangers that threaten them on all sides; dire prophecies of a none too promising future; and of disintegrating forces at work throughout the world. This future belongs to our young people, for better or for worse.

The oncoming generation of youth looks to their educators to develop in them "an understanding, a love, and a zeal for the skills, attitudes, and ideals that will prepare them for effective and active American citizenship and world cooperation for peace." They appeal to you, dear friends, to teach them "to carry forward with unflinching determination the torch of freedom, justice, and humanity." They must be taught "to become proficient in the skills of inquiry and of discussions, and to develop habits of discriminating radio and television listening as well as reading."

"Learning experiences geared to their maturity level" must be placed at their disposal, and these experiences must challenge them "to identify democratic values and to act cooperatively and efficiently in a wide variety of life situations." (John W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education.)

The home, the school, and society at large can be powerful factors in aiding to attain these ends. Several years ago a group of public-minded American citizens was responsible for the historic nationwide journey of the Freedom Train with its priceless documents of liberty—to cite only one example of an endeavor to show our youth a part of their national heritage.

Tell them, and tell them constantly, about their wonderful country. In the heart of every young American boy and girl there is a vital spark of patriotism which can be easily kindled into a glowing flame of love for this heritage which is theirs.

You all have read the story of the man without a country. You remember, no doubt, how the young American, Philip Nolan, suffered years of atonement and regret from the terrible sentence which had been given to them—never to see or hear the name of his native land again. How he prayed that he might be allowed to return, if only to die there. "In his last hours, 'Tell me about America, tell me about America' was his constant dying appeal. Yes, friends—in the home, in the classrooms, the pulpits, the courts of justice, the playgrounds, the athletic fields; yes, friends of the press, radio, and television, tell young Americans of America." (Prof. Edwin J. Brown, University of Santa Clara, California.) Day in and day out, over and over again, from every source available to this country which God has favored above every nation, we must tell our youth that God is the author of law and the source of all authority.

To the young people of today, those in high places have a grave responsibility. Youth is a hero worshipper. Let not their idols be found with feet of clay. Integrity is more than a personal matter; large issues are at stake. Where is the man who, if he thinks at all, is willing to think of himself responsible for the shattering of some youthful ideal? We must hold up to them as models—a Washington, a Lincoln, a Jefferson, a Commander Shea, a Mayor Hines, and an Archbishop Cushing. Nature's noblemen all.

The generation coming to manhood may well profit by this splendid heritage, and it is safe to say they will not disappoint their loved country. In spite of the invectives hurled at youth today by an alarmed and outraged public, our country, like a good mother, remembers the superb courage displayed at Normandy, Iwo Jima, Korea and the like, and remembering, she loves and trusts her children.

As a representative of American manhood, I pledge to do all in my power to preserve this unprecedented heritage of freedom, to lift high the torch of liberty that it may cast its lustrous light for the peace and happiness of all posterity. In our hands has been placed this heritage. We shall strive to guard it well.

Views on the Military Reserve Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUTH THOMPSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1955

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a GI in Germany:

MAY 19, 1955.

Hon. RUTH THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MISS THOMPSON: The form of this letter might not be exactly correct, but it will carry the message. Between you and me.

My letter is in regard to President Eisenhower's bill on new military reserve program. First, let me introduce myself—before spouting off. I am a private in the United States Army in Germany. Enlisted for active service. Attended college for 1 year, before deciding to come into the Army and get it over with. I am 19 years old, a future Republican, and, after 6 more years of schooling, a lawyer, I hope.

I am very much opposed to the second part of the bill, as is almost every other GI. Look, we spend 2 years in this Army—no kick on that. However, to come home and play soldier for 1 night a week and 15 days a year just doesn't set with the average American boy (or man). Is a person so narrow-minded that he cannot see the morale of a forced unit, like proposed, would be zero? A radical statement? No.

It is not normal for one to want to live under military law—partially military law, I should say. What a laugh—miss two meetings, and 45 days in the Army. Can you imagine the attitudes a person who has already spent 2 years in the Army toward such an organization.

Miss Thompson, how much military knowledge do you think a person in a negative frame of mind would obtain or renew in 2, 3, or 4 hours a week? I have up until this time possessed much respect for the man in charge. But I say because he is a military man and "ate this life up" (in GI words), is no sign every Tom, Dick, and Harry does.

Certainly, I, like everyone else, am more than willing to spend these 2 years to gain a basic knowledge of the service. But civilian and military "just don't mix."

I might say you could find a standard idea of what the attitude would be in required ROTC for 2 years in college. Man, they just don't like the combination of civilian and military.

True—some do like it—National Guard—great, if you like it. Okay, up to now you figured this is just a guy too lazy to go to a meeting and summer camp. Don't give up—I have a little more. First of all I would like to parallel this subject as I could see it affecting myself. I plan to get married when I get out of the service and return to college. Naturally, I will have to work. So I find a job working evenings while attending college. Special case? No. There are many going to college under these very conditions.

Okay, so I work 5 or 6 nights a week—1 night a week guard. Summer vacation from work—guard or UMT for 2 weeks. Miss THOMPSON, ask yourself how would you like it? Okay say "Now, now, it won't be so bad." How about asking the guys in general who are reluctant to spend 2, 3, or 4 years in the Army how they would like to be a militarized (if such a word exists) civilian? I am sure you don't have to ask. Do you honestly believe you would maintain a high morale among a forced or UMT group?

Maybe I am ignorant of many facts—but I do not believe I am so ignorant that I cannot pick up general opinion. Think it over and I certainly hope you will or have voted negative on this bill. If it goes through, just count one less Republican in 1956. I will not stick with a GOP of UMT. Thank you. I am

Sincerely yours,

———— ————.

Give Benson a Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis Star entitled "Give Benson a Chance."

Not only the speech given by Secretary of Agriculture Benson at Purdue University but also the sound proposals offered by Mr. Benson have made an appeal to the farmers and consumers of the Middle West States:

GIVE BENSON A CHANCE

The most consistent, and we believe rightly so, member of the Eisenhower administration is Secretary of Agriculture Benson. He has not once trimmed his sails for political expediency.

Thursday, at Purdue University, Mr. Benson again answered the supporters of high rigid support prices with reason and logic. He noted that present farm-price levels, the huge surpluses in storage, the billions spent on stored grain and other commodities, the price slump all occurred under rigid price supports. Some farmers and others blame Benson for whatever woes they might now have. But Benson's program has not even gone into effect. It won't go into effect until next fall.

We've had waste, tremendous expense to taxpayers, dropping prices and other mishaps on the farm all under the present high rigid price-support program. Isn't it time to give Benson a chance to prove his case for flexible supports?

Unify and Strengthen Forces of Peace and Freedom in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Congress to the splendid efforts being made by American labor in countering the propaganda of the Communists. One of the major appeals which the Communists make is to the working people of the world, and there can be no more authoritative answer to them than the answer which comes from free-trade unionism. I especially want to point out two excellent statements adopted by the AFL executive council at its meeting in Washington, D. C., on May 5, 1955.

The statements follow:

UNIFY AND STRENGTHEN FORCES OF PEACE AND FREEDOM IN EUROPE

Ten years ago this week, the Nazi aggressors were crushed on the field of battle. But the cessation of military hostilities in Europe and the subsequent Japanese surrender did not bring mankind the human liberty and international harmony for which it yearned.

Today, world peace and freedom are gravely menaced by another dangerous totalitarian enemy—the imperialist Moscow-Peiping axis, with its worldwide subversive Communist conspiracy. In this situation, the first and foremost task of American labor and the American people, the primary task of the free world and its free labor movements, is to preserve peace and protect and promote freedom.

COMMUNIST MILITARY MACHINE

Communist imperialism has built a gigantic military machine. The Communist aggressors combine firmness of basic aim with flexibility of strategy and tactics. They often hypocritically conceal their fundamental objectives in order to confuse and divide the democratic peoples and foster among them policies of appeasement and piecemeal surrender—policies facilitating Communist conquest and enslavement of the entire world.

But Soviet imperialism is beset by many serious difficulties. Communist economy in Europe and Asia is a miserable failure—aggravated by crushing armament burdens, the war in Korea, and Peiping's mounting industrial and military needs. Disillusionment and restiveness are rife among the peoples of the Iron Curtain orbit.

The collapse of the Communist hope for a deepgoing economic crisis in the United States, with devastating consequences for the free world, coupled with the slowly but solidly rising unity and strength of the democratic camp, have likewise profoundly affected Moscow's cold war startegy for world domination.

The Kremlin is now seeking time in which to overcome its own difficulties, to strengthen its military establishment and destroy the vigilance and unity of the democratic fold. For these reasons, the Moscow-Peiping Axis is not restorting today to frontal acts of direct aggression which might precipitate a world war. It now seeks to atain its next objectives primarly through negotiations and so-called peace maneuvers.

In Europe, Moscow's present main objective is to prevent the rearmament of Germany and its integration with the democratic West. The Kremlin does not really fear the projected German rearmament which is to be controlled and restricted by the West European Union (WEU). Moreover, in the atomic age, Germany could not, even if she wanted to, wage war by herself.

Moscow opposes German rearmament and association with the WEU soley because these policies would promote the economic and political integration and the collective security of free Europe, thereby greatly strengthening the forces deterring further Communist subversion and aggression.

Because its "New Look" maneuvers and threats have failed to prevent the ratification of the London-Paris Accords, Moscow is now making a new move to prevent or at least delay, a contribution by the Federal Republic of Germany to its own defense and to the collective security of free Europe. This maneuver centers around a state treaty for Austria. After sabotaging the adoption of such a state treaty for nearly 10 years and after having compelled Austria and the 3 western powers to accept unsound economic and inhuman political amendments, the Kremlin has finally agreed to enter into a treaty.

HEAVY AUSTRIAN REPARATIONS

Under the guise of the so-called German assets clause, heavy reparation payments are to be imposed on the people of Austria. For 10 years, the Austrian people will be compelled to turn over to the Kremlin for nothing a million tons of oil annually. The sovereignty of the Austrian people, their right to independent action in their foreign relations and their freedom of association with other countries, will be seriously impaired by the provisions of the treaty which call for Austria's neutralization but do not guarantee its territorial integrity.

In pointing out these unsatisfactory features, it must be emphasized that it was the firm democratic attitude of the Austrian people and the growing unity and strength of the allied powers which forced Russia into readiness to grant even such a state treaty. Belated Soviet readiness to sign even this state treaty with Austria is intended chiefly as bait for Germany. Moscow would have the 50 million people of the Federal German Republic believe that, if they follow the Austrian example and renounce military and political association with the West they could achieve national reunification in freedom.

We appeal to the German people, and especially to their free labor movement, not to fall into the trap set for them by the Kremlin. The German people of the four occupation zones are in a position very different from that of Austria—in respect to size of their population and area, strength of their economy, potential world role, and lack of one national government authority for the whole country.

Furthermore, since the Berlin Conference of February 1954, the Kremlin has given no indication that it is now willing to accept internationally supervised free elections in its zone of occupation or to consent to German national reunification in freedom. The present Soviet attempt to strangle West Berlin is the latest confirmation of Moscow's determination to extend its stranglehold westward, with a view of bringing the entire country under the Communist yoke.

MOSCOW WANTS PUPPET

Moscow wants no national reunification of Germany in freedom, but only the creation of a bigger German puppet state behind the Iron Curtain—a state under which every German, on both sides of the Elbe, would be robbed of all freedom—national and human alike. Such Communist unification of Germany would be the gravest threat to world peace and freedom.

Free German labor knows very well that, as late as December 10, 1954, Molotov threatened to shut the door, once and for all, to any further negotiations regarding the Austrian State Treaty and German reunification, if the London-Paris Agreements were ratified. But scarcely had these agreements been ratified when Moscow reopened negotiations on Austria and even hastened to accept the very treaty it had so adamantly refused to sign in February 1954.

This shows that—contrary to what the opponents of German rearmament have been asserting—the policy of peace through democratic unity and strength is the only one that will force Moscow into earnest negotiations and concessions. Only by expanding their relations with the free peoples and strengthening their own defenses as part of the collective-security system of free Europe, can the German people hope to obtain any concessions from Moscow in the direction of national reunification in freedom.

Toward furthering the integration of free Europe and the national reunification of Germany in freedom, toward safeguarding Austria against going through an experience like the 1948 Czechoslovakian Communist coup d'etat or the 1950 experience of the Republic of Korea after the withdrawal of American troops, we propose the following measures for consideration and action by our Government:

1. Four-power guaranty—exercised only in concert—to safeguard Austria's territorial integrity in the event it is menaced by any of the signatory powers.

2. Four-power agreement to submit for binding decision to Hague International Court of Justice all differences which may arise among them over execution of the treaty.

3. Article XVI is not to be replaced with a new provision in the treaty or by any separate arrangement which might be employed against displaced persons and refugees from Iron Curtain countries.

4. After the signing of the treaty by the four powers, no other conditions shall be set for the withdrawal of all the occupation forces, whose departure shall be completed not later than the end of the year.

5. Upon the signing of the treaty, Austria should be admitted to the United Nations, which should also guarantee its national independence and territorial integrity for 25 years.

6. Set up an International Commission to supervise and assure the withdrawal of Soviet troops from neighboring satellite countries, as provided for in state treaty.

7. Press for an early Four-Power Conference, the sole agenda of which shall be: reunification of Germany in freedom.

8. In the preparations for and the deliberations of such a conference, the Western de-

mocracies should cooperate with the Federal German Republic—especially in assuring (a) internationally supervised free elections throughout the four zones and all Berlin; (b) the democratically elected National Assembly establishing an all-German central government and adopting a provisional constitution; (c) complete sovereignty of Germany in the conduct of its domestic and foreign policy and the consequent exercise of its sovereign rights to review, reaffirm, or reject any international agreement hitherto entered into by the Federal Republic or the East Zone puppet authority.

9. Toward speeding the implementation of the London-Paris accords and toward making the West European Union "a focus of European integration," the idea of European unity should be furthered in a practical manner through American economic aid and technical assistance to such specific projects for European integration as the establishment of a Free Europe Authority to construct and operate continental oil pipelines; unify the European rail, water, and air transport systems; coordinate the electricity, waterpower, and atomic energy resources; and launch all-European health and cultural projects.

10. Toward assuring the democratic character of such projects and the great mass of the people sharing equitably in the benefits thereof, the free trade unions of the cooperating countries should be drawn into active consultation and full participation in their policymaking bodies.

TOWARD LESSENING TENSION AND PROMOTING PROSPERITY IN ASIA

On the Asian front of the international cold war, Moscow is now waging a two-pronged drive. It seeks to strengthen the diplomatic prestige and military prowess of its Chinese-Communist partner. At the same time, it seeks to undermine the confidence of the peoples of the Far East in America as a reliable and formidable opponent of Soviet expansion.

Moscow does not now want to be involved in any large scale Peiping aggression which might lead to a major war in Asia. Communist Chinese economy is in a catastrophic condition. Its 5-year plan has collapsed at the very outset.

In the rural regions, increasing numbers of peasants are bitterly resisting collectivization. Here serious famine is the order of the day. The Peiping war lords have no armament industry of their own. They are dependent on Moscow for modern weapons. Soviet economy, already beset by many serious difficulties of its own, would be gravely endangered, if it were to undertake to equip and sustain Mao Tse-tung hordes for warfare in the atomic age.

FERTILE FOR SUBVERSION

On the other hand, vast areas of Asia are now fertile soil for Communist penetration and subversion. Today, the prospects for Communist advance and aggrandizement are much stronger in Asia. That is why communism is now more belligerent here than anywhere else.

Actually, Soviet communism has been waging war here for the last 10 years—on the Chinese mainland, in Korea, Indochina, Indonesia, Malaya, and in the Formosa Straits. As in World Wars I and II, the aggressors here have attacked whenever they doubted that their intended victims would resist aggression or believed that their allies would not come to their aid militarily. If world war III has not yet broken out here, it certainly is not due to any restraint voluntarily exercised by the Communists.

The Kremlin's current policy is to continue this state of affairs as most favorable for promoting Communist subversion and influence—at the same time avoiding a major war which might well lead to the destruction of the entire Soviet "paradise."

Hence, the Moscow-Peiping Axis mixes threats of war with flowery expressions of peaceful intentions to cultivate neutralism as a force against American influence in the Far East. It operates a huge narcotics smuggling ring, the profits of which are used for financing drives to penetrate and dominate the trade union and peasant organizations and to foment guerrilla warfare in the Orient. It resorts to local aggressions.

FATAL TO BYPASS U. N.

In this light, the Chinese Communist strategy of offering to engage in bilateral negotiations with the United States is very clear in all its sinister implications. It would be almost a death blow to the prestige of the United Nations to be thus bypassed by a regime which it has condemned as an aggressor. Such negotiations, conducted outside the U. N., would discourage our friends and encourage Mao Tse-tung and his masters in Moscow to redouble their efforts to conquer all Asia.

In short, the essence of Communist strategy in the Formosa Straits, at this hour, is, simultaneously, to beguile the American people and all other free nations with peaceful promises and employ threats of war so as to beguile and frighten them into bilateral negotiations and into new concessions vital to the Peiping regime's plans for further large-scale aggression.

Our Government should weigh very seriously the possible consequences of such negotiations outside the United Nations. Toward encouraging and strengthening the forces of peace and freedom and discouraging aggression in Asia, we propose that our Government should pursue the following course of action:

(1) Immediate generous aid—military, material, and technical—should be extended to Formosa along with assistance in securing higher standards of living and greater democracy for its people. Coordinated joint efforts should be made to transform this remaining territory of free China into a model for democracy in the eyes of the oppressed and hungry on the Chinese mainland and the millions of overseas Chinese throughout the rest of Asia.

(2) Seek reciprocal agreements with our European and Asian allies to join with us in the active protection of these remaining free areas of the Republic of China as part of our overall agreement to cooperate with them in protecting any other free area against Moscow-Peiping aggression.

RELEASE ALL PRISONERS

(3) Our Government should press for more energetic action by the United Nations for securing the release of all American and other United Nations war prisoners forcibly held by the Peiping regime in violation of international law and elementary human decency.

(4) Our highest military authorities, in consultation with their colleagues of the Republic of China and SEATO, should consider and determine the status of the Quemoy and Matsu Islands—solely from the viewpoint of the vital interests and strategic needs of all the free peoples of the world.

(5) Toward paralyzing the plan of the Moscow-Peiping Axis and its neutralist aides-de-camp to exploit hypocritically the Bandung Conference protest against colonialism, our Government should make every effort to convince its allies to act promptly in undertaking measures leading to national freedom for the colonial peoples of Asia and Africa.

(6) Increased aid to the peoples of the underdeveloped countries for raising their productivity and purchasing power, overcoming illiteracy, improving their health, and building up stable institutions of self-government and free-trade unions.

Labor Determined Handling of Union Welfare Funds Shall Be Controlled by High Standard of Ethics

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, a number of newspaper stories have been printed about alleged abuses in union-negotiated health and welfare funds, and some examples have been disclosed by a subcommittee of this House. I think the record should show that the responsible leaders of organized labor are aware of these situations and determined to wipe them out.

The record should include, as well, the fact that many of the so-called abuses occurred when a selfish few took advantage of all the latitude the law allowed—the perfectly legal brokers' fees and agents' fees permitted established and reliable representatives of insurance companies.

Responsible national leaders of unions are determined that the handling of union welfare funds shall be controlled by a high standard of ethics. They are determined that no labor official, of whatever rank, shall derive personal gain from a health, welfare, or pension clause in a collective bargaining contract. The executive council of the American Federation of Labor considered this problem on May 5 and adopted an admirable statement of principles. Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I add the text of the program on health and welfare funds adopted by the executive council of the AFL:

SUGGESTED GUIDES FOR ADMINISTRATION OF HEALTH AND WELFARE FUNDS

In the development of plans through the process of collective bargaining designed to provide some measure of protection to the health and welfare of millions of wage earners and their families, the labor movement is fulfilling its historic role. Being denied by Government the comprehensive health insurance protection for the people of the Nation which the American Federation of Labor has supported for many years, labor unions have secured for their members the best protection available.

At its recent convention in Los Angeles, the American Federation of Labor strongly reaffirmed its position in favor of a system of national health insurance. The convention also recommended to affiliates the advantages of prepayment plans which provide comprehensive direct medical services and which emphasize preventive care, pointing out that, in addition to their other advantages, such programs are not subject to most of the abuses that have been found in some cash indemnity plans offered by commercial insurance carriers. The convention further declared that:

"It is incumbent upon every organization affiliated with the American Federation of Labor to take every step that may be available to it to clean up any such situations that may exist within its province, to take appropriate action against any official guilty of abuses, and to establish a system of standards, methods, and procedures in the administration and policing of health and wel-

fare programs that will prevent the recurrence of such abuses."

In the control and operation of health and welfare plans of whatever type, the best interests of the members must be the governing consideration. The private interests of others concerned with these plans—whether union officials, employers, insurance carriers and agents, public officials, doctors, or others—must not be permitted to stand in the way of any steps that may be required to protect the rights of beneficiaries. Such steps should be designed not only to prevent corrupt or unethical practices, but to assure that the financial resources of these plans are employed in such a way as to be of the greatest practical value to those for whose benefit they are established and to preserve the protection these plans provide for millions of working people.

A. ACTION BY NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL UNIONS

The American Federation of Labor has no authority to direct the internal affairs of its affiliated organizations. It is, however, the responsibility of each affiliated national or international union to protect the interests of its membership in this field in the manner best suited to the particular problems and practices in its trade or industry. The recommendations which follow are designed to aid affiliates in the discharge of their responsibility. Where constitutional amendments or changes in internal administrative procedure are necessary to provide this protection, such amendments and changes should be undertaken at the earliest practicable time. They should be designed to provide national and international unions with the means and the authority to audit funds and apply remedies where there is evidence of a violation of standards, based upon the following principles:

1. Where a salaried union official serves as employee representative or trustee in the administration of a welfare program, such service should be regarded as one of the functions expected to be performed by a union official in the normal course of his duties, and not as an extra function requiring further compensation, over and above his salary, from the welfare fund. Officials who already receive full-time pay from their union should be expressly prohibited from receiving fees or salaries from a welfare fund.

2. Union officials or employees who exercise responsibility or influence in the administration of welfare programs or the placement of insurance contracts should be entirely free of any compromising ties, direct or indirect, with outside agencies—such as insurance carriers, brokers, consultants, and others—doing business with the welfare fund. Such ties cannot be reconciled with the duty of union officials to be guided solely by the best interests of the membership in any transactions with such agencies. At best, they involve a conflict of interests. At worst, they introduce corruption, profiteering, and graft at the expense, directly or indirectly, of the membership. Express provision should be made for the removal of any union official found to be involved in such ties to his own personal advantage, or to have accepted inducements, benefits, or favors of any kind from such outside agencies.

This provision is not to be construed as preventing the maintenance by a union officer or employee, of an outside relationship provided: (a) No substantial personal advantage is derived from the relationship, and (b) the concern or enterprise is one in the management of which the union participates for the benefit of its members.

3. Where any trustee—whether employer, employee, or neutral—or employee of a health and welfare fund is found to have received an improper payment, the union should insist upon his removal and appropriate legal action against both the party receiving and the party making the payment. In addition, if the insurance carrier, or agent, is involved, action against the carrier, or agent, should be pressed before the State insurance authorities, with a view to the cancellation of the carrier's, or agent's, right to do business in the State.

4. Complete records of the financial operations of welfare funds should be maintained in accordance with the best accepted accounting practice, with regular audits by certified public accountants of unquestioned professional integrity, at least once a year and preferably semiannually. All audit reports should be available to the membership of the union.

5. A full annual report on welfare-fund operations should be furnished on request to individual members. Included in the report should be a detailed statement of receipts and expenses; all salaries and fees paid by the fund, to whom and in what amount such sums were paid, and for what service or purpose; a breakdown of insurance premium payments, if a commercial insurance carrier is involved, showing the amount of retentions, claims paid, dividends, commissions, and service charges and to whom the carrier paid such commissions and charges; a financial statement on the part of the insuring or service agency, if an agency other than a commercial insurance carrier is employed; and a detailed account of the manner in which the reserves held by the fund are invested.

6. Prior to the initial establishment of the plan, the relative advantages of all of the alternative available methods of providing health and welfare benefits should be fully explored, including self-insurance and the use of programs providing fully prepaid direct medical services where they exist or can be set up within the community, as well as the use of commercial insurance carriers. The objective should be to reduce operating expenses and nonbenefit costs to the minimum consistent with the safety and security of the program, and to make available to the members the maximum in terms of actual prepaid health services (as distinguished from cash payments covering an unpredictable portion of actual medical bills) obtainable within the limits of the revenue of the fund.

7. Where a local fund selects a commercial insurance carrier, competitive bids should be solicited from a substantial number of reliable carriers, and the successful bidder selected, after thorough investigation, on a basis most favorable to the interests of the membership—with particular emphasis upon comparative retention rates, financial responsibility, facilities for and promptnescs in servicing claims, and past experience of the carrier, including the record of the carrier in dealing with trade unions representing its employees.

The trustees of the fund should be required to state in writing and to report to the membership the specific reasons for the selection of the carrier finally chosen. As a consideration for getting the right to do business with the fund, the carrier should also be required to warrant that no fee or other remuneration has been paid, directly or indirectly, to any individual (other than his own employees or agents), organization, fund, official, trustee, or employee in connection with the acquisition of the business of the fund.

8. Complete records of claims experience should be kept so that a constant check can be maintained on the relationship between claims and premiums and dividends, and on the utilization of the various benefits. In the case of medical benefits, records, and statistics should also be kept showing the extent to which cash benefits paid out are sufficient to cover, or fail to cover, the costs and charges actually incurred by the members when they avail themselves of medical services.

9. The investment of welfare fund reserves in the business of any contributing employer, insurance carrier, or agency doing business with the fund, or in any enterprise in which any trustee, officer, or employee of the fund has a personal financial interest of so substantial a nature as to be affected by the fund's investment or disinvestment, should be prohibited.

This is not to be construed as preventing investment in an enterprise in which a union official is engaged by virtue of his office, provided (a) no substantial personal advantage is derived from the relationship, and (b) the concern or enterprise is one in the management of which the union participates for the benefit of its members.

10. The provisions of the plan governing eligibility for benefits should be designed to include, as nearly as practicable, all workers on whose wages any substantial contribution has been paid, whether such contribution was withheld from their wages or made on their behalf by their employers. Waiting periods for eligibility should not be of such a length as to discriminate unfairly against some portions of the membership, to the benefit of others.

11. Every program should incorporate an adequate appeals procedure as a check against the arbitrary or unjust denial of claims, so as to afford the individual member a fair hearing and a sufficient opportunity to obtain redress where he feels his claim for benefits has been improperly rejected.

12. It should be emphasized that the duty of policing and enforcing these standards is shared by every union member, as well as by local, national, and international officials. Efficiency in the administration of health and welfare funds should not be purchased at the price of union democracy. The best and the only ultimate safeguard of local autonomy and democracy lies in the hands of a vigilant, informed, and active membership, jealous of their rights and interests in the operation of health and welfare programs, as well as any other trade-union program. As a fundamental part of any approach to the problem of policing health and welfare funds, affiliated union, through education, publicity, and discussion programs, should endeavor to encourage and develop the widest possible degree of active and informed interest in all phases of these programs on the part of the membership at large.

B. LEGISLATIVE ACTION

1. Federal: In order to qualify for tax deductions, every employer who contributes to or maintains a health and welfare plan should be required to file each year with the Bureau of Internal Revenue a statement of the amounts contributed to or expended upon such a plan. If the employer maintains the plan on a self-insured basis, the statement should be accompanied by a detailed financial statement covering the operations, expenses, and investments involved in the program. If the plan is insured with the employer by a private carrier, the statement should be accompanied by a report from the carrier on the employer's account, containing a breakdown of premiums and retentions and showing the amount of dividends or rate credits paid or due, claims experience, the amount of commissions and service charges, and to whom those commissions and charges were paid.

If the employer makes his contributions to a trust fund, the statement filed by the employer should clearly identify the name, trustees, and address of the fund. It would then be the duty of the trustees of the fund to file, with the Bureau of Internal Revenue, an annual financial report, disclosing in detail the operations, transactions, expenses, and investments of the fund.

All statements and reports required to be filed, under this recommendation, should be made readily available to the employer, union members directly concerned, authorized Government agencies and State insurance officials.

2. State:

(a) State insurance laws should be amended so that, in cases where an agent or broker is not employed and no such services are rendered, the requirement that commissions must nevertheless be paid to an agent or retained by the insurance carrier is eliminated.

(b) Where the services of agents or brokers are employed, the payment of excessive commissions and services charges should be banned. A code of standards governing commissions and charges should be adopted and enforced by State insurance commissions.

(c) State regulatory bodies governing insurance operations should be made more representative of the public and consumer interest. At present, State insurance commissions and departments tend to reflect and to be dominated by the special interests of the insurance industry.

(d) State insurance commissions and departments should assume and exercise a greater degree of responsibility for the integrity, competence, and character of agents and brokers who are licensed by the State. At the present time, such a license is virtually meaningless and offers no assurance to the public that a person having a license is reliable or subject to any really effective checks, surveillance or standards. As a minimum step, as a requirement for securing and holding a license, the records and accounts of agents and brokers should be subject to regular and thorough inspections, and they should be required to file regular reports with State insurance commissions disclosing and identifying every fee and commission received in connection with a group policy, issued as a part of a health and welfare plan, and the nature and purpose of expenditures made in the course of their business operations. The charging of excessive fees, commissions, or expenses and the making of unethical or improper payments to secure or to hold an account should result in the prompt revocation of the license to operate.

(e) Laws which, in a number of States, now stand in the way of the development of consumer-sponsored, nonprofit medical service prepayment plans should be repealed so as to make constructive alternatives to limited cash indemnity insurance plans more generally available to trade union and other consumer groups.

(f) Laws which, in a number of States, prohibit employers from withholding any part of wages earned by an employee (except taxes) without written authorization, should be amended so as to exempt from such prohibitions deductions made for health and welfare plans developed through collective bargaining by employers and bona fide trade unions.

Capitol Commentary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

My vote for H. R. 12, the farm price support program which passed in the House, is in keeping with my consistent support of a farm program assuring the farmer 90 percent of parity in normal times. That was my position when I became a candidate for Congress, and upon a reappraisal and re-examination of the facts today, I cannot sincerely and conscientiously favor a program of flexible supports in view of declining farm prices. I do not wish to be a party to a plan that will take further away from the farmer that to which he is rightfully entitled.

We hear much about parity, and it is generally defined as follows: What the farmer receives for his products in comparison with what he has to buy; in other words, a fair ratio. Under H. R. 12, price supports will be restored to 90 percent of parity for 1955, 1956 and 1957 on the five basic crops—wheat, corn, cotton, rice and peanuts. It would repeal the 1954 Agricultural Adjustment Act which established flexible price supports for these crops at 82½ to 90 percent of parity with the supports to drop at low as 75 percent in 1956 and thereafter. And the minimum level for support of dairy products is placed at 80 percent of parity instead of 75 percent as under the present law.

This legislation is not an issue to be considered from a partisan viewpoint. It is an issue that concerns all parts of our American economy because agriculture is the backbone of any real and genuine prosperity in our country. All segments of our economy—with the exception of the farmer—have a stabilized or rising purchasing power, and I feel that this legislation will help to maintain a level of income for the farmer which will enable him to conserve and improve the soil. I feel it will stem the tide of recession in agriculture and assure ample production of food for the American people.

Protection is provided labor through the minimum wage and other laws. Industry is protected by tariffs. Business is protected by fair-trade laws. And let's not overlook the subsidies to business—the railroads, the airlines, and the shipping industry. These are but a few of the laws designed to protect segments of our economy other than agriculture.

Since farmers have no voice in setting the prices of the products they sell or of many of the services they have to buy, it is my reasoning that they also should be assured of some degree of economic protection based on fairness. Much has been said about the cost of such a program to the American taxpayers. Let's look at the facts:

From October 1933 through February 1955, a period of nearly 22 years, the total cost on all price-support programs has been about $1.9 billion and for those basic commodities with which we are concerned about $326.4 million.

How does this compare with the aid we have given to foreign countries—something like $40 billion since World War II—to a $101 billion highway program still in the talking stages with a cost to the Federal Government being $25 billion, or to the deficit of the Post Office Department for the last 10 years of $4.3 billion? You could compare the cost of a price-support program with the $8.9 billion of surplus property excluding stockpile materials of the Defense Department which is not needed now nor in the future.

We might also look at a few examples of subsidies to business—$627 million to the airlines and $753 million to the shipping industry from 1931 to 1954. Therefore, we find that charges of exorbitant costs for a price-support program are misleading. It is true that there are defects in a program of 90-percent price supports but the same can be said of a program of flexible supports. One of the most common pleas made for the flexible plan is that such a program will equalize production and demand and eliminate surplus and controls. It is reasoned when price supports are lower the supply will be reduced and an increase will result in the use of these products.

But Congressman CLIFFORD HOPE—a Republican of Kansas, with nearly 30 years' service in the House, past chairman of the Agricultural Committee, and ranking Republican member of that committee since 1933—stated that during the 17 years that flexible price supports have been in existence no evidence was ever presented to the House Agricultural Committee to show that the lowering of price supports has caused any sizable degree of reduction in acreage or production, or any relaxation of controls. And, on the other hand, he continued, there has been plenty of evidence that an increase in price supports will cause an increase in production because if farmers are assured of fair prices they will farm more extensively by investing in new machinery, using more fertilizer, which in turn requires increased expenditures from a capital standpoint and operating expenses.

Congressman HOPE pointed out further that any reduction in production means little, if any, reduction in operating expenses, and that, in order to meet them, the farmer feels justified in trying to maintain the same gross income. He stated that the tendency is to increase rather than to decrease production. As to the statement that a reduction in the price farmers receive will bring an increase in consumption—it is erroneous, said Mr. HOPE, because the farm price of the raw material has practically no connection with the price of the finished article, with 2½ cents of wheat in a 20-cent loaf of bread and 35 cents of cotton in a $5 shirt.

Here I would like to point out that out of every dollar the consumer gets today, 26 cents is used for food and out of each dollar that a consumer spends for food, the farmer receives about 45 cents. Therefore, less than 12 percent of the total consumer income reaches the farmer.

The 1938 Agricultural Adjustment Act established flexible supports on the basic commodities from 52 to 75 percent of parity with such supports remaining flexible until World War II, at which time they were increased to 85 percent and then to 90 percent. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1948 extended them for the 1949 crop and the act of 1949 set the support price on a flexible basis from 75 to 90 percent. Since then supports have been continued at 90 percent by the Secretary of Agriculture and for 1953 and 1954 by action of the Congress. The 1948 act included in addition to a 90-percent figure on basic commodities for the crop year 1949, milk, milk products, hogs, chickens, and eggs and the 1949 act also provided supports not to exceed 90 percent for all other nonbasic commodities with a range of flexibility from zero to 90 percent.

In comparing the flexible and fixed support programs, it is interesting to look at the results:

In 1952, wheat was supported at 90 percent and brought $2.07 a bushel. A year later it was up 1 cent or about one-half of 1 percent.

Corn was supported at 90 percent in 1952 and in 2 years had dropped from $1.53 to $1.45, about 6 percent.

Under the flexible scale, milk in 1952 brought $4.14 and in 1954 brought $3.24, a drop of about 25 percent.

Grain sorghums dropped about 22 percent, from $2.85 to $2.14.

Here, I think it would be well to point out that the proponents of the flexible plan last year stated that the farmer should have at least 82½ percent of what was fair for one year with the reduction to 75 percent in 1956. And yet today—with the income of the farmer going down—down—down—these same supporters of the flexible plan seem unconcerned with the further reduction of parity

to 75 percent on the 1956 crops, even in view of the present financial ills of the American farmer.

Recently, the Department of Agriculture announced that price suports for barley, sorghums, oats, and soybeans would be lowered to 70 percent from 85 percent, but apparently this announcement did not result in a decreased acreage because the intention to plant more barley was about 9 percent ahead of the 1954 average, with sorghum grains slightly more than 10 percent, oats nearly 1 percent and soybeans a little more than 7 percent. Under H. R. 12, all of the basic commodities are under acreage allotments and marketing quotas apply with the exception of corn. The control program is the reason for a reduction in acreage whether the supports are flexible or fixed.

In appearing before the House Agriculture Committee, the Secretary of Agriculture stated that there would have to be the same controls for 75 percent of parity that there would be for 90 percent. Although I am the only Republican from Nebraska favoring rigid supports, the Republican delegations from Iowa, Kansas, South Dakota, and North Dakota supported my position by 13 to 4. And the overall vote for H. R. 12 was in the majority among Representatives from the midwestern agricultural States as well as those in the Southern States where agriculture is the basic industry.

In the discussion of this measure on the floor of the House, there seemed to be an apparent bond among those from agricultural States regardless of party lines. The economy of American agriculture is not contingent upon rice or corn but upon all of the basic commodities contained within this legislation. It must be recognized that the large reserves of food we have today were derived primarily from appeals for expanded production by our Government during the last war and the Korean conflict and to meet our foreign obligations. A reduction in farm exports as well as improved scientific methods in agricultural research have added to the accumulation of this store of food and fiber.

It certainly can be stated, and I think with some degree of accuracy, that as long as the farmer is financially able, he will maintain production in an effort to maintain his income in the face of declining prices. It seems unwise for our Government to let the farmer suffer, pay the bill and carry this unfair burden on his shoulders while we adjust to a peacetime economy and balance our problems of production.

The plight of our farmer today presents a grave problem to our economic structure. A prosperous agriculture with faith in the American farmer can only add to the health, comfort and financial well-being of all of our people and keep America the strongest and richest country in the world.

A Civilian Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Daily Globe of May 12, 1955.

The Boston Daily Globe is one of the foremost independent newspapers with wide circulation in the great State of Massachusetts—the home State of our distinguished majority leader. Its comments, therefore, upon the increasing trend by this administration to appoint military personages to important posts in the Federal Government traditionally held by civilians merit our serious consideration.

The editorial follows:

A CIVILIAN GOVERNMENT

Protests in Congress against approval of two Presidential nominations to high posts in the Immigration Service serve significant warning that the naming of retired professional military personages to public offices traditionally held by civilians is beginning to stir uneasiness.

Such appointments under the law, require special approval by the legislative branch—a fact which reminds us that those who instituted our Government were alert to risks attending undue predominance of the military mind in the conduct of civil administrative and executive functions. That older tradition was soundly based. It still is.

This latest flurry in no sense reflects upon the caliber or competence of the President's selections, both of whom have been exemplary soldiers. What is at issue is a principle as old as our political institutions.

Ukrainian Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday evening, May 25, I was honored to be the guest speaker at the festival of the Ukrainian Youth League of New Jersey. This event was truly a festival of song and dance exemplifying the rich Ukrainian culture. It was also a sobering occasion of rededication of our resolve to see a free Ukrainian nation. It was of this resolve that I spoke and, under unanimous consent, I ask that my remarks be included in the RECORD:

UKRAINIAN FESTIVAL, MAY 25, 1955

Dear sister and brother Americans of Ukrainian extraction, I feel honored that you have invited me to speak at your Ukrainian festival this year, and proud that you have selected a park in my district to hold the festival. We are indeed fortunate in having so many among you who have managed to perpetuate the music and culture of the old country. So long as you continue to hold and teach the native cultural traditions I know the hope of freedom for Ukraine shall not die.

The Ukrainian people are a freedom-loving people. Your great poet Taras Shev'chen'ko cried out for a free Ukraine many years ago. He instilled in the Ukrainian people a love for their land and a pride in their nationality. It is because of this that the spark of hope for a free Ukraine has never died.

Unfortunately, history has not been kind and has never given the Ukrainian nation a chance to be free for even a chance of self-determination. It has been ruled by despots and foreign princes. It is being ruled today by the dictators in the Kremlin. Except for the short-lived government after the First World War, Ukraine has never enjoyed self-government. But I know the Ukrainian people have never ceased to desire freedom.

The most encouraging evidence of your dissatisfaction with the present rulers came after the Second World War. The Ukrainian people fled from communism in tremendous numbers. They were fed up with rule from the Kremlin. They wanted freedom to worship. They had reached a point where anything would have been preferable to continuing life under the Communist yoke. Many of you are here in the audience this evening, and I can say that this Nation welcomes you. I know that you will make good Americans who cannot be duped by propaganda that sings out in praise of communism. You have lived under it and know what it is.

So long as the desire for freedom burns in your hearts; so long as you resist oppression by the Communists; so long as you keep the Ukrainian nationalist movement alive, I cannot believe that your aims and aspirations shall be thwarted forever.

I believe that the Ukrainian nation shall one day take its place among the democratic nations of the world.

Peaceful Uses of the Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an address I delivered before the Illinois Exchange Club Convention held in Belleville, Ill. on May 14, 1955:

It is a great pleasure for me to appear before you this afternoon in order to discuss the United States atomic energy program. I am always particularly pleased to talk about atomic energy before an audience of laymen, since I am myself of course a layman in these matters.

Let me assure you at the outset that advanced training in the sciences is not needed to understand the fundamental meaning of atomic energy for the future of our civilization. It is true that it takes great skill and long training to design an atomic weapon or an atomic power reactor. But as everyday American citizens, we need not be concerned with such technical problems. Our real concern must be with the question of what splitting the atom means for the future of war and peace. And this problem, I am convinced, can be understood by any layman with an ordinary education.

Today, our national atomic energy program represents a $12 billion investment of the public's money. As American citizens, what are we receiving in return for these vast expenditures?

A public opinion survey conducted not long ago by the University of Michigan shed some interesting light on what the American people think we are gaining through atomic research and development. Two out of every three people interviewed had heard of the atom in connection with something other than atomic weapons, but their knowledge of atomic peacetime possibilities was very slight. One out of every five persons interviewed did not appear to know that atomic energy could have any peacetime usefulness whatsoever. It is therefore hardly exaggerating to say that, in the minds of most Americans, atomic energy and atomic weapons are almost interchangeable terms.

Most people, in short, forget that the atom can mean as much for our everyday lives in

peacetime as it now means in the military field. There are no doubt understandable reasons for this mistaken conception. After all, it is the military atom which makes the headlines. Furthermore, we have been forced to give military uses of the atom top priority—although we have at the same time made great strides in developing peacetime applications. All of us in this audience, I am sure, regret the fact that we have been forced to manufacture atomic and hydrogen bombs. Yet I am sure all of us also agree that the mad ambitions of the Communist rulers leave us with no alternative. We are confronted with a foe dedicated to the conquest of the entire world—a foe who is aiming at the subjugation of our civilization.

I believe it is entirely accurate to say that, more than any other single factor of material strength, it is American supremacy in atomic weapons which has so far prevented a third world war. Yet the Soviets achieved both the atomic and hydrogen bomb much sooner than we had expected, and they are now working around-the-clock to overtake our atomic lead. I do not say that the Russians are a race of 12-foot giants—I do say that they have demonstrated very great, and very alarming, competence in developing nuclear weapons. This is a hard fact, and we must not shut our eyes to it. Nothing less than our very best will be needed if we are to maintain our existing lead in the atomic armaments competition.

The 10 years which have passed since the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki which brought the war against Japan to a speedy close have witnessed tremendous advances in the design of atomic weapons. The bomb which fell on Hiroshima in 1945 contained the equivalent of 20,000 tons of TNT. This is an amount of destructive force equivalent to a trainload of 500 boxcars of ordinary TNT.

Today, however, we have in being thermonuclear, or hydrogen, weapons. The force of such bombs is measured in millions of tons of TNT equivalent. It staggers the imagination to think of even 1 million tons of TNT. Fifty thousand trailer trucks would be needed to transport this amount of TNT. Or to put it differently, a million tons of TNT would make a tower 100 feet on each side and 2,000 feet high.

Or to make still another comparison of hydrogen bombs with ordinary weapons—today a single bomber, carrying a single hydrogen bomb on a single mission, can unleash a cargo whose destructive force is greater than the total of all the bombs dropped by all the planes of all the combatant nations throughout all of World War II.

Our first full-scale hydrogen test, which took place at the Eniwetok proving grounds in the Pacific in the fall of 1952, brought about a completely new order of magnitude in the destructiveness of nuclear weapons. The hydrogen shot of 1952 completely destroyed the small test island. It produced a crater in the floor of the ocean measuring a mile in diameter, and 175 feet deep at its lowest point. Ninety buildings the size of the Chicago Merchandise Mart could be put in that crater. Furthermore, the searing heat and tremendous shock wave created by this first hydrogen test caused an area of absolute destruction 6 miles in diameter. The area of severe to moderate damage extended to 7 miles from where this device was exploded, and the area of light damage reached to 10 miles from ground zero. Altogether, an area of some 300 square miles was directly affected by this explosion.

Yet the meaning of atomic energy for the future of the world does not begin and end with atomic weapons, or atomic destruction. Like every force of nature, the atom can be used for constructive or destructive purposes—depending upon the will of men. Apart from the fact of atomic radiation, the energy produced through the splitting of atoms is very similar to the energy released through the burning of coal in a steam generator, or the burning of oil in a diesel engine. The real difference is the enormous contrast between the quantity of energy we can secure from a given amount of coal, and a given amount of atomic materials. A single pound of uranium-235—one of the materials which can be used either in an atomic bomb or a peacetime atomic power reactor—contains almost as much energy as 3 million pounds of coal. This incredible amount of energy, if released in the form of weapons, can destroy our civilization. But if it is harnessed for constructive purposes, this same atomic force can bring the world to a new era of plenty and abundance.

Let me try to be specific—first by describing the problems and prospects of useful atomic power. We now know that it is technically practical to generate electricity through atomic power reactors—electricity which can be used to light the world's cities and to run its industries. An atomic power reactor is simply an engine which runs on atomic fuel instead of on coal or oil. Just like an ordinary engine, an atomic reactor produces heat—which can be used in turn to produce electricity. An atomic engine is already in operation today, in the hull of the atomic submarine—the U. S. S. *Nautilus*. The same principles which went into the construction of the world's first atomic submarine can also be used to produce commercial power, and we have already begun work on our Nation's first large-scale industrial atomic power plant, now under construction near Pittsburgh.

Now our own country has large reserves of cheap coal and hydroelectric power, and as of today, electricity produced in our Nation from the atom would be more expensive than most of the electricity now secured from conventional fuels. However, the cost of atomic power will certainly go down as our knowledge of the reactor art increases. By the end of the present century, as a result, half of the new generating capacity installed each year in the United States will probably run on atomic fuels.

In much of Europe, and throughout most parts of Latin America, Africa, and Asia, coal and hydroelectric power are now either very high cost, or else non-existent. In these regions atomic power could compete with ordinary electricity at this very moment.

Many of the underdeveloped countries of the world now totter on the balance between the side of freedom and the side of tyranny. All too often, peoples of these nations are victimized by Communist promises because they have no real hope for material advancement. Thanks to atomic power, however, the economically underdeveloped areas now have their first real opportunity to conquer want and misery.

It is, of course, of great importance that our own country demonstrate our willingness to help the other free nations develop peaceful, nonmilitary uses of the atom. But there is a right way and a wrong way to demonstrate our good intentions. Earlier this month, President Eisenhower proposed that we build an atomic-powered merchant ship, which would carry exhibits describing the peacetime atom to the various nations of the world. No sensible person can disagree with the President's objective of acquainting the other nations with what we are doing in the peacetime atomic field. Yet, many responsible people have questioned whether this entirely commendable goal can best be achieved through the construction of an atomic-powered merchant ship. Such a vessel might cost $40 million or $50 million, and it would have no practical commercial value—since it would be vastly more expensive to build and operate than a conventionally driven merchant ship. It may, therefore, be, that the millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money which would be needed to construct this ship could be put to better use on other projects designed to help ourselves and the other free nations develop peacetime applications of nuclear power which are practical and useful. The Research and Development Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I now have the honor to be chairman, is taking a careful look at this proposal for an atomic-powered merchant ship, and we want to be sure that it makes sense to construct it. The cause of peacetime atomic power will not be advanced by building a vessel which, on the face of it, is inefficient, uneconomical, and impracticable.

At this point, some of you may be saying "It is all very well to speak of gains the world will secure in the future as a result of the peacetime atom. But is the peaceful atom doing anything today to help mankind?"

The answer is a very definite "Yes"—and again I will try to be specific. The Research and Development Subcommittee has been closely following peaceful uses of atomic energy in medicine, biology, and agriculture. All those who have attended our hearings on these subjects have come away feeling that our horizons are completely unlimited in finding constructive uses for atomic energy.

First, there is the use of radioisotopes and atomic radiation in the study and treatment of disease. Public attention in this area has been chiefly focused on the use of atomic radiation in cancer therapy. Real progress has already been made in treating certain specific malignancies—such as brain tumors and skin cancers—through ionizing radiation. We should be on guard, however, against raising false hopes in this respect. The atom can help control the pain of cancer and it can prolong life, but rarely—so far, at least, has it brought about lasting cures.

In fact, the weight of medical opinion now doubts that atomic energy—if we think of it as a means of treatment—represents the final answer to the problem of cancer. Instead, the real contribution of the atom in the fight against this terrible disease may lie in giving us a completely new understanding of the basic life processes which account for the growth of healthy and diseased cells.

Here is where radioactive tracers enter the picture. Such tracers might be compared to tiny radio stations, sending our signals which can be detected on Geiger counters. By introducing these radioactive tracers into the body, it is now possible to study the workings of the human body with unprecedented accuracy. Many, in fact, call radioactive tracers the greatest research tool since the invention of the microscope over 400 years ago. Using these tracers, we may be able to secure—within the next few years—an understanding of basic life processes which would previously have required the work of generations.

Let me now cite another peacetime application of atomic radiation—which is also a present reality. I refer to preserving foods, without refrigeration, through radiosterilization. By exposing vegetables or meats to a high level of radiation, it is possible to kill bacterial action and prevent spoilage. Such irradiated foods can be sealed in a plastic container to eliminate contact with the air and then stored—for months or even years—without affecting their appearance or edibility.

Earlier this week, the Research and Development Subcommittee held a public hearing on the subject of food preservation through atomic radiation, and I wish all of you could have been present to see some of the remarkable exhibits which were brought before us. For instance, we saw samples of potatoes which had been irradiated, more than 2 years ago, and which were still in perfect condition. We saw carrots which had been stored for many months without harming their taste or nutritional value.

As you know, it is now impossible to store potatoes from 1 crop season to the next, and it is extremely difficult to ship potatoes long distances by sea. Radiosterilization, however, promises to change this. Potatoes treated in this manner can be stored for as long as 2 crop seasons without economic loss.

This same technique also seems applicable to meats. Furthermore, it now seems likely that radiosterilization can eliminate the danger of trichinosis in pork, and that it can do this without damage to the meat. The day may soon be coming, in fact, when we can walk into our favorite restaurant and order a medium rare porkchop.

There are still many problems to be solved before radiosterilization of foodstuffs is commercially practicable. It does not appear that all foods can be preserved in this manner, and we must of course make doubly sure that irradiation does not produce any toxic effects. Some measure of the great promise of this program, however, lies in the fact that our military forces are now investing $5 million in laboratory research on food preservation through irradiation. One interesting aspect of this program is that the waste products of atomic reactors serve as the source of radiation for food sterilization. To put it differently, the ashes of the atomic power industry will be the raw materials for the food irradiation industry. Atomic energy thus takes its place in the familiar economic pattern of the waste products of one industry being usefully employed in another.

I do not think for a moment that radiosterilization of food will ever do away with our refrigerators. By 1965, however, radiosterilization should be as important a factor in our economy as the frozen food industry is today. An exciting prospect suggested by radiosterilization is that of controlling famines. The famine-stricken nations of the world now find themselves unable to store food in time of plenty for use in time of want. Radiosterilization, however, should permit such nations to create famine reserves, and it is not too much to hope that widespread hunger may thereby soon be conquered.

Let me now cite one final example of how the atom is already helping improve our everyday lives—this from the field of agriculture. One of the most troublesome problems faced by the agricultural researcher is that of knowing when and where to apply fertilizer. The use of radioisotopes has now made it clear that many vegetables, fruits, flowers, and trees can be fed most efficiently through foliar feeding—that is, through applying a liquid fertilizer directly on the foliage of a plant, instead of to the ground around the plant. In this manner, scientists at Michigan State College were able to prove that—in the case of apple trees—90 percent of the fertilizer applied through foliar feeding was actually put to use by the plants, as against 10 percent in the case of fertilizer applied to the ground. It was discovered also that the fertilizer applied on the leaves was consumed by the trees in 10 days, as against the weeks or months needed in the case of ground fertilization. I am sure that the great usefulness of these findings is apparent. With the knowledge secured through radioisotopes, we can now apply specific types of fertilizer to the right parts of plants, at the right times, and thereby secure maximum usefulness of fertilizer at the lowest possible cost. In addition, foliar fertilization can in many cases be done with the same equipment used by the farmer to spray insecticides on his crops or trees. As a matter of fact, in certain cases, the insecticide and fertilizer are mixed and applied at the same time.

Foliar feeding represents only one of the hundreds of improved processes open to agriculture as a result of the use of radioisotopes. The Research and Development Subcommittee has compiled a 75-page public document, outlining the complete story of the atom in agriculture, and I can assure you that it makes absorbing reading for any farmer.

The full truth of the matter, it seems to me, is that we have not yet begun to comprehend the thousand and one ways in which the peaceful atom will affect our everyday lives. We are now barely 10 years into the atomic age, and it would be very surprising if we could not foresee all the future beneficial applications of the atom. A century ago, for example, when men thought of coal they thought almost entirely of using it as a source of heat. A hundred years ago, almost nobody would have predicted that coal would some day represent the foundation of a tremendous chemical industry—in the form of a base for organic compounds. In the same manner, I believe that we do not now begin to imagine all the constructive uses of atomic energy in the decades ahead.

There are those who regret the fact that man solved the riddle of the atom. Such people would like to turn back the clock of scientific progress, and to go back to the preatomic age—an age less filled with opportunities, to be sure, but also an age less filled with great challenges. Yet all recorded history demonstrates that man does not go forward by futile attempts to stop the march of science. Man's problem, instead, has always been to use his discoveries in a manner which would enrich, rather than destroy, life.

It is no different in the case of atomic energy. I cannot believe that mankind—which discovered atomic energy—must now be defeated in its efforts to prevent the atom from being used for the destruction of man. I believe instead that man, having found this great, great new force, now has it in his power to control it. I believe that if our wisdom is great and our courage unfaltering, we will yet make the atom the key which opens the door to a better world of tomorrow.

Quemoy and Matsu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech delivered by my colleague, Hon. FRANK BECKER, of New York, to Holy Name Unit of Pennsylvania and Long Island Railroads, Hotel Sheraton-Astor, New York City, on May 22, 1955:

Monsignor, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans, this is an occasion, I am certain, which is duplicated nowhere else in the world, except in this great land of ours—an occasion where freemen assemble openly, in obedience to a religious urging in their hearts—speak their minds plainly and without a trace of fear on their faces, or uneasiness in their souls.

It is a happy occasion, yet in some respects a solemn one. Here together, we renew our determination to continue working and teaching the reverence and respect due the Holy Name of our Saviour. Yet our very presence is evidence that much still remains to be done.

So be it. We will continue to work at it that more—and more—men in all walks of life should accept reverential respect as a way of life. The influence of this group present this morning could well spread across America and the broad pattern of other lands. You are indeed enlisted in a noble cause.

The world today is a great changing drama. We are part of it. We can either accept the role of spectators and watch others make the decisions, or we can be part of it and with our voices—and our votes—help to influence its decisions, to bring about that which is sound, and good, and right.

I do not have to tell you that these decisions—remote as they may seem when you read about them in the newspapers—affect you vitally, and may well mean the difference between freedom or slavery—for your children and your grandchildren.

But intelligent understanding and action on these problems must be based on knowledge and on an understanding of the forces which bear upon them.

So let us discuss some of these matters together.

First, we must reorient our conception of war. We are prone to think of the next war in terms of the last. This is a mistake.

It is today a military fact that we have the capability of destroying, overnight, every large city in Russia. But it is also true that Russia has a comparable capability with regard to the United States. It is further true that neither has a completely adequate defense to an attack by the other.

I cite these facts to point out that today, truly, we tread a delicate and a dangerous path in international affairs.

The threat of war—an atomic war—has been a shadowy specter clouding our vision of peace since the final gun boomed out in victory 10 years ago. Perhaps it will be ever thus for men bent on securing world peace. Modern war does not begin, however, with a march on Poland or a Pacific Pearl Harbor. It begins, in many ways, long before the first gun is fired, the first lorry loaded with fighting men.

Fundamentally, it begins from weakness—from confusion—from loss of faith; and from a lack of wisdom that erodes the confidence of the people in their leaders.

Fancy words are coined to break down the gates of freedom—one such is coexistence. It has a meaning that has been preached as Christian doctrine since the day of our Lord. To men of peace and good will, it means, "Let us be good neighbors." It does not mean—nor has it ever meant—the imposition upon a free people of an evil way of life.

Yet this phrase, as used by some, could mean—to accept—lock, stock, and loaded barrel—bloody communism as a guest in our home.

My friends, we can't help but coexist, since we live on the same globe. But few of us here today will accept that kind of coexistence.

We may have to live beside the godless on the globe, but we do not and will not treat them as good neighbors until their lives and their leadership demonstrate a clear intent to be good neighbors, with all that it implies.

The situation in Asia today is tense. It is made more tense because certain Americans, knowing little more about communism and world affairs today than they did a decade ago, insist upon—in their ignorance—paving the way for further Communist aggression against free men.

We can never forget the tragedy of Korea that laid bare the weaknesses of a foreign policy of vacillation and appeasement.

Prior to the Communist attack on our ally, South Korea, the then Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, notified the world that Korea was beyond the periphery of our interests in the Pacific. This was an invitation to aggression, and was readily accepted by the Communist leaders in China. The price we paid was 33,237 American dead; 119,196 wounded. Untold numbers of Americans still rot in Red jails.

I remind you of this tragic incident only to bring into focus a similar situation—yes, a similar tragedy that is being urged upon the American people today. I speak of the islands of Matsu and Quemoy in the Formosa Strait.

We want only peace in Asia. But we may have to fight for it, as have countless Americans in our country's history. We are prepared to fight, if necessary.

But the determination to fight is in daily danger, from the eroding propaganda of the left, and from the Communists and their brainwashed victims who dwell among us.

It is of little help for Monday morning quarterbacks to try to tell how they would have played the game and how they could have won it. There are some among us—while we face the most tense period in the postwar history, and while being coached by the world's leading military authority—insist upon firing the coach because things are not going the way they want them to.

Attempts to force the President's hand at this time, are unwise. From high places, however, demands are made, and reiterated, that we disclose to the world what we are going to do if these islands are attacked.

The Communists and their mouthpieces around the globe never ask the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa what they are going to do. They know that the allied armies of Chiang Kai-shek will trade shell for shell and blow for blow.

But the Communists are confident they can conquer the islands if we do not intervene, just as they were confident of destroying freedom in South Korea when assured that we would keep hands off. They would have succeeded except for our fighting men and that great American, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

The Chinese Communists are realists. If confronted with a determined stand and a superior force, they will pause and pull back. They did this in Europe, Iran, Greece, and Berlin.

So what they are really interested in is to find out the real intentions of other free nations, in regard to the fate of the islands. They are particularly interested in what the United States is going to do. They will not stop trying until they find out.

Knowing this, it becomes a matter of extreme gravity to hear Americans in high positions playing the Communist tune and demanding that President Eisenhower and this Government inform the Chinese Communists about our plans.

Such a request in the middle of the raging battles of World War II would have led to charges of treason and the firing squad.

I do not suggest such a fate for these misguided Americans. I only urge that we all try to remain steadfast in our support of a President who—calm and battlewise—refuses to yield to such a stupid clamoring.

To surrender Quemoy and Matsu to the Peiping Communist regime would be bowing to gangsterism. We have bowed to Soviet gangsterism in the past. There are those who would have us do it again. If we do, the cause of freedom will have suffered a devastating defeat.

We have survived the acts of perfidy and injustice perpetrated at Yalta. China, as a free nation, did not survive, but was swallowed by the Godless Communist octopus.

Confusion and fear are grist in the Communist mill of aggression. To hear some people talk you would think that, having invented the atomic weapons now stored and ready for use in the arsenals of democracy, we should prohibit their use in a just cause. They say we should hesitate to fire one more shot for freedom.

I do not advocate a world of opposing camps, based on mutual fear, as a way of life for the future. But neither do I advocate the whittling away of freedom by repeated concessions to the Communists. Such a stand only brings war ever closer. The futility of this course is written in the history of the Communists' activity in Europe and Asia in clear, unmistakable language. We know that further concessions encourage further aggression.

Some who advocate the abandonment of Matsu and Quemoy to the Communist warlords of China embellish their arguments with the intricacies of international law. Others plead that freedom's cause cannot be secured by America's armed defense.

I suggest a different course. Let us stand up and be counted on the side of freedom. Let us not be halfhearted or part-time patriots. Let us stand without fear, in the firm knowledge that we have the mightiest military machine in the world—able men of good will to lead us—and that God is on our side.

Let me read from the New York Times of April 5, 1955, a paragraph or two giving the views of men, including former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, Thomas K. Finletter, and Benjamin Cohen, so-called experts on foreign affairs. These men, according to this newspaper, prepared a memorandum on the question of the Formosa Strait. Listen to what they have to say:

"It would, therefore, seem to be in the interests of the United States to separate Formosa and the Pescadores from the power struggle for control of the mainland of China." The same thing in different language was said about Korea.

Are these men completely blind to the realities of the dangers that face this Nation?

Such words are the dregs of diplomacy. They smell of appeasement—and more appeasement. They could spell the suffocation of freedom. Let us hope that the drums of propaganda do not drown out the call in the hearts of most Americans for freedom—and more freedom.

In the days ahead the pressures on our President and on your Members of Congress will increase. The Communists are completing the construction and enlargement of coastal airfields within range of Quemoy and Matsu and Formosa. They are bringing additional guns to the mainland shore. They are stockpiling ammunition, gasoline, and other supplies, and they are moving in Soviet-built aircraft in large numbers. Perhaps they only await a statement from this Government that we will not defend Matsu and Quemoy.

That statement must never be uttered, even though the chorus of deceit and confusion arises in ever-increasing volume.

In this respect, it is heartening to know that today our foreign policy is no longer one of backtracking and blunder. We have taken our stand with freedom—let us stand there—united.

Domestically, we are enjoying and have enjoyed the most prosperous years in our history. Our homefront security is more alert than ever before and—despite the anguished cries from the left that civil liberties have been destroyed—not a single person has been deprived of due process of law.

In addition, we are taking a more realistic view of the Soviet way of life. The chorus of adulation for communism has been replaced by the thinking of sterner Americans who know that after 38 years Soviet communism is a failure in the Soviet Union. Brainwashing and soulwashing are the daily diet for the captives of communism. Russians for 38 years have endured an unending depression, an unending suppression, and an unending shackling of freedom. Communism started out without God on its side; it will end up without God on its side.

So if we are to aid in the restoration of freedom, we must make ever stronger our belief that freedom is everybody's business. Those denied it must be helped in regaining it. In Asia we pray for peace and freedom for those who deserve to be free.

At the beginning, I urged that you take an active part in this great, moving drama, because it affects you so vitally.

You can do this by using your influence to strengthen those who are weak and confused.

You can do your part by becoming informed on which of your public officials support the principles of liberty in their public actions. You can support those who do with your vote.

You can pray that God will give to the leaders of our country the wisdom and strength to guide us safely through the difficult days ahead.

If you do these things, then, you will be able to rest in the assurance that you have played your part, that no single human soul has slipped closer to the Communist mire because of your—or my—lack of interest or indifference.

Can any of us do less?

Thank you.

Wheat Marketing Quotas for 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the report of the Department of Agriculture on the wheat marketing quotas for 1956:

WHEAT MARKETING QUOTAS FOR 1956.

The final decision on whether or not marketing-quota controls will apply to wheat produced in 1956 will be made by wheat-growers in voting in a referendum on June 25.

The Secretary of Agriculture has proclaimed marketing quotas for 1956, as required by law. At least two-thirds of the eligible farmers voting in the referendum must approve quotas before they will continue in effect.

If at least two-thirds of the votes are "yes"—

1. Marketing quotas will continue in effect for each farm on which the wheat acreage is more than 15 acres in commercial wheat States.

2. Marketing-quota penalties will apply on each bushel of any excess wheat produced on the individual farm.

3. Price support at a level between 75 and 90 percent of parity will be available to each farmer who complies with his farm wheat-acreage allotment.

If more than one-third of the votes are "no"—

1. There will be no marketing quotas and no penalties for excess wheat.

2. Acreage allotments will remain in effect as the basis for price-support eligibility.

3. Price support, at 50 percent of parity as provided by law, will be available to farmers who comply with their wheat-acreage allotments.

PRICE-SUPPORT LEVELS

The 1956 crop minimum national average price-support level which will be available to eligible growers in commercial wheat States if quotas are approved will be announced before the wheat referendum on June 25.

Under existing law, wheat price support for 1956 will be within a range of 75 to 90

percent of parity. Depending on the supply situation, it will probably be within the range of 75 to 82 percent of parity.

The shift to the new parity, as required by law, will start with the 1956 wheat crop. The downward adjustment is limited to 5 percent a year. For example, present wheat parity is $2.51 a bushel. Based on this figure, the 5-percent adjustment would bring the parity figure down to about $2.38 a bushel. The 75-to-90-percent price-support level, if quotas are approved, and also the 50-percent level, if they are not approved, will be based on the adjusted or transitional parity.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The law requires that wheat-acreage allotments be in effect every year unless the Secretary dispenses with allotments under the emergency powers of the law. Acreage allotments will, therefore, be in effect in 1956 even if growers disapprove marketing quotas.

Marketing quotas which provide penalties for production on acreage in excess of the farm allotments will be in effect only if wheat growers approve them in the referendum.

HOW THE PROGRAM WORKS

The national wheat acreage allotment for 1956 is 55 million acres—the same as for 1955—which is the minimum established by law.

The national wheat-acreage allotment is allocated to States and the State allotment to counties according to the average wheat acreage in each State and county for the 10 years 1945–54 with adjustments for abnormal weather and trends in acreage.

The county wheat acreage allotment is divided among the farms in the county, with each farm allotment based primarily on the farm's wheat history during the past 3 years. Other considerations are tillable acres on the farm, crop-rotation practices, type of soil, and slope and lay of the land.

In general, each farm on which a wheat crop was grown for 1953, 1954, or 1955 will be assigned an acreage allotment. Marketing quotas are based on these acreage allotments. For a farm on which wheat will be seeded for the first time since July 1, 1952, the farmer must make a special application for a new farm allotment.

Marketing quotas will apply to all farms in the commercial wheat States with more than 15 acres of wheat, if quotas are approved in the June 25 referendum. A penalty of 45 percent of the parity price will be assessed against any excess wheat produced on a farm. When the penalty is paid or the excess wheat is stored or delivered to the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with regulations, the producer is free to market his wheat as he chooses. The grower of excess wheat is not eligible for price support on his wheat.

All States are designated as commercial wheat States for 1956 except Alabama, Arizona, Connecticut, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Nevada, Rhode Island, and Vermont. Wheat-acreage allotments and marketing quotas will not be in effect for these noncommercial wheat States.

THE SUPPLY SITUATION

Current estimates are that over 1.86 billion bushels of wheat will be available for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1955. More than a billion bushels of the total supply will be carried over from previous crops. The total supply, including the 1955 crop, will be enough to meet our current needs for domestic use and exports for the next 2 years and is 66 percent above the normal supply prescribed in the controlling legislation. The law requires the Secretary of Agriculture to proclaim marketing quotas and hold a referendum when the total supply of wheat exceeds the normal supply by more than 20 percent.

Domestic use and exports of wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1955, are estimated at a little over 900 million bushels. With average yields, a national wheat acreage allotment of 55 million acres would produce about 850 million bushels.

WHO CAN VOTE

Any wheat producer in commercial wheat States who will be subject to marketing quotas is eligible to vote in the referendum. Farmers who have farm wheat allotments of 15 acres or less are eligible to vote if they will have more than 15 acres of wheat for harvest as grain in 1956.

WHEN AND WHERE TO VOTE

Wheat quota referendum date—June 25, 1955.

Local voting places will be established and announced for each county where wheat is grown in commercial wheat States.

Get information on local voting places, hours of voting, locally eligible voters, and program details from the county agricultural stabilization and conservation office, or from county or community ASC committeemen.

Long-Range Missiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am offering for the information of my colleagues an article which recently appeared in the magazine Interavia, one of the most authoritative magazines published on aviation. This article, entitled, "Long-Range Missiles Will Make Peace Unavoidable," appeared in a special issue of Interavia relating to guided missiles. The article, which might well be called The Shape of Things To Come, illustrates that, with our profound technological advance, the alternative to world peace is a return to the stone age.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONG-RANGE MISSILES WILL MAKE PEACE UNAVOIDABLE

I. THE MILITARY ASPECT

It flies halfway around the world in less than an hour, crosses the oceans in a few minutes, ascends into the ionosphere and then plunges back into the earth's atmosphere, jettisons several casings successively before frictional heating melts them, and finally comes down and hits the earth with a thermonuclear sledgehammer—such are the main features of the intercontinental missile on which designers in more than one country are working.

Engineers see in it the evidence of a great scientific success, and strategists regard it as the supreme weapon. The complexity of the technical problems involved in its realization still further increases the power which military staffs attribute to the Inter-Continental Ballistic Missile (I. C. B. M.). All seem to consider that the first nation to possess a substantial stock of I. C. B. M.'s would become the master of the world. In their imaginations they visualize such a scene as the following:

The military leaders of country A have built up reserves of long-range missiles. They know they have a considerable lead in this field. In agreement with their government they invite the military chiefs of country B, against which they have been waging cold—or even lukewarm—war for 30 years, to witness the launching of one of these missiles. The enemy accepts the invitation. In an operations room, whose most striking feature is a television screen occupying the largest wall, country A's chief of staff asks his colleague from country B to select a target from a number of desert islands several thousands of miles away, chosen to form the guinea pigs of the demonstration. He makes his choice, and the missile is launched. The two military staffs watch its departure on the screen. Then tea and cakes are served to while away the 34 minutes of its rejectory. A few moments before the time calculated for the destruction of the target, the island appears on the television screen. Palm trees wave in the breeze, the sea comes rolling gently on to the beach. The screen recalls the illustrations of the romantic literature which so charmed the sensibilities of the late 18th Century. Suddenly a great spout of earth and water replaces the peaceful scene of a moment before. The island has disappeared. The representatives of country B get up and group together in combination. After a brief deliberation they announce their country's "Capitulation." This is how, it is said certain conflicts took place in China. The opposing generals met before the "battle," compared their strengths and their relative positions and decided on the winner without fighting. However, sensible and attractive this way of settling differences between countries may appear, it is doubtful whether the intercontinental missile will bring us back to it.

This means of forcing a decision at a distance will perhaps be in existence in 10 years. In the art of war it will mark the end of 50 years of precipitate evolution, the main outlines of which can be résumé as follows:

1. During World War I fire power was superior to speed of movement. Though at times tremendous, with vast concentrations of artillery, this fire power was scarcely mobile. It moved at 3 m. p. h. and took a very long time to manhandle into firing position. The enemy meanwhile had time to organize his defense, and in the end the defensive won over the offensive.

2. Twenty-five years later Hitler launched his Blitzkrieg. He had retained the old fire power on the same scale but added speed to it. His tanks swept forward, preceded by Stukas to crush centers of resistance. The destructiveness of his fire power was increased tenfold by the speed of movement. The offensive triumphed.

3. Hiroshima introduced a new combination between fire power and mobility. This time the carrier was combined with the omnipotence of the explosive. During World War II the explosive had remained very similar to what it had been 25 years earlier, and added power of destruction had been obtained by using the maximum number of carriers, whether armored divisions or air fleets. Each carrier had a limited power of destruction, but the enemy was worn down by their cumulative effect. Since Hiroshima the increase in unit destructive power has reduced the need for accumulation. Fire power is again superior to its vehicle, which has progressed less far than its explosive. The offensive would seem to be stronger in the air, but ground defense is possible. Defense is powerless against the former, while, returning to the combat conditions of 1914–18, a form of ground defensive appears effective in the atomic age.

4. The intercontinental ballistic missile will provide the destructive power of a thermonuclear warhead with a vehicle worthy of its effects. This time, the offensive appears as the victor in all domains, or rather a surprise aggression which would rain down atomic fireballs on the enemy's

territory. For so far no means of defense is known against such attacks.

A TWO-WAY BUTTON

Actually the situation would be no different. For the intercontinental ballistic missile to become the instrument of world domination several conditions would have to be fulfilled.

On the moral level, responsibility would first have to be accepted for annihilating part of the earth and its inhabitants. The consequences would be serious enough for countries to continue to seek to settle their graver differences by localized conflicts fought out with conventional weapons.

On the military level, the experts in the aggressor country would have to be able to reply in the affirmative to the following question: Can we be sure that the enemy has no equivalent weapons?

For if both sides were more or less equally equipped it is obvious that pushbutton war would be a two-way affair. The first button would send off intercontinental nuclear missiles, but their arrival at their destination would in turn release the reprisal missiles. Destroying all the enemy's large towns would not prevent him from retaliating and wiping out the aggressor's cities. Within a few hours the damage caused on both sides could be on the same scale. Barring an attack of insanity, which would have to affect all the leaders of a country, such an operation would seem to be, to say the least, improbable, as it would be militarily stupid.

To make sure that the atomic boomerang does not come back on to his own head, the aggressor would have to be certain of several points.

First that he had a monopoly. But how could he be sure of having such a technical monopoly? The risk would be so great that he would need to be as well acquainted with the enemy's arsenal as with him own.

Then there is the question of defense. If the aggressor is sure of being able to stop the boomerang before it reaches him own country, then the operation would become rationally possible and militarily worth while.

It may be that one day the defender will be able to launch other missiles against the attacking intercontinental missiles, destroying them in their passage through the ionosphere. The battle will then be fought out several hundred miles above the earth. Attackers and defenders will read their fate from the sudden appearance of flashes briefly lighting up in space. But we have not reached that point yet. Technical evolution suggests that the offensive missile will be ready before any defense against it is found.

There remains finally the possibility of finding a solution to the problem facing an aggressor who has decided to make use of his superiority in intercontinental weapons: that of destroying the enemy's reprisal missiles at their bases. If this were possible it would restore a virtual monopoly and remove the necessity for trying to intercept the reprisal missiles en route. The aggressor would have to concentrate the essential part of his resources on this task, since if his operation succeeded it would decide the outcome of the conflict. Deprived of its means of retaliation, the country so attacked would immediately have to ask for terms. Thus, just as in the age of the aircraft atomic bomb combination, the destruction of the enemy's means of retaliation will remain the essential or even the sole objective of the initial attack.

With one difference, however. The operation is difficult enough today and may well become impossible when the intercontinental vehicle ceases to be an aircraft and becomes a missile. The intercontinental missile is much less vulnerable on the ground than the bomber. Both the missile and its platform, or launching ramp, can be mobile, dispersed and above all buried underground. Moreover, its small dimensions make it a very difficult target to locate, even if the atomic warhead of the missiles used against it allows for a wide margin of error.

This brings out one of the peculiarities of the intercontinental missile project. Such a missile will inevitably be designed and produced in quantity. Neither of the two major powers can afford to allow the other a monopoly, even if the Iron Curtain on the one hand and the FBI on the other are sufficiently impenetrable or efficient to leave the world in doubt as to the actual existence of the weapon. But when each has a stock of thermonuclear intercontinental missiles, whether simultaneously or within a certain time lag, they will not necessarily use them. Even if moral considerations do not restrain them, there will always be the boomerange effect mentioned above; this can only be overcome by the interception and destruction in flight of the reprisal missiles launched by the victim of an aggression.

The problem of intercepting a ballistic missile traveling at 15 to 20 times the speed of sound is no easy one. A mere few misses would lead to tremendous destruction. With the means at its disposal today, the defense estimates that it could scarcely intercept more than 10 to 15 percent of an attacking force of strategic bombers. To raise this percentage to 80 or 90 percent it needs interceptor missiles. If, in turn, the offense uses supersonic missiles, will it be possible to obtain a high percentage of interceptions? In time perhaps; but there would be a long period during which the offensive would be stronger than the defensive and hence during which an aggressor would push 2 buttons at once, his own and that of a reprisal which he would be powerless to halt.

Michigan's White Pine Planted on the Capitol Grounds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I place the acceptance speech of J. George Stewart, Architect of the Capitol, on the occasion of the Michigan State Society white pine tree planting.

A little bit of Michigan has found a place on the southeast Capitol lawn—all Michiganders wish it a long enduring life. Mr. Stewart's address follows:

Distinguished and honorable Members of Congress, members of the Michigan State Society, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure for me, as the Architect of the Capitol, to participate in these tree-planting ceremonies, and to join in the acceptance of this white pine tree, presented today to the Congress by the State of Michigan.

The section of the grounds in which this tree has been planted was added to the Capitol Grounds in 1873, and adjoins the original area of the Capitol Grounds which at one time was occupied by a subtribe of Algonquin Indians known as the Powhatans, whose council house was located at the foot of the Hill.

As the years have passed, the Capitol Grounds have been developed, landscaped, and improved, and the official Michigan State tree planted by the Michigan State Society, today, will add another memorable link in the history of the Capitol Grounds.

It will be my privilege to nourish and care for this tree and, with the help of God, to watch it grow from year to year, just as the State of Michigan has grown to its present greatness.

The National Reserve Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Correcting the Weaknesses—The New Reserve Program," which appeared in the New Orleans Item, New Orleans, La., on Wednesday, May 19, 1955. This editorial emphasizes the importance of a truly ready Reserve. It is as follows:

CORRECTING THE WEAKNESSES—THE NEW RESERVE PROGRAM

The Nation will soon know whether it is to get an atomic-age Armed Forces Reserve program to replace the present horse-and-buggy system.

The United States has never had an effective Reserve. It never really tried until after World War II.

And then the "on paper" reserve force turned out to be a phantom army. Too many of its members didn't choose to meet their reserve obligations.

With no "teeth" in the reserve laws, the reservists could get away with nonparticipation without penalty.

The new program approved by the House Armed Services Committee has teeth. It is now under debate in the House. Committee Chairman Vinson predicts that this program will become law without change.

If so, it will go a long way toward correcting perhaps the major weakness in our defense setup.

The measure permits a 45-day recall to active duty for any defaulting reservist. Then he would be subject to court-martial. He would also be subject, we hope and presume, to the sympathetic persuasion of military superiors urging him to get more serious about the Reserve.

At any rate, the court-martial is not compulsory. But it is certainly necessary as a "last ditch" persuader to enforce a reserve training obligation which can be as long as 7½ years.

Enforced military duty is basically repulsive to a democratic nation presently at peace. But in this age it is necessary. If war comes it will likely be fought and ended in a flash.

Utmost preparedness for the greatest numbers of men is essential. Only a truly "ready" Reserve would have a bearing on the outcome of a future war. The House proposal would provide this readiness.

The measure would provide an Organized Reserve of 2.9 million by 1960. The figure does not seem disproportionate, since our already slimmed-down standing forces are due for another cut of 102,300 men.

The Truth About the Catholic Persecution in Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, for the better understanding of my colleagues and RECORD readers, I desire to include a very timely editorial appearing in the May 24 issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Gazette, which pointedly describes the true nature of the religious persecution in Argentina.

The sympathetic hearts and minds of the authorities in all our various American religious denominations are today turned in condemnation toward the cruel program of persecution being imposed by President Peron upon the Catholic Church and its membership in Argentina.

Unfortunately, too few other Americans, whose busy lives permit only a hasty scanning of the news captions, are aware of the unholy and unjust reprisals being vengefully forced upon an historically Catholic people and nation by a power-lusting dictator.

On April 22 the Argentine Catholic hierarchy issued a statement making it clear that the church leaders did not oppose a proper separation of powers or a just economic separation of church and state. The statement recited the Biblical command of Christ to "render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's," while at the same time reminding faithful adherents that church authority could not accept a "moral separation" that would inevitably place a Catholic in the "sad situation of having to betray his conscience in order to obey a temporal ruler."

Since last November when Peron began his open attack on "political Catholicism," he has allowed the strictly controlled Peronist press and the police to wage a vicious campaign of vilification and repression. His clear aim is to destroy the growing influence of the church among the working masses—the main base of his power. The workers cannot be allowed more than one loyalty in a totalitarian state. Eduardo Vuletich, secretary of the Argentine Labor Confederation, stated that theme clearly last November:

> Down with the enemies of the people and the enemies of God. Fatherland has only one destiny: it is called Peron. The fatherland has a single motto: Always with Peron.

From these quotations it is, unfortunately, too clear that the Peron program follows the avowed Communist objective of eventually reducing all mankind to slavish subjection in a totalitarian atheistic state.

Mr. Speaker, when the facts are known, as portrayed by this editorial, I am confident that all God-fearing Americans will unite in protestation against the outrageous conduct of the Peron Government in transgressing recognized religious rights and will join their American Catholic brethren in prayer that this pagan persecution may soon be happily resolved.

The article follows:

DICTATOR PERON AND THE CHURCH

Generally speaking, in this country all religious groups see eye to eye on separation of church and state. They are for it.

It is this common attitude that at first led some Americans to see nothing alarming in the Argentine Government's move to disestablish the Catholic Church as the state religion of Argentina. But it is clear now that Dictator Peron's aim is not merely to draw the line of separation with which we in America are familiar.

Peron used the church in Argentina to help him attain power. Now that he has shown his true colors, he is convinced he cannot remain as dictator if the church is left free to oppose him. So he seeks to destroy it or so weaken it that its opposition will not threaten his power.

The campaign is in full swing. Forty-four priests have been jailed in the last 6 months. Convents have been closed. Subsidies to Catholic schools have been removed. The Argentine Congress has completed action on laws to separate the church and state. Processions and Catholic open-air meetings have been banned. And measures have been introduced to make all religious institutions subject to taxation retroactively as from the first of this year.

This is outright persecution. It is the familiar pattern that has been employed by the Reds in the persection of Protestantism in East Germany. The same tactics were used by Hitler in his persecution of the Jews.

Even if it were marked by the most enlightened intentions, the move to separate church and state in Argentina would be a delicate one. Catholicism has been the state religion in Argentina since that country won its independence from Spain in 1810.

But Peron has turned separation into subjection. When free speech has been curtailed, religious sensibilities harmed, right to worship restricted, and practically confiscatory taxation proposed, even those who favor separation of church and state recognize things have gone too far.

Resolution of Milwaukee Common Council on $1.25 Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution of the Milwaukee Common Council adopted on May 17, 1955:

Whereas the national minimum wage is meant to provide a minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers; and

Whereas the national minimum wage should protect the employer who pays a living wage against substandard wage competition; and

Whereas the national minimum wage should discourage employers from leaving decent wage areas to seek cheap labor in substandard wage areas; and

Whereas an adequate national minimum wage is essential to local merchants to maintain their local market and to farmers to maintain and bolster a strong market for agricultural commodities; and

Whereas an adequate national minimum wage is essential to local governments to prevent runaway industries, localized unemployment, and mounting relief rolls: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Milwaukee in the State of Wisconsin memorialize the Congress of the United States to increase the national minimum wage in industries now covered to $1.25 per hour; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH MCCARTHY, and to Congressmen CLEMENT ZABLOCKI and HENRY REUSS.

American Ships for Trade, Travel, and Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, each year the Propeller Club of the United States of the port of New Orleans conducts an essay contest on the value of the American merchant marine.

The winner this year was a young 15-year-old student who resides in my congressional district—Miss Joan Fredricks, and who attends the Fortier High School, a public high school, in New Orleans.

Miss Fredricks' prize-winning essay was entitled "American Ships for Trade, Travel, and Defense."

She was honored at the annual maritime banquet in New Orleans which was addressed by our old colleague of the House, Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, now a Member of the Senate from the State of Washington.

Miss Fredricks' essay is a splendid piece of writing and composition for one so young in years. She has, however, indicated, as you will observe, a clear grasp of the importance and magnitude of the subject, even at the age of 15.

I congratulate her and here present her prize-winning essay:

AMERICAN SHIPS FOR TRADE, TRAVEL, AND DEFENSE

(By Joan Fredericks)

Search, friends. Search for the many things which comprise the strength and freedom of America.

Look to the right and see our many schools and churches. Open wide your eyes and see the young, old, rich, and poor all gathered together in silent prayer. Glance behind you and see our ever-progressing inventors and chemists, constantly striving for new and better ways to improve our standard of living. No—don't ignore our hills, rivers, timber, minerals, and the many other blessings nature has bestowed upon us. They are bountiful and seemingly never ending, a vast paradise in which our youth may strive.

Now, turn your gaze forward. There lies a portion of our surrounding oceans. Over that field of blue, which appears to continue

to infinity, sail our ships, vessels that have gained world renown.

Let's concentrate temporarily upon the benefits American ships provide for those of us who dwell constantly within our country. How deeply we are indebted to the cargo ships, cruising their assigned paths to keep Americans supplied with products not produced within our own borders. Through gales or quiet waters, those reliable sources continue stocking our warehouses to provide for Americans always to live in the land of plenty.

Our gratitude should extend heartily to those persons on our freighters, for it is they who help make it possible for us to possess some of the rarest and most valuable material. Our fashion designers are able to design dresses of Chinese silk, Irish linen, and Scotch wool as easily as those garments of southern cotton. We can wear jewels which have laid many decades untouched in the dense jungles of Africa or the smoldering deserts of Arabia. Our zoos have proved wonderful Sunday-afternoon entertainment for our children, whose inquisitive minds hunger for knowledge of the kangaroos from Australia, the reptiles from Africa, and the penguins of Arctic regions.

Also coming into one of our harbors is a luxurious ocean liner carrying foreigners who, not being able to accept into their beliefs the realization that a country can be free and offer countless oportunities for all and still reign as did Samson over the Phillistines, have come to see for themselves. Debarking with these people are some Americans, filled with exaltation in knowing they have visited the countries they had read about and their adventuresome hearts and minds prompted them to explore.

Our ships carry peope of all nationalities, religions, colors, and creeds to America and from it. In this way our tolerant minds may absorb the culture of foreign countries and practice many of their customs. Traveling is usually for relaxation and recreation; also, it is educational, and, under normal circumstances, beneficial. What better way to travel than on a liner designed especially for your convenience? American ships are among some of the outstanding liners sailing the seas; they are ships that serve as excellent ambassadors for an excellent country.

Defense conscious, we are utterly dependent on the fuel, material, and goods brought in by the tankers and cargo ships. Without them, no war machines are built and none operate.

It seems to be too easy for our Nation to look back upon our shipbuilding record in the last war and feel overconfident in our ability to build ships in a hurry again if need be; to look over the ranks of anchored Liberties still awaiting breakout from our reserve fleets, with a self-satisfied feeling of confidence that we have plenty of ships, unmindful that these were necessarily marginal design when they were built.

Let us consider just where we stand today. Truly, the matter of our national defense deserves the utmost concentration from each of us. From the transportation of the materials needed to produce the weapons to the actual fronts in mechanized warfare, we turn to our merchant marine. The shipbuilding industry, during the Second World War, produced ships of all types, merchant and military, in numbers hitherto unknown and undreamed of, and far in excess of the objectives any of those who had to do with that program thought possible at the outset. One of the major reasons why these objectives were attained with comparative rapidity was the fact that both naval and merchant shipbuilding programs had been under way for several years before Pearl Harbor and were being accelerated at an increasing rate, so that the shipyards had substantial opportunity to prepare and build up their facilities, organizations, and skilled manpower at least to a point which readily permitted and justified additional expansion when the time came. Although none of us cares to contemplate such a catastrophe, it is imperative that our industries be ready for necessary expansion at a moment's notice.

The sea is a frontier of freedom today, just as it has always been. In the main the great majority of successful republics of the past, whether in city-states or in great nations have risen in places where they had easy access to the seas. It is not that the seas protect a nation from foreign aggression so much, as it is that they provide a safe escape and, hence, a sure defense from tyranny at home.

In peace and war thousands of vessels from our ways have met and surpassed design demands. Rugged and dependable these ships—from recordbreaking 30,000-ton tankers and speedy cargo carriers to oil barges and ferries—have proven the superb shipbuilding skill of capable men.

Modern, integrated methods, all welded construction, huge facilities and shops, the many gigantic fixtures of great shipyard and—above all—the coordinated leadership and know-how of experienced men who transform ideas and steel into ships—this is only part of the story of an American ship, a ship which can do all it was meant to do—and more.

Therefore every American owes it to his country and himself to get behind those organizations working for a strong merchant marine—our key to peacetime prosperity and the basis of preparedness for national defense.

Awards of William and Noma Copley Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the announcement of the awards of the William and Noma Copley Foundation. This foundation is little more than a year old, having been incorporated in the State of Illinois on May 3, 1954, as a nonprofit organization for the encouragement of the creative arts.

Its laudable purpose is giving aid to creative individuals of outstanding talent or unusual promise to the end that they may communicate more effectively through their chosen media. It will from time to time select individuals who, in its judgment, are deserving of assistance and will make funds available after a careful study of and commensurate with their specific needs.

Such assistance may include outright grants for living expenses during periods of work or study at home or abroad or outright assistance in arranging performances, exhibitions, recordings, publications, or publicity. The foundation will protect the rights of the artist it is assisting and will not require for itself any copyrights or material gains.

FOUNDATION CAPABLY MANAGED

William N. Copley is a painter and journalist. He is a director of the Copley Press, Inc., which owns a chain of great and influential newspapers in Illinois and Calfornia, including the Illinois State Journal and Register of Springfield. The editor of this great newspaper in Springfield is V. Y. Dallman, long and brilliantly active in both the journalist and public life of Illinois.

It will interest my colleagues to be reminded that this is the chain of newspapers developed by the Honorable Ira Clifton Copley, who served with great distinction in this body in the 62d and the 5 succeeding Congresses. Colonel Copley, who died in 1947, was one of the newspaper giants of the period when American journalism was building to the stature of the present day. He was a great American. On his passing the control of the powerful newspaper dynasty that he had built passed to the competent hands of William N. Copley and James S. Copley.

Mrs. William N. Copley, who shares with Mr. Copley the administration of the foundation, has long been interested in the field of music and has worked in the motion picture industry and in publications.

Mr. and Mrs. Copley are assisted in the administration of the fund by the Honorable Barnet Hodes, Chicago attorney and art collector. Mr. Hodes, who served longer as corporation counsel of the city of Chicago than anyone in the city's history, has a distinguished record of cooperation with worthy foundations and is presently serving as chairman of the board of the American Heritage Council. While corporation counsel of the city of Chicago, Mr. Hodes established a pattern for a public law office that has been nationally adopted. He is a member of the Chicago law firm of Arvey, Hodes & Montynband.

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

Also serving on the executive board of the William and Noma Copley Foundation are the composers Darius Milhaud, of the Paris Conservatory of Music and Mills College, and the artist, Marcel Duchamp.

Advisers to the foundation in the field of music are Winthrop Sargeant, Carleton Sprague Smith; Richard Jones, of Capitol Records, Inc.; the composer, Samuel Barber; Conductor Walter Hendl; and Concert Singer Jenny Tourel. Advisers in the field of plastic arts are Alfred Barr, Jr., of the Museum of Modern Art; Sidney Janis; Sir Herbert Read; Roland Penrose, of the Institute of Contemporary Art, London; Pierre Roche and Alfred Vallotton, of Paris; and painters Max Ernst and Matta Echaurren.

AWARDS FOR 1954 ANNOUNCED

In keeping with its aims to promote and encourage the creation and development of art and music, the William and Noma Copley Foundation takes great pleasure in announcing awards of $1,000 each for the year 1954 to the following artists in recognition of their achievements in their respective fields: Joseph Cornell, constructionist, for his work in the media of film art; Atillio Salemme, artist; Harris Danziger, conductor; Benjamin Lees, composer.

Also the foundation has awarded three scholarship awards of $100 each to the following students of the Paris Conservatory of Music: Jacques Bondon, Manfred Kelkel, Jean Doue.

The William and Noma Copley Foundation plans to sponsor an exhibition of paintings in Paris for which it will invite

resident artists of all nationalities to participate. Mr. Alfred Vallotton of that city has generously offered the use of his gallery for this purpose.

Biographical sketches of the recipients of the above awards follow:

JOSEPH CORNELL

Joseph Cornell is one of the most unique artists in America and it is probably for this reason that his work is neither sufficiently understood nor appreciated. Some 20 years ago he began working in a college media, without benefit of artistic training, unconscious of the fact that his work was destined to fit into the historic showing at the Julien Levy Gallery which launched Surrealism in America. It was at this exhibition that his first two constructions appeared. Since then they have been exhibited widely. The Museum of Modern Art in New York has a Cornell construction in its permanent collection as does the Art Institute of Chicago. Mr. Cornell has always been interested in ballet as subject matter for his constructions and has done several covers for the magazine Dance Index.

He has also worked extensively in the motion picture media and has built up a collection of rare stills of use to film historians, as well as a collection of equally rare early French primitive films. He has several avant guarde films in various stages of completion.

ATTILLIO SALEMME

Attillio Salemme was born in Boston on October 18, 1911 and has been living in New York since 1929. Although he has had no formal art education, he received encouragement and valuable advice from his brother Antonio, a sculptor and painter. He has devoted all of his time to painting since 1940. In 1947, Mr. Salemme received the Flora Mayer Witkowsky prize at the 58th Annual American Exhibition of Abstract and Surrealist Art, and in the same year won the purchase prize at the First National Print Exhibition. He has received commissions to do paintings for the Manhattan House and Moore McCormick Line for the steamer S. S. *Argentina*. Pictures of his art are in the permanent collections of the Museum of Modern Art, the Metropolitan Museum and the Whitney Museum. He has had seven 1-man shows since 1945 and his paintings have been bought by many outstanding collectors. He is married and has two children, both boys. His wife Lucia is also a painter.

HARRIS DANZIGER

Harris Danziger is an American conductor with extensive experience in both symphonic and operatic fields. For the past several years he has been conducting the orchestra of the Manhattan School of Music and in this capacity has been responsible for introducing to New York audiences a number of significant modern works. In recognition of these concerts he was engaged by the Alice M. Disson Fund and New Music, Inc., to conduct a concert of important American chamber-symphonic works at Columbia University. In 1952 Mr. Danziger was awarded the first Ford Foundation fellowship in music ever granted which enabled him to spend a year in Europe studying and conducting such orchestras as the Vienna Symphony and the Paris National Radio Symphony. As a conductor Mr. Danziger has worked in Broadway operatic productions, was musical director of the Eastern Maine Musical Festival, the Lemonade Opera Co., and the Negro Opera Co. He has been program consultant for the New Friends of Music in New York. He has also been a member of the world famous Manhattan string quartet.

Mr. Danziger has studied under Pablo Cassals, Pierre Monteux, Eduard Van Beinum, conductor of the Concertgebouw, and Karl Bohm of the Vienna Staatsoper.

BENJAMIN LEES

Prize pupil of George Antheil, Benjamin Lees, at the age of 30, is one of America's most promising composers. He received his early musical education at the University of South Carolina. His first string quartet, composed in 1952, has been played by the Israeli quartet at the McMillan Theater of Columbia University, and later again on the American Music Festival program in Town Hall, New York, and broadcast over station WNYC. Recently it was played by the Budapest string quartet. He has also written a first symphony, which is soon to be performed. A profile for orchestra was played by the NBC Symphony last winter. Mr. Lees, who now lives with his wife in New York, has received the Fromm and Guggenheim Foundation awards and will soon be leaving for Europe, where he plans to continue his composition in Florence.

A Friend Prepares To Leave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Ambassador from Turkey, His Excellency the Honorable Feridun Erkin, is about to leave America for a new assignment. Ambassador Erkin is one of the greatest diplomats in the free world today. He has not only been a leader in promoting the wonderful friendship between America and Turkey but he has constantly aided the whole free world in its fight against Communist aggression. His foresight and courage during critical times has been an inspiration to all free people. He has ably represented in Washington the stanchest ally that we have in the world today, the Republic of Turkey. Ambassador Erkin will presently be representing the great Turkish people in Madrid. In this capacity he will continue to serve democracy and all of us will benefit by his experience and ability in this key post. I am wishing for Ambassador and Lady Erkin the utmost success and happiness in their new undertaking. They will have the best wishes of all the American people.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the following editorial appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 25:

A FRIEND PREPARES TO LEAVE

In his first interview here after presenting his credentials as Ambassador from Turkey, Feridun Erkin told news correspondents that he believed the free nations of the world should create a series of regional defense organizations as security against Communist aggression. In the nearly 7 years since that interview, this has in fact been the defense pattern followed by the free nations, with Turkey being one of the stanchest adherents to the theory of collective action. The NATO, keystone in today's system of alliances, was only in the discussion stage when Mr. Erkin made his suggestion in late 1948. Formalized in 1949, NATO accepted Turkey and Greece into membership in 1951. Since then, the Ankara government has committed Turkey to a Balkan triumvirate that includes Greece and Yugoslavia and to an eastward alliance that now includes Pakistan and Iraq. Meanwhile, Turkey was one of the nations to discharge with greatest vigor their United Nations obligations in the Korean war.

As his country's Ambassador here, Mr. Erkin has been a popular and effective worker in helping to carry out his government's determined policy to make Turkey a real power—rather than a dependent—in the collective defenses of the free world. A particularly close Turkish-American relationship has developed in these years with a general feeling here that our substantial military and economic assistance to Turkey has been constructively utilized. Mr. Erkin, leaving now for a new assignment, has done his full share in creating and maintaining this favorable impression.

The Issue of Our Time—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the clash between capitalism and communism has been the subject of broad and comprehensive debate, both nationally and internationally, by all types of people since Karl Marx expounded his theories on communism.

The many doubtful definitions and conceptions of capitalism and communism are wide and varied, so that their true meanings have become nebulous, and consequently created confusion and frustration in the minds not only of those who debate the subject but in the minds of those who listen in the hope of being properly informed.

The false presumption that communism is the one great opportunity for freedom, and economic security for the common man, and that capitalism is the road to ruin has been the favorite deceptive and sometimes convincing argument used by the rulers of Soviet Russia and Red China in order to convince and conform the minds of men all over the world to the doctrine of communism.

The right of the individual to own and possess what he earns, to fully develop his talents, to possess and defend the inalienable rights he was endowed with by

the Creator, and his right to defend himself against a powerful and dominant government; these rights upon which the capitalistic system of government are based are opposed by the rulers of Soviet Russia and Red China they claim that capitalism denies these rights, thus bringing about the confusion and doubt in the minds of the average person as to just what is capitalism and communism.

William J. Palmer, judge of the Superior Court of California, in and for the county of Los Angeles, whom I have personally known for a number of years, and who enjoys a reputation of great respect as a judge and as a honest and loyal American citizen, has written an article entitled "The Issue of Our Time," which in my opinion, is a highly intelligent and intellectual review of capitalism and communism, and their effect on the common man throughout the world. I am confident that each member of Congress will find the following four insertions on Judge Palmer's views on capitalism and communism well worth the time to read and study, I believe they are the best detailed definitions and elaborations of these two controversial subjects I have ever had an opportunity to read.

Judge Palmer is recognized as one of the most scholarly and well-informed members of the legal profession. His intellectual pursuits have been wide and varied. He was inclined to believe that he was born to be a mathematician, but after scoring a perfect 100 percent for an entire course in mathematics in his freshman year, he decided the subject did not provide the kind of challenge he needed, and he later took up the study of law and was a major student, and a professor's assistant in economics. He has become a popular lecturer on the law to lawyers and law students. A careful reading of The Issue of Our Time will reveal the research and detail that he has applied to the subject for the benefit of his readers:

THE ISSUE OF OUR TIME

I. THE BEGINNINGS OF CAPITALISM

Some time, far, far away in the unsearchable distances of time, a being that moved upon the earth awoke one morning to be the first terrestrial capitalist. He had not consumed, destroyed, discarded or abandoned all the gains of his yesterday's activities. He had attained, if only instinctively, a sense of the future; and he held possession of something which, he felt, would be of value to him, utilitarian or pleasurable. He had discovered the thing that he held, or had captured it, struggled for it, or himself had fashioned it entirely or in part; and he had a feeling that the thing belonged to him, that it was his, now a part of his total self. It may have been a nest, a hole in the ground, a cave; it may have been food, feathers, bone or a hide; it may have been a stone, a stick or a club. Whatever it was, it was a start against future time; to this extent his past efforts had been consolidated; he had something with which to start the new day, something for which he would not have to grub in this new interval of awareness. And, hence, he could direct his attention to other activities, or he might choose a compensating leisure.

From that day to this, the essential and simple nature of capitalism has not changed. It is still waking in the morning and finding that you have something with which to start the new day; something that belongs to you and into which your past labors have been consolidated; something that you did not expend, consume, waste or gamble away; something that makes it not necessary for you to spend this day toiling for raiment to wear, or food, or for shelter for the storm or the coming night. Your clothing is ready for you; your breakfast is in the refrigerator and on the shelves; your car is in the garage; the streets have been paved; an office with its desk, files, books and equipment or a plant or shop with its machinery and tools awaits you; your children are taken to school by bus, streetcar, bicycle or private car; a building with desks, books, blackboards and all necessary equipment is housing them comfortably in the pursuit of education. The day moves by, your office is closed, your tools laid down, and thanks to a thousand items of capital in stores and at home, your wife, although busy at PTA, club or church through the afternoon, spreads a wholesome and appetizing dinner before you. Your lounging chair, your pipe, push-button electricity, thermostatically-controlled furnace, newspaper, radio, television, phonograph, books, cards, combine to offer an evening of recreation or enlightenment as you choose. And then to bed; an inner-spring or foam-rubber mattress, clean sheets, a soft pillow, warm coverings and, if needed, an electric blanket.

All this is capitalism, and all this is all there is to capitalism in its essential nature.

II. THE GOAL OF AN ENLIGHTENED SOCIETY

To any adult person of average mental stature these facts must be clear:

1. Capitalism is the natural and necessary incident of the evolution of mind; it is the vehicle of and almost a synonym for progress; it is as necessary to a civilization of any level or quality as oxygen is to human life.

2. The ideal economic goal of any aspiring society is a state of general advancement wherein the greatest possible number of persons are individual capitalists, and the capital that each can call his own is such as to sustain a reasonable pride in personal achievement and to provide gratification, comfort, confidence, and a basis for security.

3. No progress toward that goal can be made by socialism. Its doctrinal essence calls for destroying the individual capitalist, except only in a restricted and always-controlled degree, and for destroying his opportunities. Not confessedly, but by logic and experience, it leads to the atrophy of those faculties of independent initiative, self-confidence, self-reliance, imagination, and daring, of the drive of ambition for personal achievement, of the competitive spirit, and of the will for voluntary self-directed discipline, all factors in the making of individual capitalists.

4. Manifestly the goal cannot be achieved by government. Wise government, of course, is vital in curbing the libertine and providing the protections necessary for individual development and attainment. Obviously also, government, in varied ways, either can encourage and promote personal economic accomplishments, or can discourage, retard, and obstruct them.

5. The ideal economic goal can be achieved only by individuals themselves and hence can be drawn closer only by those factors that improve the quality of individuals.

III. AT WAR: TWO KINDS OF CAPITALISM

The reader, perhaps, already is asking, "Why the title, 'The Lawyer and Capitalism'?" With assurance that the query will be answered in time, let us now proceed to business having logical priority. A world-wide, fateful war is being fought today between two types of capitalism. At stake in that conflict are not only the earth's capital assets, but the freedom of men's minds. One of the protagonists, which loosely is called communism, in its aggressive campaign to entice and subjugate the human mind, has an expedient in its own fanatical self-deceptions and in its unrestrained approval of beguilement by designed fraud.

The first self-deception and fraud of communism resides in the premise that it has something which is not capitalism to substitute for capitalism. Clearly there is no substitute for capitalism except to climb into the time machine, push the button for reverse, and travel back through millions of years to a time when no animal on earth had a nontransient nest, shelter, "home" of any sort, tool, weapon, or cached food. What communism does is to install, with the support of armed might, the worst kind of capitalism, i. e., monopolistic and gangster, as distinguished from the best kind, the kind that exists in America, which is competitive and open. American capitalism is open because no law or custom bars anyone of any level of society from joining the ranks of the capitalists. This truth has been demonstrated so many tens of thousands of times as to be almost platitudinous. Nevertheless, at this juncture in world affairs, the point cannot be overemphasized, and two illustrations from personal observation will be given.

Open doors to opportunity

A few years ago I tried a case whose parties on one side were former non-Communist Russians, two brothers who had escaped the Bolshevik terror and who, in time, had reached America and had become citizens. They had embarked upon a restaurant business, and, through a calendar year embraced within the factual issues of the case, had operated two restaurants. Copies of their income-tax returns for that year were produced in court. These two refugees from Russia had paid taxes on a net income for that year amounting to $120,000 plus some dollars and cents.

On two recent Saturdays my wife and I visited one of the most beautiful churches in the world, the Cathedral of St. Sophia (Greek Orthodox), Los Angeles. It was founded and in large part financed by a man who, as a boy of 19 and a poor immigrant, came to America from Greece: Charles P. Skouras, president of Fox West Coast Theaters.

In the open capitalism of the United States, each person's opportunity is measured by his own personality, ability, aptitudes, health, ambition, industry, integrity, imagination and daring, and, in all frankness, let us add the "breaks" of the game. They certainly often and perhaps usually go to those who make them, and they have no significance except as they go to those who are qualified to take advantage of them.

We are told now and then that a concentration of wealth exists among a small percentage of families in the United States. (Our wealthy families are independent, belong to no conspiracy, and in many instances are competitors. They belong to different political parties, different religious faiths, different clubs, and societies, and they read different newspapers, magazines, and books.) We have in our country, too, as they have in all countries, a concentration of intelligence, culture, talent, knowledge, and leadership. In any regime providing free opportunity, a small percentage will rise to the top. This fact does no social injury if the way is kept open for all persons to strive toward the top and for each to go as far as he can. Indeed, it is the law of progress that a few individuals first must go to the top, to demonstrate the possibilities and opportunities, to show the way, and to help others to follow. Plant a vine, watch it grow, and you will see how human society is carried upward by the individuals who first go upward.

The diffusion of capital

Competitive and open capitalism leads to a diffusion of capital which is both impossible and inconceivable under the monopolistic capitalism of the Socialist. The data

to follow come from the magazine Fortune, volume 46 (September 1952), page 87:

In 1952, one or more persons in each of 82.3 percent of all family units in the United States were owners of life insurance. One or more persons in each of 52.8 percent of those family units owned savings accounts. One or more persons in each of 90.7 percent of those units owned one or more of nine favorite forms of solid investment, not counting the owners of real estate. Millions of our people own real estate. Six and a half million people owned the shares of stock in 5,000 corporations, including the 2,300 listed on various exchanges. Among these family-unit shareholders, 200,000 received annual incomes of less than $2,000. But in 1952 we had not merely 5,000 business and industrial units in the United States. The average number of operating businesses through that year was 4,043,000 (Information Please Almanac, 1954, p. 130), representing, no doubt, many times that number of owners.

Shortly we shall see who owns the capital assets under a Communist regime.

IV. THE GREAT DELUSION

A second self-deception and fraud of communism derives from its foundational premise that the people as a whole, or the proletariat, can and shall own the capital and economic processes of a country.

The words "own," "belong," and "ownership" are only words. They do, of course, denote a concept to most of us, and that concept is quite well defined in the California Civil Code, section 654:

"The ownership of a thing is the right of one or more persons to possess and use it to the exclusion of others."

It is clear that public ownership, even in its best sense, is a different concept, for no one would contend that public ownership is the right of all of us to actually possess and use a property. Neither would any thoughtful person contend that the mere fact of property standing of record in a government's name makes all of us in reality the owners of it by any concept of ownership that we understand. The few officials who at any given time have control of public property come closest to its ownership in a practical sense which conforms to our concepts of possession and management. Plainly the people as a whole cannot have the control and management of any item of property; nor can they have possession of it, in the sense that individuals singly or jointly can possess property.

In practice the professed communizer is compelled by elemental facts beyond his control either to negate entirely his theory of common ownership or to compromise it. Regardless of beginning sincerity, the tendency, which may be irresistible, always is toward the former course. If, however, compromise is effected or pretended, the approach which it makes to the theory will depend on a number of factors: (1) whether or not the officers in control are in any way subject to the people's control; (2) whether or not the property is managed with such honesty, efficiency, and dedication to social welfare that the public is benefited by that management, as against the results that would accrue to the people from private ownership and management; (3) whether or not all the people share equally or have a right to share equally or share justly on some equitable and reasonable basis in any benefits flowing from the control and management of the few; (4) whether or not those few who are in actual control and management also control the police, the courts, the lawmaking, the press, the business of publishing, radio, television, education, and all means of communication, and thus whether or not the people who are supposed to be the owners of a property can be and are likely to be served with full and true information concerning it and to be protected in their rights.

Absolute monopoly

With these factors in mind, let us compare the kind of ownership actually effected by a communistic regime and that exemplified by a typical American corporation. Under communism, a nation's capital assets are in the absolute control of a handful of individuals, over whom the people have no control. This same small group controls the lawmaking, courts, and all means and avenues of public communication, information, and education. They also control the ubiquitous secret police. Having no competition, and no watchdogs over them, and having and exercising power to brutally stifle any criticism or nonconforming expression, they can be grossly inefficient, as compared with good private management, without the public knowing the facts or the case, or being able to do anything about the matter. Their prime object at all times is to maintain their own position and their own power. At this they are cunning, cruel, and relentless. These few actually own the nation's capital assets, and they do with those assets as they please. They are capitalists of fabulous magnitude. They, of course, do not please to dangerously defy or ignore the good will of the people. In spite of all their power, they, too, hunger for plaudits and they harbor continual fear. As Elbert Hubbard once said, "there is no freedom no earth or in any star for those who deny freedom to others." But without any independent vehicle of information and without any factor of control, the people must accept without audible or visible complaint what they receive from the tyrant-capitalists of communism.

Economic democracy

A certain typical American corporation has about 200,000 stockholders, no one of whom owns as much as 1 percent of the stock. At least once a year, every stockholder has a right to vote for the directors, and he does not even have to be present at a meeting to cast his vote. He may vote by proxy. The voting is voluntary and the counting is honest. Special meetings may be called on notice. The stockholder can sell his interest in the corporation or otherwise deal with it at any time he wishes. It is identifiable, precise, and immediately valuable to him. He has a right to inspect the books of the corporation at any reasonable time. Any question he may put to the management about the business will be honestly answered and with reasonable promptness. To him the directors are legally responsible in the most enlightened moral sense, and they carry that responsibility seriously. They pay him regularly his pro rata share of distributable net income. They also pay regularly to government in taxes, for the use of all the people, a large share of the corporation's income. Their books and financial records are watched over by certain of the ablest certified public accountants, whose professional ideals and obligations require their conscientious efforts in the keeping of honest records and the making of accurate reports. The corporation has competition. It does not control any of the means of public communication or any of the schools or colleges, and it has no control over government. Of necessity, the business is genuinely dedicated to the public welfare, because its profits and its continued existence depend on such dedication. The management-personnel and the directors have been chosen not because they belong to a clique, a gang, a party, or a conspiracy, but because of proved ability and character.

Two hundred thousand regular American citizens really own the assets of this corporation, and each actually owns and can deal with his own share, and, what is more, anyone else, no matter who he is, if he has or can save a little money to invest, can become a part owner, too.

In the typical, successful American corporation, democracy has attained its finest and most convincing expression. Compared with it, the Communist concept and practice of ownership are such a dissolute sham that even the past in human history would be ashamed to acknowledge a prototype.

The Issue of Our Time—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the following is a continuation of the article The Issue of Our Time, by Judge William J. Palmer:

V. WORKERS BETRAYED BY COMMUNIST THEORY AND PRACTICE

In the Communist ideology, the ownership by the proletariat of all the economic processes is a theoretical necessity. It is postulated that only by such ownership can the workers receive the total return from their labor; that they then do not have to share any of the return with stockholders and other proprietors who are a nonproductive class riding on the backs of the proletarian workers.

Howsoever plausible this doctrine may seem to the gullible, any dialectical validity indicated by it fails completely of substantiation in the actual operation of the Socialist regime. In the acceptance and advocacy of the foregoing theories reside the third self-deception and fraud of socialism. Before confronting the reasons for the certain failure of the theories, let it be noted by contrast that the real ownership of their own business by workers is an old idea and actually under open and competitive capitalism such as exists in the United States. Here no law, custom, or insurmountable difficulty ever has barred workers of ability, imagination, and good character from establishing, owning, and conducting their own business. According to the Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1953 (p. 197), published by the Department of Commerce, there were in this country in 1950 over 9,500,000 self-employed workers. By their own free choice, these persons owned the businesses in which they worked, and they received all the profits.

The Socialist tenet that the workers can receive all that they produce under socialism and, hence, will receive more than workers under competitive capitalism, promptly runs into an impasse when Socialists take over. Workers under socialism (monopolistic capitalism) have to be paid a wage to live, just as workers are paid a wage under the competitive capitalism of our country. A difference does exist: the wage is much greater in the latter case. If the worker is to have a share of profits above his wage, profits must be made. But profits are taboo under socialism. They are supreme evil that Socialists propose to end. If any profits were made in one business or industry, to be divided among its workers, those profits would have to be paid by other workers, and thus the sole purpose of socialism would be defeated. So the worker under socialism receives the wage arbitrarily fixed by the rulers, and no more.

Facts that don't surrender

Good reasons exist why the few fabulous capitalists who own all the economic processes under communism do not pay higher wages than they do.

1. One reason is that even they must have capital assets—buildings, machinery, tools, etc.—and these must be paid for, main-

tained, and replaced in one way or another, except insofar as they are stolen. Communists do seem to have an initial advantage in their doctrine of theft. Force is an essential part of their creed, not merely to gain control of government, but to effect the theft of the people's property. This method saves capital investment as they see it. The advantage, however, if it is such, is short-lived. Depreciation and obsolescence respect neither theories nor tyrants. Of greater significance is the fact that the unmoral atmosphere and principle of theft, with the concomitant faith in dishonesty, cunning, compulsion, and terror, are definite deterrents to efficiency, economy, and zeal in operation and production. And no scheme ever has been devised whereby more can be divided among workers than they have produced.

2. No utopian theory alters the fact that the cost of labor is one of the major costs of any operation in the economic field. Sometimes it is exceeded only by the cost of raw materials, and here in America it often is exceeded by taxes. Whether or not the despot-capitalists of communism have a profit-motive, they do have the motive of saving their own necks and their power; they live under the continual fear inherent in the psyche of the tyrant, and, forever fearing the ill will of their subjects, they have an incentive to hold down production costs, and hence labor costs, in each particular industry, lest for its products or services workers in other fields must pay disproportionately. Their ideology provides no escape from the difficult, practical problem of balancing what is paid to labor at one point and what is paid to it at another. Neither do their theories alter the fact that the economic effort in which active persons are engaged under any regime is the effort of trading each his own labor for as much of the labor of other persons as he can obtain.

3. The worker of the Communist oligarchy cannot eat military equipment or find in it shelter or raiment for his everyday needs. No power exists to curb the will of his overlords to divert into the makings of war a substantial part of the worker's effort and production. The licentious exercise of that will is a certain incident of the despot's fear. Neither do the workers of the Communist state have any means of restraining their masters from diverting into the sumptuous provision and living of those masters and their courtiers as much of the workers' labor as the despots choose to appropriate.

The American stockholder: Pillar of a strong economy

Now let us take a look at the anathema of socialism, the stockholder under open and competitive capitalism. His investment, derived usually from his own industry, thrift and savings, is hazarded. Indeed, the stockholder carries all the risk of the business adventure. None of that risk burdens the employee, unless he also is a stockholder, in which case his risk is as a stockholder, not as an employee. None of the risk is carried by government, although, as we shall see, government receives a large part of the profits. This venturing stockholder is not promised the return of his capital or even any sum for its use, except conditionally, the condition being a profitable operation. He takes his risk, knowing that millions of stockholders have lost. No dividend that ever will be paid him will be charged as an expense of doing business. Labor must be paid, taxes must be paid, all other costs must be paid, before the stockholder reaches the river of some return. One of all the fallacies of socialism is that stockholders constitute a class separate and apart from the rest of society. Let us grant that some of them are not engaged in what the Communist would call a productive activity. (Neither are millions of persons in any Communist hierarchy.) It does not follow, however, that such stockholders are useless members of society or that their dividends, if any, do not benefit society. Quite the contrary is likely to be true. Many stockholders are regular daily workers. They use their stock investments to build up an educational fund for children, a reserve for illness or other misfortune, a source of security in old age, or a capital asset for any opportunity or need that may come their way. Many stockholders or their beneficiaries are schools, colleges, foundations and institutions for various kinds of constructive and benevolent activity. Many of them are habitual investors in launching new enterprises or extending old ones, to provide employment and to serve society with new products or conveniences. Many of them are elderly people whose dividends from their past labor and thrift are their sole support in the sunset years, and who proudly receive no support from Government. Many are widows, maintained by dividends from the prudent investments of husbands now deceased. Many of them are business institutions using the dividends to pay regular monthly retirement allowances or disability benefits to former employees. No dreamer of Utopian dreams ever devised a more certain, healthier, socially-beneficial method of caring for the widow and the elderly, of maintaining private educational and other cultural institutions, and of financing charitable activities, than dividends.

Fair, intelligent, and democratic authority

The existence of stockholders has an incalculable effect upon the efficiency and economy of business management. Directors, officers, executives know all that has been written here and more about stockholders. They are aware of all that depends upon their management. Unlike the few supreme overlords of totalitarian capitalism, officers of American corporations are servants of a fair, intelligent, and reasonable master, the stockholder. To that employer, the managers, with rare exception, account for their stewardship in accord with the finest traditions of honor and of trust responsibility.

We need to note another fact to appreciate the amazing contribution of the stockholder to our economic well-being. Before me are data concerning three typical American corporations. The data reached my files in a random way and without any selection. The reports could be thrown away, and any of numerous substitutes could be used to tell a similar story. In the goods and services alone which they economically provide society, these three corporations are institutions of inestimable social value. But look. In a recent, unexceptional calendar year, one of the corporations paid taxes in a sum equivalent to $5.50 a share of its common stock; but it paid to its stockholders dividends of only $2 a share. Another paid to the Federal Government alone taxes equivalent to $6.77 a share of common stock, a sum two and a half times greater than the dividend paid. The third paid taxes amounting for each share of common stock to two and a half times the dividends paid.

So this is our American stockholder, the man or woman who takes all the risks of business, prepared in spirit and fortitude to suffer its losses, providing all the buildings, machinery, and tools for the workers, paying them the best wages in the world, and delivering over to Government, which has carried no risk and no responsibility, for the use of all the people, two and a half times as much a share as the stockholder himself receives. And he, too, pays additional taxes on what he receives.

VI. A HANDFUL OF PLANNERS

A fourth self-deception and fraud of the Socialist comes from the hypothesis that a handful of planners in control of a nation's economic processes can plan and handle those processes to better advantage for the people than the people can if free to use their own resources and resourcefulness, their own inventiveness and genius, and to direct their own energies to the supplying of their own and others' needs and wants.

Experiences has given reasonable minds consistent, persistent, and altogether adequate proof of the delusive quality of this Utopian dream. In American history we had an early lesson in the falsity of the hypothesis. One significant reason why the English colonies made greater economic progress than the French was that the former had more independence of initiative and action in economic affairs and fewer directives and restraints from the planners at home.

But if trial and experience had not proved convincingly the falsity of the hypothesis, its error would be clearly indicated by known natural facts. Nature does not concentrate her resources into the possession of any few entities. Billions of stars and millions of galaxies are in her heavens; on earth, the variety of her creation, in relation to any person's knowledge, is infinite; among human beings, aptitudes and capacities are so widely distributed that no one can foretell where talent, extraordinary ability, or genius will crop out. In this fact lies the second most cogent, practical justification for freedom. (The first lies simply in the spirit of the individual man, which no other person has authority to dominate, and in the inalienable rights that derive from that fact.) Men must be free if society is to receive what nature intends that it shall have and what she is prepared to give. No handful of dictatorial planners can even conceive more than the tiniest fraction of the varied contributions that people, if free, could and would make to cultural and economic advancement and to varied utilitarian values in their society. This would be true even if the dictator-planners were persons of extraordinary wisdom, intellectual fertility, character, and understanding. But they never so qualify. The world has seen a few good absolute monarchs, but none of them, in his wisdom, ever undertook what the absolutists of communism presume to do. Only little men profess to know enough to run everyone's business. It is that little man, at times definitely psychopathic, who, having been given or having acquired in some way a ruling authority, becomes the arbitrary planner for a nation's economic activities. It is that little man, sometimes a madman, who, in his fear, surrounds himself with a labyrinthine army of secret police, closes all the channels of free information, discussion, and education, and confiscates much of the energies of his subjects to bulwark himself and his coconspirators with Cyclopean armament not needed for any honest or constructive purpose. It is that little man always behind the promulgation of an ideology that makes the individual only a pawn and a helot of a mythical god called the state, a premise derived from either a profound ignorance or a licentious lust for power.

Done by an individual

By contrast, competitive and open capitalism recognizes and utilizes the truth that no "state" or "society" or government ever invented a tool or a machine, wrote a poem or book, composed a song or a symphony, played a violin or a piano, painted a picture or carved a work of sculpture, preached a sermon or delivered a speech, drafted a law or drew a contract, devised a set of financial records or balanced an account, attended the sick or cured the diseased. In a regime of competitive and open capitalism we know that all such achievements and services and a thousand more of kindred significance are done and performed by individual persons, each a self-aware, self-disciplined spirit that can best serve society through the guidance of his own inspiration, ideals, intuition, intelligence, self-knowledge, judgment, will,

and ambition. Cooperation and teamwork, yes. But a man does his best teamwork when he acts voluntarily and with his own understanding and approval of the project and methods of the team. In short, open and competitive capitalism is keyed to nature and to facts, and as Goethe said, "there is no trifling with nature. * * * It defies incompetency, but reveals its secrets to the competent, the truthful, and the pure."

VII. CLASSES AND OPPORTUNITY OR CASTES AND SLAVERY

A fifth fraud of communism is its promise to produce a classless society. It is extremely doubtful that anyone at the core of a Communist movement or government believes in this promise or intends that it be fulfilled. But it makes a seductive delusion for the hate, envy, jealousy, and vandalism that are the dominant emotions of the Communist following.

No reason, of course, can be given why we should have a classless society. We would find it difficult to imagine anything more insipid or discouraging or more deteriorating to the human species. We might as well advocate a classless school, wherein all of us would remain in the kindergarten. Or, from cognate folly, we might propose classless trees, vegetation and animals, or assembly line humans with no change in models.

Nature herself, abhoring monotony and sameness, is the great classifier. Although she has created by a process of evolution, two amazing facts about her creation are its infinite variety and its numerous sharp definitions. She has made human beings as different as they can be and still have enough in common to be identifiable as members of the species.

A classless society is an impossibility. But in a wise, cultured, and kindly civilization, every class into which people naturally group themselves by their common interests and skills, their kindred education, comparable means, intelligence, culture, or success will have 2 doors, 1 for entrance and 1 for exit, neither of which will be controlled by heredity or autocracy. Thus the existence of every class tells us all that we, too, might belong to it if we wish and try, if we fittingly equip ourselves, or if the breaks come our way as they may. And thus it is that under the competitive and open capitalism of the United States, no caste exists, and no class exists except the natural, fluid groupings of people, and none exists with a closed door.

The inevitable caste system of absolutism

Compare this with the rigid, despotically controlled class system of Russia. (Of interest: "I Escaped To Speak for the Enslaved" by Dr. Marek S. Korowiez, Life, March 1 and 8, 1954.) Her people are divided broadly into four classes, and no one moves from one to the other except by the will of the masters. At the bottom are the abject slaves. Next above them is a class composed of the greater part of the population and who fittingly might be called the ordinary or the beguiled slaves. Not all of them are beguiled, to be sure, but the intention of the rulers is that they shall be. Give the rulers a few more generations in which to pursue their program of maleducation, and their intention could be realized. Members of this class are allowed bits of freedom in areas involving no risk to the ruling caste and no loss of thought control. The next higher class may be called appropriately the preferred slaves. They are selected persons whose knowledge, talents, skills, or unquestioning loyalties are deemed necessary or of special value to the oligarchy. This class includes scientists, engineers, entertainers, artists of various kinds, athletes in state training to display the Russian prowess, teachers, minor government agents, and others of exceptional usefulness. Within this class itself exists a rigid hierarchy, and referring to it as one class is justified only by relativity and comparison. Members of this caste are allowed a good deal of freedom, paid much better than the beguiled slaves, and given other privileges. An indoctrinated member of the class might believe that he was not a slave, but he would be abruptly disillusioned if he expressed a nonconforming idea. The top, most favored, and most highly paid class in the sharply defined Communist hierarchy is composed, of course, of the rulers, their courtiers, and entourage.

It is true that when taking over a country and appropriating to themselves all the property of all the people, the Communist conspirators liquidate the previously existing bourgeoisie, always anathematized in Communist ideology and propaganda. The captors do destroy the previously existing classes. But forthwith the old classes are replaced by new ones, more arbitrary, more autocratic, more ignorant, selfish, exclusive, and cruel than the classes replaced.

The Issue of Our Time—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the following is a continuation of the article, The Issue of Our Time, by Judge William J. Palmer:

VIII. THE PROFANATION OF LEADERSHIP

A sixth fraud of communism is its promise to establish a dictatorship of the proletariat. This promise is alluring bait for simpletons; it never is fulfilled, nor could it be; but it helps the conspirators, in gaining control of a country's capital assets, the use of mob psychology and the elemental ignorance, hysteria and cruelty of the mob.

No rationale ever has been or will be formulated for a dictatorship of the proletariat. It would be equally absurd to advocate a dictatorship of seamen over the navy, of privates over the army, of freshmen over the university, or of janitors and elevator operators over the department store. The term, itself, "dictatorship of the proletariat," is a self-conradiction. When there are more than one dictator, either the dictators must agree or one or more dictators disappear. In his book, "What Happens to Communists?" Michael Padev points out that since 1917, the following Russian Soviet high officials have been shot as spies or traitors:

"Nine of 11 cabinet ministers holding office in 1936.

"Five out of seven presidents of the last central executive committee.

"Forty-three of the 53 secretaries of the Communist Party central organization.

"Fifteen of 27 top Communists who drafted the 1936 constitution.

"Seventy out of the 80 members of the Soviet war council.

"Three of every five marshals of the Soviet Army.

"All members of Lenin's first post-revolution Politburo, his inner cabinet of 1917—except Joseph Stalin.

Under Communist ideology all citizens of a country, after the necessary liquidation of nonconformists has been accomplished, belong to the proletariat. If they were to be dictators over themselves, how would they learn what dictates they might agree on except by a full, free and secret ballot? And if they disagreed, how would they reconcile their disagreements except by the principle of majority rule? If they really pursued these methods, they would have a democracy, not a dictatorship. But such methods, of course, are not pursued.

IX. PROFITS, AN ESSENTIAL OF FREEDOM

Communists and those who would prepare the way for them in this country have been badgering the word "profits" for decades until today, if the word bears a connotation of evil to naive minds, including some among the clergy, college students and faculty, we ought to be sympathetic and to venture not criticism but earnest enlightehment. In their efforts to inocluate this sinister connotation, Communist conspirators have practiced a seventh fraud upon the human mind.

If you invest all your savings and borrowed capital, too, in a business venture, work 16 hours a day to launch your project and carry it over the rugged pioneering hill, shoulder with your family all the burden and nervous strain of your risk and its uncertainty, finally reach a year when your income is greater than your expense, grow so you can provide employment for others and pay them good wages, you will have become, in Communist ideology, an exploiter of your fellow men, your employees, and they will be "wage slaves". This will be so because your business will have made profits (your compensation for your risk, worry, ability, imagination, labor, creation of jobs for others, and all your service to society).

People whose compensation is called "profits" are people, too. Throughout history, in commerce and morality, it generally has been recognized that if X makes his funds available to Y so that Y can use them as if they were his own, X is entitled to a fair compensation for the use of his property and to its return at an agreed time. The validity of this universal principle is never questioned except upon total negation of the concept of private property.

Insofar as a share of profits is paid to a person not active in a business, it is only the traditional compensation for the use of his funds. Profits gained by the active owner of a business are his compensation for both the use of his funds and his services. The only essential difference between those profits and the wages of his employees is that the latter involve no risk of capital and are much more certain. If the profits prove to be the greater, that fact is an incident of the greater hazards and responsibility and all that they have involved.

Profits, achievement and progress

In the United States thousands of persons receive "wages" which are envied by thousands of business owners, who receive only their profits when any are made. If one man's profits seem too high, so do another man's wages. These are relative matters, and under competitive and open capitalism—if it is really kept competitive and open at all levels—a tendency toward reasonable balance and relationship always is at work.

To economists, the term "profits" has a restricted meaning which I intend to respect. But we should recognize the identity of nature in the profits of a business and the margin of accumulation, reflected in possessions, which any person gains from his wages, salary, commissions, royalties or other compensation, over the cost of the consumable goods and services purchased by him. The significance in each case is merely that the receipts have been greater than the running necessary expenses.

Broadly speaking, civilizations have built the tangible structures of their cultures in either of two ways: (1) out of the compulsions of government and despots, and the slavery of peoples; or (2) out of the profits of the self-directed activity of persons, taxed or voluntarily given. We of America would be tragically unappreciative and dangerously purblind were we not to recognize that all

the tangible assets of our civilization, all its institutions of education, culture, entertainment and inspiration, have been created from the profits and kindred margins of accumulation of many persons acting in freedom.

The pivotal distinction

In 1953 the meat packing industry of our country gained a net income of seven-tenths of 1 cent on each dollar of sales. On each $5 in sales, it kept for itself 3½ cents. In the same year, the chain food stores, providing a marvel of service, gained a net income of one and one-tenth cents on each dollar of sales. Not the faintest probability exists that these vital services ever can be performed so well or so cheaply in a society whose economic processes have been taken over by a political-police monopoly.

In this matter of profits, we have the pivotal difference between competitive and open capitalism, on the one hand, and monopolistic capitalism, whether called socialism or communism, on the other. The purpose and method of open and competitive capitalism are to use profits, whether classified as such or as wages, salary, annuities, royalties, rents, dividends, retirement payments or otherwise, to make the greatest possible number of people independent of the state and independent of the charity of others. With human nature as it is, the results will fall short of perfection, but they, nevertheless, will be comparatively successful and remarkable. Having achieved them, competitive and open capitalism then provides the profits, or even capital assets, if necessary, to care for those who have not reached such independence, or who, once having gained it, have lost it.

The purpose and method of communism are to deprive everyone of profits and thus make everyone wholly dependent upon the state—or, rather, on the few who rule and who call themselves the state.

Because profits are the lifeblood of any system of free economy, those who would prepare the way in this country for a communistic monopoly never miss a chance to asperse or belittle the genius behind all our profits, the American business builder and executive, or to destroy or reduce his profits. You will find them lending their support to every proposal and project (sometimes as the originating schemers) that either harasses, or promises opportunity for the harassment of, or deprecates that businessman.

Three channels of economic activity

The Machiavelian minds behind this preparing of the way appreciate more fully than many legislators and political executives the significance of the following facts: In a free economy, people obtain gainful employment through three channels: (1) self-employment, (2) private institutions owned by others, and (3) government. Obviously, the greater the employment in channels 1 and 2, the lighter the burden on government. It would seem to be apparent to most adult minds that a wise government would do everything within its power to encouage employment in channels 1 and 2, and would adopt no measure or policy without first putting it to the test: What will the effect of this be on employment opportunities in private enterprise? Only profits make such employment possible.

Cycles of higher and lower activity and their accompanying psychological cycles are not only inevitable in any sound economy, but within limits, are beneficial. It is during periods of reduced activity that the best thinking, house cleaning, planning, and self-disciplining are done in the economic structure. Such periods are pruning times; roots are strengthened and driven into new soil; and, following every recession and depression, the economic organism of a free society burgeons with renewed vigor and variety. But you will observe that the first and only thing some persons and groups want us to think about when a business cycle enters the downward trend is not how to encourage, support and strengthen channels 1 and 2, but how to throw the Government into large-scale employing business.

How it could happen here

The Government is not a producer of wealth and has no money to pay workers, except only what it collects from the producers. Government is merely the transfer agent; it may create the jobs, but to pay the wages it takes the money from the privately owned economic structure. In so doing, especially if intemperate, it can start a vicious cycle. If the self-employed and the private employer of channels 1 and 2 already are harassed, the taking of their funds to pay for Government jobs, the creation of Government competition with capital drawn from them, and the imposition of other burdens, can reduce both their capacity and their spirit to provide employment. (This possibility is not fanciful. I am only one person, but I have known several instances of business closing down or refusing to expand because of the discouraging policies or practices, of or the atmosphere created or the interferences or obstructions allowed by, Government.) As such effects multiply and deteriorate the economy, those who know no method of solving any problem except more law, more Government, and more taxes, would throw the Government further into the business of directly providing employment. In this way, as Communists know, totalitarianism can come to America, not by choice of the people, but by our innocence, the self-seeking of candidates for, and holders of, public office, and by our being victims of the craftiness, hyprocrisy, and deception of the Communist conspirators.

It should be made known to every American citizen who wants to be free that the sine qua non of his freedom is profits.

X. ACCORDING TO THEIR FAITH, CHARACTER, AND INDUSTRY

Communists have a pretty slogan which, no doubt, is enticing to many idealistic persons: "From each according to his ability, and to each according to his need." By this slogan, they practice an eighth fraud upon the credulous.

It should be clear that only God could fulfill such a promise, for aside from the necessary mechanics of the project, only He could search the minds and spirits of men, know the capacities of their minds and bodies, and thus be able to determine their abilities and needs. Henry David Thoreau proved that man really needs very little in the way of material goods and services. Perhaps that fact is what the Communists have in mind. Their results would so indicate. However, Thoreau and all the philosophers and ascetics who have proved the same point have had intangible, spiritual resources, which communism not only does not provide, but denies. Its materialism and atheism are throwbacks, placing it thousands of years in the rear of the forefront of evolution. Its doctrine that man is a mere creature of his material environment and is molded in the image thereof has been proved false innumerable times. Mere physical environment, from that of poverty to that of luxury, has a sorry record in the matter of establishing dominance over the human spirit. It is when we consider the intangible factors in that environment—religious faith, prayer, intelligence, love, understanding, trust, patience, the art of teaching, integrity, character, and ambition—or the absence of such factors, that environment challenges heredity for supremacy in influencing and molding the human mind and character. And when those spiritual factors in environment are combined with the same factors in heredity, the results can be prodigious. Let us note one example:

An American family

David Dudley Field (1781–1867), a graduate of Yale, was a Congregational minister. He held two pastorates in a life of long usefulness, one at Haddam, Conn., the other at Stockbridge, Mass. His wife shared his faith, wisdom, and principles. Their restricted material circumstances were typically those of the clergy of their time and of most clergymen today. Their children were: (1) David Dudley Field, active member of the New York bar for over 50 years, known as "The Father of American Legal Reform," pioneer and persistent advocate of codification, of whom Austin Abbott said: "For at least a third of a century, David Dudley Field was the most commanding figure at the American Bar." (2) Matthew Field, engineer, who built the longest suspension bridge of or before his time. (3) Jonathan Field, lawyer, highly respected leader of the bar in Massachusetts, who revised the statutes of that State. (4) Stephen J. Field, an early Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of California, and a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States for 34 years and 6 months, serving longer on that Court than any other justice. (5) Cyrus W. Field, financier, railroad developer, one of the original projectors of the elevated railroad system of New York City, and the man who projected, promoted, and achieved the laying of the first Atlantic cable. (6) Henry Martin Field, a distinguished clergyman, editor, and author. (7) Mary, who died when but a young woman, and (8) Emelia Ann, who married a missionary and mothered a son who became a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, David J. Brewer.

Manifestly the very tenets of communism prevent it from knowing or providing what each individual needs. But even if we confine the meaning of the slogan to physical goods and tangible services, we are confronted by the necessary implication and the fact that the few turgid capitalists who rule the Communist state set the measure of everyone's needs. By the ideology of these overloads, the individual has no needs not subordinate to those of their golden calf, the state.

Ability, spirit, and freedom

On the other side of the equation, the side that reads "from each according to his ability," the Communist tenets and methods again make performance impossible. Society never can receive from each according to his ability when minds and thoughts and bodies are controlled by the force and oppression of dictatorship. As previously pointed out, the individual can find his ability and develop it only in freedom, in the self-choice of interests, opportunities, truthful information and learning, and in the motivations and enthusiasms born of freedom.

Napoleon, in reflection, wrote: "Do you know what amazes me more than anything else? The impotence of force to organize anything. There are only two powers in the world—the spirit and the sword. In the long run the sword will always be conquered by the spirit."

Real human beings, men and women not cowed by masters, want more from life than their physical needs. A social, political, and economic scheme that promises no more does not promise much. Above all, they want the gratifications that come from independent, self-drected achievement and from the service of others through that achievement. No gratification comes from being compelled by tyrants to serve. The aspiring musician does not practice 8 or more hours a day for years just for his physical needs. Neither for such a bare recompense does the medical student pursue the long grind of preparation for a great and necessary service to

society. Open and competitive capitalism, rather than any other scheme of political economy, has provided the most widespread opportunities for, and has created the least interference with, the gaining of the finest satisfactions in human life. Under its freedom and its generous support of religious institutions, even if one wishes to be an ascetic or to seek Nirvana, he may do so.

From the strength of the individual

All enlightened persons, all reasonable persons, wish for the welfare of all peoples. They wish also that human society will be impregnated with the spirit of kindness. They do much to promote those ends. But they know that the weak, if they are to be helped, must be helped by the strong and that to destroy or prevent strength in individuals is to promote weaknes generally. They know that no human society can be stronger, more resourceful, intelligent, courageous or better informed than the inidviduals who compose it. And they know that unless founded on these truths, no so-called welfare state can long be a welfare state.

Before me is a clipping from a dependable newspaper. It carries a factual story about the work of a charitable agency set up to help refugees from behind the Iron Curtain learn about and adjust themselves to our kind of civilization. One of the kindly women in charge of the work is quoted as saying to the reporter: "It's a trial sometimes. Some of these people are 50 years old and still have to be told like children what to do. That's how they lived in the old country. They were never encouraged to use their own ingenuity or imagination."

In this wholly sincere and artless comment, we have the ultimate test that must be faced by every government before the judgment of humanity and of God: Did it encourage and inspire its people individually to use their own initiative and imagination, to develop their own capacities and to be self-reliant and self-sustained?

The Issue of Our Time—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the following is a continuation of the article, The Issue of Our Time, by Judge William J. Palmer:

XI. WHO AND WHAT HAVE FAILED?

A ninth fraud in the Red conspirators' design, probably not a self-deception except to a duped contingent, is a propaganda piece that has been assimilated by a number of teachers, professors, clergymen, and young people right here in the United States of America. It consists of the two clichés that capitalism has failed and capitalism is doomed. We ought to recognize the promotion of these ideas as a master stroke of propaganda psychology. They are at the heart of every Communist message in school book, on campus, to labor union, or elsewhere.

Insofar as these slogans are an unconscious projection of what the Red conspirator deeply knows about his own brand of capitalism (in the manner that a dishonest person unconsciously projects his dishonesty upon others), they, no doubt, speak truthfully. The monopolistic capitalism of socialism is a demonstrated failure and may reasonably be regarded as doomed whenever installed. It might be more appropriate to say that under it the normal development of the human mind and spirit is doomed.

If you will try to learn from anyone who appears to have imbibed the ambiguous watchword that capitalism has failed, or who parrots the cliché, just what he means by it, you will have great difficulty. Your attention may be directed to poverty, hunger, disease, illiteracy, mistreatment of employees by employers, mistreatment of tenants by landlords, and other undesirable conditions existing in countries where the private ownership of property has existed. (You probably will not be told of the mistreatment of employers by employees or of landlords by tenants.) But many other factors also are concomitants of such unfortunate conditions, and nothing is proved as to cause and effect simply by the fact of coexistence. The stark truth that confronts us in all history and everywhere is that people have failed (not all people, not the species as such, but many), failed to measure up to ideals we now entertain, failed under every system, every kind of government, every kind of regime. (Also, let it be noted appreciatingly that numerous persons have succeeded wondrously.) Three facts that utopians seem never able to grasp are: (1) That people, not gods, will have to work the social, economic, political, and physical machinery the utopians intend to construct; (2) reasonably good sense requires that societies, regimes, and governments be judged comparatively before we choose one from the other, and not by an absolute, idealistic criterion, against which all will be found wanting; and (3) the folly of destroying the sound, demonstrated values of a regime, merely because people, being people, cannot and will not gain or receive equal benefits under it or under any scheme that the human mind can imagine.

The "phoniest" of deals

What the red agitator really says when he tells us that capitalism has failed is this: "The private ownership of property has failed; therefore, help a few of us to seize, own and control all property; we will liquidate the people who have owned it in the past, regardless of the industry and qualities of character by which they came into such ownership; we will manage the property—and manage you—better than they did. Not only let us have the property, but surrender to us your freedom, and your reward will be that we will take care of you from the cradle to the grave." The deal needs only to be stated frankly to reveal its own absurdity and to draw the repugnance of every sane person of moderate or greater intelligence, imbued with a nomal sense of justice.

As has been indicated already in this treatise, except for such spiritual understanding as man has gained and the warmth and enlightenment that have radiated from men of spiritual understanding, nothing connected with our mysterious journey on this planet has done so much to help so many people succeed, and to express themselves helpfully to society and gratifyingly to themselves, as the private ownership of property, and open and competitive capitalism. In productive capacity and in originality, variety and economy of production, no social, economic or political regime in all history can stand comparison with the achievements of our own people under our kind of capitalism.

As for the future, everything depends on the wisdom and character of our people. If we are to give a growing population what it wants in material goods and care; if we are to resist the terrific pressures for a universal-care-and-control-state, or to yield to those pressures without loss of freedom or of productive capacity; if we are to sustain the deceptions, incompetency and waste induced from human nature by a state-care-for-all regime; it may become necessary to abandon our primitive monetary system, now a millstone about our neck, and in spite of which the tremendous drive of our open and competitive capitalism has achieved its unparalleled successes.

XII. THE MIND IN CONTORTION

There have been persons, a few of them distinguished, who, in sincere and Christian-like concern for humanity, have been socialists of one degree or another. But the current movement for monopoly which is called communism is an offspring not of love and enlightenment but of hate, envy, lust, vandalism, and ignorance. Its specious dialectics and its motives require the atheism that accompanies it. By its atheism it makes man the supreme being of this corner of the universe, and it fortifies the position of any particular man as sovereign who can so establish himself by cunning and might. Thus it releases men from responsibility to a higher intelligence and from any reason for obedience to natural or moral law. And thus it authorizes dishonesty, theft, cruelty, murder and aggressive war to serve its ends. After a human mind has been contorted into the malformed framework of these falsehoods, its whole view of life is distorted. A mind cannot be pressed into such a misshapen mold and see facts, feel intangible factors, or think, as normal persons do.

Communist proselyting has two appeals whch are denied to both democracy and competitive and open capitalism. The first is to the gangster spirit which lingers dormant in much of humanity. In normal American boyhood, that spirit works itself off in the playing of cops and robbers, cowboys, American Indians, the villains of the early West, pirates and their caves, bandits and their hideouts, and similar imaginative adventures. Some of our intellectuals, real and pseudo, never had such boyhood experiences, and the gangster in them waited the furtive appeal of the Red plotter. He invited them into the most ambitious gangster movement in history. The second appeal is to ignorance of those truths that can be learned only from intelligent and honest consideration of practical dealings wtih people and human affairs. The greater the ignorance, the stronger the appeal.

For democracy or our kind of capitalism to use either of those appeals would be to court disaster, for the ultimate success of both is conditioned upon the prevalence within the structure of a high degree of intelligence, understanding, practical judgment, and integrity.

XIII. THE AMERICAN LAWYER: HIS RECORD AND HIS CHALLENGE

What has been the relationship of the American lawyer to our system of open and competitive capitalism and to its conflict with the monopolistic, tyrannical capitalism of communism? The author, a lawyer, has not presumed in writing this article to state truths not already generally known by his fellows of the profession. It has been his hope, rather, to articulate the knowledge and thought of American lawyers, and thus to let all know that we have not been deceived by the stratagems of communism, that we have looked beneath its tinsel and its garish facades, and that we hold it in profound contempt.

In this we are proud of our record. We are disappointed that even a few lawyers have been Communists, as, no doubt, a few have been. Although we shall do our best to see that any person charged with and denying such regression shall receive a fair trial, we shall not defend the regression. One Communist lawyer in the United States is too many. We shall not cry about "witch-hunting," "red herrings," "academic free-

dom," "suppresison of thought," or "abuse of constitutional rights" merely because a few members of our profession have been called before legislative committees to answer simple and clear questions about possible connection with the communist conspiracy. Neither shall be proclaim that because these events have taken place we have grown weak or fearful, and no longer dare speak our minds. Neither shall we please and encourage communist conspirators by joining reckless smear attacks against those who sincerely strive to expose subversive activities against us.

Where reconciliation is impossible

In addition to showing where we stand in relation to the world conflict between the two kinds of capitalism, this writing has had the purpose of proving the existence of facts disqualifying Communists from the practice of law in this country, in addition to the Red conspiracy's avowed objective of overthrowing our Government by force. That fact certainly is reason enough, but it is not the only reason. This treatise, I believe, has expressed the understanding of nearly all lawyers of our land that no reconciliation between the ethics of the American legal profession and the beliefs, attitudes, and practices of Communists is possible. They are two opposite poles of thought and faith. Both cannot be trusted to serve the best interests of our country. A lawyer cannot sincerely subscribe to those ethics and at the same time lend support to the propagation of communism. He cannot without indefensible hypocrisy accept from our society one of its highest privileges and stations while harboring intentions to destroy the very traditions and values from which the privilege and station derive their significance.

Finally I am convinced that unless lawyers zealously dedicate themselves to the business of saving our regime of competitive and open capitalism, it will disappear from our beloved land in favor of monopolistic state capitalism, with all its paralyzing effects upon the human mind and spirit.

From gratitude to vision and vigilance

That dedication must transcend all petty politics, party lines, party interests, and all the cheap, ridiculous sophistries hurled in party conflict. Our profession is the only one that has had the training and experience in detecting deception, proving fraud, and fighting craftiness, to qualify it for leadership in the fight against the preparers of the red way. I believe that we owe this leadership to our country. Without claiming perfection in our system of capitalism, we know, appreciate, and have received its many values. We know that under it we have not been the controlled hirelings of despots, but free men with immeasurable opportunities. We know that our profession has its life, vitality, and self-respect within the ideological and tangible structures of such capitalism; that most of our employment derives from the myriad interests, projects, and problems born of the imagination, daring, and activities of such a regime; that our compensation has been paid from the capital of millions of capitalists, small and great; and that numerous members of our own profession have risen from poverty to distinguished positions of executive responsibility in the commercial world. We know that the world war being fought today for the control of the earth's material assets and for the control or freedom of men's minds is a life-and-death struggle between two kinds of capitalism—the worst kind, total monopoly in the hands of gangsters who call their system communism, and the best kind, open and competitive capitalism like that of the United States of America.

Get a Horse or a New Highway

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the question is, How soon can the Congress vote a sound money plan to help pay for the many highways yearning to be born across the length and breadth of our vast and verdant land, thereby ushering in a new growth of industry, health, wealth, and happiness for our ever-increasing and vital people and thriving economy?

Life magazine, in its issue of May 30, 1955, tells a story on the highway and money problem entitled "Dead End for the United States Highway."

I trust the article will be of interest to the House, soon to be called on to vote a sound-money plan to lay down road after road on a steady schedule for years to come. The story follows. It might also have been entitled "Get a Horse or a New Highway":

DEAD END FOR THE UNITED STATES HIGHWAY

Among other things, the United States consists of 165 million people, 59 million automobiles, and 3.4 million miles of road and highway. The people are reasonably intelligent. The automobiles are big, fast, and comfortable. The highways are awful, although how awful not even the reasonably intelligent people appreciate. This may be because few Americans ever see as much as one-half of 1 percent of their Nation's roads and consequently they tend to think of the narrow, congested, archaic, and hazardous one-half percent that they themselves customarily use as worse than the rest.

This is in error. It is practically all worse.

Another reason may be that Americans identify their highway troubles with traffic rather than with the highway itself. Delayed, frustrated, or bumped from behind, the American motorist instantly blames the other guy. This is like blaming the fish in the sea for a contrary tide or a shallow channel, but the motorist does it because the highway and its defects have been so familiar to him for so many years that he simply no longer sees it as it is.

This Memorial Day weekend launches what is going to be a record motoring season, during which more cars will take to the road than in any year in United States history. Over the weekend there will be 50 million automobiles on the highways and probably 360 people will die. Everyone will see the traffic but few will really study the highways. But those who do can reduce their own danger of injury or death, and those who examine the highway long enough might even be moved to do something constructive about it and thus save themselves enormous sums.

If this weekend's average motorist could somehow be given an aerial glimpse in one look of the entire United States road system, crawling with molasses traffic, he would come to a fast boil of indignation. If he looked at it through the eyes of a highway engineer he would go jumping, screaming mad. For he would discover that while the highway network of the world's richest, most mobile nation consists of 3.4 million miles of roads, only a little over 400,000 miles has what engineers call high-type pravement—solid concrete or asphalt.

1955 CARS, 1935 ROADS

He would notice that the country has thousands of miles of back roads which average less than one vehicle per day, and that the great bulk of national travel is concentrated on the primary road system. (Seven States have half of all United States cars.) He would observe that more than half the primary road system still bears the design of 20 years ago, and that a third of it was built before 1930 when rural traffic averaged 26 miles per hour (it now averages 47 miles per hour).

He would look again at the heart of the United States highway network, the interstate system which is less than 40,000 miles long and yet links almost all cities over 50,000 population, serves more than half the United States population and carries one-seventh of all the Nation's traffic. Eighty-five percent of the interstate system is already inadequate—narrow, acutely curved, dangerously graded, frequently intersected, narrowly shouldered or shoulderless—or in in the process of becoming so in the light of the next decade's predictable traffic burden.

If our average motorist had an experienced highway engineer at his elbow as he looked down on the holiday chaos, he might learn that whatever each motorist paid for this inefficient highway system in the form of physical damage to life and limb, or psychic damage to his nervous system, he was also paying an extra (and unnecessary) cent to 2 cents a mile for the exasperating privilege of driving on it. This is without reference to tolls (there are less than 1,500 miles of toll road in the United States and only 2,700 miles of parkway or throughway). It is the cost of the extra gasoline, oil, tire expense, and lost time caused solely by bad highways, as worked out by Lawrence Lawton, a New York City traffic engineer.

Lawton's study, which was made in 1950 and figured the cost of gasoline at 23 cents a gallon (it now costs around 29 cents), indicated that it costs 5.6 cents per mile to drive an average passenger car on a congested business street, 4.5 cents on a "through" city street, 3.3 cents on an expressway. A similar study made in 1953 of Los Angeles area freeways indicated that savings, including allowance for drivers' time, averaged 2 cents a mile for a freeway compared to an ordinary highway. The total saving for all drivers using the freeway would completely pay off its cost in less than 10 years.

Our motorist-observer might also be told by an engineer that a 4-year study of Connecticut highway accidents shows that his chance of having an accident is almost doubled by driving on an inadequate, which means any old-fashioned, highway, no matter how cautiously he drives.

Finally, if he knew what the future holds for him, this weekend motorist would take a last look from on high at the highway network below, then tear up his driver's license and sell his car. In recent years United States auto production has averaged about 6 million new vehicles per year while the Nation has been scrapping around 4 million a year. The result: 15 years ago this country had 32 million motor vehicles, today it has almost 60 million. More than 3 million new cars were produced in the first 5 months of this year alone. By 1965, only 10 years from now, there will be an estimated 81 million cars, buses, and trucks on the highway.

But what kind of highway?

This year the Nation will spend at least $10 billion for new cars. It is spending only $6 billion both for highway construction and for repairs. We are actually building cars

faster than we are pouring the concrete on which to park them, let alone drive them. Barring a world war or a 5-year strike in the auto business, the United States in the next decade faces highway congestion and general traffic paralysis that will be simply incredible.

What has gone wrong? The answer can be found in the history of one stretch of a typically busy highway, U. S. No. 1 from Baltimore to Washington. For 200 years No. 1 has traversed almost 30 miles of rolling, sun-warmed, wooded hills in Maryland's countryside.

A road was first scratched through wood and field from Elkridge, just south of Baltimore, to College Park, north of Washington, in 1749. This was little more than a scarified streak in the earth, in some places studded with tree stumps, for no one much cared what happened to travelers. One of them in the years that followed was George Washington, whose wagon once sank up to its boxes in the road's rain-churned ooze near the Patuxent River, and had to be extricated with additional horses and ropes. Another time, when Washington had stopped at Spurrier's Tavern at Waterloo for dinner, his horse fell dead, exhausted by the highway's summer heat.

The 19th century was a stagnant time for this road, as it was for almost all United States roads. Although a Washington and Baltimore Turnpike Road Co. was organized in 1812 and obtained a 60-foot right-of-way to build a turnpike over the old road, it never kept the pike in repair. Few such companies ever fulfilled their obligations; this was a time of burgeoning rail and canal travel.

In 1844 wires were strung on poles along the road. On May 24 Samuel F. Morse transmitted his famous message, "What hath God wrought," from from the Capital to Baltimore on his new telegraph instrument. That invention helped reduce the need for travel.

After the Civil War, which affected the road relatively little since most of the fighting took place to the west, the turnpike company's charter was revoked. Ownership of the raw streak through the hills reverted to the three counties it traversed. When the 20th century dawned it was a 15-foot path of blowing dust in dry weather and an axle-snapping morass in wet, with grades as steep as 9 percent and treacherous curves coiled haphazardly through the hills. That is how things were 150 years after the birth of the road, when the Nation stood on the brink of the most stupendous transportation revolution in history, and that is how things were with almost all United States roads.

By 1906 there were more than 100,000 passenger cars registered in the United States. That year Maryland's General Assembly appropriated $30,000 for each of the next 3 years to be spent on rehabilitating the road, henceforth known as State Road No. 1. That expenditure, handsome for the times, was the beginning of a long, losing battle.

State Road No. 1 was gradually paved with 14 feet of macadam, concrete, and occasional gravel, although by 1910 the assembly had to appropriate another $100,000 for it. When it was completed in 1915, comprising 29.95 miles from the Baltimore City limit to the District of Columbia limit, it had cost more than $600,000, and portions of its thin, 6-inch roadbed already had had to be resurfaced because of the intensity of the traffic.

The steady pounding of the solid rubber tires on World War I's military trucks ground the road's tender pavement to rubble and shale, and the record cold of the 1917–18 winter damaged it further. So 3-foot concrete shoulders were added to each side, increasing the width to 20 feet, and the center was repaved. In 1919 the State roads commission proudly announced it was whitewashing all bridge headwalls, poles, and other objects near the road edge for safer night driving. Motorists applauded. White middle lines were added on hills in 1920–23.

A KILLER'S MOUNTING TOLL

The road had begun killing people—2 or 3 a year—long before. Now, with traffic mounting and commerce booming along its narrow length, more and more died in ghastlier accidents. Pop stands, a few discreet speakeasies, filling stations, and real estate shacks grew up along the road. In the dark of night bootleggers in souped-up cars ran their loads of liquor along it.

The nicknames the road collected describe its character: "Billboard Boulevard," "Death Highway," "Hot Dog Highway." Of course it had a Dead Man's Curve—a seemingly endless "S" south of Elkridge which has killed and maimed dozens, and was twice relocated and rebuilt. In 1925 the road became a part of U. S. 1, the Main Street of the east coast, running the length of the eastern seaboard from Fort Kent, Maine, to Key West, Fla. Commerce along it blossomed anew. By 1929–30 traffic was so heavy that the third complete rebuilding of the road had to be undertaken. The original 20-foot width was doubled, making four 10-foot lanes. But now it cost $1,760,000.

For the road's pattern and essential character, like that of a human, had been formed in the early years of its life and was confirmed by the army of unregulated motels, pizza palaces, used-car or trailer lots, occasional private homes, and beer joints that moved greedily to its very edge, cutting into it with abrupt, accident-causing driveways, and lining it with eye distracters. Furthermore, the State learned that while it held title to a 60-foot right-of-way wherever the road followed the ancient turnpike, it could not afford more than a 40-foot width wherever the road had been or was to be relocated because that would have meant condemning now costly business property.

Thus, even a quarter century ago, the road had become a hardened artery impossible to enlarge, a taut, nervous, peril-filled channel through which traffic poured and trucks roared in constantly increasing streams. The road averaged 6,000 vehicles a day then, but this often reached 18,000 or 20,000 on holiday weekends. Then there were horrendous traffic jams that reduced motorists, cops, and Monday-morning editorial writers to sputtering, apoplectic exasperation. But no one could do anything about it.

OXCART ROUTE FOR GIANT TRUCKS

In the years that followed, Maryland's road commission did all that could be done with that wreck of a highway: it eased some curves, eliminated grade crossings, widened bridges, installed traffic signals and spent millions of dollars in all on the 30 miles. Yet as the century's second half began, it was still a road that had once been laid out for horse-drawn stages and oxcarts, it was carrying 25,000 to 30,000 fast-moving vehicles a day (40,000 at some points near the Washington end), killing 30 and 40 people a year and injuring 15 times that number.

You did not have to know this to feel uneasy on the road. Each of its four, unseparated lanes was only 10 feet wide. (Modern cars are between six and seven feet wide.) When two pairs of cars rushed side by side at each other on an 8 degree curve like the one at Beltsville there was little room to swerve or sway without chancing a side-swipe or head-on collision. Passing or being passed by one of the towering, 20-ton trucks that thronged the road night and day was a jittery experience. Always you knew there was the chance that someone would pull out from one of the approximately 1,000 driveways that cut into the highway or that the car in front of you would suddenly slow down to turn off. You drove with a constant, though only half-recognized, feeling of irrigation and anxiety that sometimes led you to drive faster than the 50-mile speed limit in order to get this unpleasant stretch over with.

Perhaps that is how some of the more shocking accidents happened. The couple, for example, who drove too fast one night, sideswiped another car and orphaned their seven children. Or the five young soldiers starting home on leave who crashed into a taxi near the Howard County line and were all killed, as was the cab driver. So savage was that head-on collision that the State troopers who answered the call had to walk through a blood pool that seeped over the thick soles of their police boots. Then there was the 8 a. m., broad daylight crash on New Year's Day, 1951, when a Washington-bound car crossed the double center line on the road near Route 32 and smashed head-on into a north-bound one containing some Pennsylvania educators. The 2 cars contained 7 people; all of them died. One body was hurled 75 feet into a field.

There were hundreds of lesser accidents, sometimes 1,400 a year, for left turns were permitted almost everywhere, resulting in many, often multiple, rear-end collisions. U. S. 1 echoed regularly to the clunk and crash and shriek of outraged steel.

Sadly enough, much of this bruising mess was avoidable. For instance, one of the greatest single cause of traffic fatalities, the head-on collision, can be virtually eliminated by an adequate middle strip separating the opposing lanes of traffic. While this narrow road had no room for the 15-foot strip regarded as necessary, some sort of narrow but high curb would have helped. But local merchants, dependent on the road's traffic for their trade, protested loudly that such a barrier would cut their business in half. For the same reason they protested bans on left turn which would have eliminated many of the characteristic rear-end collisions.

Had the State been able to restrict the number of private driveways leading into the road, or to get enough additional land along it to create shoulders wide enough for pedestrians to walk on safely, the road's entire capacity and safety record would have been different. Even banning poles, signs, and other impedimenta from the pavement's edge would have tended to widen it in effect for, as traffic studies show, any obstacle erected at the edge of a 10-foot lane causes drivers to travel 2⅗ feet farther in from the pavement's edge than normal, whereas objects 4 feet or more from the edge have only minor effect. But the people of Maryland, and, indeed, the people of the entire United States who also help to support this road, had lost control of its borders even though borders can be as important as the central roadway itself.

Maryland finally came to the conclusion that patching old No. 1 would never be enough. It inaugurated programs costing hundreds of millions of dollars to bring its roads up to modern standards, and one of the first targets was the Baltimore-Washington stretch. A few miles to the east of No. 1 the State and the District of Columbia jointly built an entirely new expressway consisting of 2 sets of widely divided, 12-foot lanes with gentle grades and long, easy curves, through a pretty countryside devoid of billboards, honkytonk stands, or grade crossings of any sort. The speed limit is 55 miles per hour and motorists now get from Baltimore to Washington without a single stop, in a half hour or a trifle more. They get there comfortably and safely, too, for it appears the mortality rate on this expressway will at least be as low as on similar expressways—one-third to one-fourth of the death rate on parallel, comparable old-style roads. Furthermore, although the entire length of 29.29 miles was not opened until last October, a part of it was in use earlier and diverted so much traffic from the old road

that only 12 died on Death Highway last year.

Examined in the perspective of 200 years, the history of the now bypassed No. 1 is a discouraging tale of degradation and defeat. And that is the history of most United States highways. Once the highway was indeed a way—"that along which one passes or progresses to reach some place," in the words of Webster. But the rapid development of auto transportation, coupled with laggard upkeep of roads, failure to modernize, and the unrestricted encroachment of roadside business, have turned much of the national highway into a choked, slow-moving business avenue. The basic highroad principle has been forgotten.

This year the Federal Government moved to do something about the degraded United States highway. At the request of President Eisenhower, a committee headed by Gen. Lucius Clay studied the national-highway situation and then made a series of recommendations, predicated on the expenditure during the next decade of $101 billion. This is $54 billion more than would be spent in that time at present rates, and the Clay committee proposed that the difference be financed in part by creation of a Federal corporation that would issue bonds redeemable by gasoline and oil taxes. This drew heavy criticism from Congress as a dodge to escape increasing the Federal debt, and consequently national attention was focused on the plan's financial framework instead of on its farsighted solutions to the Nation's highway imbroglio.

That was very unfortunate. The Clay program is noteworthy for two major reasons. First, it took into account, possibly for the first time in our history, the fact that all estimates of future highway needs have heretofore fallen grievously short of actual needs. An example is New Jersey's new (1951) quarter-billion-dollar turnpike which was to have paid off its cost in 35 years; instead it will pay it off in 22 because its toll receipts are so unexpectedly large. (The turnpike itself is already being widened in places.) Clay and his associates recommended enlargement of the interstate highway system by 1965 to accommodate the traffic volume expected by 1975, when the United States will have upward of 100 million vehicles. If the Clay proposals were put into effect, the United States might find itself in 1965 a little ahead of its highway problem, for the first time in history.

MAKING WAY FOR A CUSTARD

The second salient feature of the Clay recommendations was the emphasis on the principle of limited access. With the exception of the present total of 4,164 miles of throughway, the United States highway system has always operated on the principles of unlimited access, i. e., anyone owning property along a highway has the right to cut as many entrances into it as he wishes, anywhere on his land. When the highway was an empty road traversing wilderness this did not matter. Today, as the example of U. S. 1 shows and every motorist knows, a busy highway that is unprotected from every entrepreneur able to obtain a license to sell frozen custard or footlong hotdogs quickly ceases to be a traffic carrier. This means that the public which may have spent $1 million per mile to get the highway service it needs is quickly deprived of that service by merchants who settle along its edge, lure traffic to the curb and fight every effort to keep cars moving steadily and swiftly. There is a neat illustration of the futility of this at Lafayette, Ind., where a bypass was built to carry east-west traffic around the town's congested business section. However, access to the new highway was not controlled, with the result that it was quickly lined with roadside business and its original purpose defeated. A chagrined State highway department is now considering the possibility of building a bypass around the congested bypass.

To restore the United States highway's character, Clay and company boldly proposed that the entire interstate network be either converted to limited access through relocation or land acquisition or protected against future encroachment by legislative act. This means that 180- to 250-foot rights-of-way would be obtained or set aside for future widening, and service roads would be built to accommodate nearby business. This would eliminate most crossroads and permit 60-mile speeds in safety.

Other Clay recommendations would increase the number of lanes in the interstate highway system by about 50 percent. The system would then consist of 2,300 miles of 6-lane or wider highways, more than 28,000 miles of 4-lane highways and about 7,000 miles of 2-lane highways. All but the 2-lane highways would be divided expressways, with lanes 12 feet wide and 10-foot shoulders for buses and disabled cars to stop on. (One car stopped on the pavement can reduce the traffic capacity of a road by 60 percent and today car disablements occur once every 20,000 vehicle miles.)

Congress will almost certainly pass some kind of highway legislation this session, though not the legislation proposed by the Clay report. A bill introduced by Democratic Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, calls for a Federal-State expenditure of about $18 billion over a 5-year period ($8.6 billion for the interstate system, $9 billion for primary, secondary and urban highways and $330 million for park, forest and other miscellaneous roads). The Gore bill's modest provisions, which would be conventionally financed by Government appropriation, have been attacked by a number of State governors, as well as by New York's famed highway and park expert, Robert Moses, who has pointed out that the Gore bill does not provide for proper land acquisition and that its pay-as-you-go feature is shortsighted, since future drivers who will use the new roads will not have to help pay for them.

Still, the Gore bill has survived Senate committee hearings. The House on the other hand, is known to show somewhat more favor for the Clay plan. Since Treasury Secretary Humphrey has suggested that the Federal debt limit be increased to include the bond-financing feature, it seems possible that some of its provisions may be adopted.

Whether or not Congress adopts the Clay $101 billion program, the United States will spend that much in the next decade on its roads anyhow. Even at the present slim rate of expenditure, it will spend $47 billion in the next decade. But it will spend far more than what it normally spends on road maintenance for automobile insurance to safeguard itself on its insecure roads. And it will spend, unknowingly, about $5.5 billion this year on extra gas, oil, tires, etc., expense caused by unnecessary stops and starts and long waits. That figure will rise to $8 billion a year by 1965.

As a former United States roads Commissioner has remarked, a nation pays for good roads whether it has them or not—and it pays more for bad roads. That being the case, it would seem that the cheaper price tag on the Gore bill is more apparent than real. The objections to the original financing methods of the Clay program were sound, but nothing less than the broad planning and new construction embodied in that program will save the country from eventual strangulation. The obvious problem before Congress, therefore, is to find a sound financial base for a program with the breadth of the Clay proposals.

Statement of Miles D. Kennedy, Director, National Legislative Commission, the American Legion, Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, on Alien Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the testimony of Miles D. Kennedy, director, national legislative commission of the American Legion, on July 1, 1954, before the Special Senate Subcommittee Investigating Administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act of the Committee on the Judiciary:

My name is Miles D. Kennedy, and I am the national legislative director of the American Legion. Our office is at 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

I would like to express to you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the subcommittee, the thanks and appreciation of our national organization for permitting us to appear before you in connection with your deliberations on the bill, S. 3423, to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act.

The American Legion was born as the result of a conflict between Germany and the United States. The legislation under consideration here involves a basic principle upon which the American Legion expressed itself shortly after it was born.

In the preamble to our national constitution we expressed the principle, and it is still there, as follows:

"To make right the master of might."

In presenting our ideas with relation to the pending bill, S. 3423, I hope you will keep in mind the American Legion is motivated solely by its desire to practice what it has always preached, namely, that the right thing must be done always.

During the 1953 National Convention of the American Legion a resolution dealing with the subject matter and emanating from the convention committee on foreign relations was duly adopted. A portion of said resolution reads as follows:

"We urge that the Congress by proper legislation return to German nationals, as has already been returned to Italian nationals, their properties seized and now in the hands of the Custodian of Alien Property."

It is on the basis of the foregoing resolution that we appear before you in support of the bill, S. 3423.

I have read the final report of the Subcommittee To Examine and Review the Administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, filed on or about the 27th day of January 1954.

Several of the statements hereinafter set forth were taken from the final report. I am frank to admit I do not see how the statements as contained in the final report could be improved upon, and furthermore, they appear to be in line with the thinking of the delegates to our 1953 national convention when they adopted the resolution quoted above.

We must keep in mind that the present policy of the United States Government is to encourage the investment of private funds in countries all over the world. A continuance of a confiscatory policy with regard to alien

assets in this country might well find the United States faced with the confiscation of billions of dollars worth of property of its own nationals by foreign governments and a precedence for such drastic measures set by our own example.

As the language which I have quoted from our 1953 resolution will disclose, the national convention which adopted our position with relation to this seized enemy alien property made no reference to the source which we now understand brought about a change of policy in the United States on this subject.

A careful reading of the report adopted by your committee, Mr. Chairman, will, we think, convince anyone that the failure to return seized enemy alien property was due to action started, inspired, and actually carried out by alleged Soviet agents operating within our own Treasury Department during World War II.

We earnestly recommend that every Member of the United States Senate make careful study of the history which is recorded within the pages of your committee's report filed on January 27, 1954. And we also earnestly recommend that every Member of the Congress obtain and study all available information relative to the operations of certain individuals named in the report, after they left the United States Treasury Department and were engaged in operations involving the International Monetary Fund, matters involving reparations, settlements, and so forth. It is our firm conviction that after such a study any Member of the United States Congress would desire, as we do, to correct the wrongs which were brought about by the successful operations of those individuals.

We respectfully submit it is inconceivable that the United States foreign policy can be so inconsistent as to be in the position of advancing huge sums of money to Western Germany and Japan, and on the other hand continue to administer millions in assets confiscated from individual citizens of these countries on a theory of reparations or deterrent to future wars. As was stated by the American Bar Association on March 29, 1943, when its house of delegates approved the recommendations of its committee on custody and management of alien property.

"Confiscation is contrary to the principles of law. It is contrary to our constitutional law principles, and to the principles of international law. When the reign of law for which we are fighting returns, parties injured by confiscation may be expected to seek just redress; and a just administration of law may be expected to award such redress. It has been so in the past, and if the basic traditional concepts of justice have meaning, it will be so again."

Mr. Justice Cardozo, in the case of *Techt* v. *Hughes* (229 New York 222), in referring to the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, 65th Congress, 1st session, Report No. 13, quoted therefrom as follows:

"Under the old rule warring nations did not respect the property rights of their enemies, but a more enlightened opinion prevails at the present time, and it is now thought to be entirely proper to use the property of enemies without confiscating it."

Former Secretary of State Hull on May 27, 1953, the American Journal of International Law, volume 37, January 1943, page 94, said:

"Moreover, the confiscation of these private funds by this Government and their distribution to American nationals would react against the property interests (some very large) of American nationals in other countries. It would be an incentive to other governments to hold American private property to satisfy claims of their nationals against this Government and to pass upon such claims in their own way. It is important from my point of view, therefore, that the United States should not depart in any degree from its traditional attitude with respect to the sanctity of private property within our territory whether such property belongs to nationals of former enemy powers, or to those of friendly powers. A departure from that policy and the taking over of such property, except for a public purpose and coupled with the assumption of liability to make just compensation, would be fraught with disastrous results."

The present foreign policy of the United States is directed toward the strengthening of the free world and integrating Germany and Japan into that policy.

We submit therefore such a policy must be predicated on the development of good will and this can scarcely be accomplished by a punitive approach to the disposition of the property of alien nationals.

As above stated, we as a Nation seek to encourage private investment in foreign countries. If, in the event of another war, other nations should follow the concept of irrevocable confiscation as a retaliatory measure, the philosophy now followed under existing law cannot be said to be conducive to the investment or risk of capital abroad. The problem is of sufficient importance to warrant prompt action by the Congress.

I have read with a great deal of interest the items contained on pages 28 and 29 of the subcommittee's final report wherein reference is made to cases of men born in Germany, and who were serving in the American Armed Forces when killed in action, but because their heirs were residents of Germany the assets of their estates were vested by the Office of Alien Property. In my humble opinion, such action was legally, morally, and ethically wrong and should not be condoned. In such cases, equity and simple justice should prevail.

It is one thing to seize an enemy alien's property while a war is being fought, but World War II has been over now for nearly 9 years and it is high time that the properties seized and still in the hands of the custodian of alien property were returned to the German nationals, especially those who are not behind the so-called Iron Curtain.

The anti-Communist nations of the world are desperately engaged in seeking an era of lasting peace. It is important that we of the United States use every possible means of selling our ideals all over the world.

The return of these vested properties would be a potent ideological weapon in the cold war now being waged for the control of the minds of men. Let us do unto other nations as we would have them do unto us.

To again quote from the preamble to the constitution of the American Legion, "Let us make right the master of might."

Last March when Chancellor Adenauer was questioned about this subject, he said, and I quote from the New York Times of March 8, 1954:

"Any just solution of this question will strengthen the confidence of the German people in the principles of the free world, will make fast the friendship between the American and German peoples and will relieve the German Government of a great worry."

At a press conference a few days later, President Eisenhower was asked to comment on Dr. Adenauer's statement. The New York Times of March 11, 1954, paraphrased the President as saying:

"This was a difficult problem, but he favored a return of the assets seized during World War II, as suggested by Chancellor Adenauer of West Germany."

The United States of America has given West Germany approximately $3½ billion since 1945. The American Legion feels that the ill will which we have incurred by our refusal to return the seized properties of West German nationals, has largely, if not entirely, offset the goodwill which our help to them should have built up for us.

The American Legion feels it is high time that we remedy this condition, reverse the policy inspired by alleged Soviet agents, and return to the West Germans, now among our staunchest allies in Europe, the property which is rightfully theirs.

Your attention is invited to the fact that the seized properties of the Italian nationals were returned approximately 7 years ago.

The pending legislation constitutes a return to the policy of Hamilton, Marshall, Hughes, and Hull, in lieu of the policy of confiscation brought about by alleged Soviet agents working within our midst.

It is my understanding that the United States authorities returned approximately one-half of the Krupp properties located in the American-controlled zone of Germany. If that be so, what justification can there be for continuing to hold properties belonging to German nationals and which are located within the continental United States?

Within the past week, in the course of Prime Minister Churchill's visit with President Eisenhower in Washington, they jointly reaffirmed that West Germany should take its place as an equal and sovereign partner in the western community. To continue at the same time to treat West Germany as a vanquished enemy would be inconsistent to the point of absurdity. The people of West Germany, potentially our strongest allies in Western Europe, can hardly be expected to give us wholehearted cooperation in defending against Communist aggression if we are at the same time trying to relegate them to a sort of second-class status.

I feel that the bill, S. 3423, provides an expeditious method of handling the return of the vested properties to their rightful owners, and at the same time affords reasonable protection to American interests.

Therefore, on behalf of the national organization of the American Legion, I respectfully request that the subcommittee approve the bill, S. 3423, and so report to the full Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

A Defense of Capitalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the following address delivered by Mr. Robert J. Block, of Seattle, at the University of Washington YMCA Public Affairs Forum on April 14, 1955. Mr. Block, a prominent businessman who is active in civic affairs in Seattle, gives a clear analysis of why our dynamic and flexible American capitalism offers the greatest benefit to all of us:

A DEFENSE OF CAPITALISM

(Address by Robert J. Block at the University of Washington YMCA Public Affairs Forum, April 14, 1955)

I am pleased to be your guest this afternoon, and to have an opportunity to respond to Dr. Huberman, whom I had the pleasure of hearing with many of you last Thursday.

Dr. Huberman and I would agree, I am certain, on many common objectives. However, I would take serious issue with him on whether his economic and social system would be compatible with our American tradition and be for the common good. I am

not one of those who cringe at socialism; one who believes that socialism is un-American. I do not trace the right of property to the inherent rights of man conferred by the Almighty.

On the basic question, however, "What system of economic organization is best for our society?" (in other words, what form of economic organization, both in theory and practice, will provide for all the people the greatest in goods and services?)—after this question is examined, I submit American capitalism will meet the test.

Last week Dr. Huberman pointed out that the profit motive created a class struggle of employers against workers, and that since the profit motive was geared to production, when markets dried up there was no production and there were no jobs. Also he said that the business cycle of boom-and-bust was inherent in the capitalist system. He said that the only way that capitalism could take care of its surplus production is by imperialist expansion and by preparing for war. He stated that productivity was the important drive of free enterprise, and that distribution was not considered. We agree, however, that an economic system must produce goods and services for people, and a higher standard of living for all. He suggested that our free-enterprise system was inefficient, wasteful, unjust; that it bred unemployment; that it created parasitic services such as advertising, and other inessential occupations. He said there was no planning and that inevitably this leads again to war and to a class struggle, to a disparity between the rich and the poor, to unequal opportunity, and that the poorer classes had no place to go. He said that socialism would result in no profit motive; that a bureaucracy would allocate resources to meet needs; that they would expand production on the basis of consumption; that we would have a planned and balanced economy and there would never be any general depression. War would be what it is and not serve the sinews of capitalism. He did say that this might not be a utopian society, but it would be a great improvement over our present free-enterprise system.

I suggest that this rather would lead to a drab, conformist community without competition and without initiative—a system which would inevitably lead people to expect and be willing to subject themselves to bureaucratic control, and that the great strides in science and technology that we have made, where they now take 10 years would take a hundred years.

The supporting statistics indicate the dynamic growth of American capitalism and the increased distribution of its productivity and our national wealth. (See table of statistics from the Changing American Market, by the editors of Fortune magazine, Hanover House, 1955.)

The all-American income class—Family units by income [1] group

[In millions]

Income [1] group (in 1953 dollars)	1929			1935			1941			1947			1953		
	Units	Percent	Cumulative percent	Units	Percent	Cumulative percent	Units	Percent	Cumulative percent	Units	Percent	Cumulative percent	Units	Percent	Cumulative percent
$0 to $1,000	6.0	16.44	16.44	8.3	21.67	21.67	6.2	14.98	14.98	5.0	11.21	11.21	4.9	9.57	9.57
$1,000 to $2,000	9.6	26.30	42.74	11.0	28.72	50.39	7.5	18.11	33.09	7.1	15.92	27.13	6.8	13.28	22.85
$2,000 to $3,000	8.5	23.29	66.03	7.7	20.11	70.50	6.8	16.42	49.51	8.5	19.06	46.19	7.6	14.84	37.69
$3,000 to $4,000	4.7	12.88	78.91	4.5	11.75	82.25	6.4	15.46	64.97	7.3	16.37	62.56	8.9	17.38	55.07
$4,000 to $5,000	2.4	6.57	85.48	2.8	7.31	89.56	5.2	12.56	77.53	6.1	13.68	76.24	10.0	19.53	74.60
$5,000 to $7,500	3.1	8.49	93.97	2.0	5.22	94.78	6.1	14.74	92.27	6.7	15.02	91.26	7.9	15.43	90.03
$7,500 to $10,000	1.3	3.56	97.53	1.1	2.87	97.65	1.8	4.35	96.62	2.1	4.71	95.97	2.9	5.67	95.70
$10,000 and over	.9	2.47	100.00	.9	2.35	100.00	1.4	3.38	100.00	1.8	4.03	100.00	2.2	4.30	100.00
Total	36.5	100.00		38.3	100.00		41.4	100.00		44.6	100.00		51.2	100.00	

[1] Consumers cash income after taxes.

Source: Fortune.

Income [1] by income groups

[In billions of 1953 dollars]

Income [1] group	1929			1935			1941			1947			1953		
	Income	Percent	Cumulative percent	Income	Percent	Cumulative percent	Income	Percent	Cumulative percent	Income	Percent	Cumulative percent	Income	Percent	Cumulative percent
$0 to $1,000	2.4	2.02	2.02	5.0	4.42	4.42	3.6	2.30	2.30	3.1	1.74	1.74	2.5	1.13	1.13
$1,000 to $2,000	14.7	12.42	14.44	16.7	14.75	19.17	11.0	7.03	9.33	10.5	5.89	7.63	10.3	4.65	5.78
$2,000 to $3,000	20.8	17.57	32.01	19.8	17.49	36.66	16.9	10.81	20.14	21.2	11.90	19.53	19.2	8.66	14.44
$3,000 to $4,000	16.0	13.51	45.52	15.7	13.87	50.53	22.1	14.13	34.27	25.4	14.25	33.78	31.1	14.04	28.48
$4,000 to $5,000	10.9	9.21	54.73	12.3	10.87	61.40	23.3	14.90	49.17	27.3	15.32	49.10	44.5	20.08	48.56
$5,000 to $7,500	19.0	16.05	70.78	12.2	10.78	72.18	36.3	23.21	72.38	40.8	22.90	72.00	48.4	21.84	70.40
$7,500 to $10,000	10.8	9.12	79.90	9.4	8.30	80.48	15.1	9.66	82.04	17.4	9.76	81.76	24.4	11.01	81.41
$10,000 and over	23.8	20.10	100.00	22.1	19.52	100.00	28.1	17.96	100.00	32.5	18.24	100.00	41.2	18.59	100.00
Total	118.4	100.00		113.2	100.00		156.4	100.00		178.2	100.00		221.6	100.00	

[1] Consumers' cash income after taxes.

Source: Fortune.

Let us first trace a little bit of the historical development of modern economics. What I am about to recite here is brief and by its very nature omits much that is important. It well may be an over-simplification, but it is my view, at least of economic history in our modern times, and for that reason I think it is important for you to understand my views.

In the 19th century, Karl Marx made a tremendous contribution to man's intellectual storehouse. He synthesized history and economics into one academic discipline—approaching man's problems on a practical, political plane. The conclusions Karl Marx set forth came from an examination of and experience with the cruelties, the injustices, and the imperfections of the early decades of the industrial revolution in the first half of the 19th century. Early Socialist doctrine, both before Marx and after him, was developed in this same climate of social injustice. European economic institutions evolved from a feudal and mercantile organization into something akin to what we call industrial capitalism. Unfortunately European capitalism retained many of its feudal antecedents. Many of Europe's political and economic problems today in my view can be attributed to a private-enterprise structure that is rigid and unresponsive to the welfare of the majority.

During this same period when Socialist doctrine was attempting to cure the ills of an ailing Europe, a new country in North America was providing a framework of individual freedom and opportunity unparalleled in contemporary history. The colonies of 18th century America had a simple, agrarian basis. From the Revolution of 1776 and the vast immigration flow of the uprooted from many lands, came a spirit of competition and conquest that opened agricultural and industrial horizons more quickly than the mind could imagine. At the same time, a tremendous technical development in transportation took place, which made possible the rapid exploration and development of the West. Our country was wise in providing free homesteads for private citizens, and there were vast quantities of natural resources available. This provided on the one hand a safety valve drawing off those dissatisfied with their opportunities in the crowded industrial centers in the East; on the other hand, the opening of the West supplied a checkvalve on those employers who were ruthlessly exploiting their labor. American industrial development has been a reasonable balance between the advantages of a free-market economy and the social welfare of every citizen.

Today American capitalism is far different from what it was at the turn of the 20th century. It is a system which is dynamic and which has a record of producing more goods and providing more services than even the most optimistic planners conceived. We

are meeting the needs of an increasing population and constantly crashing through new technical horizons to create living standards undreamed of by the average American. Our present economic era has been called the permanent revolution. I would like to try to outline why I believe this is true.

First, there is a tremendous distribution of ownership, and the initiative rests not only with management but with investors, who constantly serve to prod the operators of American business to new horizons. Opportunity for recognition and reward is only limited by an individual's ability and energy. There are no static classes in the American system. Dr. Huberman passed over this very lightly. He considered, as I recall, that the well-born were privileged and that the poorly born suffered under a burden which was almost impossible for them to overcome.

I suggest that you look around; look at who is president of United States Steel and find out what Ben Fairless' original background was. Look at Mr. Louis Wolfson, who is now challenging the management of Montgomery Ward, and find out where he came from. This is certainly not the characteristic of a static society. Whether it be Robert Young, the great financial entrepreneur who recently took over the New York Central Railway, or the man that he put in as the president, Mr. Alfred Pearlman, you will find American business people who came from humble beginnings, who had ambition, energy, and ability, and who went to the top. On the other hand, in my own personal experience, many well-born young men may enjoy the comforts of family wealth, but they hardly have the position and prestige in the community which would lead one to say that they are a privileged class.

Second, in spite of the many surface defects, there is a basic acceptance of an equality of opportunity in our Government which has given our economy a tremendous vitality and our social system democratic reality. True, equality is not complete; there are areas of discrimination. But certainly any objective social scientist would have to concede that we are making tremendous progress in erasing these blights in our system. The recent decision of the Supreme Court to outlaw segregation in the schools may not be immediate in its implementation, but certainly it is a signpost of where our country is going.

Third, I think that our traditional institutions of free expression, free speech, and free political association have served not only our social system well, but also our economic system. Embodied in the American spirit they have created the type of personality that has met the competitive challenge and produced well. We have far to go. There is nothing in our economic system that is perfect; but on the record and on balance we have produced more, produced goods more efficiently, provided a higher standard of living to our workers than any other economic order. It is for us to constantly reexamine this system, to find out where we have failed and to make it work, not to discard it in favor of some utopian idea which might appear to improve the lot of man—but which I submit in the main would only change the problems.

Fourth, the evolution of our constitutional government has been fluid; it has been able to meet the social and technological changes of our times. However, in my view, the underlying strength of our constitutional form is the principle of limitations provided by the checks and balances in our political system. It has been necessary for the Government to regulate transportation, utilities, and communication, since they are vital for the insured health of our commercial arteries. The Government has also rightly established legal safeguards against abusive monopoly.

However, when the President seizes the steel mills, he has usurped power from the Congress and is checked by the Supreme Court. This is only one example of where Government serves as a means of insuring the economic health of our country.

Capitalism is often cursed as breeding human character which counters the best interests of the people: Greed, and the exploitation of labor, are often equated with capitalism. I suggest that we not criticize the system, but examine the minds and the hearts of men. Is it proper to charge free enterprise with failing to establish Judaeo-Christian morality? Have we failed someplace else, and should not, if this be our complaint, our focus be on something other than the free-enterprise system? No economic system, I submit, inherently possesses pure morality. There can be as much corruption, waste, and human callousness in the administration of a cooperative or a collective farm as in the largest or smallest corporation.

Another charge that free enterprise suffers is that it is a cause—no, not only a cause but a stimulus—of war. I think, however, that the record would disprove this. Look at the number of American capitalists who stand against universal military training; who even take the other extreme of believing in internal retrenchment or, as it is sometimes called, isolation. I submit that capitalism is not a direct cause of war, but when war has come it has proved to be the most productive and efficient system whereby the goods and services of our society can be mobilized to meet whatever threat or challenge has faced our democratic way of life.

As I have said before, American capitalism is certainly not a perfect system. In the last 50 years, however, there has been a tremendous transition in our maturity and our economic stature. Labor unions have reached a powerful position, and now that they have achieved power and recognition, they face the real responsibility of joining with management in providing constructive contribution to the common good. Business must also be responsive to new concepts and ideas. For example, the Tennessee Valley Authority, fought bitterly by most businessmen, has contributed more to the economic stability and the growth of free enterprise in the region it serves than any chamber of commerce project before or since. An increasing number of business leaders recognize that American business must get out from behind its blinders, and realize that whether it be a Tennessee Valley Authority or a free-trade policy, it is not for them to stand and condemn but to be constructive contributors. Clarence Randall, of Inland Steel, who was Chairman of the President's Commission on Trade, is, I think, an outstanding example of the type of enlightened business leadership which America has today. There are others—men such as Paul Hoffman, of the Packard-Studebaker Corp.—who have seen that we cannot live behind our own shores alone economically and must meet the challenge of lower tariffs and develop a realistic trading policy if we are to establish markets in the free world in order to build a hard core of real strength for our survival in the contest with totalitarian communism.

Presently we have an issue of private versus public power on the Snake River, in which private power would like to build low dams which would serve the power needs but which would make it impossible to develop the region in an integrated manner. Many business leaders support the Federal dam program, and it is said in Oregon, which has never been known for its radical politics, that the low-dam policy advocated by Senator Cordon led to his defeat.

Let us examine the Valley Authority concept for just a minute. In fact it is merely the same management technique that General Motors or American Telephone would use if they were spending their own money. Should government be less efficient with public funds? This is one example where the spirit and strength of American capitalism serves to lead the way and show the people how things can be done.

Since the debacle of the stock-market crash in the thirties, we have developed an effective Securities and Exchange Commission. They must be ever vigilant to see that the small investor is protected and that the public's confidence is retained in the investment markets. As I have said before, abusive monopoly must be controlled; but at the same time we must realize that bigness in itself is not a sin as long as it does not destroy competition.

The recognition of the community responsibility of a business was well put recently by Mr. David Rockefeller, senior vice president of the Chase National Bank in New York, when he addressed the Executives Club of Chicago. Mr. Rockefeller stated, in reference to what he termed "Banking's New Look":

"Banks have changed in still another respect, one which also is having important consequence. Their management has become inceasingly aware of its public responsibility. Banks perform a rather unique function in that they are the institutions which bear heavy responsibility in administering the Nation's money supply. Although the profit motive is firmly entrenched in banking, as in other segments of our economy, bank executives have come to recognize that they must examine problems and policies from the standpoint of the public welfare. This was not always so—particularly in days when our economy was less complex and our position in the world less central. Today, bankers recognize that they must respond to the needs which emerge as great social and technical forces work themselves out. Enlightened leadership will be required if we are to keep up with this dynamic age—an age which has the constant stimulus of a growing population, rising living standards, and continuing technological revolution."

All of these trends, coming together in government, make it apparent that government should not be regarded as a dangerous separate evil that we have to live with, but rather be recognized for what it is: The spirit and the will of a great democratic community which can serve all groups within the community.

No, our economic system is not perfect. But if you examine it carefully and compare it to what has happened in countries where socialism has taken over, I submit that we should not discard what we have for a pig in a poke. American capitalism must meet the challenge of improving the public welfare. We must increase opportunities for everyone. And of course with opportunity goes responsibility—an ethical and moral responsibility to our fellow men. We are contributing strength and substance to the free world; we are faced with a tyrannical foe, a foe in which authoritarian efficiency is paramount, designed to destroy everything which we have been brought up to believe is important. American capitalism can meet this test, and look beyond—not to false hopes or dreams; but to horizons of peace—to better roads, to better homes, schools and farms, under a competitive economic system.

Supreme Court Decision in Contempt Case of Philip Bart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Supreme Court decision in the contempt case of Philip Bart would be of

interest to each Member of Congress and urge that each Member read it.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—No. 117—OCTOBER TERM, 1954

PHILIP BART, PETITIONER VERSUS UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(May 23, 1955)

Mr. Chief Justice Warren delivered the opinion of the Court:

"On November 20, 1950, the petitioner was indicted under title 2, United States Code, section 192, for refusing to answer 32 questions put to him by a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives. During the trial in the District Court for the District of Columbia, the Government abandoned 24 of these counts. The District judge, sitting without a jury, found Bart guilty of the remaining eight charges.[1] On appeal, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit reversed the judgment upon three of the counts and, one judge dissenting, affirmed as to the others.[2] From that decision, we granted certiorari [3] and set the case down for argument along with the two companion cases. (*Quinn* v. *United States, ante,* p. —, and *Emspak* v. *United States, ante,* p. —.)

"In response to a subpena, petitioner appeared before the subcommittee on June 21, 1950. He was then general manager both of Freedam of the Press Co., Inc., which publishes the Daily Worker, and of the Daily Worker itself. During the course of the interrogation, members of the committee and the committee counsel posed various questions dealing with Bart's background, his activities, and alleged associates. Among these were the five questions, which, because of petitioner's refusal to answer, led to the convictions now under scrutiny. The particular inquiries involve petitioner's name when he came to this country as a child, his name before it was changed years ago to Philip Bart pursuant to a New York court order,[4] his father's name, and the identity of officials of the Ohio section of the Communist Party in 1936.[5] To the questions concerning name or family background, he raised objections of pertinency; to the other, he unequivocally pleaded the privilege against self-incrimination.

"In finding petitioner guilty, the trial court rejected these defenses as without merit. Before the court of appeals, petitioner abandoned his defense as to lack of pertinency. The majority thought that this abandonment in effect erased petitioner's objections from the committee record and that they were thus faced with "naked refusals to answer." [6] which did not require affirmative rulings from the committee. We cannot agree. The objections were in fact made before the committee and the witness was entitled to a clear-cut ruling at that time, even though the claims were later abandoned or found to be invalid (*Quinn* v. *United States, supra*). Without such a ruling, evidence of the requisite criminal intent to violate section 192 is lacking. An abandonment made 2½ years after the objections were raised cannot serve retroactively to eliminate the need for a ruling. If the requirement of criminal intent is not satisfied at the time of the hearing, it cannot be satisfied nunc pro tunc by a later abandonment of petitioner's objection.[7] Therefore, the issue before us is, upon the record as it stood at the completion of the hearing, whether petitioner was apprised of the committee's disposition of his objections.

"At no time did the committee directly overrule petitioner's claims of self-incrimination or lack of pertinency. Nor was petitioner indirectly informed of the committee's position through a specific direction to answer. At one juncture, Congressman Case made the suggestion to the chairman that the witness "be advised of the possibilities of contempt" [8] for failure to respond, but the suggestion was rejected. The chairman stated:

" 'No. He has counsel. Counsel knows that is the law. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner." [9]

"A few moments later, when committee counsel inquired as to certain details of petitioner's marriage, the following colloquy took place:

" 'Mr. UNGER [counsel for petitioner]. Mr. Chairman, what concern is it of anybody here——

" 'Mr. WALTER. We permit you to appear with your client for the purpose of advising your client. You apparently are old enough to have had some experience in court.

" 'Mr. UNGER. Yes, indeed.

" 'Mr. WALTER. Of course, you know there are many preliminary questions asked witnesses, leading up to some point. As they are propounded you will readily learn what the purpose is. Just advise your client and don't argue with the committee, because we don't rule on objections.' [10]

"The questioning proceeded on this basis.

"Because of the consistent failure to advise the witness of the committee's position as to his objections, petitioner was left to speculate about the risk of possible prosecution for contempt; he was not given a clear choice between standing on his objection and compliance with a committee ruling.[11] Because of this defect in laying the necessary foundation for a prosecution under section 192, petitioner's conviction cannot stand under the criteria set forth more fully in *Quinn* v. *United States, supra.*

"Our disposition of the case makes it unnecessary to consider petitioner's other contentions. The judgment below is reversed and the case remanded to the District Court with directions to enter a judgment of acquittal.

"Reversed."

(May 23, 1955)

Mr. Justice Reed, with whom Mr. Justice Minton joins, dissenting:

"This case is controlled entirely by the rule enunciated by the majority in the second ground for the decision in *Quinn* v. *United States,* decided today. We shall not here repeat our comments made regarding that rule and its application which are set out in our dissent in the Quinn and Emspak cases. But we cannot agree that under the Quinn rule the petitioner here was not sufficiently apprised of the disposition of his fifth amendment and pertinency objections for him to be held guilty of violatnig section 192. For us the record establishes, as it did for the two courts below, that the petitioner knew that the grounds for his objections were not accepted by the committee; that the committee required him to answer; that he willfully refused to answer. As the majority stated the rule in Quinn, page 14, 'The committee is not required to resort to any fixed verbal formula to indicate its disposition of the objection. So long as the witness is not forced to guess the committee's ruling, he has no cause to complain.' Under this rule we think that the extract from the record set out below places this petitioner in the status of one who 'has no cause to complain.'

" 'Mr. WALTER. Did you ever hold any positions other than positions with newspapers?

" 'Mr. BART. I did.

" 'Mr. WALTER. What were they?

" 'Mr. BART. I was organizer and head of the Communist Party at different times, in different years.

" 'Mr. WALTER. Where?

" 'Mr. BART. In Illinois and Pennsylvania, among many.

" 'Mr. TAVENNER. The Daily Worker of March 28, 1936, shows you to have been a section organizer for the Communist Party in Ohio. That is correct, is it not?

" 'Mr. BART. Most likely.

" 'Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you know whether you were a section organizer for the Communist Party in Ohio, do you not?

" 'Mr. BART. I do not know the exact period of time you mentioned. It is 14 years ago.

" 'Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the other officials of the Ohio section of the Communist Party during the period of time you were organizer there?

" 'Mr. BART. I object to this question. I will not answer it, standing on my rights in accordance with article V of the Constitution, and furthermore I protest because this committee has asked this question of numerous people and has infringed upon their rights as American citizens.

" 'Mr. TAVENNER. I think, Mr. Bart, I should point out that your testimony relating to other people who were associated with you at that time could not in any way incriminate you under the fifth amendment.

" 'Mr. UNGER. I should like to correct you, Mr. Tavenner.

" 'Mr. WALTER. You advise your client.

" 'Mr. TAVENNER. You have told us you were a section organizer for the Communist Party in Ohio, and my question now is, who were the officials who worked with you in that work, that is, officials of the Ohio section of the Communist Party?

" 'Mr. UNGER. Permit me to advise my client that Mr. Tavenner, counsel, is in error in his interpretation of the Constitution so far as the fifth amendment is concerned, and that Mr. Bart, the witness, is entirely correct in his interpretation of the Constitution, and has a right to assert that this committee has no right—no right, let me make it plain——

" 'Mr. WALTER. Under our procedure the attorney is permitted to advise his client and then the client, the witness, answers the question. You may advise your client.

" 'Mr. UNGER. As he has stated in his previous answer, he is not required to testify against himself.

" 'Mr. BART. I stand on the advice of my counsel. I am not required to testify against myself, and in accordance with article V of the Constitution I will not answer the question.

" 'Mr. TAVENNER. I was not asking you to testify against yourself. I was asking you to state the names of other persons associated with you.

" 'Mr. BART. I consider this an attempt on the part of the committee to use this against myself as well as against others, as it has on many previous occasions.

" 'Mr. WALTER. And therefore you refuse to answer?

" 'Mr. BART. I refuse to answer.'

"The colloquy set out above pertains only to count 8.[12] We think the record also shows that the committee rejected the pertinency objections on the other four questions which constitute the other four counts and therefore petitioner willfully refused to answer these as well. However, since conviction on any one count is sufficient to sustain the judgment, enough of the record is set out above to show what we consider to be the error of the majority. Since in our view the committee apprised the petitioner that his fifth amendment objection was rejected, it is necessary to state our agreement with the courts below that, as the record shows, petitioner had waived the privilege by his answers to prior questions concerning his Communist Party affiliation and activities. We agree with the court of appeals that this is controlled by *Rogers* v. *United States* (340 U. S. 367); *Bart* v. *United States* (203 F. 2d 45, 51).

"It might be better practice for congressional committees to follow a procedure of specifically overruling objections of witnesses and directing the witnesses to answer in the manner commonly followed in the

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

courts. We feel, however, that in this case where the petitioner was apprised that his objection was rejected and he still refused to answer, it should be held that he is guilty of a violation of section 192. We would affirm the judgment below."

(May 23, 1955)

Mr. Justice Harlan, dissenting:

"I would affirm the judgment of conviction in this case, on the reasoning stated in part II of my dissenting opinion in the Emspak case, No. 9, decided this day. To what is said there I should add what follows.

"Even under the Court's standard of "apprisal" the record in this case is convincing that Bart must have understood that the subcommittee was insisting on his answers to the questions involved in the indictment. I need only refer to the fact that four of the counts of the indictment charge Bart with refusing to answer what was in substance the same question, namely, what Bart's name had been before he changed it. As to these questions the record shows the following:

" 'Mr. CASE (committee member). What was your name at the time you came to the United States?

" 'Mr. BART. I have already answered this question.

" 'Mr. WALTER (committee chairman). What was it?

" 'Mr. UNGER (Bart's counsel). Mr. Chairman, I think we are spending a good deal of time, with all due respect to the Chair, on a point that has absolutely no bearing on any issue here.

" 'Mr. WALTER. That is only your opinion.

" 'Mr. UNGER. I said that was my opinion.

" 'Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the question will lead up to, but it certainly has been customary, when we have been interrogating witnesses who have come to the United States from other countries, to know when they came to the United States, and to know under what name they came, and to know the name shown on the passport. There is nothing improper or out of the way in asking such a question. I think we should have an answer to the question of the name he had when he came to United States.

" 'Mr. UNGER. Are you suggesting the inquiry has to do with what this man did when he was 10 years old? You are talking about a 10-year-old boy.

" 'Mr. WALTER. Just a moment. I think Mr. Tavenner should be able to proceed, and after his questions, Mr. Case, you may ask such questions as you may desire. May I suggest, Mr. Tavenner, that you refresh the witness' recollection by telling him what his name was before he assumed his present name? Proceed.

" 'Mr. TAVENNER (committee counsel). You are a naturalized American citizen?

" 'Mr. BART. Yes.

" 'Mr. TAVENNER. How did you become naturalized?

" 'Mr. BART. Through process of my father.

" 'Mr. TAVENNER. What was your father's name?

" 'Mr. BART. I have already dealt with this question.

" 'Mr. TAVENNER. When was your father naturalized?

" 'Mr. BART. I do not remember.

" 'Mr. UNGER. Just a minute.

" '(Witness confers with his counsel.)

" 'Mr. BART. About 30 years ago.

" 'Mr. TAVENNER. Do you refuse to tell the committee your father's name?

" 'Mr. UNGER. Mr. Tavenner, he doesn't refuse to tell the committee. He is trying to tell the committee that this line of inquiry is a highly improper one.

" 'Mr. WALTER. That is not within his province. The committee determines what is proper and what is not proper, and it is not up to you to determine that.

" 'Mr. UNGER. That is true.

" 'Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the counsel should advise his client and not the committee.

" 'Mr. UNGER. I am not trying to advise the committee. I tried to respectfully point out why it is an improper question. He is not ashamed of his father's name or his mother's name. What difference can it possibly make what his name was when he came here?

" 'Mr. WALTER. We are not going to have you arguing with the committee or giving us your legal opinion, which may or may not be worth anything.

" 'Mr. UNGER. I have no further comment on the question.

" 'Mr. WALTER. All right.

" 'Mr. Bart, you claim citizenship by virtue of your father's citizenship; is that right?

" 'Mr. BART. That is right.

" 'Mr. WALTER. Under what name did your father become a citizen of the United States?

" 'Mr. BART. Under his own name.

" 'Mr. WALTER. What was that name?

" 'Mr. BART. I have already stated my reply to this question as far as I am concerned.

" 'Mr. WALTER. How can you claim citizenship by virtue of your father's citizenship if you don't know what name your father used when he became a citizen?

" 'Mr. UNGER. Mr. Chairman——

" 'Mr. WALTER. Let the witness answer the question. You may advise your client.

" 'Mr. BART. I have answered I am a citizen by virtue of that fact, and that this is my legal name by which I vote and am registered and am known.

" 'Mr. WALTER. When did you legally change your name?

" 'Mr. BART. Many years ago.

" 'Mr. WALTER. Where?

" 'Mr. BART. In the city of New York.

" 'Mr. WALTER. Did you have your name changed in court?

" 'Mr. BART. Yes; about 15 years ago.

" 'Mr. UNGER. His answer is about 15 years ago.

" 'Mr. WALTER. I understand. What name did you change your name from?

" 'Mr. BART. I have already stated my reply to this question.

" 'Mr. HARRISON (committee member). I understand you refuse to answer the chairman's question?

" 'Mr. BART. My answer is that I have answered what my name is here, which is the only question pertaining to the inquiry, it seems to me.

" 'Mr. WALTER. Of course all of this is a matter of public record?

" 'Mr. BART. Correct.

" 'Mr. WALTER. And then I suppose you know that under the law a question innocent on its face can't be arbitrarily ignored. You can't refuse to answer such a question without running the risk of the consequences.

" 'Mr. UNGER. I think, again, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Bart has indicated very plainly he has not been contumacious in any regard. He states his name has been Philip Bart for a large number of years.

" 'Mr. WALTER. Don't argue with the committee. You advise your client as you see fit.

" 'Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the witness should be advised of the possibilities of contempt when he fails to answer a question as simple and as proper as your question as to what his name was before it was changed.

" 'Mr. WALTER. No. He has counsel. Counsel knows that is the law. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.' [12]

"The very fact that the same answer was sought in four different ways must have impressed upon a man of Bart's intelligence that the committee considered his objections unfounded, and wished him to answer.

"For the reasons stated in my Emspak dissent, I do not deal with any of the petitioner's other contentions, save to say that I consider them all untenable.

"I would affirm the judgment of conviction."

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] *United States* v. *Bart*, unreported, Criminal No. 1746–50 (D. D. C.). The opinions of the district court, denying petitioner's motions to dismiss the indictment, appear sub nom. *United States* v. *Emspak*, at 95 F. Supp. 1010, 1012.

[2] 91 U. S. App. D. C. 370, 203 F. 2d 45.

[3] 347 U. S. 1011.

[4] Hearings before House Committee on Un-American Activities Regarding Communist Infiltration in Labor Unions, 81st Cong., 2d sess., 2636.

[5] As phrased in the indictment, these questions were as follows:

"COUNT THREE

"What was the name of the defendant when he came to the United States?

"COUNT FOUR

"What was the defendant's father's name?

"COUNT FIVE

"Under what name did the defendant's father become a citizen of the United States?

"COUNT SIX

"What name did the defendant change his name from?

"COUNT EIGHT

"Who were the other officials of the Ohio section of the Communist Party during the period when the defendant was organizer there [some time in 1936]." Transcript of record, p. 109, *Bart* v. *United States* (91 U. S. App. D. C. 370, 203 F. 2d 45).

[6] 91 U. S. App. D. C., at 372, 203 F. 2d at 47.

[7] Cf. *United States* v. *Rumely* (345 U. S. 41, 43): "In any event, Rumely's duty to answer must be judged as of the time of his refusal."

[8] Hearings, supra, note 4, at p. 2636.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Id., at 2637.

[11] In one instance committee counsel observed that in his opinion the question asked was not incriminating, but this was disputed by counsel for petitioner and not ruled upon by the Chair. When petitioner repeated the objection, stating that he felt the question to be of an incriminating nature, and that he therefore refused to answer, the question was immediately abandoned. See id., at 2638–2639.

[12] Count 8: "Who were the other officials of the Ohio section of the Communist Party during the period when the defendant was organizer there [some time in 1936]?" (R. 109, *Bart* v. *United States* (91 U. S. App. D. C. 370, 203 F. 2d 45)).

[13] The court attaches importance to the colloquy between Mr. CASE and Mr. WALTER shown in the last two paragraphs quoted above, and to Mr. WALTER's later rejoinder to Mr. Unger: "Of course, you know there are many preliminary questions asked witnesses, leading up to some point. As they are propounded you will readily learn what the purpose is. Just advise your client and don't argue with the committee, because we don't rule on objections." Read in context, these excerpts indicate to me nothing more than that the committee was expressing its impatience with interruptions by counsel. I am unable to read the record, as the court seems to have done, as indicating that the subcommittee was avoiding taking a position on Bart's objections.

Very Rev. Msgr. Michael J. Urbonas, LL. D., for Nearly 40 Years Pastor of St. Joseph's Catholic Church, DuBois, Pa., Is the Recipient of Two High Honors in the Short Space of 2 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the residents of DuBois, Pa., regardless of church affiliations, rejoice with the parishoners of St. Joseph's Catholic Church of that city in the two honors conferred upon the Very Reverend Michael J. Urbonas, LL. D., their beloved pastor for nearly 40 years.

Assigned to Dubois in 1915, the year of his ordination to the holy priesthood, Monsignor Urbonas by his quiet and unassuming manner yet fired with spiritual zeal has succeeded in building up his parish to the point where in piety, numerical strength, and value of church property St. Joseph's plays an important role in the religious life of DuBois.

In 1953 Monsignor Urbonas' labors in the vineyard of the Lord were given special recognition when His Holiness Pope Pius XII elevated the popular and highly respected DuBois priest to the ecclesiastical rank of Domestic Prelate with right to the title of Very Reverend Monsignor.

On May 17, 1955, Monsignor Urbonas' alma mater, St. Vincent's College, Latrobe, Pa., conferred upon the learned and highly esteemed DuBois prelate the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

The interesting career of Monsignor Urbonas reveals that kindness, patience, perseverance, and deep religious fervor are to a marked degree responsible for his outstanding success as pastor of St. Joseph's Church, and the interesting story of his priestly endeavors over a span of 40 years is related in the following article which appeared in the May 17, 1955, issue of the DuBois (Pa.) Courier-Express:

MONSIGNOR URBONAS GIVEN DEGREE

Msgr. Michael J. Urbonas, who has been pastor of a DuBois church longer than any other clergyman in local church history, returns to his alma mater today to receive an honorary degree.

His labors for the parishioners of St. Joseph's church here for nearly 40 years gains added recognition this morning at Latrobe, Pa., when he receives an honorary degree of doctor of laws from St. Vincent's college. The degree is being conferred at the Spring Honors Convention. He is one of very few DuBois persons who has ever received an honorary degree from a university or college.

According to Quentin L. Schaut, OSB, president of St. Vincent's college, Monsignor Urbonas, beloved among DuBois area Catholics, was voted the honor by the president and faculty of St. Vincent's college for his many years of outstanding service to the church and to society.

SAME COLLEGE

It was from the very same college 44 years ago that Michael Joseph Urbonas, the son of a West Virginia coal miner, emerged with a bachelor of arts degree, and eagerly awaiting the long years of seminary study in Cincinnati, Ohio. Along with his B. A. degree, he also carried a gold medal which was symbolic of his scholarship, attentiveness to study, and general sterling character.

The recognition granted Monsignor Urbonas today is the second within 3 years for the gentle and retiring priest. In November, 1953, he was elevated by his Holiness Pope Pius XII to Monsignor.

After today, he will be known as the Very Reverend Monsignor Michael J. Urbonas, LL.D.

The honorary degree of Doctor of Law comes primarily for his achievements, both physical and spiritual, to his flock in DuBois; and for his contributions to projects conducted in various parts of the Nation.

HUMBLE START

Today, St. Joseph's parish is housed in a new brick church and rectory, valued at more than $300,000; and the old frame church building, a monument to the pioneer Lithuanian settlers in DuBois, completely renovated and now used as the parochial school.

Where 40 years ago his flock was scattered here and in surrounding communities, today he finds a closely-knit organization functioning on all levels of religious, social, and civic activity.

Monsignor Urbonas was ordained December 18, 1915, in St. Peter's Cathedral, Erie, by the late Bishop J. E. Fitzmaurice.

He originally was scheduled to join the clerical staff in the Diocese of Columbus, Ohio, but because of the urgent need for a pastor in DuBois, the late Bishop J. J. Hartley, of Columbus, graciously consented to allow Bishop Fitzmaurice to ordain Rev. Father Urbonas and dispatch him to DuBois.

But the Diocese of Erie had known of Michael Urbonas before he was ordained.

During his summer vacation in 1911 he had come to DuBois as a seminarian from Mount St. Mary's Seminary at Cincinnati, Ohio, and spent the summer instructing a class of 80 children for their first Holy communion. He was the first seminarian Catechist in the Erie Diocese at that time.

He came to DuBois again during the next two summer vacations and each year his work mounted. During his summer vacation in 1915, when the church in DuBois was closed because of the lack of a pastor, he continued his religious teachings to the children and extended his duties to Sykesville, Helvetia, and Soldier, where he also prepared two large classes for their first Holy communion.

On the day of his ordination nearly 40 years ago, he was immediately assigned to St. Joseph's Church, the pastor of which he has remained until the present. His is the longest tenure in one church of any clergyman in DuBois.

PARISH MUSHROOMS

The zealous and untiring work of Monsignor Urbonas is in the fine buildings and organization that today is St. Joseph's. He had opened a grade and high school in DuBois, and another school in Helvetia with 9 grades, all staffed by Sisters of St. Francis, whose motherhouse is Pittsburgh. The high school in DuBois was discontinued in 1952 because of the shortage of teachers. The school in Helvetia was closed 9 years ago because of the lack of pupils in that small mining town.

Monsignor Urbonas through the years has been guest preacher during religious programs in the Pittsburgh, Columbus, and Altoona dioceses. He also preached several missions, beginning with an 8-day mission in his own parish. He also has given retreats to Holy Name Societies, sodalists, and Sisters of St. Francis.

EDITS MAGAZINE

For a year he was editor of the Priest's Forum and of the Meile-Chrity for 6 years, an editor of Religious Progress for 3 years. He also served as chaplain of the DuBois Knights of Columbus council.

Now more than 60 years of age, he still is quite active.

He is the first Catholic priest to be elevated to the rank of monsignor since the late Msgr. Bernard McGivney, of St. Catherine's church, and the first priest ever assigned to any of the 5 Catholic churches in DuBois to obtain an honorary degree from a college.

Monsignor Urbonas, too, was instrumental in developing the 6 acres that now constitutes St. Joseph's cemetery. He, incidentally, was granted the privilege and faculty to consecrate 4 of the 6 acres.

Following his appearance at Latrobe today, Monsignor Urbonas will go to Pittsburgh where he will participate in the dedication of a new chapel at the Motherhouse of the Sisters of St. Francis.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Adequate Military Strength—The Key to Permanent World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, last Saturday the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] delivered an address in my native State on one of the most important issues before our people—military preparedness.

With his strong grasp of the facts of defense, the Senator from Missouri summed up the forces that are allied against us and the forces that are on our side. He drew from his rich experience as one of the most distinguished Secretaries of the Air Force that we have had.

The speech was made in San Angelo, Tex., on Armed Forces Day, at the invitation of Houston Harte, one of our leading Texas publishers.

I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by the Senator from Missouri be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADEQUATE MILITARY STRENGTH—THE KEY TO PERMANENT WORLD PEACE

(Address by Senator STUART SYMINGTON at Armed Forces Day luncheon, San Angelo, Tex., May 21, 1955)

When one visits Texas one has that feeling of special satisfaction which comes to all of us when considering the many reasons we have for being proud of our country.

That is true also about those of us who are equally fortunate to have come from Missouri; and when you combine those 2 great States into 1 man, as you have done in the case of my host and friend, Houston Harte, you have all that is best about America.

Of course, we also have much of Texas in Washington. There are no 2 finer public servants than those 2 Members of your State who guide the House and the Senate—SAM RAYBURN and LYNDON JOHNSON—"Mr. Democrat" himself and our leader in the Senate—men of destiny in this troubled world.

And then you have Senator PRICE DANIEL, one who has already earned his mark as worthy of those whose traditions have made the representatives of Texas part of the immortal saga of all free people.

I also take pleasure in paying tribute to your outstanding Congressman, my friend CLARK FISHER, who has the special respect of us all for his splendid work on the Armed Services Committee.

Today we celebrate the character and ability of our military forces—our Army, our Navy, our Air Force, and our Marine Corps.

And it is always a pleasure to talk about military matters in Texas. When I was with the Air Force, about one-eighth of it was located in your great State; and for many years Texas has had a fine Army and Navy tradition.

Today the world is hopeful there may be a change in Soviet policy, and that this change may lead toward disarmament, the latter that prerequisite for the most desirable of all attainments—permanent world peace.

But we also know that no successful negotiations for disarmament would ever be possible with the Communists unless those negotiations were conducted from a position of relative strength.

And for that reason, and because of the nature of what we commemorate today, I plan to talk briefly about weapons—particularly about the weapon which may be the most important of all to our security.

The one sure way to lose the battle of freedom in this nuclear age is to be lulled into reducing our Armed Forces to the point where a possible enemy believed they could destroy us in a sudden, all-out, surprise atomic attack, without in turn being destroyed themselves.

We should always remember that in every issue of Communist dogma, under the title, "Problems of Leninism," there appears the following:

"We are living not merely in a State, but in a system of States; and it is inconceivable the Soviet Republic should continue for a long period side by side with imperialistic states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile, a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable."

The above statement of Communist policy has been reiterated many times, and as recently as after the close of World War II in 1945.

Furthermore, Communist leaders denounce all spiritual faiths, dictating as a substitute the cynical and materialistic doctrine of communism.

As we all know, but sometimes are prone to forget, the Communist does not believe in God. That is part of the foundation of his philosophy. He has always fought to destroy religion.

The leaders of Russia have not only constantly reiterated their goal of world domination; they have also predicted the doom of all other political systems, especially capitalism. They have inflamed all Communists against all non-Communists, wherever the latter may be. They have sealed off their own people behind an Iron Curtain, while taking advantage of free access in other countries to create constant distress and confusion from within.

Theirs has been a ceaseless campaign of aggression; ideological, political and economic; and wherever expedient, that campaign has been supported by guns and marching men.

We fervently hope that this recent apparent softening of policy may lead to something better for the world—and we should continue all talks incident to possible mutual disarmament, in the hope they will lead to something better for the world. But we must never let down our guard.

If the Communists lull us into a false sense of security their goal may be closer than ever before.

For many years there has been general agreement that the ultimate military weapon, at least in our time, might well be the so-called intercontinental ballistic missile.

This is a pilotless weapon which could take off from Communist territory, travel through space at a speed of many thousands of miles per hour, and explode in the United States.

Actually, one of these weapons, which only lacked range to be intercontinental, has already been tried in war, with great success.

I am talking about the Nazi V–2, first launched in 1942, and launched in heavy quantity from the Continent of Europe against England in 1944.

This V–2 pilotless weapon had a speed of thousands of miles per hour, and a range of 175–200 miles.

An idea of its lethal effectiveness can be obtained from the following statement in the book, Crusade in Europe, published some years ago by General Eisenhower (ch. XIV, p. 260):

"It seemed likely that if the German had succeeded in perfecting and using these new weapons 6 months earlier than he did, our invasion of Europe would have proved exceedingly difficult, perhaps impossible."

In 1945, the Nazis crumbled before the combined strength of the allied armies. By that time, most of their industrial production had moved from the western half of Germany to the eastern half, so as to be farther away from the ever-growing punitive strength of our bombers.

As a result, the principal manufacturing site for this weapon, including the great missile research and development center at Peenemunde, were both captured by the Communist armies, in their sudden rapid overrunning of East and Central Germany.

Since then apparently the Communists have been concentrating on further development of the range of this already proved missile; a missile which, in case of war, they would hope to fire from their territory against the cities and towns and military installations of the United States; and on which they could have placed by now both atomic and hydrogen warheads.

In radio broadcasts and such papers as Isvestzia, the Communists have boasted repeatedly of their success in 2-stage-rocket development; and any progress in the development of a 2-stage rocket is, in effect, progress in the development of this intercontinental ballistic missile.

Those who have misled the people by minimizing Soviet production ability should remember their outstanding success in the mass production of such weapons as the Stalin IV tank, the MIG–15, and MIG–17 fighter planes, the IL–28 jet bomber.

Nor should we ever forget that, whereas our experts felt the Communists would not have an atomic bomb until 1953 (the British said 1957), they actually exploded one in 1949.

The capture by the Communists of these Nazi V–2 missile factories, along with most of the scientists and engineers involved in its production, should have given them a long running start on this, the most terrible weapon of all.

Note that they have now had over 10 years to lengthen the range of the V–2.

Note also that up to now we have no actual, or planned defense whatever against this weapon.

At the end of 1945, the Communists knew that, by deceit and betrayal, they would

have their great opportunity to fulfill their often-expressed plans for world conquest.

Due to the genius of some of their scientists, plus some traitors on our side, they have now developed both atomic and hydrogen bombs.

They felt sure they were not going to be attacked by the United States.

So all the jet bombers they might well have felt they would need at this time would be relatively short-range jet bombers, whose range could nevertheless be increased by refuelling in the air; and they have built thousands of such jet bombers since World War II.

Naturally, they also decided to concentrate on lengthening the range of the pilotless missile they now knew so much about, because it was laid in their lap by the Nazis over a decade ago—most of the engineering personnel and all of the production facilities.

If this was the complete premise of their thinking, there would have been no reason for them to build medium and long-range intercontinental bombers—bombers comparable to our B–36, our B–47, and our B–52.

The Communists always strive for the best in combat weapons and therefore it is not surprising information just released from the Pentagon shows they have bypassed production of the now obsolescent B–36; but it is surprising to note how far they have progressed in production of models comparable to our latest medium bomber, the B–47—and our latest heavy bomber, the B–52.

I hope soon the administration will give further facts about this Communist plane production. These facts are of vital interest to the free world. They show once again the grim determination of these atheists to rule the world as soon as possible.

But it is the intercontinental missile, travelling at a speed of 10,000 miles on hour, armed with a nuclear warhead, which should give the most concern when considering our children and our country.

Recently one of our outstanding military writers, Stewart Alsop, wrote as follows about this weapon:

"If the Soviets first produced this weapon (the IMB) in quantity it would mean that not only our great cities, but our strategic bases as well, our means of retaliation, would be at the mercy of the Kremlin, and there is not the slightest doubt that the Soviets, ever since the war, have been making a very great effort in the field of the long-range missile."

And later, in the same article, he said:

"Yet something is still lacking—the sense of national urgency which has worked miracles in the past.

"An authoritative nongovernmental estimate is that, given this sense of urgency, plus an absolute priority, Atlas might be in full production 2 years ahead of the most hopeful present schedule—perhaps even well this side of 1960.

"It may sound melodramatic to say so, but those 2 years could make the difference between national life and death."

In any case, one would think that since World War II, the United States would have done everything possible to catch up in the development and production of this missile.

This has not been done, whistling in the dark statements to the contrary.

We lagged way behind. We may be trying to catch up.

But we are not trying hard enough—in fact, for an extended period after World War II we abandoned the development of this missile entirely.

The only sensible conclusion to be drawn from the above facts is that the Communists are ahead of the free world in the race for this ultimate weapon.

In the intercontinental ballistic missile field therefore, it would seem that our reach should ever exceed our grasp.

We should not be too complacent about the size of our subsonic bomber fleet (a fleet that is rapidly becoming obsolescent) or the money we are putting in early warning defense systems (systems which are worthless against the intercontinental missile.)

In order to rush to quantity production of this weapon we should forget any business as usual, any normal workweek. Because he who gets this missile first in quantiy may well be in position to rule the world.

In a pamphlet published recently by the Republican Party, National Defense Under the Republican Administration, there is an extended presentation of various missiles.

Thirteen missile projects are described in some detail. Included in this pamphlet is discussion of an intercontinental ballistic missile called the Atlas.

The pamphlet describes the Atlas as a rocket-powered, guided missile of the IBM (intercontinental ballistic missile) type which would be fired many miles into space (where there would be little atmospheric resistance) and then follow a ballistic arc to the target. Estimated elapsed time between United States and Moscow: about 29 minutes.

Let us remember that if the Communists have put out such a pamphlet it probably reads, "Estimated elapsed time between Moscow and the United States: about 29 minutes."

In a democracy, the people can do what is necessary to preserve their security and prosperity only provided they are given all truth which will not help a possible enemy.

Never has the importance of this been better expressed than in a recent speech by your distinguished senior Senator, LYNDON JOHNSON, when he said:

"No nation can be any stronger than the will of its people. Since ours is a democratic form of government, that will can exist only when it is informed."

As a result of this announcement last week by the Department of Defense about the current strength of the Soviet air force—it is going to be necessary to review our concept of what is necessary for security; and that is why I have asked for a military balance sheet from the Commander in Chief, so the people of this country will know where they stand.

The people are entitled to at least the same kind of accounting as to their liberty and freedom from Communist aggression that they obtain, under our law, from their corporations.

They are entitled to at least the same information as to the safety of their lives that they receive with respect to the safety of their dollars.

With those restrictions necessary to protect vital secrets, they are entitled to a current accounting of the state of the national security.

These are problems for us all and we are entitled to the facts.

We need not a crusade of secrecy but a crusade of truth.

At the graduation exercises of Baylor University in Waco, Tex., on February 1, 1950, at a time this country was steadily disarming, I dwelt on the growing Communist military strength.

On that day I said:

"I remind you that there is little, if any, peace in the world today. We don't have peace just because the guns are silent. Tragically, we do have 'fronts' where the shooting could begin at any time, and no one knows when or where."

Since then the Communists have struck twice—in Korea and in Indochina—and have placed thousands more square miles and millions more people of the free world behind the Iron Curtain.

And now they are looking at Formosa.

Tomorrow they will be looking at Japan and other places.

But always they are looking at the United States—for we are the main obstacle to their goal of world domination.

So, on this Armed Forces Day, it would seem fitting to add another quotation made at Baylor University in that talk in 1950:

"The history of Texas is the history of a battle for independence. May you in the great State and in all our other States remember the cost of such battles. When those who want to represent us in the halls of our Government consistently close their request for votes with the stressing of two words—'peace' and 'prosperity'—let us remember the long rows of those who were sacrificed because of our lack of preparedness, and who have passed on to us another heritage, and who believed that we, in turn, would pass that heritage on to our children and our children's children. Let us ask our statesmen to add a third word to the appeal of 'peace' and 'prosperity'. From Sam Houston to SAM RAYBURN one word is engraved on the heart of every Texan, every true American. That word is 'freedom'."

God still gives us our chance. But let us get on with the job and do whatever is necessary to insure that our flag will continue to fly in the land of the free.

Memorial Day Address by Hon. George H. Bender, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address I have prepared for delivery on Memorial Day.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Memorial Day is always a very reverent occasion. We call to mind at this solemn hour the sacred memory of the young men and women who have given their lives for our country.

It is shocking to realize that in the 5 wars which have taken place since the Civil War, more than 1,600,000 young Americans have lost their lives on the field of battle. Millions more have suffered wounds or incurred serious illness due directly to these wars.

We honor their memory and their sacrifice each year at this time. We could honor their memory far more effectively by establishing a world where no new war casualties might be necessary. This must remain our goal.

Yet, we must remember, too, that all of history emphasizes the eternal need to fight for those ideals in which we believe. No generation has ever found it easy to preserve human freedom. We have never had a century when the world was completely free of devastating war.

The historians tell us that most of these battles have been fought to satisfy some mad drive for power. One nation seeks to dominate another. One group of men wish to seize control of another's lands. A few determined aggressors attempt to exploit others for their personal gain. Rarely in history has there been a war to improve the conditions of men. Our own American Revolutionary War was one of these great exceptions. But even here, if we had received the liberties which our ancestors demanded, the war might never have been fought. Repression, domination, oppression, and tyranny have been the basic causes of all wars.

The philosophers tell us that the earth can be a beneficent, life-giving mother. We could

live in peace and harmony, with enough for all, if men would strive to live as the Bible teaches us to live. In this generation, there can be no other choice.

Today, the folly of war must come home to us even more strongly than in the past. There are no longer victors and vanquished in the 20th century. Our weapons have become so powerful that both sides in any conflict must suffer terrible losses.

Albert Einstein said a few years before his death that he could not describe the specific weapons which would be used in a third world war. But he could tell us the weapons which would be used in a fourth world war. They would be bows and arrows.

A third world war would wipe out all civilization as we know it and reduce us to primitive mankind. In this atomic age, another world struggle is unthinkable, yet there are people who appear to contemplate it. They do not realize what such a war would mean to our own country.

In Washington today the prevailing spirit is one of optimism. Our President, Dwight Eisenhower, hates the thought of war. He got us out of Korea because he understands the futility of such conflicts.

The forthcoming conference of world powers at the level of heads of State has stimulated the world's imagination. We hope that the discussions may cut the Gordian knot which has strangled our foreign relations. We know that international tensions can be relieved if we can reach an intelligent uderstanding of our problems. We are not seeking to impose our way of life upon those parts of the world which do not wish it. By the same token, we do not propose to have others impose their way of life upon us.

Once the Communists realize that we mean business, they will respond to this position with a new understanding of the situation. There is only one deterrent which they recognize. That is the power of superior strength. We have it. We mean to keep it. They must know that we do not wish to use it; but they must know, too, that we will use it if we must.

These are the facts of life—and death—as we confront them on Memorial Day in this year of 1955. The father of peace reminds us each year that all men are brothers. Brothers must live with each other.

I pray with you for peace. Let us do our share to preserve for our children the blessings of freedom—and for all the world, the joy of peace on earth, good will to men.

Influencing of Top Military Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 28, 1955

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address entitled "Has an Invisible Hand Influenced the Top Military Policy?" delivered by Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, retired, before the annual convention of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies on January 13, 1955.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make approximately 2⅔ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $214. I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the cost, to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAS AN INVISIBLE HAND INFLUENCED TOP MILITARY POLICY?

(By Bonner Fellers, brigadier general, retired; Chief, Psychological Warfare, Southwest Pacific Command (General MacArthur))

Fellow Americans, today the views I express represent myself only. And I hold it a privilege to discuss with you some things which have disturbed me.

Several disastrous events have characterized our participation in world politics and World War II. While we have been fortunate to win all but one of our wars, in many instances we won despite gross and costly error. I want to discuss some of these errors and seek to draw lessons.

The first instance was the matter of strategy. Now strategy is a high sounding word, but it really means the gathering of one's forces, integrating them into striking power, and delivering blows well timed and directed against the enemy. A basic element of sound strategy, of course, is to fight only on one front at a time.

Hitler knew this. Realizing that Britain and France would likely declare war on him, Hitler went into Poland, only after he had made a deal with Stalin. Then, with Poland occupied, he turned around and cleared Western Europe. But before he struck Russia, Hitler secured his right or Balkan flank to include Greece and Crete. For the remainder of the war, Hitler fought on one front only until the Allies invaded June 6, 1944.

Stalin, anticipating war in Europe, made a nonaggression pact with Japan which enabled him to fight on one front only. But, our own leaders rejected sound strategy and willingly accepted major combat on two fronts.

What was the reason for this? We wanted to get into the war and we used the blow at Pearl Harbor to enable us to strike in Europe. Now there is too much passion about World War II for us to think clearly today. However, I want to venture the prediction that many of us will live to see the time when cool heads examine the events of the last war and conclude that we did not have to abandon the Pacific.

England was safe; France was occupied; Germany was deep into Russia. Hitler might have gone all the way to the Urals and probably the Red army would have survived, although such an effort might well have led to an end of both Hitler and Stalin dictatorships. In any event, it is difficult for me to understand why we had to throw all our weight into Europe and abandon the Pacific.

Which reminds me—I hadn't intended to tell this—but I have a little personal experience to tell. It relates to the starved Pacific theater. I had been sent home from Egypt by Mr. Churchill in July 1942, because my reports didn't agree with those of the British.

Some time after my return I went to work for General Donovan in OSS. During the summer of 1943 Donovan decided to send me back to the European Theater. I said, "I can't go. The British cleared me out of Egypt." General Donovan said, "If General Marshall will permit it, will you go?" and I said, "Yes, sir." When he asked General Marshall if I could be sent back, General Marshall said that he did not know I was still in Washington; that he had agreed not to station me in Washington or in the European Theater. "He can go to China or Australia," General Marshall said. So I selected Australia. General Marshall said that he would send a telegram to General MacArthur explaining the situation.

When I called on General MacArthur in September 1943 I told him that I did not finagle this detail, that I had my choice of China or Australia. And since I had to leave the United States I elected his theater. General MacArthur replied: "I could tell from General Marshall's dispatch that you knew nothing of the circumstances which caused him to send you to me." "But," MacArthur added: "You are the only thing George Marshall has offered me since the war started, and I just thought I would take it."

The Pacific was, indeed, a starved theater.

The second episode in which we may have made a mistake is a personal experience. While I was stationed in Egypt, in 1942, there were in Palestine about 150,000 troops who could not go back to Europe. They were all anti-Nazi, some Jewish, some Yugoslavs, some Greeks, some free French. They all had been torn from their homes and had lost their families. They were desperate people and they wanted to fight against Hitler.

There were in Turkey at that time some airbases which had been built by the British. From these bases, north to the Baltic Sea, it was only 900 miles. We had a new B–24 bomber which was capable of flying there and back. At that time Hitler was a thousand miles deep into Russia, on the Leningrad-Moscow-Stalingrad line. His supply was over four railways and had those railways been bombed out that vast German Army—220 combat divisions—would have been out of supplies and a thousand miles into Russia.

I worked with the RAF in Middle East headquarters. They gave me the necessary data and we worked out a program to use those men in Palestine to defend bases in Turkey. With B–24's on these defended bases the four railways could be interrupted. With supplies cut off, Hitler would have been a thousand miles into Russia, and rather helpless. I cabled that scheme back to Washington. Nothing happened.

Nevertheless, it did seem like a sound solution. Think what would have happened if the war could have been ended with the German Army deep into Russia. An armistice then would have been a godsend to Europe now.

Upon the termination of my Egyptian service, July 1942, I reported to General Marshall in Washington. He advised that I was to see the President at 11 o'clock, and that the idea of bombing from bases in Turkey had caught the President's fancy. "I spend much of my time talking him out of it; it is very embarrassing to me," General Marshall said. During my call on the President the subject was not mentioned.

However, I would still like to have some explanation of why this plan wouldn't have been sound. You know what the eventual solution was—we waited 2 years longer—very bloody years—invaded Europe, which was precisely what Mr. Stalin wanted—and this invasion was at a great cost to Americans in blood and treasure. It enabled Russia—eventually—to come all the way to Berlin. This gave Stalin the satellite states of central Europe and has resulted in much of the grief in Europe today.

The third instance I want to discuss happened in the Far East. In 1943, I joined MacArthur in Australia. Already Japan's military position was not as strong as past performance indicated. Her soldiers were brave and tough, but they were poorly led. Japan had gone into the war without the necessary resources—and she has few natural resources of her own. So, by the time we reached Manila, it appeared to us that Japan's position was becoming increasingly difficult.

We landed in Japan on the 29th of August, 1945, to take her surrender. Soon we learned that on the 14th of February, 1945, the Emperor, realizing the war was lost, had sent his Foreign Minister to see Jacob Malik, the Ambassador from Russia, and the same Malik of the United Nations. The Japanese Minister asked Malik to arrange for peace con-

versations with Russia acting as a mediator between the United States and Japan.

Mind you, this was the 14th of February, 1945. Malik told me, himself, that he cooperated and messages went back and forth from Tokyo to Moscow—Stalin wanted to know what the terms would be—what Russia would get out of it, and so forth. The Emperor realized that his plan was not working. Nevertheless, he felt his position was strong enough, because of the reverses of the military, to appoint a new Prime Minister.

He appointed Admiral Suzuki. There had been an attempt on Suzuki's life in 1932. At that time the young officers of the Jap Army took over Tokyo and assassinated 200 civilians who opposed Japan's military expansion. Suzuki was a pacifist who had opposed Japan's entry into the war. To save his life, he was forced to go into hiding. So here was the Emperor, able and strong enough by the 7th of April, 1945, to appoint a pacifist as Prime Minister.

For the first time, the Emperor had a man in Suzuki, with whom he could confide. They decided to try a new approach. It was quickly decided to send Prince Konoye, who had been Prime Minister three times, to Moscow to see if Konoye couldn't arrange for peace talks between the United States and Japan. Prince Konoye was to fly to Moscow. The Emperor had told him that he could arrange surrender terms and the Emperor would approve them, regardless of what happened to him in Japan. But, Konoye's effort met the same fate as previous mediation efforts.

A member of the Emperor's staff told me that he heard the Emperor say, as he stood on his porch of the palace in Tokyo in March—he was watching a bombing—"I am going to stop this war, no matter what happens to me, personally."

In July, Stalin went to Potsdam and met our President. At that time, he disclosed to Mr. Truman that talk of peace conversations had been going back and forth between him and Japan. It was unpardonable of the Russians not to advise us that Japan was endeavoring to discuss surrender.

But when I came home—in 1946—I found that all the while our own top officials in our own Government knew Japan was endeavoring to discuss surrender terms. Why we took no opportunity to discuss surrender and possibly end the war then, is a mystery to me unto this day. But the fact that we decided to continue the war, and to continue so that Russia could come into it, has changed the whole course of events in the Pacific.

Let's look for a moment at what would have happened had Russia not come into the Pacific war. First, China would not have gone Red; there would have been no war in Korea; there would have been peace in the Pacific today. Some 150,000 American casualties would have been avoided.

Now, what was the reason for our refusing to discuss peace? I made this suggestion to the Japanese Emperor. "Why didn't you broadcast your appeal for surrender conversations direct to the United States?" He replied that the radio stations were not available to him and that he was virtually a prisoner.

Of course, we all know the Yalta agreement. That is one thing we are familiar with. It gave Russia czarist rights in the Pacific which has led to most of the trouble we have out there now.

After the war ended, another mysterious thing happened. The Boeing plant in Wichita, Kans., received a message from Washington to destroy the means to make the B–29, which was the best bomber we had in World War II. It was also the best bomber that we used in the Korean war.

And the Boeing people took from their plant the jigs, dies, and presses that had made the B–29, put them on a concrete ramp, ran over them with a road-roller and sold them for junk. Thirty-five million dollars worth of equipment, used to make our most potent weapon in World War II was destroyed.

What was going on in Russia at this time? In 1946, the Kremlin's representative on the Allied Council for Japan was General Derevyanko. He had a staff of 186 members, who went about Japan studying our bombings. We had destroyed 66 cities of Japan before the atomic bombs were dropped. The Russians studied and reported this bombing; they interrogated those who were in the cities when the bombing occurred; they probably made the most exhaustive study of bombing ever made.

We had this warning—On August 18, a paper in Moscow, the Communist Agitator, published this statement: "Soviet planes must fly higher, and faster, and farther than those of any other power. The Red air force must be the best in the world." And the Kremlin started right then—with German mechanics, and German technicians and industrialists, and German equipment from plants they had dismantled and taken into Russia—to build what they considered to be the best air force in the world. And it is the largest.

While this was going on, we were reducing our Air Force. We had 250 wings when the war stopped and it was a decisive weapon—the hardest hitting weapon in the war. Within a year we had reduced 250 wings to 2 wings. This reduction of our Air Force and the destruction of the means to make the B–29 were our answer to the Soviets announcing publicly they were building the biggest air force in the world.

This wasn't all that happened. When the Red Army entered Manchuria, 60 divisions strong, they captured a million Japanese soldiers. At this time, the Red Chinese forces were forming in Manchuria. And for the first time they had enough weapons because the Russians gave them the small arms weapons they took from the million Japanese. After this, the Red Chinese had enough ammunition and small arms to invade China and knock off Chiang Kai-shek and drive him to Formosa.

During this time also, we sent General Marshall to China where he was to form a coalition government and make peace in China. The slogan was that everyone wanted peace and the Reds were nothing but agrarian reformers. In China, General Marshall slapped an embargo on ammunition and weapons which the United States was sending to China. Some of the ammunition was dumped in the Indian Ocean. Consequently Chiang Kai-shek was denied arms while his Red enemy was being armed. We tore down our Air Force and we stopped production on the best plane we had, while Russia was building what she hoped would be and is now the largest air force in the world.

Now this is all incomprehensible to me, if you pitch pennies for a crack, you cannot lose every time. Yet, time after time, everything we did strengthened Russia and weakened us.

During World War II, there was a man in the Treasury Department named Harry Dexter White. He came out with a very remarkable study at the end of the war. He said to guarantee us the resources we need for the long pull, we should leave our own natural resources in the ground. We haven't enough resources, he said, to support a war economy anyway. We should, therefore, buy our strategic materials from the outside world. His theory was to lend Russia $10 billion to develop her natural resources so that we could depend on her for our defense production. Fortunately, for us, we were growing apart from Russia, at that time, and Dexter's plan never went through.

But the State Department saw something there which was magic. They saw a chance to say that we need strategic materials from all over the world. Therefore, we must support the countries of Europe because their colonies contain these strategic materials. But if these colonies were to become free or fall into the hands of the enemy, we would lose access to those essential materials and be helpless. The Department of State published a bulletin in September 1950 which said "there were no longer sidelines to war. The only way the United States can keep out of war is to prevent war from happening." This concept offers strength to our policy of global intervention. We now have troops in 46 foreign countries.

Recently the Malone committee of the Senate has made an exhaustive study of the Western Hemisphere's strategic materials. They find we have everything we need in this hemisphere in ample amounts for war production. If we don't have precisely the right materials, suitable substitutes are available. There is no foundation for the theory that strategic materials in foreign lands must remain in the hands of our friends lest we perish.

To safeguard strategic materials was one of the reasons, I presume, that we almost intervened in Indochina. We would have intervened had Mr. Churchill been willing to join hands with us. But because he refused to join hands we decided not to go it alone, for which we should be grateful.

Having grown away from Russia in the postwar era, we adopted the containment policy. Its chief proponent was George Kennan, of the State Department. Very briefly, the containment policy means that upon any act of aggression by a Communist power anywhere about the Communist frontiers we would meet it by equal counterforces. The containment policy took us into the war in Korea. That is why we nearly intervened in Indochina, and that is the basis for our continued aid to Europe.

I would like to talk just for a moment about the situation in the Far East.

We all have great sympathy for the Chinese, who are now more oppressed than they have ever been in their history. And they have never been free from suffering. But there is a very great fallacy in the idea that we ought to fight a war against Red China. I want to give my reasons to you for your consideration.

Supposing we do enter a war with Red China. There is no way that we could supply enough manpower to defeat the masses of Chinese in ground combat. We haven't that many men, even if this 5 million Reserve, that we are being asked to provide, were made available. But some tell us war against Red China would be limited to sea and air action. It is not going to be like the others which got rather bloody. We can blockade with the Navy and we can bomb with the Air Force. And the airmen can be back at the bar in the Manila Army-Navy Club by dark. Of course, Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee will furnish the cannon fodder and take the losses on the mainland.

Chiang Kai-shek has 600,000 men. But he couldn't land in China unless we took him there with our fleet covered by the Air Force. He couldn't depend upon recruits from China, although the Chinese mainlanders would like to join him. But were Chiang to land in China, a Red Army several million strong would pin his forces down in a small bridgehead. Consequently, recruitment of the Nationalist forces would be practically impossible.

Syngman Rhee has a good army but he needs it along the 38th parallel. He would not dare to pull his troops out to invade the mainland of China. If Red China is invaded by ground forces, a great segment of the troops would have to come from America. We could not depend upon our allies to supply them.

All right, we don't have the men, so the only way to win a decision is by bombing. We would use the big bomb. There is no great war industry to speak of in China; their war materials are supplied largely by Russia. We would have to bomb the Red troops in the field and Chinese population centers to gain a victory.

Now, what sign from heaven do we Americans have that says we should drop atomic bombs on tens of thousands of Chinese people whose only sin is they live under a Red Government that they don't like? What would happen if we start such a bombing expedition? All Asia would grow to hate us. Immediately the Communist would exploit it. He would say that we are dropping the bombs on the Chinese, but we wouldn't bomb the white man in Europe. And we would have precisely what the Kremlin wants—a race war against the United States.

And about the time we won, through a very bloody ordeal of bombing, and ran our debt up to six or eight hundred billions of dollars, and pretty well depleted our Air Force, Russia might decide to attack.

All the while we were at war with China, Russia would have been growing stronger. Would we be in position to receive an attack should the Red forces strike? We had all better think a long time before we say, "Oh, thank goodness, at last we have gone into Red China."

The enemy is not Red China—the enemy is the Kremlin. Who supported the North Koreans against us? Who supported the Chinese against us? The Kremlin—there is the enemy. No war that we could fight in the Pacific or in Europe would influence, to the slightest extent, the determination of the Kremlin to dominate the world. We must not be sucked into a war against Red China and thereby permit the Red forces of the Soviet Union to grow strong while we grow weak.

There is a great clamor today, and justifiably so, to get our boys back that are being illegally held and tortured and punished in the prison camps of China. But sometimes we make mistakes, which can't be rectified. I am afraid we made a tragic mistake in Korea when we didn't win—a mistake that may never be rectified.

But if we can do anything to save those men in China, I hold it's not in a blockade of China. Let's notify the Kremlin that we hold it responsible for what is going on in its puppet—China. Let's withdraw diplomatic representation. That would be a signal to the oppressed people under the Kremlin domination that at last we no longer support or recognize the Kremlin tyranny.

This would be the greatest morale factor that the oppressed Russian and Chinese people could possibly have. Where we go from there, I don't know. But the ferment to throw the Kremlin out is present in the Soviet Union. The oppressed peoples don't know where our Government stands and we have never made it clear to them. This withdrawal of our diplomats might be the signal they seek.

This group assembled here today at the Mayflower has more influence than we realize. I believe that it is essential to make known our will to our leaders in the Congress. Let's act to make clear to the Kremlin oppressed peoples that we don't approve of slave-labor camps and that we hate the tyranny under which they are living.

I want to just touch a moment on the call that is coming this month in the Congress for 5 million callable reserves. There are two threats to the United States, and I assume that no one, even the most ardent internationalist, would hold that our military forces are not primarily to defend the United States. If that be true, are our forces in Europe and Asia defending the United States?

What are the threats against us?

1. Over the North Pole from Arctic bases of the Soviet Union, the Red Air Force has about 3,000 bombers which are capable of striking us with nuclear weapons.

2. The other threat is the Red submarines. The Kremlin has 350. Hitler had only 120 in the last war. Those Red submarines now have the capability of launching guided missiles with atomic warheads. These missiles can strike our coastal cities; they are a very great threat.

But how can these 5 million callable Reserves play a role in defending us from those two threats? The first threat—the threat over the Pole from the air can be met only by airpower; airpower that can strike Russian bases; airpower than can take out Red industry and fuel. Red bomber attacks must also be met by interceptors based in North America. And finally, Red bomber attacks must be met by the antiaircraft on the ground. This, of course, is the last ditch stand. It is not too effective.

How do these 5 million callable Reserves play a part in this defense of the sky. They could not. If there is anything wrong with the Armed Forces today, it is that the regular personnel is not sufficiently well-trained. How can we strengthen the Regular forces with Reserves who are scarcely trained at all? We could train every man in America as well as a West Point cadet and the entire lot couldn't influence to the slightest degree, an air attack against the United States or a submarine attack from the sea.

The troops in Europe, we are told on the highest level, are not there to defend Europe. They are there to defend the United States. And every war we get in, we are told when Europe falls or when Germany takes France or something like that, we are next. Yet, in two world wars, we found, after the peace, that Germany had no plan whatsoever to invade the United States.

Now, again, we are told that if Europe falls, we are next. Therefore, we have to have troops over there to hold Russia out of Western Europe. A war in Europe, favorable or unfavorable to us, would in no way keep Russia from bombing us from her Arctic bases, or from striking us from submarines. Therefore, our troops in Europe are not there to defend us because the only way we can be struck is not from Europe, but from submarines and Red bombers from enemy air bases—already in existence—in the Arctic.

Therefore, I see no reason for these 5 million callable reserves. No one has given a reason, except to say that it is imperative we have them. I didn't see any reason for them until I read a piece in the New York Times magazine section about a month ago, written by the editor. It threw some light on this issue. The Times magazine explained that there are peaks which Americans must overcome as we fulfill 20th century destiny of leadership. The first peak is high taxes; we have to have them, and we have got to get accustomed to them. The second peak to overcome is universal military training, which is imperative. The third peak to overcome is that we must become accustomed to our youth garrisoning critical global areas threatened with aggression. So this possibility is the reason for this vast reserve which we are about to create if the law is passed.

Can stationing troops in these threatened countries save them from Communist domination? We don't want Russia to nibble off country after country until we are the only one left. Let's look deeper. Suppose we put 10 American armies on the northern frontier of Indochina and they sealed that frontier off so that no Chinese or Russians could come across it. Might not the governments behind those 10 armies be undermined and become Communist? I doubt the wisdom; I doubt the effectiveness of stationing troops all over the world to prevent certain regions from going Communist. Communism isn't stopped by bayonets.

America is the only free country left in the world today. It's not selfish of us to say it is time we regained control of our own national destiny. I have listed instance after instance—and there are many more—of high-level planning in which we planned something that helped Russia and weakened us. We have got to get control of ourselves and stop such planning. We finally must turn to doing what is best for America. This is not at all selfish. We are the only free country left, and when freedom is lost here, it is lost everywhere. Our only hope is to keep our country free in this dark world which is moving about us. I urge each of you to search your souls to see if you cannot draw some lesson from these tragic instances in which we help our enemy and weaken ourselves. If the lessons are clear, make your will known.

Can we survive if, in the future, we continue the mistakes of the past? The Constitution put the power in the people. Let's exercise it.

Thank you.

West Virginia Public Schools 1 Year After the Supreme Court Decision on Segregation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from Mr. Roy Wilkins, executive secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which gives the findings of a survey made by the association of the progress of public school desegregation in West Virginia in compliance with the decision of the United States Supreme Court of May 17, 1954. I urge my colleagues to read this letter for the evidence of constructive progress which it provides.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
May 24, 1955.

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: I thought you might be interested in the findings of a survey which our association has made on the progress of public school desegregation instituted in compliance with the decision of the United States Supreme Court of May 17, 1954.

I am happy to report that our survey indicates that the State of West Virginia has been in the forefront in desegregating its public schools. Our report indicates that of the 44 West Virginia counties in which Negro schoolchildren live, 12 have completely integrated their public schools and 17 others have initiated desegregation in varying degrees.

Mr. W. W. Trent, the State superintendent of schools, informs us that 12 high schools, 37 junior high schools and 86 elementary

schools have been desegregated in the State. These schools have a total enrollment of 45,600 pupils. The great majority of Negro children still attend all-Negro schools. However, 19 such schools have been eliminated and their pupils absorbed into integrated schools.

This record was achieved on a voluntary basis inasmuch as the Supreme Court had not yet handed down its final decrees in the public school segregation cases.

There was, as you will recall, one unfortunate incident in which desegregation was rescinded at White Sulphur Springs in Greenbier County after an adult-inspired strike among high school students. The school board capitulated to this antidemocratic demonstration. In sharp contrast to this an incipient revolt at Four States in Marion County was promptly quelled by Judge J. Harper Meredith as a rebellion against the Government and threatened to jail offenders.

At the college level West Virginia following May 17 last opened its 11 State institutions of higher learning, including 2 for Negroes, to all qualified students, irrespective of race. Interestingly, the number of white students attracted to the two formerly all-Negro colleges exceeds the number of Negro students attracted to the previously white colleges. There was a sizable enrollment of white students at the State colleges at Bluefield and at Institute.

We are all gratified by the progress in West Virginia and we confidently expect that with the opening of school in September of this year there will be no public schools in the State from which any student is excluded by reason of race or color. We believe that the example set by West Virginia should be helpful to other States faced with the same problems and which have not yet initiated desegregation.

Very sincerely yours,

ROY WILKINS,
Executive Secretary.

Most Powerful Force in World Is Woman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL M. LANDRUM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article written by Dr. Pierce Harris, of Atlanta, Ga., for the editorial page of the Atlanta Journal.

Dr. Harris is a former country boy from north Georgia, a former minor and major league professional baseball player, and now one of the great Methodist ministers of our Nation and powerful influence for all that is good for America.

Dr. Harris contributes regularly to the editorial pages of our newspapers, and many will enjoy and all agree with his article entitled "Most Powerful Force in World Is Woman":

MOST POWERFUL FORCE IN WORLD IS WOMAN

(By Pierce Harris)

One phase of my life that brings a big thrill is the opportunity to meet students on university and college campus levels, and sit with them at roundtables when they come to grips with the realities of life.

You hear a lot of loose talk about the revolt of youth. Let me tell you my experience, my grey-bearded friend. I have had much more trouble with the revolt of age, against the departure of youth than I have ever had with the revolt of youth against the advance of age.

Youth is impetuous and often takes the wrong road because it was moving so fast it didn't see the turn. Age turns to the left with calculated deliberation. Age does wrong knowing it is wrong, but blindly treads the path, hoping against hope that "It won't happen to me." Always it happens.

PUZZLING QUESTION

In a roundtable at the University of Tennessee this question came up: "What is the most powerful influence in life?" It is just like youth to raise a question that philosophers would turn back from—something like "fools rushing in where angels fear to tread." It caused quite a discussion.

Electricity got a big vote. Radio, television, the airplane, and the atom had their friends around the table. But the accolade went to a little girl with brown hair and blue eyes who maintained that woman is the most powerful influence in the world. There is no doubt about it. She was right. The others finally furled their flags and stood with her.

Woman is without any doubt or debate the most influential force the world ever saw.

Since this is the day of the emancipated woman their decision was doubly important. Either good or bad, and there are both kinds, woman wields the greatest power. She has her hand more firmly fixed on life than any of God's living creatures.

LIKE HEAVEN

A bad woman leaves back of her a trail of soil and stain—a sad, dark, cloud of suffering, engulfing all who come within her baleful shadow.

A good woman comes nearer being an ambassador of the Kingdom than any other living thing. She is so nearly like heaven that in her train comes an atmosphere suggestion the choir invisible, singing the praises of its God and King.

In this changing world, here is one thing that has not changed, and God will never let it change: The heart of a good woman is the repository in which the good Lord hides the ideals out of which He will someday build a better world. It is unchangeable—like the law of the Medes and the Persians.

It could happen—but rarely ever does—that a good man would carry on without the support of a good woman at his side. He would find it a hard task. In nearly every case, where you find a fine man, doing great good, you find a good woman at his side, praying for him, loving him and believing in him. That believing is the priceless ingredient. To be believed in by a good woman is indispensable. Maybe God has given up on us men. You couldn't blame Him. Those college kids may have something. "A good woman is more to be desired than gold—yea than much fine gold."

President Says He Will Not Wreck TVA—We've Heard That Before

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in the 1952 national campaign General Eisenhower—then a candidate for the Presidency—went into the State of Tennessee and assured the people there that, if elected, TVA would be supported to its maximum efficiency. Immediately following his election and inauguration, the people of Tennessee and the Nation were shocked with the announcement of the so-called Dixon-Yates deal—a private-power syndicate scheme to invade the TVA and to break the yardstick rate on electric power. This deal by the private-power monopoly, sanctioned and supported by the President, would render to the TVA a death blow.

Most recently, Mr. Speaker, the President has felt called upon, as a shameful defense of his many unfriendly acts against TVA—a great agency of our Government—to issue a statement that he would not wreck TVA. This was just in advance of a Hoover Commission report directed at killing TVA by dividing its activities and proposing the sale of the power program and also a Budget Bureau restrictive and throttling financing program which would mean high rates to consumers and the end to TVA's effectiveness and usefulness.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, the press today along with many others are saying, "We've Heard It Before."

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD 2 recent editorials—1 from the Nashville Tennessean, dated May 19, last, and another from the Louisville Courier Journal, dated May 22, last. The editorials follow:

[From the Nashville Tennessean of May 19, 1955]

WE'VE HEARD IT BEFORE

Another campaign year is just ahead, and President Eisenhower announces that he never will wreck the TVA. It is a going, historical concern, he says, and not many people quarrel with the purpose for which it was established.

All this in answer to a question about reports that the Hoover Commission on Government Reorganization is about ready to recommend that the steam-plant facilities of TVA be turned over to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Well, the President couldn't say about that but he thinks the Hoover group has served a very great purpose. Seemingly, he reserves judgment on the forthcoming recommendations on TVA and public power in general.

It is always interesting to hear the President express sympathy for TVA in ambiguous phrases, after the fashion of 1952's memorable campaign. But after more than 2 years of constant attack on what he has branded as "creeping socialism," he can now expect to be judged by actions instead of words.

Will the foremost champion of the Dixon-Yates contract kindly be more explicit?

[From the Louisville Courier Journal of May 22, 1955]

HE WOULDN'T WRECK, JUST STARVE, TVA

President Eisenhower's smiling insistence that he would never do anything to wreck the Tennessee Valley Authority must have caused a chill to run up the spines of TVA supporters. For the President has been making this sort of reassuring sound since the day he started running for the White House. And just as consistently have he and his advisers been moving to starve TVA into such a weak state that it will be no annoyance to the private power interests.

Some of the President's defenders in the Tennessee Valley have been protesting that the President doesn't mean to hurt TVA, but that he doesn't really understand the true nature and function of the agency. It is discouraging to think that a President must be excused on the grounds that he doesn't know what is going on. It is his duty to know what is going on. And from the record it is not unreasonable to believe that the President does know what is happening to TVA.

It was President Eisenhower who brought into Government, as head of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, the ardent Brickerite and TVA opponent, Clarence Manion. It was the President who brought back into Government Lewis L. Strauss, an acknowledged foe of TVA. It was Mr. Eisenhower who appointed Strauss to the chairmanship of the Atomic Energy Commission, from which position Strauss was instrumental in bringing about the doubtful Dixon-Yates contract.

While he was campaigning for votes in the Tennessee Valley, Mr. Eisenhower promised to develop TVA to its maximum efficiency. But once elected, it was the President who referred to TVA as an example of creeping socialism, a pet phrase of private utility propagandists. It was the President who went out of his way, during the dedication of McNary Dam, to warn against the monopolistic practices of the TVA and other public power agencies, ignoring the fact that all public and municipal power agencies of the United States combined produce less than 19 percent of our electricity. It was the President who first laid down the rule against creation of new power-producing facilities in the TVA system. And it was the President who, by refusing to reccmmend funds for the Fulton steamplant near Memphis, left the way open for the Dixon-Yates scheme.

Mr. Eisenhower now raises his hands in horror at the idea that he would do anything to wreck TVA. But he chose for his administrative assistant Sherman Adams, a private-power spokesman who has fought public power in New England for years. He chose for his Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, an arch foe of public power and an old enemy of TVA. He refused to reappoint as Chairman of the TVA Board, Gordon Clapp, who knew the job and believed in the agency. Instead, he dumped Clapp and appointed Gen. Herbert Vogel, a military man who knew nothing about TVA.

President Eisenhower, who creates the impression of being quaintly unpolitical, has handled the TVA with all the political skill and cynicism of a Brooklyn wardheeler. Why, gracious, no, he isn't going to kill TVA. He is just going to slash its appropriations and let it starve, so that the private power interests, like Dixon-Yates, for example, can close in and take over. With such great-hearted leadership, is it any surprise that Republicans in Congress have introduced 13 bills proposing to sell TVA to the highest bidder, and that the Hoover Commission is readying a report that will recommend that the country get rid of TVA once and for all?

Should the Panama Railroad Be Abandoned?—Views of General Steese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in an administrative way action has been taken for the discontinuance of the Panama Railroad of historic fame. Last year, on the Isthmus of Panama and elsewhere there was celebrated the centenary of the completion and opening to traffic of this, the first transcontinental railway of the Western Hemisphere. Its record is one of signal achievements, and it has earned for its owners—whether private, or as an agency of the United States Government—vast totals of dividends. In various emergencies of isthmian life it has served beneficial causes in the most vital fashion. If permitted to endure it may likely prove a very much-needed policy of insurance in times of emergency or disaster, as, for instance the closing of the Panama Canal for any considerable period through slides, or through other causes.

It appears that at the annual reunion of the Panama Canal Society of New York on the 7th of May 1955, the guest speaker was our former colleague, Dr. Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky, the sole surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission. In his remarks on that occasion he took the position that the Panama Railroad should be continued, urging that future needs and requirements of the Panama Canal and the isthmus justified such action.

On the 21st of this month, at the annual meeting of the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D. C., a distinguished Army engineer, Lt. Gen. James G. Steese, retired, gave his views on the indicated subject, and I believe that, coming from so eminent an authority, they are worthy of incorporation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and under leave accorded, I am including them as a part of my remarks.

I may add that the question of whether or not the Panama Railroad should be discontinued and supplanted by a second roadway across the Panamanian Isthmus, is a very serious one, and requires the most careful consideration by the Congress and the responsible committees. This has been, and is, my viewpoint, and that of the House Appropriations Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman. The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—the so-called Hoover Commission—in its report to Congress in March 1955, in discussing the proposed abandonment, expressed a similar judgment, embodied in the specific report on the subject by a member of the Commission, our colleague, Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio. From that report the following summarizing recommendation is quoted:

It is recommended that the appropriate committees of Congress examine the circumstances surrounding the decision to abandon the Panama Railroad before it authorizes or appropriates in favor of the new highway construction.

There follows the remarks of General Steese on the subject:

REMARKS OF GEN. JAMES GORDON STEESE, D. S. M., EX-ENGINEER OF MAINTENANCE, THE PANAMA CANAL, AT ANNUAL LUNCHEON OF PANAMA CANAL SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 7, 1955

Mr. President, Mr. Toastmaster, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure, as well as an honor, to be your guest upon this occasion, where I see so many of the few old-timers left from construction days. I first went to the Isthmus in August of 1907, and last visited there last October. I have, therefore, been more or less in close touch with the project for 47 years, during which time I had 2 tours of duty under Colonel Goethals, 1907–12, and served throughout World War II, 1941–47, under 2 successive Governors. In the intervening years, I made many vacation trips to the Isthmus to see my friends and to keep up with the job.

Starting as a rodman on preliminary surveys for the Panama Railroad relocation, I worked up to assistant engineer, a high title in those days. Later I served as assistant engineer of maintenance, acting general manager of the Panama Railroad, engineer of maintenance, and finally assistant to the Governor.

It so happens that I was chief of party and transitman on the plugging through of the final location of the railroad from the Bohio Ridge across the swampy bottom of the future Gatun Lake and cleared the right-of-way through the heaviest jungle in the world to the Gatun Ridge, and later witnessed the construction from our base camp at Monte Lirio.

I have recently returned from a 14 months' zigzag trip around the world, and have just gotten access to the Comptroller General's Audit Report on the Panama Canal Company for fiscal year 1954. In it he reports that last October the Board of Directors approved recommendation by the president of the company that the Panama Railroad be abandoned, that a trans-Isthmian highway totally within the Canal Zone be constructed at an estimated cost of $9 million and that the company include in the 1956 budget provision for the purchase of a fleet of motor vehicles for the transportation of canal freight and passengers (estimated cost not stated).

The report further stated that traffic over the existing trans-Isthmian highway is insufficient to warrant a new highway at this time, and that this highway was built and paid for by the United States, is still maintained at United States expense, and though under the jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama, there are no restrictions imposed on United States Government agencies or their employees.

In the House Appropriations Committee Report No. 603, May 15, 1955, it is stated that a majority of the committee believes that the abandonment of the Panama Railroad should be looked into by the appropriate legislative committee before any further action is taken. The committee also takes a slap at the board for their converting the steamship *Panama* to a freighter and immediately thereafter reconverting her to a passenger carrying vessel. It states: "Such indecision reflects improper planning and it naturally prompts inquiry on the part of the committee."

I am informed that the Hoover Commission's recent report on transportation recommends against the abandonment of the Panama Railroad, and states that the recommendation therefor seems to be conditioned by the desire to build a new highway. The two things should not be confused.

Identical bills have been introduced in the Senate by the Honorable THOMAS E. MARTIN, Republican, Iowa, and in the House by the Honorable CLARK W. THOMPSON, Democrat, Texas, calling for an independent interoceanic canals commission to investigate and report upon the enlargement of the present canal, which has been in abeyance since the Secretary of War suspended construction on the third locks project in May 1942. It is to be hoped hearings may be held soon with a view to getting action in the current Congress.

As to the abandonment of the Panama Railroad, the only reason I have seen alleged

is that it has had a small operating deficit in the last 2 years. But that is mere bookkeeping. If the railroad were given full credit for free passes to Panamanians and others and for cut rates to canal employees, I am confident such apparent deficits would disappear. But even at that the proposed cost of a highway, which, after all, is merely a figure plucked out of the air, would pay for such deficits, if any, for untold years to come, and we would still have the railroad as a going concern and a pledge against the future.

The Panama Railroad has recently celebrated its 100th anniversary, during which time it has returned fabulous profits to its owners, including several times its original cost in dividends paid into the United States Treasury. It has been repeatedly stated that the canal could not have been built without the railroad. I have never seen such statements challenged. Certainly we could not have handled World War II without it with the facility that we did.

In addition to dividends of some $25 million, the railroad was required in World War II to give to Panama some $12 million worth of real estate, without any consideration whatever, upon which it was receiving rentals of about $350,000 per annum. Under the recently negotiated treaty, it is required to transfer, again without any consideration whatever, its Panama terminal, including the railroad station, which is the handsomest building in Panama. It would seem that the United States is gutting the Panama Railroad to meet real or fancied political or diplomatic obligations of no interest to the railroad.

As to the utilization of the railroad right-of-way for a modern four-lane highway, such a proposal would be extremely hazardous. For the 5 miles across Gatun Lake there is only a single-track embankment over 70 feet high on a mud bottom of unknown depth. We had to put many millions of cubic yards of fill from Culebra Cut in excess of the normal prism to make it stand up. Instead of the normal 1½–1 slopes, we had 4–1 slopes, plus a heavy rock dike along both ties as a partial counterbalance. The highest sections were built up in 3 or 4 successive stages. We had slips and slides. What the total vertical settlement was, I do not recall. On a lower fill across Stilsons Pond, an arm of Gatun Lake, near the Gatun railway station, I do remember that the total vertical settlement was 126 feet.

And that was in the dry. The embankment is now saturated by the lake on both sides. To widen it for a modern highway would involve dumping millions of yards into the lake from one or both sides, as the maximum lake level is 87 and the subgrade on the embankment 92 feet above sea level. Were the equilibrium of the existing fill to be disturbed, the whole thing might disappear overnight, as happened too often during construction days.

The old Panama Railroad followed a water grade, and is now, in this neighborhood, under about 75 feet of lake. When it was double tracked to get Culebra Cut excavation to help build Gatum Dam, there was one section through the Black Swamp where it was found impracticable to widen the embankment, so a gantlet track was installed. Even then the track would sink under the swamp for 12 or 14 feet overnight. Borings were taken to 228 feet, without striking bottom, but the drill did hit what seemed to be a French dumpcar. There had been several upheavals and subsidences within geological times, and under Gatun Dam are two prehistoric canyons over 200 feet deep, representing former channels of the Chagres River, subsequently filled up with black muck.

At the International Engineering Congress, held at the Panama-Pacific Exposition in San Francisco in 1915, General Goethals submitted a symposium on the Panama Canal, by himself and his chief assistants, which was published in two volumes. Frederick Mears, then chief engineer of the Panama Railroad, submitted a paper with wonderful photographs showing the railway construction troubles. I have not access to these volumes at the moment, but I was one of Mears' lieutenants on the Panama Railroad relocation, and some 15 years later succeeded him as chairman and chief engineer of the Alaska Railroad.

To sum up, in my opinion, the abandonment of the Panama Railroad is ill advised and unjustified, and the replacement by a modern highway both hazardous and of indeterminate cost.

Congressman With Integrity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial on the status of forces agreement and the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. The editorial appeared in the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item of May 20, 1955:

CONGRESSMAN WITH INTEGRITY

Our neighboring State of Ohio has a Congressman who is against passively allowing our servicemen to be thrown into foreign jails without the right of trial by jury.

This Congressman is Representative FRANK BOW, living near Canton.

He is aware of the act of would-be traitors to our country who approved a treaty nearly 2 years ago which strips our fighting men of constitutional rights.

Representative BOW took a healthy whack at that treaty when the current military Reserve measure was before the House. He proposed an amendment to the bill which would free any man taken into the Reserve hereafter from loss of his rights as a citizen of the United States.

His courageous stand won a 174 to 56 vote of acceptance.

Under the bungling leadership of former President Truman, a treaty was negotiated with foreign nations, which gives them the right to arrest, try and sentence United States servicemen according to foreign law.

Where a man in service is taken into custody for a law violation, he cannot claim his legal rights as a citizen of the United States. He is presumed to be guilty and must prove his innocence.

Already there are instances where our own men in service have been thrown into filthy jail cells by order of a foreign judge acting without a jury. Their sentences in some cases have been greater for their smaller offenses than are the sentences given to native citizens for greater violations of the law.

The treaty agreement under which this unjust action is approved was passed July 24, 1953, only 6 months after the Eisenhower administration came into office.

Seventy-two United States Senators voted to rob of citizenship these men we send overseas to stand guard. If they cannot claim the Constitution as their supreme law they are denied citizenship's greatest protection.

With shame we report that only 15 United States Senators were men enough to vote against the enslaving device of treaty law.

There is involved in such treaties the question of the authority of any such agreement to deprive any citizen of this country of a single constitutional right.

Former President Truman is not entirely to blame. The job that he started was carried out by President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles.

They approved this move to please foreign allies at the expense of the individual rights of the men who are thousands of miles from home helping to defend those either unable to defend themselves from Red attack, or who are too cowardly to fight for their own people.

Even now the Eisenhower administration is trying for the second time in 2 years to block the passage of an amendment to our Constitution which would prevent any treaty with a foreign nation from becoming the law under which citizens of the United States would have to live.

These leaders are betraying their trust and sworn obligations to this Nation.

Address by Gen. Thomas D. White, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, at the Armed Forces Day Dinner Sponsored by the Pittsburgh Chapter of the Military Order of the World Wars, Pittsburgh, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

ADDRESS BY GEN. THOMAS D. WHITE, VICE CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, AT THE ARMED FORCES DAY DINNER SPONSORED BY THE PITTSBURGH CHAPTER OF THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS, PITTSBURGH, PA.

I know of no more appropriate place than Pittsburgh to commemorate Armed Forces Day. Since its beginning as Fort Pitt, this city has had a long and illustrious history. For a generation Pittsburgh was a military outpost, protecting our frontier and serving as a gateway to the West.

The theme of this Armed Forces Day is power for peace. Power has been a byword of the Pittsburgh area. Coal and steel produced in this region have contributed to our Nation's strength and growth in peacetime and to our military power in war.

Industrially you have looked ahead. Research as well as production has been another of your notable accomplishments. Laboratories, along with factories and mills, line your river valleys. You have some of the leading research agencies in the country. Your scientific institutes are among the oldest and largest in the Nation.

I cite these accomplishments not simply as an appeal to your civic pride. I stress them because they are elements we must have in the power for peace relationship.

Our main problem today is to maintain a position of strength. Much of our strength must be military. Our defense establishment must fulfill a twofold need.

First, we must have the forces to meet and beat an attack if one should come today. This emphasizes the importance of forces-in-being.

Second, we must keep up our effective strength for an indefinite period, 10, 20 years

or perhaps even longer. I stress the word effective. Large numbers of planes, ships, and divisions would be worthless unless they are effective against an enemy; and to be effective they must be superior. This means we must develop weapon systems that keep us ahead of the enemy.

In short, we must be ready at any time and for a long time. Meeting these needs poses a problem more difficult than any we have ever faced in history and it means larger and more expensive peacetime forces than we have ever had.

In the years after World War II the Soviets were building up their forces while we were reducing ours. They outnumbered us in men, guns, tanks and planes. They still do. But despite their great numerical advantage we were, and still are the main obstacle to their aggressive aims. Their massive army and their many planes have been a powerful influence on the Eurasian land mass. But these forces have not been capable of exerting strong military pressure directly against the United States.

On the other hand, the United States had the means of exerting military pressure directly against the vital centers of the Soviet Union. The fact that we had this ability while they did not put them in an inferior strategic position. Although their ambitions for conquest were not dampened, they were wary of starting anything that might result in their having to face the full power of the United States.

Faced with this situation, the Soviets looked for a way out. The answer was obvious. The practical way for them to put real pressure on the United States—and at the same time relieve some of the cold-war pressure we were able to put on them—was to develop long-range nuclear air power. With long-range air power they would have the ability to strike directly at this continent. With nuclear weapons they would have the ability to use their air power with tremendous effectiveness.

Building this force and these weapons presented the Soviets with a problem they had never before faced. In the past they had created little in the way of new weapons of war. In World War II, their allies provided most of their up-to-date weapons. Their ships, planes, tanks, and guns were largely adaptations and modifications of existing weapons.

The Soviets further developed this ability to copy, and they used our B–29 as well as captured German planes and missiles as models. In the post-war period they profited by the spying and defection that was going on in the field of nuclear weapons, and they copied some more.

However, the Soviet goal was not just to catch up; it was to get ahead. They had entered a race in which we had a head start. The result was this: For the first time they had to develop a technical structure that could create new weapons. This decision to embark on an air power-nuclear program is significant. It marked the first real forward step by the Communists into the field of technology.

When they embarked on this program to create new weapons it marked the beginning of the technological race we are in today. I know I need not remind you that our whole future depends on the outcome of this race.

How do we stack up in this contest for technological superiority? What are our prospects for the long 10- or 20-year pull?

Throughout the whole 20th century we have been one of the leaders in technological progress. Our industries have consistently produced commodities of superior performance and value. We have made these things in greater volume and at less cost than other nations. We have also been the leaders in substituting mechanical devices for manual labor. However, our great strength has been more along the lines of production rather than invention. Many of the key scientific breakthroughs of this century were made in England, France, or Germany.

Nor have we always been first in the development of military weapons. We were not the first to have tanks. We were not the first to have jet aircraft. In the end, however, our production paid off. In every war we equipped our forces with large amounts of superior weapons and won.

As a nation we take great pride in our achievements. It has become habit to believe that we are bound to win any technological race, particularly with the Soviets. This is a dangerous complacency. We must be careful not to overrate ourselves and underrate our competitors.

Just as the technical leadership of the United States seems unquestioned, some take it for granted that Soviet technology is primitive and backward. Although many admit that the Soviets have produced some first-class scientists and even a few inventors, we are often amused by Soviet claims of technological firsts. This amusement leads to the belief that they could never be first. Most people are convinced that because of our great record in the past we will continue to outinvent and outproduce everybody else in the future.

This is a comforting thought, but it may prove to be dangerously in error. The records of the last few years indicate that our technological lead is by no means self-perpetuating.

The Soviets are showing signs of technological maturity. What many of our experts predicted they could not do, they did. Even more surprising, some of the things they were supposedly unable to do at all, they not only did, but they did in a big hurry.

For example, we thought they could not duplicate the B–29 in less than 6 or 7 years. They duplicated it in 2 years.

We estimated that it would be difficult for them to make a good copy of the British jet engine. They produced a better version of this engine in less than a year.

In 1946, our experts thought they could not produce an atomic bomb in less than 6 to 10 years, if at all. They rocked the world with a nuclear explosion in about 3 years. This is just about the same time it took the United States to produce its first weapon.

Now it is true that all these accomplishments were for the most part duplication. They were not original achievements. But they duplicated and even improved upon some very complicated weapons. This is significant. As a nation acquires the technological ability to duplicate complex weapons, it becomes capable of building new and original weapons.

We have seen examples of this. The MIG–15 may not be superior overall to the F–86. But who can deny the fact that it was a first-class fighter and, in many ways, an original design? Even more important, could a backward technology produce 15,000 of these modern jets in just a few years?

They now have the MIG–17, an aircraft comparable to the F–100, one of our newest fighters. We can forget the MIG–15, because the 17 is replacing it. They now have thousands of these new models.

Although weather interfered with their May Day show, we saw two new models of fighters during rehearsals for the big parade. One is a new supersonic model. The other is an all-weather fighter.

You may say, "Well, they have concentrated on fighters." But this is not the case. They are developing and producing the planes for a great bomber force.

Last year we observed a completely new medium bomber. We expected they might develop such an aircraft taking several years to get into production. But this year they showed us enough of them to make us realize that they were already in production.

These are great steps in progress. But the airplane that gives us real reason for concern here in the United States is the long-range jet bomber. The Soviets have no use for a long-range bomber except to attack the United States. Last year we saw one Soviet model. This year we saw numbers of them in formation.

These observations establish a new basis for our estimate of Soviet production of the heavy jet bomber and the medium jet bomber. This knowledge is evidence of the modern technology of the Soviet aircraft industry and the advances which are being made by them.

We must continue to be on the alert and maintain our own forces to insure the lead over the Soviets that we have.

The Soviets may have started slowly, but they are learning fast.

The national resources needed in a race for technical superiority are not God-given endowments like minerals. They are man-created resources like industry or transportation. To be strong in technology a nation needs alert scientific leadership and it must invest a basic and experimental research, in laboratories and in testing facilities. It must also have a broad population base, so that numerous young people can be channeled into the scientific and engineering professions. The more people you can funnel into training, the better selection you have to choose from.

In the past, we in the United States have had the physical resources, and many of our people entered scientific and technical careers. We are continuing to invest in technical resources, but our production of trained people is not increasing.

Russia is making rapid progress. The Soviets have come from a period in which most of their population was illiterate, to a point where their present output of scientists and engineers exceeds that of the United States. This is one area where they have gained leadership.

Of course, they did not have to start from scratch. They had the resources for a sizable production base. They had scientists and engineers of their own and they "borrowed" large numbers of German scientists and engineers who were experts in the field of aircraft and missiles.

Furthermore, their population is larger than ours by about a third. This gives them a greater educational potential, which they can be expected to use to the limit.

Here are some cold facts: In 1950, the United States graduated 50,000 engineers—an alltime high. This peak was composed of veterans studying under the GI bill. Last year we graduated only 20,000 engineers. By contrast, the Russians graduated 28,000 engineers in 1950, 40,000 in 1953, and 54,000 in 1954. Russia now has almost caught us in total numbers of engineers and has passed us in total numbers of scientists. These figures are nothing to be optimistic about.

Of course, questions can be raised about the quality of the Soviet graduates. The United States does have the advantage that our young men are brought up in a machine-age environment. They soak up a lot of technical background. But the Soviets work their students harder.

In summary, we had the lead in scientific manpower—but this lead is going, if it has not already gone. On the technical manpower front, time does not seem to be working in our favor.

Turning now to another phase of technical resources, we find the Soviets have another advantage—the Iron Curtain. This security barrier allows the Communist bloc to hold on to their inventions and discoveries. Free nations cannot share them.

By contrast, the United States and free nations are liberal with technical information. This is an outgrowth of the democratic system. Besides, we believe that ex-

change of information aids scientific and industrial progress. I do not believe that all releases we have made are based on sound reasoning, but I believe our position of freedom of information is sound.

However, we must recognize that we are paying a price for this freedom, just as we must pay the price for other freedoms we enjoy. The price is this: The Soviets profit from our efforts.

A final point in this comparison of Soviet technological systems with ours is speed of production. I do not mean the speed of one production and assembly line. I am referring to what we call lead time—the whole period from invention of a weapon through development, test, training, and finally a combat capability. With the complex weapons of today lead time is a matter of years.

There is also evidence that the Soviet technological structure is simpler and more streamlined than ours. Their programs are controlled by military necessity and the urgency of getting ahead. Ours are somewhat confined by democratic processes of decision making and influenced by the need for economy.

Whatever the reasons are, we do know that they have produced first-class equipment, and their lead time across-the-board is shorter than ours.

On our side we have cut down some of our bottlenecks. In the Air Force we have reorganized and streamlined our research and development activity. This has saved valuable time, but there are other complicating factors that are not so easy to remedy.

For example, our budget cycle. However beneficial this system of budgeting may be, it undoubtedly costs us in time lost.

Our desire to build safety into our equipment and the need to keep equipment in service for a long time; our tendency to build multipurpose weapons—all these lengthen our weapon lead time.

We must do everything we can to reduce it. Under United States policy we will not start a war. This means we must maintain many weapons programs, against many eventualities. By contrast, the Soviets can choose their time and their strategy and work toward it. They can select particular weapon systems and put on a crash program. By concentrating in this way they may be able to telescope progress in specific areas. The danger is that they may do this in areas that can be decisive.

These comparisons of scientific manpower, the safeguards on our technical effort and weapon lead times indicate how foolhardy it would be to assume that we will automatically keep the lead. Technical superiority is not automatic. It must be made to happen.

Of course, a major technological breakthrough could again give us the lead for a period of 2, 3, or even 5 years. But we cannot gamble that this will happen. The only sure way is to make the effort needed for a progressive improvement. Any breakthrough would then be a bonus. It would be further insurance for us.

The future will not hold an encouraging picture unless we make the right decisions and then act decisively. But we cannot neglect the other main need I mentioned in the beginning—strength-in-being.

We are up against an enemy that could strike at any time. If war came today—and it could—we would have to fight it with the trained divisions that are ready to take the field, the airplanes that can fly, and the ships that are afloat today. Our strength-in-being is a shield. Behind this shield we can go on working to get better weapons. Our strategy will undergo change. But it must change as our combat strength changes, not as we get the ideas for some new weapon system.

Despite the improving strength of the Communists, our prospects for the future look bright. We can fail to win the technological battle only if we fail to recognize its importance.

Unless we keep up our day-to-day strength we will have no shield to assure our future developments.

The answer to both these needs lies in power for peace.

We all hope that eventually a practical plan can be found to dispense with arms. When that day comes we can follow the tradition set by Pittsburgh. The first homes here were built blocks from the crumbling Fort Pitt. The fortress was no longer needed. When the force of arms is no longer needed we can turn again this power into elements that will improve our life and our freedom. But until that time comes, just as the walls and garrison of Fort Pitt were kept strong in the days of danger, we must be resolute in keeping up our guard.

Hail, Senator Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD an article from the Boston Herald which appeared in the May 25 edition.

The article heralds the return of the junior Senator from Massachusetts, JOHN F. KENNEDY, after his absence from the Senate for 7 months and 3 days due to major spinal surgery. The article reflects upon not only the courage of the distinguished and able junior Senator from Massachusetts but lauds his clear and lucid thinking on the large issues of our day.

I know it was a great day for Senator KENNEDY when he returned to the Senate floor after his long illness but I also want to point out that it was a great day for the people of Massachusetts, both Democrats and Republicans alike. I have known and admired the junior Senator for many years and I know personally the place he occupies in the hearts of his constituents. If there is any two-word capsule of the character of the junior Senator from Massachusetts it would be courage and determination. He certainly displayed his tremendous courage during World War II when as commanding officer of a motor torpedo boat he saved the lives of members of his crew by dint of tremendous determination to keep these men afloat for 24 hours in the cruel waters of the South Pacific. He once again showed this courage and determination in his long, lonely fight to conquer his injury which he has done.

I am especially happy to express my gratitude that Senator KENNEDY is back on the scene he loves so well. I know that all the members of the Massachusetts delegation join me in this feeling. I personally am delighted that my good friend is back.

The article follows:

HAIL, SENATOR KENNEDY

Senator KENNEDY has fought a gallant battle to recover his health. He has won, and the whole Nation rejoices, without regard to party. And it is not only because he has persevered against a seemingly hopeless crippling; it is also because he has proved his ability as a Senator.

He returns as a member of the opposition party in Congress. He will take his stand many times against President Eisenhower. But it will be no higgling opposition, no business about the squirrels on the White House lawn. It will be an intelligent opposition that will challenge the President to the utmost, that will bring out the big issues more clearly, that will contribute to the better ordering of the Nation. It will be fair fighting, with respect on both sides.

We have ourselves differed with Mr. KENNEDY in the past, and we probably shall again, for we believe he is sometimes too ready to abandon the tested in favor of time-saving expedients (like Federal aid to school construction). But we know we shall find the contest exhilarating, and his marshaling of facts will demand the best we have.

It is good to have him back in the high counsels of the Nation.

The John Day Dam Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I have here an editorial from the Union Bulletin, Walla Walla, Wash., entitled "Would Not Change Method." This editorial concerns H. R. 5789, and I would like for my colleagues to read it. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I insert it in the RECORD:

WOULD NOT CHANGE METHOD

In connection with a recent analysis made in these columns of the John Day Dam legislation introduced by Representative SAM COON, of Oregon, we mentioned that the bill would not change the proportion of the cost to be borne by the Federal Government. This statement was an accurate one, but there was one incorrect aspect of our analysis which we hasten to change.

We said that at the present time the Federal Government absorbs the proportion of cost on its multipurpose dams which is allocated to navigation and to fishways. The fact is that the Government does absorb all of the cost of navigation facilities, but most of the cost of the fishways is charged to power and is paid off out of power revenues.

In the case of the McNary project, for example, the sum of $22.5 million for cost of fishways was allocated on a joint use basis. These and other joint costs, in turn, were allocated on the basis of 97.5 percent to power and only 2.5 percent to navigation. Thus the power revenues will repay substantially all of the cost of the fishway installations.

However, and here is the significant point with respect to the Coon bill: Exactly the same method of allocating costs would be applied in the case of the John Day Dam. All exclusive power costs would be paid for by power users; all exclusive navigation costs would be paid by the Federal Government; and joint costs such as fishways and other facilities common to the various uses would be allocated according to accepted principles. Since the John Day project is similar to McNary in all of its essential aspects, it may be assumed that costs will be allocated on substantially the same basis.

In other words, power would pay for all costs of the dam except for those which are

allocated specifically to navigation, just as in the case of projects which have already been built by the Federal Government on the Columbia River. There would be no additional expense to the Federal Government, whether it is built as an all-Federal project as originally planned or whether it is built under a partnership arrangement as contemplated in the Coon bill.

The point is important in view of Senator NEUBERGER'S sweeping criticism of COON'S proposals for building John Day as a partnership project. The Oregon Senator has sought to give the impression that the partnership plan would increase the nonreimbursable costs to be borne by the Government. Such is not the case, as he must be well aware.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column Keenotes for May 26, 1955, concerning the President's statement before the convention of the National Association of Radio & Television Broadcasters to the effect that the broadcasters may have an influence even greater than the press.

The column follows:

KEENOTES

(By Hon. ELIZABETH KEE, of West Virginia)

Yes and no.

Personally, I think it is more no than yes—referring, that is, to the remark by President Eisenhower the other morning in attempting to measure the relative effectiveness of radio and television on the one hand, and the press of the Nation on the other, in influencing public understanding and in disseminating information.

Speaking to 3,000 delegates at the convention in Washington of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, the President said he thought the broadcasters may have an influence "even greater than the press."

The black-on-white print of a newspaper report is "essentially cold," he said, whereas television and radio "put an appealing voice and an engaging personality into homes."

Yes and no. The voice and personality of radio and TV may be warm and appealing; the newsprint cold. We could say yes to that. But as to the relative effectiveness of their informational work—in not just entertaining but in informing the public—well, on that score I'd have to say no to the President's theory.

How many times have you half heard a radio bulletin, glanced at but not really seen a TV news film clip, and because you hadn't paid sufficient attention to get the facts wished you could hear it or see it again—or read it?

It's not the fault of the voice of the broadcaster—the appealing voice the President referred to. The fault lies in our own senses—or in the impossibility of paying attention to the sounds and sights and calls and demands upon us which seem to fill each moment.

But then the newspaper arrives and we can read the news and think upon it. We can disbelieve it, too, but in reading it we feel more certain we have the facts of the story only because we are less inclined to mistrust our eyes than our ears—because we can read and re-read a news report to doublecheck those same eyes.

This is certainly not meant to disparage radio or TV. There are things the broadcasters can do—and do perform day after day—that make the publishers and editors green with envy. But as one broadcaster who is also an outstanding editor-publisher, Mr. Mark Ethridge, of Louisville, Ky., told the same convention, radio and TV are putting greater emphasis on entertainment and less and less upon the primary things for which readers buy newspapers.

Happily—and for all of us it is, indeed, a happy thing—both media have not just a role in American communications but vitally essential roles, which complement each while competing with each other.

The last thing I'd want as a citizen or as a Congresswoman would be to have to choose between the newspaper, on the one hand, or radio-TV, on the other—to be forced to give up one or the other.

It's just that I can't sit quietly by and let the President go unchallenged when he puts the appealing voice of radio-TV a notch above the cold but solid, re-readable type of a newspaper in conveying information the public.

Now, if you'll excuse me, it's time for the news broadcast and I want to switch on the set.

United States Airman Faces French Trial for Slaying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the French Communist press is howling for the head of an American GI.

Airman Jose Montijo, of Phoenix, Ariz., is being held in prison in France today, denied the aid and counsel of his fellow countrymen, threatened with death on the guillotine.

He has been left to the mercy of the French courts under the terms of a treaty which deprives him and all of his comrades of the protection of the American Government whenever they run afoul of the law in whatever foreign land they are stationed.

The first report of Montijo's incarceration coincided with the introduction of House Joint Resolution 309, calling upon the President to seek modification or to denounce the Status of Forces Treaty, under which this young man and others are deprived of their constitutional rights.

Montijo's arrest, his imprisonment in a French jail, and refusal of American officers to discuss the case, the fact that our only information comes from a British press officer, the violence of the French press in its denunciations of this young man—all of these circumstances dramatize how important it is that we act promptly on House Joint Resolution 309.

We may be too late to rescue Montijo. We can save other American servicemen from a similar fate.

I call to your attention that this young man, whether guilty or innocent, does not have a fair chance to defend himself as he would under our concept of justice.

He may even be tried by a Communist judge, since the French, despite all of our billions, have many Communist public officials. What justice can he expect under these circumstances?

Under leave to extend, I include herewith newspaper accounts of the Montijo arrest, of House action on the Status of Forces Treaty, and a letter from Mr. George J. Thomas, publisher of the Greater Nebraskan, Omaha, Nebr., with reference to the others:

THE GREATER NEBRASKAN,
Omaha, Nebr.

Hon. FRANK T. BOW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Chicago Tribune of May 20 carried two closely related but far different articles.

The one from Fontainebleu, France, reported the arrest of an American airman, Jose Montijo, of Phoenix, Ariz., for the murder of a Frenchman. It also explained how his case will be handled under the status of forces agreement, with incarceration in a French jail, his legal representative a French lawyer, appointed by a French judge, the only information about him available in very meager way through an English officer, and the complete silencing of any American interest or interference. That's the way we treat our soldiers, and especially those who are there because we forced them, through the draft.

The other was your resolution that was introduced and passed amending the Reserve Act, so as to prevent the sending of our troops to any country with which we have such an agreement as results in such a situation as outlined above. I admire your interest and your courage and I trust that you will be able to enact the same resolution into law or into the Bricker amendment, in case the Reserve Act dies, which I also hope will happen.

I am writing you because I appreciate the acts of a good American when I can recognize them.

Very sincerely,

GEORGE J. THOMAS.

[From the Chicago Tribune of May 20, 1955]

FIRST UNITED STATES AIRMAN FACES FRENCH TRIAL FOR SLAYING

(By Paul Ress)

FONTAINEBLEAU, FRANCE, May 19.—The first American airman to face trial by a French court for the death of a Frenchman was in a cell here today.

Jose Montijo, 25, of Phoenix, Ariz., was arrested early last Sunday and accused of the fatal stabbing of Andre Mallet, 19, during a midnight street brawl involving several men, allegedly over the pretty French girl Montijo planned to marry this weekend.

The girl, Madeleine Thomas, 18, is the mother of Montijo's 6-month-old son.

UNITED STATES OFFICERS MUM

American military authorities have refused to discuss the case. Capt. Maurice Davis, commander of Montijo's company in the 1141st Air Force detachment, said he is "under strict orders to say nothing to the press."

Maj. F. C. Seeley, detachment executive officer, refused to say anything about the airman, and Gen. Dudley D. Hale, senior Air Force representative at Allied Air Forces Central Europe (AAFCE) declined to receive reporters, telling them: "Get all your information from the AAFCE public information officer." The latter, a British air force wing commander, Colin Cooper, revealed only a few minor details.

American Air Force officers also refused to disclose the names of three of Montijo's bud-

dies who were questioned by French police as material witnesses. Neither would they reveal what the airman told military investigators after his arrest by Air Force military police who turned him over to the French.

COULD GET DEATH

Under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Status of Forces agreement signed by President Eisenhower providing for the trial of American soldiers in foreign courts, Montijo could be sentenced to die on the guillotine. He will be defended by a French lawyer to be appointed by the court. The NATO accord does not authorize an American attorney to defend a Yank in trouble.

French police and judges will have complete control over the investigation of the case, the questioning of witnesses, and the trial. An American legal observer may watch but may not speak in court. Murder suspects may be held indefinitely in jail before being brought to trial. Bail is not allowed.

The French press, led by the Communist Party newspaper Humanite, already is demanding Montijo's head.

CHARGE YANK "JUMPED" VICTIM

Exactly what happened in front of the Cafe du Depart and the Avenue dance hall on Avenue Franklin Roosevelt is not clear.

French friends of Mallet, a truck driver for NATO air force headquarters in Fontainebleau forest, charge Montijo and several Yank buddies "jumped" the victim.

Montijo's fiance said he assured her in the single conversation in prison allowed them that Mallet provoked the fight and, with several friends, attacked him.

[From the Chicago Tribune of May 19, 1955]

APPROVE PLAN TO BAR GIS IN SOME NATIONS

(By John Fisher)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—A severe blow to administration foreign and military policy was dealt in the House today when it tentatively approved an amendment barring the use of American troops in countries where they are subject to prosecution under foreign laws.

The effect of the action would prohibit the sending of American forces to 14 other nations belonging to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as well as Japan, Yugoslavia, and various other countries.

Adoption of the amendment, offered by Representative Bow, Republican, of Ohio, on a standing vote, 174 to 56, to the administration's tough new military Reserves bill place that measure in jeopardy. While subject to a later rollcall vote, the 3-to-1 vote favoring the amendment strongly indicated its retention in the bill.

DEATH IN HOUSE LIKELY

Predictions were the measure would be killed by the House, if the amendment is retained, because the administration could not afford its passage.

Democrat leaders were so alarmed over the surprise approval of Bow's amendment that they suddenly moved postponement of further consideration of the Reserves bill until tomorrow, although they had planned to complete action today.

[From the Chicago Tribune of May 20, 1955]

HOUSE ACTION SUSPENDED ON RESERVES BILL—BACKERS ACT IN FACE OF DEFEAT

(By John Fisher)

WASHINGTON, May 19.—Faced with apparent defeat, House backers of the administration's tough military reserve programs bill, today called off further consideration. The action on the bill, which is backed by the Republican and Democratic leadership, came after the House reaffirmed its action of yesterday in barring racial segregation in National Guard and Reserve units.

* * * * *

BOW PLAN ADOPTED

Besides the amendment by Representative POWELL, Democrat, New York, barring racial segregation, a provision also was written into the bill yesterday barring American troops from nations which exercise criminal jurisdiction over them for violation of foreign laws, under existing treaties or executive agreements.

This amendment, offered by Representative Bow, Republican, Ohio, and adopted 174 to 56 would have banned the use of American troops in most of the approximately 40 nations where American troops are stationed. This would have included the 14 other nations belonging to the North Atlantic Treaty organization, Japan, and other nations.

Bow's amendment was directed toward modification or abrogation of such treaties and agreements to remove the right of other nations to try and imprison American troops.

DEPRIVED OF RIGHTS

Bow charged this power deprives American citizens of their constitutional rights and constitutes reversal of the historic doctrine of international law under which the soldiers of a nation are under the exclusive jurisdiction of its military courts.

Bow said today that if no further action is taken on the Reserves bill he will press for adoption of a separate resolution he introduced yesterday directing the President to modify or abrogate treaties and agreements giving foreigners criminal jurisdiction over American troops.

Bow said he will circularize the house, and considered chances favorable for adoption of the separate resolution in view of the 3 to 1 vote in his favor yesterday. He said the proposal would carry out the intent of the proposed constitutional amendment introduced by him in the House and in the Senate by Senator BRICKER, Republican, Ohio, to protect American constitutional guaranties from being overridden by treaties, agreements, or membership in international organizations.

LEADERS REGROUP FORCES

Yesterday, the leadership suspended operations on the bill after the Powell and Bow amendments were adopted, as the leaders attempted to regroup their forces overnight.

As the House met this morning, VINSON offered an amendment which he hoped would save the bill. His proposal would have knocked out the antisegregation amendment, but retained the Bow amendment.

Federal Construction of Hells Canyon Dam Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the American Public Power Association, at its recent annual convention, has again reaffirmed its endorsement of the Federal Government building the proposed Hells Canyon Dam, in the public interest. In this connection, I include in the RECORD a resolution adopted by this association.

The resolution follows:

HELLS CANYON DAM

Whereas the Hells Canyon issue, like the Muscle Shoals struggle of 30 years ago, involves the right of the people to develop their rivers for the greatest good of the general public; and

Whereas the Idaho Power Co. is proposing to develop only about 60 percent of the waterpower potential in the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River; and

Whereas the Federal construction of Hells Canyon Dam provides for the maximum comprehensive utilization of the Hells Canyon damsite for flood control, river regulation, and power: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the America Public Power Association reaffirms its endorsement of Federal construction of Hells Canyon Dam.

Chinese Communism and the Proletarian Revolution—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the average American has been in a state of doubt as to whether communism in Red China is of the same type and character as communism in Soviet Russia.

Probably the best authority on this subject is Dr. Theodore Hsi-en Chen who is professor of Asiatic studies at the University of Southern California. I am personally acquainted with Dr. Chen and have had the opportunity of briefly discussing this subject with him. I believe that the following speech which he delivered recently in Los Angeles will be both revealing and interesting to all Members of Congress.

It is vitally important for the people of the United States to be well informed on the subject of whether Red China is the same as Red Russia. Certainly there is a difference in the racial origin of the people of the two countries. China is populated almost entirely by people of Chinese origin, while Russia and her satellites on the other hand are made up of peoples of widely divergent racial origins. And while some of the peoples who are under Soviet domination have been subjected to tyrannical rule for generations without achieving the necessary unity and determination to revolt against their oppressors to gain their freedom, the Chinese people maintained their national independence throughout history until the recent Communist aggression, and even now under the leadership of the exiled government of the Republic of China, they are actively working from Formosa to dislodge the Communist hold on the Chinese mainland.

Dr. Theodore Hsi-en Chen speaks from knowledge and experience as a Chinese, and I am confident that what he has to say will be of interest to all Members of Congress.

CHINESE COMMUNISM AND THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION

(By Theodore Hsi-en Chen)

The Communist Manifesto, written by Marx and Engels in 1848, concluded with the following words:

"The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.

"Workingmen of all countries, unite."

A century later, Mao Tse-tung spoke in practically the same vein. "We Communists," he said, "have never tried to conceal our political views. Our future, or ultimate, program is to push China forward to socialism and communism; this is definite and beyond question. Both the name of our party and our Marxist world outlook clearly and definitely indicate the direction of our future." [1]

In spite of such unambiguous words, there are still people who think that Chinese communism represents a different brand from Marxism or Leninism. They aver that the Chinese Communists are more interested in a peasant revolution than in the proletarian revolution. Evidently, these people have not taken the trouble to read the writings of the Chinese Communists. Even during the years when naive observers described the Chinese Communists as agrarian reformers rather than Communists, Mao Tse-tung declared again and again that the Chinese revolution must be considered a part of the proletarian-Socialist world revolution.[2]

The Chinese Communists formally set up their regime on October 1, 1949. Since then, they have carried on a well-planned program to rebuild China according to the Communist blue-print and move ahead toward socialism and communism. It is the purpose of this paper to review the actual policies and practices of the new regime in the last few years in the light of its overall objective of advancing the proletarian revolution in China.

I. STRENGTHENING THE PROLETARIAN CHARACTER OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The party of the proletariat

The Communist Party calls itself the party of the proletariat and the driving force of the proletarian revolution. The preamble of the constitution of the Chinese Communist Party declares that the party is "the organized vanguard of the Chinese working class, the highest form of its class organization." The Communists recognize, however, that the conditions in China are not yet ripe for a full-fledged proletarian movement or Communist revolution. With industries still undeveloped and the working class occupying only a small fraction of the population, it is necessary for the workers to seek the help of other social classes which may be accepted as allies in the proletarian revolution. The most important ally, the Communists decided, is the peasant class.

It must be remembered that when Mao Tse-tung decided almost 20 years ago to make the rural areas his revolutionary base, it was after the Communists had tried to organize workers' revolts in the cities and had failed. In defense of his policy to capture the support of the rural masses, Mao explained that the Chinese revolution could not succeed without the peasants for the simple reason that they constituted the vast majority of the population. In the last analysis, however, he consistently maintained that the workers must be considered the central force of the revolution and that the peasants were important as an indispensable ally of the workers.

Never did Mao or any of his associates ever suggest that the peasants could take the place of the workers as the leading force of the revolution. On the other hand, they always made clear that the peasants must accept the leadership of the workers. Writing on the Chinese revolution and the Chinese Communist Party in 1939, Mao argued that there had been numerous peasant revolts and agrarian revolutions in China's long history, but they had all ended in failure because they lacked the leadership of the proletariat. Without the leadership of the proletariat, he said, the peasants remained an important force; but even the proletariat would be ineffectual without the leadership of its organized vanguard, namely, the Communist Party.

The emphasis on the peasants was a necessary detour in the course of the proletarian revolution in view of the weakness of the Chinese proletariat and the inability of the Communists to take control of urban areas. By the early months of 1949, however, the Chinese Communists for the first time found themselves in control of the cities. In March of that year, the central committee of their party passed a resolution to shift the center of gravity of party work from the rural areas to the cities. In terms of party membership, the new policy meant a systematic effort to increase the proportion of the proletarian elements in the party.

More proletarian elements wanted

The war and postwar years had seen a rapid increase in party membership. The total membership was no more than 40,000 in 1937 but had increased to 1,210,000 by 1945. The workers, of course, constituted a small minority. According to official statistics released in 1949, even if the farm laborers, poor peasants, and the city poor were all grouped together with the workers, the proletarian and semiproletarian elements would constitute only 62 percent of the total membership. In June 1950, Mao Tse-tung reported that the party had grown to 4,500,000 members but he warned at the same time that opportunistic elements had crept into the party. To strengthen and enlarge the proletarian character of the party, he recommended the general policy of accepting no more new members in the rural areas which had hitherto been the base of the party.

At the same time, the plans for industrialization opened up new possibilities of an emerging working class. Since Manchuria was a key industrial zone, an intensive recruiting campaign was launched in that area. In other cities, such as Peking and Tientsin, most of the new members admitted into the party in 1949–50 were workers. The central organization announced at that time a plan to draw into the party one-third of the industrial workers of the nation in the next 3 to 5 years.

The new emphasis on proletarian membership does not mean that the peasants are now forgotten. After all, they still constitute the largest class in Chinese society and a large part of the appeal for mass support must still be directed to the peasants. But the Communists are today more emphatic than before that the workers are the mainstay of the proletarian revolution. An unmistakable sign of the change of policy may be seen in the writings and speeches of Communist leaders. For example, in 1927, when Mao Tse-tung made his report on the peasant movement he had personally led in Hunan, he went out of the way to praise the peasants. In terms of actual contributions to the revolution, he said, the peasants must be given 70 percent of the credit, while the contributions of the city people and the armed force would amount to only 30 percent. It is significant that in the recently published and officially approved Complete Works of Mao Tse-tung, this passage has been expunged. Evidently, the old passage would not be in line with the present proletarian emphasis.

It is not within the scope of this paper to discuss the weaknesses of the new regime in China. Suffice it at this point to call attention to the fact that the task of building a strong proletarian party is not without difficulties. In the first place, there is the danger of alienating the peasants, who are now relegated to a secondary position. The Communists have taken pains to assure the peasants that their welfare would not be neglected; but signs of peasant restlessness continue to arouse the anxiety of party leaders.

Even more serious is the problem of a party which in its recruitment policy places class origin and ideological dependability above ability and competency. Many proletarian elements recruited into the party are illiterate or near-illiterate. Yet these are the people the party must depend upon to carry on the important programs of the new state. They are given supervisory positions in the farms, in the factories, in the local governments, and in other important areas of national life. The ambitious programs of industrialization and national reconstruction call for trained and educated personnel, but the Communists are suspicious of persons of bourgeois background and prefer to place their trust in less qualified but ideologically more acceptable persons. Unfortunately, ideological fervor does not compensate for the lack of education, and the Communists are burdening the political and economic structure of the nation with a host of incompetent persons in key positions.

II. STEPPING UP THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Struggle is a key word in the Marxist ideology. All existences, according to the dialetical materialist, are "complexes of opposing elements and forces." Change takes place as a result of the conflict of opposing elements. Conflict means strife, or struggle. Since the opposing elements, or the contradictions, are ever present, the conflict, or struggle, never ends. Struggle, therefore, is a normal function of existence.

In human society, the opposing elements appear in the form of social classes, and the class struggle becomes the all-important expression of social life. The proletarian revolution is a class revolution. A good Communist is a fearless and faithful warrior of the class struggle. He must be conscious of class differences and recognize the class enemies who must be exterminated. He must acquire the class viewpoint of the proletariat.

Class consciousness permeates the entire structure of Communist society and state. The Chinese Communists fully accept the dictum of the Communist manifesto that political power is merely the organized power of one class for oppressing another. Since the state is the organ of class domination, the question is, according to Communist logic, what class does the dominating. In China today, it is explained, the workers and their class allies have now assumed political power and openly use it to suppress their class enemies.

Inasmuch as the class war must be bitter and unrestrained by bourgeois sentimentalism, the suppression of the class enemies must be ruthless and uncompromising. Hence the bloody purges with their mass trials and summary executions. Who are the class enemies? The Communists list the imperialists, the landlords, and bureaucrats and the compradore class who act in collusion with the imperialists. These are the "enemies of the people" who must be liquidated for the sake of the proletarian revolution. The liquidation of these classes has been steadily and systematically pushed in the past few years.

---

[1] Mao Tse-tung, On Coalition Government, sec. 4, (1945).

[2] Mao Tse-tung, The Chinese Revolution and the Communist Party of China (1939); also On the New Democracy (1940).

Class struggle in the rural areas

In the rural areas, the class struggle is directed against the landlords. The means for liquidating the landlords is the land reform. Many liberals in the Western World have misinterpreted the Communist agrarian program as essentially an economic reform. They fail to realize that to the Communists the land reform is not merely a measure to end the exploitation of peasants; it is a phase of class struggle and an essential step toward socialism in the rural areas. Let us look at the class struggle first.

To the peasants, the most important result of the land reform is the division of land which enables tillers to own the lots they plow. But to the Communists, the most important fruit to be gained from the land reform is the class struggle resulting in the liquidation of the landlords as a class and in a higher degree of class consciousness among the peasants. The cadres in charge of the land reform were trained first of all in the technique of inciting class war against the landlords. In the preparatory stage of reform in a given village, the cadres' first task was to instill class consciousness in the people and to assign a class status to each individual. In each village a number of landlords were singled out as the exploiters and enemies of the people. The peasants were taught to use the methods of class warfare against these symbols of feudalism.

The Communists found it necessary to teach the peasants how to carry on the class struggle because, according to their explanation, most peasants lacked class consciousness and did not realize that the landlords were their class enemies whom they must hate and fight without mercy. It thus devolved upon the cadres to develop in the peasants a strong class hatred and a determination to wage a bitter class struggle against the landlords. An effective means to achieve this end was the accusation meeting, which became a standard procedure of the land reform. Under the stimulus and direction of the cadres and party members, the peasants were brought together in mass meetings in which they were encouraged to hurl accusations against the landlords. Mass emotions were incited by giving the people a chance to curse the landlords, to spit at the accused, or to take a hand in beating the "enemies of the people." These accusation meetings and public trials were sometimes called struggle meetings in Communist terminology, for it was claimed that participation in such mass actions created the necessary emotions for an effective and bitter class struggle.

It is not too much to say that the Communists think less of the division of land for the benefit of the peasants than they do of the confiscation of land as a weapon of class war against the landlords. Actually, their propaganda in connection with land reform has given far more emphasis to the class struggle than to the distribution of land as such. The land reform law specifies that the reform in any area must be under the strict supervision of trained cadres. The real motive of the Communists is clearly revealed in their attitude toward villages where landlords proposed a voluntary redistribution of land. In the winter of 1950, landlords in some villages in Kwangtung province were so frightened by reports of bloody purges in the land reform in North China that they voluntarily surrendered their land holdings and turned them over to the peasants for redistribution. Alarmed by this development, the Communist authorities sent word that they could not recognize such peaceful reform as valid and that no reform could be considered complete unless it included the all-important class struggle and the physical liquidation of the worst "enemies of the people." Trained cadres were promptly sent to the southern villages to teach the right way of carrying out the reform.

Not only is the class struggle considered an indispensable prelude to the distribution of land, but even after the completion of the reform, the peasants were told that they must keep up the class struggle, otherwise the landlords and erstwhile exploiters would use methods of infiltration and sabotage to deprive them of their fruits of victory. More than once, Communist leaders complained that the peasants tended to forget their class enemies once they obtained the land distributed to them. Cadres were then instructed to intensify their educational activities—in plain English, their propaganda campaign—in order to "heighten the class consciousness of the peasants" so that they might realize the never-ceasing necessity of class struggle.

Before leaving this topic of the land reform, we should point out that the Communists used it as an object lesson in class struggle not only for the rural population, but for the petty bourgeoisie as well. The Communists found that the students and the intelligentsia responded eagerly to the liberal aspects of reform but were often reluctant to join in the more violent phases of the class struggle. Such people, said the Communists, had become too deeply influenced by their bourgeois education and had adopted the "bourgeois mentality" which erroneously and viciously considers it a virtue to be aloof from class distinctions. To the Communists, political consciousness and class consciousness are synonymous and a person without the proper class viewpoint cannot be considered a progressive citizen of the new age.

Chinese Communism and the Proletarian Revolution—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the following is a continuation of the speech of Dr. Theodore Hsi-en Chen entitled "Chinese Communism and the Proletarian Revolution":

Intelligentsia who are products of bourgeois society must therefore be reeducated before they can be of service to the new state. One way of educating them is to have them take part in the actual process of the class struggle.

In the winter of 1949, thousands of students and intellectuals in North China were organized into work teams to go to the villages to take part in the land reform under the direction of party cadres. It was claimed that participation in the accusation meetings and struggle meetings opened the eyes of the intellectuals to the class antagonisms in society and created in them a will to fight for the proletarian cause. After they returned from the villages, the intellectuals were asked to tell how they had developed a new hatred for the enemies of the people and how their experience in the class struggle had given them a new class viewpoint and a resultant ideological conversion.

Class struggle in the cities

The liquidation of the landlords is only the first phase of the systematic class struggle the Chinese Communists have launched since they took control of the Chinese mainland. By the winter of 1951 they were ready to start a new phase of the struggle in the cities. Just as the land reform was used as a vehicle of the class struggle, so the Communists had to devise some urban movement of sufficient emotional appeal to the masses and use it as a weapon against the city bourgeoisie. The urban counterpart of the land reform was the so-called five-anti-campaign.

Officially, the "five-anti campaign" was directed against five "criminal acts" committed by the bourgeoisie: viz, bribery, tax evasion, fraud, theft of state assets, and leakage of state economic secrets. Since these were broad charges which could be pinned on any person whom the new rulers chose to chastise, the campaign actually became one of persecution against merchants, industrialists, and business people in general. Again, the methods of the class struggle included mass meetings, the incitement of mass emotions, and the physical elimination of those condemned as the most flagrant offenders.

Party propaganda explained that the bourgeoisie had used different methods to sabotage the new state and its economy and had sent agents into the factories and the government offices to corrupt the morale and morals of the personnel. They were charged with infiltrating the ranks of the labor unions and carrying on subversive activities against the state. Just as the landlords were deprived of their land, so the merchants accused of profiteering or tax evasion were required to return to the state what they had failed to pay through the years. Numerous business people were completely divested of all their assets and reduced to bankruptcy. Even then, they were required to publish full confessions of their guilt and to express their gratitude to the government for having been lenient enough to spare their lives. In view of the fact that many of their friends in business circles were executed without mercy, those who were merely reduced to poverty perhaps really had reason to feel grateful.

As in the rural areas, mass participation was considered essential, not only in order to reenforce the Communist claim that the liquidation of the bourgeoisie was carried out "democratically" in accordance with the will of the people, but also to give the people the actual experience of class warfare and to develop in them a new class consciousness. Labor unions, women's organizations, youth groups, and professional organizations were "mobilized" so that they might direct and organize their constituents to support the campaign and to aid in apprehending offenders. In Shanghai alone, more than one thousand "investigation teams" were organized and the teams were sent out to discover what merchants among their acquaintances should be brought to task for any 1 of the 5 criminal acts. In Tientsin, the trade union organized store clerks into 276 "combat teams" which succeeded in catching 177 "big tigers" and bringing them to Red justice. The "tiger-hunting" campaign was extended into families, where wives were urged to inform on their husbands and children rewarded for denouncing the unpatriotic acts of their parents.

The campaign was waged with fury in the first 5 months of 1952. During those months, the strain and mental agony that business people underwent were even more unbearable than the actual penalties imposed on them. The air was full of accusations; no one felt safe; no one knew who the next victim might be. In cases where the accusers could not be sure of the charges, pressure was exerted to compel the suspected individuals to confess. So unrelenting was the pressure that many a businessman confessed more than he actually committed. The magnitude of the campaign may be judged by the fact that, according to an official report, 76 percent of the 450,000 merchants and industrialists investigated in seven leading cities were found guilty of 1 or more of the 5 offenses. In Shanghai, 90 percent of the 160,000 business people were brought to trial for one offense or another.

The Communists have expressed deep satisfaction with the success of the "five-anti campaign." They actually succeeded in breaking the power and destroying the prestige of the urban bourgeoisie. Another class had been eliminated from society; another important step had been taken toward a proletarian society. Those who survived the persecution could not have the slighest doubt that they were firmly in the grip of the state and the party and their survival must depend on their complete willingness to follow the orders of the authorities. If private business could exist in any form, it would have to serve as an obedient agent of the state.

III. ADVANCE TOWARD SOCIALISM

Early in 1940, when Mao Tse-tung drew up a blueprint for a transitional stage between present-day China and the ultimate stage of socialism and communism, he warned that the transitional period could not be short. Since that time, the Communists have met with greater success than they had originally anticipated. They conquered the mainland with surprising ease in 1949. Their bold intervention in Korea and Indochina as well as their military success in Tibet not only enhanced their prestige at home and abroad but also enabled them to tighten their control over national life in the name of wartime necessity. These successes encouraged them to speed up the process of transforming China into a socialist state.

Socialism in the rural areas

The redistribution of land in the rural areas and the liquidation of the landlords had paved the way for the next phase of the land reform. Again it is here necessary to state that the Communists consider the land reform as only a means to an end. From the standpoint of the class revolution, the end is the liquidation of the landlord class. From the standpoint of the Socialist revolution, the end is the collectivization of agriculture. Mao Tse-tung stated in 1950 that there were 2 major tests which China had to pass, namely, the civil war and the agrarian reform. The civil war, he said, had been successfully concluded, and the agrarian reform on a nationwide basis was just beginning. "When the tests of war and land reform are passed," he declared, "the only remaining test—the test of socialism; of carrying out Socialist reform throughout the nation—will be passed easily."

After the redistribution of land, the Communists embarked upon a systematic plan to remold agriculture according to the Socialist pattern. A new slogan was adopted urging all peasants to organize. By this was meant that peasants could not expect to increase rural production by working singly or in small family groups on their small lots. In order to be able to enjoy fully the benefits of the land reform, the peasants were told that they must organize into larger units and pool together their efforts in order to achieve the greatest efficiency.

To the Communists there is no doubt that collective farming is the solution to China's agricultural problems. They say that two fundamental reforms are needed in Chinese agriculture—mechanization and collectivization—but the former must be built on the foundation of the latter. They realize, however, that the individualistic Chinese peasants could not accept collectivization right away and that the new owners of land could not be easily persuaded to give up what they have just obtained. Thus, it is necessary to devise intermediate steps between private land ownership and collectivization. These intermediate steps consists in mutual-aid teams and cooperatives. The last few years have witnessed an intensive campaign to get the peasants to organize mutual-aid teams and cooperatives.

Mutual-aid teams

The mutual-aid team represents the first step in the direction of collectivization. It is the most elementary form of cooperation. It is considered most feasible for peasants who are not yet ready for the organization of regular cooperatives, not to say collective farms. The simplest form is the seasonal mutual-aid team, in which several farming households carry on cooperative activities during busy seasons only; they pool together their labor, tools, and livestock temporarily but their cooperation ceases as soon as their specific need is met. There is no permanency to such teams, and there is no standardized procedure of cooperation; yet in areas where the idea of collectivization is alien or even repugnant to peasants who have not yet been imbued with progressive ideas, this form of elementary cooperation is considered a good beginning.

After this introduction, the peasants are urged to organize year-round or permanent mutual-aid teams. Besides being more stable, these long-term mutual-aid teams provide more definitely for some degree of division of labor, for elementary group planning, and for profit-sharing in common projects. There is also a more standardized procedure of counting workdays and of making payment in proportion to the work contributed. A small amount of property is owned in common, for the members of the team contribute to the purchase of farm implements such as waterwheels for irrigation, etc.

A third and most advanced form of the mutual-aid team is a combination of 2 or 3 permanent teams into a larger unit. This makes possible a further enlargement of cooperative activities and the use of modern farm machines for large-scale cultivation. Official reports at the beginning of 1953 claimed that 60 percent of the peasants in north China and 70 percent in Manchuria had joined the various forms of mutual-aid teams.

The Communists see great value in the mutual-aid teams. They claim that this elementary form of cooperation has increased agricultural production and shown the peasants the advantages of collective effort. "The mutual-aid teams," said Vice Minister of Agriculture Wu Chueh-nung in 1951, "are generating a totally new outlook among the peasants." Team members, he observed, acquire "collective thoughts and emotions." They are, in other words, learning their first lesson in socialism. Furthermore, it is claimed that mutual-aid teams serve the function of training the personnel needed in future advanced stages of rural socialism. According to the Vice Minister, "leaders of the present mutual-aid teams * * * may become chairman of collective farms or superintendents of State farms in the future."

At the same time, the Communists emphasize that mutual-iad teams are inadequate in many ways. Individual ownership of land is still retained and common property is limited to some tools and implements. Land is still managed separately by the various households and each household is free to plant its own crops. Payment is made for work done on the land of other households. The socialistic features are still undeveloped. It is therefore necessary, say the Communists, to recognize the mutual-aid teams as only a transitional step.

Cooperatives

The next stage of advance is the cooperative. The more stable and successful mutual-aid teams are urged to reorganize themselves into agricultural producers' cooperatives. According to official figures, some 100,000 producers' cooperatives were formed in 1954 and 90 percent of them had begun as mutual-aid teams. In a cooperative, the participating members pool together their land and offer them as shares. Legally, they still retain the title to the lands and do not relinquish their private ownership, but the pooling of lands makes possible a unified operation and a further division of labor. Land and manpower as well as farm implements and livestock are all placed under unified management. In general principle, it is maintained that implements and livestock should be collectively owned, but in the early stages of growth, a part may be privately owned but communally used. The crops are planted according to the overall plan of the cooperative, and the plan of the cooperative is coordinated with the overall program of the State. Profit is divided among members on the basis of land and labor contributed, and a fixed proportion of the yield is set aside for communal savings and welfare funds. A cooperative of average size consists of about 20 households; a large cooperative would have as many as 40 to 50 households.

Under the constant prodding of the Communist cadres in the rural areas, the peasants have been pressured to organize producers' cooperatives. The Communists proudly report the rapid growth of cooperatives in the past 2 years and predict that all the peasants of China will have joined coopeatives by 1958 and will then be ready for the last stage of rural socialism, the collective farm. According to official statistics, there were 14,000 producers' cooperatives in 1953 but 6 months later, by May 1954, the number had increased to 95,000. State planning looked forward to 600,000 cooperatives by the spring of 1955, 1,500,000 by 1956, and 3,000,000 by 1957. Teng Tzu-hui, Director of the Rural Work Department of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party and currently one of the vice premiers of the government, summarized the state planning as follows:

"Calculating in terms of time, cooperativization and collectivization will generally be completed in the first two 5-year plans. * * * Mechanization may be realized on a large scale in the third 5-year plan. In view of the current situation, the present form of cooperativization may be basically completed throughout the country during the first 5-year plan, 1953–57, and the early part of the second. Then we can gradually turn to high level cooperatives of the collective-farm type." [3]

The Communists describe the cooperatives as semi-Socialist in character. The Socialist characteristics are the unified operation of land, the unified distribution of labor, capital, and goods produced, the increase of communal savings, and collective ownership of implements and livestock. On the other hand, private ownership of land has not yet been abolished and the landowner still claims renumeration for the use of his land. These non-Socialist characteristics must eventually disappear in the completely Socialist collective farming of the future, when all peasants will surrender their land ownership to the collective and will be renumerated solely on the bases of labor.

Inasmuch as systematic advance toward socialism is an important phase of the proletarian revolution, it cannot be separated from the class struggle. The backbone of the cooperative movement, declare the Communists, must be the poor peasants. The middle peasants may be tolerated if they agree to unite with the poor peasants, but no rich

[3] Address before the central committee of the New Democratic Youth League, July 15, 1954.

peasants are allowed to join the cooperatives. To admit the rich peasants or to allow the middle peasants to play a major role, the leaders gravely warn, would be to open the way to the growth of capitalism in the rural areas.

It is to be noted that collectivization is not to be completely held off until the time when cooperatives may be changed into collective farms. The first collective farm was formed in Manchuria in 1950. Since then, many others have appeared in different parts of the country. They follow the principle, "from each according to his ability and to each according to his work." The workday is computed not in terms of hours but in terms of work actually accomplished; for example, harvesting of 128 sheaves of grain, each weighing 12 kilograms, is counted as 1 working day. In addition to collective farms, there are hundreds of state farms which are designed to be models of mechanized farming and boast of the advanced techniques learned from the progressive U. S. S. R. The state farms are owned by the state and the farmers become employees of the state working for their wages.

It is also important to note that the cooperatives not only mark a further step toward socialism but also enable the state to exercise control over peasants through the cooperatives. Again quoting Teng Tzu-hui:

"Individual peasants cannot be directly controlled by the state plan. They formulate their production plans according to their own requirements and potentialities; they do not formulate plans according to the requirements of the state. Individual peasant units are too numerous for the state to conclude contracts with every household. But once these individual peasants have been organized into cooperatives, the situation becomes different. On the one hand, the number of units becomes smaller, and, on the other, their productivity is increased and it is easier for them to accept the state plan."

Besides the producers' cooperatives, there are supply and marketing cooperatives, credit cooperatives, and handicraft cooperatives. They are all sponsored by the state and under the control of the state. The credit cooperatives are exempted from tax and get loans from the People's Bank; through them the peasants become more dependent on the state. The supply and marketing cooperatives are actually the agents of the state. It must be remembered in this connection that peasants are not permitted to engage in private trading in grain and cotton; they are required to sell them directly to the state. The supply and marketing cooperatives are authorized agents for the purchase and marketing of agricultural produce. They also supply the countryside with industrial goods, ranging from rubber shoes to chemical fertilizers. They maintain close contacts with the state trading companies. As a part of their contract to purchase from the peasants and supply their needs, they get the peasants to make their production plans in harmony with state plans. According to the estimate of a British writer in Hongkong, one-fourth of the country's total retail trade in 1953 was done through cooperatives and in some areas the percentage was as high as 50 percent to 80 percent.[4] "As more and more rural trade is handled by the cooperatives instead of by private merchants," observed one Communist writer, "the peasants will have that much less connection with private capitalism."[5]

[4] Far Eastern Enomic Review (Hongkong), 17: 788, December 16, 1954.

[5] Ai Ti, Supply and Marketing Cooperatives, People's China, December 16, 1954, p. 10.

Chinese Communism and the Proletarian Revolution—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the following is a continuation of the speech of Dr. Theodore Hsi-en Chen entitled "Chinese Communism and the Proletarian Revolution":

Peasant reactions

The peasants who at an earlier stage joyously supported the agrarian reform in anticipation of the pride and benefit of land ownership soon found themselves in precarious temporary possession of land which is eventually to be taken away from them. In spite of the exhortations to organize and reap the benefits of increased production, their innate individualism creates in them a strong resistance against the pressure of the cadres. Not only are they anxious to hang on to their land holdings, but they are unenthusiastic about the appeal for increased production because they have to accept the production plan of the state, meet the production quotas assigned by the state, pay high taxes to the state, and sell their produce to the state at prices determined by the state.

Peasant reactions have been expressed in various ways. Some peasants who were given land in the agrarian reform became so dissatisfied with conditions that they deserted their farms and homes and drifted into the cities in search of relief. Some of them returned to the local authorities the land which had been distributed to them. According to the official Chinese Communist news agency, two cities in Manchuria reported the influx of more than 20,000 peasants within 1 month in February 1953, and the city of Sian reported a daily influx of more than 600 peasants. The migration of villages into the cities, where they merely joined the ranks of the unemployed, assumed such serious proportions that the central government in Peking issued a directive on April 17, 1953, prohibiting the blind migration of peasants and ordered the local authorities to cease issuing travel permits to peasants unless they could present definite proof of urban employment.[6]

Among those who remained on the farms, many resorted to negative methods of resistance. Some neglected their farms, others refused to meet production quotas. Communist leaders openly criticized the growth of formalism in the rural cooperative movement, because many peasants followed the form of organizing mutual-aid teams and cooperatives but failed to carry out their spirit. It was admitted that many peasants yielded to the pressure to organize but showed no interest in the teams or cooperatives they joined. It was found that many mutual-aid teams and cooperatives were very badly managed and there was much waste and confusion. So unsatisfactory was the situation that 2,600 cooperatives in north China were in the spring of 1953 changed into mutual-aid teams, and many peasants were given a chance to quit the cooperatives they had joined.

It is now well known that whenever there is a failure, the Communists must always find a scapegoat. The top leadership is never wrong; its basic policy is always correct. If the results are not good, the trouble must lie in the erroneous execution of a correct policy. In this case, the rural cadres were blamed for undue haste in pushing the peasants into mutual-aid teams and in transforming the teams into cooperatives. The big guns of ideological purging were now brought into action. The cadres were chastised for having fallen into "left" deviation, for having committed "blind actionism" and "adventurism." Those who were forcing peasants to organize were condemned for "commandism" and violation of "the mass line." Others who had allowed the teams and cooperatives to lose their effectiveness were accused of "routinism" and "formalism."

The central committee of the Communist Party issued a directive in December 1953, calling attention to the "passive attitude" of peasants toward mutual aid and cooperation as a result of undue haste in the introduction of socialism. At the same time, the directive reiterated that the eventual goal of agricultural development was collective and Socialist farming. The important thing was to push abead as much as possible without antagonizing the peasants, but not to rush into advanced stages of cooperation before the peasants were ready. Whether or not the peasants are ready seems to depend entirely on results. To be too slow in guiding the peasants is to lapse into laissez faire, which is also condemned by the directive. As in other instances, the cadres are expected to steer a difficult middle course between the pitfalls of "commandism," which means to get too far ahead of the masses, and "tailism," which means failure to lead the masses.

The warning against adventurism did not mean any relaxation in the effort to push forward toward socialism as quickly as practical circumstances would permit. The emphasis is now put on the education and persuasion of peasants so that they may see the benefit of organization and voluntarily join the cooperative movement. Party organizations and cadres are directed to intensify the education program among the rural population. Member of the Communist youth corps are instructed to undertake blitz functions to induce peasants to join cooperative units. Peasants who are slow in accepting are to be contacted individually so that their thought may be remolded and their backward ideas and doubts may be dispelled. Proper education is needed to overcome the "peasants' attachment to their land."[7] While propaganda and persuasion are the chosen methods, the pressure that is brought to bear on peasants is strong and unrelenting. By hook or by crook, the Chinese Communists intend to attain their objective of the Socialist remolding of agriculture within the next 5 years.

Socialism in the cities

Communist planning gives a high priority to industrialization. The goal is the transformation of China into an industrialized nation. For the promotion of industry at the present stage of China's economic development, private capital is much needed. At the same time the Communists have always maintained that industries, banks, big business, and all major means of production, transportation, and communication must be owned and controlled by the state. Private capital and private business, while needed and tolerated during the present transitional period, must be restricted and subordinated to the state-owned enterprises. As the nation moves forward toward socialism, private capital and private business

[6] Jen Min Jih Pao, April 18, 1953

[7] Also in Teng Tzu-hui's address, cited above.

must dwindle in importance and the state-owned enterprises must increasingly become the prevailing mode of the national economy.

In the early days of the new regime, the Communists gave all kinds of assurance to the business people to induce them to offer their capital and service to the new society. It was emphasized that capitalism was still needed in China and would be needed for a long time. Private capital was assured of legitimate profit and the state even undertook to curb the ambitious hopes and demands of labor by proposing the principle of mutual benefit to capital and labor and warning the workers that they should not deprive capital of its legitimate profit. That was a time when the new regime was known for its moderation of policy.

After the Korean war, moderation gave way to tough measures. The campaign for the suppression of counter-revolutionaries turned out to be a bloody purge which struck terror in the hearts of all and left no doubt that the only chance of survival lay in full cooperation with the new rulers. With the five-anticampaign the ax fell hard on private business. Actually, the purging of business people did not represent a sudden reversal of policy; it was merely a measure to make sure that the business people who survived the purge would accept the dictation of the state. From the standpoint of the class struggle, the liquidation of capitalists in the cities was as essential as the liquidation of the landlords. From the standpoint of socialism, the five-anticampaign was a necessary prelude to Socialist industrialization and the socialization of trade and commerce, just as the land reform paved the way for the Socialist remoulding of agriculture.

The Communists frankly say that the five-anticampaign laid the groundwork for the first 5-year plan inaugurated in January 1953. Space permits only a brief mention of a few characteristics of the 5-year plan. The emphasis is on heavy industry and on the industrial basis of national defense. The people are frankly told that they cannot expect any great increase in the comforts of living for sometime to come; for the sake of industrialization, the people are asked to tighten their belts, work harder than ever, and practice austerity living. The new industries are state enterprises; the party and the state exercise strict control not only to insure centralized planning but also to make sure that the Socialist pattern is followed. Socialist industrialization is the keynote; capitalist industrialization in any form is not to be tolerated. Party cadres and members of the youth corps play an active and leading role not only in the campaign to increase efficiency of production, but also in the political indoctrination and the proper Socialist education of all industrial workers. Ideological orthodoxy is considered as important as technical competency. Any symptom of laggardness or inefficiency is attributed to ideological inadequacy and brings forth a renewed emphasis on political indoctrination to correct any erroneous thoughts that hamper greater effort. Finally, it is constantly emphasized that the 5-year plan cannot succeed without the material help and technological guidance of the U. S. S. R. All branches of industry and agriculture as well as schools and propaganda agencies are urged to learn and adopt the advanced techniques of the U. S. S. R.

The general line

As the 5-year plan got under way the Communists felt the need of a further clarification of the Socialist goal of all planning and effort. This came in a statement which was propagandized as the "general line of the state." The general line is the economic policy of the state in the period of transition to socialism. It calls upon the nation to put forth a concerted effort to achieve the Socialist industrialization of the nation and the Socialist transformation of agriculture, handicraft production, and private industry and commerce by the state. Its objective is a steady expansion of the Socialist economy and a corresponding decrease in importance of the non-Socialist sectors of the national economy.

In the summer of 1953 Communist propaganda went into high gear to flood the country with discussion of the general line. Youth groups, women's organizations, the trade unions, the cadres and members of the party, Government personnel, as well as business people and peasants, were led to organize study groups to gain a clearer understanding of the general line and the specific contributions each is to make toward the success of the general line. As in other instances of Communist propaganda, special documents and study outlines were prepared for this purpose. The study of the general line was coordinated with an intensive study of chapters 9–12 of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, for it was maintained that the new economic policy of the Soviet Union and its experience in economic development provided a most valuable guide for China's 5-year plan.

The urban counterpart of the Socialist remolding of agriculture is the Socialist remolding of private industry and commerce. The new constitution of Communist China declares that "the policy of the state toward capitalist industry and commerce is to use, restrict, and transform them." The state utilizes the resources and experience of private industry and commerce for its own purpose, but at the same time it must control and restrict private enterprises in order to suppress their exploitative character. In the long run, however, it is necessary to insist on the reform of all private enterprises so that they may be transformed into Socialist enterprises.

Transitional stages

Just as mutual-aid teams and cooperatives are proposed for intermediate steps in the remolding of agriculture, the Communists offer for private industry and commerce the intermediate stages of state capitalism. State capitalism, they say, is the most appropriate medium through which private capitalism may be remolded into Socialist economy. In state capitalism, private business accepts the control of the government and the leadership of the state-owned economy. State capitalism, it is explained, represents a form of cooperation between capitalist and Socialist economy, with the latter assuming the role of leadership. State capitalist enterprises are guided by the needs of the state and facilitate the direct supervision of the state over private capitalism and capitalists in order to lead them toward socialism.

There are various form of state capitalism now offered as transitional stages. The most elementary form of state capitalism provides for the purchase of the products of private industry by the state. This form is today considered inadequate.. A more-advanced form, considered more acceptable today, provides for state participation in private industry by means of processing jobs, orders for goods, centralized purchase, and underwriting of sales. In plainer language, this means cooperation between state and private capitalism in the following ways:

1. Private factories turn out finished goods for the state to its specifications, within a stated time. The state supplies all raw or semifinished materials and pays for their processing.

2. The state places orders with capitalist firms, for which it may make part payment in advance or supply part of the raw materials.

3. The state purchases the entire output of capitalist enterprises producing certain goods needed in the economic life of the nation. Such goods may not be sold by private producers on the free market.

4. The state undertakes to sell all the finished products of a capitalist firm.[8]

By fulfilling these tasks according to the demands of the state, the Communists point out, private capitalism takes a long step toward accepting the direction of the state and coordinaitng its planning with state planning. The fundamental nature of capitalism, however, has not been changed, and ownership of the enterprises remains entirely in private hands. The capitalists continue in charge of production, but the state controls the supply of raw materials and the marketing of products.

A still higher form of state capitalism is the state-private joint enterprise. During the last year, the Communists stepped up their campaign to change capitalist enterprises from private ownership to joint state-private ownership. Joint ownership entails joint operation, and the state appoints representatives to run the business together with the capitalists. The operation of a state-private joint enterprise is based on the needs of the state; operation and management "no longer follow the capitalist ways," but approach the ways of the state enterprises. The guiding policy is the planned development of the national economy. Only a small part of the profit goes to dividends for shareholders. The greater part is set aside as reserve funds to be used for the development of production or for investments beneficial to state plans.

The regulations governing state-private joint enterprises clearly stipulate that such enterprises shall be under the leadership of the state and the state is the more important and powerful partner. The state-private enterprises are placed under the direction of specially designated organs of the government and their financial affairs are controlled by the government. Representatives of the state occupy the leading position in the operation and management of the enterprises and the representatives of private capital must accept the leadership of the former. Nevertheless, the Communist theorists emphasize that even this higher form of state capitalism must be considered as a transitional stage. It is only semi-Socialist in nature; in time its capitalist elements must be gradually eliminated and its Socialist elements must continue to grow.

Reform of industrialists and merchants

Despite Communist declamations on the advantages of Socialist transformation, business people are slow in responding to the appeal. As in other instances, the Communists officially declare that any remolding must be done with the voluntary cooperation of the business people. They use all kinds of pressure, ranging from exhortations to indirect threats, to induce the capitalists to offer voluntarily to put their enterprises under state-private joint ownership and operation. Only 12 percent of private industry accepted joint ownership and operation in 1953. Even in the relatively elementary form of processing jobs for the government, the Communists complained that many capitalists showed no interest in the needs and plans of the state and turned out inferior products at high production cost. Thus they saw that the Socialist transformation of capitalism could not succeed without the Socialist remolding of the capitalists. True to their ideological zeal and their passion for thought reform, they embarked upon a campaign of socialist education of capitalists and business people.

In doing this they employ the familiar formula of self-education and self-reform. Progressive elements in industry and commerce were asked to lead and organize their fellow men for careful study and active support of the general line. The Federation of

[8] Chien Chia-chu, State Capitalism in China, People's China (Peking), December 1, 1954, pp. 5–6.

Industry and Commerce was organized for this purpose. Local organizations were established to guide industry and commerce in development along the lines of State planning. The local organizations were coordinated under the All-China Federation of Industry and Commerce. How this agency is used as a means of control over private industry and commerce is clearly shown by the activities of the national congress of the federation meeting in Peking in October, 1953. The congress was attended by 640 delegates representing State-owned enterprises, cooperatives, public-private joint enterprises, and private enterprises. The great majority were representatives of private industry and commerce and it was obvious that the whole show was being planned for their benefit. The representatives of non-private enterprises were there simply to increase the pressure brought to bear upon private enterprises to reform themselves for more effective service to the State. The socialist remoulding of private industry and commerce was the one central theme of the congress. The opening address of the chairman of the congress was entitled "Struggle for Pursuing the General Line of the State and for Correct Manifestation of the Positive Role of Private Industry and Commerce." After 3 weeks of sustained propaganda and pressure, the congress adopted resolutions pledging the readiness of private industrialists and merchants to move toward state capitalism actively and spontaneously, to combine individual reform with the reform of enterprises, to strengthen the reform of our individual ideology, and to accept the leadership of the state in all matters. The resolution reads in part as follows:

"The Congress unanimously supports the general line of the state during the transitional period and the policy of utilizing, restricting, and reforming private industry and commerce. Private industrialists and merchants throughout the country must actively undertake the operation of enterprises beneficial to the state and the people's livelihood, accept the control of the People's Government, the leadership of state-owned economy, and the supervision of the masses of workers, and actively meet the demands for their socialist reform by the state."

Chinese Communism and the Proletarian Revolution—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the following is a continuation of the speech of Dr. Theodore Hsi-en Chen entitled "Chinese Communism and the Proletarian Revolution":

Another resolution of the congress deserves attention. It declares that it is the unanimous aspiration of the people, industrialists, and merchants through China to strengthen cooperation with the Soviet Union and to learn from the Soviet Union. It directs all local organizations of the federation to join the local branches of the Sino-Soviet Friendship Association as group members in order to facilitate the study of the advanced scientific techniques of the Soviet Union and to work together for a further strengthening of the unbreakable fraternity and friendship between China and the Soviet Union.

The reform of the industrialists and merchants was carried out by the usual methods of propaganda and brain washing. Well-known business people were asked to make public statements indicating their new viewpoints and convictions as a result of the socialist education and their criticism and self-criticism in the course of such education. Newspapers widely publicize such statements in which leading industrialists and merchants confess their past errors and selfish ways and vow their wholehearted support of the Socialist goal of the state.[9]

State trading companies

In the meantime, the Communists have established a network of state trading companies which are assuming practically monopolisic control over trade and commerce. There were 35,000 state trading companies in 1953, and the number is still increasing. They control foreign trade as well as domestic trade. They process and market almost all the products of the state-operated factories and most of the products of the private industries. So complete is their monopoly that private business enterprises were forced to convert themselves into marketing agencies for the state companies. This, of course, is exactly what the Communists want in the Socialist transformation of private enterprises. The British Far Eastern Economic Review reports as follows:

"By the summer of 1954, the wholesale trade of the state trading companies had reached 80 percent of such trade, while the retail trade reached 50 percent. Instead of depending upon the private wholesalers and producers to supply them with goods in the past, the private retailers were forced to depend upon the state enterprises and cooperatives for their supplies." [10]

The names of a few state trading companies may give some indication of their nature and scope. Among the large companies, each controlling many subsidiary units at various levels, are the General Goods Co., the Cotton, Cotton Yarn & Cloth Co., the Coal Enterprise Construction Supplies Co., the Hardware & Machinery Co., the Communications Electrical Engineering Supplies Co., and so on. The power of the trading companies was further increased by the policy of planned purchase and supply. By means of planned purchase the state controls the supply of commodities; by planned supply it controls the distribution of goods and the rationing of scarce commodities. In 1953, the state instituted planned purchase and supply of grain and oil-bearing crops.[11] In September 1954 cotton and cotton cloth were added to the list. Transactions in these areas have been completely taken away from private business and have further enhanced the scope of the state monopolies handled by the state trading companies. The disappearance of the free market and the consequent expansion of the orbit of state capitalism is again hailed by the Communists as progress in the right direction.

Despite these apparent successes, the path to socialism is by no means smooth. Reference has already been made to the unfavorable reactions of peasants and of industrialists and merchants, even though there is no alternative except to yield to persuasion and Socialist education. Communist leaders have on many occasions expressed alarm over what they call the rebirth of capitalism in rural and urban China. They point out that peasants insufficiently educated in Socialist ideas resist the policy of planned purchase and supply and illegally seek to sell their produce in the free market. In the cities, even party members and cadres, officials complain, have shown a tendency to set up their own independent business in violation of the official policy of restricting and reforming private capitalism.

Furthermore, the performance of the state trading companies has been disappointing to the Communist leaders. They have been severely criticized for mismanagement, for waste and inefficiency. They have failed to fulfill state plans.[12]

These difficulties, however, do not deflect the Communists from their goal. They are perfectly sure that their socialist goal is right and attainable. Any shortcomings in the execution of State plans, they believe, can be corrected by closer supervision and a more systematic effort to eliminate "erroneous thought" and to implant the proper ideological outlook. A fundamental solution they always fall back upon is more study of Marxism-Leninism. If production lags behind the assigned quota, the trouble is believed to lie in the lack of enthusiasm for production, and the enthusiasm must be supplied by more study of Marxism. If there are gross errors in planning and management, they can be corrected by a more careful study of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. If workers and industrialists are too much concerned about their personal interests, what they need is a clearer understanding of the people's democracy. The Communists have a superstitious belief in the efficacy of their ideology in solving all problems pertaining to the proletarian and socialist revolution. Stricter control, intensified ideological indoctrination, more brain-washing, more "criticism and self-criticism"; these are the sure cures the devoted and determined disciples of Marxism-Leninism prescribe for all economic, social, and political ailments.

IV. STRICTER CONTROL BY STATE AND PARTY

The increase of State power has taken place not only in the economic life of the Nation, but in all phases of political and social life. As a matter of fact, every major development of the past few years and every reform inaugurated by the new regime have resulted in a more rigid control of the population by the state. Even such a reform as the marriage law, directed apparently against feudalistic marriage customs and professing to accord freedom and equality to women, turned out to be a measure to displace the old family tie with a new loyalty to the state and the proletarian cause, and a device to make the family an instrument of the state to "mobilize" its members to lend active support to state plans. The military adventures abroad, the purging of counter-revolutionaries at home, the class struggle, the land reform, and the Nation-wide program of ideological indoctrination have step by step put the entire population under the manipulation of the state and the Communist Party. Even "universal suffrage," propagandized as a magnificent example of democracy when the people were given a chance to vote for the delegates to "people's congresses," constituted another step in tightening the grip of the party and the government, because the elections were preceded by the careful investigation and screening of qualified voters and special

[9] For example, the Jen Min Jih Pao published 3 of such statements in 1 issue, September 26, 1954.

[10] Far Eastern Economic Review 17: 677–678, November 25, 1954.

[11] The Communists admit that one reason for the shortage of such items is that agricultural produce has been exported in exchange for machinery and industrial equipment. It is understood that most of the export has gone to Russia, and the shortage of grain, vegetables, oils, meat and other consumers' goods has necessitated a strict system of rationing and "planned supply."

[12] See, for example, editorials of Jen Min Jih Pao, October 18, 1954, and November 4, 1954.

courts were set up to disqualify and to expose as counter-revolutionary any individuals who were not completely in accord with the new regime.

Besides, the government structure introduced in 1949 has been modified to make for greater centralization of power. At first, it was found convenient to divide the country into six administrative areas, each ruled by a governmental body which served as liaison between the central government and the provincial or municipal governments. By the end of 1952, the Communists were ready for a more direct enforcement of central authority. A series of changes in the structure of government throughout 1953 steadily reduced the importance and authority of the administrative areas and brought about a consolidation of the provinces under the direct control of the central authorities.

The trend of centralization in government became even clearer with the reorganization of the government in October 1954. The Central People's Government Council, which stood in an intermediate position between the chairman of the People's Republic (Mao Tse-tung) and the Premier has been abolished so that the Premier and his cabinet are now directly responsible to the Chairman of the Republic. From 1949 to 1954 there were six Vice Chairmen under the Chairman; now there is only one Vice Chairman.

The new reorganization has tightened the grip of the Communist Party on the reins of government. The Communists now take over all the top offices of the government. Whereas three of the six former Vice Chairmen were non-Communists, but sympathizers who helped to put up the appearance of a multi-party government, the Chairman and Vice Chairman (Chu Teh, the commander-in-chief of the Red Army) today are both Communists. The Premier (Chou En-lai) is a Communist and the Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress, now called "the highest organ of state power" is the Communist Party's leading theoretician, Liu Shao-chi. Among other members of the Politburo of the Communist Party who hold key positions in the government are P'eng Chen as Secretary-General of the National People's Congress, Ch'en Yun as the First Vice Premier, and Tung Pi-wu as the President of the Supreme People's Court.[13] Furthermore, Communists occupy the majority of seats in all the major governmental bodies: the State Council (the cabinet), the National Defense Council, and the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress. To all intents and purposes, the Politburo of the Communist Party now runs the government in China today, and the "other political parties" have no real position except to serve as echoes of state policy and supporters of the Communist Party.

In view of the Communists' claim that they are building a "workers' state" of which the workers are the "new masters," it would be interesting to look briefly at the position of workers in the new state. One finds a marked difference in the Communist labor policy before and after their seizure of national power.

When the objective was the overthrow of the existing order, the Communists were labor agitators who organized labor to make demands upon capital and to express their opposition to capitalist exploitation by strikes, riots, and other destructive methods. After the establishment of the new regime, the new rulers found themselves confronted with the tasks of economic recovery and industrial development and they were determined that progress should not be retarded by excessive labor demands. A new slogan, "mutual benefit to capital and labor," was proposed. Furthermore, labor was told that while antagonism toward capital is justifiable in an exploitative capitalistic state, in the People's Republic of China the state represents the people and industry belongs to the people and as long as the interests of the state are being served it would be unwise to start labor disputes that tend to disrupt state plans. Indeed, to endanger the program of the state by demands for excessive privileges would be to fall into the error of left deviation.[14]

Consequently, labor discipline became as important a concept as labor welfare, or perhaps even more so, as far as the immediate situation of today is concerned. Trade unions are instructed to organize their members for greater effort for the fulfillment of state plans, even at the personal sacrifice of workers. To show their support of the state, workers are encouraged to volunteer longer hours of work without extra pay, even to ask voluntarily for lower wages in order to advance the cause of the people's democracy. It is, then, no surprise that the trade-union law specifies (in art. 9 of the law) that the following activities that the trade unions are supposed to carry out "to safeguard the fundamental interests of the working class":

(a) Educate and organize the masses of workers and staff members to support the laws and decrees of the people's government; carry out the policies of the people's government in order to consolidate the people's state power which is led by the working class.

(b) Educate and organize the masses of workers and staff members to adopt a new attitude toward labor, to observe labor discipline, to organize labor-emulation campaigns and other production movements in order to insure the fulfillment of the production plans.

(c) Protect public property; oppose corruption, waste, and bureaucracy; and fight against saboteurs in enterprises operated by the State or by cooperatives and in institutions and schools.

(d) Promote in private enterprises the policy of developing production and of benefiting both labor and capital, and oppose acts in violation of government laws and decrees or acts detrimental to production.

V. LOYALTY TO INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM

The proletarian-Socialist revolution is a world-wide movement. It is not confined by national boundaries. The Communists call themselves proletarian internationalists who accept the duty and responsibility of aiding and promoting the proletarian revolution in all parts of the world. They cannot rest satisfied with a successful revolution in their own country; they must actively associate themselves with the world struggle. Liu Shao-chi expressed this view most clearly when he said:

"Communists will be betraying the proletariat and communism if, after their own nation has been freed from imperialist oppression, they descend to the position of bourgeois nationalism, carrying out a policy of national selfishness, and sacrificing the common international interests of the working people and the proletarian masses of all the nations throughout the world, or if they adopt the policy of national seclusion and chauvinism to oppose proletarian internationalism, to reject the international unity of the proletarian and the working people and to reject the Socialist Soviet Union."[15]

When they pledge their unswerving support of the proletarian-socialist world revolution, the Chinese Communists never fail to emphasize that such a resolution cannot succeed without the leadership of the Soviet Union. The bond between Red China and Soviet Russia is not only political and economic; it is rooted in the Communist ideology. Mao Tse-tung said that the dividing line in history is the Russian October Revolution of 1917, which opened the way and set the example for other proletarian-socialist revolutions. He and his associates repeatedly declare that the guidance of the first and the "most advanced" socialist state of the world is absolutely essential to the success of the Chinese revolution. Ideological fervor impels them to look to the Soviet Union for leadership.

The recent decision of the Chinese Communists to establish diplomatic relations with Yugoslavia furnishes another indication of their readiness to follow the lead of the Soviet Union. When Tito incurred the wrath of the Kremlin in 1948 the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party adopted a resolution violently denouncing Titoism as a betrayal of the proletarian cause. Although Yugoslavia was among the first nations to recognize the new regime in China in October 1949, the Chinese Communists ignored the friendly gesture and declined to negotiate with Tito. In recent months, however, the Soviet decision to normalize relations with Yugoslavia produced a corresponding change in the Chinese attitude. In January of this year, Communist China finally agreed to establish diplomatic relations with Yugoslavia.

Communist China is not a Soviet satellite, but neither is Mao Tse-tung a Tito-in-the-making. There are indications that the present leaders of the Soviet Union recognize the growing stature of Communist China and are quite willing to recognize it as a partner, rather than a mere follower, in the world revolution. From the standpoint of the Chinese Communists, they are ready to accept Russia as the senior partner or the "Big Brother." At any rate, the tie is close, and the fundamental basis of the close tie is the common devotion to the proletarian-socialist world revolution.

[13] Chou En-lai also serves as the chairman of the People's Political Consultative Conference.

[14] See editorial of New China News Agency on this subject in China Digest (Peking), September 21, 1949.

[15] Liu Shao-chi, Internationalism and Nationalism.

John Stelle, of Illinois, Sponsored Idea Which Led to GI Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, John Stelle, of Illinois, more than any other man in the United States, can be regarded as the father of the GI bill of rights.

Under leave to do so, I include with remarks I herewith make on the House floor an article from the American Legion magazine of June 1955, which outlines some of the benefits which came not only to the veterans but to our national economic life from the enactment of the GI bill by a Democratic Congress in 1944.

Probably no one within the Legion or outside it did more to promote this program than did John Stelle. He led others in putting the full force and influence of the Legion behind an idea which resulted from a motion he made on November 18, 1943, before the national executive committee of the Legion. In

that motion, he proposed a special committee to draft a bill for the readjustment of World War II veterans then still engaged in fighting for their country.

John Stelle became chairman of that special committee and steered the course of his idea into a reality.

There were, of course, many men within the Legion who joined with John Stelle in the promotion of the GI bill of rights, and he would be the first to give them the full credit for the success of the Legion planning to promote this legislation. But I think they would also join me in paying tribute to John Stelle as the father of the idea and as the keyman in bringing about successful congressional action on a proposal, which President Franklin D. Roosevelt said as he signed the bill on June 22, 1944, "gives emphatic notice to the men and women of our Armed Forces that the American people do not intend to let them down."

The article in the June Legion magazine follows:

WHAT THE GI BILL DID FOR AMERICA

(By Sam Stavisky)

On November 18, 1943, the national executive committee of the American Legion adopted a motion offered by the member from Illinois, former Illinois Governor, John Stelle.

Stelle (later national commander of the Legion) proposed a special committee to draft a bill for the readjustment of World War II veterans, then engaged in global warfare.

Twelve days later, National Commander Warren Atherton named the committee, with Stelle as chairman and six other outstanding Legionnaires, including Robert W. Sisson, of Arkansas, secretary; Past National Commander Harry Colmery, of Kansas; Sam Rorex, of Arkansas; W. B. Waldrip, of Michigan; Robert M. McCurdy, of California; and Maurice F. Devine, of New Hampshire.

To the committee was added a special Legion task force, including Past National Commander Roane Waring, of Tennessee; Lyon W. Brandon, of Mississippi; James P. Ringley, of Illinois; Pat Kelly, of Georgia; and Lawrence J. Fenlon, of Illinois.

On June 22, 1944 (when the Normandy beachhead was expanding in Europe, and New Guinea had been brought under effective control in the Pacific), the program of that special American Legion committee became Public Law 346 of the 78th Congress. In slightly less than 7 months the committee, together with a staff task force and outside consultants, had hammered its program into shape and, with the legislative backing of the entire Legion and thousands of other citizens, had turned it into a law the like of which had never been written before. It was known as the GI bill of rights.

Outstanding service in presenting the bill to the legislature was rendered by the late Frank Sullivan, of Connecticut, then acting American Legion national legislative director. The Hearst newspapers had assigned men full time to the project and kept the development of the bill constantly before the public.

As he signed the GI bill on June 22, 1944, President Franklin D. Roosevelt said: "This law gives emphatic notice to the men and women of our Armed Forces that the American people do not intend to let them down."

Ten years later, on June 22, 1954, the United States Government made a 10-year appraisal of the GI bill of rights, and, through the Veterans' Administration, publicly proclaimed:

"But the veterans have not let the American people down either."

Nor had the GI bill.

On the contrary, the GI bill had proved to be not only a successful method for helping the 16 million veterans of World War II return and readjust to civilian life, but it also turned out to be a wise national investment in people—the Nation's most important resource.

The dividends of this unique investment have been unexpectedly large, both to the veteran and the Nation—so great, in terms of national security, welfare, and prosperity, that the cost of that vast program has already been paid for many times over. And the dividends will keep rolling in for generations.

Even in terms of the least important standard of measurement—dollars—the GI bill has shown itself to be a self-paying proposition.

For example, the education and training program under the GI bill has cost Uncle Sam some $15 billion, according to VA estimates. However, the same Government statisticians calculate that by 1970, the more than 7,800,000 veterans who took training under the GI bill will have paid off the full cost of the program because through their training these vets have already attained an income level at which they are paying an extra billion dollars a year in Federal income taxes.

Through the GI bill loan-guaranty program, the veterans have purchased 4 million homes and have become America's largest single group of homeowners. The repayment trend of the past decade gives evidence that these veterans are excellent mortgage risks. Meanwhile, these veterans and their GI bill homes contribute to the commonweal of their communities, counties, and States through the payment of real-estate taxes.

Surprisingly few studies have been made of the overall impact of the GI bill upon the national economy. However, the huge 5-year study called America's Needs and Resources: A New Survey, just released by the 20th Century Fund, gives the GI bill an important role in America's post-World War II prosperity. The fund reports that the unprecedented GI program on behalf of veterans returning to civilian life after World War II restricted the growth of unemployment during the demobilization period and at the same time added substantially to personal income and consumer demand.

The survey goes on to say: "Since the veterans' program got underway at the time of a precipitous decline in Government demand for goods and services, it helped forestall a postwar economic crisis by stimulating civilian demand."

The GI bill benefits—such as readjustment allowance, schooling subsistence, housing loan on easy terms—also helped cement the stability of millions of veterans' families, which in turn gave a fresh spurt of power to the postwar economic boom.

In addition, according to the VA, the GI bill helped refill the national reservoir of trained manpower, dangerously depleted right after the war, with such persons as engineers, doctors, nurses, scientists, radio repairmen, mechanics, construction workers, metalworkers, electricians.

The total results of the bill surpassed the most optimistic dreams of the men of the American Legion who conceived it, who drafted it into law, and who fought it through Congress over bitter opposition.

The Nation had a long history of aid to the disabled veterans of our wars. But the GI Bill was the first major attempt to help the physically able veteran in his transition from war to peace.

The basic idea of the bill, explained by Dave Camelon, the Hearst newsman who covered the dramatic congressional battle over the new legislation, was: "* * * to give the men who were fighting the opportunity they deserved—to restore them, as nearly as possible, to the position they might have held if they had not been called to serve America."

While that was the nut of the bill and the main thought expressed by John Stelle when he started the ball rolling, the Legion never doubted that it would also be a tremendous boon to the country, and its representatives stressed again and again to Congress in 1944 that the GI Bill was sound national policy. The bill was fought, and almost successfully opposed, by others who claimed that it was dangerous.

The Legion leadership, backed by a thoroughly aroused rank-and-file, and enthusiastically supported by the public, smashed through the opposition of bureaucrats, educators, labor groups, business groups, real-estate lobbies, social workers—and even of other veterans organizations.

Four of them, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Regular Veterans Association sent an open letter to the Congress on February 16, 1944, opposing the bill—specifically the educational provisions—and urging Congress "not to be stampeded into hastily and possibly unwise legislation."

At times the battle appeared hopeless. The odds and the obstacles appeared insurmountable.[1] But the American Legion vowed that never again would America permit its men who served in war to be forced to walk the streets selling apples as they were after World War I. The specter of that national disgrace hung over the Legion's GI Bill battalion like a flag, and gave the Legion's drive new strength when the outlook for victory was dimmest.

The GI bill, noted Richard S. Jones, in his A History of the American Legion, "was the largest single legislative achievement of the Legion."

It was for sure. It was also an earnest promise by the American people—through Congress—that the United States was still a land of opportunity, and that for the veterans, the GI bill was the key to that opportunity.

The Nation made good its pledge. The veterans made good the opportunities, of which the major ones were education and training, readjustment allowance; job-finding aid; loans for homes, farms, and business enterprise.

Of the more than 7,800,000 ex-GI's who participated in GI bill training and education, some 2,200,000 attended colleges and universities; 3,500,000 went to schools below the college level; 1,400,000 took on-the-job training; and 700,000 enrolled in institutional on-farm training.

"The universal verdict of the accredited schools, colleges and universities is that veterans aided by the GI bill of rights made excellent use of their opportunities. The Nation is decidedly better off than it would have been had these returning veterans received no further education at public expense," declared Earl J. McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education, in urging Congress to extend the GI bill benefits to the veterans of the Korean war.

On the same occasion Dean Chester H. Katenkamp, of Baltimore Junior College, speaking officially for the 450 schools belonging to the American Association of Junior Colleges—and unofficially sounding the universal chord of approval by the Nation's educational leaders—put it this way:

"We believe that the GI bill of rights was one of the most constructive and beneficial pieces of legislation ever passed for veterans, that its real benefits will continue for a long period of time by reason of the fact that education and training will produce better citizens and more efficient and

[1] I Saw the GI Bill Written, by David Camelon, the American Legion magazine, September, October, and November 1949.

productive workers and professional people.

"We believe that the GI bill of rights is an investment by the Government which will really pay dividends in better citizenship, better workers, and people more competent to support the Government."

Yet a few months after the GI bill was passed, Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, then chancellor of the University of Chicago, publicly decried the new program. Colleges and universities, he said, would be converted into educational hobo jungles, and the veterans into educational hoboes.

Never was a prophecy wronger.

Ten years later it had been proved beyond a doubt that the veteran-student was more serious minded, more intent on getting ahead, and maturer than the nonveteran. Typical were the results of a 3½-year study at Brooklyn College which concluded that the veterans held a slight but consistent superiority over the nonveterans students.

College standards, instead of falling, as direfully predicted by GI bill opponents, rose under the impact of GI students questing for knowledge.

"The veterans have brought stability, maturity, higher standards of work, and a broadened adult viewpoint to the classrooms and compus," commented the social survey magazine, School and Society, 6 years after World War II.

Through the GI bill, the VA noted in its 10th anniversary summary of the program, World War II veterans have become the best educated group of people in the history of the United States.

Backing up this VA assertion is a study by the United States Census Bureau which shows that the average male veteran has completed high school and gone ahead for some college work, while the average male nonveteran has only completed 2 years of high school.

The advantage of educational privileges under the GI bill used by many veterans after completing their service is listed by Census as one of the major factors contributing to this difference in educational achievement.

Another Census survey reveals that veterans have generally shot ahead of nonveterans in earnings.

In 1947, according to the survey, the median income of male veterans between 25 and 34 years of age, was only $2,401, as against $2,585 for nonvets in the same age bracket. Six years later, the median income of the veterans rose 51 percent, to $3,631, while the median income of nonveterans rose only 19 percent, to $3,065.

"The higher income of these veterans may reflect the combined influence of the increase in work experience and the higher level of education which veterans have achieved as compared with nonveterans," the Census Bureau commented.

The heavy flow of ex-GI's into college stimulated university expansion programs, and gave a vigorous boost to the junior-college movement. The $2 billion in tuition and fees proved to be a financial shot in the arm for the hard-pressed schools. The tuition and subsistence permitted tens of thousands of young Americans to go to college who would have been unable to further their education simply for the lack of funds.

Furthermore, reports the Twentieth Century Fund study, the fact that many veterans did take advantage of the GI educational benefits to go to college is bound to spread the desire for higher education and to affect the long-run enrollment trend upward.

Veterans surging into below-college-level classrooms sparked the creation of some 7,600 new educational and training institutions. Public schools created and expanded job-training classes to aid the eager ex-GI's.

Veterans trained in the under-college-level schools showed, through a sampling poll, that they felt the Government and they themselves had received value for money spent on their education. A large number of the veterans replying to the poll expressed thanks to the Nation for the opportunity afforded them by the GI bill. The survey disclosed that 3 out of 4 veterans had found a job as a direct result of their training.

On-the-job training, despite widely publicized abuses by a small minority of veterans and chiseling schools, also made a substantial contribution to the national interest. The trainees were given the opportunity to earn while learning a trade.

During the peak of the on-job enrollment, the National Association of State Approval Agencies queried 19,000 participating employers. The poll disclosed that the employers wanted to continue their job-training programs by a preference of 3 to 1, and that they consider the programs worthwhile by a vote of 6 to 1.

The survey also revealed that more than one-third of the vet trainees had been hired by the firms which had trained them, and that half as many again were working elsewhere in jobs for which they had been trained under the GI bill. A congressional committee, while deploring abuses in the program, nonetheless reached the conclusion that with 65 percent of the veterans in on-job training having reached their employment objective, the program had been highly satisfactory.

A study of training courses pursued by veterans under the GI bill "leaves the impression" that the "vast majority" of the veteran-trainees "were interested in advancing themselves and attaining a secure position in society," according to an official information bulletin published by the VA Department of Veterans Benefits.

This training, the VA bulletin added, "generally prepared them for occupations which require a considerable amount of ability and skill and constitute important elements of our economy."

Key factors of the well-being of a nation include the skills of its workers, the abilities of its businessmen, the capacity of its professional men, and the husbandry of its farmers. No single national program ever gave so many people so many skills in so many pursuits as did the GI bill.

One-third of all who took GI bill training enrolled in craft, trade, and industrial courses. More than 700,000 went into mechanical training, principally for repairing autos. Nearly 450,000 went into radio and communications fields. Over 380,000 undertook training as carpenters, bricklayers, cement workers, plasterers, painters, plumbers, pipefitters, and tilesetters. Metalworking attracted more than 280,000 ex-GI's, including 62,000 who specialized in jewelry and watch repairing. Another 180,000 vets trained as electricians or in electrical equipment manufacturing. Refrigeration and air-conditioning courses drew more than 115,000 vets.

One-tenth of the veterans (around 700,000) enrolled in managerial or business administration training. More than 100,000 ex-GI's went into law courses, and over 240,000 into accounting and auditing. The clerical and sales occupations attracted more than 430,000 vets.

Teaching was the objective of 238,000 veterans, and 744,000 veterans aimed at becoming scientists. The social studies and social welfare work were pursued by some 100,000 ex-servicemen. Over 460,000 vets were trained in the humanities. Some 158,000 veterans were given special training in domestic, personal, and protective services.

Nearly 10 percent of all the veterans training under the GI bill aimed for agricultural goals, chiefly through the on-farm institutional training, a combination of classroom studies and practical farmwork.

In 1952, a House Select Committee, headed by Representative OLIN TEAGUE, of Texas, after an intensive investigation of the GI bill programs, reported to Congress as follows:

"As a readjustment device, there is little question that the educational program provided a spot for literally millions of young, bewildered veterans.

"It provided a place where they could learn, live, and at the same time adjust themselves to their civilian surroundings.

"Almost every American knows a young ex-serviceman who entered training, found his life's work, settled down, and is now doing well.

"It is significant to note that there has been no national incident of any importance involving disgruntled exservicemen * * * following the termination of World War II. This fact cannot be overemphasized. Our servicemen returned in great numbers at a time when industry was attempting to switch to peacetime production, and the future of the Nation was uncertain."

Perhaps the best evaluation of the GI bill education and training benefits is a single sentence from the Teague committee report:

"The good that has been accomplished and which will show itself more clearly in each succeeding year and in succeeding generations is incalculable."

A second major element of the GI bill—readjustment allowances—was so subjected to bad publicity through a relatively small number of abuses that even today there is little understanding by the public of the beneficent impact of this provision on the Nation's economy and general welfare.

At the unyielding insistence of the American Legion the GI bill contained a provision which provided that GI's returning to civilian life would be given $20 a week as a readjustment allowance, for a maximum of 52 weeks, while seeking work. It was easy for the GI bill detractors to pin—unjustly—the label of 52–20 Club on the entire program.

Yet those who have studied this facet of the GI bill are convinced that the readjustment allowance was an important factor in the integration of some 14 million veterans into the Nation's labor force within a few years after the end of the war, with a minimum of confusion to the Nation and hardship to the veterans.

Consider that near the end of World War II there were 54 million persons in the civilian labor force, hardly any unemployed. When the fighting ceased the war plants closed down, other plants shut down temporarily to convert from wartime to peacetime production.

In the midst of this economic shock some 11 million veterans were dumped on the labor market within a period of 12 months. For practical purposes, nearly all of them were unemployed.

Leading economists freely predicted that the idle would quickly number seven million, and they urged business and Government alike to make decisions based upon an impending postwar economic collapse.

In fact there were no riots, no armies of apples peddlers, no marches by hungry veterans seeking to aid of their Government. The public at large was hardly conscious of a veterans' unemployment problem.

The readjustment allowance served as a cushion—together with mustering out pay—to tide the veteran over the rough period between discharge and getting a job.

During the 5-year life of the readjustment allowance program, nearly 9 million veterans drew weekly payments, amounting to around $4 billion in all.

Some 10 percent of the payments went to self-employed veterans needing a little help while getting started in a business or profession.

The average veteran who drew his allowance did so for only 19 weeks. One out of

19 veterans exhausted his full 52 weeks of payment rights. VA studies make it clear that few veterans sought to stay on the idle rolls. On the contrary, many of the veterans applied for readjustment allowances only after weeks of seeking for work on their own.

Upon the virtual completion of the so-called 52–20 program, the VA, in 1951, assessed this benefit as follows:

"With the help of the readjustment allowance program, millions of veterans were successfully fed into the labor market, as demands and opportunities arose, without either violent disturbance to the national economy or undue hardship to the veterans."

Despite the rush for jobs and training on the part of the veterans discharged from the Armed Forces, the GI bill encouraged them to take vocational counseling so as to help them find their way to a worthwhile objective. VA gave more than 2 million vets vocational counseling before clearing them for education or training. The Department of Labor—through its Bureau of Employment Security and its Veterans Employment Service—provided job counseling for more than 2,500,000 veterans, and then gave the veterans priority in job referrals.

Through these provisions of the GI bill, veterans have become "the best educated, the best trained, and probably the best occupationally adjusted group of people in the history of the United States," declared Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell.

Among those well trained and well adjusted for their life work are the thousands of veterans who, under terms of the GI bill, received institutional on-the-farm training, and bought their own farms.

More than 750,000—1 out of 10 of all veterans taking education or training—combined classroom studies in successful farming (including instruction in the most effective management, production, and marketing techniques) along with practical training on the farm.

These veterans "have gone far in raising the standards of living for themselves and their families," according to congressional testimony by A. P. Fatherree, speaking for the American Vocational Association Committee on Institutional On-Farm Training Program.

In Mississippi alone nearly 40,000 veterans have enrolled in the program, he said. Among the accomplishments of these veterans, he cited an increase in their net income of $150 million in 5 years; more than 10,000 farms bought; construction of dwellings and farm buildings, and repairs, amounting to $24 million; purchases of $16 million in home appliances; expenditures of $30 million for farm machinery and repairs.

These veterans also bought more than 11,000 pure-bred dairy cattle, 8,300 pure-bred beef cattle, 18,000 registered hogs. They seeded and mineralized 201,000 acres of land; and, as a result of their training, they painted more than 15,500 homes; added electricity for more than 12,500 families; added some 4,000 bathrooms to their farm homes; installed running water in more than 9,000 farm homes.

Backed up by their know-how, more than 67,000 veterans obtained GI bill farm loans, guaranteed by the VA. Of these, half went into specialized operations, the rest into diversified crops.

Five times as many more veterans, more than 369,000, obtained special farm and farm operation loans from the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture, which through another provision of the GI bill gave veterans preference in the obtaining of farm loans based largely on personal integrity. Under both loan programs, the veterans have proven to be outstanding credit risks. Veterans have repaid, for example, more than half of the $505,790,000 farm operating money they have borrowed to date.

As in the case of agriculture, thousands of veterans combined their GI bill training with a GI bill loan to go into business for themselves. Some 221,000 vets obtained business loans amounting to more than $600 million in all.

A small percentage of these ex-servicemen, 12,300, defaulted. The remainder, however, appear to have made good. More than half of the business loans have already been repaid.

Again, not only the veterans themselves, but the country as a whole has benefited. For as these veterans became successful in their new enterprises they created jobs in their communities, and helped create or maintain prosperity in the Nation.

In terms of both short and long range national impact, the GI bill home loan program stands second only to the GI bill education and training program. By helping the veteran establish his own home, and thereby raising his standard of living, the GI bill created a tremendous demand for consumer goods of all kinds, energized the construction and allied industries, and invigorated the economic health of the United States. Yet, as in the education-training program, the most important contribution from the housing provisions of the GI bill is the human factor. Good housing means better citizens; better citizens mean better communities, better States, and a better Nation.

Four million veterans have taken advantage of the GI bill loan guaranty to establish a home. About $29 billion in home loans has been stimulated into action through this demand for better living. Veterans have already repaid in full $3,800,000,000 worth of GI loans (680,000 homes) and have reduced their mortgages by another $4 billion. Up to now, veterans mortgage defaults have amounted to about one-half of 1 percent of the home loans.

"This remarkable record is unexcelled in the history of credit experience," declared Harvey V. Higley, Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

"For the success of their programs, the veterans themselves should be accorded the most enthusiastic plaudits. They again have justified the Nation's confidence in them."

The veterans home loan program made a definite contribution to the improvement of American housing. In the midst of the stampede for housing right after World War II, the Veterans Administration increasingly tightened up its minimum construction and property standards. The VA regulations, along with the rules of the Federal Housing Administration, provided standards for structural soundness which have become the generally accepted criteria for urban residential construction.

At every income level, according to a Bureau of Labor Statistics survey, veterans tended to buy less expensive houses than nonveterans, "probably to keep the size of their monthly payments within manageable limits * * *."

Another Labor Department study concludes that "the VA-guaranty program was a major factor in bringing about large-scale construction of moderate priced homes."

The industrial impact of the GI home loan can be assessed by the fact that the outstanding indebtedness on these loans is more than $19 billion or about one-fourth of the total outstanding residential mortgage debt. The GI home loan has made a substantial contribution to the growth and expansion of mortgage and real-estate companies, insurance companies, mutual-savings banks, commercial banks, and saving and loan associations. The coming of the GI loan considerably changed the investment pattern of the lending institutions. More than 15,000 different institutional lenders have had an active interest in the GI loan. In 1953 alone, more than 17,000 builders constructed homes for sale to GI's under the VA home-loan guaranty program.

Even today, 11 years since enactment of the GI bill, the veterans are having an enormous impact on the Nation's construction industry and housing market. Some 3 million additional World War II and Korean conflict veterans are likely to get GI loans for new housing before their benefit expires, according to a VA forecast.

Even as the immediate effects of the World War II GI bill run out, the rich harvest that was planted by the American Legion back in 1944 has already reseeded itself. The GI bill of rights had become so woven into the fabric of American life that no sooner had the Korean war broken out, than Congress—with hardly a murmur of opposition—quickly provided a GI bill tailored to fit the needs of the Nation's new crop of veterans.

The newer GI bill differs from the old in that it, founded on experience, contains (a) fewer loopholes for abuses, (b) improved procedures, and (c) more stringent standards. Basically, the newer GI bill of rights, through the education-training program, unemployment compensation, and easy-to-obtain loans, proclaims the "same, new theme"—the right to opportunity for the man and woman who served our country in time of need. And as with the World War II bill, the Nation will be stronger in goods, jobs, and people, because of the Korea GI bill of rights.

Dixon-Yates Would Plunge a Dagger in the Heart of TVA, Bring About Higher Electric Rates to Consumers, and Guaranteed Huge Profits to the Holding Company Combine

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a resolution addressed to the Congress, which was adopted by the American Public Power Association in recent convention at Jacksonville, Fla.

The resolution follows:

DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

Whereas the so-called Dixon-Yates-AEC power contract was privately negotiated, without competitive bidding, and imposes upon all the taxpayers of the Nation a power cost to AEC of over $100 million more than would have been required had an equivalent amount of power been obtained from a power plant built by TVA; and

Whereas under this contract there is provided a huge subsidy for two giant utility holding companies who have as their purpose the encirclement, curtailment, and eventual destruction of TVA; and

Whereas such eventual destruction of TVA would remove its great value as a national asset and yardstick in holding power rates down, the results of which have been the saving of untold millions of dollars to ratepayers all over the Nation, and particularly to the whole Nation for the Government's national defense power costs; and

Whereas the Dixon-Yates combine arrogantly proposes to use as engineers and contractors upon the project a firm whose engineering and construction methods have been publicly criticized as being wasteful and uneconomic by officials of our Government upon other power projects, for which they have been engineers and contractors, thus unnecessarily adding millions of dollars to the Government's power costs on these projects; and

Whereas the dispute over the Dixon-Yates-AEC contract has plunged the Atomic Energy Commission into the middle of a political controversy, entirely foreign to the purposes for which it was created, thus causing widespread loss of public confidence in its ability to carry out its designated program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved—

1. We urge the Atomic Energy Commission to cancel the Dixon-Yates power contract,

2. We urge the Congress, after cancellation of the contract, to make possible the construction of a powerplant by TVA to furnish an amount of power equivalent to that proposed to be furnished by Dixon-Yates under this contract, and

3. We urge the Congress, in the event the AEC does not do this, to deny appropriations to AEC, and also to TVA, for the purpose of completing the contract.

The Fundamentals of TVA—An Adventure in Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Florence Times, Florence, Ala. I urge the entire membership of the House to read this splendid article:

THE FUNDAMENTALS OF TVA—AN ADVENTURE IN FAITH

For more than a century the Tennessee River was a stream of great undeveloped and wasted power, a potential inland waterway, a destroyer of life and property as it ran in flood, year after year. American capital, private and public, bypassed the Tennessee Valley and chose instead to invest in other regions. Why? The priceless resources of the area—sunshine, soil, water, and human beings—were not working together.

The creation of TVA May 18, 1933—22 years ago—established a new administrative resource to restore harmony. TVA's job was to rebuild the river so it would serve and not destroy. TVA's job was to see to it that the facts about the wise use of water, soil, minerals, and climate were discovered and made available to become part of the everyday working life of the people and their State and local governments.

These are the essential facts of the TVA's 22-year story:

1. Flood control is now an accomplished fact.

2. A 9-foot navigation channel 630 miles long connects the Appalachian Mountains with the Mississippi River. Freight traffic in ton-miles has increased thirtyfold since 1933, and the end of the growth is nowhere in sight. Shippers save $12 million a year using cheaper water transport. The safe, slack-water lakes are never idle, winter or summer, day or night.

3. Today, the Tennessee River neither destroys nor sinks into idleness. Waterpower once wasted now is transformed into electricity, consumed by households, farmers, industries, and great atomic plants. It earns more than enongh revenue to pay its own costs and repay the Federal Government for its appropriations invested in power. Demand for electricity for defense and peacetime use has outstripped the power capabilities of the river, requiring huge steam plants which soon will be TVA's main source of power—and this investment, too, is repaid to the Government through power earnings.

4. TVA's low electric rates have been an example for the Nation and a check on the power rates of privately owned utilities. Consumer savings resulting from lower private power rates—and among the important consumers is Uncle Sam—run to the hundreds of millions of dollars. Earnings for the private utility stockholders at the same time have swelled.

5. Fertilizers developed, tested, and demonstrated by TVA are speeding a revolution in southern agriculture. Pastures are supplanting broom sedge and sassafras briers. Dairying and stock farms are returning a better living than corn or cotton. Forest industries are growing and trees are becoming a money crop. Erosion is declining and water is retained to do its work on the land. The use of fertilizer is increasing nationwide.

6. By stimulating the interest of State and local agencies close to the people, TVA has opened new avenues for joint action against common problems, strengthening State and local initiative. Real incomes are rising, creating new buying power for the entire country. Per capita income in the valley has gone from 44 percent to 60 percent of the national average.

7. TVA power furnishes the base for some of the most strategic defense industry of the Nation. Two giant atomic plants operate in the valley, as well as a great Air Force supersonic wind tunnel, a guided-missile installation, and vital light-metal industries for jet aircraft; these defense plants and industries will by 1957 be using 75 percent of TVA power.

These are some of the facts which have made TVA's 22 years of creative effort a cooperative adventure in faith—faith in man's ability to voluntarily achieve harmony between human pursuits in making a living and nature's fruitful habits of growth and production.

And these are some of the reasons why TVA dams carry the label "Built for the people of the United States." Today, sunshine, soil, water, and human beings are working together in a once economically depressed Tennessee Valley.

All America benefits.

Armenian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr Speaker, whenever the Armenian people are mentioned, I think of the many substantial contributions Americans of Armenian descent have made to our national prosperity and free way of life. And I realize that Armenians represent another important national building block along with many other nationalities upon which our country has grown powerful.

As with those Americans of Dutch, Polish, German, or any other national origin—each has united on this continent with some positive contribution to the greatness of America which helps our country stand firm as the bulwark of freedom.

Armenians have not only given us great material gains from their own cultural, business, and artistic heritage but Armenians have given us an inner spiritual strength to help us believe in freedom and all for which it stands. For what national group understands the yoke of oppression better than they? What nation has demonstrated more actively its longing for a free atmosphere in which to live?

Tomorrow, May 28, is a day upon which to stop and consider the background of these brave people. For although small in population, they are united in their courage and determination. On this day, in 1918, Armenia achieved its goal of independence after centuries of rule dictated by Romans, Arabs, Turks, and Russians. Their independence was short-lived, because in September of 1920 they were again lashed to cruel oppression, this time by Russian dictatorship. But there is much more to any nation than meets the eye. Armenia has proved this wtih its great spirit and dedication which can never be chained in subjugation. So, although their country may not be physically free, the spirit of this small nation can never be anything but free, and this spirit will permeate to many corners of our country as well as of the entire world.

Academic Grand Slam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader Evening News May 19, 1955, which lauds the academic accomplishment of Richard Eugene Carr, Plymouth, Pa., for overcoming almost insurmountable odds in an extremely competitive examination for entry into the first class at the new United States Air Force Academy in Colorado. I, his congressional Representative, would like to extend my heartfelt congratulations to this young man for a job exceptionally well done and wish him, as well as the other 300 young men entering the Academy this year, the best of luck and happiness in the years that follow.

The editorial follows:

To this newspaper, it was especially gratifying to learn that Richard Eugene Carr, of Plymouth, had been accepted for the first class of cadets to enter the new United States Air Force Academy in Colorado. He is a Little Merchant and an honor student at Plymouth High School.

More than 6,000 American youths, the cream of the crop, had applied for the 301

available appointments, for the odds he had to overcome were 20 to 1. That he successfully met this stiff competition attests to his qualifications and attainments.

With so many clamoring for admission, the Air Force could be even more exacting than normally. The prestige of being a member of the first class at the Academy made the appointments especially desirable. Each of these cadets will be a marked man and can be expected to go far in this branch of the service.

It is a pleasure to join with his hometown and alma mater in offering congratulations and best wishes.

If This Is Monopoly—How Very Delightful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent obtained in the House yesterday, I insert in the RECORD an editorial entitled "If This Is Monopoly—How Very Delightful," from the Waukesha Daily Freeman, of Waukesha, Wis., under date of Monday, May 2, 1955. Since the committee is having executive meetings to consider this problem, I think the editorial very timely. The editorial reads as follows:

IF THIS IS MONOPOLY—HOW VERY DELIGHTFUL

Attorney General Vernon Thomson of Wisconsin testified last week before a House committee in Washington that the people of this State are victims of a monopolistic system of producing and distributing natural gas. The attorney general—like the Waukesha city council, its attorney and others—is on record as opposed to a bill by Representative HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas, which would free independent producers of natural gas from control of the Federal Power Commission. Attorney Thomson's statement is spectacular and alarming but we seriously question its veracity. It so happens that a survey of natural gas prices charged in Waukesha has been made by a nationally known economist, Dr. John W. Boatwright, for presentation to the committees in Congress studying this question. It is believed to be the first of its kind and it discloses some very interesting data.

The introduction of natural gas to Waukesha, the study reveals, reduced the average cost per thousand cubic feet for residential gas service by nearly one-half from 1949 prices. The average cost per thousand cubic feet for residential service by Wisconsin Natural Gas Co. in 1949 was $2.88 on an equivalent basis. The company converted to natural gas from manufactured gas in February, 1950. In 1953, the average cost for the same residential service was $1.48. During the 1949–53 period, the average use of natural gas per residential customer served by the company increased from 16,800 cubic feet per year to 51,300 cubic feet per year.

Prices received by independent producers in the fields where the Waukesha gas supply originates represent only a minor portion of the prices ultimately paid by consumers. Producers received an average of 9.5 cents per thousand cubic feet in 1953, an increase of 1.3 cents per thousand cubic feet from 1950. Thus, despite a slight increase in field price, the introduction of low-priced natural gas was responsible for very substantial reductions in average residential consumer costs. Costs of transporting the gas from the producing fields to the company rose slightly during the period, as reflected in average delivered costs at the Waukesha city gate. Average delivered cost was 28.2 cents per thousand cubic feet in 1950 and 35 cents in 1953.

The splendid price performance record shown by the foregoing was compiled during the period when there were no Federal controls upon natural-gas production. The pending legislation would, of course, continue controls upon the transportation and distribution phases of the industry, just as they have always been, and would provide additional safeguards for the consumer. But in answer to the Attorney General's cries of "wolf" on the Harris bill, we can only reply:

"If a natural-gas monopoly has produced the price the people of this community now enjoy, what a delightful monopoly it is."

The Letter Carriers' Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Providence Journal, Providence, R. I., for May 26, 1955. This article is a letter to the editor entitled "The Letter Carriers' Position," written by John B. Martin, president of branch 15, National Association of Letter Carriers.

The thoughts expressed in this letter are an excellent example of the fair and reasoned approach which these Federal employees have applied to a question of vital importance to them. It must have been with heavy hearts that they learned of the Presidential veto of their much-needed raise—particularly in view of the previous pattern of complete Presidential acceptance of other governmental pay raises.

Yet, though undoubtedly deeply disappointed, they make no recriminations but confine themselves to gratefully acknowledging any help extended to them. In my opinion, the letter is indicative of the dignified manner in which postal employees have regularly conducted their affairs.

The letter follows:

THE LETTER CARRIERS' POSITION

As president of branch 15, National Association of Letter Carriers, which is composed of all letter carriers within the confines of the Providence postal district, I extend to you and your staff our sincere feeling of appreciation for your recent editorials wherein you clearly indicated why the postal pay bill should not have been vetoed.

At the present time, when many varied opinions are being presented both pro and con on the question, it is rather difficult for us, the local letter carriers, to present our position to the public. I feel quite confident that you convinced your readers through these editorials, which were concise, factual, and to the point, of the fairness of the bill.

In regard to the recent increases in congressional and military salaries to which you referred in your editorials, I wish to emphasize that letter carriers, both locally and on the national level, not only appreciated the worthiness of these bills but in many instances urged their passage, since it was felt that such action was far overdue.

In conclusion, regardless of the ultimate outcome of our salary legislation, whether we shall receive compensation to which we feel we are justifiably entitled or, for the second year, through the power of the veto, we shall once again find ourselves in the unenviable position of the forgotten men, your editorials in our behalf and for public information shall be remembered by the letter carriers.

JOHN B. MARTIN,
President, Branch 15, National Association of Letter Carriers.
PROVIDENCE.

The Russian Air Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, we were subjected this week to a chatty bit of so-called reassurance of the American people about the threat implied in the report of combat-ready groups of big, modern Soviet jet bombers. The Secretary of Defense blandly intimated that there was not anything for us to worry about, that all the defense plans of the administration were working out wonderfully, and that our alleged "bulge" over Soviet airpower was still an adequate "bulge."

It does not seem to me that we should dismiss so lightly the truly alarming reports that have reached us about Soviet development of long-range airpower. There is talk now of "speeding up" the actual delivery of our own modern jet-powered B–52's. But we need a very serious reappraisal of our situation, of whether we are doing enough. I hope that the Armed Services Committee will undertake a new look at the doctrine that we can get stronger faster by cutting down our long-range program.

Stewart Alsop, columnist, has a column in the Washington Post and Times Herald that pinpoints the question of what our problems are and that suggests the Secretary of Defense is reading a mistaken picture of Soviet airpower. His analysis is so clear, and presents so serious a report of the feelings of our own Air Force leaders, that I offer it for the RECORD:

THE KNOW-HOW MYTH
(By Stewart Alsop)

At his press conference a few days ago, Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson administered the expected large dose of soothing sirup when he was asked about the status of American and Soviet air power. Technological know-how, one of his subordinates pointed out, is "the real key to superiority in the air," and Secretary Wilson made plain his conviction that American know-how is somehow inherently and unquestionably superior.

No doubt this conviction is entirely sincere. It is difficult for Americans, especially Americans with Secretary Wilson's background, to believe that the backward Russians really are capable of surpassing this country in tech-

nological achievement. Yet the cold, hard facts suggests that the Russians have done just that, and the British, too, for that matter.

Take jet engines. The power of a jet engine, which largely determines the quality of a jet plane, is measured in thousands of pounds of thrust. Our best operational jet engine, designed and produced by Pratt & Whitney, develops a claimed thrust of 10,000 pounds. It is a fine engine. Yet there are at least two and probably three British engines which develop more thrust than any operational engine produced in this country.

Indeed, although the aircraft industry does not shout the fact from the house tops, American air power is dependent to a remarkable degree on British-designed engines manufactured here on license from Britain. The most important single contribution to American air power of Secretary Wilson's old company, General Motors, is probably the production of British-designed Sapphire engines. American naval air is particularly dependent on British engine design. At least one authority maintains that British jet know-how has rescued American air power from near oblivion in the jet age.

It should be a shock to most people's complacency that the British, with a defense budget a tiny fraction of our own, should have moved so-far ahead of us in jet technology. But it really ought to shock even Secretary Wilson's complacency that the Soviets in turn are unquestionably ahead of the British.

Consider the story of the Bison, the new Soviet heavy bomber. The Bison has 4 engines, as compared with 8 eigines on its American equivalent, the B–52. A single Bison was flown low over the American Embassy on May Day 1954. When pictures and performance data on this nose-thumbing gesture reached the Pentagon, the experts figured on their slide rules that each of the Bison's 4 engines must deliver a thrust of 18,000 to 20,000 pounds.

This meant almost double the thrust delivered by any American jet engine and well above the thrust of any British engine. It meant a genuinely frightening technological lead for the Soviets. Rather than accept this meaning, with all its expensive implications, the Pentagon powers-that-be developed the Potemkin Village theory to explain the new bomber. Prince Potemkin was, of course, the favorite of Queen Catherine II, of Russia. He erected fake villages along the queen's route in order to delude and please her.

Suppose, the Pentagon powers-that-be said, the Russians had made a fake heavy bomber with outward characteristics like the Bison, but capable only of short hauls with no payload, to delude and frighten us. The experts obligingly figured that a fake Bison could be powered with engines of less than 8,000 pounds thrust, and thereafter the Potemkin Village theory to explain the Bison was happily put about.

The recent flights over Moscow of formations of operational Bisons knocked the Potemkin Village theory into smithereens. A feeble echo of the theory appeared in Secretary Wilson's wistful press conference remark, to the effect that the planes might be hand-made prototypes. But this notion flies in the face of all the evidence, and if Secretary Wilson really believes it, he is the last man in the Pentagon who does.

In short, hard as it is to credit, the Soviets have achieved a commanding technological lead over us in the key field of jet engine design. This is, of course, no cause for despair. In other important fields, American technology maintains a real advantage. Moreover, thanks above all to our force of well over a thousand B–47 medium bombers, we still probably enjoy a superior long-range striking power, despite our much weaker air defenses.

Indeed, if Secretary Wilson had chosen to say what was really in the minds of most informed Air Force men, he could have done so very briefly—"Thank God for the B–47." But even in this field of the medium bomber, where our superiority is still real, the Soviets are pushing hard with their equivalent aircraft, the Badger, which also has superior jet engines. And surely the above facts suggest that self-deceiving complacency about American know-how is as dangerous as the Bison and the Badger put together. There is plenty of evidence that Secretary Wilson and his associates are not only deceiving the people about the seriousness of the Soviet air-power threat—they are also deceiving themselves.

Voting Is the Price Citizens Must Pay for Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this morning's newspapers report that in Thursday's British elections 76 percent of all eligible British voters went to the polls and voted. This turnout of voters was not regarded as good by Britishers since in the previous general British election 82 percent of the eligibles had voted.

When, however, we Americans compare our own voter participation in general elections with that of the British, our American faces should turn red from shame.

While an average of 7½ Britishers out of every 10 eligibles appear to have voted yesterday in Great Britain, only 4 Americans in every 10 of voting age bothered to go to the polls last November for the elections in which 435 Members of our National House of Representatives and 41 Members of the United States Senate were chosen.

Bureau of the Census statistics reveal that last November there were 100,223,000 Americans of voting age. Figures of the Clerk of the House of Representatives show that only 42,579,977 of these cast votes in last year's 435 congressional elections.

Had American voters turned out last November in the same percentage for the American congressional elections as the British did Thursday for their parliamentary elections, the vote in these American elections would have been about 76 million instead of the less than 43 million votes that actually were cast.

The 33 million American stay-at-home eligible voters who could and should have voted last November to bring our American voter participation up to the British standard have no ground for complaint if they do not get the quality of government they think they should have.

If Government is not as good as voters think it should be, the blame lies as much upon the doorstep of the fellow who did not vote as upon that of the person who was elected.

This apathy about voting for congressional candidates in 1954 was not centered in any special area. It existed everywhere throughout the United States, in every one of the 48 States and in all of the 435 congressional districts. The citizens of no State or congressional district in the Union could point with pride for having gotten out a big vote for last year's elections.

Voter apathy was greatest in the Southern States, apparently because of the South's one-party system which results in there being few contests in general elections. In Mississippi only 8.4 percent of the people old enough to vote went to the polls in the November 1954 congressional elections. On 1,181,000 Mississippians of voting age, only 99,342, or less than 1 in every 12, voted last November. Eleven out of every twelve Mississippians stayed home election day. In Texas only 12.7 percent voted; in Louisiana, 13 percent; in Florida, 14.7 percent; in Alabama, 16 percent; and in Georgia, 16.3 percent. In the States of the solid South, where there is only one political party, less than 1 person in every 6 bothered to go to the polls.

The States with the best voting record were Idaho with 64.2 percent of the eligibles voting and Utah with 63.5. Even in these best vote-participation States, it will be observed, one-third of the eligibles did not bother to vote.

In only 6 out of the 48 States was the percentage of eligibles participating in the congressional elections of 1952 more than 60 percent. In 26 States out of the 48, less than 50 percent of the eligibles went to the polls.

Such public apathy toward congressional elections as was manifest last November is not only deplorable. It is dangerous. The price good people must pay for good government is to go to the polls and vote. If good people stay away from the polls in vast numbers as they did last November, pressure groups, who seek special favors for themselves from government, eventually will exercise far greater influence than their numbers justify.

For the sake of argument let us assume that 80 percent of all eligible American voters want only good government while only 20 percent have some special selfish interest of their own to serve. It is among the 80 percent who want nothing but good government that the greatest number of stay-at-home voters are found for they have no special selfish interest to serve that impels them to vote. On the other hand the 20 percent with some special selfish favor to seek from government almost always vote.

If out of the 80 percent who want only good government, three-fourths stay home and only one-fourth goes to the polls then the 20 percent who want selfish favors from government will have just as many votes in an election as the 4 times their number who want only good government.

If good people who want good government continue to avoid their voting responsibility, good government eventually will be lost.

In Oregon, the democratic senatorial candidate won last November by a mar-

gin of only 2,462 votes. Despite enormous sums spent by both parties for campaigning in that Oregon election, about 500,000 eligibles out of 1,046,000 did not vote.

In New Jersey, the Republican candidate won the United States senatorial race by a margin of 3,370 with more than 1,500,000 eligibles failing to vote.

In Michigan, the winning senatorial candidate had a majority of less than 40,000. More than 2 million Michigander eligibles failed to vote.

These few examples should indicate to every citizen that his or her vote is important. In scores of national United States Senate and United States House of Representatives races the results might have been different had 5 percent of those who stayed at home bothered to go to the polls and vote.

Almost everyone realizes the desirability of greater participation by citizens in voting. How to persuade these stay-at-homers to vote is the problem that must be solved.

I have little faith in last-minute drives to get people to register and to vote. It is proper, of course, for newspapers, the radio, and other agencies to call to the attention of citizens that only so many days remain for registration and finally that a certain day is election day. I doubt very much, however, the wisdom or the benefit of last day door-to-door canvasses and the use of free automobile rides to the polls, except in the cases of shut-ins.

The citizen who has to be dragged or hauled to the polls in order to get him to vote probably has not spent much time studying either the issues or the candidates. It is just as important, in my opinion, to have the vote polled a well-informed vote as it is to have it a numerically heavy one.

The way to build up voter participation in American elections, it seems to me, is by year-around educational processes rather than through last-minute emotional appeals to get out the vote.

Some of the great nonpartisan foundations could strike an effective blow for good government by studying why the citizens of most European nations participate so much more heavily in elections than we Americans do, and then make their findings known to editors, columnists, commentators, ministers, educators, and the heads of great national organizations so that a vast year-around educational campaign to stimulate voter participation will be started.

Church, farm, labor, parent-teacher organizations and service clubs, fraternal orders, and other great national groups could do much to awaken Americans that voting is an obligation of American citizenship that should be exercised by all.

Citizens should vote because they want to vote. Wendell Phillips, in revolutionary days, said, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

It is equally true that voting in America's free elections is the price our citizens must pay for good government.

Unless Americans pay this price for good government they eventually will get bad government by selfish pressure groups. Government by selfish interests leads to irresponsible fiscal and economic policies. All history demonstrates that irresponsible fiscal and economic policies in government finally, inevitably, will destroy both security and prosperity.

It is well to remember on election day the Benjamin Franklin adage that "for the want of a nail, the shoe was lost; for the want of a shoe, the horse was lost; for the want of a horse, the rider was lost; for the want of a rider, the battle was lost; and for the want of a battle, the kingdom was lost, and all for the want of a horseshoe nail."

Each of us as citizens are the nail upon which good government hangs. By voting we drive a nail for good government.

Americans should go to the polls when they have bad government to vote that bad government out of office. They should remember, also, that it is just as important that they go to the polls when they have good government to keep that good government in office.

Each person's vote is the price he or she pays for good government.

Attached to this speech is a table showing, first, the civilian population of each State that was eligible to vote last November; second, the number of votes cast in last November's congressional elections; and, third, the percentage of eligible persons in each State who voted:

Voter participation in the 1954 congressional election, by States

	Civilian population of voting age, 1954 [1]	Votes cast for Representative [2]	Percentage of voting population [3]
United States	100,223,000	42,579,977	42.5
Alabama	1,747,000	279,789	16.0
Arizona	563,000	223,402	39.7
Arkansas	1,090,000	280,264	25.7
California	8,018,000	3,873,281	48.3
Colorado	865,000	480,084	55.5
Connecticut	1,485,000	935,744	63.0
Delaware	231,000	144,236	62.4
Florida	2,217,000	326,287	14.7
Georgia	2,147,000	350,171	16.3
Idaho	352,000	226,012	64.2
Illinois	6,023,000	3,257,721	54.1
Indiana	2,658,000	1,586,631	59.9
Iowa	1,648,000	817,253	49.6
Kansas	1,259,000	614,989	48.8
Kentucky	1,698,000	668,488	39.4
Louisiana	1,663,000	216,323	13.0
Maine	569,000	241,443	42.4
Maryland	1,585,000	638,875	40.3
Massachusetts	3,289,000	1,782,722	54.2
Michigan	4,360,000	2,133,390	48.9
Minnesota	1,917,000	1,131,492	59.0
Mississippi	1,181,000	99,342	8.4
Missouri	2,678,000	1,184,813	44.2
Montana	378,000	224,587	59.4
Nebraska	857,000	406,692	47.5
Nevada	135,000	77,639	57.5
New Hampshire	341,000	191,818	65.3
New Jersey	3,497,000	1,786,853	51.1
New Mexico	396,000	188,862	47.7
New York	10,470,000	4,999,878	47.8
North Carolina	2,352,000	604,179	25.7
North Dakota	367,000	188,934	51.5
Ohio	5,469,000	2,498,837	45.7
Oklahoma	1,368,000	545,789	39.9
Oregon	1,046,000	565,494	54.0
Pennsylvania	7,017,000	3,685,910	52.7
Rhode Island	524,000	323,154	61.7
South Carolina	1,156,000	216,335	18.5
South Dakota	390,000	232,167	59.5
Tennessee	1,989,000	344,797	17.3
Texas	4,905,000	622,763	12.7

Footnotes at end of table.

Voter participation in the 1954 congressional election, by States—Continued

	Civilian population of voting age, 1954 [1]	Votes cast for Representative [2]	Percentage of voting population [3]
Utah	414,000	263,031	63.5
Vermont	237,000	114,289	48.2
Virginia	2,031,000	342,344	16.9
Washington	1,553,000	815,822	52.5
West Virginia	1,118,000	591,492	52.9
Wisconsin	2,237,000	1,140,788	51.0
Wyoming	180,000	108,000	60.4

[1] Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Current population reports, Estimates of the Civilian Population of Voting Age for States, November 1954, Series P–25, No. 100, Aug. 22, 1954.

[2] Source: United States Clerk of the House of Representatives, Statistics of the Congressional Election of Nov. 2, 1954, Feb. 15, 1955.

[3] Computed percentages of col. 1 and col. 2.

Dr. Henry M. Wriston on the Struggle for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch is running a series of notable articles on the Struggle for Peace in an effort to throw new light on the much-discussed subject of how to relax world tensions. I was particularly impressed by the first piece in this series by one of our eminent educators, Dr. Henry M. Wriston, of Brown University.

To me, one of the significant events during this session of Congress has been the growth of bipartisan thinking in foreign policy matters. Unquestionably the leader in this movement today—he might even be called the catalyst of our foreign policy—is Senator WALTER GEORGE, whose chief premise is that there must be realistic, affirmative and unremitting efforts to negotiate peaceful settlements if we are to avoid atomic war. Dr. Wriston's thinking follows this same line of thought, and he has expanded this thesis in convincing fashion. I commend his article to all of our colleagues:

Everybody wants to ease tensions and assure peace. The problem is what road to take toward those goals. My thesis is that, having failed to arrive at global solutions for the major problems following the war, we should establish as many limited objectives as possible and direct our diplomacy to the achievement of those useful ends, however undramatic they may appear.

Before 1914 such a proposal for limited action would have seemed natural; now it requires a real effort to comprehend it.

The century between Waterloo and Sarajevo saw more evidences of progress toward a peaceful world than any other period in modern history. It was by no means a quiescent or stagnant era; indeed, it was one of the most energetic in human history. Nor was it free from war. On the contrary,

hardly a year passed without some manifestation of the use of force for international purposes somewhere in the world.

Progress toward the goal of peace consisted in the multiplication of devices to keep wars small, to quarantine fighting with a view to preventing its spread.

LESSONS OF 19TH CENTURY

The idea of limited war for limited objectives gained such headway that it came to seem normal. The first great war of the 20th century was miscalled World War I because men had forgotten that before the 19th century general wars were common; the Napoleonic wars and earlier struggles had been as extensive as the political world.

Our generation did not realize that the failure of these global struggles to produce global peace was one of the prime reasons for the reversal of emphasis during the 19th century and for the effort to limit war both in space and in objectives.

World War I represented not only an abandonment of attempts at spatial containment of fighting; it was global in its objectives, also. At the Paris peace conference statesmen sought not only to solve all the territorial, economic, and political issues; they wrote a constitution for a world government to perpetuate their work.

One might suppose that, when peace was not achieved after the employment of these new concepts during the First World War, men would have been persuaded that such grandiose assumptions were incorrect. Yet, despite the collapse of the structure of reparations, the failure of the prohibitions of Versailles, and the breakdown of the League of Nations, the basic notions of total global war and an integral world peace continued to dominate international life.

The unfulfilled promises of the Atlantic Charter illustrate this global perspective. The United Nations conference at San Francisco likewise has a world ideal. The notion that the 19th century could teach the atomic age anything was rejected. Everything was globalized—health, welfare, nutrition, culture, economics, finance, and politics. World-embracing institutions were established to unify all problems under one aegis.

NEW SET OF ABSOLUTE TERMS

A new set of terms has been tailored to fit the new structure of ideas. They are usually stated as stark absolutes. One such phrase is total war. The slogan leaves no room for any different or competing idea. Yet even a few moments of serious reflection make it clear that history shows no instance, ancient or modern, of total war. Indeed, if every thought, word, and deed were completely engrossed in war, there would be no room for even thoughts of peace; thus war could never end; peace could never come.

Unconditional surrender was another verbal absolute which misled even those who gave it currency. It is the proper objective of the military to induce the enemy to yield with a minimum of bargaining. Civilian leaders, however, should never employ as a political concept an idea appropriate only to the military—to do so is to lose touch with reality. If a great power is actually rendered politically impotent, the politician faces an impossible task in making peace. When a political vacuum is created, new forces will rush in to fill it. Unconditional surrender simplifies an armistice; it complicates peacemaking.

A third absolute also captured the public mind. With advertising fanfare we were given the phrase, one world. But the neglect of racial, religious, cultural, economic, and 1,000 other differences, the suppression of all inconvenient characteristics of reality, made the one world dogma a mirage.

As a kind of reaction from one extreme we are likely to lurch toward another. The one-world concept has now been superseded by a two-world dogma. But biaxiality is as false as its predecessor. Because the United States and Russia are the strongest protagonists, there is a tendency in the United States to forget that neither power dominates large sections of the world, and that they influence other sections in varying degress. The Asian-African conference at Bandung should have taught us that much.

The biaxial dogma refuses to admit that a nation can be at peace with both parties and not an active participant in the cold war. This is contrary to history. India, for example, stands today in somewhat the position of the United States in 1793. It is young in years of independence, it faces daunting domestic problems—economic, social, political, religious; indeed, it is in more parlous condition than the United States 162 years ago. Consequently we should have some realization that a measure of isolation from the intensity of the struggle may be essential to its survival. What is unquestionably true of India applies in greater or lesser degree to other nations.

The habit of thinking in political absolutes culminates in the incapacity to make wise political decisions. Under absolutist principles, there is no way to deal with Russia except by total war. That is a simple, direct conclusion and accounts for occasional demands for a so-called preventive war.

Analysis proves such an idea to be self-defeating for after force has been employed to the ultimate, politics must still supervene. The effort to substitute force for reason can be successful only in a transient sense. Ultimately reason must be the principle implement of political action. From this hard fact there is no conceivable escape.

Recently the limits of political action in dealing with Russia have been very narrow. Experience shows the hope that we could now negotiate a general settlement with Russia to be unrealistic. But again we must beware of absolutes. Because we cannot settle all our problems with Russia, it does not follow that we can settle none. That notion is just as dangerous to sound policymaking as its opposite. It has proved possible, even during the cold war, to relieve some tensions. The Russians withdrew their threat to Iran; they were stymied in Greece, they lost control of Yugoslavia; they modified their stand in the face of the Berlin airlift. There has been an extraordinary gesture lately—the peace treaty for Austria.

Merely to state the proposition, "because we cannot do everything, we can do nothing," is to reveal its absurdity. Yet somethimes public opinion, nurtured on false absolutes, borders upon that attitude. In fact, sentiment of that sort may prove so strong as to damn all efforts at negotiation as "appeasement" and doom them to failure at home even should they succeed abroad.

SOUND, IMMEDIATE PROGRAM

The sound immediate program is to substitute specific efforts to achieve limited goals for the ideal of global settlement. The British Prime Minister, Sir Anthony Eden, has accepted the thesis that limited objectives are valid. With restraint and good temper, but firmness and clarity, he has dedicated himself to the solution of as many problems as possible, leaving to time and better fortune the resolution of others that can be dealt with successfully only as tensions are relieved. There are clear indications that President Eisenhower is not allergic to such a method.

TWO KINDS OF ACTION NEEDED

Progress along even so modest a line requires action of two sorts.

First, negotiation must be undertaken wherever there is a chance that it may be fruitful. The objective should be to nibble away in order to reduce the size of problems for which a tolerable solution seems presently unattainable. That process may not produce dramatic headway toward a general settlement, but the useful is often not dramatic. It may be possible to take only a short step toward peace with long intervals before another step can be taken; yet every advance is worthwhile.

Simultaneously, another sort of action is essential. The Free World should be strengthened in order to extend the area of negotiation. That involves continuation of foreign aid—in our own interest. There is ample historical evidence that negotiation from situations of strength is more likely to succeed than dickering from a condition of weakness.

Here we must be aware that tension between the military and the political branches of the Government is normal. The military must try to be ready for any eventuality that requires more preparedness than the political arm of Government is usually willing to undertake. One reason for the tendency of the political branch to go more slowly with rearmament than the military desires is the danger that, instead of producing a situation of strength as a basis for effective negotiation, too large an armament program may eventuate in an arms race, the effect of which might be to postpone negotiation until after war had come and been completed.

MAKE ENEMY RESPECTFUL

It is essential to make the potential enemy respectful of our power, but it is unwise so to stimulate fear as to precipitate rash action on his part. That is why it is the inescapable function of political authority to determine how much preparedness is necessary for negotiation from situations of strength, and how much more preparedness would eventuate in so sharp an arms race as to bring on war. No rule of thumb has the least utility in deciding how much is too much.

The practical course is to combine strengthened armament with alert seizure of every opportunity for useful negotiation. If more and more irritations are ameliorated by negotiations, the evidence of adequacy in armament becomes cumulative.

It is true that angry discussion over the partition of Korea and over Quemoy and Matsu shows that some Americans feel no confidence whatever in the validity of limited objectives. Nevertheless, there are indications of a tendency to revive some useful 19th-century concepts. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, despite its vast sweep, attempts to handle a limited range of problems in a specific area with which the United Nations could not cope effectively. In the same way, the mutual-defense agreements between the United States, Australia, and New Zealand made a limited approach to a defined objective. Other neighboring nations are members of the recently organized SEATO.

These are evidences of a dawning realization that many of the world's problems are like food; they cannot be taken all at once or in too large amounts. As with the items in a well-balanced diet, it is necessary to take one bite at a time. The simple truth is that there is so much diversity of interest, even among cooperative nations that the attempt to deal with everything at once is almost certain to break down.

History strongly suggests that limited action is more conducive to peace. Bismarck offers the classic example of a statesman who followed the doctrine of limited objectives. He abhorred total war, not on moral grounds, nor for humanitarian reasons, much less upon sentimental bases. To him, all-out war was the height of stupidity because it would prevent reaping the fruits of victory. "War," he said, "should be conducted in such a way as to make peace possible." We do not have to admire everything that Bismarck did to be willing to accept one of his ideas which proved sound.

EVERY PEACE IS NEGOTIATED

The reality is that in the long run every peace is a negotiated peace. That the treaty must be acceptable to the defeated nation is reenforced by the nature, and the cost, of modern warfare. After victory is won, the triumphant nation is virtually exhausted. For many other reasons, the moment of victory is brief and the settlements made in that moment are brittle unless they are satisfactory, not superficially but fundamentally, to the defeated, for politics is continuous, while war, even a world war, is episodic.

This is evidenced by the fact that nothing is writ larger upon the pages of history than the reversal of alliances. Within the few years since the last war we have seen a reversal of orientation regarding Italy, Japan, Yugoslavia, and Germany—and toward Russia, in the other direction.

What of Russia? Is there no hope of attaining, if not peace, at least a mitigation of the cold war, a tolerable modus vivendi?

It will be urged that the ideological barrier is insuperable, that the contrast between the democratic West and the totalitarian East is so great that no accommodation is conceivable.

When that is said, we do well to remember that history is long and memory short. For many years Mohammedans and Christians carried on religious wars. Their enmity was so profound and so implacable that no middle ground seemed available. Now Moslems and Christians manage to live beside each other by curbing their religious intolerance. They no longer use force for purposes of proselyting; neither vows the extinction of the other. Indeed, Turkey has demonstrated its capacity for democratic government and is a member of NATO. This is clear enough evidence that an ancient barrier has fallen; coexistence between Moslems and Christians is a modern reality.

RUSSIA CAN CHANGE

Today we tend to regard the Russian state as it now exists under the Bolsheviks as permanent; but it is scarcely more than 35 years old. In the course of those years it has gone through several phases, during some of which it was, for a time, cooperative. It would be as grave a mistake to regard the current phase as ultimate as it would be to say that it is likely to pass in a brief period of time.

Meanwhile, we must be patient with the burdens imposed by essential rearmament until the attainment of situations of strength makes our enemy see the wisdom of negotiation upon a broader base than has so far been possible. For the present a policy of limited objectives can ease some tensions and help preserve us from all-out war which time and a change in Russia or her satellites may make wholly unnecessary.

A Bill To Amend Section 14 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House of Representatives a bill which provides for the amending of section 14 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act.

This section permits the several States to enact the so-called right-to-work laws. This title sounds intriguing to the uninformed, and creates the illusion that such laws would promote economic progress. Such is not the case, and the title is a fraud and a flagrant misrepresentation of the real meaning behind the movement to have such legislation enacted.

These laws give no one the right to a job, nor do they create jobs for all. In effect, they ban all forms of union security that may be included in freely negotiated agreements between employer and employee. Their aim is to halt improvements in the wages and working conditions of the people, and they result in lower wages and lower standards of living. This in turn affects the entire economy of the community.

They encourage the destruction of unions and are actually a menace to society and sound economy in that they tend to weaken and undermine the stability of the trade-union movement, and threaten the wages and working conditions of the members of these unions. Collective bargaining under present circumstances is a proved condition of stable industrial relations, and it is an absolute necessity that both employer and employee contribute to the cause of industrial peace. Only a strong union which has the support of all the members of the union can bargain effectively for better wages and working conditions. Our national labor policy must not be hampered by restrictive State laws which are contrary to public opinion and moral law.

Past history has shown that the unorganized worker is unable to help himself when it comes to obtaining satisfactory terms and conditions of employment. Benefits for all employees must be negotiated by the union which has been designated by the majority of employees as the exclusive bargaining agent for all employees of the unit. Through the union his rights are protected, and he can assist in the formulation of the various policies and decisions which affect his status and that of his fellow workers.

This follows the simple democratic idea of majority rule, and in effect gives to the individual the bargaining power he could never hope to attain. It can easily be seen that additional negotiations or representations for minority groups within the same unit could cause serious conflicts, and could negate all the gains that the majority union had obtained.

Trade unionism has made terrific strides forward in raising wage levels, improving working conditions, and protecting workers, and it is certainly not unreasonable to ask a worker who has gained innumerable benefits through the efforts of the union, to contribute to the support of that union. It is a situation which is comparable to a citizen who resides in a community, enjoys all the privileges and benefits of that community, but who refuses to contribute in any way, shape or form to the operation of that community.

A workable and satisfactory labor policy is a national concern, and should not be turned over to the States where 48 different laws could be enacted, resulting in chaos and numerous obstacles to union security and industrial progress.

We must be realistic, and we must enact a national labor policy which will contribute to the national economy. A step in the right direction would be the passage of legislation to prevent the enactment of the so-called right to work laws in the individual States.

I urge each and every Member of the House of Representatives, and particularly those members of the House Committee on Education and Labor, to give this bill prompt and serious consideration at this time.

Small-Projects Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have heartily supported the original provisions of H. R. 5881, which was known as the small-projects bill. The legislation permits State and local public agencies to plan, construct, and operate small reclamation projects and receive the same benefits and credit for Federal funds on a nonreimbursable basis as though the project was constructed under the present reclamation laws.

First. It generally would authorize the Secretary of Interior to participate with water-users' organizations, or other public bodies organized under State law, in the construction of water-resource development projects, whether single or multipurpose.

Second. The non-Federal agency receiving funds following approval of plans would construct, operate, and maintain the project, subject to compliance with Federal rules and regulations applicable to those features of the project which supply national benefits.

Third. With respect to reimbursable features, the Federal Government would advance funds to cover cost subject to execution of repayment contracts as presently provided for in reclamation law; funds allocable to irrigation benefits would be interest free.

Fourth. As introduced, H. R. 5881 generally provides for a payment from Federal funds, on a nonreimbursable basis, to the local organization for project features which provide national benefits.

The basic reclamation law has always applied to the 17 Western States. Since the bill was reported an amendment has been suggested which was never considered by the legislative committee. This has for its purpose bringing the 31 States outside of the 17 western reclamation States into the bill and under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture. It seems to me that such an amendment, if adopted, would give a dual administration to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Secretary of Agriculture. This amendment is known as the Jones amendment, and attempts

to confer jurisdiction to the Secretary of Agriculture and gives him authority to administer the reclamation laws as contained in this bill. This would appear to me to create considerable confusion.

The bill calls for an appropriation of $100 million. It is hard for me to understand just how this money would be divided among the 48 States. It occurs to me that when irrigation is involved, it ought to be all under one umbrella. The Secretary of Agriculture has not been called on in the past to administer reclamation law as contained in this bill. It would be necessary for him to set up another division or bureau to handle the administration in the 31 States. I am not sure that the Secretary of Agriculture would want to assume the responsibility of administering certain phases of the reclamation law.

I hope the Jones amendment is not adopted, and if it is adopted, I would be reluctant to support the measure, because I believe it would be unworkable. The Jones amendment was never considered by the legislative committee. It should be defeated.

The Cry of Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, one of the most urgent problems the Nation faces today is finding methods of aiding those among us who are mentally ill. Much progress has been made in very recent months in bringing new methods to bear upon the treatment of various mental disorders. The Nation saw concrete and vivid evidence of the progress that has been made in this field when the television program The March of Medicine, presented a most impressive dramatization of the life of Dorothea Lynde Dix by the patients of St. Elizabeths Hospital here in Washington last Sunday evening. In addition, the program also brought to the attention of the public the very important steps still to be taken.

A very substantial part in any improvement to be achieved in this field must come about with and through the cooperation of the Federal and State governments and the various institutions and agencies dealing with mental disorders. The Congress has recently taken cognizance of this fact in its passage of the Mental Health Study Act. Other bills in this field are or soon will be before us for consideration. I hope the Congress will give these measures prompt and sympathetic hearing.

The States too, have been doing much along these lines. It is a matter of very real pride to citizens of New Jersey that it was our State that first heeded the pleas of Dorothea Lynde Dix to establish special hospitals for the treatment of the mentally ill. Since 1848 New Jersey and the other 47 States have continued to make much progress in dealing with this problem. But the States must not rest content with such progress as has been made. Much remains to be done and we in the Congress must do all in our power to aid in this fight. I feel sure that we will heed the cry of humanity.

Included here is an article from the Welfare Reporter, official publication of the New Jersey Department of Institutions and Agencies, by Robert C. Myers, Ph. D., chief, Community Mental Health Services of New Jersey:

MENTAL HYGIENE CLINICS IN NEW JERSEY

There is important news about mental-hygiene clinics in New Jersey. In the past few years many more new clinics have been developed than most persons who were close to the field felt would be possible. Most of this has come about through cooperation between the State and resources of local communities and counties. An important help throughout this period has been the distribution of New Jersey's share of Federal funds for community mental-health activities, even though these have shown a tendency to decrease rather than increase since the Federal-aid program was commenced in the fiscal year 1948.

In the Welfare Reporter of September 1949 (vol. IV, No. 5), there appeared an important and timely article by Dr. Luman H. Tenney, director of the mental-hygiene bureau of the State hospital at Trenton (Mental Hygiene Clinics Hampered by Lack of Community Resources) in which he wrote forcefully and convincingly of the extreme shortage of services in the area assigned to his bureau. This area included the entire western half of New Jersey, from Warren County in the north to Cape May County in the south bracketing nine more counties: Hunterdon, Somerset, Mercer, Burlington, Camden, Gloucester, Salem, Cumberland, and Atlantic.

Dr. Tenney cited estimates by the National Committee for Mental Hygiene (now the National Association for Mental Health) indicating a need for 11 full-time clinics in this area. At the time the mental-hygiene bureau had the equivalent of two full-time clinic teams "spread too far and too thin" trying their best to fulfill the community mental-hygiene needs of the entire area. No other clinic services were available in 1949, and the goal of 11 clinics seemed impossible—and still does—because of a continuing shortage of trained professional personnel. Nevertheless, only 5½ years later, in early 1955, most observers are astounded to find a total of 7 full-time clinics in actual operation in this area, and additional ones in gestation. Although many people have had a share in this development, most of the credit for it is due to the tireless missionary efforts of Dr. Tenney and his devoted staff.

Over the more than quarter-century in which the department of institutions and agencies has financed mobile community mental hygiene clinic teams from its various mental hospitals, the underlying philosophy has been one of demonstration and stimulation of local developments rather than the building of a network of completely State-controlled clinics. In effect, the entire effort has been missionary in the sense that we seek partnership with local communities in stimulating their development of their own resources to the point where they can have their own clinics. This philosophy was well expressed by Dr. Tenney in his 1949 article when he said, "The public must be brought to see that our clinics are demonstration ones, that they are the scaffolding upon which local and county clinics can be developed, trained and brought to an independent status belonging to and servicing that community or county."

One of the stumbling blocks to the partnership phase of clinic development was a State law which prohibited units of local government, such as boards of freeholders, from allotting funds for the operation of clinics not under the full control of the appropriating local government. Operating on the theory of, "If you find a law in your path, get it changed," a group in Mercer County, who had been promised substantial county funds to help establish a clinic if there were no legal bars against it, took a draft of a new law to their local assemblyman, FRANK THOMPSON, JR. (now United States Congressman from the Fourth New Jersey District). In the latter part of 1952 this bill passed both houses of the State legislature, was signed by the Governor, and became law. The Thompson law is what is known as enabling legislation and specifically enables or permits local governmental units to appropriate funds to bona fide nonprofit corporations set up to operate and manage mental hygiene clinics. Soon after its passage the Mercer Board of Freeholders appropriated $30,000 to the Mercer County Child Guidance Center, Inc. This appropriation, together with an allotment from the Delaware Valley United Fund (the local "Red Feather" agency), free quarters from a Trenton children's home (the Union Industrial Home), and furnishings and equipment from the Junior League, enabled this clinic to commence full operation. The important "scaffolding" which had been provided by Trenton Hospital's Mental Hygiene Bureau since 1949 was then withdrawn. Many other counties have since made allotments of funds to clinics, but none so generous as the Mercer County appropriation which has been continued each year.

Camden County fully financed a new clinic for juveniles through its county mental hospital at Lakelands, and so did not need to make use of the enabling legislation. Another new clinic which was established outside the enabling legislation is the Out-Patient Psychiatric Service at the Hunterdon Medical Center which was made possible by a grant from the Commonwealth fund.

In actuality, stimulation is rarely a one-way street, but most often develops into interstimulation. This has proved to be true in the case of developing new clinics. We have not only called upon the communities to help us help them, but they in turn, as citizen awareness of the need mounted, have called on the State for increased help. Perhaps the starkest way to illustrate the extent to which the State has gone to help those communities who want to help themselves is to point out that in 1949 the budget for Dr. Tenney's mental hygiene bureau was $74,000. Today it is $137,000—an increase of almost 100 percent.

Two additional clinics in Dr. Tenney's area in the partnership phase of development should be highlighted here. One is the Somerset-Warren Area Mental Hygiene Clinic where the services of the State-employed professional personnel are augmented in Somerset County by the Somerset County Guidance Center, Inc., and in Warren County by the Warren County Guidance Center, Inc. These two corporations receive $15,800 and $6,000 annually from the Somerset and Warren Boards of Freeholders, respectively.

The other is the Atlantic Area Guidance Center in Atlantic City where newly designed quarters have been furnished by the school board in the school administration building, and contributions are being received from the Freeholders, the Community Chest, and other local philanthropies. Its development, which was sparked by the local mental health association, has been under the aegis of a nonprofit corporation set up for that specific purpose.

In 1949 it was unfortunately true, as Dr. Tenney wrote, that "The lack of rural community awareness and readiness for the mental hygiene demonstration clinics is evidenced by the inadequate facilities offered the clinic." Today, however, the picture has entirely changed, and a glance at the handsome, spacious quarters, modern new equipment and furniture in the clinics of Warren, Hunterdon, Somerset, and Atlantic Counties evidences full awareness and readiness and action on the part of the local sponsoring groups.

Yet this is not all.

A few months ago the Burlington County Giudance Center, Inc., received its incorporation papers. Already it has received offer of quarters from the Burlington County Children's Home, the Freeholders have made an initial appropriation of $6,000, the Children's home has offered to pay the salary of a psychiatric social worker, and further help is being sought from the State and other sources.

A Salem County guidance center is about to be chartered, and the long, hard work of arousing sufficient local interest to obtain the necessary financial backing for a new clinic will begin. Meetings are being arranged in Gloucester County looking toward the same end.

The frontiers in Dr. Tenney's missionary work are receding rapidly—much more rapidly than anyone thought possible only 5 years ago.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Social Security: It Must Be Restudied," written by Charles J. Lynn, president of the board of trustees of Hanover College, and published in the Bulletin of Hanover College, Hanover, Ind.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The term "social security" as we know it today should really be called social insecurity, for that is just what it is. There is absolutely nothing back of it but the willingness, if such there will be, of the American taxpayers of the future to pay in taxes the amount necessary to meet the obligations of the social-security system. It is not a funded program in the usual sense, as all of the billions of social-security dollars that have been poured into the Federal Treasury from employers and employees have been spent as soon as received to help meet the ordinary daily running expenses of the Federal Government. Social-security funds are represented by bonds of the United States Government, which do not represent cash and are simply a promise to pay. As the only source from which the Federal Government can get the cash with which to meet its social-security obligations is the American taxpayer, it follows that under the present program, future taxpayers will have to carry the load of accumulated social-security benefits.

When our people were told that thrift was all wrong, that the way to prosperity was to spend, spend, spend, and were promised that when old age came along and gainful occupation was no longer possible the Government would take care of them, more was done to undermine the moral fiber of our people than anything that had happened in all the previous history of our country.

Are we as a people so bereft of the power to think and to reason that we cannot see the fraud in our present social-security program? Must we follow the politician blindly when he says that the Federal Government will provide security for all of us in our old age? Where do you think the Federal Government will get the money to provide security for us when we need it? The Government has only one source for money, and that is from folks like you and me. It gets it from us in the form of taxes.

Let us not forget that all the billions of dollars paid on social-security taxes by wage earner and employer alike have all been spent to meet current and general financial obligations of the Federal Government. The Government's promise to pay is all there is to show for these billions of dollars workers and employers have poured into the Federal Treasury.

It seems clear that the sonner the people of the United States face up to this unpleasant situation the sooner will it be corrected. We might even show the good sense to get back to the ways of the old days when thrift was considered a virtue, when folks saved to provide for their own old age and when families felt their obligation to take care of their own and were proud to do it—when, in fact, a feeling of personal responsibility was general.

There always have been and always will be folks who, through no fault of their own, have been unfortunate and for whom adequate provision must be made. A prosperous and thrifty people can do that and do it well and at the same time take good care of themselves and their own. Security en masse on the promise of the Government to take care of all not only will not work but definitely weakens us as a people. The accrued liability of the Government today under social security is perfectly enormous and is mounting steadily every day. Where are social-security payments to come from when there isn't as much as a thin dime in the Treasury of the United States out of which these payments can be made, excepting insofar as current social-security receipts might go in meeting current social-security payments? Isn't it clear that the only source from which the deficit can be made up is the American taxpayer? The whole scheme as now set up is unsound, and the Congress should lose no time in appointing a fully competent commission to look into the social-security program to see if it can be put on a sound basis, preferably on a pay-as-you-go basis. If it should be the judgment of the commission that the whole social-security program, as now set up, is unsound and unworkable in so far as it will provide future security for all citizens coming under its terms, the sooner we as a people can face that fact the better it will be for us all.

Have we gone so far down the road toward socialism that there is no retreat? Our present social-security program is definitely socialism in action and is as mistaken in its promises as are the promises of Socialists wherever you find them.

Let us face up to this situation and get back to the good old fundamentals that made our country great, when we were proud to stand on our own feet without the aid of a Government crutch.

We must admit that there is a growing tendency towards socialism in our country. Our present social-security program has taken us a long way down the road to state socialism, and unless we, the American people, quickly awaken to the direction in which we are traveling we will in time find that we have lost the freedoms so dear to us and have become merely creatures of the state instead of masters of it, as we have heretofore been—no longer free to give orders, only to take them.

Our system of free enterprise is what has made this country great. It has provided opportunity for everybody and made it possible for each to enjoy a fair share of the profit resulting from his contribution to society. Not so under state socialism. There the individual takes just what the state gives him, no more and no less. Is that the road down which we wish to travel? If not, we had better review our social-security program and see just where it is leading us. Let it be studied from the standpoint of its economic soundness and not from its vote-getting attractiveness to the politician. The best minds we have, regardless of party affiliation, should be brought to bear on this study. Congress should provide for this study and without delay. If the present social-security program is unsound, as so many believe it is, the quicker we undo what has been done and get our feet back on solid ground again, the better it will be for all of us.

We must, of course, recognize that the ever-increasing span of life is bringing new problems in connection with the aged, and in any revision of our social security program this fact must be taken into account. A new social security program should make provision for all who reach retirement without having accumulated enough of this world's goods to provide for themselves, but no security should be provided for those fully able financially to provide for their own security as well as for those dependent on them. Thrift should be encouraged and its virtue again taught in our public schools.

There is something fundamentally wrong in a system that provides retirement or old-age assistance to those who have no need for it. Why should you and your children be taxed to provide support for one fully able financially to provide his own support? Yet there are literally thousands of individuals now drawing social security benefits who are financially well to do in their own right.

Have we lost our senses? Have the eyes of our politicians been so blinded that they can see only the votes of those who benefit by the program? Cannot they see that our present social security program as now in operation is heading us straight toward catastrophe? England has a social security program, too, and England is in trouble now with her social security program. Her benefit payments are much less than our own but even today, in the comparative youth of the program, England has to look to current taxes for 50 percent of her social security benefit payments. What will it be like in another score or two of years? Surely England is riding for a fall, and so are we.

It will interest you to know that for the period January 1937–June 1954 approximately $30.5 billion have been received by the social security trust fund. Benefit payments during this period have aggregated $12.8 billion. As of June 1954 there should have been a balance of approximately $18 billion in the social security trust fund. It is there, but only in the form of United States bonds, which merely represent the Government's promise to pay if they can get the money from the American taxpayer to make good the promise to pay. Under the present social security program time will dissipate this surplus between income and outgo payments for us just as it has already done for England, and that is why our social security program should be restudied by a competent commission.

It may never be possible to get back to the good old days of rugged individualism when we were all happy to stand on our feet, the rugged individualism which made us a great

nation. We may have to accept a certain degree of social security, but if we do, let us see that it is on a pay-as-we-go basis so that we are not building up huge obligations for future generations to meet, obligations which might make a total wreck of our entire economic system. The social security trust fund should be preserved to meet unforeseen contingencies, but there should be a maximum limit on the amount permissible to accumulate in such fund, which should be invested in high-grade marketable securities other than United States Government bonds.

It is not too soon—and let us hope, not too late—for Congress to take action and appoint a nonpartisan group, such as the Hoover Commission, to study our social security program and report back to Congress with recommendations. If you agree, won't you write to your Senators and Congressman at once and urge the naming of such a nonpartisan study commission?

Nation's Oil Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Anthracite Institute Bulletin, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., May 18, 1955, which advocates that this Nation take heed of the adverse experiences of the past, especially during periods of emergency, and urges the Congress to draft a national fuel policy:

A LESSON FROM RUBBER

If full credence is to be given to the recent testimony of international oil company executives regarding the increasing dependence of this country upon foreign sources for its petroleum requirements, it would seem that there should be no further delay in the Government's acceleration of its synthetic-oil program. The experiences of the rubber industry in having its source of raw material cut off during World War II should be fresh enough in the minds of those responsible for the Nation's energy requirements to insist upon the immediate development of such a program.

It will be recalled that this country, while in the midst of waging World War II, was forced to develop a synthetic-rubber industry. It was developed only through necessity, after our normal sources of raw rubber in Malaya and Indonesia were taken over by the Japanese. Now our synthetic-rubber industry has developed to the point where we no longer are forced to depend upon a foreign source because our own plants can furnish the quantity and quality we require at economic prices.

It is very likely that our synthetic-rubber industry would never have developed except for the exigencies of war. Undoubtedly, the rubber cartel would have effectively blocked such competition by poising natural-rubber prices at just the point where a synthetic-rubber industry could not compete.

A parallel case exists today with regard to the Nation's oil situation. We are told by spokesmen of international oil companies that domestic production cannot supply the Nation's petroleum needs and therefore we must import. Spokesmen of these same companies have testified that synthetic liquid fuel will be needed someday. However, they say it is uneconomic to build or operate synthetic-oil plants at present because the product could not compete on a cost basis with natural petroleum. And, of course, natural petroleum prices reflect the low prices of imported foreign oil. It is a safe assumption that if no foreign oil were being brought into this country, at the present time, a flourishing synthetic-oil industry would be in existence.

In the meantime, the international oil companies play both ends to the middle by making it uneconomic for private capital to operate synthetic plants, at the same time strenuously objecting to Government subsidy.

It is apparent that though the best thinking in the Nation's petroleum industry believes a synthetic-fuel industry is inevitable, the large oil companies would prefer to capitalize to the fullest degree on their investments in foreign oil before undertaking the manufacture of synthetic liquid fuels. Undoubtedly such a policy is best for their stockholders. However, history surely dictates to this Nation that it should not depend upon foreign shores for a continuing supply of any commodity as vital as oil.

This is another reason why Congress should promptly resume hearings on the urgent need of the country for a national fuel policy.

TESTIMONY OF OIL EXECUTIVE RE SYNTHETIC FUELS

Shown below are excerpts of the testimony of a leading oil-company executive, Dr. Robert R. Wilson, chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), regarding the need for synthetic fuels. The testimony was given before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during its hearings on National Fuel Reserves and Fuel Policy, March 7 and 8, 1951:

"I think everyone in the oil industry recognizes that synthetic fuels from coal or oil shale or both are likely to be our ultimate reliance at some future period. Just how distant it is we do not know.

"That is the reason why the industry spent a great deal of money on research and development on that type of process. We want to know about it, and we want to be ready. We have not the slightest objection to anyone who thinks it is competitive today taking his own money in building it. We have done this research and development because we wanted to be well informed on it, and we do not think it is competitive.

"We do object to taking Government funds or subsidizing construction of something which we do not think is economic at the present time."

Replying to a question as to the comparison of the 1951 technique of the synthetic process with that used by the Germans in World War II, Dr. Wilson stated:

"The process has been tremendously improved since the days of Germany, particularly with regard to the quality of the gasoline. The German gasoline was a very bad type of gasoline. By changing the operating conditions the quality of the gasoline has been greatly improved and by applying American engineering the scale of operations per unit has been multiplied some twenty-fold, I believe, so that we do have a process here which might later be applied to coal."

Asked how close we then were to the investment of private capital in the development of coal liquefication plants, Dr. Wilson replied as follows:

"I would say that if gasoline and other products were 3 cents a gallon higher than they are now, you might give serious consideration, but, of course, 3 cents a gallon is $1.25 a barrel, and I am afraid it will be quite a time before crude oil increases that much. By that time the labor cost, in particular, of mining coal or oil shale may go up to raise the differential again. But it is a substantial distance away at the present time according to the best of our figures."

Asked about the feasibility of liquefying and gasifying coal, Dr. Wilson replied:

"There is no question but that it can be, and, of course, to some extent it is liquefied in ordinary coking distillation, but the yield of liquid is very small. There is no question about the technical feasibility of both processes."

Asked whether there should be any concern regarding the longtime availability of gasoline either in natural or synthetic form, Dr. Wilson replied:

"No question about that. That is why Mr. Holman (Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey) says, being peddlers of liquid fuel, we feel we have to stay in business and use our distribution systems for liquid fuel and supply the people who need liquid fuel. We just want to make it from whatever is cheapest at the time."

House Farm Vote 90 Percent Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAGE BELCHER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial entitled "House Farm Vote 90 Percent Politics," as it appeared in the Tulsa Daily World, Saturday, May 7, 1955:

The House vote on rigid price supports gives further indication that many Congressmen are more interested in "writing a political record" than in giving Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson's flexible price program a fair chance. It is significant, at any rate, that the House pushed the vote in spite of indications the Senate will hedge on a decision this session and that, in any and all events, a rigid price measure would face a Presidential veto.

During debate on the rigid-versus-flexible price proposition, it was more than evident that principal arguments in favor hinged on the incidence of localized soft spots in the farm picture; moreover many of the Congressmen, with the decision before them on the record, were dragged onto the rigid-price bandwagon through the necessity of having to "vote right," as they saw it.

Thus, as usual, the farm debate showed up to be 90 percent politics and 10 percent sincerity. Also, it was shown up as a further demonstration of the heavy emphasis among some political masterminds to weld together a farm-labor bloc in the Congress and in the voting booths. Many Northern members, pledged to a dropping of peanut supports, swung back in line under the blandishments of capable CARL ALBERT, Democratic Party whip from Oklahoma.

"Provincialism" had considerable influence in garnering the 206 rigid-support votes. And here, perhaps, is the area in which the Eisenhower administration is on the spot. It cannot consistently reject import restrictions—particularly on oil—and accept identical localized economic ailments in other economic areas. Oklahoma is a good example of the harm that excessive oil imports can wreak on the strictly local economy—yet to reject oil import restrictions while playing politics in favor of localized farm income weaknesses is, to be blunt, inconsistent.

There is a better reason why the rigid-support plan should not be voted. The Benson program requires a year to 18 months to "prove" itself. It has not had that oppor-

tunity. Hence, until it succeeds or fails, drastic farm legislation should be postponed. And the Benson program has certainly not shown itself to be an abject failure.

The Living Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of pride to me, as I know it is to my colleagues from Illinois on both sides of the aisle, that the Department of Illinois of the American Legion has set a pattern for the teaching and advancement of Americanism that has been nationally recognized and accepted. I join with my colleagues from Illinois in applauding and in complimenting Department Comdr. Irving Breakstone and the Legionnaires of Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include an article from the Christian Science Monitor of May 24, 1955, as follows:

ILLINOIS LEGION SHIFTS PATRIOTIC ACCENT

(By Godfrey Sperling, Jr.)

THE LIVING CONSTITUTION

CHICAGO.—For a year, American Legion members in Cook County have been meeting in small groups and reading and discussing the Constitution and other important American documents.

Now, under the leadership of the Illinois Legion commander, Irving Breakstone, this positive approach to Americanism is being extended to the entire State, and perhaps beyond.

In extending the program, Mr. Breakstone and the Legion's State chairman of education for freedom, John W. Bottomley, say they are seeking something more positive than the organization's former zeal in branding as disloyal those who did not subscribe to the Legion's version of loyalty. In a policy statement they spell this out:

"In the past, the Legion has devoted a major portion of its Americanism program to rooting out Communists and other enemies of Americanism and to exposing the nature of communism as the enemy of American principles.

"Our zeal to protect Americanism from subversion and un-American sets of loyalties has sometimes appeared to take the historic form of a right to extirpate persons and ideas deemed heretical or disloyal."

Negative stand hit

"This phase of the Legion's Americanism program has received an emphasis out of all proportion to its extent and importance when compared with other Legion Americanism activities, such as those carried on in the schools and veterans' hospitals.

"In concentrating on the negative phase of fighting the enemy, we have neglected the positive phase of Americanism set forth in the preamble to the constitution of the Legion, which places us under the obligation of upholding and defending the Constitution of the United States. The preamble obligates us to safeguard and hand down to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy."

Partial financial support for this program comes, interestingly enough, from the Chicago Sun-Times.

It was the Sun-Times which led the criticism of the Legion earlier last year when the organization passed a resolution denouncing Girl Scout leadership and questioning the patriotism of these leaders.

New policy directive

Mr. Breakstone says the idea for the discussion groups came, in part, from courses he had been taking on great books. It occurred to him that this teaching format could be applied to courses on Americanism.

Also, he says, he had become convinced that the zealots and crusaders in the Legion were doing the organization more harm than good. "They would accuse people of being un-American just because they did not follow the Legion's line of thinking," he observes. "And usually these same accusers could not for the life of them tell you what was American—that is, what was in the Constitution or Declaration of Independence, etc."

In a statement of policy, the Illinois commander directed every post in Illinois to appoint an education-for-freedom chairman who was to be responsible for implementing the education-for-freedom program in his community.

Further, in an effort to give the program national scope, Mr. Breakstone informed every State commander of the activity giving detailed report on what was being done in Illinois.

"By enlisting the aid of educators, experts in constitutional law, writers, TV and radio commentators, etc.," Mr. Breakstone said as the State program began, "the Legion will bring to every community a series of programs as traditionally American as the old townhall meeting or cracker-barrel session, yet as novel and entertaining as tonight's panel telecast.

"The program will be based on the reading and free discussion of the basic documents and critical issues of our heritage, especially the Constitution of the United States and the writings of great Americans like Abraham Lincoln.

"It is the principles and ideas expressed in these important source materials, as they have been defined and redefined by great Americans in times of crisis paralleling our own, which we must first understand if we are to protect them in the present global battle of ideas between our own free world and the dictatorships."

In the closing passages of the policy statement, Mr. Breakstone and his educational aide underscore the potency of this new, positive approach to Americanism.

"Education for freedom programs will bring to people in the State of Illinois an understanding of principles and ideas to which Americans are loyal—principles and ideas which if dropped behind the Iron Curtain and actually practiced there would prove more powerful than any H-bomb.

"This is the Legion's Operation Freedom."

The state study groups are now well underway.

A Valid Repudiation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, so that the Congress may be fully and properly informed, I submit for the RECORD the protest and repudiation of one Stanley Novak and Thomas X. Dombrowski, self-annointed and appointed spokesmen who appeared before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and allegedly represented themselves as spokesmen for the great American element of Polish antecedents, by whom they have quite properly been disavowed.

The claim of these gentry that their background and bloodstream are of Polish origin and loyalty has always been in doubt and never proved. They are professional demogogs who speak not for the 8 million or more loyal and patriotic Americans of Polish forefathers; they speak only for themselves and their masters. Their connections, philosophy and loyalty are anything but American. Their views and expressions are as a rule anti-American and anti-Polish, and when Russia or communism are in question the record of the years will show their loyalty to the party and principles of communism.

Under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I insert in the RECORD a letter signed by Miss Clara Swieczkowska, executive director of the Polish Activities League of Detroit, Mich., and the resolution adopted by the league so they may serve as a warning to congressional committees. I endorse both the letter and the resolution. They are as follows:

POLISH ACTIVITIES LEAGUE,
Detroit, Mich., May 10, 1955.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Congressman from the 15th District of Michigan,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On May 3, 1955, the American Women of Polish Descent of Metropolitan Detroit, held a very important meeting at the Dom Polski Hall, protesting the self-appointed representation of the Poles of America at the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations by Stanley Nowak and Thomas X. Dombrowski.

Enclosed you will please find copies of the resolution that had been adopted at this gathering and letter which had been sent along with it to both the Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE and the Honorable WALTER RICHARDS.

Trusting that you will apprise your colleagues of the House of Representatives of our protest, we remain

Very truly yours,
POLISH ACTIVITIES LEAGUE,
CLARA SWIECZKOWSKA,
Executive Director.

Madam Chairman, I move the adoption of the following resolutions:

"Whereas the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations held hearings on the termination of the occupation regime in the Federal Republic of Germany and its accession to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization on Thursday, March 30, 1955; and

"Whereas Stanley Nowak and Thomas X. Dombrowski, of Detroit, Mich., appeared, testified and represented themselves to the committee as speaking for Americans of Polish descent; and

"Whereas Stanley Nowak has pending in Federal courts action for deportation; and

"Whereas Thomas X. Dombrowski is the editor of the Glos Ludowy (Voice of the People) a Polish language weekly which was listed by the Attorney General's office as a Communist organ and its sale was banned in Detroit and Hamtramck; and

"Whereas both Stanley Nowak and Thomas X. Dombrowski appearing as self-appointed representatives of the Poles of America voted in opposition to the termination of the occupation regime in the Federal Republic of Germany and its accession to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

"Whereas no authority was conferred on Stanley Nowak or Thomas X. Dombrowski to appear before your committee in our behalf: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we emphatically reject their leadership and beg the committee to totally disregard their testimony as representative of loyal American Poles; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forthwith transmitted to Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE, Senator from Georgia, Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, Senate Building, Washington, D. C.; and Hon. WALTER RICHARDS, Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, House of Representatives Building, Washington, D. C."

Seconded by Mrs. W. Ambrozy, resolution was adopted by the unanimous vote of the assembly.

MAY 9, 1955.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Senator from Georgia, Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On March 30, 1955, there appeared before your committee Stanley Nowak and Thomas X. Dombrowski, who testified as representatives of American Poles.

Because of this action, a special protest meeting was called by organizations which have been active in the Greater Detroit area for approximately 50 years, engaged in civic, social, cultural, religious, and political activities, representing some 22,000 members.

The meeting held May 3, 1955, was comprised of members from Polish Women's Alliance of America; Polish National Alliance, women's division; Polish Roman Catholic Union; Polish Activities League; Polish Falcons of America.

In repudiating their leadership we have acted as good Americans. However, we, like the French people, have long memories and are somewhat fearful in regard to German rearmament and trust that if such powers be given to Germany it be under strict supervision of the United States Government to safeguard the security of Germany's neighbors.

Attached hereto please find resolution prepared and proposed by Amalia Pasternacki, an attorney, which was duly adopted.

We trust that you will apprise your colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Relations of our protest.

Assuring you of our highest respect, we are,

Very truly yours,

JANINA RZECZKOWSKA,
State President, Polish Women's Alliance of America.

JOSEPHINE WOLAS,
President, Polish National Alliance, Women's Division of Circuit X.

MARIA STACHOWSKA,
National Director, Polish Roman Catholic Union.

ANNA MORTKA,
President, Polish Activities League.

THEODOSIA KOLACZYNSKA,
Secretary, Polish Falcons of America, Women's Division of Circuit XIII.

More Truth Than Poetry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, our great and growing need for more and more safety on our inadequate highways has produced many fine efforts from many sources to make drivers more safety conscious.

One of my constituents, Mrs. L. H. Gravely, of Shawnee, Okla., has made a contribution in the form of a parody on a currently popular song which I think has special merit. There is more truth than poetry in this grim reminder of what is in store, unfortunately, for many of our citizens in the months ahead. Her jingle is as follows:

This old car once knew some children,
This old car once knew a wife,
This old car once knew a husband and a merry family life.
But this family's trips are over,
Picked a hopeless spot to pass;
Then they saw death's angel peekin' through the broken windshield glass.

Ain't gonna need this car no longer,
Ain't gonna need this car no more.
Had no time to fix the brakes up.
Had no time to fix the door.
Had no time to fix the steering,
Or to drive with more restraint.
Ain't gonna need this car no longer,
They've all gone to meet the saint.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*--------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*---------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*---------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*---
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*----------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*-------4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*---
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2737 Devonshire Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*--------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----1727 Mass. Ave.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*-------
Bell, John J., *Tex*---------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----7304 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*--------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*-----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*-------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*------
Bray, William G., *Ind*-----
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*-------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*-------
Buchanan, Vera, *Pa*-------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*---------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*-------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*-----1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*-----
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*------The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*-----
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*-----The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*---------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*-------
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*------The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*----The Dorchester
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*--------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*----
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---4454 Tindall St.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*--------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*-------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*---
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*--
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*---------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*--
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*---------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*--------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*-----The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*-----
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*----------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*---------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*--------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*-----
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fine, Sidney A., *N. Y*------
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*--------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*-----
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*-------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*-----3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*--------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*------
Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*----
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*-----
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*--------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*--------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*----
Granahan, William T., *Pa*--
Grant, George M., *Ala*-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*--------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*---------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*----
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*-------2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*-----The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*------
Harris, Oren, *Ark*---------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*--------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*---------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*------The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*------
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*------104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--125 Marthas Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*-----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--2108 Suitland Terrace SE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*---------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*-----------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*--------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*------
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*---------
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*-------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*------The Washington House
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*--------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*---
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*--
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*----3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*-----2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1249 31st St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*-----
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*-------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*-------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*-----
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*-----
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----The Coronet

Appendix

Memorial Day, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to participate in the annual Memorial Day services sponsored by the various veterans' organizations of Boyertown, Pa., May 30, 1955, at which time I delivered the following address:

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE FAIRVIEW CEMETERY, BOYERTOWN, PA., MONDAY, MAY 30, 1955

Ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor to have the privilege as past commander-in-chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of joining you my fellow veterans and your neighbors in this annual observance of Memorial Day.

This is the day when all of us are united in a common purpose.

Yes; this the day when our thoughts and words pay homage to those who have given their lives in the defense of all that we have, all that we are, and all that we hope to be.

We call this day Memorial Day because through a custom established more than 90 years ago May 30th was set aside as a special day for commemoration of our honored dead.

Memorial Day is the only day of the year on which our entire Nation mourns its dead.

This is the only day on which the Stars and Stripes is flown half staff everywhere as a symbol of national tribute to soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen who made the supreme sacrifice in defense of the country they loved so dearly.

Memorial Day is in commemoration of those departed men who have defended our land during the past 180 years.

To us every man is a hero, whether he fought at Lexington or Belleau Woods, at the Normandy beachhead, or on Okinawa, in Korea, on the high seas, or in the air.

Today we honor their memory.

It matters not who they were, nor their color, creed, or station in life.

The only thing that counts is that they were loyal, brave Americans who gave their lives for the principles of freedom we hold dear to our hearts.

As we commemorate Memorial Day here in Boyertown many of us are thinking of some departed war veteran.

To him we direct our silent tribute.

We recall the bravery of this outstanding loyal citizen who answered his country's need.

Add to that veteran more than 1 million others and we have the rollcall of American war dead reaching back to the beginning of our history.

That is the number who have died in all of our battles for freedom.

The mortal remains of those heroes rest in many places around the world.

The sun never sets upon them.

More than 100,000 of them are buried away from their homeland, in Europe, Africa, and Asia.

Nearly 30,000 more lie beneath the waters of the seven seas.

Many thousand others are buried here in the United States.

Above those men, wherever they are, flies the Stars and Stripes of our country.

The flag says to us, these were your defenders and mine.

They fought for our cherished ideals of liberty and freedom.

Their courage was tested on the fields of battle.

They shall always be sacred in our memory.

Who were these men?

They were the sons who answered the Nation's call to arms.

They left their schools and shops, their homes and their cities, to battle the tyrants of their time.

They defeated the armies of the kings and kaisers, the Nazis and the Fascists, the Jingoists and the Communists.

The men we honor on this Memorial Day were the very blood stream of our American civilization.

There were our Protestants and Catholics, the Gentiles and the Jews, the white men and black, the native sons of foreign born.

They were the rich and the poor, the college graduates and the untutored, the men and the boys.

They came from city streets and country roads.

They represented every strata of our social and economic life.

They were as different as the brilliantly contrasting hues of the flag under which they fought.

However, like the red, white, and blue of our national emblem, those men were the symbol of unity.

They fought shoulder to shoulder for a single cause.

That cause was freedom for one and all.

Together they formed the most powerful force on earth.

Their matchless courage revealed the strength and determination of a nation of freemen fighting for existence.

It was that mighty combination which brought armed victories and renewed hopes for justice, security, and peace to the peoples of all nations.

Of course the question is, Have the battles truly been won?

Have the supreme sacrifices of a million men really given us worldwide peace?

Do we dare say that freedom has become a certainty?

The answer to each of those questions is "No, not yet."

We know that we cannot rest upon the victories of the past.

Nor do we dare to proclaim blind faith in the future.

We can only take warning from the words of the philosopher, George Santayana, who declared:

"Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

But we have not forgotten.

Three wars within 38 years have left indelible marks upon our memories.

We know now that we cannot leave our ideals unguarded.

We know that we must protect them boldly, positively, for we can see all too clearly with our own eyes that the principles we cherish so highly, the inherent rights of men, are qualities still unobtained by many people who have never tasted real freedom.

The world population today totals 3 billion.

Less than half of those 3 billion people live in countries where individual rights are respected.

The other half of the world is populated by the unfortunates who are trapped or overwhelmingly pressured by Communist aggressors.

It has been declared often, but we repeat it, that the world cannot long endure half free and half slave.

The fierce struggle between free people and dictators has been quickened by man's scientific progress.

Time and distance are no longer safeguards against surprise armed attacks.

That is why American forces are on guard today along a wideflung perimeter of military might.

We have extended our watchfulness to Europe and Africa and to Asia and South America.

Our Army and Air Force are in the polar regions.

Our radar system, sensitive to every aircraft, extends across this continent from coast to coast and far north through Canada.

Who will deny that the Kremlin's fixed goal is world dominion by means short of an all-out war through the use of propaganda, fifth-column subversion, civil strife, and treacherous diplomacy?

Do you realize that a blunder could ignite the third world war, which nobody wants but which could be thrust upon us?

A moment ago I mentioned that American forces are on guard today—along a wide-flung perimeter of military might, that our Army and Air Force are in the polar regions, and our radar system extends across this continent from coast to coast and far north through Canada.

Let me add that our strategic planners have installed airbases circling Soviet Russia in general.

Although the Kremlin rulers have ridiculed the American idea of an encirclement of a Communist power by American-built airbases it is no longer a laughing matter for Soviet Russia, because the bases have been established and there they stand ready for American air might in the event of a war.

The Bangkok Conference united anti-Communist countries of the Middle East—into a fighting force that stands ready to challenge communism wherever it appears in Asia.

The eight nations that constitute the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, commonly called SEATO, can be built into a mighty union of merit forces that can turn Red China into a paper tiger.

Nor can we overlook the outcome of the Bandung Conference, which cured a lot of misconceptions in the world as to the attitude of Africa and Asia regarding our approach and our policies concerning world communism.

In short, little opposition to the policies of the United States was found to exist as far as the Asian world was concerned.

Then, too, we cannot overlook the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, commonly known as NATO, which is the most effective and powerful weapon of defense that exists in the world today.

All of these preparations for defense are a phase of preventive warfare—designed to

avert or postpone a war until war becomes impossible because of the effectiveness of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

From a national security standpoint we dare not do less.

Although we earnestly want peace we cannot afford to merely dream about it, not in this day of coldly calculated unfriendliness.

This is not a nice subject to discuss at the resting places of our honored dead.

However, the men who died fighting for our country were realists.

They faced facts bravely when they plunged into battle.

Certainly they would not have us falter today.

So it is in tribute to them that we translate our debt of gratitude into terms of practical thinking and positive action.

On Memorial Day we fulfill three obligations:

We strengthen our appreciation of the men whose sacrifices made secure in large measure the freedoms we have inherited.

We pay tribute to those men through our spoken word, our floral tokens, and our prayers.

Furthermore, we reaffirm our courage and determination to carry on our defense of the cause for which they so nobly fought.

Finally, we declare again that our honored dead shall never be forgotten.

To this solemn declaration we quote these words from Theodore O'Hara's Bivouvac of the Dead:

"Nor shall your story be forgot,
While Fame her record keeps,
Or Honor points the hallowed spot
Where Valor proudly sleeps."

J. Edgar Hoover Awarded National Security Medal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for 31 years, under 5 Presidents and many Attorneys General, was awarded the National Security Medal by President Eisenhower in ceremonies at the White House on Friday, May 27. Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a copy of the remarks made at the presentation ceremonies, and the citation which accompanied the medal:

REMARKS AT THE PRESENTATION CEREMONY OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY MEDAL TO THE HONORABLE J. EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, MAY 27, 1955

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Hoover, your dedication and devotion to public service are so long and so well known, your accomplishments in that service are so great and so well known, that it seems idle for me to try to say anything that could add to the dignity of this ceremony.

Perhaps it is just best for me to say I am proud to be an agent for our people in conferring upon you this highest award that the Government has, and to say that your real reward—as all of us here know—is in the hearts, the thanks and the gratitude of our entire Nation.

Mr. J. EDGAR HOOVER. Thank you, Mr. President. I am deeply grateful for this honor which you have accorded me. I realize that it has been brought about through the dedicated accomplishments of the personnel and my associates in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as well as by the magnificent support which you as President and which the Attorney General has afforded us over the years.

It is a pleasure, indeed, to serve as one of your appointments.

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE PRESENTATION OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY MEDAL TO JOHN EDGAR HOOVER

The President of the United States takes pride in presenting the National Security Medal to John Edgar Hoover for service as set forth in the following citation:

"As Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for 31 years, he has made an outstanding contribution to the national security of the United States. Exercising exceptional tact, perceptiveness, judgment, and brilliant leadership in a position of great responsibility, he has established the highest ideals of Federal law enforcement and has directed them to realization. His tireless efforts have brought to a new height of effectiveness the law enforcement machinery of the United States Government. Through his well-grounded and clearly defined concept of investigative procedures, reinforced by his recognized integrity and high personal prestige, he has won international recognition for the Federal law enforcement system of the United States.

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

Upper Colorado Project Opposed by Oklahoma Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council has issued an interesting folder in which it opposes the proposed upper Colorado River storage project on economic grounds, with particular reference to the status of the national debt.

Discussion of the project is preceded by the following statement concerning the national debt vis-a-vis the project:

Interest on the Federal debt this year will cost American taxpayers more than they paid in total taxes in 1939—nearly $50 for every man, woman, and child. It is the second largest item in our Federal budget—second only to national defense. Since 1930 this debt has increased over $260 billion—yet, Congress is being asked to run you through the tax wringer again by authorizing new spending projects committing us and our children to additional tax burdens for the next 100 years. This folder will give you a brief description of one such horrible example that will cost you, the taxpayers, another $4 billion.

The folder then relates specifically certain objections to the project which should be evaluated by the House if the authorization bills should come to the floor. These are as follows:

The upper Colorado River project (H. R. 270, H. R. 3383, and S. 500) is but one of many proposed new tax spending projects for unneeded irrigation and big dams that will plunge the Nation further into debt—increase the tax burden on you, your children and grandchildren. This particular project provides for the construction of huge dams on the upper Colorado River and its tributaries at a cost to the Nation's taxpayers of $4 billion, all in hidden interest subsidies.

This extravagant, fantastic plan to change the face of the earth would:

Flood magnificent valleys, destroying some of the Nation's great scenic canyons, and flood part of Dinosaur National Monument, one of the world's most beatiful wilderness areas, dedicated to recreation. All this in the general region of the largest coal, oil, and uranium deposits in the world.

To irrigate arid highlands with a very short growing season. In much of the area there is frost every month of the year. The Bureau of Reclamation report shows that only a small part of this land is listed as class 1.

On which to raise crops already in surplus. Even if we spent the fabulous amount of tax money requested to irrigate this arid land, it would grow a limited quantity of those crops which are already in great surplus and heavily subsidized by the taxpayers.

At a cost far greater than the value of the land, the project would require us, as taxpayers, to pay $750,000 to irrigate each 150-acre farm—or as high as $5,000 per acre.

To favor a few highland farmers in four States, when far more productive land, in many other States, could be developed, if needed, for less than one-tenth of the cost.

The Late M. E. Hennessy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Globe of May 15, 1955:

ROUND ABOUT WITH M. E. HENNESSY—MIKE'S COLUMN WAS HIS PRIDE

(By James Morgan)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—When Mr. Hennessy was sick a year ago Mr. Morgan handed an envelope to Daniel J. O'Brien, Sunday editor of the Globe. On the outside of the envelope Morgan had written: "This memorial of Mike is intended to be run in his column if he should not get well; otherwise I should like to have the envelope remained sealed. J. M." As it turned out, Mr. Morgan died at 3 p. m., Thursday and Mr. Hennessy at 8 p. m. of the same day.)

It will be more natural, less formal, to speak of him here as Mike, the name by which he was the most widely known and the most widely endeared member of the Globe staff. My earliest recollection of him runs back to his apprenticeship as a "space writer," when he had to think up subjects and try to bring in acceptable stories. I see him now as a youth, when he handed me one day an interview with a man who for 25 years had been the most-talked-of person in Massachusetts, General and former Gov. Benjamin F. Butler.

Butler just then was a Republican, but in this interview, which a young fellow unknown to me submitted for publication, he endorsed the Democratic candidate for governor, William E. Russell. This would be startling news, since Russell's father had been a leader of the Silver Tops, or anti-Butler Democrats when Ben was a Democrat.

I suspected that it might be a booby trap. The Globe was for Russell, and if we printed it and were disavowed, we should have perpetrated what used to be known in campaign terminology as a roorback. It would have boomeranged on our candidate.

To play safe, I put the interview in type and told Mike to bring back the proof of it with Ben's approval in writing. To my surprise, he returned with many scribbled changes on the margin in Butler's penmanship but with no weakening of the endorsement of Russell, and I still have it somewhere among my keepsakes. It was the last time in more than 60 years which followed that anything written by Mike was questioned by me or, to my knowledge, by anyone else. He quoted two generations of public men, and I have no recollection of his ever having been accused of a misquotation.

As a reporter, he was in the thick of nearly all the political battles and quarrels of an epoch. He had his own emphatic preferences for good men and good causes. His contempt for fakes eand fakirs was equally strong. But he never made the paper the vehicle for his personal feelings, and he preserved his standard of impartial objectivity. His overruling loyalty was to the Globe and its readers. In that inseparable companion, his notebook, he set down naught in malice, and I don't believe there was a mean line in all he wrote. His innate taste and tact gave him an unerring sense of what to print and what to leave out.

Though his manners were modest and unaggressive, a casual meeting with him left the impression of an unforgettable personality, generally with an appeal to the affections. There cannot be a major city in the United States where he did not have a friend. He had a gift for anecdote, both written and spoken, and he could be depended on to return from an assignment with a batch of new stories. In the brief course of an Atlantic crossing with Mrs. Hennessy, his good fellowship made him a shipboard favorite. A crowd of passengers bound through to Liverpool either stayed up or got up to give him a sendoff somewhere around 3 or 4 a. m., when he went ashore at the Irish port of Cobh for a visit to his ancestral land.

Although born in the sound of Bowbells in London, he was, as his friend Patrick A. Collins said of John Boyle O'Reilly, intensely Irish and intensely American. It was the good fortune of this 19th century pilgrim to our stern and rockbound coast to be brought in boyhood to West Roxbury, then a rural section of Boston. There he was to pass the rest of his life in neighborly relations with the earlier as well as with the later comers to these shores. His character was molded in that environment of both racial stocks, and he was ever at home with each.

He knew every President since Cleveland, back in the days when he sat on the porch at Gray Gables down on the Cape and listened to the unexpurgated opinions of men and things by Grover, who never permitted the country at large to catch him off guard. He rode Theodore Roosevelt's campaign trains and was on Woodrow Wilson's last fateful transcontinental tour. F. D. R. was in the habit of singling him out in a crowd for special greeting. Taft told me it seemed as if he never came into Massachusetts without Mike boarding his car at the State line.

Like the other reporters, he left Plymouth Notch when President Harding apparently was recovering in San Francisco from what was to be his fatal illness, and he missed the swearing-in of Vice President Coolidge by his father in the light of a kerosene lamp. But, as the new President had predicted, his special train picked up "Col" Hennessy at North Bennington, the first stop, whither Mike had rushed through the night in an automobile.

The men on the national stage that Mike knew most intimately were James A. Farley and Wilson's secretary, Joseph P. Tumulty. It was quite in keeping with the experience of this trusted confidant of public men to have been called from his garden to the telephone one morning by James F. Byrnes in Washington on a delicate matter of personal importance to the then Secretary of State.

Mike knew also the would-be Presidents from Bryan to Dewey, and these two particularly well. He was close to Al Smith. But I saw him steal the show from Al when he walked into a hotel parlor in Chicago in 1932 and was greeted by cries of "Hi, Mike!" and an uproarious welcome from the men of the press who were waiting for a conference with the Unhappy Warrior in his losing fight to put a chock under the Roosevelt bandwagon.

His Side Lights were a popular Globe feature in the coverage of every national political convention between 1900 and 1944. It was hard to dissuade him from taking the serious risk of going to the 1948 conventions. He enjoyed those occasions for fraternizing with his friends from the press galleries at Washington and from newspaper offices all over the country. But he so organized his work as to keep business before pleasure. In his rigorous self-discipline there was no time for play until he had put on the wire his last sheet of copy.

There was rare beauty in his homelife. He and his wife had been boy and girl sweethearts, and so they remained until death did them part shortly after their golden wedding day.

They had been called upon to endure more than their share of family bereavements, which they met as valiantly as he bore for 11 years the crowning sorrow of his parting from her. Happily, this was relieved by the devotion of two daughters, who kept the home for him and were admirably qualified to carry on its tradition of a gracious hospitality.

I have chosen Mike's column for these recollections because it was his pride. In some 35 years he didn't miss a week until his last illness. Still he strove to continue what had become a labor of love and as his vitality ebbed, his work seemed to improve.

My friendship for him shrinks from expressing itself in cold type. We did not keep books on each other. But I know that a balance sheet would disclose me heavily in debt to one who took more pleasure in giving than in receiving. Lonely as my world is without him, it would be lonelier still were it not for the companionship of his happy memory.

The Late James Morgan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Globe of May 15, 1955:

ON JAMES MORGAN

It is the presidential election night, November 3, 1952. On the fifth floor of the Boston Globe are the customary three big rooms of men intent at long tables over tabulations of figures and adding machines. Teletypes click, telephones jingle, copy goes up and proofs come down the pneumatic tubes, there is a subdued hum but no hustle, no confusion. This is the outer ring.

Then there is the inner office. Here sit 5 men at 1 large, square table. The place is quite still. If they consult, it is in undertones. At the head of the table (for wherever he sits, there is the head) is an absorbed figure of a man, gray haired, clean-shaven, quietly well tailored, bending over a pad of copy paper. He and his colleagues look at the clock. It is half past 10. The managing editor says to him: "You might as well begin to write."

He is writing the news lead for the first morning edition. This is James Morgan, the senior editor; he is 91 years old; one eye is gone and the other has to be helped with a powerful lens. He writes with a penpencil, close to his vision, in a hand which would be difficult to read, but which he will presently dictate to a secretary, and what he writes will be better than anyone else on the staff could do. Have a good look at him, for take him all and all, you will not see his like again.

Some time after midnight, the Globe taxicab will drive him out to his home beside the sea in Lynn, and the next day, or the next but one, he will write the Sunday article on the election and have the copy ready by Friday morning. He has been doing this, and feats like it, for only 60 years.

Back in 1922 it was said, "Better go with Mr. Morgan to the national conventions. It may be his last time." He was still going to them a quarter of a century later.

Bear in mind there has been nothing spectacular about this career. It has been modesty itself, built quietly block by block out of solid merit. This boy chose to leave school at the age of 9. From then on whatever was done, he did himself. He came of stout ancestry, the Bruces of Virginia and the Morgans of Kentucky, where James was born in Fleming County (Dec. 18, 1861). The family moved on into Illinois, a determined stroke, since it was into Sangamon County, where the lad grew up with the name and fame of Lincoln ringing in his ears. We all have our saints and heroes. Lincoln was his. Not only did he write Lincoln's life, but in spirit, and within the work given him to do, he relived it; and, as the decades rolled on, long communing with that theme seemed to carry over a depth of understanding, a mystical insight into the meaning of this American adventure in the self-government of a great people.

He came up from a telegrapher's key. It was the then-new magic craft; he began with the United Press, first in Albany, then in Washington, later in Boston.

His permanent engagement on the Globe staff came about almost by inadvertence. Intending to leave Boston, he was asked to come to the Globe and to stay a while longer. He did.

His adventuring as a reported took him into Oklahoma Territory with the opening rush of the pioneering settlers in 1887. It was the last free land-grant in this country; the last frontier. Historically, that marks the close of one epoch and the opening of another. He saw the one closed and the other opened, and was among those who early understood what had happened.

Meanwhile he becomes Globe Washington correspondent, then is called from Washington to Boston to be editor of the Sunday Globe. This Kentuckian, with the blood of Virginia in his veins, and a midwesterner by rearing, now proceeds to assimilate New England into his being. For his indoctrination he went to live in Marblehead, an easy train journeyed into Boston. Now it is well known that Marbleheaders, of the Old Village, sometimes refer to the later-coming residents who live in the borderland near the Swampscott line, as "foreigners." In no

time at all Mr. Morgan had lived down this stigma; he was gradually accepted into the status as one of the native-born, and finally came to be known as "Cousin James." To the end of his days he was a passionate student of Marblehead history, customs and folklore, and one of the rewards of knowing him well enough was to be taken on a pedestrian tour of the old town, starting with the records in the town clerk's office, penned in brown ink with a quill in the 17th century handwriting of the Elizabethans, to Agnes Surridge's well, and that stirring romance which plays out its last act in the ruins of the Lizbon earthquake.

He was a little in the line of that sort of rescue himself. For when a furious storm tore out the causeway to Marblehead Neck, making an island of that part of the town, and the town itself could not afford to rebuild, Mr. Morgan quietly reminded the proper authorities in Washington that Marblehead, with the causeway (but not without), was the one practicable harbor between Boston and Gloucester.

Everybody is to some extent at the mercy of the historic period into which he is born. The vigorous and independent spirits emancipate themselves from the servitude to time or place, and rise to dwell in a timeless world, in the great principles which are ageless and placeless. The period which followed our Civil War was one of political corruption, low standards, shameless careerism, and utterly reckless pursuit of money. Toward the end of the century William James memorably termed it, "worship of the Bitch-Goddess, Success." Very few voices had then questioned it, but one of them was the novelist, William Dean Howells.

"It was Howells," said Mr. Morgan, nearly a lifetime later, "who put me on my guard against it. I was a young fellow, just learning my way around; everybody thought it was 'smart' to be 'slick.' Howells wrote a novel on that subject. I read it and, of course, was admiring, as I was intended to do, the get-ahead fellow who could outsmart everybody else, until my author suddenly rounded on me, and, without changing his tone, showed me that my hero was a scoundrel."

With this personal revelation, include a political one. After our war with Spain, Mr. Morgan saw the rise of American imperialism, "manifest destiny," "pole to pole," and the expansionist yawp. It looked like the end of our democracy and some of our farthest-sighted citizens thought so. Then within 10 years he saw that gas balloon deflate, and Theodore Roosevelt, by the grace of God and the accident of an assassin's bullet, let loose the Progressive movement. This, and experiences like it, bore sustaining fruit in the dark years to come. During the depressant events after the First World War, when the young men around him had little recourse but to suppose that the powers of darkness were victorious and that glaring wrongs had been a complete political success, Mr. Morgan's judgments were reserved; he was not downcast, he evidently expected something and was quietly waiting for it to appear. And appear in due season it did.

But he was also experienced enough to expect its opposite to appear, in turn also. And that did, too. He did not predict it, although by 1938 the predictions were rife. But he had surmised the approach of the Second World War long before.

Too sensible to indulge in prophecy, he was prophetic in the genuine sense of that term; not the weather-forecasting of events, but the profound insight which knows that if certain conditions are present, the law of cause and effect is bound to produce certain consequences. Late in life he was speaking of men who have prophecy in them. And as his years went on, that was a quality which his own writing so often had—

"Till old experience do attain
To something like prophetic strain."

He had early embarked upon his life's voyage of voracious reading. History, biography, politics, belles lettres, his shelves began to fill, and so did his mind, memory, and reflective faculty. His reading was both European and American, and it sharpened on down into New England's local lore. As the years went by, he explored our towns, first on foot, then by trolley trip, next on bicycle with Mrs. Morgan, his young wife (Helen Dailey, of Cambridge, married in 1894), and finally by motorcar; but all the while in the pages of local histories, in the Sunday feature articles which he himself caused to be written, and personal encounters with its people. New England's poets, novelists, historians, and philosophers he knew to the point of offhand quotability; but then, he knew his English and American poets, from Shakespear to Whitman and Robert Frost, so well that their phrases rolled off his pen easily with his own. On his library shelves, and overflowing gradually downstairs into the living room and to a solid inner book-wall of the bow-windowed alcove, were the rows on rows of volumes he had read, digested, and assimilated.

This, in the language of the daily editorial conference room, was what was known as the heavy reading. James was willing to do the heavy reading; but willing is hardly the word; he was eager. That is to say, there is the daily news in the papers, a kind of alluvial silt of fact and emotion, of action and thought, deposited in the riverbed of our minds by the stream of time; then there are the weekly and monthly periodicals; next, the current books of importance; and finally, the solid substratum of western thought, from Homer and the Bible, from Greece and Judea, down through Rome, the Middle Ages, and the Renaissance to our modern world. The landmarks are well known: the great Greeks, the Romans, the poets, historians, thinkers—in order to know where we are, it is necessary to know where we came from and what happened on the way. In the decades of daily editorial conference from the beginning of the First World War (August 1914) up to almost the very end of Mr. Morgan's life, it was on this solid substratum of knoweldge that the Globe's editorials were first talked over and then written. For when he no longer came daily to the office, he was at the end of a telephone. When in doubt, "Call James: Lynn 2–4611." Or even long distance. In midwinter it could happen that he would be consulted by transcontinental telephone, in California.

Add to this, travel. It began with characteristic modesty, on foot, by trolley, bicycle, and peavine railroads to New England villages. Travel was his supplementary university. With Mrs. Morgan, who was quite as eager for adventure, he braved the rigors of New England country inns long before they were mitigated by motorcar travel. Everything was fish that came to his net, from the local family names on gray slate headstones to the regional histories in the village public library. Suppose you met him in some town like St. Johnsbury, Vt., say in June or October. After he had been there 10 days he knew the local history not only of that town but also of Peacham and Danbury, and could walk you around its streets, monuments, gallery, and museum like a native—and (shush) better than many a native-born.

As the years went on, this broadened out to include repeated tours of the United States and Europe. His skill at rifling a New England village of its lore was carried over into European capitals and their museums. How many a member of the Globe staff he sent off to Europe briefed for his tour from the English Lakes to the Acropolis. It was he, more than anybody else, who set the custom of the staff to go traveling at home as well as abroad as a part of their regular professional schooling. We were helped to know what we wanted to see before we started, and were expected to write about it when we got home.

His own travels brought him, and others, an unexpected piece of good luck. Not forseeing that history will reckon the 19th century from 1815 to 1914, from Waterloo to the start of the First World War, but well aware of the approaching centenary, he followed, in person, the tracks of Napoleon from his birthplace in Corsica, and traversed the whole course of his military movements across Europe and as far as Moscow. This he had ready to publish serially in the Globe when the European war erupted. It meant that he had military strategy, a history of the last serious quasi-world war, and the European terrain vividly in hand at the very start. (The work was later published as a book, In the Footsteps of Napoleon—1915.

Our world has supped so full on horrors since 1914 that it is hard today for people to recall, even if they are not constrained to imagine, the moral shock of those First World War years. It was a society which had supposed itself relative secure, it had developed the humane scruples of a high civilization, and it saw them violated from day to day in ever-new outrages. Everything had to be rethought: Politics, economics, statecraft, military strategy, technological invention, ethics, religious beliefs, and this was to go on, in one form or another, for the next three decades, actually for the rest of Mr. Morgan's life.

He met it. He met it year by year, day by day, and sometimes hour by hour. He met it during the long vigils at the office, and at all seasons at the end of a telephone in his home. His Jeffersonian democracy held firm, and so did his Lincolnian faith in the American people and the common man. There was a comic moment when, after that prolonged suspense, from Sunday to Thursday before the second election of Woodrow Wilson as President was confirmed in 1916, it was confirmed at last. Mr. Morgan burst out of his inner office with his sheaf of copy to send up to the composing room, and, being asked what had happened, said, as much to himself as to the questioner:

"It's the first time the just ever elected anybody."

But the world scene had shifted from politics to economics. Could he shift with it? The next half dozen years were an exciting chapter in the editorial room. With him were associated young men who were ready and eager to move over into economics bag and baggage. Jeffersonian democracy and political action looked to them like last year's birds' nests. The "heavy reading" was being done by all hands. One title will suffice to date the epoch, Maynard Keynes' "Economic Consequences of the Peace." And was not territorial representation out-of-date in the advent of occupational representation? Those questions underlay every editorial discussion. James was the Senate; he was also Chief Executive; the rest of us were the House of Representatives, with proponent power only. Question: Could we get our ideas for editorials accepted by James?

The three of us would go up (at 4 p. m. during the war, at 2 p. m. in the decades that followed 1922), armed with sheaves of notes and memoranda; everything would be tossed into the common fund; actually, anyone of us was expected to be able to handle whichsoever topic, or topics, were decided upon—politics, economics, humanism, history, local affairs, the arts, science, letters, and music—the whole run-of-the-mill; actually, however, though with due regard not to overload one writer too many days in succession, the one best suited to a subject duly congenial was generally assigned. These discussions lasted an hour, sometimes two. Everything was threshed out, and by the time the session ended it was well understood what and what not was to be said.

These discussions could get very spirited. Even heated; but never on James' side. He

had taken over a maxim of Napoleon's: "Never let your choler get above your collar." The blood above his neckband was always cool. The rest of us were not invariably so wise. There would be days when we would come out of the conference room sputtering mad. But James? Imperturbably calm and urbane. And, after all, it was true; he was the one who had to act as shock absorber, and stop the bricks, if any.

He had only 1 or 2 rules, but they were very good ones. They had been picked up gradually somewhere along the way. One was: "No negatives." The ideas must be positive and constructive; otherwise leave the subject alone until we had something helpful to suggest. This itself can sound negative or sterile, and often did so seem, but in the long term it was good sense, for out of it came the other rule: "Never berate." As a young man he had been turned loose once or twice on a justly unpopular figure, only to discover how fatally easy it was. What has to be avoided if you expect to stay in the arena of public discussion for a long while is the peril of detiorating into a common scold. As the years went on, thanks to James, we watched that pitfall being tumbled into by near neighbors and esteemed contemporaries, in 1 or 2 cases, to their extinction.

These contests—they went on 5 days a week and Sunday afternoons by telephone—were called "putting on the gloves with James." He fought fair, but often with very fancy footwork, both in, and sometimes afterward, outside the editorial conference room. Of course, there would be intervals, sometimes longish ones, when the conferences were Moravian love feasts, all sweetness and light; or, again, there would come an occasion know as blue Monday, when James himself was negatively minded. No idea was any good. A dozen, 15 of them might be put up, only to be knocked down. Finally, the question would be, "Well, James, what would you suggest?" James would pick up the afternoon paper and absently turn its pages. It was probably from sessions like this that the decision came to use general topics of permanent interest, often having nothing to do with the news at all. These proved unexpectedly popular. It even came to be said, "Thank heaven, there is no news. Now we can write about something worthwhile." And evidently a good many readers felt the same way, for they became a permanent feature of what is known as the Dudley column.

This liberal attitude was, and is, owing to Mr. Morgan. His own mind was so spacious, his town temper so tolerant, his own spirit so genial and gracious that it came naturally to him to let others develop whatsoever talents they possessed in their own way. This, accidental though it may seem, was a sheer master stroke. It resulted in richness, variety, versatility, and depth. Everything was grist which came to that editorial mill, and as time went on those columns were filled with the great ideas which have animated western man for the past 30 centuries, and the people heard them gladly.

A roving dialectric such as this is much rarer than it sounds. Almost the last lesson which any responsible executive learns is the fine art of letting things alone; of picking the man and the task, then trusting him to go ahead and do it on his own. Once the topic had been discussed and decided upon, the man assigned was left alone to write it, his competency was not questioned, and his copy was not tampered with; the presumption being that he knew his business or he would not have been there. There was a mysterious something known as "the mandate," a word picked up from the Versailles Conference and the League of Nations. It was a mystical entity. No one had ever seen it in the flesh, but all the same it was a very palpable presence. The man assigned to write a given editorial had a mandate; he knew the limits within which it had to be written and how far he could go; he could not exceed that mandate without a breach of faith.

It was this procedure which Mr. Morgan developed during the 10 years from 1914 to 1924. After that, he could go away to Europe and leave it running for months. (But we were mighty glad to see him back again: Life was not only much easier with him; but also much happier. His return was an event.) Belatedly, we realized that what we were having—"enjoying" would be the more correct verb—was an equivalent of the Platonic method of discussion in the Dialogues. That is, several speakers advanced various viewpoints, each doing his best to sustain his thesis; in the process, the general comprehension of the subject widened and moved forward; often nothing was proved, indeed, often there was no attempt to prove anything, only to explore the subject and set it forth more clearly for general understanding. The conferences ceased to be arguments and more and more became a collaborative production of ideas. This, of course, is Plato's method in the Dialogues, although a good many classical scholars seem to have missed the point.

It so happened in the decade when this method was forming in our little editorial room, the colleges, universities, and even preparatory schools were rediscovering it. There was a good deal of talk about the matter then, and much has been done with it since, but, meanwhile, in a newspaper office, deluged with Niagaras of woodpulp and printers' ink, what was being learned were those two great principles of liberal thought—intellectual sportsmanship toward the survival-value of great ideas, and faith in the average reader to give him the very best, confident in his willingness to accept and ability to understand. The editorials were written out of this matrix; a perpetual excursion into ideas, fertilized by wide reading. Often the so-called news became only a peg on which to hang ideas as various as Plato's or Thomas Jefferson's. It was once said in derision of a member of the conference, "Here he comes with a piece of news 2,000 years old." The joke was just the other way around, for the big news was not in the afternoon edition, it was in the "Republic" of Plato or the Book of Job. The morning edition was a convenient means of imparting it.

Halfway through the 1920's when the world seemed to be calming down, the Morgans began spending 3 months of the year in Europe. One says, "the Morgans," for they were inseparable. These European sojourns were no split-up academic sabbatical; they did it on their own, in leaves of absence. This undoubtedly saved Mr. Morgan for the Globe for another quarter century of active work, for he was then in his sixties. His travel was by then less strenuous, being mostly in Italy, the Riviera, and Switzerland, with once to Greece—all mild climates—but it was still nonetheless thorough and he always came home refreshed, reinvigorated, and brimming with enthusiasm for work. Travel, in him, had by now become a sort of sixth sense.

On one of their returns from Europe, when he was past 70—it would have been early in the 1930's—and he had evidently been thinking the matter over, he said:

"From now on my assignment is to put a crown on old age."

The only slip in that remark was the word "old." The age he had, but old he never grew. As for the crown, it shone more brightly year after year, and year by year he gemmed it with brighter jewels.

In the mid-1930's something quite striking began to happen. He had always written well, with a brisk, competent, journalistic style. But now he began to write with heightened gusto. This went on in crescendo for the next 20 years. He had sloughed off any lingering timidity, confident of what he wanted to say; confident, too, that he could say it without being unduly provocative. His sentences grew pungent and epigrammatic; his pen tossed off neat aphorisms; he reached back into his immense experience and wide reading for historical precedent and apposite allusion; and phrases from the poets fraternized naturally with his prose. The writing was quiet, but it was that quietude of a person who says startling things without raising his voice.

The point was, he knew things about the American political system, and the democratic temper of our people that no one else knew. They are not in the books. Yes; he had read the books. Had he not himself written half a dozen? But when he wrote, he began where the books leave off, at the water's edge of that mighty sea on which the adventuring voyage of our experience as a self-governing people has embarked. His insights were sudden and direct; they had the self-confirmatory impact of recalling to us things we already knew unconsciously but had never formulated to ourselves; or, it might be, pointed out self-evident truths which we were seeing for the first time.

Here let Mr. Morgan speak for himself. It is a letter written for his friends, October 6, 1952, but to his wife:

"If time were measured by events rather than the clock and the calendar, our 58 years of wedded life would lengthen into an age, an age of change. Together, we have seen all the mighty empires of the earth turn to dust, the British, Russian, Austrian, German, Dutch, Turkish, Chinese, along with the last relics of imperial Spain in the New World she discovered, and in Asia. Together we have watched countless kingdoms vanish, from Portugal, Spain, Bavaria, Wurtenberg, Saxony, Prussia, Italy, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania. Together we have dwelt in the shadow of endless warfare, from the Spanish-American to the Korean, and through two of the only worldwide conflicts in history. * * *

"We have sat side by side at the rise and fall of the plutocracy from its dizzy pinnacle in the gay nineties, when the names of the playboys of New York and Newport and their butterflies were on every tongue and in every Sunday supplement but are now lost in nameless obscurity. We are contemporaries of the beginning of a social revolution caused by readymade clothes for women. No longer does apparel proclaim the class of the wearer. * * * We saw sitting with the Utah delegation in 1896, the first woman delegate to a national convention and the suffragettes besieging the St. Louis Democratic Convention of 1916. They were to win the ballot for all women before the presidential election of 1920.

"We have watched the passage into history of universal celebrities on thrones, in statesmanship, in science and literature, on the stage, and in trade, and we have waited in vain to see their successors mount the pedestals that still remain vacant."

This brings us to one of Mr. Morgan's aphorisms. One who lives within less than a decade of a hundred years has been forced to watch his former comrades fall out of the ranks. Having reflected on the adage, "No man is indispensable," he amended it:

" 'No man is indispensable'; but there are men whose places are never filled."

With this epilogue of his own for prologue, we come to the most extarordinary period of his life, his triumphant old age. Imagine a man still active, and doing better work in his 70's than in his 60's, then better work in his 80's than in his 70's, and finally keeping it up with no perceptible slackening of quality in his 90's.

He laid no flattering unction to his soul for his bodily health. It was a birthday present. The Morgans in his generation were a long-lived family. "Really," he wrote in his New Year greeting, 1951, "longevity is

not so much to boast of in a family where 10 out of 12, counting parents and children, crossed the psalmist's limit of 3-score years and 10, with 8 octagenarians and 3 nonagenarians among them." James took good care of what he had, but the point is, what he made of it.

"We are not responsible for the binding of our book of life," he wrote in that same greeing, "but we are for its contents. So long as we keep it open to new ideas and hopes, we are young. No dog is old while it can learn new tricks. Lately I have learned to think on a typewriter instead of at the point of a pen, and this year I learned to travel by air in crossing the continent to Pasadena. My acceptance of the airplane was a radical departure for me. Though I flatter myself I am a progressive intellectually. I am a reactionary in my habits. Why, I was forty before I would carry a watch, and then it had to be thrust upon me as a gift from Globe associates."

For one who got on amicably with everyone, even a bizarre assortment of human beings, he himself was not pronouncedly gregarious; and when the time came to draw in from what social calling he had done, people came to see him. The best time was late Sunday afternoon; that is, when his conference by telephone with the editorial writers of the Globe was out of the way. In summer, his guests were taken to the upstairs veranda which opened off his study and where he all but lived from June to October; or downstairs on the brick terrace of the flower-bordered garden behind the house; from both of which stations could be had glimpses of the summer sea, the sound of its surf, and the aroma of its briny tang; and in winter, in a long living room, at one end of which is a fireplace into whose blaze the caller can look, and, by a slight deflection of glance, out through a French glass door to the horizon line of open ocean. Just at that corner of the house is a centenarian English elm, planted by the historian Prescott, for the land on which this street is laid, Prescott Road, was originally the 4 acres of the historian's shore estate.

However varied the human assortment in that room might be, it was always adroitly mingled and harmonized. Something would be found of common interest to them all, and found often very fast, too, for the subject might need to be shifted to suit fresh arrivals. It was no monolog. The guests might come to afterward and discover it was they who had done most of the talking, their remarks enlivened by terse comments from James. If he did spin a yarn, it was always new and different, always vivid and to the point, and sometimes, in the heat and glow of narration quite forgetting himself, James would get up and act it out as if to an imaginery audience. These were among the great moments.

But there were greater. They came when the company was fewer and when the conversation had deepened and intensified. Then out it rolled: discussion give-and-take adroit questioning to explore his companion's knowledge and make it his own, themes from political experience, historical scholarship, generalizations in sociology, observations from studious travel on two continents, and all with a lively flavoring of illustrative anecdote. In the guise of eliciting from his caller the best of everything that he was or knew, James, whether he knew it or not, and sometimes it seemed to me that he did, and again that he didn't, was pouring out and into the other mind the best of everything he knew and was.

Now, ordinarily a time comes with advancing years when your man, say, in his eighties, begins to slow down or forget or repeat. At the age of 93, that time had not yet caught up with Mr. Morgan. There might be days when he was tired, or had been ill, when it was more considerate not to stay very long; half an hour would do. But in that half hour the flame burned as brightly as ever. His knowledge was at his fingertips and his ideas at the tip of his tongue. In no time at all the birds of thought would rise from their coverts with an exhilarating whir of wings, and—bang! bang! bang!—the eager gunners would begin to bring them down. Spirits would mount with the sport, and in what could have been a house of grief there would be sallies of wit from Mr. Morgan and peals of laughter from his guests. In the summer of 1952, when Mrs. Morgan was painfully ill, when Mr. Morgan himself, nearly blind, was reading his newspapers with half of one eye and the help of a powerful lens, keeping up with events by the radio and television, writing "middle article" for the editorial page of the Sunday Globe every alternate week, and available for telephone conversation from the office at any reasonable hour from after breakfast until bedtime, he was capable of playing a vigorous game of intellectual football, up and down the field, with end runs, forward passes, and brilliant field goals, which time after time would send a caller away breathless. Was this man immortal? Was he immune from discouragement, low spirits, old age, and death? If asked how Mrs. Morgan was, he would reply explicitly; if asked how he himself was, he would reply with candor and then dismiss the subject as of no special interest and come to something which was.

Bear in mind, too, that this was a hot summer, some of the time fearfully hot, and on all but the very hottest days, once a week, on Fridays, this man of 93 would go in to the office sometimes by train or bus, often alone, lunch with the managing editor at Patten's on Court Street, alert and eager to see all that was going on, read his galley proof, and go home again the same way, sometimes with an escort, sometimes without. In the summer of 1951, he had a route figured out from the bus terminal in Haymarket Square to the Globe building on Washington Street, on which he could cross the street by the pedestrian light signals which he could still see well enough to follow.

How was this sort of thing possible? Apparently he had made up his mind gradually and beginning years ago, in his fifties, that he would keep going and meet situations as they came. For here, in his nineties, was a situation which ordinarily would decide a man that he was justified in desisting. But James? Not at all. He would work just so long as there was any work left in him; work well—as well as he ever had, if not better, and work with his favorite word about work, which was "zest." His writing still had zest; he had enjoyed doing it, and there was laughter in it, that intense, silent laughter of the mind, when he tossed off something neat and tasty.

A time finally came when his colleagues stopped wondering and took all this quietly, for the prodigy that it was. That was the more seemly course. Something was going on here that was extraordinary; the fitting thing to do was fall into step with it and march along by its side. Ordinarily, this sort of human achievement is assigned to religion. There must have been religion in it, but one never heard it adduced. One of his best friends was the late Reverend Mr. Garfield Morgan, his neighbor in Lynn. When the Reverend Mr. Morgan, a genial, hearty, hard-working, hard-reading, hard-thinking dominie of infinite kindness and mercy, was a Sunday afternoon caller, as he frequently was, the talk might explore any aspect of religion from its history, folklore, theology, to its sociology, but never personal. What religion was in James—and there was plenty of it—was in so deep that it needed no talking about; it had been so long ago assimilated into his automatic reflexes that it had only to be lived.

And so he went to meet those two enemies of mankind—old age and death—without fear and, being so met, behold, no enemy was there.

LUCIEN PRICE.

Give Surplus Food to the Unemployed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, after passing out billion of dollars to help other nations, it is time that we showed a little consideration for needy Americans.

There has been a conspiracy of secrecy to ignore the labor-surplus areas throughout the United States.

Every appeal to the United States Government for assistance has been ignored.

"Sssssshhh—do not speak about such matters. They interfere with business. Confidence is the word."

When we insisted that the thousands of unemployed concentrated in a few areas could not wait 1, or 3, or 10 years for the economic recovery that would solve the problem of getting 3 meals a day the facing up to this human issue was always postponed.

It was considered indelicate to mention such fundamentals.

Distressing, in fact.

Then the counterpsychology started. Put the unemployed out of sight and out of mind. The problem would vaguely solve itself.

Unfortunately, this cannot be done.

We have spot areas of unemployment, where the hungry cannot be ordered into a state of suspended animation to wait for a leisurely solution to their problem.

Relief must flow to them from the bulging storehouse of surplus farm commodities. Even here the food needs of the unemployded who have no jobs or money with which to acquire food, are subordinated to the so-called integrity of our agricultural program. While all of us are sympathetic toward the special problems of the farmer, and bearing in mind that the Government has been most generous toward him, we also recognize that the unemployed are entitled to some form of relief.

Inasmuch as H. R. 2851 would provide for the distribution of such surpluses only among a handful of labor-surplus and disaster areas, I fail to see how this program would adversely affect the normal channels of distribution throughout the Nation as a whole.

The first and foremost fact is that the large number of unemployed who are concentrated in a few areas, cannot be helped by the communities involved, or by private—as distinguished from public—welfare agencies, or both.

The second fact is that the Federal Government has huge stocks of surplus farm commodities that will rot unless we put them to good use.

The farmer can always manage to raise some food for his own family, and to secure some income, thanks to the benevolence of the Federal Government.

The miner or the textile worker, living in areas where thousands of jobs have disappeared—with few replacements—has difficulty in getting any food or any income.

Are we going to quibble over the terms "areas of substantial labor surplus" and "major disaster areas" because of pride and sensitivity, while many people go in want?

To my way of thinking, this is a false and selfish pride.

Even though an area may be included in one of the above designations, the program authorized in the bill will not become operative therein until, first, the Governor of the State has certified to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that there is acute distress in the area because of the conditions prevailing there; and, second, arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary have been made with a properly designated State agency for distribution of the food within the area.

Public opinion will say that the House of Representatives has done well in passing this bill.

Disposing of surplus farm commodities acquired by the United States Government through price-support operations for the benefit of the needy will help substantially in meeting two separate problems.

Nixon Still Receiving Kudos as Goodwill Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, during a recent visit to the Carribean, I had occasion to discuss Vice President NIXON'S goodwill visit with the people there. Universally he was praised and I felt toward my own self as an American a goodwill on the part of the people their that his visit had inspired. Americans can be proud and thankful to have such an able friend maker to send to areas of the world where regard for America and Americans needs bolstering.

The following editorial appeared in a recent issuing of the Long Beach Press-Telegram commenting along the same lines:

NIXON AND THE GOOD NEIGHBOR POLICY

In its political journal, Straight From the Shoulder, the Republican National Committee this month has published a group of pictures of Vice President and Mrs. Nixon on their Central American tour.

Publicity for the Republican administration? Of course. And the best possible. For here is reflected a splendid accomplishment by that administration in the field of neighborly relations.

NIXON talking with blind Catholic Archbishop Pittini, of Santo Domingo; Mrs. Nixon greeting an ordinary citizen of Trujillo; NIXON getting a shoeshine from a small boy in Guatemala City; NIXON examining banana tree seed pods at a plantation, shaking hands with children at a school in Mexico City, leaving his official car and walking among the crowds in Antigua.

The warmth and friendliness of the Vice President and his wife made millions of new friends for this country. Their mission was a success because they circulated not only in the official circles but among the common people of the countries they visited.

The Nixons put America's best foot forward. They represented America in a good light. None of that egghead business of carrying domestic political squabbles abroad or sowing wild oats on the Riviera.

We need to sponsor more ambassadorial missions of the Nixon brand. And the office of Vice President is an appropriate one for carrying out such missions, especially when that office is occupied by a man so gifted in personal diplomacy.

Katyn Forest Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following is a personal interview with Jozef Swiatlo, former lieutenant colonel of the Communist security police and who was former Assistant Chief of the Ministry of Security in Warsaw, Poland. Mr. Swiatlo fled from Poland over a year ago and now resides in the United States.

The announcer and interrogator of this interview is an employee and announcer for the Polish Hour on the Voice of America. This broadcast was to Poland and other captive countries:

Mr. WEGRZECKI. We are going to give our listeners now an interview by Kazimierz Wegrzecki with Jozef Swiatlo, former lieutenant colonel of the security police and assistant chief of the 10th department of the Ministry of Security in Warsaw. Jozef Swiatlo fled from Poland about a year ago and resides now in the United States under the protection of an American committee for assisting refugees from behind the Iron Curtain.

In our last interview you told us about the ruthless persecution by Soviet Russia and its agents of all Polish movements tending toward liberation, and of attempts to eliminate the leaders of those movements. Could you give us some more instances of this terroristic action in addition to those you told us about in your earlier interviews?

Mr. SWIATLO. Obviously the first thing that comes to my mind is the mass murder by the NKVD of thousands of Polish officers in the forest of Katyn.

Mr. WEGRZECKI. Are you familiar with the investigations and findings of the Select Congressional Committee on the Katyn Massacre? The popular name of this committee was the Madden committee.

Mr. SWIATLO. Of course I knew about it. At the time of this committee's investigations I was in Warsaw as the Deputy Chief of the 10th Department of the Ministry of Public Security. Soviet agents in Poland followed with particular attention the work of the Madden committee. I happen to know it very well because of my personal contacts with the members of the Politburo, and also because I had access to confidential information and secret files. The results of the Madden committee's investigations put the Soviet agents now ruling in Poland into a very tight spot.

Mr. WEGRZECKI. Would you care to explain why?

Mr. SWIATLO. You see, all through these last years the Communists in Poland never even mentioned the massacre that took place in the Katyn Forest. Before the Madden investigation neither radio nor the press mentioned a word about it. The Communist rulers were betting on the passage of time and hoping that, as years go by, the Katyn mass murder will be forgotten. The Madden committee interrogated over a hundred witnesses. International experts who examined the bodies of the Katyn victims were summoned and testified under oath. A great volume of conclusive evidence was heard by the committee. All this broke the silence that up to that time was so convenient for the Communists in Poland. One of my tasks was to listen to the foreign broadcasts. The numerous broadcasts of the Voice of America, full of detailed descriptions of the proceedings and the achievements of the Madden committee investigation, stirred Polish public opinion and shocked it profoundly. The Communist regime in Poland was thus forced to line up with Soviet Russia and take the side of the murderers of Katyn.

Mr. WEGRZECKI. How did they do it?

Mr. SWIATLO. To start with, the Warsaw regime announced the full text of a statement by Soviet experts, in attempt to whitewash Soviet Russia of the responsibility for the Katyn murder. Then, on orders of the regime one Boleslaw Wójcicki wrote under the pen name "Slaw," a book entitled "The Truth About Katyn." "Slaw" is a writer used often by the Communists to falsify and distort the truth. Finally, the Communist press began to lay a barrage of abuse and insults, in lieu of refutation. The findings of the Madden committee pinned the guilt for the Katyn massacre on Soviet Russia without a shadow of a doubt. The Warsaw regime didn't have any way out: It had to state common cause with the murderers. This, of course, still widened the rift between the Polish people and the regime. In my opinion the Voice of America broadcast about the Madden committee investigation made a terrific impression on the Poles.

Mr. WEGRZECKI. How do you know that?

Mr. SWIATLO. To get information about the mood of the Polish people the security police is censoring private letters mailed inside Poland. We found that the Madden committee's investigation was the subject matter of many letters. The investigation brought hope and encouragement to a great majority of the people. The letters showed conclusively that no one was in doubt that Soviet Russia was guilty of the horrid mass murder in the Katyn Forest, for the sole purpose of exterminating the cream of the Polish intelligentsia. The letters praised the United States Congress for this impartial investigation, and emphasized the abject solidarity of the Communist regime with the Soviet murderers of Katyn.

Mr. WEGRZECKI. Were the activities of the Madden committee subject to special attention of the Communist Party leaders?

Mr. SWIATLO. Of course they were. Party leaders had plenty of headaches trying to get out of a situation created by the Madden committee. The Communists looked frantically for remedies. One of them was the infamous book by Wójcicki "The Truth About Katyn." The radio and press was used for a series of violent attacks on the Madden committee.

Mr. WEGRZECKI. Was there any noticeable reaction to the activities of the Madden committee in countries other than Poland?

Mr. SWIATLO. Yes, certainly, the Madden committee investigation made a strong im-

pression in Soviet Russia proper and in the other satellite countries.

Mr. WEGRZECKI. I am sorry, our time is up, thank you very much for your valuable information.

You just heard an interview by Kazimierz Wegrzecki with Jozef Swiatlo, former high-ranking Communist official in Poland.

Criminal Jurisdiction Over Armed Forces Personnel in Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, on May 18, 1955, my colleague, Hon. FRANK T. Bow, introduced House Joint Resolution 309 providing for the revision of the status of forces agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries.

On May 26, 1955, I joined my colleague by introducing an identical resolution which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I am convinced that early consideration to these resolutions should be given by the committee in view of the evident injustice done to American servicemen overseas.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the column of John O'Donnell, dated May 30, 1955, which appears in the May 31, 1955, edition of the New York Daily News, pinpointing the problem:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON, May 30.—On this day of memory to honor those who wore a uniform in defense of this Republic (a day made brighter by the hope that Red China soon will release a few illegally imprisoned American servicemen), it's worthwhile to take a long look at those overseas jails of so-called friendly nations which now hold as prisoners Americans stripped of uniforms. These Americans arrived in those foreign lands as members of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Until 2 years ago, such a fantastic situation would be unthinkable. Today, quoting from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 18, "Several hundred Americans (in the Armed Forces) have been tried by foreign courts. The Defense Department reports to me that as of February 10," Representative FRANK T. Bow, Republican, of Ohio, talking, "there were 58 serving sentences ranging up to 15 years for various alleged infractions of the laws of the nations in which they have been stationed."

Until 1953—when the White House pressured through the Senate the so-called status-of-forces treaty which permitted foreign civilian authorities to arrest a draftee in United States uniform to remove him from American control, and then try and sentence him under their foreign procedure—this would be unthinkable.

It didn't happen in World Wars I and II or in the Korean war—even in cases of murder. We took care of our own and punished them if guilty. We stuck by the basic declaration of the great Chief Justice John Marshall (1755–1835), who handed down the simple and definitive decision which flatly stated, "Service in the Armed Forces of the Republic of the United States of America shall not abrogate or nullify the constitutional rights of an American citizen."

Now the basic rights of Americans in uniform have been abrogated by White House negotiated treaties. As a result, the administration bill to provide for an adequate military Reserve went down to defeat—because the House voted overwhelmingly for a Bow amendment which would bar the sending of drafted American troops to serve in foreign nations which could impose their judicial procedure on American soldiers.

This amendment won by a surprising 175–56 margin on a standing count and, if the vote had been recorded, the Bow majority would have been greater.

HIGH PRESSURE FROM BACK HOME

The high emotional pressure from back home, from families and friends of those United States servicemen who have been sentenced by foreign courts, moved the issue of the controversial status of forces treaty into a campaign issue. Also, the rousing fury gives new zest to the Bricker amendment, designed to whittle down the treaty-making powers of the White House.

When the status of forces treaty came up before the Senate, Ohio's BRICKER pointed out that Truman's State Department under Dean Acheson had for some time been surrendering Americans in uniform to the tender mercies of the foreign nations whom they had been ordered to defend after being shipped overseas. The men in uniform always thought they were protected by the United States Constitution so long as they wore the American uniform.

Senator BRICKER put some tough letters into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD back in those days—letters telling what happened to luckless GI's picked up by local police in France or Japan.

Among these was that of a soldier convicted in a trial in which he had not been permitted to put on his own witnesses; another where a soldier suffering from tuberculosis had been confined in a damp underground cell; and the case of still another who on appealing his sentence had his original sentence increased from 10 months to 16.

PUBLIC TRIAL NOT GUARANTEED

Bringing the situation up to date, Representative Bow, in his speech to the House, which carried his amendment so overwhelmingly, pointed out that these Americans in uniform who have been surrendered by their officers to foreign authorities: "Have been subject to all sorts of indignities, to unusually long and severe sentences for offenses which we consider minor, and they are held under conditions which we would not tolerate in any penal institution in the United States. Life in an American jail is no bed of roses. For an American, life in prisons of Turkey, Yugoslavia, Japan, or France would be a hell on earth."

But the clincher came with the phrases:

"Under these agreements members of our Armed Forces charged with the violation of the law of the country in which they are stationed are turned over to the police authorities and the courts of that country for trial.

"They are not guaranteed the right to have a public trial. There is no guaranty against cruel or unusual punishment before or after trial. There is no prohibition against a demand for excessive bail. In many countries there is no presumption of innocence. There is no guaranty of conviction only on proof of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. There is no guaranty of right to trial by jury and, of course, no possibility of trial by a jury of one's fellow citizens. There is a possibility of conviction by a mere majority vote. The President of the United States cannot exercise his right to pardon.

"These rights and guaranties which are the heritage of every American are denied the men who are sent overseas to defend America."

A Phony Complacency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues two very significant items which have appeared in the news within the last few days. The first is an article by Joseph Alsop, an outstanding authority on international affairs, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald for Monday, May 30, 1955, and which is entitled "A Phony Complacency"; and the second is a brief note in this week's issue of U. S. News & World Report, page 12. Mr. Alsop has just returned from 6 months in Asia, and is in a position not only to know the situation there, but also to bring a fresh viewpoint to the situation in Washington. Both his article and the note from U. S. News & World Report give us substance for very serious reflection:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 30, 1955]

A PHONEY COMPLACENCY

(By Joseph Alsop)

It is just a bit bewildering to return to Washington after 6 months in Asia.

Judging by the repercussions on the other side of the Pacific, the Asian crisis was producing paroxysms of alarm in the United States until only a few weeks ago. But in Washington today, it is pretty bad form even to mention Asia, let alone ask about American policy in Asia.

Meanwhile, however, the outlines of the crisis in Asia have not changed a bit. The tempo may have altered slightly. We may have a few more months to reach decisions, or to prolong our indecision, as the case may be. But all the facts that made the crisis are still right there, ugly as ever, staring us in the eye as grimly as ever, and basically every bit as critical as ever.

The best case history is the situation in the Formosa Strait, which was the immediate cause of the recent war scare in America. It has to be remembered that the real cause of the scare was not Communist words, but Communist acts. Peiping's threats to attack in the Formosa Strait would have been meaningless and empty, if Peiping had not been making active, extensive and costly military preparations to launch an attack.

When Admiral Carney turned the country upside down by saying there would be dan-

ger of war from mid-April onward, he meant that these Communist military preparations would be far enough advanced by mid-April to permit an attack being launched at any time. And he was, of course, entirely right.

Since mid-April, moreover, the Communists have gone right on strengthening their potential attacking force. More IL-28's, the twin jet bombers that are the great threat to the Seventh Fleet's aircraft carriers, have been redeployed into the Shanghai area. MIG-15's, which can be beaten by our F-86's, have been replaced by MIG-17's, which appear to be markedly superior to the best American fighter plane in the Pacific area. Reconditioning has started at the important Changting and Kienow airfields.

In the last weeks, too, the enemy has made a series of small, careful, undramatic attacks on Quemoy and the Matsu Islands exactly like the probing attacks an the Tachens that preceded the invasion of Yikiangshan. Meanwhile, our own alarmingly inadequate strength in the Formosa area has not been increased in the slightest. On balance, therefore, the basic military situation has grown distinctly worse, rather than better.

In these circumstances, what has changed the climate in Washington must be the change in Communist talk. The drumfire of threats to Formosa has been muted in Peiping. At Bandung and thereafter, Chou En-lai has said that he would be glad to discuss the situation in the Formosa Strait with representatives of this country. As long as you manage to forget the enemy's continuing military preparations, Chou's change of tune seems hopeful if you do not study it too carefully.

At Bandung, however, the more astute observers were particularly struck by the way Chou made his offer there. It was a very peculiar offer. He said he was willing to talk. But he made it very clear indeed that one point he was emphatically not willing to talk about was Peiping's claim that Formosa belongs to Communist China as a matter of right.

The Chinese Communist mood, in short, appears to resemble the mood ascribed to Adolf Hitler by Sir Winston Churchill, in his great speech after Munich. If one may paraphrase Churchill, "The Chinese dictators, instead of snatching the victuals from the table, will be content to have them served up course by course."

Apparently the Eisenhower administration is now ready and even eager to serve up the first course, in the form of Quemoy and the Matsu Islands. But Chiang Kai-shek has told Admiral Radford and Assistant Secretary of State Walter Robertson, in plain terms, that he will fight for the offshore islands no matter what the United States may do. If the Generalissimo means what he says, where does that leave the Formosa Strait crisis?

Then again, if the Generalissimo does not mean what he says, and the islands are handed over without a fight, the Communists will then be able to move their airpower into Fukien Province. Once the Fukien airfields are strongly occupied, the enemy can demand the second course of the banquet, Formosa and the Pescadores. But the Eisenhower administration radically altering its defense policy, in order to be ready to contest of the air over the Formosa Strait with the extremely strong Communist air force?

These questions are enough to suggest the phoniness of the complacency in Washington.

[From the U. S. News & World Report]

Top generals in Russia are beginning to talk of a "preventive war" against the United States to be launched when this country least expects it. American generals are uncertain whether the Russians really mean it or are whistling to keep up their courage.

Farm Income a Major Key To Preventing Another Depression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the following statement by Mr. Carl H. Wilkin, economic analyst, Raw Materials Council, Washington, D. C., pointing the way to a balanced budget and the prevention of another depression, is worthy of the most sober consideration on the part of all Members of Congress.

Farm prices—

Says Mr. Wilkin—

must be restored to the balance existing in 1946–50 or the entire economy will have to level downward to get back on an even keel. * * * Added deficits at the national, State, and local levels will merely add to the severity of the adjustment downward if farm prices are not brought back to a point of equal buying power. * * * The 1946–50 record should prove that we cannot have the earned income from which to balance the budget unless farm prices are in balance.

Mr. Speaker, I offer for printing in the RECORD the full statement by Mr. Wilkin, setting forth causes, effects, and a policy to stabilize the Nation's economy.

RAW MATERIALS NATIONAL COUNCIL,
May 1955.

THE ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE OF THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY IN 1954

1. Our potential income resulting from the full use of our facilities should have been $345 billion.

2. Our actual national income was $300 billion.

3. Of this total, $270 billion was earned.

4. Approximately $30 billion was created by deficit spending.

5. The loss in earned income was approximately $75 billion.

6. The shortage of income to consume our potential production was approximately $45 billion.

7. This shortage of $45 billion in income forced the Federal Treasury to lose approximately $10 billion of tax revenue which would have automatically balanced the budget.

8. The loss of $45 billion of income resulted in a loss of $9 billion in operating profits or gross savings which would have been available to buy and pay for capital goods.

9. Our income potential for 1955 is approximately $358 billion.

10. Our new wealth production of $52 billion total raw material income at current prices projects an earned income of $260 billion for 1955.

11. Any additional income above this amount will have to be generated by deficit spending.

ANALYSIS

The above conclusions are based on the economic record of the United States from 1919 to 1954.

The 5-year period, 1946–50, the last 5-year period since 1925–29 that we average a balanced budget, is used for a base period of average industrial production, consumer prices, national income, consumer goods sales, utilization of new wealth production, the source of new income, and the physical materials to which our labor force is applied. This 5-year period is quite similar to the 1947–49 period used by the Government in computing the above factors.

1. Our average income in 1946–50 was $211 billion.

2. We utilized $32.2 billion of farm products.

3. We utilized $45 billion of total raw material production.

4. Consumer sales averaged 55.3 percent of the national income. This percentage was slightly less than the average use of income for consumer goods in the period 1935–40 prior to World War II.

5. The expansion ratio in determining potential income for 1954 is 4 percent the average potential since 1910 and the same as used by the President's Economic Report which projected a potential output of $500 billion in 1964 equivalent to $425 billion of national income.

POTENTIAL INCOME

In July 1953, our economy reached a proved output of 137 percent of the base period and a price level of 115. The potential income for 1953 was, therefore, 137 by 115 by $221 billion, the average income for 1946–50, or $332 billion. Using the expansion ratio of 4 percent, our potential for 1954 was $345 billion.

LACK OF MARKETS

To generate the market for the 1953 potential we should have been feeding in a minimum of $66 billion of raw materials as an exchange market to utilize our potential output. Instead we fed in only $54 billion or a supply to earn $270 billion of income. The lack of this market forced a cutback in 1953 to $305 billion of national income. Average trade turn of raw material production into national income is $1 of raw material income for each $5 of national income. This ratio is the average for the 25-year period 1929–53.

With a potential of $345 billion in 1954 the low prices for farm products had not been corrected and we again utilized only $54 billion of raw materials or enough to earn $270 billion of income. The reverse turnover of new income from deficits is the same as the normal turn of the new wealth dollar. In 1954, we added $6 billion of deficits which generated $30 billion of unearned national income or a total of $300 billion for the year.

CONSUMER MARKETS

The lack of markets as a result of the relatively low raw material income is found in the record of consumer goods sales in 1954. To earn $300 billion of income the normal ratio of 55.3 percent of the national income for consumer goods in 1946–50 would have required 55.3 percent of $300 billion or $165.9 billion of consumer goods sales. Instead we had $149.5 billion or only enough to support an earned income of $270 billion.

Approximately 40 percent of the subnormal consumer market would have been food sales. This illustrates the underconsumption of farm products in our so-called surplus.

In order to earn our potential of $345 billion of income in 1954 we should have had 55.3 per cent of our potential income in consumer goods sales or a total of $190.7 billion or $41 billion more than was available as a result of too low a level of raw material prices.

Approximately one-half of our market for consumer goods is generated through raw material production. With raw material buying power in 1954 approximately 20 percent less than in 1946–50, we lost 20 percent of our potential market in raw material producing areas or 10 percent overall thus reflecting a consumer market in 1954 totaling $149.5 billion or 90 percent of the market required to support $300 billion of earned income.

CAUSES OF THE PRICE DISLOCATION

The cause of the price dislocation between raw materials and the balance of our economy can be traced to overspending of funds for capital goods from deficits.

Since 1950, we have added approximately $20 billion to the national debt. We have expanded the mortgage debt outstanding from an average of $56.5 billion in 1946–50 to $112.8 billion at the end of 1954 or an increase of 100 percent.

Installment credit has expanded from an average of $15.2 billion in 1946–50 to $30 billion at the end of March 1955 or also an increase of about 100 percent.

In addition, we have had a tremendous expansion in other private debt to construct more facilities to produce capital goods.

The total public and private debt of $710 billion existing at the end of 1954 requires a national income of $355 billion to service it on an earned basis.

SOURCE OF CAPITAL PROFITS

The operating mechanism from which profits for capital investment and principal payments originate is the production, processing and distribution of consumer goods and services from our supply of raw materials.

Excessive capital investments taxes and the fixed payments on borrowed funds in the past 4 years has resulted in a surplus of farm raw materials from underconsumption thus forcing a continuous downward pressure on the new wealth income required to earn the profits with which to meet our obligations at the national, State, local, and individual level.

The extent of this underconsumption can be realized with a comparison of $32.2 billion of farm production utilized in 1946–50 to earn an income of $211 billion and the situation in 1954 when $34 billion of farm production was called a surplus. Instead the input of farm raw materials to generate an earned income of $300 billion in 1954 should have been $45.7 billion. The turnover of this additional farm income would have resulted in $345 billion instead of $300 billion of income in 1954.

The low level of consumer goods sales in 1954 as compared to 1946–50 and the loss of $45 billion of potential income in 1954 combined totaled $41 billion. The loss of this market is the danger point in our future economy.

Farm prices must be restored to the balance existing in 1946–50 or the entire economy will have to level downward to get back on an even keel. We cannot continue operating our economy with one-half of our economy at 80 percent and the other one-half at 100 percent of the level required to use our facilities.

Added deficits at the national, State, and local levels will merely add to the severity of the adjustment downward if farm prices are not brought back to a point of equal buying power.

In conclusion, the 1946–50 record should prove that we cannot have the earned income from which to balance the budget unless farm prices are in balance.

The $64 question—is it better to carry the cost of maintaining the farm-price structure or to lose the billions of dollars which we are now losing and will continue to lose until we do something about it?

Finally, is it a good investment to spend a billion or two to prevent a loss of $75 billion of earned income which the record proves we lost in 1954?

Every indication at the present time points to still lower farm prices on one hand and more and more capital deficits on the other. So-called recessions such as took place in 1920, in 1929, and 1937, in 1949 and in 1953 give little warning. If we wish to avoid a repetition, the time to act is now.

Security and Fair Play

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of Life magazine, dated May 30, 1955, contains an editorial entitled "Security and Fair Play."

As the editorial echoes my own concern expressed recently on the floor of this House over abuses which have occurred in the handling of our national security program, I recommend it to the attention of all my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

SECURITY AND FAIR PLAY

In their resolve to protect their freedoms against communism are Americans themselves roughing up these same freedoms? Few citizens feel any imminent menace to their personal liberties. But an elder statesman of the law, John Lord O'Brian, 80, in recent lectures at Harvard on security, sanity and fairplay, soberly warns that the Nation's obsession with security is creating "an atmosphere hostile to our traditional freedom of ideas and which threatens * * * the American sense of fair play," and that many basic constitutional rights already have been seriously impaired.

One cannot ignore O'Brian's warning, for disturbing symptoms are all about us. In Seattle last week a Government employee for 20 years with an "outstanding performance" rating was stripped of his duties without a hearing because his brother-in-law, believed to have once been a Communist, had moved into an apartment in his basement (guilt by association). Nearby, a 22-year-old Army corporal was threatened with court martial or dishonorable discharge because his father was alleged to be a Communist (guilt by heredity). In Washington a 65-year-old retired Interior Department clerk was denied a passport for her "prolonged adherence to the Communist party line," on evidence which evaporated when former Senator Harry Cain went to bat for her and showed up the flimsy nature of the charges. Before the Federal Communications Commission, Broadcaster Edward Lamb, of Toledo, Ohio, is still fighting for renewal of his TV license, even though two witnesses who accused him of long-ago Communist affiliations had admitted lying; instead of clearing Lamb, the Government got one of the turncoat witnesses convicted for perjury. Moreover, Congress is considering a bill which would extend present security procedures—already involving an estimated 12.6 million Americans—to embrace virtually all of private industry. This vague bill, which Attorney General Brownell endorses, is opposed by organized labor on the ground it would make it possible to fire any worker as a security risk, however innocuous his job.

These symptoms show that something is getting out of hand. There are two major types of work in which employes must be rigorously and officially screened: sensitive Government jobs and sensitive private jobs on classified Government contracts. But the valid purpose of keeping potential spies out of such jobs keeps fanning out. The Federal Government's rigorous standards, which deny sensitive job holders the benefit of any real doubt, are gradually being applied to other Federal, State, municipal and private employees whose jobs are a cross section, and a very big cross section, of the whole of American life.

John Lord O'Brian fears that this insidious encroachment upon traditional freedoms is establishing a new kind of preventive law aimed, not at actual misdeeds, but at dangerous thoughts. "Defamation, historically the most foul of all weapons used to impair integrity, has become a commonplace of reckless usage. * * * Instead of promoting a sense of security among the citizenry it has had the opposite effect of spreading doubt, suspicion and distrust."

O'Brien feels confident that the basic American sense of fair play, once the public is aware of the dangers, will check this drift toward supervising everybody. We feel sure it will, too, but the time has come for intelligent review of the whole proliferating welter of security rules. We need another considered look at what our real security objectives ought to be, and how best to meet them.

Security is too important a matter to be decided by policemen. Every security decision ought to be in the hands of men with a sense of law, of psychology, of politics and of history. Since there is a shortage of such men, the administrative procedures themselves must be more carefully drawn, so as to give the individual some of the same protections he can demand in a court of law. Democracy's job is to limit the areas of suspicion, not widen them. Not even a police state can be 100 percent riskproof; and our real security rests on the trust citizens have in one another.

New Merger Efforts Made by Bethlehem and Youngstown; Action by Brownell Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Attorney General Brownell on September 30, 1954, disapproved a proposed merger between Bethlehem Steel Corp. and the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. on the ground that it would violate the Celler Antimerger Act. Bethlehem and Youngstown now propose to get around that ruling by suggesting that they would increase their combined capacity by 12 percent—adding 2 million tons of capacity in the Chicago district and 1 million tons in the Youngstown area—if the Attorney General will immunize their merger from antitrust prosecution.

How can the augmentation of a wrong excuse that wrong? It is to be hoped that the Attorney General will assert that such a transparent subterfuge gives no basis for reversal of his stand thus far.

The officials of Bethlehem and Youngstown have the temerity to say that unless their merger is approved and a violation of law condoned, the public will not get additional steel capacity. That must not be sanctioned by the Attorney General. Although the public needs more steel, the price proposed—immunity from antitrust prosecution—cannot be paid.

To allow this merger on the basis now suggested would decrease competition

in the steel industry all the more, and would exacerbate the evil.

I urge Attorney General Brownell to make known immediately his condemnation of this proposal to get around his ruling.

School-Lunch Cost Increase Posing Legislative Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks and to include other material, I take this opportunity to request the reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of an article which appeared recently in the Florida Times-Union. It deals in a clear and straightforward manner with the always important subject of the school-lunch program, both from the State and national levels:

SCHOOL-LUNCH COST INCREASE POSING LEGISLATIVE PROBLEM

(By Clifton L. Paisley)

TALLAHASSEE, March 28.—Should the State step in with a financial assist for little Johnnie, who is having to plunk down a nickel or so more of Daddy's money for a school lunch?

That is a question which has been silently building up for a decision by the legislators, who have been hearing a lot more on the question of whether to raise the pay of Johnnie's teacher $250 a year.

According to the State department of education which has been getting up some information on the subject, the cost to the State of an aid program of the sort would be a tidy $5,100,000 for the biennium.

Whether the forthcoming legislature is asked for the sum may depend on the State advisory council on education, which is scheduled to hear something on the subject at a meeting set for next Friday.

Mrs. Thelma Flanagan, supervisor of the school lunch program for the office of School Superintendent Thomas D. Bailey, said today that such an appropriation at the most would peg lunch prices where they are and perhaps reduce them in some places where participation in the program is falling off because of the high price.

PRICES RISE SHARPLY

School lunch prices have risen sharply in recent years, she said, and added:

"We find that in prosperous communities there is a falling off of participation when the price is raised higher than 25 cents and in less prosperous communities when it is raised higher than 20 cents.

"Just to see whether a reduction in price wouldn't cause a lot more children to buy school lunches, we asked one school sometime ago to reduce the price from 25 to 20 cents for a trial period.

"When it did we found there was an 18 percent increase in participation.

"We have just completed a survey of 787 schools in the State, though, and find that 74 percent of them, serving 81 percent of the children, had prices of 25 cents or more. Back in 1951–52, the percentage of schools with these prices was 65.

"In the just completed survey, the largest number of schools, 454, had a price of 25 cents, 101 had a price of 30 cents and 27 had a price of 35 cents. There was one school with a price of 40 cents.

"On the other hand, 152 schools had a 20-cent meal and one school evidently because of local subsidy, had a price of only 5 cents."

FEDERAL AID DECREASED

Along with higher food costs has gone a decrease in Federal aid and both of these factors have served to increase the price paid by the child.

"Back in 1946–47, when the average cost of a school lunch—as distinguished from the price charged the child—was 21 or 22 cents, the Federal aid amounted to 9 cents per lunch," Mrs. Flanagan said.

"Today, with the average cost 34 cents per lunch, Federal aid amounts to only 3.2 cents. The children themselves are bearing the brunt of both the increase in cost and the reduction in Federal aid."

Despite higher prices charged, more children are buying school lunches every year, Mrs. Flanagan said. In 1952 the percentage was 59 and today it is 66.

"That might seem to contradict my previous statement," she said, "but the increase is because of better facilities, more consolidation and stressing the program. In Louisiana, where fewer children had lunches than in Florida a few years ago, 90 to 95 percent now get them. They have a strong State program.

"And we do know that more Florida children bring their own lunches than a few years ago."

The food in the school lunch program represents only part of the cost. There is the expense of preparing and serving it, a job done by about 4,000 persons. Food costs, however, have increased more than other costs.

In the 1949–50 biennium for instance, food cost $12,800,000 and other costs came to $7,300,000, while for the present biennium the food bill will be an estimated $23,300,000 and other costs will be $10,600,000.

It is estimated that during the biennium starting July 1, food costs will come to $33,800,000 and other costs to $14,400,000.

In Mrs. Flanagan's opinion, the children (except in instances of financial hardships) should pay the cost of the food but the taxpayer should bear the overhead costs.

The $5,100,000 is the estimate of State funds needed to finance a nutritionally adequate program based on probable needs, she said.

"I know this," she added, "if the State doesn't provide the money than either (1) there will have to be further increases of prices, (2) there will be fewer free lunches, or (3) there will be less food on the plate."

Although lunch prices have been on the increase, Mrs. Flanagan said, she reported one bright spot on the school food price front—the price of milk.

Under a new Federal subsidy program started last fall, the Federal Government will pay 4 cents of the cost of every glass of milk in addition to what children had been paying.

Navy Hamburger: Facts Not Headlines Show Efficiency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, despite headlines and despite demogogery on the Navy's supply of canned hamburger, the facts show that Secretary of the Navy Charles S. Thomas and his able colleagues in the Defense Department have exercised considerable good judgment and commonsense in remedying this holdover situation from Truman days, and, in fact, started this job long before the Hoover Commission pointed out the situation.

Washington correspondent Virginia Kelly reviews the facts in the following column which appeared in the Long Beach Press-Telegram, amongst other newspapers:

"HAMBURGER CHARLIE" GIVES HIS SIDE OF GREAT DEBATE

(By Virginia Kelly)

Defense Secretary Wilson has a rugged sense of humor and likes to be called "Engine Charlie." Recently, he has been joshing his friend, Navy Secretary Thomas by calling him "Hamburger Charlie."

Secretary Thomas takes the joke in good spirit, but neither he nor high ranking officers are amused at the steaming hamburger controversy.

According to Secretary Thomas and Navy officers this is the hamburger story:

The Navy has had a special combat reserve of reduced fat hamburgers. The meat is partially cooked, needs no refrigeration and can be eaten out of the cans, or warmed or cooked, on the beaches or in other emergency locales.

The hamburgers are not for general Navy use but are reserved for emergency use when Marines are deployed suddenly as in the Korean conflict.

Normally, the meat is issued only to certain small craft without adequate refrigeration. Since it is necessary to rotate the meat in order to keep it fresh, it is sometimes issued to general messes of the Navy and Marine Corps.

The present stocks are in excess for emergency use because early in 1954 requirements for Marine emergency use were decreased by about 360,000 pounds. Early in 1955 the substitution program was speeded up to reduce excess stocks and to rotate the "burgers." On March 31, 1955, the Navy had only 154,000 pounds in excess of its requirements. This is about a 5 months' supply at current issue rates.

The Navy does not have a 1,400-year supply of hamburgers at the Naval Supply Center in Oakland. The Oakland center has no hamburger in excess of emergency requirements. The Oakland supply could be served in 1.75 meals. The Navy could use its entire hamburger reserve in five meals if it were not necessary to keep a reserve.

Foreign Policy Speech Delivered by Hon. Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin, at Appleton, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a foreign policy address delivered by me at Appleton, Wis., on May 14, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, I want to speak to you tonight about our foreign policies. I admit that these past few months—when I speak to the American people—I talk about little else but foreign policy. But foreign policy matters have got to be talked about, and thought about and prayed about—unceasingly—for the very good reason that if we continue to make mistakes in this field, all that we may say or do in the domestic field will be just so much wasted breath and wasted exercise. What do we gain, for example, by reducing taxes or raising farm prices—if tomorrow international communism succeeds in taking over America?

None of us, I suppose, would claim that American foreign policy over the past 10 years has been successful. But I am not here tonight to list the failures—let's leave that task to the historians. Our job is not to recite the mistakes but to try to discover their causes.

At the same time, we have got to keep clearly in mind just how badly we have failed over the past 10 years. I think we will demand a better foreign policy from our Government if we remember the horrible depths of the tragedy—the human tragedy—that has befallen civilization since the end of World War II.

Do you remember your feeling of optimism just 10 years ago this month? It was V–E Day, May 1945. Do you remember the blessed relief in knowing that suffering was nearly over for the human race? Do you remember your bright hopes for the future? And why shouldn't you have had bright hopes for mankind? After all, this country possessed the mightiest military machine the world had ever known. And our leaders had promised to use all our power to stamp out tyranny and bring freedom to oppressed peoples. We had said in the Atlantic Charter:

"(We) * * * desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the expressed wishes of the people concerned * * * (We) respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and * * * (we) wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Three months later we heard about the atom bomb. It was frightening news, but at the same time reassuring—because we knew then, for sure, that no force on earth would dare defy us. We had an unchallenged monopoly on the bomb. If international communism wanted to follow in the footsteps of Hitlerism and attempt to conquer the world by force, we could prevent it. Since we had the bomb, we were in a position to stop communism in its tracks—and to roll it back. To be sure, Soviet armies had already occupied Eastern Europe. But with the bomb in our exclusive possession, they would not dare have remained, if we told them to get out. Yes, there was good reason to believe that the world would at last be blessed with freedom and peace—if only we would act boldly and wisely.

But you know what happened. We were neither courageous nor wise. We let the golden opportunity pass. Soviet Russia consolidated her control over the unfortunate nations of Eastern Europe—one by one. Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria—listen to the rollcall, the tragedies we might have prevented—Albania, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary. In 1948 Czechoslovakia fell. In 1949 it was China, the most populous nation in the world. In 1954 it was northern Indochina.

In this short period of time—10 years—nearly 700 million human beings lost their freedom and became Communist slaves. This is both a gross figure and the net figure. For not a single fresh entry appears on our side of the ledger. There is not a single nation that has regained its freedom. There is not a single suman being—unless he is a lucky fugitive—who was under the Communist heel in 1945 and has obtained his freedom since then. That is the score to date: 700 million to nothing.

We should remember, too, that communism has not once given up the offensive; it has never stopped advancing. And the free world has consistently backtracked—by retreat or appeasement or surrender. The three horsemen—appeasement, retreat, and surrender. Like the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, they are the evils of our time.

In Korea we appeased—we gave the Communists an armistice (which they soon broke) just when we were poised to drive them back to the Yalu.

In Indochina we surrendered. At the infamous Geneva Conference we surrendered 12 million human beings to communism. Some people have the idea that Asiatics don't much care whether they lose their freedom. But do you know that in spite of all the attempts of the Vietminh Communists to keep them in chains, 900,000 Indochinese have abandoned their homes in Communist territory and fled to southern Indochina. These pitiable souls—900,000 of them—are now wandering about, without homes, with not enough to eat, in a country torn by civil war. Most of these people are deeply religious and would rather endure these sufferings than be unable to worship God as they choose.

Then, in the Tachen Island crisis of 3 months ago we retreated. The free world had a bastion off the northern coast of China from which we ordered Chiang Kai-shek to retreat.

In all these years we have been unable to wrest the initiative from the Communists. The question right now, for example, is not whether Red China will consume Quemoy and the Matsu Islands—but when.

So much for the tragedy that is behind us.

The temptation is very great to settle on this factor or that one as the single cause of our foreign policy debacles. But there are, of course, many causes; and I hope, as the weeks go by, to talk about them to the American people—one by one. Tonight, however, there are two such causes to which I want to give special attention.

One is the appalling absence of moral courage that has marked recent national administrations. And I must admit—even with a Republican administration—that on this score things are not improving. I think if you search our 180-year national history you will not find a more shameful episode than the refusal of the current administration to secure the freedom of our Korean prisoners of war.

Now, I've talked about the prisoner-of-war situation before—and I intend to go on talking about it. But there are two facts I don't think I have stressed enough—and these go a long way toward proving that our Government lacks the moral qualities of honesty and courage.

First, most Americans have the impression that only 11, or perhaps 15, American servicemen are in Communist concentration camps. This is absolutely untrue and the administration press agents who continue to use these figures know perfectly well that they are false. The figure was originally 944. That was back in September 1953—right after the postarmistice prisoner exchange was supposed to have been completed. Since then that figure has been reduced by 463—463, as nearly as we can tell, have been murdered—they have been shot or allowed to die by their Communist torturers, which is the same thing. There are thus 481 American uniformed men left in Communist prisons. Remember that figure—481; it represents the latest information we have, as unearthed by the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations only 2 weeks ago.

Now, the second item of misinformation is this: Most Americans are under the impression that the administration first found out about this Communist treachery last November when Red China announced it was going to try several of our airmen as spies. This is also untrue, although the administration is doing its level best to sell the idea to the country. I have here in my hand a document prepared by the Defense Department in September 1953. It proves that the administration knew the full story then. (Read from document.)

The administration has thus had since September 1953 to obtain the release of our prisoners—nearly 2 years—and what has been done about it? You, my fellow Americans, know the full story. Two weeks ago I thought I might learn something that was not public information. Our Senate committee thought the administration might be doing something behind the scenes, so we called top State and Defense Department officials to an executive session to find out what was going on. This is one executive session whose results I can disclose. I can reveal what administration officials told us—because they told us nothing. They had nothing to tell us. Absolutely nothing was being done beyond what we and the public had read in the newspapers.

And what had we read in the newspapers? That the President had mentioned the American airmen in one of his letters to General Zhukov, his Moscow pen pal. Now, I don't like to speak lightly of the President—or disrespectfully. But neither can I treat lightly the spectacle of our Government doing nothing to free our soldiers—except trying to soft-soap a Communist thug. I cannot treat lightly the spectacle of the mightiest nation on earth refusing to lift a finger to protect the young men who have gallantly defended it.

Some say the administration is still working through the United Nations to obtain the prisoners' release. But there is not the slightest indication that the U. N. is even interested in the problem. The U. N. made the great gesture of sending its Secretary General to a jasmine tea party in Peiping. After this bit of futile dramatics, our noble international organization lost interest in the troops that supposedly fought under its flag.

But however contemptible is the attitude of the U. N., the primary blame does not rest there. Let's not make that mistake. An American Army is still the responsibility of America. When the Senate ratified the U. N. Charter, it did not thereby repeal article II, section 1 of the Constitution of the United States—which makes the President the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States. We did not relieve the President of the duty of protecting our fighting men and give it to the U. N. God help us if we ever do that.

The President, I am sure, is aware of his obligations; but why doesn't he do something about them? Who is tying his hands? Why doesn't he exercise his Executive power to allot foreign aid appropriations in the way I have so often suggested? Why doesn't he put Communist China in an economic straitjacket by telling our alleged European allies that they will get not one red cent of our money as long as they ship to Red China? Such a policy would get results.

Moral cowardice is one of the explanations of the sad state of world affairs. It is one of the reasons other nations don't keep their agreements with us. They don't have to. They can get away with deceit and treachery and broken promises. They can insult us and then thumb their noses. What respect, after all, can you have for a nation that abandons its fighting men after a war is over? The world must learn that when an American soldier goes overseas, he packs on

his shoulders the entire strength and power of the United States of America.

May I remind you, my fellow Americans, that we have criminally prosecuted several of our soldiers who were traitors—who abandoned their country during the Korean war. I say that a country cannot long go on punishing its soldiers for abandoning it when the country abandons its soldiers.

The American people must speak out on this issue. They must remind our Government that the Nation owes the same duty to the soldier as the soldier owes to the Nation.

The second cause of our foreign policy failures that I want to mention tonight is our constant fear of calling the Communists' bluff. The Red sword-rattlers have learned that nosy threats intimidate us. At this very moment, Chou En-lai's tought talk is persuading us that we must give up Quemoy and the Matsus—even though these islands are vital to America's and the free world's security.

If these islands fall, it will be a military disaster of the first order. For they are immensely important to the defense of Formosa. The administration is now encouraging the belief that Quemoy and the Matsus have no military value, so it will be useful tonight if we outline the military factors involved. I think the country suffers seriously from a lack of information on this subject.

First of all, the island of Quemoy lies only a few thousand yards off the Communist port of Amoy. Amoy is the place from which the Communists plan to launch an invasion fleet against Formosa. At the moment, however, the Communists cannot amass their invasion fleet because heavy Nationalist guns on Quemoy can rake the entire area. That's why the Reds are so anxious to take Quemoy.

Second, the Matsu Islands are only a few miles from the important Communist city of Foochow. Foochow is important to the Communists because it has the only sizable navy yard equipped to build armored junks which the Communists plan to use in their invasion of Formosa. At the present time the Communists can't use the Foochow navy yard because they have to bring materials that are used in building the junks by sea to Foochow. The Matsu Islands control the sea approach to Foochow. Consequently the Communist junk-building program is largely blocked.

Third, the Quemoy and Matsu Islands sit astride Communist shipping routes running all the way from Canton to Shanghai. Coastal communication by sea is impossible to the Communists so long as Quemoy and the Matsus remain in Nationalist hands.

Fourth, the Communist airbase nearest Formosa is some 200 miles inland from the coast. The broken terrain in that area makes it impossible to have airfields right along the coast. But the island of Quemoy has three airfields and room for more. If the Communists should take that island their air run to Formosa would be cut down by over a half.

Fifth, the airfields on Quemoy are invaluable advance bases for Chiang Kai-shek in the event that Formosa is attacked. Now Nationalist aircraft are 150 miles closer to Communist targets than should they have to fly from Formosa itself. Quemoy is an aircraft carrier permanently anchored a few thousand yards off the enemy coast—and one, to boot, that cannot be sunk.

Now just as Quemoy and the Matsus are Formosa's first line of defense, Formosa, in turn, is an important link in our whole defensive position in the western Pacific. That great strategist and statesman, General MacArthur, has pointed out that Formosa is the key to our island defense chain. If Formosa should fall, the enemy would sit astride the middle of our line leaving our right and left flanks fatally exposed. Japan and the Philippines would be vulnerable; our mainland positions—Korea in the north and Vietnam, Thailand, and Malaya in the south—would, for all practical purposes, have fallen behind the Iron Curtain. Once our western Pacific line has been pierced, the Communists can afford to set their sights on Hawaii and California.

The crisis over Quemoy and the Matsus cries for an unequivocal declaration by the President that the Peiping regime may have those islands only when it has defeated the United States of America. It is highly improbable that the Communists would try to stretch their luck in the teeth of such a warning. But when we refuse to say what we will do, we invite the Communists to attack, and put ourselves in the position of having to fight or surrender. The President's silence is pushing us into that awful dilemma whose horns are appeasement and war.

The John Day Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I have here a copy of an editorial from the Corvallis (Oreg.) Gazette-Times of May 21 and also a copy of a letter which Senator NEUBERGER wrote to the editor of the Gazette-Times. The letter is in criticism of an editorial explaining the John Day bill, H. R. 5789, and the instant editorial is in answer to that letter.

This letter and answering editorial bring out so many of the unfounded questions which the opposition to this legislation ask and answers them so clearly that I would like for them to become a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I ask for their insertion:

THE NEUBERGER LETTER

We did not contend the Northwest has been getting too much of the Federal public-works budget, but that we have been most fortunate in the past to have received as much money as we did. While this may not have been out of proportion to our needs, it was certainly out of proportion to our population and taxes paid. You know this and so do Congressmen from other sections of the country.

Like you, we would like to see the Northwest get 100 percent of the budget and realize this wouldn't be enough to do the complete job. Everyone, also including you, know that former Senator Cordon and our Republican House delegation did a wonderful thing in getting one-third of this budget for us.

It will be most interesting to see if you, as Senator Cordon's replacement, can equal this record. Since the Republication delegation talked the money out of a Congress dominated for the most part by Democrats, it should be easy for you as a Democrat not only to exceed this record but to improve upon it.

We don't go along with the entire Colorado River program any more than you do. You voted properly, but how could MORSE vote for it? At least the McKay position is consistent—he is willing to spend Federal money where private money cannot or will not do the job.

We don't know how accurate your power sale figures are and will be interested in knowing the answer to your accusation and will write to Mr. COON to see what he says. However, we do know the bill authorizes sale of the power on a prepaid basis to all power outlets—public and private—so it is not just the reactionary political forces who are concerned.

Speaking of the preference clause and your charging yourself with protecting the public interest, will you please explain to a dumb editor just how this preference clause works to the best interests of all of the said public?

The preference clause, as we understand it, governs the sale of Government-produced electric power. Now suppose the Government builds a flood-control dam and has as a by-product a large amount of power to sell. Is it not logical that the Government, after establishing a price for the power, would sell it without discrimination to any distributor who wanted it—whether municipalities, REA co-ops, or the publicly regulated private utilities? But, again as we understand it, the preference clause won't permit that * * * it makes it obligatory that his power must go first to customers of certain public bodies.

We interpret this to mean that "preference" makes sure that certain consumers (distinguished largely by the fact that they do not get power from electric companies—are allowed to buy electricity which all the taxpayers pay for; while other citizen taxpayers who do buy their electricity from electric companies (about 80 percent of all the consumers) may have only what's left over—if any.

Now this 80 percent of the people pay a lot of their taxes through the power companies (20 percent of all private-power utilities income is paid back out in taxes) but these same taxes are not paid proportionately by users through the REA power companies. So it would seem that the preference clause subsidizes the users of public power and these people pay less in taxes through their power supplier to create the dams which provide the power on which they have a preference.

If the above interpretation is correct, how is it that you, who have charged yourself with looking out for the interests of the people, are only concerned with protecting the unfair advantage of the 20-percent minority?

Perhaps you will straighten us out in our fallacious reasoning on this preference matter because we know you want to represent all of the people as well as the squirrels.

NEUBERGER ON JOHN DAY

To the EDITOR:

I have read your editorial of May 11 criticizing my opposition to the Coon partnership bill for John Day Dam. I believe your readers may be interested in some facts which the editorial did not disclose.

You infer that—because the Northwest gets one-third of the Nation's Federal funds for multipurpose river projects—this is too much. I contend that—because of the power potential and the need in the Northwest—this is too little. We have 42 percent of the Nation's waterpower potential, and the volume of water carried by the Columbia poses one of the worst flood-control problems in the Nation. Would you propose that the money be spent where there is no power potential and no flood-control problem, merely to equalize geographically the distribution of funds

You said there are no funds for John Day as a Federal project. The total cost of John Day as an authorized Federal project would be about $310 million. Yet you do not explain why Secretary McKay is urging Congress to authorize $1,815,000,000 worth of Federal projects on the upper Colorado River.

Evidently, according to McKay and COON, there is not $310 million in the United States

Treasury for John Day Dam, but there is 6 times this much for projects on the upper Colorado.

Of course, the real reason for this contrast is easy to see. John Day is a marvelous power site coveted by the private utilities. The sites on the upper Colorado are marginal and of poor quality. McKay is quite willing to have these developed as Federal projects.

The Cordon-Coon John Day bill of 1954 provided that power companies would put up $164 million to get the power facilities for 50 years. The bill was defeated when Senator MORSE and others opposed it. Now, the Coon John Day bill of 1955 provides that the companies put up $273 million. Isn't this a bald confession that the 1954 version tried to deprive the public of $109 million? How much will the 1956 bill offer?

According to the Army Engineers, the power facilities of John Day are worth $25,538,000 annually. Over 50 years this would amount to a total of $1,276,900,000 worth of electricity at wholesale, for the utilities to sell at a profit. No wonder the reactionary political forces in our State are trying so hard to put across the Coon bill for the private power companies. What a bargain they would get.

Partnership power would be high-cost power. Private utilities pay more interest for their money than does the Federal Government. In addition, partnership power would not be pooled as to costs with the extremely cheap energy now obtained from Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams. Furthermore, piecemeal use of the river reduces administrative efficiency, increases conflicts over use of this great national asset.

Your editorial did not mention the outstanding farmers' rural electric cooperatives, like the Benton-Lincoln Cooperative, which are dependent on the Columbia River Federal dams for their energy. Yet, under the Coon bill for John Day, the preference clause protecting these co-ops will die. The kilowatts will be monopolized by private companies. Where will the co-ops turn for power? They have no generating sources of their own.

As a United States Senator, I regard myself as charged with protecting the public interest. That is why I oppose the Coon bill to surrender the John Day power facilities to private utility companies for half a century.

I appreciate the fine willingness of the editor of Gazette-Times to open his letter columns to discussion of this crucial issue to our State.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

Address Delivered by the Governor of Maryland at University of Maryland Commencement Exercises in Heidelberg, Germany

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on May 27, 1955, Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of the Free State of Maryland, delivered an address during the University of Maryland commencement exercises in Heidelberg, Germany.

We in Maryland are proud and happy that under this administration and that of Dr. Wilson H. Elkins, president of the University of Maryland, the school has now been fully accredited. And we feel that Governor McKeldin's address is the type of statement that will do much to bind together the educated peoples of the free world.

I ask unanimous consent to have this address delivered by Governor McKeldin printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The native of any country, when he stands on foreign soil, must be on guard against the natural human tendency to assume that the people to whom he speaks know more than they actually know about the speaker's country. This applies with great force to Americans because our system of government, which seems simple to us who have always known it, is in fact complex and confusing to people who have lived under a different system.

For instance, a European may be excused for assuming that because I am an official at home I am an official everywhere; and because I am a Governor of a State, therefore I must be a representative of the State Department. Neither is true. In Maryland, indeed, when I speak as Governor what I say is an official utterance. But beyond the bounds of Maryland and especially beyond the bounds of the United States I am, as far as the State Department is concerned, a private citizen speaking for myself alone.

The point is more than academic; it has a highly practical significance for an American making a public address in a foreign country. The law of the United States is severe upon any private citizen who goes abroad pretending to be a representative of the Federal Republic; under a statute enacted in 1799 he is subject to a heavy fine and a long term of imprisonment, and he is not excused if it happens that he is, in fact, a representative of one of the 48 States.

When I bring greetings from my State to the University of Maryland in Germany I speak with authority for the people of Maryland, but it must be understood that when I say more I am speaking as an individual, expressing my own opinions, which are not necessarily those of the State Department or any other agency of the Federal Government. As Governor of Maryland I am happy to bring to all members of this university, whether students or teachers, the warm good wishes of the parent institution and of the State that it adorns; and the assurance that the people of Maryland regard the University of Maryland in Germany with increasing confidence and pride.

So much is official; but I cannot let the occasion pass without speaking to you, unofficially, of what I believe to be the hopes and aspirations of thoughtful Americans in connection with this institution. This is not foreign policy, it is merely what intelligent Americans wish that foreign policy might accomplish.

Heidelberg is an ancient and illustrious seat of learning, one of the creative centers of that European culture from which American culture is derived, one of the old fields from which, as Geoffrey Chaucer remarked, the new corn comes from year to year. The presence of a large number of Americans in this city affords an opportunity for a renewal of touch with one of the original sources of our intellectual strength, and this renewal is bound to profit us.

No doubt of this can possibly exist in the mind of anyone who has lived in Baltimore, Md., for it was there that the first American university on the German model was founded. It is true that the Johns Hopkins University never bore much physical resemblance to, say, Heidelberg; but German thoroughness, German precision, German industry in pursuing the truth, characterized it from the start, for many of its original members had been trained in Germany and were imbued with the spirit of German scholarship. The success of that institution was so great that within 10 years after its founding every important university in America was copying some of its methods. In the long life of a university, 10 years is a very brief period, so it is not misleading to say that German scholarship transplanted to Maryland was instantly successful.

Let me emphasize that the immensely valuable part of our borrowing from Germany was no material thing. It is true that we imported, especially in the early days, German scientific apparatus, German books, German processes of various kind; but we were soon making our own apparatus, writing our own books, devising our own processes. One thing only we have never been able to improve, for one thing only we have found no substitute, which is German belief that a scholar labors in vain unless he arrives at the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and that the discovery even of a small fragment of new truth is worth the labor of a lifetime.

This is an austere creed, implying that all scholars are in some sense failures, since none has arrived at the whole truth. But an ideal so high that it is beyond the reach of mortal man is by that fact a permanent ideal. Never quite to be attained, it is never to be discarded; and he who spends his life in pursuit of such an ideal is like the lover portrayed on Keats' Grecian urn:

"She cannot fade, though thou hast not thy bliss,
For ever wilt thou love, and she he fair!"

The moral and intellectual value of the gift of German scholarship is beyond computation. It was not, of course, restricted to America. The whole republic of letters, all the world of science, has profited by it. But let that pass. What I am interested in today is the relation of two nations only, Germany and the United States, and I have wondered what, if anything, my country has to offer that in kind, if not in degree, might be regarded as a fair exchange for the stimulus to learning that we obtained from Germany.

The presence in Germany of many thousands of Americans, in and out of uniform, is, of course, an anomaly. Nobody planned it; it is an outcome of war and especially of the difficulty of establishing a just and lasting peace after the catastrophe. But it is the mark of an ingenious and resourceful people that they are able to turn to account even an anomalous circumstance. Americans pride themselves on their ingenuity and resourcefulness; and I can imagine no better way of justifying that pride than by seizing the opportunity offered by the presence of so many Americans in Germany, some of whom represent the vigor of the youth and some the maturity of its thought, to make a return to Germany of something that we owe her.

I am not thinking primarily of material things. We have already contributed to the economic reconstruction of Germany and in so doing have made a fair return, I think, for instruments and books and other material goods by which we have profited. But these do not touch at all the great debt, which is the inspiration we received from German scholarship—not a material, but a spiritual value.

Obviously, we cannot repay the debt in the same currency. The achievements of American scholars have been creditable and every American takes pride in them; but we do not flatter ourselves that we have achieved so greatly that we are now in a position to instruct and inspire the scholars of Europe. We must cast about for some other means of balancing the account, and the logical way

to do it is to ask what there is in American experience that is unique but that might be of value to others.

It comes to mind that since 1783 the United States has been remarkably free of foreign pressure. We have had no powerful and dangerous neighbor on our borders, and for that reason have been able to concentrate on the problem of self-government under a representative democracy. Certainly others have been engaged in the same study, but none has been as free from distraction as the Americans; therefore, our ideas on the subject ought to be exceptionally clear and definite and, to the extent that they are sound, should be valuable to others.

One thing that our relatively uninterrupted study of domestic issues has made clear is that freedom from a foreign threat does not mean perfect safety. A representative democracy is always threatened by foes from within—the disruptive force of greed, of course, but in addition to that prejudice, intolerance, arrogance, and corrosive hatreds carefully nourished and kept alive through generations. Against those foes the United States has had to struggle constantly, and is still struggling; victory over them is a long way ahead, but at least we have not been utterly defeated and the struggle itself has brought certain rewards.

The chief of these is the fact that this is a war in which we can invite all civilized men to join us including those with whom we may have had political differences in the past. We cannot expect the German people, for example, to have any interest in projects for the aggrandizement, political or economic, of the United States, and we should be ashamed to suggest such a thing. But when the war is against the darkened mind, the frozen heart, the ethical and social ideals of Neanderthal man, whether in Heidelberg or in Maryland, we can expect them to be our loyal and enthusiastic comrades.

The difficulty is to persuade mankind of the sincerity of our purpose and that difficulty makes you Americans now in Germany an outpost in a dangerous but extremely important position. Nothing that the President and the Secretary of States can say is half as eloquent as what you do. For good or for ill, men will be persuaded by your acts who could never be persuaded by anybody's words.

I am happy to believe that the vast majority of Americans have now attained a level of civilization at which they are determined to repudiate and reverse the grim maxim that has come down to us from the 13th century descriptive of a military victor: "Where the hooves of Genghis' horse have trod the grass never grows again." Until that longed-for day when war shall be abolished it is our aspiration to have men say "Where an American army has passed the grass always grows again." That is part of the explanation of a whole group of activities typified by the Marshall plan. Victory that ends with the destruction of your foeman is partial and incomplete; it reaches perfection only when you have converted him into a friend.

But while I am certain that this is what is in the hearts of the American people, I am bound to admit that we have been confused and uncertain as to how to achieve it. After all, we are far indeed from being a nation of saints and sages. Like other nations, we have our quota of men of ill will; and, worse than that, our best and wisest are still fallible mortals whose best intentions sometimes produce the wrong results, driving them to lament with St. Paul, "what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I."

The inevitable result is that the real purpose of the American people is frequently misunderstood, not always by the fault of other nations. It is true that our antagonists have constantly misrepresented us, but sometimes we have misrepresented ourselves through faulty information, or by the ambiguity of language. But misunderstandings are one of the conditions of human existence, and no wise man allows himself to be driven to pessimism or cynicism because they arise.

Yet all wise men are eager to prevent or remove them, and you Americans now in Germany are in an exceptionally favorable position to do that. Nor will your opportunity end with your stay in this country. To the extent that you take back to America a true understanding of the country in which you have sojourned, you will be invaluable mediators with those of our people who tend to grow fainthearted because the organization of a just and lasting peace is so long delayed.

This is why, as I said in the beginning, the University and State of Maryland look upon you with confidence and pride. In this ancient citadel of learning, this place hallowed for six centuries by memories of Germany's great and good, you have been privileged to come into touch with that intellectual and spiritual power by comparison with which all physical force is a feeble and transient thing. To doubt that it will make you better Americans would be to doubt that the truth can make men free; and on your return you will be better equipped to share in the work of making a better America.

Naturally, we look upon you with confidence and pride. The fact that "old, unhappy, far-off things" are responsible for your being here is no longer relevant. To the extent that you make the best that is in the mind and heart of America plain to those with whom you associate here; and to the extent that you take back to Maryland or your own beloved State an understanding of the real greatness of Germany, you will make the grass grow again to cover and obliterate the scars of war.

I covet the opportunity that this commission gives you, and wish you Godspeed.

Address by German Ambassador Heinz L. Krekeler Before National Press Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege this afternoon, at the National Press Club, to listen to a notable address delivered by His Excellency Heinz L. Krekeler, Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany.

I have known that distinguished statesman for approximately 5 years. About 5 years ago he came here as a sort of attaché of something which did not really exist. He has built up the Embassy, and has built up consulates throughout the country. He is a close friend of Chancellor Adenauer. He delivered an excellent address, and subjected himself to questions by the press. They were really knotty questions.

I ask unanimous consent that the address by this excellent statesman from Germany be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY AMBASSADOR HEINZ L. KRECKELER, THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 31, 1955

Mr. President, gentlemen, I feel honored to have the chance to speak to you today. This is not the first time that I sit at this table. But this is my maiden speech to the National Press Club. My relationship with the American press has been a close and fruitful one right from the start. It began in June 1950. I had just landed in New York as the first postwar Consul General of the Federal Republic of Germany. My mission was to be exclusively of a technical and not at all a political nature. Little did this dampen the inquisitive ardor of the American reporters who met me. "What do you think of the Korean situation?" was their first question. My answer was what it had to be under the circumstances: "No comment." A lot has happened between that first "No comment" and today's opoprtunity to discuss with you the most burning political problems of concern to us all.

Let me interject here a word of thanks to you as members of the press. As one who has witnessed the downfall of the free press in his own country in 1933, I appreciate doubly the value of what a free press by its ceaseless discussion of the great issues can do to set things right in a world out of balance through tyranny and war.

Looking back upon those 5 years I mentioned, I cannot help but feel gratitude for the contribution of the press toward the goal recently achieved: The return of my country as an equal partner to the community of free nations. The American press in particular has had, I think, an outstanding share in the reestablishment of normal, that is friendly relations between the United States and Germany.

What was the situation of my country in those June days 5 years ago? What were the main stations on the road we have traveled since?

The Federal Republic of Germany was then not yet a year old. It had been formed out of the three Western zones of occupation, after all attempts on the part of the Western Powers to come to a workable agreement with the Soviet Union for the creation of a unified government for all of Germany had ended in failure. Fifty million Germans were given an essential amount of freedom, successively enlarged, enabling them to form a democratically elected government. To this government was entrusted the task of rebuilding the greater part of Germany—three-fourths in terms of population—physically, economically, politically, and morally, and of assuring thus the survival and rebirth of the country. To this government also was entrusted the responsibility to speak for those Germans who were unable to act in freedom. All this was achieved or at least set in motion by 1950.

You know the results of this undertaking which at that time still was considered by many an experiment, the outcome of which was by no means certain. The success which we seem to consider today a foregone conclusion was made possible by the willingness of my people to work, to rebuild, and to begin anew and by the enlightened statesmanship of the Western Powers which recognized that the new men in control in Germany held from deepest conviction the ideals common to all free countries, and that these men needed encouragement, help and active cooperation. This attitude on the part of the West and in particular on the part of the United States of America led to the unparalleled generosity by which Germany, until recently the deadly foe, was included in the general scheme for the rescue and recovery of Europe. The Marshall plan and its European counterpart, the joint economic cooperation of the European countries had by 1950 begun to yield its astonishing and beneficial results.

But one threefold question remained as yet unresolved: How was the peace of the world to be kept, nay, to be established, on firm foundations? How was the security of the West to be achieved? Finally: How was the division of Germany, both symptom and cause of the terrible East-West tension, to be overcome?

The invasion of South Korea had revealed as if in a blinding flash the full extent of the peril to the West.

And, gentlemen, what was geat peril to the West in general, was greater peril to Germany in particular.

Once again, western statesmanship, with insight and great moral courage, faced the consequences. Pushing aside deeply rooted fears, habits of thought, and psychological obstacles of all kinds, it recognized that the inclusion of Germany in the economic rebuilding of Europe was insufficient. The West realized that its peace and security could neither be attained nor safeguarded without Germany's sharing in the common defense of the West.

The Schuman plan of an integrated European economy was duplicated in the military field. There was to be created an integrated European military establishment as well. This in turn was to be part of the Atlantic defense alliance. This momentous development led by its own inner logic to another one: the conception and elaboration of a European political community. Vistas of the future opened before the European peoples such as had not existed for a long, long time. The antagonism, rivalries, and mutual frustrations of the old Continent seemed amenable to solutions on the higher plane of common interest and endeavor.

The German people in particular saw a way before them of realizing their most legitimate national concerns as well as the possibility of making a real contribution to the welfare of the larger community of which they hoped to become an increasingly valuable and integral part.

You all know the sudden and tragic halt—although I believe we now see it was temporary only—to which this promising development came 9 months ago. I do not wish to cast blame in any direction. Perhaps all of us were aiming too high in too short a time. At any rate, the failure of EDC made imperative the attempt at another solution of our basic problem: the maintenance of peace and the securing of the West's position of freedom and independence. It seems to me too few of us realized last summer the tremendous peril in which the West found itself at that juncture. Perhaps this was fortunate, because a full realization on the part of our peoples might have resulted in something like panic at that moment.

Fortunately, however, the statesmen of the West did realize the extent of the danger. For the third time, they rose to the challenge, and in an unprecedentedly short time they restored the situation. You all are familiar with the Treaties of Paris, creating the Western European Union and providing for the inclusion of Germany into NATO. It was only at the beginning of this month that this process was brought to its consummation. The unity of the West has been established in a measure not ever attained before. Secretary Dulles has, and I believe rightly, called it a turning-point in history.

With startling rapidity the results of this long drawnout, patient, and constructive policy of the West have begun to come in. For years, the opponents of this policy of firmness and strength have tried to convince us that it would lead to increased tension, if not to something worse. Yet, what do we see? Acceptance of a four-power conference at the summit, suggested by one of the West's leading statesmen 2 years ago; conclusion of a greatly improved treaty restoring freedom denied for 10 years, to Austria, a voyage of Soviet leaders to Yugoslavia, and the sudden emergence of a climate of détente.

Now, gentlemen, in this new situation, created, I repeat, by the policy of the West—a policy in which, I am proud to say, the Government I have the honor to represent here, has had its share—there exist side by side both new perils and new opportunities.

As you know, I have just returned from consultations with Chancellor Adenauer, and you will with good reason expect to hear from me answers to the questions: How does Germany view the situation? What does Germany expect of it? Where do we go from here?

First of all, these treaties which have restored our sovereignty we do not regard as an end, but as a firm and solid foundation on which to continue building and completing the structure of European unity, not only in the military field, but also along the lines of closest cooperation in the political, economic and cultural sphere.

We in Germany have now come to a new chapter in our postwar history and it may well turn out that all of us here are also witnessing the opening of a new chapter in the history of our times. Her geographical situation in the heart of Europe has made Germany one of the main battlegrounds in the cold war. Perhaps she could—some day—become the key to a solution of the problems still pending between East and West—provided that we all remain watchful and strong and continue to act in unison, with determination and great endurance.

My Government's position in the East-West debate and on the question of reunification of Germany is clear: We know that the greatest hope for the reunification of our country lies within a worldwide settlement of the present tension between East and West. We also know that we must not try for a reunification of Germany at a price or under conditions which would endanger our security. We cannot possibly agree, therefore, to any plans for a neutralization of Germany. We know too well that this would mean the collapse of the defensive system of the West, the eventual withdrawal of American troops from the Continent and the final loss of Germany, and with her certainly of all of Europe, to Soviet domination.

On the other hand, any solution on the basis of the status quo must be just as unacceptable to us. Let me remind you of article 7 of the Paris Treaty. It reads as follows:

"Pending the peace settlement the signatory states * * * will cooperate to achieve by peaceful means the common aim of a reunified Germany enjoying a liberal democratic constitution like that of the Federal Republic and integrated within the European community."

The reunification of my country is for us a problem which we face together with our friends. We are deeply gratified by the help and encouragement which we have received in this matter from the American Government as well as from the Governments of Great Britain and France and of all the other NATO members.

While we are anxious to explore any and all chances for easing international tension, we must never for a moment allow ourselves to be lured into neglecting our security. If I may say so, the problem of national security is not exclusively a problem of great powers like the Soviet Union, but it is also a matter of concern—perhaps even greater concern—to a much weaker country like Germany.

Perhaps it would not be inappropriate here to recall certain developments of recent years. In good faith the western powers had discarded their weapons at the end of the most frightful of all wars. In the face of the terrible danger which threatened them from the East—and which became very real with the outbreak of the Korean war—the free nations of the West reluctantly resolved to rearm in defense of their freedom and their age-old civilization. After many years of patient labor and with great individual sacrifices they have now succeeded in establishing an effective defense system. The inclusion of Germany will complete this system, so that after its implementation it will afford us protection from any sudden attack. It would be utterly irresponsible, not to say suicidal, were we to break it up. We must not waver in our determination to stand together in this decisive hour. Any kind of European security system without participation of the United States—as it has been suggested by the Soviet Union—seems worthless to us and could only result in establishing Soviet control over all of Europe. Without American help no European country could ever hope to defend itself.

Let me stress one other point: We Germans have not concluded the Paris treaties so that we might be able to sell them as part of a deal with the Kremlin—as has been suggested in certain quarters.

Chancellor Adenauer, as proof of our determination to adhere fully to our obligations under the treaty, has just emphasized that legislation will be passed as soon as possible enabling the Government to establish the new armed forces.

We believe that speedy implementation of the treaties is the most valuable contribution the German people can make at this moment to the cause of freedom.

It is our impression—supported by Soviet actions and statements—that the Soviet Union also basically recognizes the German people's moral right and natural desire for reunification. They ought to sense that the population of the Soviet Zone of Germany is hostile toward them. They ought to tire of having to maintain their regime by force and they ought to have given up their hope by now that they can ever succeed in turning their zone into a real satellite country. As the self-determination of peoples is one of the basic human rights, so reunification in our opinion should not be made an object for bargaining and, in that sense, we feel that the Soviet Union is not morally justified in asking a price for it.

We demand nothing but our right in urging that Soviet Russia set free the 18 million Germans to whom it denies freedom by means of force and permit them to be united with us. For the Soviet zone is nothing but German territory occupied by Soviet Russia. According to the Hague Convention, Soviet Russia is under the obligation to administer this territory as a trustee, that is, in doing so to preserve the freedom and rights of the inhabitants, and to return the zone in this condition.

We realize, however, that inclusion of all of Germany in the defensive system of the West—and there is no doubt that a reunified Germany would seek close association with the West—presents certain problems, mainly of a psychological nature, to the Soviet Union. And these problems will endure as long as the tension between East and West continues to exist. I believe that the West should be willing to discuss with the Soviet Union anything which would help to allay these groundless fears and which might make it easier for her to withdraw from central and eastern Germany. If there is anything within reasonable limits which we could offer as security to the Soviet Union, we should not hesitate to discuss it with her.

At this stage of scientific progress, war has defeated its own purpose. It can never again be a mere instrument of policy for any nation—it only spells universal disaster and annihilation. We believe that the leaders of of the Soviet Union basically share this view. Only in general disarmament is there any hope for survival of mankind. We fervently hope that the great powers of the world will follow the wise counsel which President

Eisenhower gave in his famous speech of April 16, 1953, and realize their great responsibility—and opportunity—toward their people and all of mankind.

My Government is greatly encouraged to know that the American Government, as well as our other friends in NATO, fully share these views. We sincerely hope that the four-power conference may bring us closer to finding a system of security which might be acceptable also to the Soviet Union and which would, some day, make possible a reduction of costly armaments and free mankind from the terrible nightmare of nuclear warfare.

If we could achieve this, we would be justified in having a vision which is very dear to me, as a scientist by training. I refer to to the vision of utilizing the great scientific achievements of our age for the benefit of mankind, for the relief of suffering, and for the many humanitarian tasks which still lie ahead.

For the first time in history we are partners with you in an alliance—an alliance formed under the threat of the great danger which besets us all. For us Germans this alliance is of the highest value. It secures our existence as a nation and a people. If we may follow this great vision, we shall be allies beyond this; that is, in a common effort to strive for a brighter future for humanity.

Thank you.

The Hoax of Bipartisanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address entitled "The Hoax of Bipartisanship," delivered by me before the Greater Buffalo Advertising Club at Buffalo, N. Y., on May 24, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HOAX OF BIPARTISANSHIP

I have a reason for talking about bipartisanship" to a group of advertisingmen. The idea of a "bipartisan foreign policy" is one of the most popular items on the political counter down in Washington. And I am hoping that you admen can explain to me how such a rotten apple ever got sold.

The success of bipartisanship is baffling, to say the least. This is a phrase that breathes defiance of our two-party tradition; it scoffs at the idea that a Congressman or Senator should do his own thinking; it tells him that his only function is to be a Charley McCarthy for the current White House tenant. But despite these rather formidable handicaps, bipartisanship is enjoying zooming sales on Capitol Hill. The Washington politician, these days, who does not sport a bipartisan label is like the teenager who does not wear bobby socks.

Now I maintain that bipartisanship is a flagrantly transparent hoax, and I just refuse to believe that the American people—as distinguished from some of their representatives—have been hypnotized by the deafening drum beating in its behalf.

The great evil of bipartisanship is that it has created an atmosphere of stultifying conformity in the foreign policy field. There is a growing reluctance on the part of members of both parties to subject our international conduct to independent, critical evaluation. And at the same time an increasingly hysterical intolerance of those who do criticize and who do suggest alternative policies.

Let me give you an example of this. Several weeks ago, Senator JENNER, of Indiana, delivered on the Senate floor a carefully reasoned and cogent address on our far eastern policy. He pointed out that all of the available clues suggest the administration is going to surrender Quemoy and the Matsus to the Communists, and he urged the administration to change its mind.

The next day, Governor Craig, of Indiana, an administration wheelhorse, let loose a frenzied personal attack on Senator JENNER. He didn't bother to explain why Senator JENNER was wrong; he simply sputtered indignation at anyone who had the temerity to criticize the administration. Governor Craig reminded his audience that the White House always follows a policy—and you've heard this one—of "patience, firmness, and friendship." And he concluded that since Senator JENNER didn't understand that all the world's problems are solved by such cliches, he was "neurotic."

And he is just one of thousands who insist that the administration's foreign policy, no matter how bad, must never be criticized.

Now I think this intolerance, this unwillingness to discuss the issues—this toadyish subservience to the approved line—can be traced to the bipartisanship craze that first took hold 10 years ago. Bipartisanship originally demanded only that the two political parties have a common foreign policy—which is bad enough; but it now demands that every Member of Congress toe the White House line—"in the interest of national unity."

I think it is vitally important that we understand the fallacies of this doctrine. The advantage of bipartisanship is supposed to be that foreign policy is put above politics. As a virtuous Senator or Congressman, you are asked to forego "partisan politics" in order to present to the world a front of national unity.

The trouble with this theory is that matters which are represented as "partisan politics" in the speeches of the palace guard and in the news stories of the kept press are often matters of basic principle in the eyes of the Senator or Congressman involved.

The hard truth of the matter is that there is nearly always fundamental disagreement on foreign policy matters—both between the parties and between the individual members of the parties. So what bipartisanship really means is that you should conceal your disagreement. You are supposed to pretend that you agree in order to convince the world that there is unity in America. You are supposed to abandon your principles, to ignore your personal judgments, to say that black is white and wrong is right, to do anything and everything that is needed to give the impression that everybody in America thinks alike. I just don't believe that unity is worth that price.

The prisoner-of-war problem affords a good example of the price, the pound of flesh, that bipartisanship exacts from those who disagree with the approved line. Let's remember that bipartisanship does not only mean that the opposition party and the administration must agree, but that everybody must toe the line. Now, if I, JOE MCCARTHY, were to play along with bipartisanship, I would be telling you that in my judgment everything possible is being done to secure the freedom of the 481 uniformed Americans in Communist prison camps. That is the current bipartisanship line. But I happen to believe that it is untrue. I happen to believe that we can do a good deal more than commission Dag Hammarskjold to discuss the subject with Chou En-lai over a cup of jasmine tea. I believe we can do more than write polite letters to General Zhukov. I believe that we can and should put Communist China in an economic straitjacket until she decides to abide by the terms of the Korean armistice.

I cannot subscribe to that topsy-turvy code of morality that permits this country to subject some of its soldiers to criminal prosecution for allegedly abandoning their country in the Korean war, when the country turns around and abandons its soldiers.

Bipartisanship would require me to abandon these beliefs—or at least be quiet about them. But this I don't propose to do when it means—as I see it—helping to prolong a human tragedy and helping to implant an indelible stain on our national honor.

This is why I say bipartisanship is a hoax. It is supposed to be a noble gesture—it is supposed to be an act of self-denial in the interest of the Nation. But there is nothing particularly noble about trying to get the country 100 percent behind a policy you think is wrong. There is nothing very noble about agreeing that death or a life term in a Communist prison shall be our boys' reward for fighting for their country.

I sometimes wonder if the advocates of bipartisanship have thought through their position. They say it's all right to disagree about foreign policy during an election campaign; but once the election is over, we must unite with the opposition. Well, why don't we apply that same principle to domestic policies? Why don't we say we will forget all our campaign differences about Government subsidies, labor legislation, and what have you, and agree to have a bipartisan domestic policy for the next 4 years? Then we would really be united.

When you come right down to it, bipartisanship is just a $5 word for a two-bit theory—a theory that used to be known by a two-bit word, "me-tooism."

Bipartisanship is the first step toward establishing a one-party system in this country. Bipartisanship means that the minority must abandon its historic duty of acting as a watchdog to alert the American people to the errors of the majority. And it's for this reason that I refuse to have any part of it.

Now it may seem a little strange that I, as a member of the party in power, should be criticising bipartisanship. The "in party" is, after all, supposed to be the one that benefits. But bipartisanship can be a two-edged sword, and the Republican Party has shown a remarkable talent for getting the American people cut by both edges.

When Truman was President, some of my party—notably the late Senator Vandenberg—cheerfully adopted the role of yes-men and promised to play the bipartisanship game with the administration. You know the results of that. The Republicans who followed Vandenberg simpy ratified Democrat errors and gave them a stamp of approval.

Now that a Republican administration is in power, the reverse is happening. Today the tail is wagging the dog instead of the other way around.

Now let me spend the rest of my time giving you specific examples of what I am talking about. I charge that in every single instance in which Republican policy has differed substantially from Democrat policy, the administration and the "toady wing" of the Republican Party have sooner or later adopted the Democrat policy. The craze of bipartisanship has resulted in the adoption of the Democrat policy on each 1 of the 7 points of foreign policy that once separated Republicans from Democrats.

Point 1: Let's start off with the central foreign policy plank of the Republican platform of 1952. We Republicans promised that our election would—and now I quote directly from the platform—"mark the end of the negative, futile, and immoral policy of con-

tainment which abandons countless human begings to a despotism and godless terroism. * * * It will be made clear on the highest authority of the President and the Congress that United States policy, as one of its peaceful purposes, looks happily forward to the genuine independence of those captive peoples."

In a word, the Republican policy was one of "liberation." The Democrat policy was "containment"—trying to stop the Communists but making no attempt to free enslaved peoples.

What happened? The administration in the interest of bipartisanship publicly adopted, as the slogan of its foreign policy, the word "coexistence"—which, of course, is just another word for containment. The President even went so far as to say that any attempt by the free Chinese to recapture their homeland would be "an aggressive war." Now I am not saying that coexistence is wrong because it is a Democrat policy; but because like the Democrat policy of containment, it is a prescription for national suicide. The idea that the free world and communism can live side by side is a theory every bit as plausible as the contention that cancer and healthy tissue can subsist side by side in the human body.

Point 2: Perhaps the most widely publicized promise of the Republican platform in 1952 was that "The Government of the United States"—and I am again quoting directly—"under Republican leadership, will repudiate all commitments contained in secret understandings such as those of Yalta which aid Communist enslavements." The Democrat policy was, of course, not to repudiate Yalta.

Again, what happened? Republicans in Congress tried, right after the inauguration in 1953, to pass a resolution repudiating our agreement to the enslavement of Poland and Yugoslavia and the dismemberment of China. But the administration, again in the interest of bipartisanship, blocked this attempt. And to this day the White House and the toadies refuse to make good on this Republican campaign promise.

Point 3: Three years ago the Republican Party solidly supported General MacArthur and General Van Fleet, and our other military leaders in the field who believed that we should win the war in Korea and drive the Communists to the Yalu. The left-wing Democrats believed in appeasement. The Truman administration wanted an armistice at the 38th parallel.

And what happened in this case? No sooner had the Eisenhower administration taken office than it adopted bipartisanship and signed a humiliating armistice with the Communists which sacrificed our military advantage in the field and sealed the fate of 10 million North Koreans.

Point 4: A year ago the Republican Party solidly supported the assurances of Secretary Dulles that we would help defend Indochina and stop the Communists at Dienbienphu. The left-wing Democrats of course didn't want to get involved in Indochina; they preferred to appease.

And what happened there? At the infamous Geneva Conference the administration adopted bipartisanship and in the process acquiesced in the surrender of an additional 12½ millional human beings to the Communists. And even worse: we agreed to hold a national election 15 months later—that's this coming August—knowing that the Communists would control the votes of nearly two-thirds of the country's population.

Point 5: In 1953 the Joint Chiefs of Staff unanimously agreed that Quemoy and the Matsu Islands were vital to the defense of Formosa. The administration therefore decided that the United States should defend those islands at all costs. And this policy was, of course, wholeheartedly supported by Republicans in Congress. The Democrat leaders on the other hand—Harry Truman, Adlai Stevenson, Estes Kefauver, the ADA crew—trumpeted the idea across the country that Quemoy and the Matsus were militarily useless. They said we should surrender those islands.

And what is happening in this case? Little by little for the sake of bipartisanship the administraiton has backed away from its former position, and now it is very clear that Quemoy and the Matsus will be surrendered just as the left-wing Democrats wished. Two weeks ago in Paris—in his last statement on the subject—Secretary Dulles said that we would defend Quemoy and the Matsus if the Communists attacked Formosa at the same time—the clear implication being that we would not defend the islands if they are attacked separately, which is, of course, the way the Communists will attack them.

Point 6: The Republican position, until 2 months ago, was that we should not enter into any negotiations with the Chinese Communists on the Formosa situation unless Chiang Kai-shek were allowed to take part in the negotiations. At Taipei, last March, Mr. Dulles said this: "The United States will not enter into any negotiations dealing with the territories or rights of the Republic of China except in cooperation with the Republic of China." Last month, when Chou En-lai offered to negotiate with us about Formosa Under Secretary of States Hoover immediately reaffirmed this position.

You know what happened then. The day after Hoover made his statement Senator GEORGE, Democrat, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said that we should negotiate with the Communists without Chiang Kai-shek. And within 24 hours we had bipartisanship on this issue. Did the Democrats give in? Not a bit of it. Twenty-four hours after Senator GEORGE announced what Democrat policy was, Mr. Dulles performed the most abrupt about-face in diplomatic history and said that we would talk to the Communists about the Formosa situation without Chiank Kai-shek.

Point 7: Bipartisanship's most recent victory is probably its most important. The Republican Party has insisted for many years that conferences with Russia at the summit, as they now say, are futile and dangerous. Until this last week President Eisenhower took the position that he would not confer with the Communist leaders until they had proved by deeds—not words—that they had changed their minds about conquering the world. But the left-wing Democrats wanted the President to take part in a high level conference, to help resolve world tensions, as they had done so successfully at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

Now if the Communists have given any evidence that their objective of world conquest has changed, I am certainly not aware of it. No one, surely, is so foolhardy as to argue that signing the Austrian Treaty means anything. Its purpose, quite obviously, was to establish a pattern for neutralizing West Germany. We are going to sit down and talk with the Communists, knowing they never keep their word, and knowing that the subject of the conference will be how to neutralize Germany and how to neutralize Formosa—i. e., how to arrange the free world's next concession to communism.

I have now give you seven cases in which, in the interests of bipartisanship, the Republican Party has abandoned its principles.

I am not saying that bipartisanship is evil because it has resulted in the adoption of Democratic policies—but because it has resulted in the adoption of the wrong policies, and because it has blocked all attempts to change those policies. Bipartisanship has kept us on the road of appeasement, retreat, and surrender.

Bipartisanship discourages independent, critical evaluation of our foreign policies. It has bred a race of political sycophants. And now it seeks to destroy the remnant—to intimidate and silence any voice that ventures criticism.

I shall always support any administration, whether it be Republican or Democrat, that deals with communism firmly, courageously, and honorably. But these are the only conditions under which bipartisanship can be urged or tolerated. The policy of retreat, appeasement, and surrender must stop. And if America's voice must be divided on this issue, then let it be divided until the day that leaders of both parties finally appreciate the consummate evil of communism and together resolve to destroy it.

Bull Evans, One-Man Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, over the Memorial Day holiday, we were reminded of western Maryland's own famed Marine Master Gunnery Sergeant William S. "Bull" Evans.

On May 15, 1955, the Cumberland Times published the highlights of his career, and I ask unanimous consent to have a condensation of this article entitled, "Bull Evans, One Man Army," printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BULL EVANS, ONE-MAN ARMY

Many are the stories written of men who have gone to war. Many are the courageous deeds recorded in history that will forever attest to the fortitude and devotion to duty of those who fought for their ideals. Here in the mountains of western Maryland there lived such a man; a man who believed in the American way of life with such a fierce determination that was to inspire him on to greater efforts and to carve for himself a place in history along with other great fighting American men.

William Seymour Evans was next to the youngest in a family of 3 brothers and 1 sister. Son of Rosa and the late Felix Evans, he was born in Cumberland, Md., on April 24, 1921.

Schooling and Bill parted company when he was 16, and in order to help out at home he became a house painter. One year of this convinced him that he had the wrong occupation, and he decided he would see the world via the Marine Corps. Advancing his age 1 year he was found to be "physically perfect" and his next stop was boot camp in the Carolinas.

After a stay in Cuba and Puerto Rico, Bill was among those who established the 1st Marine Garrison on Guam.

His first furlough found him in Honolulu awaiting transportation home, when the Japanese began the infamous Pearl Harbor attack. He canceled his own furlough and volunteered for immediate duty.

Private Evans was one of the first volunteers to fill the ranks when Col. Evans Carlson organized the famous 2d Battalion, 1st Marine Raiders.

Early in June 1942 Private Evans landed with the first assault waves on Midway Island and for 36 hours he was in continuous action.

From Midway, the Raider Battalion turned south to Tulagi. The landings on the beaches of Tulagi were not difficult, but enemy fire grew intense as the Raiders moved inland. When their platoon was pinned down by machinegun fire, Private Evans, advancing alone, crawled within throwing distance and silenced the machine gun and its crew with well-placed grenades. The Tulagi campaign was a quick job for the 2d Battalion. It was on this island that his hometown buddy, Pfc. Woodrow Barr, won a Silver Star—but lost his life in the initial landings.

In the early morning of the 17th of August 1942, the Marine Raiders, 2d Battalion, under the command of Maj. JAMES ROOSEVELT, slipped ashore on Makin Island, 1,500 miles northeast of the American-held Solomon group. Three hundred and fifty Japanese died in the brief but furious fire-fight, and nine fell before the rifle and knife of Private Evans.

Guadalcanal was next in line and the Raider battlion captured the first Japanese prisoners of war and Private Evans picked up his first Purple Heart. On November 11, in the face of a hard assault by Japanese Marines, Private Evans, according to reports, strung barbed wire on their position front on the Lunga River, that stopped the enemy attack and undoubtedly saved them many casualties. While thus exposing himself to enemy fire, he was struck in the hip by shrapnel. The fragment of steel ranged downward in his leg and although not serious, he was out of action for a month. This wound proved to be troublesome throughout his entire military service.

After the battles of Gavatu, Tanenbago, Florida, and Guadalcanal were over, Sergeant Evans was still alive and ready for new assignment. His experiences gained from these campaigns had made him a deadly fighter and his name was known throughout the 1st Marine Division.

Fighting now with the 2d Battalion, 3d Marine Division, the island of Bougainville in the Solomon group was next to come under the gun of Sergeant Evans, and it was here that he really caught fire against the enemy and earned the name of "Bull" Evans—"One-Man Army."

On November 22, 1943, while leading a rifle platoon against the enemy Japanese forces at Piva Forks, Bougainville, Sergeant Evans was pinned down by intense battle artillery and grenade fire. Believing that the entire platoon had been detected he ordered them to return to their own lines, and continuing alone, he penetrated the Japanese rear areas. From concealment, Sergeant Evans plotted the location of the enemy's underground bunkers, automatic weapon positions, and troop dispositions. Returning to his own lines, he accurately reported the information that enabled artillery fire to be delivered with effect on the targets.

Following this action Sergeant Evans again penetrated the Japanese perimeter. With stealth acquired on countless patrols he stalked the enemy sentry. Using his pistol as a bludgeon Sergeant Evans smashed the sentry's skull. Within a pace of 300 yards he disposed of 2 more sentries in the same manner. Moving inland from the perimeter, Sergeant Evans located the Japanese bivouac. Waiting until several of the soldiers congregated, he pulled the pins on two grenades and threw them simultaneously into the group. In the ensuing confusion Sergeant Evans withdrew to his own lines. After returning from this rampage he was dubbed with the name of "Bull" and his superiors remarked, "Tonight put X Company on the right flank and Sergeant Evans on the left and we will get some sleep." Intelligence reports later showed that Evans had killed 12 Japanese in this foray.

When Bougainville was secured, Sergeant Evans had added another cluster to his Purple Heart, five citations, and a promotion to Master Gunnery Sergeant. With months of hard combat behind him he was rotated home for a well-deserved furlough.

Arriving at his mother's home in Cumberland, Md., Sergeant Evans found himself a hero, and his story was featured by the Cumberland Times and News. His galaxy of campaign ribbons was enough to tell the story. He appeared to be in the best of health, but it was noticed that he had difficulty in rising after being seated for a time. His mother mentioned this to him and expressed the wish that he should "take things easy." Sergeant Evans replied, "Mom, we all must die somewhere—sometime. I want to die in battle, and I hope I can do something that will be remembered." A few days later he left for California and assignment.

The enemy in the Pacific was reeling from hard blows and the island of Guam was designated as the next objective. Sergeant Evans' assignment was with the attacking forces here. When the barrage from Admiral Halsey's task force had lifted, Sgt. "Bull" Evans' rifle platoon had gained shore, engaged the enemy, and liberated the first captured American marines of the war. Sergeant Evans remained on the island that he had first garrisoned for the duration of the Pacific campaign.

After the fighting was over in the Pacific, Sergeant Evans was assigned to occupation duty in Japan, and while there met and married a young Japanese girl.

Evans' duty time expired and he was reassigned to the United States. Restrictions at that time prevented his wife from accompanying him because of her nationality.

Spending but a few days of his furlough time with his mother in Cumberland, Md., Sergeant Evans reported to the Marine base in Quantico, Va., and then went to Washington to see if there was some way that he could be returned to Japan. Speaking to an aide to the Commandant, Marine Corps, Sergeant Evans explained his situation and then returned to Quantico. Within a week he was informed that he could be assigned to the Panama Canal Zone with duty in Japan at a possible later date. Evans, deciding that this was a step in the right direction, was soon on his way.

Meanwhile, a critical situation was building up in Korea. This crisis came in June 1950 and when the fighting began the First Marine Division moved to the Far East and battle. Sergeant Evans, in garrison at Panama, requested transfer to the First and his request was granted. Joining his outfit in Korea was no problem, but getting into battle was another story. Because of his wounds acquired in the Pacific campaign, his superiors were reluctant and suggested that he could be of greater use training new marines. But "Bull" Evans was not to be denied. Insisting that he was a professional fighting man, he spurned all suggestions of rear area duty. His determination recognized, he was soon on the line against the Chinese and North Korean troops.

Sergeant Evans collected his last Purple Heart on the bleak North Korean front. A piece of high ground simply designated as "That Hill," stood in the way of the company's advance. Patrols reported the hill was not too heavily defended, but the terrain was such that a frontal attack would prove costly. It was imperative that the hill be taken from the Communist forces. With other platoons serving as feints, Sergeant Evans led his rifle platoon up the outward approach of the hill. Reaching the first outlying bunker he was met by two Chinese soldiers who were emerging from the hole. Sergeant Evans clubbed the head of one with his rifle butt and killed the other with a burst of gunfire. Signaling the platoon to "come on," Sergeant Evans threw a grenade in the bunker and raced to an adjoining one. Chinese troops were emptying from concealment from all points on the hill and Evans killed three more with rifle fire. Gaining the next bunker he observed the other platoons were now in action. Finding no resistance in the second bunker, Sergeant Evans turned to regroup his men. In that instance he was caught in a combination of shrapnel and machinegun fire which knocked him to the ground. Although bleeding profusely, Evans rallied his platoon and the assault carried. When the medics were through working on him, there were 66 stitches in his stomach, chest, and arm.

In short order, Sergeant Evans was flown to a hospital in Japan. There, for the first time since he had left his wife, they were again united.

It was just a matter of time after the ceasefire that Sergeant Evans was reassigned to Japan where he was assigned to a military police unit of the Marines. He secured living quarters in Yokosuka and in the following year a son was born. In letters to his mother, Sergeant Evans reported that everything was fine and he expected to return to the States in the fall of 1954. Later his wife wrote that he had reentered a military hospital for additional treatment of the last wounds suffered in Korea.

Early in the spring, Sergeant Evans' mother, anticipating the return of her famous son and his family, began to prepare a home for them in Cumberland. Here Sergeant Evans would settle his family until he had completed his retirement time of 5 years in the Marine Corps.

On the 16th of May 1954, Sergeant Evans took his son and went to the beach of Yokosuka, Japan. During the day he was engaged in wrestling and judo practice for a considerable length of time, with Marine buddies and Japanese nationalists. Suddenly, and with no previous warning, Sergeant Evans collapsed and before his companions could reach his side, he was dead. The heart that had carried "Bull" Evans through 7 years of war had stopped. Death was attributed to cardiac failure, obviously caused by his last battle wounds.

In the 15 years of his Marine Corps service, Sergeant Evans had been awarded the Purple Heart with 4 clusters, 2 Presidential citations, Bronze Star, Silver Star, and has been recommended for the Nation's second highest award, the Navy Cross. His many service ribbons carry the battle stars of six major engagements. For his exploits on Bougainville, Sergeant Evans was cited by Admiral Halsey, Major General Vandegrift, James Forrestal, and former Secretary of the Navy, the late Frank Knox.

Mrs. Rosa Evans, his mother, who lives at 477 Lena Street, in Cumberland, Md., is appreciative of the letters she has received and justly proud of one from Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., U. S. M. C., Commandant of the Marine Corps, who sent his deep personal regrets. Mrs. Evans trusts that someday she can visit hed grandchild in Japan and see the grave of her hero son. Until then she has her memories.

Russia's Coexistence Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Russia's Coexistence Policy," published in the Washington Daily News of November 30, 1954.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA'S COEXISTENCE POLICY

(From a 1930 speech by D. Z. Manuilski to the international students of the Lenin School of Political Warfare, Moscow, reprinted in the American Mercury, November 1954.)

War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concession. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clinched fist.

Commencement Address by Senator Knowland at Cumberland College, Williamsburg, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a commencement address which I delivered at Cumberland College, Williamsburg, Ky., yesterday morning.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, AT CUMBERLAND COLLEGE, WILLIAMSBURG, KY., MAY 30, 1955

Mr. President, members of the graduating class, fellow Americans, we of this generation owe much to those who founded our Nation. We have grown from 3 million people scattered through Thirteen Colonies on the Atlantic seaboard to a great nation of 165 million, stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from Canada to Mexico.

Today we are here to salute a new class of graduates who have much to contribute in the years ahead. We also pay tribute to the Nation's heroic dead whose sacrifices made and preserved us a nation.

We have the most productive nation, industrially and agriculturally, that the world has ever known. We offer to our young men and women more opportunities than exist in most of the countries in the world today.

This has not been brought about because we had more natural resources for there are other nations in the history of the world that have had as much or more in the way of natural resources. It has not been because we are the nation with the largest population for as you all know there are today and there have been in the past nations with a larger population; nor is it because we are the largest in land area for there have been in the past and there are today other nations that exceed us in size.

Our priceless ingredient has been a constitutional system which encouraged the productive energies of a free people to develop our culture and our enterprises so that each succeeding generation could leave to their posterity a better land than they themselves found.

Personal troubles as a people and economic and other problems as a locality, State, region, or Nation we have had in the past and with them we do now contend.

But we must never despair. We must never cease seeking an equitable and constructive solution.

Statesmanship is not alone required of Government officials but also of the leaders of industry, labor, and agriculture.

The Golden Rule of dealing with others as we would like to be dealt with is important equally in normal human relations as well as in foreign or economic problems.

We have a dynamic economy. We cannot ignore the development of new inventions, new techniques, and new fields of activity.

Both labor and management in the wagon and buggy business suffered an irreparable blow when the internal combustion engine took to wheels but the Nation as a whole benefited.

We are only at the threshold of great progress in the atomic field.

The men who drafted the Constitution were very wise. They know the history of civilization up to their time. They understood the fact that where people had lost their freedom it had come about through the concentration of power in a Nation's capital and in the hands of the executive power be he called an emperor, czar, king, president, or council.

In an attempt to safeguard for themselves and for their posterity the blessings of liberty outlined in our Declaration of Independence, and later in our Constitution, they determined to set up a system of checks and balances to prevent the concentration of power in any one organ of the Government.

This was achieved through the establishment of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government, each coequal. They were meant to be co-ordinate with and not subordinate to each other.

As an additional safeguard, they made the Federal Government one of specified and limited powers and reserved to the States or to the people thereof the balance of the powers.

As long as we maintain our constitutional system we have the opportunity of making our contribution as members of a free society to the improvement of both the cultural and material resources of a country whose survival is essential to the presenvation of a free world of free men.

Our objective in foreign policy is peace with honor. The basic principle which should guide us is that what advances the cause of human freedom we should susport, and what undermines or destroys it we should oppose.

We would hope for all mankind that in our lifetime or that of our children the nations of the Western Hemisphere, of Europe, Africa, and Asia, might live together as good neighbors as we do with our great neighbor of Canada to the North.

For a long period of our history we have had a common international frontier stretching 3,000 miles from the Atlantic to the Pacific without a singe military post or fortification on either side for the purpose of protecting one of our countries from invasion by the other.

However, in the world in which we now live we must recognize the fact that all nations are not as civilized or as peace loving as are Canada and the United States of America.

Like the early pioneers who first established our country and then moved out through the West into your State of Kentucky and ultimately on to the Pacific coast, we should, of course, continue to work, hope, and pray for peace, but also "to keep our powder dry."

In the 10 years since the Yalta Conference of February 4-11, 1945, great advances have been made by the Communist world.

At that time there were less than 200 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today, over 800 million people have lost their freedom to the most godless tyranny the world has ever known.

The world balance of power has been so upset that no prudent person can ignore the realities of the situation. Not only the future of this Republic but the hope for a free world of freemen largely depends upon the policies that we follow and the firmness with which we and the free nations deal with future Communist aggression or threat of aggression.

Recognizing the inherent danger in further Communist conquest, the Government of the United States has undertaken a series of commitments under the North Atlantic Alliance, the ANZUS (Australia-New Zealand-United States) Mutual Defense Pact and Mutual Defense Pacts with the Republic of the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Japan, Southeast Asia, and the Republic of China.

The last two treaties were overwhelmingly ratified by the Senate during this session of Congress.

In a display of national unity that should have encouaged our friends abroad, given courage to the neutrals and opened the eyes of the would-be aggessor, the House of Representatives passed the Formosa resolution by a vote of 409 to 3 and the Senate by a vote of 85 to 3.

This action had no sooner been taken and the two treaties ratified than diplomatic moves started on the part of certain Asian and European powers to bend the line of defense in the Pacific.

The Soviet Union is now engaged in a series of diplomatic moves of far-reaching consequences.

Their apparent objective is to build a neutral block of nations between the Soviet Union and is satellites and the free Western world.

This effort is primarily directed toward the neutralization of nations which have had close ties with the West.

The first step was the signing of the Austrian Treaty. Through this required the removal of Soviet forces from their zone in Austria it simultaneously required the removal of American, British, and French forces from that country and established the start of the policy.

At the present time Khrushchev, Bulganin, and Mikoyan have gone as members of a high-powered Soviet delegation to meet with President Tito, of Yugoslavia and members of his government.

Press reports seem to indicate that to date not much progress has been made, but it is constantly well to keep in mind that what is put out by Communist governments (both the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia have Communist governments) may be for the purpose of confusing rather than clarifying the non-Communist world.

The interesting fact about this delegation is that the man who heads it is Khrushchev, the Community Party leader, though the negotiations are being carried on with the head of another government. The premier of Russia, Bulganin, with whom the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and the Premier of France are to meet within the next 2 months, goes to Belgrade in a secondary position to Khrushchev and in the photographs taken at the Yugoslav capital it shows Tito and Khruschev walking together while Bulganin followed behind.

Now what is the significance of this? Many times in Moscow foreign diplomats and correspondents first learn of shifts of power in the Kremlin by watching the order in which Soviet leaders review a May Day parade or sit in an official meeting.

Was this Belgrade meeting arranged for the purpose of showing to the world that Bulganin is in fact not at the summit?

Does it indicate that Foreign Minister Molotov who was not even made a member of this high diplomatic delegation and Bul-

ganin, the nominal head of the government, are on their way out while Khrushchev and Mikoyan are on their way up?

Is it for the purpose of showing to the world that in dealing with another Communist power (Yugoslavia) it was important to send the de facto ruler of Russia (if that now be Khrushchev's position) whereas when dealing with the heads of the Governments of Great Britain, France and the United States they are sending a man with a title but without the power in the hope that this may be looked upon throughout the Communist world as a "loss of face for the West."

Was the purpose to notify Communists at home and abroad that in order to be effective and binding any international agreements had to be negotiated by party boss Khrushchev rather than the nominal leader of the government, Bulganin?

This may be the tipoff as to why international agreements with the Soviet Union have been constantly violated by that nation for a quarter of a century.

This may be a substantial confirmation that in Communist eyes the party is the superior and the Russian state the subordinate agency.

All of these questions are important in dealing with the communism of Europe or of Asia.

Regardless of the success or failure of the mission to Belgrade, Soviet policy will probably seek to neutralize Western Germany and the two Scandinavian countries now members of the North Atlantic Alliance (i. e., Denmark and Norway).

On Wednesday, May 11, the Soviet Union proposed three United Nations resolutions. This was part of their effort to retain the initiative in carrying out their long-term policies.

Their so-called disarmament proposal would:

1. Destroy freedom of the press, radio, speech, and public discussion in the free nations of the world relating to warning the public against the homicidal mania of communism against human freedom. It would gag the opponents of communism in the Free World as they have been gagged behind the Iron Curtain. Since the Communist totalitarian governments already have complete control over such media of public information they have nothing to lose.

2. It claims a success for the Korean and Geneva armistice agreements, both of which have been flagrantly violated by the Chinese Communists. In Korea there is still a divided country despite pledges of 10 years ago, in which the Soviet Union joined, that it would be united and free. In Vietnam the Geneva Conference turned over half of the country and 15 million people to the Communists. This is their standard of a successful conference.

3. The proposals provide for the immediate withdrawal of United States forces in Germany back across the Atlantic to the United States (approximately 3,600 miles), whereas if the Soviet Union lived up to their agreement (it would be the first time in a quarter of a century that they would have), their forces would only be approximately 600 miles from the Elbe.

Such a withdrawal would also contemplate two Germanys (like divided Korea and Vietnam) each with its own police force. It would also require the withdrawal of the Republic of Germany from the western NATO defense alliance.

4. Under the proposal our overseas bases would have to be dismantled as a "requisite for discontinuing the arms race." We would trade a bird in hand for several in flight.

5. It contemplates that our industrial and scientific atomic know-how will be made available on an extensive basis to all Communist countries.

6. The proposal would result in yielding to Chinese Communist demands for Quemoy, Matsu, Formosa, the Pescadores, Chinese Communist membership in the United Nations, and removal of the provocative Seventh Fleet from the Far East, all of which contribute in Communist eyes to the existing tense situation in certain areas of the Far East.

7. It would eliminate all trade restrictions with the Soviet Union, Communist China, and their satellites, including trade in strategic materials.

For the past quarter of a century the Soviet Union has violated 50 out of 52 international agreements it has entered into.

The $64 question is, Has the Communist leopard changed its spots and carnivorous appetite and now become a milk-fed pussycat?

I believe not. They now zag instead of zig, but their long-term strategic concept of the destruction of human freedom remains the same.

Let us examine the record of the United Nations as an agency for effective collective security as envisioned by some or as a basis for a world government as contemplated by others.

The United Nations has an important place as an international forum but not as a world government.

World War II had not yet terminated in 1945 when the United Nations Conference was held in San Francisco. The people of the world did not know that we were on the threshold of the atomic age though those high in government had reason to believe a vast new power that ultimately could be used for destructive or constructive purposes was soon to be unveiled.

Hopes were high everywhere that the Soviet Union, though a dictatorship, had learned the folly of aggression and of war and because of the vast help given by the free world to them they would be willing to help establish a system of international law and order to preserve the peace of the world for ourselves and our children.

Unfortunately both during the San Francisco conference and in the 10 years that have followed a vast propaganda effort has taken place to build the United Nations into something which its charter provisions could not or did not permit it to become. In the United Nations different people envisioned different things.

Some envisioned it as a mighty force of collective security that would rally most of the nations of the world to resist aggression and preserve the peace. In moments of oratorical fancy some even suggested that the fact the United Nations was in being would warrant free nations to scrap most, if not all, of their Armed Forces and place their reliance upon the "police power" of the United Nations and the collective moral persuasion of that organization. On June 25, 1950, this concept was shattered.

When the Communist forces crossed the 38th Parallel, the United Nations Security Council promptly acted and first called upon the Communist aggressor to cease the aggression. The Communists, of course, forthwith showed they were not impressed by a United Nations resolution or the adverse moral reaction of that organization. The Security Council next called on the 60 members of that organization to give aid and support to the victim of the aggression, the Republic of Korea.

What is the record on this? After 3 years of the Korean war, of the 60 members of the United Nations only 17 contributed a single soldier, sailor, or airman to the resistance of aggression. Outside of the United States of America, the other 16 contributed Armed Forces in the amount of 45,000.

The United States of America alone contributed more than 450,000, and we rotated more than 1 million men through the Korean theater of war. The little Republic of Korea, which was the victim of the aggression, supplied over 600,000.

This means that of the United Nations members the United States of American supplied more than 90 percent of the manpower and better than 90 percent of the resources.

When the forces of the Republic of Korea, not being a member of the United Nations (having been kept out by a Soviet veto), are added to those of the United States, it means that our two nations alone supplied better than 95 percent of the manpower.

Does this indicate that the United Nations is an effective instrument of collective security? The answer must come back in the negative.

Our associates in the United Nations so tied us down that a stalemate was all that could be gained after 3 years of struggle in Korea.

We were denied the right of hot pursuit and the enemy was protected in his sanctuary across the Yalu.

With that example are we prepared to risk the future of our Nation and the safety of our people upon the collective ability of the United Nations to function in the event of aggression? The answer must be in the negative.

There are some who have envisioned the United Nations as a world state to which openly or clandestinely, individual nations would surrender their sovereignty. Some of the more enthusiastic proponents of this type of super state compared the San Francisco meeting with that of our own constitutional convention at Philadelphia. Of course, the two gatherings are not comparable when one considers the building of a government upon which man might depend for the protection of his life and his religious, econocic, and intellectual freedom.

In the first place, those who met at Philadelphia spoke a common language and had a common heritage. True, they had come from different areas of the world, but they or their predecessors had come seeking a new way of life, freedom from old world tyranny or a desire to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences.

They had fought a common battle against the mightiest empire of that time. They had carried over from the old country the background of the Magna Carta and of representative government. They had had experience as an independent nation, much of it unsatisfactory, under the Articles of Confederation.

With that background, under what I believe was divine inspiration, drafted the greatest document produced by the mind and hand of man for his self-government and protection of his natural rights.

A little more realistic understanding of the history of the nations gathered in San Francisco should have made it clear that such an organization could not be and should not be considered a basis for world government.

There is no common language or common heritage. Nations which have had no experience with representative constitutional government sit on equal terms with those that have had long experience. Nations of less than one million have equal representation with those of over three hundred million.

The Soviet Union, which is perhaps the most tyrannical government since western civilization entered the modern era, sits as an equal partner with nations with long-established constitutions of law, order, and a respect of the rights of man.

Now there are those who urge the admission of Communist China which was the aggressor in the Korean War. This, together with the other Communist states, give that system of tyranny over 800 million people.

We must not consent to permitting the guaranties of freedom under our Constitution being diluted or modified directly or

indirectly by any organization having in powerful policy positions nations which have no appreciation of or respect for free institutions, nor for God-given rights of man which no government may properly take from him.

It is one thing for the American people by deliberate choice, after thorough debate, to amend our Constitution to meet changing conditions. To allow it to happen by default would be a betrayal of our responsibilities.

It is important that we have a system of effective collective security and to demonstrate to the Communist world that there will be no further retreats or the abandonment of free people into Communist hands.

This Nation will live up to all of its treaty obligations, and we have the right to expect that our allies will do likewise.

I have a deep conviction that the American people and those throughout the free world who understand the dangers facing us will never again pay the price of another Yalta or another Geneva in order to buy a temporary respite from the insatiable appetite of international Communists to destroy human freedom.

Despite the lessons of history, the voices of appeasement appear to be growing at home and abroad. Some suggest that Quemoy and Matsu be allowed to pass into Communist hands. It is my strong belief that such an event will be looked upon as a great Communist victory in Asia and will undermine the remaining confidence the free anti-Communist nations of Asia have in the Government and the people of the United States.

Why it is that the voices of appeasement always urge that our friends and allies be the ones to give up territory or to yield up more people to communism? Why do they not suggest that it is time for the Iron Curtain to move backward rather than forward? The fact of the matter is that Quemoy and Matsu are as important to free China as western Berlin is to free Germany.

What military or civilian official would try to maintain that Western Berlin, a metropolitan island completely surrounded by Soviet territory, is defensible in and of itself? The fact of the matter is that our garrison in Berlin, the wives and children who accompany them, are hostages to potential Soviet aggression.

We have felt it essential, however, to maintain this island of freedom in the heart of Soviet territory despite the fact that it is aggravating to the Communists of the Soviet Union and of Eastern Germany, because it is important to the morale of the free German republic and it is a beacon of hope to the Germans behind the Iron Curtain that some day they too may be free.

The reason that Western Berlin has not passed behind the Iron Curtain is the fact that the Soviet Union knows that any attempt to take over the area by force would immediately involve the Western allies in military action.

Though we took some grave risks, we broke the 1948 blockade of Berlin by the airlift. There are now indications that the Communists are again attempting to strangle the economic life of the island of freedom.

Have they been encouraged in this new action by the voices of appeasement here and abroad which have indicated that we must placate communism when they get aggravated, for otherwise we may be risking armed conflict?

Does history teach us that this is the way to a lasting peace? The answer, of course, is "No."

At Munich, Chamberlain and Deladier succumbed to the threats and pleadings of Hitler that if they would but agree to turn over the Sudetenland area of Czechoslovakia to him that he would have no further territorial demands in Europe.

Without the consent of the Government of Czechoslovakia this sordid deal was made. To salve their conscience, Great Britain and France agreed to guarantee the frontier of the reduced Czechoslovakian state.

Seven months later, Hitler's legions took over the balance of Czechoslovakia. The conscience of the two guarantors was disturbed and several speeches were made as to the immorality of such aggression. But the guaranty given 7 months before did not save the people of Czechoslovakia for by then they had lost their will to fight, largely because they had lost their faith in the western allies to do anything more than to talk and to appease.

What deadly parallel does this furnish to the situation in the Formosa Straits today.

Quemoy and Matsu have never been Chinese Communist territory and they are not today.

That these outposts have a military value, no man can deny, for they certainly make more difficult the launching of an amphibious assault out of Amoy and Foochow as long as the free Chinese control these islands.

But equally important as their military value is their psychological value. Their loss by appeasement will bring as much despair to free China as the deal at Munich for the Sudetenland caused despair to the free people of Czechoslovakia.

It will also shake the confidence of our friends in Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan, and elsewhere, where the people understand the brutal and aggressive nature of communism.

This Nation was not born nor did it grow to its position of greatness based on a policy of fear, but rather one of faith and courage.

The Meaning of Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, too seldom in our generation do we hear some of the fervent praises for our Nation that echoed during the period when it was founded. I refer, of course, to the writing of the Battle Hymn of the Republic, The Star-Spangled Banner, and other compositions. However, a few days ago the Seattle Post-Intelligencer carried in the Voice of the People column an item by Henry Broderick which I think merits a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Broderick is a very distinguished citizen of Seattle.

I ask unanimous consent that this item may be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE ARE THE PATRIOTS?

School children of the early part of this century were stirred by the lines of Sir Walter Scott—

"Breathes there a man with soul so dead
Who never to himself hath said—
'This is my own, my native land.'"

If there were a modern version, it would read something like this—

"Breathes there a man so old-fashioned
That he takes his patriotism unrationed?"

Much as it might appear, this critical essay is not directed against teachers, professors, the intelligentsia, parents, or whatnots. Rather it is an indictment of a generation. In short, it is a plain diagnosis of what has happened to the American flag since World War I.

To be sure, the "grand old rag" of songs and storied fame is exhibited on State occasions, in parades, and celebrations where military units are participants and on flag staffs on specified dates. Hats are doffed when the flag passes in review, and momentarily, one may get the impression that reverence for the national emblem is in full bloom.

The fact is, the red-white-and-blue ensign is generally shown in a complusive or directive sense, and the deference offered is generally automatic or superficial—not spontaneous. Time was when the sight of the flag evoked tense inner passions in the heart, yes, even sentimental tears. The emblem stood for all that the United States meant at home and abroad. Nearly every home owned one or more flags and displayed them on big and little occasions.

Every foreign nation had a conscious and abiding respect for it, because they knew it was backed by the determination of Americans not to permit it to be slighted or trampled upon. But during the 20th century, certain processes and procedures have churned themselves into the thinking of our people. The one world chimera has appealed to many of the upper strata of our intellectuals, who have in turn sifted down to the lower levels the doctrine that stress on nationalism is out of harmony with the oncoming trend of globular attitudes.

In many schools and colleges, American history is no longer taught, so that the youngsters have not the faintest notion or knowledge of what the flag stands for. On the contrary, they are taught that all national flags are to be considered collectively and that sentimental leanings toward any particular flag is contrary to modern realism. So in the minds of many, the old flag with its original motto, "Don't tread on me," is now just one of a family of flags and almost forgotten in the hurrying mass effort toward comforts and conveniences. The emphasis is on leisure, not on liberty. Millions of Americans have succumbed to the new philosophies and have lost their patriotic souls, but we can still have faith in the other millions of Americans who courageously cling to the idea that our flag is a living symbol of the free world and that it represents the only instrument left to enforce the maintenance of the freedoms. Their spirits are saturated with the words of the poet:

"Up to the breeze in the morning, I fling you.
Blending your folds with the dawn in the sky.
There let the people behold you, and bring you
Love and devotion that never shall die.
Proudly, agaze at your glory, I stand
Flag o' my land! Flag o' my land!"

Fearing the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address which the Korean Ambassador to the United States, Dr. You Chan Yang, delivered before the

Manufacturers Association of Berks County, at Reading, Pa., on May 23.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEARING THE FUTURE

(Text of address given by Dr. You Chan Yang, Korean Ambassador to the United States, before the Manufacturers Association of Berks County on May 23, 1955, in Reading, Pa.

Mr. Chairman and my dear American friends, I am highly honored by your invitation to speak to you this evening. There is a complete realization on my part, however, that in asking me, you are paying tribute to my people—the most beaten-up and battered people in the world today. As their servant in this country, may I tender you the heartfelt thanks of my fellow Koreans. They are beaten up all right, but I tell you they remain unbeatable.

There is a reason for this: They do not fear the future. They do not fear the future, because, out of the agony of the Communist war, has come a double confidence that beside us to the end is the greatest power for goodness and human decency on the face of the earth. That power is the United States of America.

Fear is a dreadful thing. It produces a paralysis of both the mind and the body. It renders the making of a decision almost an impossibility. It corrodes the moral fabric and it dissipates the strength of individuals as well as entire nations. It ripens them—rotten ripe—so they are easy pickings for the enemy. A trembling, fearful, purposeless man and a trembling, fearful, purposeless nation are alike in that they supinely await doom. And doom in this extraordinary period of history means only the triumph of communism, the triumph of godless atheistic communism, and our mute acceptance of the slavery it imposes and enforces upon the individual.

Now that, you will agree with me, is infinitely more horrible even than is fear. Yet it can only come about through fear, but with faith in God, and the faith He gives us in His immutable verities we are at once the possessors of a priceless weapon—a weapon which the Communists neither can steal nor sabotage.

It is good to be in an assembly of businessmen. Hand in hand with agriculture you make civilization go forward, and how civilization has gone forward in this great country.

Your own historic city and the charming countryside of Berks County give me all I need to prove to you my premise on fear. There would be no Reading today if fear dominated your ancestors and yourselves. Courage was their virtue. They didn't fear the Indians. They fought them. They didn't fear tyranny. They hated it and they ended it—ended it on the battlefield. Just think: a tiny 3 million persons on a fringe of the Atlantic threw down the gauntlet to the then mightiest power in the world and made it surrender.

My history tells me that one of the sublime pages of that inspiring story was printed in the blood of patriots from Reading and Berks County, that a company of your militiamen was the first unit to report to General Washington at Cambridge in response to his call for troops through the Second Continental Congress and that the Ringgold light artillery thereafter bore the hallowed name of "The First Defenders." Defenders of what? Defenders of freedom. Defenders of the rights of man.

But that isn't all. You brought into being the granddaddy of the steel business. You forged here the first cannons for the young American army. You made other weapons. Your farmers tilled their fertile fields, and supplied vast amounts of food to the army. Your women worked the looms to turn out warm garments for the soldiers.

So you can see what inspiration I, a Korean, can take from Reading's past, present, and future. I salute you with profound respect and admiration.

Now, you gentlemen are competent businessmen, and as such I know you have an appreciation of facts. So I am going to put the cards on the table, face up, and let you draw your own sound conclusions. The first fact I would like to draw to your attention is that we—and when I say "we" I mean the entire free world—are losing the so-called cold war. With a few heartening exceptions, the Communists have had us behind the eight ball during the past 10 years. Nation after nation has succumbed to their machinations. More than half of the world's population either is within their fold or teetering in that diretcion. We have been enticed into conference after conference with them and all to no avail so far as our side is concerned. They have come out of most conferences either with definite territorial gains or propaganda victories that presage further territorial gains. You know the rollcall as well as I do: all of China on the mainland, East Gemany, Poland, the Baltic nations, Hungary, Rumania, half of Indochina, half of Korea, and so on. And not one Soviet soldier has had to be expended in the process. The scoundrels in the Kremlin are cunning and remorseless men. They are fearful of nothing except superior force.

We, the free world, have that force. And when we show that we mean to use it, the Communists back down. It's the old, old story of the bully brought to bay. Let me recall some of the heartening examples I just referred to.

The Berlin airlift was one of the early ones.

Military and economic aid to Greece and Turkey when the Soviet was about to pounce on them was another. Military and economic aid to Iran, another next door neighbor of Russia was a third. The Communists have long coveted the Iranian oil fields which are among the richest in the world.

And last, but not least, your magnificent response to my Government and my people when the Communist armies swept down on Korea. As your own military leaders on the scene have told you, we could have won the Korean war, but tragically instead we listened to the siren song of the Soviets and agreed to a truce when we had the enemy beaten. We relinquished force for words and the Korean people feel we shall rue the day when we did so. Thank God, we don't speak the same language the Communists do, for their language has to do with the debauchery of words. Let me quickly tell you how.

They go in all the time for the three words, "peoples democratic republic." Communist China is supposed to be that. So is the puppet regime of North Korea, likewise, most of their satellite slave nations. The peoples in none of these countries have one single, solitary thing to say about their governments. They are herded to the polls to vote * * * to vote for one person only, the person selected by the Communist Party. I say their elections are 99 44/100 percent impure.

Take the word "democratic." Their use of it, in my opinion, is actually obscene.

Take the word "republic," which means in essence that the people are the masters of the state and the state not the master of the people. My country is a Republic, patterned designedly after the greatest Republic of all time, the American Republic, and our 2 peoples are, I am sure, as far away from communism and all its evil works as any 2 peoples in the world.

Pray God, I say, that we may treasure and adhere to the sublime words of Abraham Lincoln—honest words, true words, noble words, so that government of the people, for the people and by the people shall not perish from this earth. Let's adhere, I repeat, and not fear, because fear would cause us to debase these words, forfeit our heritage of freedom and be the beginning of our acceptance of a lexicon of cowardice.

In your consideration of world affairs, I should like to give you the Korean viewpoint of Communist China and what that slippery, eel-like Chou En-lai is up to, right now. Here are his main objectives:

First, he wants the off-shore islands of Quemoy and Matsu without a fight. In fact, he wants them via the appeasement route.

Second, he wants Formosa "neutralized" so as to freeze the military power of Chiang Kai-shek and thus render hopeless the fate of the millions of Chinese on the mainland.

Third, he wants Red China to be admitted to the United Nations and given a seat on the Security Council.

Now, next to my own great patriot and leader, President Syngman Rhee, who has fought communism all his long and honored lifetime, Generalissimo Chiang, a younger man, is really right up there with President Rhee, in the free world's common cause against the devil. We Koreans, as well as countless Chinese, beg of the free world not to appease the Reds further. If there is further appeasement, it may sound the death knell of freedom in all of Asia. Appeasement just cannot buy "peaceful coexistence" with any enemy whose hands still drip with blood—American blood, Korean blood and the blood of the other members of the United Nations that joined us to meet the challenge of aggression in my faraway country. Our memorial services in many an American and Korean military cemetery in Korea will be almost a hollow mockery if the soft winds from the Yellow Sea whisper to our dead a dirge of further appeasement. Will not those who paid the supreme sacrifice for freedom—our freedom—ask themselves for what they fought and why they had to die? I think they will.

It is my great privilege to know an American father who lost two sons on Korean battlefields. He is an honorable man. He is against appeasement in any way, shape or form, and he phrases it this way, and I quote: "To compromise with evil is as evil as is evil itself."

That also is the way the Korean people feel about it. We are conscious of the deep bonds between our country and the United States. We know what you did for us and we shall be eternally grateful. And I, again as a Korean, am unutterably proud of my people, who were the first with guts enough to stand up and fight aggresive communism. We responded with complete trust to the magnificent leadership of our own George Washington, Syngman Rhee. But we would have been driven into the sea and destroyed as a nation had you not been the first to come to our help.

We have been, naturally, the chief sufferers of the war, both in lives lost—military and civilian—and with the frightful devastation visited upon our land. More than 50 of our cities were churned into heaps of rubble. Our ancient capital, Seoul, saw warring armies 4 times in and out of possession of it. Our casualties have exceeded the 2 million mark, our homeless the 10 million mark. The lcthal legacy of war has left us with 200,000 orphans to care for and 300,000 widows.

It is a grim picture, my dear American friends. While the guns are temporarily silenced, the truce we are experiencing is a most uneasy one. More than 1 million Chinese are in occupation of the northern half of our country. They have used the truce and armistice to build underground hangars and storage facilities for planes, tanks, heavy artillery, and ammunition. They have built many, many new airstrips and airports. Sources of your own Government, the American Government, have said that the Reds have brought in some 500 MIG's, and from their nearest airport it is only an 8-minute

flight to Seoul. How would you feel if a cruel and rapacious enemy could strike Reading from the skies in 8 minutes and follow up his attack with an army of a million? Why, you'd fight like wildcats to get that enemy out of your country. And in this blessed United States, you would be able to count on the entire Nation.

We're not unusual in wanting a reunited Korea for we feel that whatever eventually happens to Korea will determine the fate of the entire Far East. The Soviets may have a new administration, but their blueprint of world conquest, the architects of which were Lenin and Stalin, remains unchanged. It was Lenin who said that "the road to Paris lies through Peiping." It still does, and we would be most unrealistic after the stalemate in Korea and the complete military defeat in Indochina, if we tried to blind ourselves to the Reds' ultimate objectives. The cataracts of appeasement should be sufficient warning to us. They are to me. Maybe it's because I was a doctor before President Rhee asked me to take up this trade of diplomacy.

I have supreme faith in the courage of the Korean people, and I share that faith in my belief in the courage and steadfastness of purpose of the American people and their Government. Most of my life has been spent with Americans, and the United States has treated me as she is willing to treat anyone who believes that man is the child of God, that man is master of the state and not its slave, and that opportunity only awaits the initiative of the individual.

That is all that is desired by my people. We want to work our land; we want to build up our industries; we want to educate our children, and we also want the reunification and independence of our nation. You don't think we are unreasonable, do you?

We do not want, I assure you, to be behind the walls of an arsenal of terror. We do not want tabs kept on everybody. We do not want a knock on the door at midnight and the secret police there to take away a father, or a mother, or an entire family. We do not want to have to whisper when we meet friends. We are by nature a happy and outspoken people. We want to continue that way. When there is a song in our hearts, and we have many such, we want to sing it. I believe that you will agree with me that these are reasonable wants.

I should like at this point to repeat and emphasize the gratitude that is deep in our hearts for all you have done for us, and for what you may do in the future. In commenting on this extraordinary phase of American compassion, I have never neglected before an American audience to thank you for this from the bottom of my heart, and in so stating my thanks I echo the same thanks from millions of Korean hearts. Your wonderful GI's, out of their small compensation as soldiers, raised and gave nearly $20 million for the relief of our Korean orphans. There has never been anything like it before in the history of the world; compassion and generosity to this overwhelming extent from what were lean, lean pocketbooks. God bless GI Joe.

Somber thoughts must dictate when one talks about Korea today. As you know, and as has been said, the past is prelude to the present, and the present is prelude to the future. The Korean people have had a magnificent past, more than 43 centuries of it on our peninsula. Protected from the mainland of Asia by rivers and mountain ridges, we were able to develop down through the long corridors of time a culture and a way of life that enabled us to grow from a few hundred into a homogeneous nation of 30 million. And no more homogeneous nation ever existed on the face of the earth. We are an inventive people. Long before Gutenberg we contrived movable type. Long before any other nation, so far as we know, we built—and it still stands in Korea today—the first solar observatory. Lost somewhere in the dim recesses of time is our invention of the magnetic compass. Nearly 500 years ago our scholars evolved the first alphabet of the Orient—24 letters, the existing vowels and most of the consonants. All these things we did by ourselves alone.

Now, I tell you all this only so you may know what our past has been, and what we have tried to contribute to the onward march of civilization.

And I want to emphasize that we would belie our past and forfeit our future, if, in the present, we did not show the qualities that enable us to look backward with pride and forward with hope.

Down through the centuries the Korean people established not only a good livelihood for themselves out of the soil and fruits of the comparatively small peninsula that is our homeland, but also an oversufficiency for our needs.

That meant, naturally, an exportable surplus. As everyone knows, when a country produces more than it can consume itself, it is able to sell the overproduction and to buy back in return the products of other peoples. Our willingness to work, our cultivation of our soil, our exploration and development of our mines and minerals, our utilization of our forests, and our recognition of the vast marine wealth in the seas around us made us a vigorous and a growing land with happy people.

Korea, standing as a bulwark against any Chinese advance further eastward in the Pacific, and equally as a bulwark against any Japanese advance upon the continent of Asia, lived in peace for many centuries. But our dream of perpetual peace was shattered when Japan defeated Russia and moved into our homeland. This was in 1905 and for four decades we knew the harsh tyranny of alien rule.

American victory over Japan restored to us our liberties in part of our country, and let me say, as I always do, that America won the war alone in the Pacific. You destroyed the massive Japanese military machine and you did it singlehanded. The Russians were a Johnny-Come-Lately—1 week before the Japanese surrender.

Uneasy as the present is, we in Korea still yearn and hope to do the things civilized men and women do in other parts of the world. We have proved that we can fight, but we are most proud of our record as a nation of never having committed an aggressive act against any other people. For centuries we have been known as the Land of the Morning Calm, and our love of peace has been such that the ordinary hello and goodby and goodnight in Korea take on an added connotation, because we say when we meet a friend or a stranger, "May you come in peace," and when we bid him adieu we say, "May you go in peace." Likewise, when it is time for a goodnight to visiting friends, we say, "May you sleep in peace."

I should like to make it plain that the Republic of Korea does not now, and never has, advocated preventive war against the Soviet Union. What we do advocate may be summed up simply and directly:

1. We believe there is little hope for safeguarding human rights and democratic freedom unless the people who enjoy these rights show unmistakably that they will fight if necessary to defend them.

2. We believe that when the United Nations defines a warring nation as an aggressor—as it did define Red China in February 1951—that it will be false to itself and false to humanity if it permits the aggressor admission without atonement.

3. We believe the best way to prevent a world war, with unlimited destruction, is to beat the aggressor into submission and surrender whenever and wherever he starts anything against any part of the free world.

Courage and not fear must be our guide. If it is, we are on the side of the angels. Principles must not be sacrified to appeasement. If they are, we surely will be on the losing side in the long run. As we approach Memorial Day, let us solemnly and gratefully remember what it stands for. It is to honor those who fought for freedom and those who died for freedom. I believe in God, and I believe God has given eternal gifts to those brave and dauntless souls.

Here we are, with our beloved wives and children, in the midst of the adventure of life. Have we a message to send to our silent ones? I think we have, and the words which come to my mind are that "that which is morally wrong can never be made politically right."

I thank you.

Homes for Old Folks Designed for Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, an awareness of the problems of our aged people has characterized the past 20 years in America. I am particularly gratified to note the institutions which provide companionship and sociability in old age to so many worthy citizens. I ask unanimous consent to call to the attention of the Senate a report on this development by Elizabeth Toomey, a United Press correspondent, as published in the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of May 25, 1955.

I am pleased that Miss Toomey's excellent article contains favorable reference to the magnificent new Willamette View Manor, which leaders of the Methodist Church have erected near the attractive community of Milwaukie, Oreg., on the banks of the Willamette River.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article by Elizabeth Toomey printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOMES FOR OLD FOLKS DESIGNED FOR "LIVING"

(By Elizabeth Toomey)

NEW YORK.—The men and women who sat on the leather bar stools were white-haired and not as young as they'd like to be, but they were gay as they sipped before-dinner cocktails.

The setting: An old folks home, 1955 version.

The scene was the little bar at the Mary Manning Walsh residence for old people in Manhattan, operated by the Catholic Order of Carmelite Sisters.

The faces reflected in the mirror behind the bar were just a few of the 750,000 men and women in old-age institutions who have benefited from the spreading theory that a home for old folks helps them enjoy life, not just stay alive.

All across the Nation equally startling departures from rocking-chair routines can be found. Churches, lodges, labor unions, local governments, and private citizens have built homes of all sizes and designs in the past 10 years.

They ranged from those free of charge or based on the ability to pay to luxurious institutions where a wealthy older person may turn over $25,000 in return for a guaranty of complete care the rest of his life.

The problems of aging have become one of the Nation's No. 1 concerns as the life span is lengthened by science. There are almost 15 million Americans who are 65 or over, and the rate goes up by 400,000 each year.

POORHOUSE CHANGE

Most of them are in their own homes or living with children or relatives. An ever-increasing number are living in homes for the aged that bear little resemblance to the once dreaded poorhouse.

"The poorhouse was the gateway to oblivion for old people," says Dr. Murray Federber, assistant professor at the University of Pittsburgh, and a leader in planning one of the Nation's most modern county homes for the aged. It is a $20 million home and hospital which will be completed next summer. The building is designed so that 1,100 of the 2,000 residents will have rooms accessible directly to ground level. Those who aren't bed patients will live in colony style and have a solarium, snack bar, shuffle board rooms, TV rooms, beauty parlors, and an auditorium.

That huge project contrasts with the 46 oldtimers living in a 1-story, ultramodern building of glass and brick completed 2 months ago in Bensenville, Ill., by the Evangelical Reform Church.

APARTMENTS COMPLETED

In Portland, Oreg., an 8-story building containing 240 apartments was completed 6 months ago for tenants who average 69 in age. The first ones paid from $4,500 to $15,000 in advance for lifetime residence. They have a river view, their own theater, a library, and horseshoe courts.

At the Walsh home there is careful attention to keeping the senile or chronically ill from the active men and women who are encouraged to keep busy.

This week they gave a Gay Nineties Review in their auditorium. It was written, produced, and performed by the residents. They have instructors in pastel painting and needlework, a room for carpentry, looms for weaving, and weekly movies.

Performers from New York night clubs entertain them. The owner of the Copacabana sends his performers to the home. Martin and Lewis put on a skit in the small auditorium. Joan Weber sang recently, and when the home's only 100-year-old resident celebrated her birthday, Dennis Day dropped by to sing.

The Postal Pay Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "After the Postal Veto," published in the Pittsburgh Post Gazette of May 26, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFTER THE POSTAL VETO

Now that the Senate has failed to override the President's veto of the bill to raise the pay of postal workers, it's up to Congress to pass a new bill that will meet the President's well-taken objections.

Everyone is agreed that the postal workers deserve a raise. They haven't had one for 4 years. But the President felt that the average raise of 8.8 percent that Congress wanted was too high. He has said he will go for one of 7.6 percent.

There was more here than hair-splitting over a few percentage points. What 500,000 postal workers get will set a pattern for raises for a vast army of Government workers.

Moreover, the President objected hard to the discriminatory way that Congress would have applied the raise in postal pay. Item: Supervisors and technical personnel would have got less of a raise, relatively, than clerks. That makes for poor incentive. Item: City letter carriers would have got more of a raise than rural ones. That makes for morale problems.

The President's veto may have been sorry politics. But it was certainly sound management. Congress ought to forget the politics now and write a bill that the President will sign.

The American Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the stirring Memorial Day column on the American Soldier, written by Walter Winchell, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald and other newspapers on May 30, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN SOLDIER
(By Walter Winchell)

He was born in Lexington on a spring day in 1775 when a British officer waved his sword and bellowed "Lay down your arms. Disperse, you rebels!" There was a moment of intense silence. Then he shattered the stillness by firing a shot. And the ragged patriots attacked. At that historic moment, on a note of heroic defiance, his saga was inaugurated. A story of victory and agony which gained, conserved, transmitted, and expanded a priceless heritage. He was not a professional soldier but an armed civilian. With more fighting spirit than military training he left his plow, seized an antiquated musket, filled a pillowcase with supplies for a day's fight, and rushed into a 6-year war.

From Lexington, Concord, Bunker Hill, and Fort Ticonderoga to Trenton, Germantown, and Saratoga, he was intimately acquainted with the thunder and terror of war. And he forever reminded the Nation that before it can reach the glory of Yorktown, it must have the physical and moral courage to endure Valley Forge. His name has the sound of drumbeats. He is Paul Revere and Lafayette and George Washington. He is the Minute Man and Yankee Doodle.

He triggered the cannon fire on Fort Sumter. A Nation that was still in its morning was suddenly cloaked by the darkness of violence. Fate beckoned and life trembled—and he was involved in the unspeakable anguish of civil strife. The development of human destinies has rarely evolved a more profound tragedy. The melancholy national anthem became an agonized cry in the night. The password was bitterness. He marched destructively with Sherman through Georgia and fought gallantly with Lee at Gettysburg. He is Abraham Lincoln and Robert E. Lee.

He heard the lilting rhythm of Over There and embarked on a perilous journey. He survived the crucible of hell in a magnificent effort to join the angels. For he was convinced he had ended all wars and made the world safe for democracy. He immortalized the Argonne, St. Mihiel, and Chateau-Thierry. He is Alvin York, Woodrow Wilson, John J. Pershing, and the doughboy.

He was stunned by the horrible ferocity of exploding bombs on December 7. The concentrated experience of his lifetime was endangered by a destructive split-second. The globe was on fire—all the latitudes and longitudes were his battlefields. From North Africa to Okinawa, from Guadalcanal to France. He landed in Normandy and raised the flag atop Iwo Jima. He inscribed his deathless story in the skies and oceans, in cities and jungles. As before, he struggled to preserve an ideal and make a reality of a bright aspiration: World peace. His deep conviction represents the Nation's mightiest force: Devotion to freedom. He is the national hero who is the individual expression of national concepts. He is Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Dwight David Eisenhower, Colin Kelly, and GI Joe.

He read the headlines in 1950—disclosing North Korean troops had crashed across the 38th parallel. Inevitably, he repeated a cruel transaction: Sacrifices in exchange for liberties. And there were echoes of previous grim adventures which began 175 years ago. The banners were again proudly borne and death executed its macabre dance. Thus, another ordeal was launched which has not ended. He is one of the kidnaped fliers in Red China.

And he is the Unknown Soldier—who was born everywhere. Immigrant, refugee, descendant of the Pilgrims. Pioneers who extended the frontiers, laborers who extended railroads over mountains or erected fabulous cities. He belongs to every race and creed. He was born at Lexington, but he will never die. He lives in the everlasting life of this country. For the biography of the American soldier is the history of the United States.

Salute.

Final Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, over recent years much has been heard about Communist infiltration into various phases of American industry and American life. Not the least of this danger has been in the maritime field, on the ships and docks where seamen and longshoremen from all parts of the world constantly are mingling.

Fighting this Communist threat on our ships has been no easy matter—but loyal American seamen and union officials have waged a long battle that has been finally successful to a remarkable degree.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an editorial from the April 15 issue of the Seafarers Log, a publication of the Seafarers International Union, Atlantic and Gulf District, AFL, entitled "Final Victory," which deserves widest publicity.

I congratulate the officers and members of this union on the fine job they have done.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Seafarers Log of April 15, 1955]

FINAL VICTORY

At long last United States seagoing unions, after a bitter 20-year struggle, have been cleansed of Communist influence. The victory of the Seafarers International Union Pacific district in the three-department vote has driven the Communists out of their last stronghold in maritime—the steward departments on west coast ships.

The United States has been so strongly anti-Communist in the last few years that most people take it for granted the Communists are on the run. They tend to forget the very real threat the Communists posed in some sections of industry, particularly in maritime. If anybody thinks that defeating Communists is a soft touch, they should look at the record. It took 5 years, for example, to free the west coast cooks and stewards from Communist control, and they are only one small segment of the industry.

The Communist strength in maritime came originally from the fact that seamen used to be among the most ill-treated and exploited of any American worker. By 1946 the Communists on the waterfront had grown to menacing proportions. They had fed well on the wartime honeymoon atmosphere and seized control of the apparatus of one union after another while the seamen were busy manning the ships.

In fact, in the immediate postwar period the Seafarers' International Union of North America stood virtually alone against rising Communist strength. The NMU was under their thumb, as was the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, the Canadian Seamen's Union, the American Radio Association, and important sections of the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association. Communist forces were also making a determined bid to capture the Marine Firemen's Union and made such serious inroads on the masters, mates, and pilots that they barely missed taking that organization into their camp.

Were it not for the SIU A. and G. district on this coast and the Sailers' Union out West, it's likely the Communists would have swept all of maritime into their net.

Now the situation has been completely reversed. In both Canada and the United States the Communists remain a threat in maritime, but they are on the outside looking in. The fact that they are is a fitting tribute to the rank-and-file membership of all SIU affiliates who carried the brunt of the battle.

Game Refuges in Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on May 27 in a well-documented speech demonstrating careful research, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] told us about misuse of the duck-stamp funds. He showed that these funds had been diverted for various administrative expenses and had not been used for the acquisition of land for refuges and nesting grounds contrary to the original purpose and intent of the act providing for the levying of the duck-stamp tax.

But even if the lands had been purchased as intended they would be subject to another peril. In a recent article in Sports Afield entitled "One Man Can Wipe Out Our Wildlife Refuges," Mr. Arthur H. Carhart called attention to this menace to our wildlife protection and conservation program.

Mr. Carhart told how, under the present law, the Secretary of Interior had the power to wipe out refuges, without hearings, without notice to the sportsmen and conservationists affected, without discussion with interested groups. On May 23, I inserted Mr. Carhart's article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where it can be read in its entirety beginning on page A3538.

Even if we pass legislation now pending, such as has been introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON], by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], and others, to earmark the receipts from the sale of duck stamps for the acquisition of migratory bird refuges we still would be in danger of having the funds misused. The Secretary of Interior can declare the lands so acquired surplus and they can be taken over and used by any other agency that wants them. With one stroke of the pen the Secretary of Interior can permit these refuges to be used for oil drilling, for target ranges for the military, or allow them to be incorporated into grazing districts.

The following editorial from the Great Falls Tribune, Great Falls, Mont., points out the danger:

HE COULD WIPE OUT GAME REFUGES

By merely signing a typewritten order, one man can wipe out great national wildlife refuges. In the same fashion, he may open the gate to oil drillers, stockmen, rocket shooters, or others to overrun our refuges and destroy their value to wildlife.

According to an article in the June issue of Sports Afield magazine—researched and written by Arthur H. Carhart, who visited refuges in six States—the man with this life-and-death power over our Federal wildlife refuge system is Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.

At least 40 refuges may be in immediate jeopardy. We have 254 (Federal) refuges in 40 States and 18 in Alaska, Hawii, and Puerto Rico. They contain about 17½ million acres—less than 1 percent of the Nation's total area. Their size and services vary greatly.

Each refuge meets definite needs of one or many types of game. They protect scarce species from extinction; they produce stock for unpopulated areas; they are testing stations for game-management programs. Any official who would reduce their acreage or allow uses that would dispossess wildlife on them would deal a grievous blow to our natural life.

The nationwide issue is this: Will the Secretary of the Interior hold fast to gains in our Federal refuge system? Or by using his power, will he wipe out some refuges entirely and allow uses in others detrimental to their wildlife values?

The Sports Afield article on the situation says there is enough evidence over the Nation to demand that the Secretary of the Interior define his policy on our national wildlife refuges.

In order to prevent this from happening, I have introduced H. R. 5306 declaring it to be the policy of Congress that national wildlife refuges be maintained and preserved and providing that the Secretary of the Interior cannot dispose of or relinquish any of the national wildlife refuges, or parts thereof, without the approval of Congress. Senator HUMPHREY has introduced S. 2101, a companion bill, in the Senate.

If we are to keep faith with the sportsmen who have contributed more than $44 million to the duck-stamp fund and who have paid millions more in excise taxes into the Pitman-Robertson funds, we should enact this legislation at the earliest possible date.

How Eisenhower Can Merit United Support at the Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on the 26 of May 1955, the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal contained a very thoughtful and constructive editorial entitled "How Eisenhower Can Merit United Support at the Summit." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of May 26, 1955]

HOW EISENHOWER CAN MERIT UNITED SUPPORT AT THE SUMMIT

The United States has taken the plunge. President Eisenhower reportedly has agreed to meet between July 18 and 21 with the chiefs of state of Soviet Russia, Great Britain, and France. The Western Allies still want to meet in Lausanne and the Soviets want Vienna, but that point can surely be worked out.

This leaves us less than 2 months to prepare for a new and dramatic test. How can America get ready for it?

Our first preparation should be spiritual. We have need of earnest prayer, and of a great act of national humility. We are a proud Nation, and dead sure we are right on the issues that divide East from West. But we must remember not to be like some people who are good but self-righteous—too haughty in their rectitude to allow for an honest disagreement. We need not only to be right as a Nation on these vast issues. We need to be persuasive, eloquent, and convincing. Neither people nor nations achieve those qualities if they insist on being rigid and unyielding in their righteousness.

We will need to be cautious. Yet caution in itself is not a national or international policy. It is the negation of a policy.

What we need even more than caution is a new boldness in facing a new challenge at the big four conference. We must use this meeting, with all its dangers, as an opportunity to deal with what Adlai Stevenson calls "the great unfinished business of humanity," the prevention of a war that would ruin the world.

For Mr. Stevenson is right in saying that we have "crossed a great divide." War is no longer a possible instrument of policy, for a nuclear war would destroy all policy and the policymakers along with it.

There is no reason to expect our differences with the Soviets to be resolved at the Big Four meeting, or in our lifetime, as Mr. Stevenson notes. The one thing we might hope to settle now is that war cannot and must not be the solution to East-West differances. If Soviet willingness to attend this conference shows that they have reached that conclusion, then the world has suddenly become a decent place in which future generations can live. If they have not yet reached that conclusion, the meeting is a striking opportunity for us to force it to the attention of their leaders.

In any case, the July conference opens a chink in the Iron Curtain at a most vital spot. Due to the Communist form of government, it is next to impossible for the West to talk directly to the Russian people. We can only address them through their leaders. And as long as those leaders stay sealed behind the heavy doors of the Kremlin, we have no chance to bring to their personal attention certain arguments that are bound to weigh with any group of men who are not insane.

At least we can count on the Soviet chieftans to listen to an argument directed at their own self-interest. We should be able to demonstrate that it is not to their personal benefit, not to the benefit of their country, to force the West into a war that would be ruinous to both sides. Once that point is in their minds, further lines of peaceful negotiation are bound in time to open up.

It is of the first importance for President Eisenhower to go to the conference armed with the moral support of his whole country.

He will not merit that support if he goes to the meeting in a cynical, defensive mood. It is not enough for America to keep its fists up in a posture of defense. We must hold out our hands, at such moments as the Big Four meeting, with some positive and appealing program to offer.

The President will need to renounce the advice of certain right-wing Republicans who want him to do nothing but look for Communist traps. He will need to be wary, but he must be acutely alert to opportunities as well as dangers.

We believe Mr. Eisenhower should go to the conference with a positive program in his hand and with a show of faith in the ultimate good sense of human beings, whatever language they may speak and whatever government they may follow. Such an attitude would command the fervent support of the great American public. Party labels would be forgotten. His strength would be not as the strength of 10, but of tens of millions of united people.

But the President can only earn such support by deserving it, in his attitude toward the giant task that looms ahead of him for mid-July.

Unemployment Caused by Importation of Foreign Bicycles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by the Bicycle Manufacturers Association, of 122 East 42d Street, New York, together with a copy of a letter which I addressed to the President of the United States on the subject of unemployment caused by imports of foreign bicycles.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTH REPORT TO THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS—FEAR OF FOREIGN INTERFERENCE CONCERNS AMERICAN BIKE INDUSTRY FOLLOWING PRESIDENT'S DELAYED ACTION ON PROPOSED TARIFF RISE

The President's failure to reach a final decision in the bike tariff case comes as a deep disappointment to the American bicycle industry. We were banking heavily on Presidential approval of the United States Tariff Commission's recommendations for a higher duty on imported bicycles, which would have helped to relieve our hard-hit industry.

The Tariff Commission, following a 9-month analysis of all the facts, agreed by a 4 to 1 majority that the bike industry had sustained an actual and serious injury. The vote was one of the most decisive majorities of the Commission in recent years. Now the Commission has been asked by the President to conduct additional studies and report back to him by July 15.

It is noteworthy that the Commission's report, which was publicly revealed for the first time by the President's recent announcement proposed only a modest tariff increase—considerably less than that required to remedy the injury—but a rate that was designed to make the competitive situation slightly better balanced.

Despite the Commission's substantial affirmation of the serious injury our industry has suffered, we must confess to a strong fear that extraneous considerations have tended to complicate our case. In no wise are these factors legally defined—nor do they appear anywhere in the criteria established in the "escape clause" provision of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

FOREIGN SOURCES IGNORE OUR LAW

We are concerned with the foreign interference which became evident soon after the Commission made its favorable recommendations. We are worried about the force and effect this opposition will exert. Since this influence manifested itself before the Commission's full report was publicly disclosed, it is apparent that foreign interests were not opposing the facts, but rather the application of the law dealing with protection of damaged American industries.

In recent weeks, we have seen representatives of foreign governments question the exercise of the escape clause in the bike case. Witness a May 10 dispatch of the United Press which quoted a White House official as revealing "that the Office of European Economic Cooperation, representing 16 European countries, has shown its grave concern at the Tariff Board's recommendation on imported bicycles." On May 11 the same source said "the British and other governments had made representations to the United States against any restrictions on the trade in bicycles."

What is behind these foreign warnings? Certainly, foreign spokesmen are aware of the existence of the escape-clause provision. Surely, they know that it has been an integral part of our Nation's trade agreements for many years. All other nations insist on the same safeguards for their own industries—and have employed protective measures more frequently than our country.

The President himself has often asserted his support of these safeguards. In his April 14 message to Congress on the Organization for Trade Cooperation, he reaffirmed "The right of this country to protect the legitimate interest of its industries and labor is clearly provided for."

DELAYED DECISION RAISES QUESTIONS

Do the foreign nations advocate that the law be bypassed or nullified in the bike case? If that is not their intention, how then can they legitimately oppose the Tariff Commission's recommendations? If their objective is to influence the final decision, then, in all justice, we have the right to be informed of the materiality of such considerations.

The bike case has been properly and effectively adjudged under the established criteria of the escape clause. We see no justification for judging our case against another set of rules—rules that are not spelled out and against which we have no means of defending ourselves.

We are also seriously disturbed by reports that have appeared in leading newspapers suggesting that the delay of final action in our case is related in some way to pending trade legislation. The May 12 issue of the Wall Street Journal, referring to the administration's trade program, quoted a Government leader as saying, "Certainly the atmosphere will be a lot quieter for a decision on the bicycle case by the middle of July." What has the operation of the escape clause to do with other legislation?

We previously noted that foreign spokesmen feel that the bike problem should be settled by discretion, rather than under existing law. In that vein, they further contend there is nothing strategic about bicycles. The April 20 issue of the Journal of Commerce in an item from Paris titled "Europe Fears Possible Rise in Bike Tariff," quoted foreign economists as saying: "Thus if the United States decides to boost bicycle tariffs, Europe will assume that the Government wishes to protect a single, relatively small, decidedly nonessential industry."

In this instance, the Europeans seem to be classifying the relative importance of American industries. As far as we know, the "escape clause" provision to help industries injured by imports makes no such distinction. Our so-called nonessential industry, try, we cannot help but note, made many outstanding wartime and peacetime contributions to the welfare of our country.

BIKE CASE SHOULD BE JUDGED ON ITS MERITS

It is extremely unfair that such extraneous issues—the attitudes of foreign governments, pending legislation and essentialfty—should become issues in our case. We have not been asked to produce evidence on these points. We have hewed to the law which asks proof of injury.

We believe the facts in our case have been well illuminated. Nonetheless, we have offered our prompt and complete cooperation in furnishing the data requested by the President. We maintain our faith in President Eisenhower who has repeatedly expressed the sentiment that no American industry will be sacrificed for international trade.

Similarly, we have deep confidence in the Congress of the United States. We are sincerely grateful for the helpful and considerate support many of its members have given to the American bike industry. And in line with the desire of many of you to be kept informed of developments in our case, please be assured that we will continue to do so.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
March 21, 1955.

HON. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is my understanding that the United States Tariff Commission has submitted to you its findings and recommendations in an "escape clause" proceedings under the Trade Agreements Act

which was brought by the American bicycle industry.

While the Commission's report to you has not been made public, information I have received from other sources in regard to this industry, an important segment of which is located in my State, would indicate very strongly that relief is needed.

Just this morning I received in my office a notice that the Honorable Renata Ricciuti, Commissioner of the Connecticut Labor Department, has recommended that Torrington, Conn., be declared a group IV labor surplus area. The commissioner assigns as one of the reasons for heavy unemployment in this area "a cutback in employment by a bicycle parts manufacturer due largely to imports of foreign bicycles."

An increase in imports, from 66,289 units, or 3.4 percent of sales in the United States market in 1950, to 593,659 units, or 22.8 percent in 1953, and 291,314 units, or 40 percent in the first 6 months of 1954, clearly has resulted in injury to the domestic injury.

A major factor enabling foreign producers to invade our markets to the detriment of employment in the domestic industry has been wage differentials. In contrast to foreign wage scales, which I am informed range from 15 to 45 cents an hour, American bicycle workers are paid in excess of $1.90 an hour. It is apparent that competition based on this kind of a disparity in wages has the effect of undermining our American standard of living.

As you know, I have had a keen interest in the Trade Agreements Act and appreciate the reasons which led you to recommend its extension with additional authority to negotiate reductions in tariffs on a gradual, selective, and reciprocal basis. I have discussed those reasons with many audiences in Connecticut, and I believe there is a general understanding of the importance of this program from the standpoint of the long-range security of this and other countries in the free world, and the stimulating effect which an increased flow of carefully selected imports can have upon our domestic economy.

However, there is much concern on the part of the thoughtful and responsible citizens in my State over the administration of the act. As a member of the Randall Commission, I joined fully in its recommendations for extension of the act with additional authority to negotiate trade agreements with other nations. However, those recommendations were coupled, as you know, with emphasis upon the essential safeguards to industry and employment which are provided by the scape clause and peril point, if properly administered.

In this connection, I was highly gratified by your letter of February 17, 1955, to the Honorable JOSEPH E. MARTIN, minority leader of the House of Representatives, and particularly by the following passage:

"Obviously, it would ill serve our Nation's interest to undermine American industry or to take steps which would lower the high wages received by our working men and women. Repeatedly I have emphasized that our own country's economic strength is a pillar of freedom everywhere in the world. This program, therefore, must be, and will be, administered to the benefit of the Nation's economic strength and not to its detriment. No American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure. Were we to do so, we would undermine the ideal for which we have made so many sacrifices and are doing so much throughout the world to preserve. This plain truth has dictated the retention of existing peril-point and escape-clause safeguards in the legislation."

From the facts in my possession, I am led to believe that the American cicycle industry and the jobs of the men and women it employs are distinctly in jeopardy at the present time. It is my hope that you will be able, consistent with your responsibilities to the overall national interest, to grant the relief it has been seeking and so urgently needs.

Always with great respect, I am

Sincerely yours,

PRESCOTT BUSH,
United States Senator.

Milking Shorthorn Cattle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news item which appeared in the Alaska Weekly on Friday, February 18, 1955, entitled "Shorthorn Highly Recommended to Alaska Farmers."

I insert this item in the RECORD for two reasons—first, it contains information of interest to dairymen and cattlemen throughout the United States and the Territory of Alaska; and, second, it pays tribute to a fine friend and constituent of mine, Mr. William Eccles.

Mr. Eccles is now 82 years old. He probably knows more about shorthorn cattle than any other layman in this country. He has been untiring in his efforts to bring this particular breed to the attention of young farmers throughout the State of Washington and the world.

To quote Mr. Eccles himself, shorthorns have more to offer farmers and dairymen than have any cows on earth. I commend the article to my colleagues, particularly to those from the reclamation States.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Alaska Weekly of February 18, 1955]

SHORTHORN HIGHLY RECOMMENDED TO ALASKA FARMERS

When Alaska farmers and dairymen plan their new herds, they could do no better in selecting Shorthorns for the best in milk, butterfat, and beef on the hoof. The record published in the 100th anniversary of Coates Herd Book, in London, in 1954, should satisfy all breeders of milking Shorthorns that they have the most perfect system known up to this time, says one of their most consistent boosters, Wm. Eccles, who has watched them produce the world over during the past 40 years.

Eccles believes that cattle improvement makes healthier people in all climates and all countries and that the Shorthorns are the finest of all the world's cows.

And Eccles is not the only one who thinks this. At the Royal Windsor Stock Show in London last fall, for the first time in 100 years, 4 Shorthorns owned by 4 different breeders won both milk and butterfat and top beef awards over 21 other breeds of cattle, all of which were the popular breeds.

Two of the four winners were Milking Shorthorns, 1 bull and 1 cow, selected for top places from 14 special dairy breeds. The other winners were 2 beef Shorthorns, 1 bull and 1 cow—each from 7 beef breeds of cattle.

TROPHIES GIVEN

Trophies for the supreme breed of milking and beef shorthorns were presented to the Shorthorn Society by Queen Elizabeth II.

Such a word record, never equaled in bovine history, should be of interest to everyone in Alaska who demands the best for their herds. William Eccles, now 82, who first helped to introduce these shorthorns into the Argentine in 1838, is not content to retire until the milking and beef shorthorns are better known in the agricultural areas of Alaska. The Argentine now has them in 82 percent of their present herd populations.

"Shorthorns have more to offer a farmer and dairyman than any cow on earth," insists Eccles, and after helping to place them in Greece, Egypt, Portugal, West Africa, China, Iran, and other places, he ought to know.

So far as is known, Alaska now has only four purebred shorthorn bulls. Purebreed cows are also needed. The United States Milking Shorthorn Book for 1954 records an average weight of from 1,300 to 1,400 pounds each in beef, and an average weight in milk annually of 9,400 pounds, with 4.4 percent butterfat content.

FAVORS SHORTHORN

After watching the increase in shorthorn population for four decades—and more—William Eccles still has the enthusiasm for them as a winning captain of a football team. In spite of his fourscore years—and two—he answers letters and welcomes them at his home, 1317 Seventh Avenue, Seattle.

Alaskans looking for better cows, more milk, more butter, and more beef in their future plans should inform themselves fully on shorthorns and then not permit breeders of other kinds of cattle unsell them on these prize world champions—the shorthorns.

Memorial Day 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD what I consider to be a very fine editorial, entitled "Memorial Day 1955," which was published in the Washington Evening Star on yesterday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 30, 1955]

MEMORIAL DAY, 1955

When Gen. John A. Logan, commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, issued the order designating May 30, 1868, as a day for decorating the graves of men who fell in the Civil War, he expressed the hope that it would be observed "from year to year while a survivor of the war remains to honor the memory of the departed." The custom of thus paying homage to the dead had come from the South and represented in its original form only spontaneous local activity on the part of relatively few women and children. But the appeal of such an annual commemoration to large numbers of people soon was demonstrated throughout the reunited Republic. By 1900 William McKinley, himself a Union veteran, could say in truth: "The army of Grant and the army of Lee are together. They are one now

in faith, in hope, in fraternity, in purpose, and in an invincible patriotism."

The principle implicit in formal remembrance of the fallen, of course, had been established long before the first Decoration Day. It had been expressed in noble language when Abraham Lincoln, dedicating Gettysburg Military Cemetery, November 19, 1863, while the strife between the States still continued and the outcome was uncertain, declared: "It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

Looking back over history, it seems clear that in the very nature of human experience the task of progress and the cause of freedom never completely are performed or won. The challenge of all who have lived and died for ideal ends still stands, confronting successive generations. Indeed, the passing centuries plainly teach that liberty, justice, and fellowship constantly must be reborn in the hearts of millions through rededication in every individual heart. It was with that thought in mind that President Eisenhower this year again proposed to his countrymen that they employ Memorial Day to "unite in beseeching God to guide the nations of the world into the ways of peace."

Rock Creek Park Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Rock Creek Park is a symbol to all of us who reside in Washington, even temporarily, of the vast and greater wilderness which lies far to the westward in the States between the Continental Divide and the Pacific Ocean.

Rock Creek Park serves to remind us in the Congress of our duty and obligation to protect the scenic grandeur and outdoor majesty of our country.

For that reason, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a moving and eloquent address delivered by Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society, in commemoration of Rock Creek Park Day at the Carter Barron Amphitheatre on May 15, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ROCK CREEK PARK DAY

(Remarks by Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society and editor of the Living Wilderness, to an audience of adults and children at the Carter Barron Amphitheater "FUNerama" program in celebration of Rock Creek Park Day, Washington, D. C., May 15, 1955)

I do not know why I should break into a "FUNerama" and make a speech, even a short speech, except that the people who organized this day and this program asked me to say some things they thought ought to be said, and I wanted to do anything that I could to help them. What they have done to plan and organize this first Rock Creek Park Day is something for which we are all grateful. And of course, all of us are glad to do anything that we can to show our appreciation—even if it means a speech, I suppose.

These people asked me to talk about the significance of Rock Creek Park Day. That seemed a kind of hard topic for a Sunday afternoon "FUNerama" program. So I changed it. Now my subject is What's the Big Idea? So if you will settle back or lean forward, I shall begin this little Rock Creek address entitled "What's the Big Idea?" I shall begin with something we are all interested in very much.

My friends, Davy Crockett, king of the wild frontier, is very much alive these days in broadcasts and ballads. He rides into Washington on the airwaves and sings on in the minds and voices of a thousand children. King of the wild frontier.

If Davy Crockett could really come to life again, and would come to Washington to visit all his friends, I suppose that he would want to go up to the Halls of Congress again, and visit some of the other great sights in our city also. But I am absolutely sure of one place he would want to go before very long. Davy Crockett would surely head for Rock Creek Park—away from the pavements, away from the crowds, away from the noise, away from so much of our just plain confusing, though wonderful, civilization.

Davy Crockett would want to hear water running wild over rocks and stones, and he would want to hear birds singing in treetops and bushes thick enough that he couldn't see houses and automobiles through them. He would want to go along some paths in the woods, and have his feet on the good soft earth. He would want to walk a ways without being in danger from automobiles, and without having to stop and stand around to wait for a light to change color. He would want to have a chance to think some long thoughts and some quiet thoughts, too.

Davy Crockett wouldn't want to forget altogether what the frontier was like, and what the freedom of the wild frontier was like, any more than we ourselves want to forget these altogether either. Davy Crockett—and this is one of the reasons that he is one of our heroes—Davy Crockett would want to have something of wild nature around where, once in a while, he could get off there and remember who he was.

And he could have it here in Washington. He could have it in Rock Creek Park. We can invite Davy Crockett to Washington, D. C., anytime we want to, and be sure that we will not kill him off with our noise and hurry and confusion, our hot hard pavements, and all these machines and distractions of ours. We can show him the way to Rock Creek Park. And we can go with him and keep alive in ourselves the same qualities of outdoor Americanism that we admire in him.

The first year I came to Washington to live, 25 years ago, I was down in Rock Creek Park hiking, and all at once I was surprised to see a United States Senator, from Idaho, coming along the trail toward me on horseback. You would have been surprised, too. But when you think it over, it isn't so surprising after all. It's natural.

All of us Americans are people who love the outdoors. We love the rocks and rills and the woods and the hills. We feel as though we are a part of all this wild nature. We love the sunshine as much as the birds and the squirrels and the other animals do.

Somehow or other we realize that we even owe our lives to these other creatures, and that we live as a part of the great community that we all share. We realize that we can stay alive only because the plants help us get our strength from the sun. Sometimes we get along in the great cities we have made so long and so well that we almost forget about our wild frontiers. But we always come back to them, and we realize all over again that we Americans are the kind of people we are because we are interested in wildlife, in trees, in creeks and rivers, and in being part of the great outdoors.

So, when we think about it we are not surprised, not surprised at all, that a United States Senator should come up here in Rock Creek Park and go horseback riding. Even Presidents have taken off for Rock Creek Park, and a famous Ambassador from England wrote about how you could force yourself through thickets in Rock Creek Park and test your ability to climb up the faces of the high cliffs down here.

We all find in Rock Creek Park just the kind of refreshment, rest, and inspiration that we need. I heard a general say not long ago, at a hearing about Rock Creek Park, before a Senate committee, that it was because he could get off and get into this natural area for exercise and rest that he had been able to stay in good health and be able to give the testimony he was then giving.

Another thing I have seen is a gang of boys and girls running along a path in Rock Creek Park making noise and running without worrying about anything at all. Sometimes I think that that is as great a sight as seeing a Senator riding there on horseback. Because, I think, if we Americans even in the big cities, especially in the big cities, can see children running free in the woods this way, we can have the great and beautiful country we now have for many, many centuries.

And what a pleasure Rock Creek Park is, all the year round. Here is a place where you can find a skunkcabbage bloom in a swampy place in the spring, right in the midst of the city. Here are the cool woods and the creeks in the hot summer days. In the fall, here are the colored leaves that you don't have to rake and burn; you can just enjoy them. Here in the winter is a place where you don't have to shovel the snow; it can just lie on the ground and be beautiful. And it doesn't melt away so fast either.

I haven't mentioned the picnic grounds and golf courses and ball fields and the tennis courts, and this big amphitheater. Why? Because these are all wonderful, but I guess we could find ball fields and tennis courts and playgrounds somewhere else, or we could even tear down buildings and make them if we had to. I have been thinking more particularly about all this wild nature that we could not have somewhere else in Washington if we ever spoiled Rock Creek Park.

How does it happen that we have it? Do you ever wonder why there aren't houses all through Rock Creek Park? Do you suppose there isn't somebody who would like to fix these woods all over for a nice place for a house? Do you think that maybe it just happened that Rock Creek Park is here?

Do you?

Well, let me tell you that is the big idea. The big idea was the idea of making a park out of Rock Creek and its valley.

Sixty-five years ago, Congress started Rock Creek Park. Congress passed an act and said this park should be (and I am quoting the act now, the law the way the Congress wrote it) "perpetually dedicated and set apart as a public park and pleasuring ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States."

Note, that Rock Creek Park is for all the people of the United States—not just for the people of the District of Columbia or Maryland or Virginia, but for all the people of the United States. This is the Capital of the entire country. Just as we are determined to preserve some of our land in our great national parks and in the magnificent wilderness areas of our national forests wild and unspoiled, so also here in our Capital we have an area of wildness. And it is kept so by that act of Congress passed 65 years ago.

Rock Creek Park has been perpetually dedicated ever since. You have it, we all have it,

today, because people who are no longer here kept it for us. If we still have it next year, if we have it when my children and your children are grown and in their turn have children and grandchildren, it will be because we understood this and appreciated it. It will be because we realize that you can keep a beautiful wild frontier like this in a great modern capital city only by making it a park and using it rightly and appreciating it and protecting it.

That's the big idea.

That's the significance of Rock Creek Park Day. This is a day that we shall all remember for many, many years—the time when, after 65 years, we first celebrated on a special day by itself our great privilege in being the possessors and protectors of Rock Creek Park—a day when we resolved to use it more wisely and protect it more carefully than ever before—kings ourselves of our own wild frontier.

Promotion of Friendly Relations Between the United States and France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, many Members of the Senate are familiar with the work done by Mr. A. N. Spanel to promote friendly relations between the United States and France.

I have in my hand an editorial, written by Mr. Spanel, which appeared on May 25 in the Washington Post and Times Herald, the New York Times, and other important papers in the principal cities of the Nation, as a public service sponsored by Mr. Spanel's company, the International Latex Corp., of Dover, Del.

I feel the editorial puts into present-day focus the historic alliance between the United States and France, a kinship which has endured for 175 years. I believe that it merits the attention of all Americans who value indispensable allies in a free and troubled world, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMERGENCE OF FRANCE

(By A. N. Spanel, chairman, International Latex Corp.)

A near miracle is in progress in France. It is the measurable process of a national recovery the credit for which, fairly and squarely, belongs to the hard-pressed, hard-working French men and women—and not to some mythical "Uncle."

Bled to exhaustion by Hitler's goose-stepping locusts who converted the whole of France into a national prison camp which they labeled "occupation," the people of France secretly nursed the hope for liberation; secretly worked for it, and heroically fought for it in the underground. We are apt to forget that in the first months of World War II France suffered nearly a million casualties.

To understand present-day French progress, we should remember that Hitler's retreating hordes blew up and laid waste enormous French areas. In bridges alone they destroyed a total of 2,800. Their calling card was occupation; their thank you note was destruction.

As though this was not enough, France found herself, soon after liberation, in a full-scale war in Indochina. It quickly became clear to the free Western World that the initial colonial aspect of this war had been transformed in fact and in deed into a war against communism in southeast Asia, and nothing less.

The United States and the whole free world had a vital interest in it, but it was French blood and the lives of the best youth of France that were sacrificed in this struggle.

Significantly, all the moneys given to France by the United States since 1946, every dollar and more, in a budgetary sense, was spent by the French Government in pursuit of a war against Communists in southeast Asia. This meant that while other countries of free Europe—foremost among them Germany, our deadly enemy of World War II—received billions of American dollars in reconstruction aid, the French people were obliged to rebuild a weakened and ravaged France with their own depleted resources, their own toil and sweat. Little wonder that their standard of living fell dangerously low, to the delight of the Communist vultures.

Today, a new France is emerging. In 1954 alone, her industrial production increased over 10 percent. Today her industrial machine is expanding and taxed to near capacity. The French automobile and electrical industries are flourishing, thanks to the introduction of widespread consumer credit. Like their American cousins, they are learning to enjoy these modern conveniences on budgeted, monthly payments. This year her industrial output will far exceed the gains of 1954.

Significantly, France has not had a serious strike in a year and a half. French currency and prices have remained remarkably stable for nearly 3 years. And in this period there has been an encouraging gain in treasury gold. Even so, there is a desperate, urgent need for housing and industrial modernization.

The backbone of the French economy is deeply rooted in a rich agricultural productivity. By our standards French farming is hardly mechanized, but by realistic standards of output, both as to quantity and quality, French agriculture (with little or no government aid) ranks among the best in the world. Fifty million horses play no small part in the success of French farming. There are about 5 million in the United States.

Recently, oil has been discovered in France and the initial success has been so encouraging that explorations are going on almost everywhere. We Americans can readily appreciate what this will mean for French industry, for her automobile business, home heating, and the inevitable network of roads.

Most important for the long pull is the fact that France, which has had a stationary population for over 100 years, now enjoys the highest birthrate in Western Europe.

France is "feeling her legs" again. She is going forward which means that Europe is certain to become progressively stronger. And a strong Europe is the best hope of the free western world. The more reason that France merits our sympathetic understanding and backing.

The French have a long way to go—their problems are many, both internal and external, but these vital allies of ours of 175 years standing, also have reason to be proud for what they have accomplished in the last 10 years in this hate-ridden and confused world.

(Presented as a public service by International Latex Corp., Playtex Park, Dover, Del.)

Contribution of Portland, Oreg., Golfers to United States Walker Cup Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Oregon and Portland are proud of the two young Portland golfers, from the Columbia Edgewater Country Club, who contributed so much to the United States Walker Cup victory on the famous old St. Andrews course in Scotland.

Dick Yost and Bruce Cudd contributed four points in the easy 10-to-2 United States victory margin, the second worst British defeat on their own grounds. It was an honor for Portland to have two men on the Walker Cup team representing all amateur golfers of the United States.

Mr. President, it is with pleasure that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the columns of the Portland Oregonian of May 24, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICTORY AT ST. ANDREWS

Portland is proud of its two young golf stars, Dick Yost and Bruce Cudd, who played famous old St. Andrews course in Scotland as confidently and masterfully as if they were on their own Columbia-Edgewater. It was a great honor for Portland to have 2 men on the Walker Cup team of 9 representing all the amateur golfers of the United States. Young Messrs. Cudd and Yost proved they had been chosen wisely, by contributing 4 points to the easy 10-2 margin by which the United States won the cup for the 14th time in 15 tries.

The British team was described as the strongest since the war. The American team was composed in large part of young and inexperienced players—inexperienced, that is, in international competition. The weather at St. Andrews was cold, wet, and windy. These factors tended to make the British optimistic that they at least might keep the score down. But only once before in Walker Cup competition had they been beaten so badly on their own grounds.

One doubts the weather was any handicap to the Portlanders. Rain and wind are common golfing companions to year-around players of the Pacific Northwest, and Yost and Cudd, of course, are year-arounders. The weather didn't slow the other Americans, either, and this is not surprising when one thinks of it, for American golfers play in tournaments over a large part of a continent which offers a wide variety of weather conditions.

The principal reason the United States has run up so unequal a record in Walker Cup matches and the reason the American team won so easily again the past weekend is that this country has an overwhelming supply of capable golfers. Although the British invented golf centuries ago, the game there is not the popular pastime it has become here in recent decades. Youngsters like Cudd and Yost are constantly coming up from the stiff competition on the United States more than 5,000 golf courses. (There are fewer than half that number in the rest of the world.) In Great Britain golf has been largely a game

of the leisure class, which is becoming smaller and smaller.

An old Glasgow golf enthusiast, Allan Munro, put it in a nutshell: "The Americans can name 10 different Walker Cup teams which could beat us."

Unless Great Britain can find the leisure, the money, and the vacant ground to make golf truly a game of the people, it is not likely that it will ever be able to complete on equal terms with the United States. Realization of this takes some of the shine off the brilliant victory won by the Americans at old St. Andrews.

Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I recently made over station WJAS, Pittsburgh, with introductory remarks by Alice Wherry Watson Schoenefeldt:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY MRS. ALICE WHERRY W. SCHOENEFELDT

The National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, adopted a resolution at the April 1953 Continental Congress, endorsing the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law 414. Immigration regulation has long been an American problem. There are those who want to open the gates of America to a vast number of immigrants, and then there are those who think we have already gone too far in opening the portals. The 82d Congress was responsive to the latter group, and recognized the present danger by passing the McCarran-Walter immigration and nationality law, which erected safeguards for our Nation. The legislation was built upon the sound foundation of 3 years of intensive study and investigation, and provides for a more complete screening of aliens, seeking to enter the United States. The McCarran-Walter Act was passed by both Houses of Congress in 1952, and was promptly vetoed by President Truman; but Congress immediately overruled the Truman veto, thereby putting the McCarran-Walter bill on the books. However, after the bill was passed, the groups that had been trying to defeat it, started mobilizing for a crusade to force a change and have the bill "remade" into a liberal pattern devised by the Humphrey-Lehman political faction. This pressure fight is still in progress, and is going on with fury and determination. The McCarran-Walter Act was written by two Democrats, the late Senator Pat McCarran, and Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER. Your speaker happens to be a staunch Republican. I believe in the McCarran-Walter Act because it protects and safeguards our country. We have learned that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and we cannot for one moment relax. The opposition has been hard at work writing letters to their Representatives demanding that the McCarran-Walter Act be scuttled. For every letter they have sent, we must send 10, urging the retention of the McCarran-Walter Act, without any weakening amendments.

And now may I present to you, from Washington, D. C., the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER:

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 15TH DISTRICT, PENNSYLVANIA, FOR PITTSBURGH CHAPTER DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION, ON STATION WJAS, PITTSBURGH, PA.

Congressional mail is swelling again with identical letters, postcards, some of them mimeographed, some of them printed, some of them written by hand—all demanding that our present immigration laws be junked and that a new law proposed by Senator LEHMAN, of New York, be enacted by Congress.

Coupled with this letter-writing campaign, another campaign goes on in newspapers, over some radio and television stations, and in magazines "fighting for a cause." That press, radio, and television campaign is primarily devoted to the vilification of the late Senator Pat McCarran and myself and to the law that bears our names—the McCarran-Walter Act—officially, the Immigration and Nationality Act.

What is this all about? It boils down to one simple question: How many immigrants from foreign countries is the United States to admit annually and where should those immigrants come from?

At the present time we admit immigrants from the whole world, but we make a distinction between those who were born on the continents of North and South America on the one hand and those who were born in other parts of the world on the other hand. We do not restrict the number of immigrants that we admit from the Western Hemisphere if they were born in that hemisphere. This policy, a direct corollary to the good-neighbor policy first proclaimed by President Roosevelt but actually an extension of the doctrine announced by President Monroe, is one of the pillars of our foreign policy.

Of course, we check whether those immigrants, born in the independent countries of the Western Hemisphere, are free of contagious diseases and whether or not they are criminals or subversives, or whether they appear to be able to make a living in the United States and not become public charges. But we do not put them under the annual quota which regulates the entry of immigrants born in places other than the independent countries of the Western Hemisphere.

What would the new bill sponsored by Senator LEHAN and some of his friends do with regard to immigrants born in the Western Hemisphere? It would restrict their entry, put them under numerical restrictions, under a quota. It appears to me that this is the best way to turn away from us the people who have been our best friends and whose friendship we must retain in these troubled times. I believe that this is an attempt to destroy our good relations with our closest neighbors. It is a truly devilish scheme to turn our Canadian and Latin-American friends away from us and to give aid and comfort to future Moscow agents like Arbenz, of Guatemala.

Having thus taken care of our Latin-American friends, Senator LEHMAN'S bill turns toward Europe and Asia and Africa, and it almost doubles the annual quota of immigrants from the present 154,657 to 250,000. At the same time, Senator LEHMAN'S bill throws out the window the time-tested formula of national origins, under which quota numbers were allocated since 121 to natives of the various countries of the world, and substitutes for it a giveaway system of immigrant visas. Instead of a mathematical formula under which every country of the world which is put under the quota is being allocated a fair share of the total number of immigrants which we annually admit to the United States, three politicians, appointed by the President of the United States, would distribute the immigration quotas according to—I guess—their own will, or, more likely, to the amount of pressure put upon them by lobbyists or national, or religious groups, each of which has its own ax to grind. As I have said before, I much prefer that visas be allocated under a formula devised by mathematicians rather than under one contrived by politicians.

In looking at all this maneuvering with a problem as vital to the survival of this Nation as immigration, it should be borne in mind that our annual immigration quota of 154,657 is but a base. We actually admit more than double this figure, because under the McCarran-Walter Act all wives, all husbands, and all children of United States citizens come in outside of the quota restrictions. Suffice it to say that in the case of the British island of Jamaica, for instance, where the annual quota is 100, we have admitted to the United States for permanent residence in the fiscal year 1954 not less than 2,100 people, or not less than 21 times the quota. In the case of countries with larger quotas, like Italy, for instance, which has a quota of 5,645, we have admitted in the last fiscal year 15,501 immigrants of Italian birth, which is 3 times the quota.

An impartial report just submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House states that the total annual increase of immigration in the last fiscal year was 22 percent over the number admitted in the preceding year. In addition to immigrants, we have admitted well over half a million visitors, businessmen, students, foreign merchants, artists, performers, sportsmen, etc. The grand total of admission of aliens in the year just ended was over 770,000.

Now please bear in mind the simple fact that many of those who enter for temporary periods get married here, or otherwise manage to stay permanently, which further increases our total intake of new population.

In that regard it is good to cast a look from time to time on statistical data published regularly by the Bureau of the Census of the United States Department of Commerce. By January 1, 1955, the total population of the United States had reached 164 million people. For the first time in our history we had 4 million babies born in this country in the year 1954—God bless them and God bless their mothers and fathers. The year 1954 was the eighth year in succession in which births exceeded 3½ million annually.

With the mortality rate—another blessing—declining and reaching the record low rate of 9.2 deaths per 1,000 population in the year 1954, this Nation is annually growing by very close to 3 million people at the present time and will grow in excess of 3 million people annually within the next decade. I better say right away that this is a conservative estimate not taking into account the vitality of our young generation.

I believe that before we go on admitting increasing numbers of immigrants, we better stop, have a look around, and take stock of our natural resources, of the progress in our industry, and of the growing number of unemployed Americans. It is well known that in my own district and in the districts of eastern and western Pennsylvania, as well as in Kentucky, in West Virginia, and in other places, the number of unemployed coal miners alone has reached truly dangerous proportions. A similar situation begins to show in the steel industry and in the automobile industry. Some people blame it on what they call "automation," which displaces workers and permits machines to take their jobs away.

We do not know at the present time what our record-breaking increase of population and the new methods of industrial production will do to our labor market. When we have reached the point where a baby is being

born in the United States every 8 seconds, and an immigrant enters this country every 2 minutes, it is better to pause and to do a little counting and reasoning before we jump into what at least one proponent of Senator LEHMAN'S bill—Dr. Israel Goldstein, the president of the American Jewish Congress—recommends, namely, that we admit immigrants in proportion to the size of population in their own countries. Dr. Goldstein said recently on a TV program that we have to increase immigration quotas for Japan because that country has a population of 70 million people and for India because the population of that country has exceeded 300 million. Well, I asked Dr. Goldstein, should we not turn over all of our immigration quota to China, since that country has a population of 600 million people?

I fully realize that this is an absurd question, but I am putting it to Dr. Goldstein, in order to dramatize the danger of departing from formulas that fit and benefit the United States in the first place. After all, the United States Congress has an obligation to its own country rather than to the outer world, or am I wrong on that? I often wonder.

Memorial Day Address by Hon. James E. Van Zandt, 20th District of Pennsylvania, at the Annual Memorial Day Services, Roosevelt Junior High School, Altoona, Pa., May 27, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on May 27, 1955, to deliver the following address at the annual Memorial Day services of Roosevelt Junior High School, Altoona, Pa.:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor to be invited to join you this morning in your annual tribute to the veterans of America's wars who offered their lives on the altar of freedom.

This annual Memorial Day tribute to our honored dead not only represents a symbol of devotion to their sacrifices but is a constant reminder of the part the young men and women of this Nation played in protecting our cherished liberties on the field of battle.

The observance of Memorial Day, or Decoration Day, as it was called originally, dates back to 1864, when women of Pennsylvania and Virginia placed flowers upon the graves of Union and Confederate soldiers.

In 1868 Gen. John A. Logan, commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, an organization composed of those who served in the Union Army during the Civil War, issued his famous general order No. 11, designatinng May 30 of each year as Decoration Day, for the purpose of paying floral tribute to the Civil War dead.

That was the beginning of the nationwide practice of eulogizing America's war dead on May 30, which is now known as Memorial Day.

Let me read in part General Logan's famous general order No. 11, issued in 1868:

"We should guard their graves with sacred vigilance.

"All the consecrated wealth and care that the Nation can add to their adornment and security is but a fitting tribute to the memory of her slain defenders.

"Let no wanton foot tread rude on such hallowed ground.

"Let pleasant paths invite the coming and going of reverent visitors and fond mourners.

"Let no vandalism or avarice or neglect, no ravage of time, testify to the present or coming generations that we have forgotten as a people the cost of a free and undivided country.

"If other eyes grow dull and other hands slack and other hearts cold in the solemn trust, ours shall keep it well as long as the light and warmth of life remain to us.

"Let us then, at the time appointed, gather round their sacred remains and garland the passionless mounds above them with the choicest flowers of springtime; let us raise above them the dear old flag they saved from dishonor; let us in their solemn presence renew our pledges to aid and assist those whom they have left among us, a sacred charge of a Nation's gratitude—the soldiers' widows and orphans."

Thus, Memorial Day was born and has become a beautiful custom which has been kept alive down through the years, sponsored by America's great veterans' organizations, and with the wholehearted cooperation of the American people.

Each year the graves of the Nation's heroes are decorated with flowers and the American flag, then the familiar three-volley salute by the firing squad, and, finally, the bugle call of taps, known the Nation over as the traditional and reverent tribute to our honored dead.

Let me pose this question:

Why do we pay this tribute to those veterans who have passed to the great beyond?

And still another question.

What is the purpose of the annual pilgrimages to the graves of those who are no longer with us?

The answer to these questions is because we, the people of a free nation, realize we can never repay in any manner those who fought and died to preserve the American heritage and who helped to perpetuate the freedoms so dearly bought during the American Revolution.

Therefore, with a deep sense of pride and gratitude, we conduct memorial rites and visit graves so that all Americans will understand that what we enjoy today was gained with great sacrifice, and that liberty as we know it on this continent is unique and must be jealously guarded.

Those who are honored on Memorial Day were sentinels of this Republic.

In the performance of their duty, they made sacrifices which are not ordinarily demanded of the average citizen, and in so doing, relinquished their personal freedom.

Many of them in their increasing devotion to American ideals made the supreme sacrifice in order that this Nation, as a citadel of freedom, could be perpetuated for those of us who followed them.

These sacrifices began when our courageous forefathers broke the bonds with the mother country.

Later, similar sacrifices were required of those who, after a long and bloody Civil War, reunited to build what has become the great foundation for liberty throughout the world.

In our own generation, on three occasions, more men, and women, too, stepped forward resolutely to protect our Nation from those who threatened it with a form of tyranny which would have forfeited our rich and blessed land.

On each occasion these hostile forces were repelled at a great loss of life and money.

Today we honor them as we meet to pay solemn tribute to all patriots.

Although dead they will live forever in our hearts because of the noble part they played in preserving this Nation.

During the Memorial Day observance, as taps are sounded throughout the Nation, we are reminded that many beautiful words have been written to the notes of this traditional bugle call taps, which signifies the day's end for the soldier, sailor, marine, and airman.

Taps has become known down through the years as the "all is well" signal that the duties for the day are over, and that rest has finally come to men wearied in battle.

It is recorded that a soldier in a hospital saw a comrade being carried away to his last resting place.

He asked the chaplain, "Are you going to have taps sounded over my buddy's grave?"

The chaplain replied, "Certainly. It is the most beautiful of all the military calls, and is an appropriate symbol of farewell to a comrade in arms."

"Chaplain," said the soldier, "he was my buddy. We lay side by side on the field of battle, suffering from wounds.

"Now he is gone.

"Please, instead of playing taps for him, will you sound reveille?

"You see, he is just beginning to live."

The soldier's request was understandable, because, if one has true religion, and if he believes in a life hereafter, death is the beginning of eternal life and not the end of everything.

We, too, can learn a lesson from the soldier's conversation with his chaplain by sounding reveille in our hearts, not for those whom we wish to commemorate for their heroism and their great personal sacrifice, but for ourselves.

For us this can be a new beginning, a challenge to go forward in our zeal to protect our Nation.

It is for us to hold high the torch which our hero dead were forced to yield in their struggle to preserve the freedom which we are permitted to enjoy as citizens of this great Republic.

Memorial Day 1955 should remind us of our unfinished task.

Within our Nation's borders are those who would destroy the very things for which these noble dead gave the last full measure of devotion.

Therefore, we must be alert to the dangers that still confront us as a nation of freedom-loving Americans.

Although we may not be able to express our pride of American citizenship in a forcible manner, we should feel in our hearts as 16-year-old Elizabeth Evans did when she was inspired to write a prize poem teeming with patriotism.

This young American said, in part:

"I am an American.

"Listen to my words Fascist, Communist.

"Listen well, for my country is a strong country, and my message is a strong message.

"I am an American.

"My ancestors have left their blood on the green at Lexington and the snow at Valley Forge, on the walls of Fort Sumter and the fields at Gettysburg, on the waters of the River Marne and in the shadows of the Argonne Forest, on the beachheads of Salerno and Normandy and the sands of Okinawa, on the bare bleak hills called Pork Chop and Old Baldy and Heartbreak Ridge. A million and more of my countrymen have died for freedom.

* * * * *

"This is my answer Fascist, Communist.

"Show me a country greater than our country.

"Show me a people more energetic, creative, progressive, bigger-hearted, and happier than our people.

"Not until then will I consider your way of life.

"For I am an American."

These were the inspiring words of 16-year-old Elizabeth Evans, which are echoed by all true Americans.

Therefore, let us resolve on this Memorial Day that taps shall have a new meaning to all of us.

Let the beautiful and traditional bugle strains pierce the breezes with those familiar words of Sir Walter Scott, "Soldier rest, thy warfare o'er."

For us, the living, let us sound reveille in our souls on this Memorial Day and rededicate ourselves to the ceaseless struggle to preserve our great principles of liberty and freedom, which are twin monuments of enduring memory to those who died in freedom's cause.

A Report on Financial Woes of Schools Training Physicians for a Growing Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article by Howard A. Rusk, M. D., entitled "A Report on Financial Woes of Schools Training Physicians for a Growing Need." The article is from the New York Times of May 29, 1955. The problem of the need for increased medical education is a very real one, and I encourage all the Members of the House to review Dr. Rusk's article.

A REPORT ON FINANCIAL WOES OF SCHOOLS TRAINING PHYSICIANS FOR A GROWING NEED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

If our national supply of physicians is to be increased to meet the growing demands for health services and keep pace with our expanding population, it is obvious that the number of our medical school graduates must be increased.

Our Nation's 80 medical schools are now in need of $10 million a year more than their current financial resources to keep their training, research, and patient-care programs at present levels.

The average cost of training a physician is estimated at $13,000—more than double the cost 20 years ago. If the direct costs of free services provided for 2 million people a year in medical school hospitals and clinics were added, this would be much higher.

Of the $3,000 to $4,000 a year it costs to educate a medical school student, he pays from $600 to $1,000 in tuition. The remainder must be met by gifts, income from endowment, general university funds, or public funds in the case of tax-supported institutions.

In his excellent public-affairs pamphlet, The Challenge to Medical Education, Robert M. Cunningham, Jr., points out succinctly why these additional costs cannot come from the students. Medical tuitions have increased 85 percent since 1940. A survey of 6,000 medical school students shows that one-third of them borrowed money to continue in school.

TUITION RISE OPPOSED

To further increase tuition would restrict medical education to a few chosen on an economic basis. It would not only deny many deserving and capable students the opportunity to study medicine but would lower the quality of our health care in the future.

Nor can most universities expend a larger proportion of their general budgets on medical education. Most medical schools now absorb 30 percent of the total budgets of the universities of which they are a part, although they have but 10 percent of the total student enrollment.

It is also unrealistic to think that present budgets can be reduced without substantially lowering the quality of instruction. Many schools have already reduced teaching staffs to the minimum, and faculty salaries have not kept pace with higher costs of living and opportunities in private practice.

Scientific and technical developments constantly mean more expenditures for special equipment so these new advances can be included in the curriculums. An electron microscope, for example, costs $20,000; an analytic centrifuge, $14,000; electrophoretic equipment, $13,000. Upkeep and maintenance are also costly.

One new source of income for medical education in recent years has been the National Fund for Medical Education, a nonprofit corporation of leaders in business, education, and welfare, which is soliciting funds for medical education from business corporations. At the same time the American Medical Educational Foundation is soliciting contributions from physicians. These proceeds are then pooled for distribution to the medical schools in accordance with a formula developed by the foundation, American Medical Association, and Association of American Medical Colleges.

To date, nearly $7 million has been distributed and another $2,500,000 is expected to be available for distribution this summer.

HELP IS NOT SUFFICIENT

This is encouraging, but it is not enough. The National Fund for Medical Education is a significant and successful venture. It has not, however, provided the level of financial assistance that our medical schools must have if they are to continue their present responsibilities, let alone expand their enrollments.

Earlier this month the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare started hearings on legislation that would authorize a 5-year Federal program of financial grants to medical schools for the construction of medical, educational, and research facilities.

The legislation proposes that $50 million be allocated annually for 5 years to enable the Public Health Service to make grants for the construction of new medical schools and the expansion and improvement of facilities in existing schools.

Except in certain instances of new schools or existing schools that would agree to increase enrollments, grants would be limited to half the cost of such construction. The legislation also provides that no one school would receive more than $3 million during the 5-year program.

There are some who fear that Federal grants-in-aid to medical schools are not desirable, as they might lead to some degree of Federal control over medical schools.

FEDERAL AID AT WORK

For a number of years, however, the National Institutes of Health have been providing Federal grants to the 4-year medical schools for specific teaching programs in heart, cancer, and mental health. Government supervision has been limited to seeing that the funds are used for designated purposes, and there have been no complaints of Federal control.

Similarly the Department of Defense has been making grants to a limited number of schools for experimental programs of teaching military medicine. Again there have been no problems of Federal control.

Our land-grant colleges, which have benefitted from aid under the Morrill Act of 1862 and its amendments, have not complained of Federal control. Nor have there been complaints of Federal control in the administration of the Hill-Burton program for Federal grants for hospital construction.

There is a continuing need for industry's support of the important program of the National Fund for Medical Education. At the same time, however, it would seem that a carefully conceived and administered program of Federal grants to medical schools for the construction of medical, educational, and research facilities would be a realistic and practical corollary to the efforts of the National Fund for Medical Education.

If both of these programs are successful, the current acute financial problems of our Nation's medical schools would be solved and it would be possible to train a sufficient number of physicians to meet our national needs.

Failure of either, however, will mean the necessity of resorting to general Federal aid for medical education. There is no alternative. Our Nation must have enough physicians to meet the increasing demands of our growing population.

The Shifting Vaccine Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the May 29, 1955, issue of the New York Herald Tribune:

THE SHIFTING VACCINE PROBLEM

Since the issuance of the favorable report by Dr. Francis on the Salk antipolio vaccine on April 12, public reaction to the great discovery has passed through three distinct phases, as various aspects of the situation became prominent.

The first mood was one of unquestioning jubilation at the knowledge that science had supplied a magnificent new weapon to combat a disease which had brought fear and suffering to many. That emotion may have been excessive in the sense that it obscured problems certain to arise; there is every reason for confidence, however, that it is the one which will best characterize the introduction of Dr. Salk's vaccine.

The second phase was a preoccupation with the problem of distribution. As the limitations on supply and the magnitude of the demand became clear to the American people, there was a disturbing realization that the precious stuff was not being applied exclusively to those in greatest need. The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis had, to be sure, contracted for the bulk of the supply, for free distribution under conditions which it imposed. But the Foundation's authority was strictly limited, and vaccine outside the contract requirements was going into strange channels.

The third stage began late in April, when it became apparent that there was an unexpectedly high poliomyelitis rate among those vaccinated with the product of the Cutter Laboratories. The effect of this development still clouds the fight against polio, worrying parents, complicating the distribution problem and presenting a number of

difficult questions for scientists, manufacturers, and public health authorities.

The first two phases could have been readily foreseen. It should have been apparent that a report endorsing the Salk vaccine, on the basis of last year's tests, would surely awaken a storm of happy excitement, and that the pressure for the swiftest, widest, and fairest distribution of the serum would become intense. Until it is definitely known in what respect the two lots of Cutter vaccine that caused the trouble differ from safe vaccine, it will not be possible to say whether this contingency, too, could have been guarded against. But certainly the possibility that some unusual manifestation might appear in a new treatment should have been recognized—not merely as a scientific problem, demanding prompt recall of the suspect vaccine and reexamination of methods of manufacturing and testing (which was done) but as a crisis of public confidence.

Unfortunately, no apparatus was available to deal with any aspect of this complex situation on a national scale, except by a slowly organized, clumsy, voluntary organization. The scientists have worked hard and selflessly, the manufacturers have cooperated, communities have improvised methods of policing distribution. The President has given assurance that no one in the ages susceptible to polio will be debarred by economic considerations from receiving the protection of the vaccine. New and rigorous testing procedures have been introduced to insure safety, so far as is humanly possible. Yet the crisis of confidence persists.

It does so for the same basic reason that created it: the lack of a central authority which could speak with equal clarity and force to doctor and layman, to manufacturer and local health official.

Such an authority—national in scope, headed by men of national prestige—could have curbed the confusion which has marked the last several weeks. It could still meet the present dilemma, in which distribution is lagging, because of the new tests; in which numerous parents are refusing to have their children inoculated and in which the period of highest polio incidence is rapidly approaching. Valuable time has been lost in setting up such an instrumentality, but it is not yet too late—if Congress acts forthwith.

American Legion Urges No Curtailment of House Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution passed by the national executive committee of the American Legion meeting held May 4 to 6, 1955:

RESOLUTION 55

Commission: National Americanism commission.

Subject: Urge no curtailment of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Whereas the American Legion feels the House Un-American Activities Committee of our Congress has done an outstanding job in the field of anticommunism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the national executive committee of the American Legion, assembled in Indianapolis, Ind., May 4–6, 1955, urge that the functions and powers of the House Un-American Activities Committee be not hampered or curtailed by any proposed administrative redesignation or subordination; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our United States Representatives in Congress.

PTA's Are a Vehicle That the Radical Integrationists Are Using To Destroy State Sovereignty and Individual Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a motley group of prointegrationists planned to stage a packed meeting at the Annandale, Va., High School on April 30 for propaganda purposes. This staged meeting was to be known as a workshop on integration.

The workshop organizers had prepared a program to be completely dominated by those advocating mixed schools for whites and blacks, and opposing separate schools.

Learning of this proposed packed meeting, PTA members and other citizens interested in the proper administration of the Fairfax County school system attended the open meeting, and by their vote showed the overwhelming sentiment of the meeting to be directly opposite the prointegrationist views of those who staged the so-called workshop program.

At this meeting a talk was made by Mr. Paul Lee Sweeny, Fairfax attorney and civic leader and a member of one of the Fairfax County Parent-Teacher Associations.

I am pleased to insert herewith Mr. Sweeny's talk to the group meeting in the Annandale High School on the occasion above mentioned:

PTA'S ARE A VEHICLE THAT THE RADICAL INTEGRATIONISTS ARE USING TO DESTROY STATE SOVEREIGNTY AND INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY—FAIRFAX COUNTY PTA COUNCIL WORKSHOP TYPICAL OF TACTICS USED BY LEFTISTS TO MISLEAD AND INDOCTRINATE PEOPLE

(Preface: An attempt to put the parents and teachers of Fairfax County, Va., on record on the subject of integration was scotched on Saturday, April 30, when a meeting that had been primed to come up with an integration recommendation was invaded by enough parents and citizens to sway the vote the other way, whereupon the PTA Federation-sponsored group of speakers left the hall and held a rump session in the schoolyard at Annandale High School. Meanwhile, the group of citizens charged with breaking up the preplanned session formed a new group to be known as the Virginia Citizens Association for Better Schools. The following prepared statement was read to the new group by Paul Lee Sweeny, Fairfax attorney and civic leader, and a member of one of the local PTA's in the county:)

As representative of the Fairfax Chapter of the Defenders of State Sovereignty and Individual Liberty, I have been drafted by a great many deeply concerned Americans to come to what was to have been this PTA workshop and attempt to see that the real facts relating to the school integration issue are made known to the parents and the teachers.

Under the guise of presenting all the facts about the grave crisis in public education brought on by the 1954 Supreme Court opinion holding segregated public schools unconstitutional, the Fairfax County PTA's have been manipulated by the prointegrationists into holding this meeting at which only those favoring mixed schools will be heard from the platform.

When this meeting was first announced it was stated that those favoring alternatives to integrated public schools would be on the program, more specifically, a member of the Virginia governor's commission. During the last several months a studied campaign has been carried on in the local PTA's to try to place them on record for integrated schools—a campaign involving controlled meetings at which only one side of the issue has been presented, packing of the meetings with proponents of integration without adequate notice to the opponents, passing out of loaded questionnaires, and all the other devices of trickery and low political maneuvering. At the last minute a panel of members for this workshop was announced without any member of the governor's commission, a panel, all of whom are red-hot integrationists or officials who must take a completely neutral position.

Yes, we have Mr. Benjamin Muse, a prointegrationist in the allout integrationist Washington Post, a paper that deliberately censors and refuses to publish news that is unfavorable to the integration point of view. We have Rev. Robert Emerson Smith, of the prointegrationist Virginia Council of Churches, and Mrs. Lois Burton, of the prointegrationist Arlington Association of University Women. It was proposed to have two school officials from Washington, D. C., both of whom would lose their jobs immediately if they expressed any opinions or brought out any facts adverse to integration.

But not only was the program packed with advocates of integration, the audience was to have been controlled so that they could not freely express anti-integrationist sentiments and bring out the sordid facts associated with this perverted program. When we asked that a speaker be allowed to present the other point of view, we were told that I might have 5 minutes after Mr. Muse finished his 30-minute speech.

What kind of speech can you make in 5 minutes on a subject of so great consequence?

This refusal to accord me equal time to present my views in opposition to integration in the schools exposes completely the biased nature of this meeting. The sponsors were afraid to have the facts surrounding integration brought out at this meeting because they did not wish to be fair and to present any objective approach to the subject.

For example, they do not wish to allow what is happening in Washington under integration to come to light; but let me tell you the newest problem there. Integration has killed the flexibility in the school system that previously permitted children to attend schools anywhere in the city according to their intellectual abilities. Both white to Negro children tended to go to the schools where there were children of their own attainments or abilities: average, subnormal, or above the average. So the Park View Negro School was considered the best for exceptional Negro children, and was attended by Negro children from all over the city if they were intelligent enough. Now it is different. The boundaries are strictly and rigid for all children, white and Negro, must

attend the school in the neighborhood where they live. The individual child's adjustment is sacrificed to this rigid ruling. So, intelligent whites and Negroes are suffering. School standards are deteriorating, for either the drones are sacrificed to the children of average or above the average intelligence, or, these are sacrificed to the drones. Actually, both are sacrificed and educational standards are steadily dropping. But the joker is that two-sevenths of the city is untouched by integration, for no Negroes live in those neighborhoods. There is where live many Congressmen, Mr. NIXON, Mr. Brownell, and members of the Board of Education. They can prate about integration for their children are untouched, as yet, by the agitators.

This just shows what the sponsors of this meeting, and of many others like it, are after. Their object is to dish out propaganda in order to condition your minds and the minds of the other citizens of the country to accept their ultimate aim of complete integration of the children in the schools and the complete amalgamation of the white and black races. This action on the part of the sponsors of this meeting is not in accord with the best interests of the overwhelming majority of the parents and of other citizens of this county. The program which they desire to present to you has been laid down for them by persons outside the State of Virginia, with no knowledge of, or interest in, the welfare of the children and the people of Virginia. I refer to the National Congress of the PTA's headquarters in Chicago, Ill. By their actions here today, the sponsors of this meeting have demonstrated that they are not interested in the welfare of the citizens of this county but are willing to follow the dictates of persons far removed from and with no interest in the welfare of the county.

The propriety of such a meeting as this at this time, when the Supreme Court is still deliberating the terms of its decision in the so-called segregation cases, is open to serious question. The bylaws of the PTA groups provide that the local PTA groups shall not interfere in the administrative affairs of the schools. The question of who goes to what school is certainly an administrative problem. There are many other considerations involved in such a determination, other than the color of the child. More important are such matters as mental, moral, and health standards. Any intelligent approach to the problem must consider all of these questions. Syphilis in the blood stream is an insidious destroyer of nerve and brain cells, leading eventually to insanity and death. Any unnecessary exposure of any group of children to this peril is to be avoided at all costs as a threat to the very fiber of our civilization. We have only to look to those nations to the south of this country where integration is practiced to see the effect it has on the minds of men and the character of the peoples' civilization.

Nor is there anything in the opinion of the Supreme Court of May 1954 that requires integration in the public schools. The opinion of the Supreme Court at the present time has not reached the stage of being a decision since no decree has been formulated. It therefore does not have any force or effect whatsoever at this time, since it can be changed by the Court on its own motion at any time. On the contrary, section 140 of the constitution of Virginia specifically and expressly prohibits the teaching of white and colored children in the same schools. That is the law of Virginia, and we are all bound by it. It has not been amended, altered, or repealed in any way. The Supreme Court cannot, by the very nature of our system of government and separation of powers, tell the States that they must operate integrated schools. There is no mention of the word "education" in the Constitution of the United States, and the entire matter of education is left to the States.

The Supreme Court does not have legislative power, this being expressly given to the Congress of the United States by section 1 of the Constitution. Decisions of the Supreme Court, when formulated and entered, do not even then become any part of the supreme law of the land. Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides that the supreme law of the land shall consist of the Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land. Nowhere is there any mention in the Constitution of decisions of the Supreme Court as forming any part of the supreme law of the land. Supreme Court decisions are not, and ought not to be, any part of the supreme law of the land. They are handed down in the first instance by the judiciary and not by the legislative arm of the Government. They are subject to change overnight by the same court that handed them down in the first place, none of the members of which are elected by the people nor directly responsible to the people for their conduct.

The approach of the Supreme Court to this question is, and always must be, purely negative. It can only say, within the language of the Constitution, what the States cannot do in the field of public education, never what they must do. It cannot tell the States they must maintain integrated schools. It can say no more than that, upon the facts of a given case, the practices of the States in this field are or are not discriminatory. Basis for such a holding as this must be grounded on the language of the Constitution. The Court cannot by judicial usurpation of power, legislate in the field of public education, nor in any other field. Enforcement of the Supreme Court's pronouncements can be attained only by statutory implementation by act of Congress or through the contempt citation. Not even the power of a constitutional amendment, fortified by acts of Congress, sufficed to enforce prohibition. In the last analysis, the decision of the Supreme Court, like acts of Congress, depend upon whether or not they reflect the will of the people.

There is a very serious question in my mind as to the reason for the clamor at the present time by this group, and by some others, for integration, in advance of the Supreme Court decision on the subject. Would it not be better procedure at least to wait until the Supreme Court hands down its decision in the form of a decree, in order to see what it provides, before discussing ways and means of bringing about a tremendous social upheaval as is bound to follow any attempt to enforce the decrees of the Supreme Court? How can anyone intelligently discuss the best means of dealing with a decision of the Supreme Court when they do not know yet what the terms of the decision will be? The conclusion is inescapable that this meeting here today is but another part of a well-organized program by the proponents of racial and biological integration to condition the public mind so that the people of this country will so far surrender their individual liberties as to meekly accept the terms of the Court decree when or if it is finally rendered. It is hoped in this way to bring about racial amalgamation and thus help these people to fulfill political ambitions even though it means eventual destruction of our way of life and our civilization. It is my firm belief that before the story is told in full the proponents of integration will learn that the white race is not yet ready to abdicate its place of leadership in our society and that the expected political rewards for their perfidy will not materialize.

The myth of judicial infallibility is exploded by a reference to the case of *Gong Lum* v. *Rice* (275 U. S. 78) decided by the United States Supreme Court in a unanimous opinion handed down 28 years ago by Chief Justice Taft. That Court, composed of men of great judicial stature, such as Oliver Wendell Holmes, Brandeis, and others, stated in an opinion directly contrary to the opinion of May 1954: "The right and power of the State to regulate the method of providing for the education of its youth at public expense is clear. * * * The education of the people in schools maintained by State taxation is a matter belonging to the respective States, and any interference on the part of Federal authority with the management of such schools cannot be justified except in the case of a clear and unmistakable disregard of rights secured by the supreme law of the land. * * * The same question * * * has been many times decided to be within the constitutional power of the State legislature to settle without intervention of the Federal courts under the Federal Constitution. * * * (citation of 15 earlier opinions). * * * The decision is within the discretion of the State in regulating its public schools and does not conflict with the 14th amendment."

In its opinion of May 17, 1954, in the case of *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka* (347 U. S. 483) the Supreme Court brushed aside all of the reason and logic embodied in the foregoing well-settled principles in one sentence and in referring to the Gong Lum case twice erroneously referred to the child involved as a boy when in fact it was a Chinese girl named Martha Lum whose father, Gong Lum, instituted the suit in her behalf. This circumstance raises a serious question whether the Court even read the earlier opinion in the Gong Lum case.

It remains to be seen whether or not the opinion of the Supreme Court of May 17, 1954, arrived at solely by a reference to the writings of certain psychologists, and in considering as it did only the alleged effects of segregation on the colored child without any discussion of or thought given to the effect of enforced integration on the mental, moral, and health standards of the white child, will be able to stand the test of time and the assault of logic and legal reasoning that may be expected henceforth to challenge its validity.

The Death of William Burchfield Ross, Vice President and Editor Emeritus of the DuBois (Pa.) Courier-Express Reduces the Ever-Thinning Ranks of of Pioneer Newspapermen

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker—

Till, like a clock worn out with eating time,
The wheels of weary life at last stood still.
—*Dryden.*

When the angel of death on May 11, 1955, summoned William Burchfield Ross, vice president and editor emeritus of the DuBois (Pa.) Courier-Express, the DuBois area lost one of its most highly respected residents.

Born in DuBois, Pa., 77 years ago, Bill, as he was affectionately known, spent the greater part of 62 years of a busy and useful life with daily newspapers in that city.

None will deny the power of the daily newspaper in molding public opinion and influencing the human mind. By reason of the tremendous power of the press, there devolves upon newspaper editors the solemn obligation to discharge their responsibility to their community for fair and accurate reporting of the news.

Bill Ross, from his editorial chair, steadfastly adhered to the high principles of his profession, abhorring yellow journalism conscious of the fact, that above all things, it has no place in a hometown newspaper which must be fit for all the family to read.

Bill began his apprenticeship in journalism at the age of 15 and the 62 remaining years of his life were devoted to upholding the lofty principles and ethics of the fourth estate. His journalistic career embraced the period often referred to as the horse-and-buggy era when putting a paper to bed was a man-size job for the average editor.

In the early 1900's there was great difficulty in collecting news as compared with present-day methods. Many of us recall the common practice of standing in front of hometown newspaper offices until the wee small hours of the morning eager to obtain the results of political contests, sporting events, and so forth, from bulletins posted in the window of the newspaper office.

Bill Ross for years was night editor of the DuBois Morning Courier. For many years he held that position working nights while the populace slept to make certain that the DuBois Morning Courier like the proverbial bottle of milk would be on the doorstep of every reader bright and early in the morning. In later years the Morning Courier acquired the DuBois Evening Express and the merger resulted in changing the name to the DuBois Courier-Express which after a period of time was changed to its present status as an evening newspaper.

Oldtime residents of DuBois in particular have long appreciated the services Bill Ross rendered them as readers of the DuBois Morning Courier and the Courier-Express. For many years, Harold T. Gray as president; Lloyd F. Mohney, treasurer and general manager; Jason S. Gray as secretary; and Frank "Hap" Gillung as city editor; with Bill Ross as vice president and editor comprised the quintet that guided the destinies of the DuBois Courier-Express with the avowed determination to maintain its high standing as an ideal family newspaper.

The long, hard grind of editing a daily newspaper and serving in the executive position as vice president took its toll of the genial, quiet, and unassuming Bill Ross with the result that ill health forced his retirement as editor in 1953. He was named, however, editor emeritus and continued his interest in the Courier-Express until his recent death.

Bill Ross performed his work diligently, quietly, and efficiently down through the years. Many employees of the Courier-Express acknowledge their debt of gratitude to Bill for the kindly criticism and wholesome advice he gave them as they embarked upon their journalistic careers with faltering courage and stumbling steps. He was in truth a father confessor to many cub reporters, who today are better newspapermen because they crossed paths on the highway of life with Bill Ross.

When speaking or thinking about the field of journalism, we are always reminded of the importance to newspapermen of the task of acquiring one of the cardinal requisites of their profession—"a nose for news."

The important task of gathering news admits them to palaces and hovels as they seek interviews with persons in all walks of life. In following their profession, their badge of authority is the traditional "Press Pass" which admits them unchallenged to every conceivable event of public interest.

In speaking of this special privilege, I am reminded of a certain stanza of verse the author of which is unknown to me:

Some day I'll pass by the Great Gates of Gold
And see a man pass through unquestioned and bold.
"A saint?" I'll ask, and old Peter'll reply:
"No, he carries a pass—he's a newspaper guy."

Bill Ross in the opinion of his vast legion of friends was a real newspaper guy. This fact is further attested to by his associates on the newspaper staff especially Harold T. Gray, president, and Jason S. Gray, secretary of the Courier-Express, together with Marv Bloom, a highly talented and versatile staff writer. These three close friends and associates of the late Bill Ross have written eulogies expressing their down-to-earth impressions of him and which I wish to make part of my remarks at the conclusion of this tribute to my departed friend.

It is common knowledge that Bill Ross was in failing health the past several years yet he was reluctant to curtail his daily activities until his illness forced him to relinquish his editorial duties and engage in a less strenuous daily routine. Bill found it a difficult task to retire to the sidelines after 62 years of active participation in the publishing of a daily newspaper. His retirement, which he so richly earned, proved to be of short duration for with ebbing strength, he answered the final summons as the evening shadows began to fall on May 11, 1955. Like the dreamer in the poem, When I Sail Away, by Elizabeth Clark Hardy, Bill Ross turned his eyes toward the eternal sea in the evening twilight of a beautiful day in May and was ready:

Sometime at eve, when the tide is low,
I shall slip my moorings and sail away,
With no response to the friendly hail
Of kindred craft in the busy bay.
In the silent hush of the twilight pale,
When the night swoops down to embrace the day.
And the voices call in the water's flow—
Sometime at eve, when the tide is low,
I shall slip my moorings and sail away.
Through purple shades that darkly trail
O'er the ebbing tide of the unknown sea,
I shall fare me away with a dip of sail
And a ripple of waters to tell the tale
Of a lonely voyager, sailing away
To mystic isles, where at anchor lay
The craft of those who have sailed before,
O'er the unknown sea to the unseen shore.
A few who have watched me sail away
Will miss my craft from the busy bay;
Some friendly barks that were anchored near,
Some loving souls that my heart held dear,
In silent sorrow will drop a tear.
But I shall have peacefully furled my sail
In moorings sheltered from storm and gale
And greeted the friends who have sailed before
O'er the unknown sea to the unseen shore.

The following tributes to the late Bill Ross appeared in the DuBois (Pa.) Courier-Express. These sincere expressions are from the pens of three of Bill's close associates, and are eloquent testimony of his noble character summed up in the words of Byron:

He had kept the whiteness of his soul, and thus,
Men over him wept.

BILL ROSS PASSES

(By Harold T. Gray)

The office force of the Courier-Express will miss the almost daily visit which Bill Ross made to his desk in the editorial office every nice afternoon, when he hadn't been confined to the hospital for the past few years. Before that, one could have found him in the office at odd hours, both on weekdays and Sundays, for his desk was almost his home, and it was there that he used to sit for hours, looking over local exchanges, and making notes for his next issue. Bill, during the past few years, seldomly took a vacation, and then for only a day or two, seemingly always glad to get back to his desk. We suggested 2 years ago that he go with one of the James Wick tours to Europe and the Near East, with the idea that it would broaden his experience, and give him greater perspective in his daily editorials. But he was more content at home, rotating for his meals between the Hotel DuBois, the Elks Club in winter, and the country club during the summer months, with an occasional visit to one of the other hotels or restaurants of town. We had urged Bill also to spend the winter months in Florida, where he would have the advantage of enjoying the warmer climate, and an opportunity of visiting with many contemporaries in the winter spas. But, again, he expressed himself as being more content at home, and here he spent the twilight years, visiting with his business associates and friends, until Father Time wrote "30" to a long and uneventful life. Perhaps Bill missed a great deal of life, for he reached neither the heights of exultation nor the nadir of human despair—he was happy and content, and who shall say that he should have lived otherwise than as he did. So on his last journey to the bourne from which no traveler e'er returns, we wish Bill Godspeed, with the hope that he may find the same peace and contentment in his life eternal.

WILLIAM B. ROSS

(By Jason S. Gray)

We can't help but say a few words about our old friend and coworker, Bill Ross, who passed away recently, and with whom we had been associated for many years. Bill, in his younger and later in his mature years, was regarded as a very capable newspaperman, particularly in the period before the present-day news-gathering methods developed, which proved of great assistance in channeling many items across an editor's desk. Bill worked his shift on the Courier for many, many years as night editor—not a very pleasant duty at many times, and undoubtedly monotonous as the years moved along, missing much of the sunshine and many of the daily contacts that usually follow a more normal routine. He did this without complaint however, and for years, with his limited staff, turned out a daily

paper that was both newsy and respected in the community, and compared favorably with other small-town dailies in the State. All this in addition to other duties that included taking extended news reports by telephone from a press agency that then required editing and "heading up" before their final use in the paper. We worked with Bill in those days for a short time in picking up our first knowledge of newspaper work and initiation as a cub reported and came to respect both his knowledge and ability, and it was with regret that we saw him pass into his retirement in recent years and later his illness that led to his eventual death. Bill was a good scout, a sincere friend, and a good newspaperman, and we shall always remember him when he was in the full prime of his life when he could well hold his own with the best editors in the State. He will be missed by the writer and by all of his coworkers at the Courier-Express.

To Bill Ross

(By Marv Bloom)

Around the news sanctums the quiet, mild-mannered Bill Ross was known as Willie by some, the Veep by others, and as plain Bill by others.

The little fellow with the same-tempered personality is gone but not forgotten, and the news folks with whom he was associated can recall many an incident in which the late editor was a principal participant.

Of Willie, as he would prefer us to refer to him, the CE organization, directors, and employees alike, will always say, "There was a man who lived his own life in his own inimitable desire, a man believing the other fellow should also live with his own desire."

Bill Ross never bothered anybody, never complained, nor protested. He maintained his individuality as he wished, his decisions as he deemed fit, yet never would he make a decision to harm his fellow man or associate.

Willie, as we knew him, adhered to the news school which believed in the laissez faire policy—meaning hands off.

We frequently disagreed, arguing our own points, yet always the late editor would listen to our arguments, voice his own, and that was that. Afterward no so-called hard feeling nor ill feeling existed. That's as disagreement should terminate.

And the following day all would be serene with Willie, until another argument broke into the open.

But always, W. B. Ross, as sternly as he ensued his own policies, would respect his fellow man for his answer or the other opinion.

For Bill believed in freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and, above all, the right for a man to think for himself. Yet in his own news policy, he maintained a neutral course, flaying public discussion. That, Willie felt, was his prerogative as the editor.

Bill is now reading his proofs and following the Bucs (Pittsburgh Pirates) from the editor's chair in the great beyond, and you can always be sure the little fellow with the quiet-mannered, individualistic personality will always be saying, "Let man think for himself, keep his public ideas to himself, not try to persuade others, and the fellows on earth will get along a lot better." For that was the Bill Ross way.

The following account of the death of the late William B. Ross appeared in the May 12, 1955, issue of the DuBois Courier-Express:

William B. Ross, Editor, Succumbs—Had Been Associated With Local Newspaper Since 1892

William Burchfield Ross, 77, editor emeritus of the Courier-Express since his retirement in November 1953, and vice president since 1914, died in his apartment in the Maple Avenue Hospital yesterday afternoon at 5:15. His last hours were spent quietly in his room with his radio and newspaper, and he had received some visitors during the afternoon hours. At 5 o'clock he was given a light supper, but in a few moments he lapsed into unconsciousness and died in a matter of moments before either relatives or associates could reach his bedside.

William Ross had for many years made his home in theh Hotel DuBois. He had never married, but had devoted himself to his profession, which had encompassed three score years, since he first entered the newspaper field as an apprentice in 1892. He carried on actively in his profession until ill health forced his retirement from his editorial position with the Courier in 1953. Since that time he has spent much of his time in the hospital, and about a month ago he took a small suite of rooms at the Maple Avenue where he passed his final day listening to the Pirate games and reading his favorite newspapers and books.

During the final days of his life, as he sank in weakness, he escaped the colored coils of mortality. At the penultimate moment, as he was loosed from the burning obedience to life, he was content to lie listening while the robins sang, and the world went softly violet before the nightingale began. With such a sigh, after a long and useful life, he put on the soft silk robe of absolute sleep and forgetfulness.

William Burchfield Ross was born in Du Bois on November 17, 1877, the son of William T. and Susan Angus Ross. He was the grandson of Rev. John Wray, the first pastor of the Beechwoods Presbyterian Church. He bore the name of William Burchfield, first pastor of the Presbyterian Church here.

He attended the public schools here and later numbered among the early graduates from DuBois High School.

He first became associated with the Courier in 1892 as an apprentice, while still attending school. Following his graduation from high school he enrolled at Lake Forest College, where he completed his higher education. Returning to DuBois in 1904 he again became associated with the Courier in the editorial department, remaining with the Courier for only 1 year before moving to the Daily Express, where he assumed the position of editor of that daily paper. In 1914 he again became associated with the Courier as managing editor and associate publisher, remaining in that position until 2 years ago at the time of his retirement, when he became editor emeritus of the paper. He is also director and vice president of the Gray Printing Co., Tri-County Broadcasting Co., and Courier Building Co.

At the time he returned to the Courier he became associated with the late E. W. Gray, the late L. C. Sheffler, and L. F. Mohney in the ownership and operation of the paper and has remained in an active capacity in the editorial department and management of the paper until the time of his retirement.

Only one brother, J. Wray Ross, of West Scribner Avenue, survives of a family of 9 children, those preceding him in death being Mrs. Nellie Bell, Mrs. George Wert, Bruce, Scott, Richard, Charles, and Dr. Samuel. Two nephews, Scott M. Ross, of Philadelphia, and William B. Wert, of Munhall, also survive.

He was a member of the BPOE, and a past exalted ruler of that lodge. He was an organizing member of the DuBois Country Club, and its past president. For many years he had been a member of the Rotary Club, having been also one of the organizing members of that club. He was a member of the Troop Committee of the Courier-Express Troop 25, Bucktail Council Boy Scouts of America. Throughout his long career he had been associated with many organizations and committees, active in the building of DuBois.

Friends will be received at the N. R. Moore Son Funeral Home until the time of the funeral, Saturday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock to be conducted by Rev. Ross M. Haverfield, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, of which the deceased was a member for many years. Interment will be made in the family plot in Morningside Cemetery.

The Facts of Foreign Aid—I. Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year Human Events published some very interesting facts relating to foreign aid. In view of the fact that this Congress will soon be considering further extension of that program, I am inserting, as part of my remarks, an article that appeared in the January 1, 1955, issue. This extension relates to Great Britain. Others will follow in sequence relating to France, Italy, Yugoslavia and other countries.

The Facts of Foreign Aid

On December 9, the British Government in its 18th report on Anglo-American cooperation (published as a government white paper) stated that Britain received $3,597,500,000 in "aid from the United States in the 6 years from 1948 to last June 30."

Now, the statement is unquestionably correct, but it gives to a hasty reader an impression that postwar aid is less than it actually is. The real question is exactly how much aid have we given Britain since the end of the war? Why select 6 years (1948 to 1954)? Why simply specify outright gifts from the Government? Why not include gifts from private sources? Why exclude "loans outstanding" which are certainly aid and which, moreover, may never be paid or only paid in small part (as with those in World War I)?

The question (which no official statements honestly answer) is: what has Britain received from the United States since the end of the war (World War II) in outright gifts from the Government or private agencies, or in outstanding loans? Now, on Capitol Hill, it is well known that no Government agency has ever assembled the complete statistical picture of postwar foreign aid. It took us a lot of work to get a tentatively reliable answer to the foregoing question, but the answer obtained—from Government statisticians who have unofficially reported it to us—exposes the British white paper's selection of the time period and failure to include even in that selected period, "loans outstanding."

We offer the picture—in approximate round figures—not only to our subscribers, but especially to Congress. Next week we shall reveal the figures on aid to France; in following weeks, aid to Italy and other nations.

Here is the picture of the real magnitude of American aid to Britain:

1. From July 1, 1945 through June 30, 1954, we gave Britain (outright gifts from our Treasury) $4,225,055,000. This is broken down into: (a) UNRRA—$8,369,000; (b) technical exchange program—$732,000; (c) economic assistance, 1948 through June 30, 1954—$3,786,000,000 ($200 million above the white paper estimate of the British Government); (d) surplus products which we gave England to sell—$72,200,000; (e) American Red Cross, a private agency—$16,207,000 (no figures available from another agency, CARE); (f) lend-lease after the conclusion of World War

II and prior to war in Korea—$341,547,000. (The latter item was a clear gouge. Why, after the termination of hostilities should lend-lease have been continued?)

2. At present the British Government has outstanding loans, payable to the United States Treasury, of $5,076,361,000. This item is broken down into: (a) direct loans to the British Government of $3,750,000,000 in 1945 on which $3,660,441,000 is outstanding; (b) $384,800,000 from the American Export-Import Bank, outstanding; (c) $390,000,000 from the RFC, outstanding; (d) $62,720,000 in silver subject to terms of repayment but at present outstanding; (e) $538,400,000 of credit advanced by the Government to be ultimately paid back but still outstanding and unamortized; (f) $40 million credit extended on surplus property and unpaid.

3. Total military aid to Britain from fiscal 1950 through fiscal 1954 is $905 million.

In short, total aid (civilian and military) to Britain since the end of World War II amounts to $10,206,416,000.

This is practically three times the aid reported by the British white paper for the selected period for the 6 years 1948 to last June 30. But even the three times figure does not include other items which have been a direct charge against the American taxpayer. Let us cite just two: (1) Under lend-lease we gave the British $28,600,797,000 worth of American war materials. Under reverse lend-lease, the British charged us with $5,300,000,000, leaving a total of over $23 billion. Granted that a considerable portion of this 23 billions was used up, there remains the vital question of how many ships (mercantile and naval) the British have kept. Our sources indicate that they have retained a number of such vessels. These were clearly returnable to the United States. But the whole lend-lease account was hurriedly cast up at the end of World War II and its equitable accuracy is highly suspect. There is still another item which has not even been considered in estimating direct American aid to Britain. In the NATO infrastructure program, we are given no credit for building airfields, fuel storage tanks and the like, in Britain, all of which contribute directly to the prosperity of England through the outlay of American dollars. So, in addition to the over $10 billion of civilian and military aid to Britain must be added millions (probably many hundreds of millions), because of a careless adjudication of lend-lease and our contributions to the infra-NATO structure.

The Facts of Foreign Aid—II. France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr Speaker, this is the second insertion on the question of foreign aid to France which was published in Human Events of January 8, 1955. The statement follows:

UNITED STATES AID TO FRANCE

The average citizen, if asked to gues what nation has received the most aid from the United States since the end of World War II, would probably pick Britain without hesitation. But the fact is that France has received more than any other nation on our prodigal foreign bounty rolls as June 30, 1954.

Here follows an analysis based on figures from Government statisticians (as we explained in last week's chapter of this series), detailing for the first time in public print the total burden of our foreign aid.

Last week we pointed out that total United States aid (civilian and military) to Britain since the end of the Second World War amounts to $10,206,416,000. But total French aid comes to $10,646,693,000.

This total is broken down into:

(a) $371,469,000 of lend-lease after the end of the war. The termination of the war should have automatically cut off all lend-lease but the French like the British pulled a clear gouge of over one-third of a billion dollars apiece;

(b) $3,812,000 from UNRRA and $60,000 in post-UNRRA aid;

(c) $311,388,000 described as interim aid;

(d) $3,188,816,000 from ECA, MSA, and FOA (direct economic assistance);

(e) $2,146,000 from the American Red Cross;

(f) $15,850,000 in surplus commodities;

(g) $2,552,000 for the technical exchange program.

Thus the total economic assistance to France came to $3,896,093,000.

Total credit extended to France from American credit sources added up to $1,910,900,000 which is broken down into: (a) $1,233,698,000 in direct loans or guaranteed loans from the American Export-Import Bank still outstanding; and (b) $677,202,000 of credit (still on the cuff) from other government agencies for ships, surplus property, etc.

Total military assistance 1950–54 to France in Europe amounted to $4,003,700,000 and (in addition) for the French war in Indochina, United States taxpayers made available $785 million. (During the last years of this war, United States taxpayers were carrying over 65 percent of its total costs.)

A final item of around $51 million, representing expenditures by the United States Air Force to bring NATO airfield up to United States standards, rounds out the total of known aid (civilian and military) to France to $10,646,693,000—nearly a half billion more than that received by Britain since the conclusion of World War II. The curious thing about the billions lavished on France by the United States is that in spite of numerous warnings that France was definitely our most risky ally, we continued to open our national purse to her announced needs (frequently bold demands).

The warnings included: (1) The instability of the French political system (more than 20 cabinet ministries have fallen since the end of the war). (2) Two members of the Communist Party became Ministers of the French Air Force and the infiltration of Moscow agents into this vital branch of the French military is widely known. Infiltration of the French Government in general is equally well known. In World War II, Nazi-Communist infiltration of the French republic is said to have resulted in France lasting only six weeks in the war and Moscow infiltration is said to be far worse today. (3) Two United States Senators, after a trip to France (less than a year ago), stated that key French war industries were under the control of Communist-dominated unions and that the possibilities of effective sabotage were large. (4) The French Communist Party, despite billions in American postwar aid, continues to be a powerful factor in the decisions of the French Government.

The Facts of Foreign Aid—III. Italy, Yugoslavia, and Other Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including statements that appeared in Human Events for January 15, January 22, January 29, and February 5, 1955:

[From Human Events of January 15, 1955]

UNITED STATES AID TO ITALY

In computing aid to Italy since the end of the war, two adjustments are necessary: (a) the war in Italy ended in early 1945 and consequently the period of United States aid to Italy is longer by some 5 or 6 months than in the case of England and France; (b) aid to Italy includes aid to Trieste which Italy claims as Italian territory.

Since the end of the war in Italy, the United States total economic assistance to Italy amounts to $2,922,875,000, which is broken down into:

U. S. Army civilian supplies	$413,115,000
American Red Cross aid which in the case of Italy was appropriated by Congress and handed over to the Red Cross for disbursement as it saw fit	3,183,000
UNRRA aid and an additional $128,461,000 of post-UNRRA aid	416,769,000
U. S. Treasury for civilian supplies	134,487,000
Interim U. S. Government aid	176,006,000
ECA, MSA, and FOA	1,629,600,000
Sale of surplus agricultural commodities	18,500,000
Technical exchange program	2,754,000

As of June 30, 1954, Italy had outstanding in loans and credits from the United States (various Government agencies) $299,619,000, consisting of:

American Export - Import Bank	$138,862,000
Basic materials development	2,482,000
Sale of surplus United States property	121,879,000
Sale of United States merchant ships	36,396,000

Although exact figures are available for total military aid to England and France since the end of World War II, it is curious that only a part of our military aid to Italy is revealed. The rest is marked "classified." For offshore procurement, we are informed Italy received $490 million—but how many hundreds of millions more is a secret. This secrecy ban also blocks any estimate of how much the United States has contributed to the infra-NATO structure.

Thus, total economic aid to Italy, and that part of United States military aid which is not classified, amounts to a grand total of $3,712,494,000.

[From Human Events of January 22, 1955]

UNITED STATES POSTWAR AID TO COMMUNISM

Since the end of World War II, the United States has given aid to Russia and her satellite states in excess of $1 billion. As of June

30, 1954, this aid, comprising direct aid from the United States Treasury (gifts), bank loans outstanding, and gifts from private agencies (such as the American Red Cross), amounted to $1,325,050,000.

Assistance to Communist nations after the conclusion of World War II is somewhat incomprehensible. At the time the United States recognized Soviet Russia, Maxim Litvinoff, the Russian Ambassador, gave solemn assurances that the Soviet Union would cease conspiring for the overthrow of the United States Government, assurances which were never kept. At the time of our entry into World War II, the New Deal was fully aware of this doublecrossing. During the war the Roosevelt administration went out of its way to protect the formidable growth of a Soviet espionage system in the Nation. It was during the war that the Soviet Union laid the real groundwork for a wholesale infiltration of America.

In 1949, Larry E. Kerley, former FBI operative, revealed to a Senate committee just how far the Soviet espionage apparatus had been protected during the war by our own State Department. He testified that all during the war Soviet spies were not checked chiefly because our State Department withheld the right to get out process for them which kept them from being arrested. He testified that the FBI was even prevented from picking up Americans who helped the Russians in their spy work, because if they had been arrested the whole Soviet apparatus would have been disclosed.

By the end of World War II, the Russians had seized Poland, and it was clear as daylight that they intended world revolution. Why, then, postwar United States aid to communism? Much of the aid given is squarely chargeable to Dean Acheson while he was in the State Department. The bulk of this assistance to communism went into UNRRA, and it was Acheson's rulings which made it possible for the Russian Communists to use UNRRA food and clothing to coerce the Polish people into submission and to extend Soviet power into other parts of Europe. It was the Acheson law firm which arranged for a $90 million loan to Soviet-controlled Poland, the approval of which was announced by Acheson in person while acting as Secretary of State in 1946. The American Ambassador to Poland, Arthur Bliss Lane, vigorously opposed the granting of the loan to Soviet-controlled Poland. Testimony of high Polish authorities subsequently showed that the money, including UNRRA grants, was used mainly to equip the Communist secret police in Poland, and to effect the submission of desperately hungry people.

Here is the picture of United States postwar aid to communism:

1. Russia:	
American Red Cross	$1,800,000
UNRRA	186,380,000
Continued lend-lease in spite of the cessation of hostilities	277,254,000
Credit still outstanding an unpaid	222,493,000
2. Poland:	
American Red Cross	855,000
UNRRA	364,031,000
Lend-lease	92,000
Unpaid indebtedness	68,669,000
3. Hungary:	
UNRRA aid	2,359,000
Unpaid indebtedness	12,794,000
4. Czechoslovakia:	
American Red Cross	75,000
UNRRA aid	183,374,000
Lend-lease	2,000
Agricultural commodities donated through private agencies	2,000
Credits outstanding	4,870,000

The total of all postwar aid to Russia and satellites comes to $1,325,050,000.

[From Human Events of January 29, 1955]

POSTWAR AID TO YUGOSLAVIA

Members of Congress are aroused over a news item (January 17, from Rangoon, Burma) to the effect that Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, was offering arms to the Soviet puppet government of Burma, now at odds with its neighbor, Thailand (independent of Moscow). The latter country is backed by the United States and is receiving aid from us. Members of Congress are suspicious that the arms offered to the Red puppet government of Burma are from the store which the United States has given Marshal Tito in recent years.

They are also viewing Tito's offer to a Red satellite as one more sign that he is doublecrossing the free world. At the time we started giving aid to Tito, experienced observers warned that his alleged break with Moscow did not look convincing, and that it was risky to give him economic and military aid. But the liberal policy of the State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency, which favored aid to Socialist regimes, prevailed.

How much assistance have we given Yugoslavia since the end of World War II? Our military aid is classified as top secret, but it is believed to run into many hundreds of millions. Civilian aid reaches the very sizable total of $704,719,000. This is broken down into:

UNRRA	$298,054,000
Postwar lend-lease	74,000
Agricultural commodities from private United States agencies	15,723,000
A special act of Congress for Yugoslavia aid	37,560,000
The American Red Cross	719,000
ECA, MSA, and FOA	296,100,000
Technical exchange program	1,273,000
Loan from American Export-Import Bank on which, as of June 30, 1954, no payments had been made	55,000,000
Prior grants from U. S. Government agencies converted into credit arrangements and still outstanding	216,000

Thus, total aid to Yugoslavia, in postwar years, is $704,719,000.

[From Human Events of February 5, 1955]

FOREIGN AID (CONCLUDED)

In our issues from January 1 to January 29, we recited the figures on United States foreign aid given since the end of World War II to five countries—Britain, France, Italy, Russia (and satellites), and Yugoslavia. We chose these because of various reasons, but principally because the figures have been distorted or minimized in one way or another, and because our outlay has brought disillusion in terms of what we had expected. These figures (which have brought numerous expressions of surprise and dismay from readers) were obtained from reliable Government statisticians who had been prevented from getting the story out to the public. The total of foreign aid to these five countries runs to over $26 billion. But that is not the whole story.

Actually, the balance sheet of foreign aid lists 51 countries as recipients of our bounty. The list runs from the big countries mentioned above to smaller ones—the Philippines, Greece, war-torn Korea, Turkey, etc. It comprises such diverse items as United States Information Agency, Inter-American Highway, government and relief in occupied areas, international education and exchange, relief of Palestine refugees and dozens more—all in varying degrees of generosity.

For instance, in the fiscal year 1954, foreign aid consisted of the following:

Civilian relief in Korea	$58,000
Mutual Security Organization	4,531,507,000
Contribution to international organization	29,614,787
International information and education	75,000,000
Relief and rehabilitation in Korea (from Defense Department fiscal year 1954 appropriations)	200,000,000
Government and relief in occupied areas	43,538,000

Thus, the fiscal 1954 handout abroad comes to a total of $4,937,659,787.

All told, from the fiscal year 1946 to the fiscal year 1955 inclusive, the grand total reaches the sum of around $67 billion. Our sources are unable to give one precisely accurate (down to the penny) total figure because of conflicts between items included and excluded in and from various categories. But they assure us that the differences are negligible.

Sixty-seven billion is no insignificant sum even in an age that talks only in billions. It is equal to the book value of all manufacturing corporations in the United States (plants, equipment, and land). It is equal to the total mortgage debt on all 1 to 4 nonfarm family dwelling units in the Nation (the homes of the great bulk of the Nation's workers) as of January 1, 1953 ($66.3 billion). Assuming an average population of 155 million during the 10 fiscal years 1946 through June 30, 1955, every man, woman, and child in the Nation has paid out during this period or been made responsible for $430 or $43 for each year of the period.

In the 10-year period (fiscal 1946 through fiscal 1955), the American people paid out or pledged themselves to pay an average of $6,700,000,000 a year. This was roughly equal to 10 percent of the average annual budget of the Nation. During this same period the budget has been balanced only 2 years (by the 80th Republican Congress). In the other 8 years the Nation went further into debt. Consequently, but for the heavy drain of foreign aid, the Nation would have enjoyed balanced budgets for the whole period of 10 years, and additionally, taxpayers could have enjoyed a substantial tax cut. Thus foreign aid has been a major factor in creating unbalanced budgets and weighing down the American taxpayer.

The Care of Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at the regular annual convention of the fifth district organization of the American Legion, Department of Georgia, which was held on May 22, 1955, two resolutions were unanimously adopted by the convention. One of these resolutions originated in Asa Warren Candler Post, No. 65, American Legion, and the other resolution originated in the East Point American Legion Post, No. 51.

These resolutions are indicative of the concern which Legionnaires feel for veterans and their families.

It is inspiring to witness the never-ending efforts being made by Legionnaires to improve the conditions of our veterans while in life, and in death to see that they are appropriately honored and provided with a suitable last resting place.

I insert the two resolutions referred to herewith:

Whereas there are approximately 750 mentally ill veterans at the Milledgeville State Hospital and approximately 135 tubercular veterans at Battey State Hospital; and

Whereas most of these veterans are not eligible to be admitted to Veterans' Administration hospitals because their illnesses are not service-connected; and

Whereas there is now a prevailing Federal law known as aid to State or Territorial home, which provides that where a State establishes separate housing and maintenance for disabled veterans hospitalized in State Institutions the Federal Government will pay up to $700 per veteran per year; and

Whereas under this Federal law the State of Georgia can qualify for these funds amounting to approximately $500,000 per year; and

Whereas the General Assembly of Georgia should qualify our State to receive these funds by passing legislation designating a portion of the already existing Milledgeville State Hospital and Battey State Hospital as a Georgia State Veterans' Home; and

Whereas veterans segregated in the said designated Georgia State Veterans' Home could be better serviced by the various veterans' organizations; and

Whereas for morale considerations the segregation of veteran patients would be desirable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the East Point American Legion Post, No. 51, on this 11th day of April, 1955, do go on record as urging the next general assembly to pass enabling legislation which would qualify the State of Georgia to receive Federal funds for the care of disabled veterans.

ROY GUNTER,
Post Commander.
E. W. CAWTHON,
Post Adjutant.

Unanimously adopted by the fifth district of the American Legion, Department of Georgia, in annual convention assembled, this 22d day of May, 1955.

CLAUDE W. PEEK,
Adjutant, Fifth District.
JAMES H. PORTER,
Commander Fifth District.

Asa Warren Candler Post, No. 65, Department of Georgia, American Legion, in regular meeting convened, passed the following resolution offered by Buddy John F. Bass, Sr., and seconded by Buddy Johnnie Mobley, and that it shall be carried to the 1955 American Legion Fifth District Convention for passage by that body, and that the district convention request its passage by the State convention of the American Legion to be held in Macon, Ga., in 1955:

"*Be it resolved,* That each and every member of the Georgia delegation to the Congress of the United States—

"1. Be accurately and impressively informed as to the deplorable condition, resulting from lack of space, which exists at the National Cemetery in Marietta, Ga.; and

"2. Be authentically apprised of the ever-increasing death rate of veterans of all wars whose loved ones or officials of State or National Government may wish to pay them this last tribute of honor and glory by interment in a national cemetery.

"3. Be requested to instigate appointment of and action by their duly authorized committees to investigate and examine the conditions existing at Marietta National Cemetery and to calculate the desirable capacity based upon available statistics or utilize the services of the American Legion for this purpose.

"4. Be requested, with such interest and enthusiasm as may be necessary, to persuade their colleagues in both Houses of Congress, of the dire need for additional land in Georgia as will assure the immediate obtaining of adequate space and its permanent maintenance in a manner consonant with the highest ideals and national tradition of the people of the United States; and

"5. Be convinced of the national obligation to provide a place suitable of adequacy, dignity, and beauty where on the last sad day the heroes who have kept this a Nation may be laid to eternal rest in honor and glory.

"JOHN F. BASS, SR.,
"Chairman.
"WILLIAM HOLLOWAY, JR.
"Vice Commander.

"Unanimously adopted by the fifth district of the American Legion, Department of Georgia, in annual convention assembled on this 22d day of May 1955.

"JAMES H. PORTER,
"Commander, Fifth District.
"CLAUDE W. PEEK,
"Adjutant, Fifth District."

How To Build a Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor is studying bills to extend library services to the 27 million of our rural folks who either have no library service at all or who live in areas where library facilities are inadequate.

During hearings last week, the subcommittee's attention was called to an article How To Build a Fire, in the June 1955 issue of the Wilson Library Bulletin. The author is Miss Particia Paylore, assistant librarian of the University of Arizona in Tucson.

I believe those interested in making good books available to all our people will gain from this warm and enthusiastic account of how the first bookmobile came to a huge county in Arizona and how it was received:

HOW TO BUILD A FIRE

(By Patricia Paylore, assistant librarian of the University of Arizona in Tucson)

It was 7:46 in the morning as I pulled over beside the bookmobile parked in front of the Tucson Public Library and Phyllis leaned out to call, "Let's go!"

The handsome young man at the wheel leaned out and called back, "You're late!"

We were. One minute.

But except for the very beginning we kept to our schedule for the next 3 days and 400 miles while we took the new Pima County bookmobile on a demonstration tour of neighboring Cochise County. In the belief that our experience might prove useful to other librarians, I should like to tell the story of how this idea began and how we worked it out.

Cochise County in the extreme southeastern corner of Arizona has an area of over 4 million acres, but with a population of only 1 person to every 5 square miles. There are 2 libraries supported entirely by a large mining company, and 2 other small women's club libraries. There is not a cent of tax money spent for libraries anywhere in the county. Into this bookless wilderness Donald Powell, past president of the Arizona State Library Association and a colleague of mine on the University of Arizona Library staff, and I, the new president of the association, had gone in September 1953 to talk to a countywide meeting of homemakers' councils.

On the way home we conceived the idea of taking a new bookmobile, which we knew the Tucson Public Library had on order, through Cochise County to show its people exactly what we had been talking about for years. This conception so intrigued us that we could not wait for morning, but called Gertrude Burt, librarian of the Tucson Public Library from a pay station on the outskirts of Tucson that same night. Did she think it was a good idea? Would she let us take it before it was put into service here? As a member of the executive board of the association, would she approve of using association funds to finance the trip? To all of these inquiries we got unqualified and enthusiastic affirmation.

During the next 2 months, I got association approval of such expenses as we might incur, permission of the Tucson Public Library Board, and authority from the Tucson city manager. A pleasant correspondence with the Gerstenslager Co. ensued.

At my request, Gerstenslager sent a glossy print of the bookmobile, with the great seal of the city of Tuscon and library service to Pima County already painted on the panel. The only drawback to our use of the cut was that it showed the vehicle parked in the snows of Wooster, Ohio. Fortunately for our relations with the Tucson Chamber of Commerce, this background disappeared in the mats which we had made up for newspaper publicity.

This had all taken weeks, and it was now late January.

Two wires to Gerstenslager finally brought the actual delivery date: Monday, March 1, 1954. Now that this definite information was ours, the schedule was worked out, day by day, hour by hour. Stories and the cut went out to every weekly newspaper in Cochise County. Similar stories, with dates and hours, were sent to all radio stations in the county. Responsibility for our visit was vested in some local library-minded citizens in each community where stops were to be made. To the mayors of the larger incorporated cities we sent letters asking them to be our special guests, and only incidentally asking for permission to park on a public street. Blue ribbon letters went to each member of the Cochise County Board of Supervisors, urging them to visit the bookmobile when it was in their district. The four librarians in the county were also apprised of our plans.

Since Gerstenslager's insurance on the bookmobile was in effect until the city of Tucson took possession, which it was not to do until after the trip, it was necessary only for the association to take out a policy on the book stock. Accordingly, we had a 3-day policy for $10,000 written, with the Tucson Public Library as beneficiary, and the association paying the premium.

Monday, March 1: Mrs. Burt telephoned me just before noon, her voice shaking with excitement. "It's here," was all she said. "I'm coming," was all I could muster in reply. When I got downtown, there it was, parked by the library, the most beautiful sight I had ever seen in my life.

I brought three student assistants from the university library and, together with the public library staff, they worked all afternoon and into the evening stocking the bookmobile from the collection which had been prepared during the previous weeks by

the librarian who would take it into Pima County after our tour. I went back after supper to take a last look, and began to worry about there being too many children's books. I thought of some special titles I wanted to take with us. By 11 o'clock that night I had 2 huge cartons of university library books packed in the back seat of my car. Then I went home and tried desperately to think of any detail I had forgotten.

Tuesday, March 2: The man who was to be the driver, after it was put into service at home, went along the next morning to learn how to handle it on the road. Phyllis—of the University of Arizona library staff—and I led the way in my car. At the bottom of the hill, where we drop down into the San Pedro Valley just outside Benson, our first stop, we pulled off the road and transferred the university books I had picked out the night before to the bookmobile's shelves, then drove on and parked in front of the post office on the main street exactly at 9 o'clock. Where was our welcoming committee? There was no one in sight. The minutes dragged by. A young woman appeared around the corner and approached. I invited her to come in and see the books.

"Honey, I'm too tired," she explained kindly, "I've been waitin' table all night and I just want to get home to bed."

Half of our allotted time for Benson was gone. A woman went by with a 10-year-old boy in tow. He dragged his feet as I intercepted them, cast a longing glance at our open door. His mother gave his arm a vigorous yank. "Come on, we're in a hurry." They disappeared, and I was mad—at her, and at me, too. Maybe my approach was wrong. A man came by. He laughed when we invited him in. "I'm from California, just going through. I know all about bookmobiles. They're wonderful." But he came in anyhow, and we all felt better.

Our official delegation arrived, finally, the entire board of the local women's club library. "But we have a library," they protested. "Thank God for that," I told them as fervently as I could, and went on to explain that a countywide library service, mobile or not, would strengthen their own library as well as provide books for their neighbors up and down the river in St. David, Pomerene, Cascabel. This was the beginning of the fear that we met in all four library towns in the county: that additional service would somehow jeopardize their own autonomy. We hope we allayed this misunderstanding, for without the existing libraries we could not hope to extend service to the real hinterland.

In Dragoon, a forgotten way-station of the Southern Pacific Railroad deep in the granite foothills of Cochise's stronghold, cut off from the world by the new highway miles to the west, we made our second stop. The postmistress, a veritable Madame LaFarge, was suspicious when I asked if we might park in her yard for a half hour. While she sized me up, I asked innocently: "Whatever became of that old shed up on the hill there?"

Her jaw sagged slightly. "You remember that old shed?"

"Sure. I slept in there one Fourth of July night about 20 years ago. The river was up and we couldn't get through." I was laconic. But I remembered more vividly than I dared tell her the wondrous and frightening beauty of that wild night with the rain roaring down on the tin roof of that shed and the thunder growling through the hills and the lightning splitting the sky open with its own special kind of fireworks.

The shed won the day for us. While my companions parked, I drove off to find the president of the local woman's club, which was sponsoring us in Dragoon. There I discovered to my horror that we were not expected until the next day. When I protested, she showed me my own letter stating plainly: "Wednesday, March 3." Alas, for my carelessness in not proofreading letters! By the time she and I got back to the bookmobile, there was a small crowd gathered, thanks to madame's husband who had telephoned around to neighboring ranches to spread the word of our premature arrival.

One sunbonneted lady, with trowel still in hand, was particularly forceful in her expression of their need. "We had a library in the club," she told us, "just stuff people around here had given us. In 2 months everybody in Dragoon had read everything. Then we lost interest in it. Can you blame us?" This was our cue to explain how a Cochise County bookmobile would bring fresh bookstock on each trip. Our audience was awed. Different books every time? Our discussion was interrupted by a little shriek of delight from the rear. We all rushed back and found one of our visitors holding in her trembling hands the complete button book. She looked at Phyllis with her eyes round and shining, as though she were almost afraid to open it. "A whole book about buttons. Oh, can I keep it for a while?" And this was the beginning of the hard part: to bring books to people but not let them have them.

And yet, in a way, this was what we were trying to do. Show them the way, make them mad, if necessary, that they didn't have libraries, tempt them, hold out the bait, then reluctantly withdraw it.

Our schedule was inexorable. We drove off on time, leaving them standing there in the dusty road looking after us with we knew not what mixed emotions.

When we stopped at the town of Cochise later, a homemakers' group, the Progressive Pioneers Club, met us in the schoolyard. While Phyllis talked to them about assessed valuations, bonded indebtedness, and mill-tax revenue, I went in and arranged with the principal of the school to bring the classes through. We ate lunch in relays in the school kitchen as the guests of the principal and his teacher-wife, while the other half of the team talked to the children. When I came back to relieve Phyllis I found her surrounded and besieged by a swarm of loving kids.

"Miss Ball. Miss Ball. Look, I found a book about Daniel Boone. We learned all about him in history.

"Say, my old man would like this. He's raising quarter horses."

A woman from the club, who had been literally pushed out by the children called in to us: "Got anything in there about how to get rid of jack rabbits?"

"No, but give me your name and we'll send you something as son as we get home."

The bell rang and the children went out slowly, reluctantly. "How soon will you be back?"

'As soon as you get one of your own down here. Tell daddy about it tonight, will you?"

We took time out to renew our lipstick, then drove on with stops in Willcox, Bowie, and San Simon before returning to Willcox for the night. In Willcox, as in Benson, there was a library, and people were hard to interest. Arrangements had been made locally to park in front of the club library, but when no one came to visit us, we drove back onto the main street. The mayor owned a service station. We thought it would be politic to get some gas from him. But he was away for the afternoon. We went on to a station whose credit card I carried. While the gas foamed into the cavernous tank of the bookmobile, I told the attendant our troubles. He laughed. "Lady, you just park anywhere you want for as long as you want. I'm on the city council." Our luck was still with us.

In Bowie, our arrangements broke down. No one expecting us. No one to meet us. But the school principal where we went said finally, "It's just about mail call. Why don't you go park by the post office?" We did, and had one of our best stops. Everybody in town was down for mail and they streamed through in a continual line. We had to coax only one person in, and when he found a book on automotive repairs, we had to coax him to leave, for we were slaves to our schedule.

WARM RECEPTION

In San Simon, the whole town was out to meet us, led by an elderly woman of considerable energy. We found them on the trip, usually one to a community, the driving, doing women who refuse to bog down in the morass of rural intellectual inertia. When Phyllis tried to get the woman's husband to come in, he balked and said he couldn't read. After Phyllis had appealed to his wife, she threw back her head and laughed. "Him?" she gasped finally, "why, he's nothin' but an old cowboy." Undaunted by this bit of information, Phyllis took him by the arm and led him to the corner, where she pulled down Winchester, the Gun That Won the West. He looked from it to her and back again, and then opened it eagerly. Couldn't read? No, that's just the way of old-time cowboys.

As we left San Simon I noticed in my rear-view mirror that the bookmobile was stopped at a service station. I stopped, too, and waited a moment. The delay stretched on. Fearing trouble, I turned around and pulled up beside it. As I started to call out to the driver, Phyllis put her finger to her lips. Marvin was giving our spiel to the garage owner. We sat in quiet amazement while we heard him telling his audience of two what it was, how it worked, why we'd brought it, and how they could have one, too. He told us later he had stopped for some minor adjustment on the air filter, and just thought he ought not to waste the opportunity. Whoever said it first, that getting library extension was like getting religion, was right.

Back in Willcox that night we were too tired to do much more than figure out that we'd driven nearly 200 miles, made 6 stops, that 79 adults had signed our guest book, that about 70 children had gone through at Cochise, and that we wished we were 15 years younger.

Early the next morning we met Donald Powell and John Thayer, of the University of Arizona Library staff, 15 miles west of Willcox where the road down through the Sulphur Springs Valley turns south off the highway. Phyllis drove on with Don, and John got in with me. I briefed him on the previous day's adventures as we drove past the great dry lake mirage, past the ghost town of Pearce, past the sere cattle ranges, past the Dragoon Mountains where the spirits of Apaches are ever present. This was historical Arizona, and everywhere we had been people had asked us, "Do you have Blood Brother? Oh, yes, we've read it, we just wondered if you had it." And they'd pick it up and handle it lovingly, wishing, perhaps, as I always do when I see it, that we could read it again for the first magic time.

We missed the turnoff to Webb, and had to backtrack. There was nothing there but a former schoolhouse converted into the residence of the principal of the union school which we would visit later. His wife was there, and invited John and me in while she telephoned to see if she could round up some visitors for us. In the end, she was our only guest at Webb, but she was appreciative, and more important, influential in the community.

A few miles farther on, we stopped at the Elfrida Union High School. It had turned cold and blustery, and the students were waiting indoors for us, their faces pressed anxiously against the windows as we swung into the driveway.

We waved and they waved back, relief flooding their faces. They came through by classes, varied in their interests and responses like any typical crowd of teen-agers. Some of the boys were more interested in the construction of the bookmobile itself than in the books it carried. At first we

were puzzled by the quietness. Then suddenly John took a book off the shelf and offered it to one of our younger guests. "Here, wouldn't you like to look at it?" She looked at John, then at her teacher in the background, and then at the book. "May I?" So that was it. Their teachers had told them not to touch the books. We protested, and suddenly bedlam broke loose, and we relaxed.

SOURCE DRIED UP

There was a subtle difference between these adolescents and the younger children in Cochise, a difference besides their ages. I think Phyllis put her finger on it when she observed that, whereas the little ones on the previous day were eager for more books to expand the new experience of learning to read, the Elfrida teen-agers were already spoiled for reading by the very lack of opportunity to read. Their source of reading pleasure had dried up, and with it the pleasure of reading.

Donald had brought a big thermos of coffee from Tucson, and we all gathered in the bookmobile and drank it black and scalding while we assessed the trip and our experiences, went over our Cochise County statistics, with which we had come armed, to be sure we had the information ready against any possible question, then pushed on into the stronghold of political opposition to our statewide library extension agency bill which had been defeated in the last legislature. Behind us was the explosive meeting at 1 little way-stop which shall be nameless, where 3 women only were on hand. But what women. One, the postmaster, as she insisted she was, was Irish and buxom. And hot tempered, as we found out. She was indignant over the countrywide paternalism emanating from the company offices in Douglas-Bisbee that made it impossible for anyone outside those cities' limits to borrow books from the Copper Queen libraries, but at the same time prevented State aid to rural libraries. "If they want to be slaves in town, let 'em," she sputtered. "But we don't need to take it out here. We're free and independent and just as good as town folks."

I winced, hearing my own words thrown back at me from scores of rural communities throughout the State where I had preached this gospel for years: that country people were first-class citizens, too, entitled to the intellectual and educational privileges of their city brethren. I had exhorted them abstractly. But to the postmaster this was a personal pragmatic situation. And now we had brought her something to fight for. She and her companions, who were an excellent foil for her, climbed down the steps and stood there for a moment, looking up at us.

"If you believe in the meaning of this," I told them gravely, "you can bring it about. It won't be easy and it won't be free, but it'll be worth it." They nodded soberly as Marvin swung the big truck back on to the highway.

On south we drove, past the end of the Swisshelm Mountains, past the peach orchards and the chili fields, saw the Chiricahuas disappear behind us, saw the open range take over. It was dry, dry, and we said maybe if it rained on the trip, people would think we'd brought it and that would be a good omen.

In Douglas, as in Benson and Willcox, our visitors found it hard to think beyond the city limits. But a representative sent to town by her homemaker's council in an outlying district pumped John dry while the rest of us went to lunch. When we got back her little notebook was crammed with facts, figures, suggestions, ideas But we worked on the town people, too, because we knew we had to have their support. We told the story, over and over, a little emphasis here on one thing, a little more there on another, depending on our listener. But all in all, the visits to the towns depressed us each time, and we were glad to be on the road again, as the sky lowered and the temperature dropped.

At Double Adobe, a country school surrounded by ranching and farming country, a sharp drizzle had set in but there to meet us were all the children, lined up in the rain-soaked schoolyard. There was something pathetic about all this, and we never failed to be touched immeasurably by the sight of those faces turned in our direction, eager, anxious, wondering. While I talked to several of the parents who had come over to share our visit with their children, the boys talked with the teachers, and Phyllis took on the kids. One little girl stayed through the parade of several classes, sitting in the corner trying not to take up too much room, while she finished a Jenny Linsky book. We risked being late in Bisbee, our next stop, while we stalled to give her time to come to the end.

In Bisbee, Phyllis and I left the bookmobile to John and Don for the third and last day. They made stops in the San Rafael Valley, at storied Tombstone, and at St. David and Pomerene back in the San Pedro Valley, and brought the bookmobile back to Tucson late Thursday afternoon. Their experiences were similar to ours in the problems that were discussed, the reactions of various types of visitors, and the questions that were raised and answered.

The bookmobile went to the garage for servicing and cleaning. We sorted out the university books the next afternoon, and then I reported fully on the trip to Mrs. Burt. The expense account which I submitted to the association was as follows:

Insurance on book stock	$22.50
Engraving cut for publicity	7.23
Gas and oil	22.97
Garage servicing and washing	4.50
Per diem expenses for 2 cars	40.00
Telegrams	3.56
Total	100.66

We made some mistakes: too many children's books, too many copies of the same children's book, too many readers; not nearly enough adult informational books. In spite of everything we had done in advance, publicity in one newspaper came out a week after we had been and gone, and in another almost 2 weeks ahead of time so that everybody had forgotten all about it by the time we arrived. I had given one stop the wrong date, but we consoled ourselves by saying it was better to be a day early than a day late.

We had some failures: In spite of our invitations, not a single county supervisor visited us, and only one mayor.

But it was in the faces and voices of those who did welcome us that we felt we had succeeded in some measure. The final measure will be known only when Cochise County holds a successful tax election to finance its own county library system. Inquiries are coming in, and we have had reports of action taken by various groups who visited us.

The smoke has cleared away and we can see at least that the kindling has caught fire.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Commencement Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at the Eastern Baptist College, St. Davids, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at last Saturday's commencement exercises at the Eastern Baptist College at St. Davids, Pa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS OF HON. EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE EASTERN BAPTIST COLLEGE, ST. DAVIDS, PA., May 28, 1955

I deeply appreciate the high honor of being invited to address you this morning.

Never in the history of our country has the place of our colleges been as important as it is today.

We cannot praise too highly the tremendous contribution of the small colleges of America toward the maintenance of the American way of life. If we are to continue as a land of liberty and opportunity the small colleges must be preserved and protected.

They must be supported on a financial basis adequate to sustain their historic part in developing leadership for our country.

They must be kept free from dependence upon government. They must be kept free from bureaucratic regimentation and control. They must have freedom in their cultural, spiritual, and academic policies.

The small colleges of America are the guardians of the religious tradition in education. They have produced leaders in business and industry, science, education, military affairs, government, and the church.

No dictator will rise among us so long as our small colleges teach young men and young women to lead clean, decent, God-fearing lives and to appreciate the real meaning of patriotic Americanism.

We live in a time of desperate challenge. Great problems confront us.

Your generation will be called upon to assume responsibilities of vast magnitude. You will be called upon to assume the burden of a world torn by two conflicting ideologies.

One preaches the Word of God, sustained and strengthened by faith in the divine teachings of the Holy Bible.

The other plots in darkness to enslave mankind under a cruel tyranny that denies God and would tear down all that we hold sacred.

One believes in freedom under God as the source of all human progress. That philosophy, to which we adhere, upholds the dignity and sanctity of the individual. The other would destroy all freedom and all religion except worship of the state. In the Communist philosophy the individual exists only to serve the purposes of the government.

Within the lifetime of all of us here today revolutionary changes have taken place.

The swift pace of modern scientific development has touched upon every aspect of human activity. The old concepts of time and space have been swept away. Research into the secrets of nature has made possible the destruction of civilization should the world become involved in total war.

I bring these grim facts to your attention only to emphasize my firm belief that the future of mankind depends upon a clear understanding of the eternal and unchanging truths that govern the destinies of men and nations.

Let us, therefore, consider some things about the American Government and the American way of life.

The Founding Fathers erected a great landmark in human progress when they proclaimed that the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" are divine endowments, bestowed upon all mnkind by the Creator of the universe. They built the foundation of our Republic on faith in God. They placed their reliance upon the ideals that have guided men of good will on the path of honor and righteousness since the dawn of Christianity.

Their plan embraced the fundamental proposition that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

They knew, however, from their profound study of history, that great democracies of the past had failed because the moral fiber of the people had become undermined by greed and corruption—because the people demanded their rights but failed to appreciate their obligations.

They knew that tyranny and dictatorship had always overwhelmed free people who ignored the sound principle that government has nothing to give except that which it first takes from the people.

They feared that the people through their own votes would rob the Public Treasuries—that they would fail to recognize that no government can give security—that anything given by government is counterbalanced by some loss of freedom.

Therefore, in framing the Constitution, the Founding Fathers sought to protect the rights and personal liberty of every individual from oppression by government and by their own acts. They established a constitutional Republic under which the people govern through their duly elected representatives. They adopted a Bill of Rights, placing definite limitations on the power of the chosen representatives of the people.

These fundamentals of the American system of government are well known to you. I mention them only because I believe that the principles and precepts of the Founding Fathers should be told over and over again until every citizen, young and old, understands and appreciates what America means and the reasons for its greatness.

As graduates of a fine, Christian college you are qualified by background, education, and experience to take leadership in the big job of teaching Americans the reasons we have become such a powerful Nation.

We must teach the glories of the American way of life and what it has accomplished. We must arouse among our people a deeper recognition of personal responsibility for good government. We must teach our people to be self-reliant, tolerant, and unselfish.

Our people should be taught in the schoolroom, from the lecture platform, the pulpit, the legislative halls, and the courts the difference between our republican form of government and the Communist system of Soviet Russia.

We must emphasize that freedom of the individual, as ordained by God, is the firm foundation of our national strength.

Americans are guided by the sacred principles of their religious faith. In the Communist philosophy there is no God; therefore there is no morality, no truth, no honor, no justice.

In the United States we the people are the Government. In Soviet Russia the people are ruled by the iron hand of tyranny. They have no choice, no voice, and no vote. They have no rights, no privileges, no freedom.

Under our Republic, government is the servant of the people. Under the distorted concepts of godless communism, government is the absolute master of the people—the will of the dictator is all powerful.

Many reasons have been advanced to explain why the United States has become such a great and powerful country. If we make an analysis, we find that we have no more intelligence. We have no greater natural resources. We have less territory than many of the competing nations.

Then why is it that in 200 years we have carved out of a wilderness a nation that is the world leader in material, cultural, and spiritual attainment?

Why is it that with only about one-sixth of the world's population and territory, we produce one-third of the world's goods?

To my mind, it can all be summed up in the fact that we have freedom of the individual—that here the dignity of man is recognized because he was created in the image of God.

Recognizing those ideals, we have lived under a system of government which has left personal ability and productive capacity unshackled. It gives to each man the rewards of his ingenuity and hard work.

There is another side. A great thinker once was asked why North America has advanced so much more in material progress than South America. South America, as you know, has some of the richest natural resources ever uncovered in the world. They have hard-working people. The answer was that those who came to South America were in search of gold, while those who settled North America were searching for God.

We are so fortunate that our country was built on the everlasting premise that God is sovereign and that the law comes from God.

In all the history of our country, great men—dedicated men of the cloth—have preached the word of God and the way of Christ.

There have always been great preachers to stand in the pulpits and guide the spiritual lives of our people.

There have always been church leaders and educators of great moral courage to fight against evil conditions that bring corruption into private lives and public affairs. Those men knew that the moral standards

of government cannot rise above the spiritual strength of the individual citizen.

They did not hesitate to take an active part in public affairs and to fight for clean, decent, honest government in order to protect the liberties of the people.

They taught that obedience to the laws of God and man is the foundation of good citizenship.

No matter what career you may choose as your life work, I suggest that you study the lives and achievements of the great teachers and preachers who dared to fight for the principles of government in which they believed. Their example of militant Christianity can guide us today in meeting our duties and responsibilities as Americans.

I ask you to remember that religious duty and civic duty are interwoven.

Without the sustaining power of religion the United States could never have become the greatest and most powerful Nation of all time.

Without religion the blessings of freedom which we now take for granted could never have been ours.

Through religion unity of purpose was achieved; the will to help one another was strengthened.

Without religion there can be no lasting peace.

We must develop a stronger and more willing spirit of public service, civic-mindedness and moral leadership. We all should take part in government.

You all know about the three R's in early education—reading 'riting, and 'rithmetic. There have now been added three more R's—reality, responsibility, and reverence.

Things in the world are real. Let each of us prepare to do something to make a better world. Let us accept our full share of responsibility in our communities, the State, the Nation, in civic affairs, and in the church. We must appreciate decency, courtesy, and reverence.

If we are to retain our individual freedom, all Americans must be alert. We must realize that it is our Government.

What endangers our Government?

It is bigness. Twenty-five years ago we had 600,000 employees in the Federal Government. Today, even after a reduction of 200,000, we have 2,300,000 on the Federal payroll. The cost of the Federal Government 25 years ago was $3 billion a year. It is now $67 billion. The national debt 25 years ago was $25 billions. It is now $280 billion.

In 15 years private and public debt in the United States has multiplied by three.

These are things which should have your attention because the solvency and stability of our Government has a direct relationship to freedom of religion and the progress of education.

But regardless of American shortcomings, we are the hope of the world. In our prayers let us thank God that we are Americans.

In closing let me recall the words of Woodrow Wilson who said, and I quote:

"Freedom and free institutions cannot long be maintained by any people who do not understand the nature of their government."

For a better understanding of the nature of the American Government, let us teach that the three great supports in the tripod upholding the American way of life are:

1. Faith in God, in ourselves and in our fellow men.

2. Faith in our constitutional form of Government.

3. Faith in our plan of economy.

You can serve our country by teaching Americans what our Government really is and what American freedom means to us and to the world.

Program of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Saturday night, May 28, it was my privilege to deliver an address broadcast from station WGN, Chicago, as a part of a regular series of reports to people of the Midwest.

My subject was the program of the 84th Congress for its 1st session.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this talk be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS' PROGRAM FOR 1955

(Address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, over station WGN, Chicago, May 29, 1955)

I would like to talk to you tonight about the work of your United States Congress in Washington.

I am going to set forth the things which I think your Senators and Representatives should be doing in the months remaining in this first session of the 84th Congress.

I am going to spell ort a detailed legislative program.

I will tell you the bills that I am personally for; how I intend to vote on them.

I will mention such important subjects as—

The problem of the city person and the farmer;

Problems of national defense; the matter of small business;

The problems of our young people and of our old people; the health of America, and many other issues.

I'M FOR IKE'S PROGRAM

Basically, I am for the legislative program of Dwight D. Eisenhower. It is a forward-looking, dynamic program.

It conforms to the best principles of the Republican Party—but it is big enough, broad enough—to win the enthusiastic support of millions of independent voters as well.

What America wants is an All-American program, not just a Republican program. And that is what Dwight D. Eisenhower offers.

America doesn't believe in extremeism of the right or extremeism of the left.

It doesn't believe in stand-pat reaction or in wild-eyed radicalism.

America wants stability; it wants continuity; but it wants a modern program for the future, it doesn't want narrow-minded partisanship.

In domestic affairs, America wants Eisenhower moderation. In international affairs, it wants Eisenhower leadership in the worldwide alliance aganst communism.

Now let's get down to cases on what Congress' program should include.

INVINCIBLE DEFENSE

Now, first and foremost, is the matter of adequate defense. The No. 1 challenge to the Congress is the survival—I repeat—the survival—of America in the face of the worldwide Communist peril.

That is why Congress should closely evaluate and strengthen the present and future adequacy of our Army, Navy, and Air Force. In this dangerous atomic age, we cannot be "second best."

The Soviet Union is making alarming progress in her atomic development, in her long-range bombers.

And, so, I am personally in favor of accelerating our most crucial military programs. I think that we must still further strengthen our United States strategic aviation, heavy, and medium jet bombers.

I think that we should speed up our effort for the development of intercontinental missiles, both guided missiles and so-called ballistic missiles.

I think that we should speed up our program for atomic development—for nuclear-powered ships, above the sea and below the sea.

I think we should speed up our research into atomic powered airplanes.

I don't believe in wasting a dime, but I do believe that every single cent which is necessary for the most modern American defense and offense should and will be paid. Why? Because, it is a matter of our own survival.

STANDBY CONTROL POWERS

That is why we've got to get civil-defense "on the road."

It is why we've got to pass standby control powers for any emergency which may arise. I don't believe in leaving plans unmade until the last minute—when it may prove too late.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Now, secondly, on problems right here at home, I want to turn to the problem of young people and old people.

This session of Congress, in my judgment, should not close without passing juvenile delinquency control legislation. I personally have sponsored such bills. I think that it is essential that a comprehensive program be set up so as to end the situation which has arisen with an appalling number of youngsters getting into trouble.

As a matter of fact, a million of our children are getting into trouble with the law every year. A third of a million end up in the Nation's courts.

That doesn't mean, of course, that the youngsters of America aren't fundamentally sound and wholesome. On the contrary, 95 percent of our youngsters never get into trouble at all. But the 5 percent that do get into trouble, merit our careful attention.

So, we need strong coordinated action, by home, church and school, by Federal, State, and local governments to help protect our young people. As a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, I pledge my continued efforts toward those ends.

OLD-AGE SECURITY

Now, I want to turn to the other end of the age scale. I want to turn to the problems of our old folks.

Ten percent of our population is aged 65 years or older. Too many of our old people find themselves on the scrap heap, so to speak. They can't find jobs because of prejudice against old age. They have problems of inadequate recreation, of health; they have problems of housing.

That is why I am a cosponsor of legislation to set up a new commission on the problems of the aged.

I think old people are a great human resource which we can ill afford to squander.

I think that men's and women's older years can be their best years. I recall the words of the poet: "Grow old with me; the best is yet to be."

I think that there is no real limitation on man. Chronological age does not matter one bit compared to men's thinking and their spirit. As we are young at heart, we are

young in mind and body, and I am for a square break for old folks.

That is why I've introduced bills to liberalize social security. It is why I've offered the Wiley bill to extend old-age pensions to attorneys at law.

It is why I'm in favor of giving higher incentive to older folks to continue to work in their later years, without losing their modest pensions.

RAISE MINIMUM WAGE

Now, let me turn to the problems of the laboring man.

I think that the minimum wage ought to be increased. Right now it is only 75 cents an hour.

There is an unfortunate tendency for industries to shift from the North to the South merely to get the benefit of cheaper wage rates in Dixie.

Now, I am for fair competition between sections and States. But I have seen industries pack up and leave my own State of Wisconsin and leave other Midwestern States, and I certainly don't want to see more of them leave our Northern States because of unfair southern wage differentials.

I think workers in the South are entitled to decent wages. "The laborer is worthy of his hire."

And I think workers in Wisconsin, as well as in Illinois or in other States, are entitled to a decent minimum wage. You can't raise a family these days on $30 or so a week for a 40-hour week, and so I definitely believe that the minimum wage should be increased.

PROTECTING CONSUMERS

I've referred thus far to the problems of defense, of old people and young people and workers.

Now, what about the consumer? I am in favor of definite protection of the consumer.

That is why I will continue to fight against the effort which would destroy controls over natural gas. If these controls were destroyed, natural-gas rates—which are already high—would skyrocket. That must not happen. It will not happen, if consumers get busy and write to the Congress, urging fair protection and fair controls on gas rates.

JUSTICE FOR THE FARMER

Now, what about the farmer? There are several key points I want to mention as regards the farm program.

First of all, I believe that farm parity should be increased. I think that the farmer's income has been nosediving, and that the time has come—in the national interest—to halt that nosedive.

I think that the dairyman has been having a particularly serious problem making ends meet. And I see no reason why the dairyman should not get the same amount of parity return as do the producers of the so-called six basic crops.

After all, there is nothing more basic nor more essential than milk: nature's first food, nature's best food.

And I think that it is a shame that some of our dairy farmers have had to sell out, have had to auction off their livestock and close their farms.

The dairyman is entitled to a just price, as are other United States farmers.

Toward that end, I have introduced a bill to establisn in Madison, Wis., the capital of my State, a dairy research laboratory. I think that such a laboratory could prove a tremendous boon for the dairymen of our country, and for every American as well.

It could help improve America's health; it could help improve the stability of our dairy industry. And that is why I have introduced the bill for a dairy research laboratory, in hope my listeners will give it their support.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Now, what about the problem of the small-business man?

On June 30, the Small Business Administration will die unless it is renewed.

I am very definitely in favor of renewal of this agency's authority to exist. If anything, we need more small businesses in America, rather than fewer.

As you and I know, there is a tendency toward mergers in our country today. There is a tendency for more and more relatively large corporations to swallow up smaller ones.

In addition, right now, tax rates tend to discriminate against the small businessman. He can't raise sufficient capital. And if he earns a profit, he can't keep it, because Uncle Sam grabs it up.

I think that the Federal Small Business Administration can do and has done a vital job, to protect smaller enterprises, and that is why I am very definitely in favor of continuing it.

SEAWAY CHANNELS

Now, what about the problem of internal improvements in our country?

One of the most important such problems is the matter of the Great Lakes connecting channels. This is the legislation for $100 million to, in effect, complete the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway.

By enacting this bill, by deepening the connecting channels, above Lake Erie, we will have a 2,400 mile long artery into the heartland of the North American Continent.

We will have a fourth great coast on the oceans. The Great Lakes—the heartland of America—will have 27-foot deep water access to the ports of the world.

That is why the deepening of the connecting channels—as proposed in the Wiley bill—must be authorized.

Moreover, once the proposed Cal-Sag Canal is completed, as I believe it should be, we are going to see an artery right down through the midpart of North America, so that shipping can move from the Great Lakes to the Mississippi down on the gulf coast. This, too, will strengthen America internally. I am definitely in favor, therefore, of completing the Calumet-Sag Waterway.

MISCELLANEOUS BILLS

Now, friends, in the few minutes remaining to me, I'll like to mention a few of the other subjects which I believe your Congress should advance.

Let me just refer to them briefly:

1. Roads—The Congress should, I believe, enact the President's broad-visioned program for highway improvement. We can't continue with horse and buggy roads which are already choked with traffic.

2. Second, anticommunism: We should strengthen our internal-security laws by closing certain loopholes which now exist and by putting more teeth into anti-Red statutes. That means, for example, passing the Wiley bill to increase the penalties against seditious conspiracy.

3. Third, crime: There are several key anti-crime bills which we of the Kefauver crime committee had recommended but which Congress has not enacted. These bills—against gambling, tax evasion by gangsters, interstate bookmaking, and the like should definitely be enacted without further delay.

4. Taxes: There should be further liberalizing of the tax laws. That's one reason why I've offered a bill to permit parents to deduct the heavy cost of educating their youngsters in college. And, too, there should be more tax deductions, for working mothers.

5. Now, fifth, reservists: Congress should definitely provide a fairer break for our reservists who have been treated very arbitrarily in the past by the Pentagon.

Many World War II veterans were called back into the colors for the Korean conflict even though other men, without any prior service were not called at all. Reservists are the backbone of our defense and must be treated fairly.

6. Education: Congress should make available oil revenues from the rich outer Continental Shelf for purposes of bolstering United States national defense and for purposes of school aid.

7. Health: Pending bills to provide a Federal program for expansion of United States medical schools, training and research centers, should definitely be enacted in the interest of better health for all.

Meanwhile, Congress should continue its various investigations:

Its probing of subversive forces.

Its investigations of monopoly.

Its investigations of the causes of juvenile delinquency.

Its investigations of Canadian stock swindlers, a probe of frauds and racketeers, conducted in the interest of the investing public, which I personally have been spearheading.

And other probes against graft and corruption should likewise continue.

CONCLUSION

Well, friends, I want you to know that I've enjoyed submitting this legislative program to you.

I hope that you've found it helpful.

It would be a pleasure to get your reaction to it; just write me what you think Congress should do prior to its scheduled adjournment.

This is ALEX WILEY signing off from Washington, D. C.

Arizona Uranium Rush Started in Texas Family's Backyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the beginning of the great uranium rush in the Four Corners area of Arizona should properly be credited to a Texas family.

The story was told recently by Merl Hudson, writing in the Houston Chronicle. Being a firm adherent of the policy of giving credit where credit is due, I ask unanimous consent that this story be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that the historical record of the Arizona uranium rush will be complete and accurate.

There being no objection, the news story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whenever Eugene C. Weafer of Bryan reads about another big uranium strike in the Four Corners area of Arizona he gets something of a headache. Because, time was when his youngsters played with chunks of uranium ore in his front yard out there, and Weafer did nothing about it.

Back in 1949, the Associated Press filed a story on the lonely life Weafer and his family led in the Four Corners area, where he was a teacher at Teec Nos Poc, a Navajo Indian reservation. The story really started the headache. The gimmick was a reference to uranium, coupled with the statement that "the older (Weafer) children can identify ore they pick up in their own yard."

Not much, that, but letters began to arrive, asking questions. Then people showed up in Jeeps and began snooping around with Geiger counters.

Talk of uranium was no news scoop to vanadium mining operators in that region, but they maintained that the ore was of a low grade and too difficult to mine to make

it profitable. Weafer was aware of this opinion and did not stake a claim, but amateurs deprived of this expert advice continued to prospect.

Soon thereafter, the Weafers returned to Texas. He is a teacher at Allen Academy in Bryan, and Mrs. Weafer directs the activities of their five children. There, they organized the National Milk Bowl for small-fry football games, and the Arizona sojourn could have remained a pleasant memory if practically every month some national magazine didn't print an exciting story about another amateur geologist who struck it rich in the Four Corners area.

"The irony of it all," laughs Weafer, "is not only that I heeded expert advice and did not file a claim, but that I got scolded for bringing in a rush of prospectors through the news story, while a Navajo Indian who found a chunk of uranium 2 years later, 250 miles away, got all the credit."

Participating Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have here a copy of the commencement address delivered by the Honorable Eric Johnston, president, Motion Picture Association of America, at Virginia State College on Monday, May 30, 1955. Mr. Johnston in his address sought to imbue young America with those ideals of citizenship which have made our country great.

Therefore, with unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

I'd like to talk to you this morning about being a participating citizen in our democracy.

By participating citizens, I mean citizens with maturity of mind and of character. I mean citizens who are not afraid of old ideas and who welcome the testing of new ideas.

I mean citizens who view the Nation and the world as they actually are, and not as they wish them to be.

I mean citizens who despise intellectual barbarism as much as they despise political, and economic, and social barbarism.

As a Nation, as a people, we have a passion for education. It has always been that way with us. It is a must of our democratic society.

The pioneers who created this Nation knew it. In the beginning the church and the school arose almost before the plough or the spade had broken the soil. Stubbornly, the settlers insisted that their children be versed in reading and writing and ciphering. First came the itinerate teacher. And then they built the schools. They carried on their shoulders willingly an additional tax burden to make education available not only for the privileged, but for the underprivileged.

All through our history, though, there have been sullen recalcitrants. They said: "It doesn't take a high school education to milk a cow or follow a binder." Or they said: "A year of algebra never added a nickel to the price of wheat." And some chimed in: "A degree in liberal arts, in the humanities, isn't necessary to build an automobile, or a brick house."

There were some people—diehards—who jeered at what they called "bookfarming" when institutions such as Virginia State College were born.

Man needs to know more than how to milk a cow, run a binder, figure the price of wheat, or build automobiles and houses.

He needs to know how to live. From evidence abundantly around us, it is clear he is sadly lacking in this knowledge. Education alone cannot provide it. But it takes education to give man the rounded, balanced view essential to fruitful living. These things, fortunately, most of us appreciate.

In our history, luckily, the diehards weren't many and the educational process went steadily forward. Sometimes, as in recent years, we have kept our pursestrings too tight, but the passion for education has persisted.

Yet, with all this, there is probably no free nation in the world where the educated man, the intellectual, is more demeaned today than in our land. For him we use the jeering and sneering terms of egghead, of muddleheaded professor. He is the butt of our jokes. We suspect him, doubtless because he thinks, even philosophizes and criticizes.

Why? Why do we go to all the trouble, spend all the money, in behalf of our enviable educational system to wind up by scoffing at the end result?

Is it because we're afraid of something, afraid particularly of ideas? Old ideas as well as new ideas?

There is much evidence that this is regrettably true, that there is among us too much fear of ideas, of those precious things born of the mind, of the intellect.

What is it that disturbs us? Old ideas, such as democracy, such as equality of opportunity, such as being innocent until proved guilty? New ideas, such as the United Nations, such as the willingness to examine all phases of human relations and human conduct, such as welcoming every opportunity of developing a means to enable the peoples of this earth to live in peace with one another?

Fear of ideas is so unbecoming to us. It was not fear, but courage and confidence and willingness to take a risk, that led to the Declaration of Independence—the most revolutionary document devised by man. It set off vast social and political upheavals at the time, and it is still rocketing revolutions around the earth as man everywhere strives to achieve in daily living the potentials of things of the mind. It is these things of the mind that move and shake the world.

When historians chronicle the events of the present generation, I suspect that some will be powerfully tempted to describe it as the age of fanaticism, dominated, in large degree, by the intellectual barbarian. The the intellectual barbarian demands that the minds of individuals, of nations, be surrendered completely, unquestionably, to him. Thinking stops.

Look around us. There was Mussolini. He was a minor-league fanatic, in many respects a laughable, strutting peacock, but he advanced the pattern and turned part of the world backward.

There was Hitler, unspeakable, brutal, who debauched a national and a continent, and brought the whole world to the point of chaos. The lights of western civilization were almost extinguished.

There was Stalin. There are today the leaders of the international Communist conspiracy in Russia, in China, in many places on the globe.

All these intellectual barbarians have followed precisely the same pattern. They seek, above all, to destroy independence of mind, to enforce on people a steel-ringed mode of conformity. The rest is then easy. Individuals disappear into a faceless mass.

We have our intellectual barbarians—a few so-called statesmen, who would like us to barter away our independent judgment to go on wild emotional sprees with them. They are small-bore fellows, and they usually bore us after a while, but, small or large, intellectual barbarians are a menace to our kind of society.

They leave traces after they've been here and gone. Conformity, like evil odors, is not easy to eradicate. Fears and mistrust, once spread, are hard to overcome. Suspicion lingers.

Conformity-thinking is no thinking at all. It provides false comfort, in the belief that the mass thinking to which we are conforming is safe. Without questioning, how can you be sure you are safe? Your history has given you many examples of the danger of mass acceptance of false concepts. And conformity-thinking atrophies the mind, eventually making independent judgment impossible. Our real safety lies in testing all ideas to find the soundest procedures.

Mental conformity produces citizens who are robots. Totalitarian government can flourish with mechanical citizens. Political democracy cannot.

We need fully participating and discerning citizens. And what is such a one?

He is conservative, because there is so much here to conserve. But he is also progressive, because he refuses to accept the stalemate and the defeat of the status quo.

He is more of an innovator than a reformer. He works with the tools at hand. He doesn't expect perfection overnight. Nor does he turn sullen when it seems to elude him on will-o'-the-wisp wings.

He discards smugness, sanctified lies and whiskered philosophies. But he also discards the medicine-show promise and the snake-oil prescription.

He is not afflicted with fear or inertia. He is forever buoyed up by the inner compulsion of hope plus determination.

If he is truly discerning, he will know that much of the world's woes come down to a frightful and outrageous paradox. While we have achieved a master hand over nature, we still bicker and brawl over the distribution of the abundance.

The discerning citizen will recognize the threats to democracy. He will know that the chief of these lies inside, not outside.

He wil know that if democracy goes down, it will be because of dry rot at the core—because the citizen has become indolent and complacent, in mind, in spirit, in action.

The participating citizen will fight these tendencies that subvert a democracy. Most of all, he will fight them in himself. He will combat any attempt to pour our citizens into a common mold, for that would destroy originality, ideas, and ideals. In the conformist society, ignorance, prejudice, mediocrity, and stupidity are kings. They have no place here.

He will welcome diversified thinking and cherish the differentness of his fellow beings.

Democracy is a hard task master. It is the most exacting and risky of all systems of living. It requires the most of every one of us.

The sum total of our individual attitudes determines our national course. Out of this, if we want, can come a future we have all dreamed about—a future satisfying, rewarding, abundant.

Years ago I remember being told to hitch my wagon to a star. I hope you will hitch your minds and your hearts to a star. Be eager to meet life. Expect a lot from it. Give a lot to it.

As I come now to wish you well and to say good-bye on this commencement day, I want to give you a few remarks that were made in the long ago by one of my teachers of English. She told a group of us graduating students:

"You are leaving now. You have all made passing grades. Some of you have been brilliant. But I can't tell whether you have been educated or not. Only you—and time—can tell that.

"I don't know whether you'll remember a line of Chaucer, or will be able to recite a single speech from Shakespeare. I don't know whether you'll remember to put commas in right places, or whether you'll even recall what syntax means.

"And I don't care very much, either. Those are not really the important things about an education.

"If you have developed a bump, just a little bump even, of intellectual curiosity, these 4 years in school have been tremendously worthwhile, and I have no fear of what you'll do in life. That bump is the most priceless asset that you can ever possess. It is the mark of a great human being."

So, as you leave the campus and go out into life, take that bump with you, and keep it growing, forever.

Independence Day of Armenia, May 28, 1918

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, much of the tension in the world today arises from the fact that so many nations have been deprived of their freedom and independence. Under such conditions there can be no real or lasting peace. The United States by espousing the cause of self-determination for all nations both great and small has become a beacon of hope for those enslaved or subject to alien domination.

As the leader of the free, the United States, is striving to ease those international tensions that have their roots in the denial of liberty to so many millions in Europe and Asia and thus bring back genuine peace to our world.

Among those nations which today are deprived of their independence is Armenia. Armenia's political independence was lost late in the 14th century, and from then until 1918 the Armenians had not known what it meant to be free. For more than 500 years their historic homeland was overrun and parcelled out among its conquerors—Persians, Russians, and Ottoman Turks. During all that time they suffered many hardships and lost heavily in worldly goods; often they were subjected to wholesale massacres. Early in World War I their very existence as a people was threatened in a massacre unprecedented in modern history. One million Armenians lost their lives in that atrocious butchery. But the survivors of those horrors did not lose heart. Early in 1918 in a portion of their homeland then part of the old Russian Empire, they declared their national independence on May 28, 1918.

It is that day which is being celebrated today in all Armenian communities where there is freedom to celebrate national holidays. Armenian independence was supported by the United States and we gave our moral and financial assistance to the struggling government of that counry. We tried to help it in every way possible. At one time we were even asked to be a mandatory over Armenia but, not being as fully conscious of our world leadership as we are today, we declined it. Besides, the course of international events proved fatal to Armenian independence. Late in 1920 the new Republic of Armenia became an easy victim of aggressive Turkish nationalism and expanding Russian communism.

Since then Armenian independence has vanished, but the Armenian people and their sympathetic friends continue to celebrate that independence day in the hope that someday, and perhaps soon, they may regain their independence. I heartily join in this memorable celebration.

House Backs Bow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Massillon (Ohio) Evening Independent of May 26, 1955, on the subject of my amendment to the Reserve bill:

HOUSE BACKS BOW

Many Americans may not know that members of this country's military forces stationed in foreign countries are subject to the laws of the country in which they are stationed should they become involved in some criminal offense.

But that is the case and many Members of Congress are not at all in accord with such a setup, particularly FRANK T. BOW, of Canton, Republican Congressman from the 16th Ohio District.

And Bow's fight to have this situation changed recently won the endorsement of the House of Representatives by a 174–56 vote.

Known as the Status of Forces Treaties, these documents bind the United States to give criminal jurisdiction over United States military forces stationed in a foreign country to the country in which the men are stationed.

This new idea in international relations, according to Congressman Bow, means that in Yugoslavia, for example, if an American serviceman is stationed there and breaks a law he may be tried by a Communist judge in a Yugoslavian court under Yugoslav law, instead of by a United States military tribunal under our own code of justice.

"Traditionally and historically each nation has always had jurisdiction over its forces in a foreign country," says Congressman Bow. "It has been true in foreign relations for centuries. Under the Status of Forces Treaties, signed first by our Government as a part of the NATO agreement on June 19, 1951, we give over the right to the country in which the servicemen are stationed."

This situation has brought some appalling injustices, according to Congressman Bow. He cites the case of a United States marine from the 16th Ohio District now serving a 3-year sentence in a Japanese jail for "joy-riding."

In this country the extreme penalty may be as much as 90 days in jail.

By the Status of Forces Treaties, America is giving up the right to assure its citizen-soldiers the protection the Constitution guarantees them, Bow contends.

"I don't believe any young man should be deprived of his right as an American citizen while serving far from home in defense of those rights," he declares.

The whole idea of Status of Forces Treaties is a reversal of the historic doctrine of international law under which the soldiers of a nation remain under the exclusive jurisdiction of their military courts, according to the Ohio Congressman.

In inaugurating his campaign to have Congress change the treaties, Bow drafted an amendment to the National Reserve plan bill. The amendment says that no American troops can be sent into nations with which we have Status of Forces Treaties until the treaties have been revised or abrogated.

Bow's colleagues apparently thought well of his plan because they adopted his amendment by an overwhelming vote.

Congressman Bow's proposal seems to have plenty of merit.

It is hard to understand why members of United States Armed Forces, on duty in foreign countries, must be subject to the criminal laws of that country. After all these servicemen and women are citizens of the United States, serving in a foreign country because their government has sent them there.

They are not citizens of the country in which they are serving. They are under the jurisdiction of this Government's military organization and subject to its rules and regulations. And if they become involved in some criminal offense, they should be subject to the action of a military tribunal rather than the courts of the country in which they are serving.

Holiday Highway Accident Toll Mounts—Speeding Automobiles Called Misguided Missiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as usual, the aftermath of the Memorial Day holiday tells a sickening story of death and destruction on the highways of the Nation. Latest reports, which may be revised upward, indicate that some 360 persons were killed on the road in automobiles during the weekend just past when the Nation observed Memorial Day.

We call this holocaust which plagues our Nation with each national holiday season, a series of accidents. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is very little "accident" connected with the driver who sends his car down the highway at terrific speeds or a driver who ignores traffic regulations drawn up for his safety or who drives while intoxicated. These drivers are not involved in accidents; they are involved in almost certain destruction. The accident victims are those whom these murderous drivers encounter or who are so unfortunate as to be passengers in these missiles—these misguided missiles of death.

A recent compilation of highway casualty statistics has been supplied by an esteemed friend and is a reliable and accurate report which, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD. These statistics may startle, but they should be read.

The tables are as follows:

Actions of drivers resulting in deaths and injuries—1954

	Persons killed	Percent	Persons injured	Percent
Exceeding speed limit	12,380	45.7	659,000	43.1
On wrong side of road	4,970	18.3	131,480	8.6
Did not have right-of-way	3,060	11.3	351,670	23.0
Cutting in	100	.4	45,880	3.0
Passing on curve or hill	140	.5	3,060	.2
Passing on wrong side	320	1.2	32,100	2.1
Failed to signal and improper signaling	410	1.5	58,100	3.8
Car ran away—no driver	30	.1	3,060	.2
Drove off roadway	1,980	7.3	79,510	5.2
Reckless driving	3,440	12.7	142,200	9.3
Miscellaneous	270	1.0	22,940	1.5
Total	27,100	100.0	1,529,000	100.0

Age of drivers in accidents—1954

	Drivers in fatal accidents	Percent	Drivers in nonfatal accidents	Percent
Under 18 years	1,440	3.4	53,310	2.6
18–24 years	8,800	20.7	348,570	17.0
25–64 years	29,920	70.4	1,584,960	77.3
65 and over	2,340	5.5	63,560	3.1
Total	42,500	100.0	2,050,400	100.0

Operating experience of drivers in accidents—1954

	Drivers in fatal accidents	Percent	Drivers in nonfatal accidents	Percent
Less than 3 months	550	1.3	28,710	1.4
3 to 6 months	260	.6	16,400	.8
6 to 12 months	550	1.3	34,860	1.7
1 year or more	41,140	96.8	1,970,430	96.1
Total	42,500	100.0	2,050,400	100.0

Types of motor vehicles involved in fatal and nonfatal accidents—1954

	Vehicles in fatal accidents	Percent	Vehicles in nonfatal accidents	Percent
Passenger car	33,400	78.3	1,767,700	84.4
Commercial vehicle	7,290	17.1	215,750	10.3
Taxi	210	.5	58,650	2.8
Bus	470	1.1	33,500	1.6
Motorcycle	770	1.8	12,600	.6
All others	510	1.2	6,300	.3
Total	42,650	100.0	2,094,500	100.0

Condition of vehicles involved in fatal and nonfatal accidents—1954

	Vehicles in fatal accidents	Percent	Vehicles in nonfatal accidents	Percent
In apparently good condition	40,640	95.3	2,025,300	96.7
Brake defective	510	1.2	33,500	1.6
Steering defective	130	.3	6,300	.3
1 or 2 lights out	260	.6	4,200	.2
Taillight out or obscured	40	.1	2,100	.1
Other defects in equipment	600	1.4	16,800	.8
Puncture or blowout	470	1.1	6,300	.3
Total	42,650	100.0	2,094,500	100.0

Weather conditions prevailing in accidents—1954

	Fatal accidents	Percent	Non-fatal accidents	Percent
Clear	25,930	84.2	1,021,360	80.0
Fog	370	1.2	12,770	1.0
Rain	3,640	11.8	183,840	14.4
Snow	860	2.8	58,730	4.6
Total	30,800	100.0	1,276,700	100.0

Days of occurrence of accidents—1954

	Persons killed	Percent	Persons injured	Percent
Sunday	6,530	18.4	313,600	16.0
Monday	4,370	12.3	260,680	13.3
Tuesday	3,660	10.3	231,280	11.8
Wednesday	3,940	11.1	237,160	12.1
Thursday	4,080	11.5	245,000	12.5
Friday	5,470	15.4	307,720	15.7
Saturday	7,450	21.0	364,560	18.6
Total	35,500	100.0	1,960,000	100.0

Hours of occurrence of accidents—1954

	Persons killed	Percent	Persons injured	Percent
12 to 1 a. m	2,060	5.8	58,800	3.0
1 to 6 a. m	6,390	18.0	176,400	9.0
6 to 7 a. m	780	2.2	31,360	1.6
7 to 8 a. m	600	1.7	64,680	3.3
8 to 9 a. m	710	2.0	72,520	3.7
9 to 10 a. m	780	2.2	62,720	3.2
10 to 11 a. m	960	2.7	73,620	3.8
11 to 12 a. m	1,100	3.1	90,160	4.6
12 to 1 p. m	920	2.6	90,160	4.6
1 to 2 p. m	1,170	3.3	95,280	4.9
2 to 3 p. m	1,710	4.8	110,620	5.6
3 to 4 p. m	1,850	5.2	141,120	7.2
4 to 5 p. m	1,880	5.3	174,440	8.9
5 to 6 p. m	2,130	6.0	165,400	8.4
6 to 7 p. m	2,020	5.7	121,520	6.2
7 to 8 p. m	2,420	6.8	111,720	5.7
8 to 9 p. m	2,200	6.2	94,080	4.8
9 to 10 p. m	1,950	5.5	82,320	4.2
10 to 11 p. m	1,810	5.1	72,520	3.7
11 to 12 p. m	2,060	5.8	70,560	3.6
Total	35,500	100.0	1,960,000	100.0

Direction of travel of cars involved in accidents—1954

	Persons killed	Percent	Persons injured	Percent
Going straight	27,760	78.2	1,305,360	66.6
Turning right	570	1.6	33,320	1.7
Turning left	1,770	5.0	99,960	5.1
Backing	390	1.1	33,320	1.7
Skidding	2,240	6.3	70,560	3.6
Car parked or standing still	1,170	3.3	117,600	6.0
Slowing or stopping	430	1.2	239,120	12.2
Miscellaneous	1,170	3.3	60,760	3.1
Total	35,500	100.0	1,960,000	100.0

Almost 40 percent of the deaths occur on weekends.

Saturday was the most dangerous day of the week.

Crossing between intersections was the greatest cause of pedestrian casualties.

Drivers under 25 were involved in more than their proportionate share of accidents.

Three out of five deaths occur during the hours of darkness.

Ninety-five percent of the vehicles involved were in good mechanical condition.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Memorial Day address given by our colleague, the Honorable JAMES M. QUIGLEY, of Pennsylvania, on Monday, May 30, 1955, at Camp Hill and New Oxford, Pa.:

We are gathered here today on this sacred ground to remember our dead and to pay special tribute to those men and boys who were born and grew up in this area and who then went forth to offer their lives so that we and our country might live. It is proper that we should do this—for this is the purpose of Memorial Day. This is the reason for the holiday.

Unfortunately, this day will come and go, and have little or no significance for many Americans. The meaning of Memorial Day will be lost in the roar of racing automobiles, the cheering at the doubleheaders, in the excitement of the season's first picnic. Too many Americans will be so wrapped up in their pursuit of happiness that they will not remember even for a moment that good, brave men met death that we might continue to live in America with the reasonable hope of meeting up with happiness somewhere along the way.

Fortunately, however, there are many good Americans who will remember. Throughout the length and breadth of this land—in small towns and big cities—men and women will gather today, as we are gathered here. In simple but dramatic ceremonies, our honored dead will be remembered. And the honor thus bestowed upon our war dead should serve to remind all of us of why they died, and to help us to be more firmly resolved that they did not die in vain. For Memorial Day will indeed become a shallow thing when it fails to remind all of us of our duties as citizens. Duties which are always with us. Duties which may be more colorful and romantic in time of war but are nonetheless vital and unavoidable in time of peace. This is indeed the true value of Memorial Day that, remembering those who sacrificed even life itself, for the American ideal, the living may take courage and strength in their defense and development of that ideal.

America can be proud that it was the first Nation of the world to set aside a day on which to pay tribute to those who died in defense of their country. It is not fitting, however, that we should remember only those who died and at the same time to forget those who are still suffering from wounds received in service, particularly the paraplegics, the amputees, and the mentally ill. These men and their families have paid and are paying even a higher price than those who met death on the battlefield.

It is true that in indirect ways—such as the sale of poppies these, our living dead, are remembered on this day. It is also true that throughout the year our veterans organizations and their auxiliaries do a grand job of easing the burden of our hospitalized veterans. But, sad to note, by and large this Nation as a whole does a pretty thorough job of forgetting those veterans who were unable to march home from the wars. This forgetfulness is not to our credit as a people.

I trust that we will live to see this defect in our Nation's character corrected. It has

been my hope for sometime that the day will come when this Nation will have a day set apart to memorialize and pay tribute to our disabled war veterans. I visualize that on this day, dedicated to the disabled, good men and good women, led by their former comrades in arms and fellow veterans, will flock to the various veterans hospitals to visit and to cheer and to pay tribute to those to whom we owe so much and remember so seldom.

I express this hope fully conscious that in many respects this country can't stand another holiday. Our holiday accident rate for example is indeed a crime and a disgrace. I make the suggestion for this special day for the disabled even though I share the feeling that we in America already have too many special days and special weeks for a vast variety of purposes, good, bad, and indifferent. Nevertheless I urge the establishment of just this 1 more day, for just this 1 more purpose because I believe that by and through such a day we can, in a small way, fulfill our duty to those less fortunate and at the same time focus public attention on the great work of rehabilitation that remains to be done in this field.

I do not presume to suggest when such a day should be observed. Initially my thinking was that it should be the anniversary of V–J Day, because while the Civil War gave us Memorial Day and World War I Armistice Day, now almost 10 years since its end, no special day of remembrance has been effectively set aside to commemorate World War II. However, I am no longer certain that V–J is the ideal day. This change in my thinking is caused in part by the fact that just a year ago tomorrow the President signed into law an act of Congress which caused Armistice Day as this country has known it since the end of World War I to go out of existence and to be commemorated henceforth as Veterans' Day. This presidential and congressional action was in a sense a recognition that Memorial Day and Armistice Day tended to duplicate one another. I suppose it was this recognition of duplication and a desire to avoid triplification more than anything else which prevented the successful establishment of a special day to commemorate World War II.

In any event, on the basis of the action of Congress this Nation will now officially remember its war dead, of all wars and of every battlefield on 1 day out of the year. That day is today, Memorial Day. Likewise from now on this Nation will officially remember its veterans, of all wars and every battlefield, 1 day out of the year and that day will be November 11. In the light of this development I seriously suggest that from now on November 11—Veterans' Day—would be the ideal day to give special honor and special remembrance to those veterans who have sacrificed in an especially hard way for the defense of our country.

If such a day is to become a reality, it will need more than my dreaming. But all it really needs, is a few people who believe that it is a dream worth dreaming and with a willingness to do something about it. After all, Memorial Day was the result of the efforts of a few women and we as a nation are grateful to a Philadelphia Sunday-school teacher for giving us Mother's Day. There is no reason why we could not this morning light the spark that could spread throughout the entire country, the burning desire to do more for our disabled. From the town of Camp Hill starting at this moment, there could go forth an ideal, a spirit which could eventually add much of character and beauty to our national life.

Such a project would indeed be worth our efforts. Few of us, in our lifetimes will have an opportunity to participate in an effort more worthwhile. I humbly but honestly submit this my dream, for your consideration and action. A Memorial Day for our living dead would bring forth a public acknowledgment of our unpayable debt to those in the beyond who fought and died that this ceremony here today is not just so many hollow words, but a hallowed tribute to them and to all who fought and sacrificed in the defense of our great Nation.

It is within our power to make this a Memorial Day that will never be forgotten.

Attempt To Move Airlines Appears Blocked for Present

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News of May 27, 1955:

ATTEMPT TO MOVE AIRLINES APPEARS BLOCKED FOR PRESENT

To nobody's great surprise, the nine commercial airlines based at Willow Run have decided to reject the overtures of Detroit officials to change their base of operations to Wayne Major Airport.

The Detroit authorities were so informed this week by the airlines' spokesman, Robert J. Wilson, vice president of Capital Airlines. The difference in travel time from Detroit to the two airports was not sufficient, he said, to justify the expenditure the move would involve.

The decision appears to end a climactic chapter of the airport dispute. Although the outcome was in little doubt—the airlines long ago showed their lack of interest in the move—other plans can now proceed.

For instance, a project for beautifying what one Wayne Major advocate termed "barnlike" Willow Run, can move ahead. A survey has been underway for months to assess needed and feasible improvements. Planners think such improvements can be made for between $300,000 and $500,000, a fraction of the sum which use of Wayne Major would have necessitated.

More important, the meeting opened the door for a new decision by the Air Force concerning the jet squadron they are presently planning to send to Willow Run in July. Now that there is no longer any question that the commercial planes will remain at Willow Run, it is apparent that Wayne Major will be available for further military air traffic. Most observers expect the Wayne port to become the center of military installations. It is to be hoped that the Air Force will see fit to follow suit.

Navy spokesmen, who last month indicated that they were prepared to spend $10 million on a jet airbase near Detroit, said they would wait until the meeting this week before taking any action. It looks like Wayne Major is their site.

All indications are that the commercial airlines will remain at Willow Run for some years. A projected new northeast Detroit airport is still in the theoretical stage, but all the same it figured prominently in the airlines' decision this week. They do not want to contribute to two new airports, they assert, and they anticipate being called upon to put forth a sizable sum toward the new port.

Although the issue was not settled with all good fellowship, it has ceased to be a burning question, for which most people will be grateful. Partisans of either camp can now retire to the shade for a drink of water.

Some people, of course, never will. Leroy C. Smith, unofficial manager of Wayne Major, and one of the most vocal proponents of the move, left this week's meeting nothing daunted. The airlines will move eventually, said he briskly. Which sounds just a little bit like whistling in the dark.

Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, Spiritual Mobilization, 1521 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles 17, Calif., is, for the fifth consecutive year, urging an observance of Independence Day which calls attention to the spiritual foundations of the Government of the United States of America and to the inherent relationships between religious faith and freedom.

The Government of the United States of America was the first in history established on the recognition of the fact that man is free only as he seeks freedom according to divine laws. The signers of the Declaration of Independence acknowledged that the freedom they proclaimed was a gift from their Creator. The Declaration of Independence is a proclamation of conviction in the supreme worth of each man as a child of God. It heralded the birth of a Nation in which each man might claim his birthright of freedom under God. It proclaimed that there is no freedom but freedom under God. Thereafter people would have the right to be what they ought to be and to possess what they ought to possess.

"The freedom under God observance of Independence Day" was originated, under Spiritual Mobilization's sponsorship in 1951, through a 175th anniversary committee. The Honorable Herbert Hoover and Gen. Douglas MacArthur were among the committee's 89 distinguished members. Focusing attention on the religious significance of America's heritage, this annual nationwide effort enlists the support of clergymen, public officials, businessmen, clubs and organizations, publishers, and broadcasters. Governors and mayors throughout the country each year, issue official proclamations for a "Freedom under God observance of Independence Day."

Individuals are urged to take part in the "Freedom under God observance of Independence Day"—

By commemorating the birth of our country with personal dedication to the spiritual concepts set forth by our Founding Fathers;

By reading and pondering the Declaration of Independence in an effort to understand and value its profound meanings;

By recognizing that God is the source of freedom and that "men are endowed

by their Creator with certain unalienable rights";

By fortifying freedom with faith in God, faith in one's self, faith in other men;

By writing editors, columnists, commentators and public officials their opinions on happenings which infringe on individual liberty;

By personally taking the responsibility for meeting a community need or for helping another stand on his own feet;

By applying religious principles to every problem they face.

Spiritual mobilization assists individuals and groups in contributing to the "Freedom under God observance of Independence Day" by making available on request a variety of material and literature designed to inject the "Freedom under God" theme into the observance of Independence Day. It would be difficult to conceive of a more fitting and, in these critical times, a more significant day than July 4 on which each of us may once again rededicate ourselves to the purposes for which our forefathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

We hope that everyone will act within their own sphere of influence to help carry out this "Freedom under God observance of Independence Day, 1955."

Not Only Jackson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of May 29, 1955:

NOT ONLY JACKSON

Mayor James N. House, attending the United States Conference of Mayors in New York, the other day was asked by the New York Daily News what is the most pressing problem in your community?

His answer: "A community is as good as its citizens want it to be. Trouble is, too many people don't want to shoulder the burden of civic and community effort. They prefer instead to leave the job to an overworked few. If we can lick apathy, the battle for a better community will be half won."

Apparently Mayor House thinks that Jackson's most pressing problem is the need for more good citizens ready to take on civic and community effort.

We'll agree. But we would hate to have the record show that Jackson is unique in that problem. It is universal.

In every city, large and small, there are good citizens whose readiness to serve is imposed upon. And there are many more who shirk all community responsibilities both in the giving of their own time and the contribution of funds.

We need more leaders willing to carry on for the good of Jackson. We need them badly.

But so do Detroit, Saginaw, Indianapolis, New York, and just about every community everywhere.

Ambassador Morgenstierne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, the eminent dean of the diplomatic corps, Ambassador Wilhelm Munthe de Morgenstierne, of Norway, completed 45 years of service in his highly specialized and unusually difficult field on Thursday, May 26, 1955, and entered upon his 46th year without fanfare on his part. However, the Washington community did not fail to take notice of his extraordinary record, as is revealed by the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald under date of May 26 and is one of the well-deserved tributes paid to this remarkable gentleman whom I am proud to claim as my friend:

Wilhelm Morgenstierne has achieved the distinction of a landmark of Washington, and, in his quiet way, a genial landmark he is too. Norway's Ambassador, is, of course, the dean of the diplomatic corps (which means that he is a sort of ambassador for the collective body of 77 envoys in Washington, an assignment he fills with a high degree of respect and responsibility). But more than that, today he will celebrate the completion of 45 years of diplomatic service. In another couple of years he will have retired. By far the bulk of Mr. Morgenstierne's service has been spent in the American Capital, and this was his first post, back in 1910. Since then the Ambassador has been a familiar figure in the homes of hosts of capitalites as Washington has grown up, and his Embassy has been the scene of thousands of brilliant functions. He and his Canadian-born wife have a genius for entertainment and for friendship. Both of them are diffident on the surface, but once a connection has been established, they exhibit a warmth and a simplicity which are endearing and, shall we say, very American. They have been good advertisements for Norway. Many a Washingtonian will join the diplomatic corps in spirit as the corps honors its dean today.

Mr. Speaker, the Ambassador has often said in affectionate voice that he regards my home town, Decorah, Iowa, as his second home. That is understandable for Decorah is a center of Norwegian-American culture. There, in 1861, Norwegian immigrants founded Luther College, now the largest of Iowa's many private colleges. There is published the Decorah Posten in Norwegian which has the largest circulation of any newspaper printed in that language. There is located the celebrated Norwegian-American Museum which is attracting increasing numbers of tourists with the passing of the years. There is the post of the Norwegian vice-consul for Iowa, so long held by the late Dr. T. Stabo, an intimate friend of the Ambassador and in whose home he was a frequent guest. There, too, is Symra Literary Society which is limited in membership to 25 men who are specially interested in Norwegian-American culture. Other time-tested organizations like Normandsforbundet and Luren Singing Society have done and are doing their part in preserving and promoting Norwegian culture which fits so beautifully into American life.

Yes, indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is understandable that the Ambassador refers to Decorah as his second home, for there during his long diplomatic career he has spent many happy days in an atmosphere of culture and refinement which he is so fully equipped to appreciate and enjoy. In Decorah the dean of the diplomatic corps and Ambassador from Norway will always be welcome for he is recognized as a man who can walk with kings nor lose the common touch, as the poet wrote so well.

On this significant occasion, Mr. Ambassador, the Decorah community salutes and congratulates you. There is a landmark in northeast Iowa that will always cherish another visit from the genial landmark of Washington.

Soviet Union and Red China?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting editorial from the Boston Post, Wednesday, June 1, 1955:

AT THE CROSSROADS

American foreign policy is now dead center of a perilous crossroad. The choice of a road to peace—indeed, a road to anywhere except war, must soon be made, for the Soviet Union and Red China, its most powerful satellite, are moving toward a bargain.

Both the ponderous wheels of the Communist juggernaut have been oiled by a new Communist policy so that they do not shriek a warning that the vehicle is on the move.

Any bargain that the Soviet Union and Red China may make with the West will have to be in their favor. But, whatever the objective of the new Communist policy, it is worth enough for the leaders to risk losing what orientals call "face."

The freeing of four American fliers by deportation from Red China, although covered by an official explanation of the change of policy in Peking, nevertheless is a concession by the Chinese Red leaders. They have let Indian Diplomat Krishna Menon, a Soviet agent, take the credit for arranging the release of the American prisoners and for extending the hope that other Americans will be released.

Note that Dag Hammarskjold, U. N. Secretary General, was specifically excluded from credit for the release by Krishna Menon. The United States will be forced to pay for this release of prisoners in dear coin.

At the other end of the Communist axis, Soviet leaders of the very topmost rank went hat in hand to Belgrade to sue for the friendship of the man they denounced a few years back in such furious terms that only his death by purging would satisfy the Soviet leaders. The very fact that Tito moved the bargaining session from Belgrade to his retreat on Brioni Island testifies to the fact that the Soviet leaders have made progress in getting whatever they are after.

None of these signs of easing of international tension bodes good for the United

States. The Soviet Union is and always will be our implacable and remorseless enemy. For as long as the United States is rich and powerful and capable of fighting a two-front war the Soviet Union will not relent in its efforts to destroy this last fortress of freedom.

Freedom for Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that on the occasion of the 37th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania, numerour Members of the Congress of the United States expressed their sincere expressions of encouragement and support to the American citizens of Lithuanian descent, and joined them in the fervent hope that the day may not be too far distant when this brave little country will once again enjoy true liberty and freedom.

A number of Members spoke on the floor of the Senate and in the House of Representatives.

Other Members addressed mass meetings in various cities where observances of this significant anniversary were held.

Other Members of Congress voiced their sentiments in statements to the Lithuanian American Council, a nationwide organization of Americans of Lithuanian descent, or to its press agency, the Lithuanian American Information Center in New York City.

We were particularly proud in having had in the Senate and in the House on the days of the observance of Lithuanian independence, two eminent Lithuanian American religious leaders, both members of the Lithuanian American Council, to offer the invocations—the Very Reverend Monsignor John Balkunas, of Maspeth, Long Island, N. Y.; and the Very Reverend Francis M. Juras, of Lawrence, Mass.

In addition to this observance in the Congress of the United States, the governors of several States and many mayors of cities urged other millions of Americans to join in observing this significant anniversary.

With confidence that the people of Lithuania will soon regain their natural rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, Mr. Speaker, I have prepared the following statement on the observance of Lithuania's Independence Day and her right to freedom. Under unanimous consent, I ask that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The statement follows:

LITHUANIA: VICTIM OF U. S. S. R. AGGRESSION

On June 15, 1940, just 15 years ago, Lithuania, a peaceful and freedom-loving nation was overrun by barbaric Soviet Russian hordes and through terror and fraud, reduced to a slave state in the vast Communist empire.

This sad anniversary is a warning to all free peoples of the evils of the pernicious world Communist conspiracy. It should inspire us with a determination to guard zealously our own liberties and should serve as a reminder of our obligations toward unfortunate and defenseless peoples, victims of Soviet aggression.

THE SOVIET MILITARY PREPAREDNESS FOR AGGRESSION

The notorious secret agreement, between the German Third Reich and the U. S. S. R., following the defeat and partition of Poland, actually sealed the fate of Lithuania.

When on September 1, 1939, Hitlerite Germany attacked Poland, Soviet Russia began massing her armed forces along the Polish frontiers and in front of the Baltic States. Lithuania had no common borderline with Russia at the time.

With the deterioration of relations between Germany and Poland, the Government of Lithuania, in January 1939, proclaimed its decision to preserve absolute neutrality and strictly adhered to such a decision.

When the German armies, after 2 weeks of continual advance, occupied a substantial part of Polish territory, the Soviet Union on September 17 suddenly invaded Poland from the opposite side.

Poland fell before the two aggressors who divided the spoils between them.

As a result of this deal, Lithuania found herself on the southeastern border of the Russian-occupied territory.

The Soviets were carrying out a premeditated plan of aggression which was later confirmed in secret agreements with Hitler's government.

It was in compliance with that plan that the Soviets soon demanded the admission of Russian army garrisons into Lithuania.

Under Soviet Government pressure, a Lithuanian delegation summoned to Moscow, on October 10, 1939, signed the so-called pact of mutual assistance, in accordance with which a month later, 20,000 Soviet troops entered Lithuanian territory and occupied 4 separate bases there.

After the establishment of the Soviet Army garrisons in Lithuanian, Latvia, and Estonia, the Soviets moved a part of their armed forces from the Baltic States and placed them along the Finnish frontier in preparation of the assault on Finland, which began in November 1939 and lasted 3 months.

It is interesting to recall that, according to Soviet propaganda, the excuse for the aggression against Finland was the alleged intention of Finland under the influence of western capitalists—the United States and England—to invade the Soviet Union.

THE SOVIET QUEST FOR A PRETEXT TO INVADE LITHUANIA

Concluding the peace treaty with Finland, Russia again began to concentrate her armies along the Lithuanian frontier and, in March 1940, she had from 12 to 15 divisions there.

Two months later the Soviet timetable of conquests called for preparation to swallow the three Baltic Republics.

The Soviet Government first made public false accusations against the Lithuanian Government and, in May 1940, sent General Loktionov, Deputy Commissar of War of the Soviet Union, to Lithuania to direct the Soviet campaign of provocations.

Immediately upon his arrival in Kaunas he presented a note to the Minister of Defense and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, accusing the Lithuanian authorities of kidnapping Soviet soldiers from established military bases.

The Lithuanian Government immediately appointed a special commission to investigate the charges, and invited the Soviet Government to appoint representatives to participate in the investigation and to produce the allegedly kidnapped soldiers for questioning. The Soviet Government refused to cooperate but, instead, kept repeating the trumped-up charges.

The Lithuanian commission, after thoroughly investigating all evidence, found these charges to be absolutely groundless. It was established that one soldier, attempting to desert the Soviet Army, had hidden in the home of his fiance, but later returned to his base.

In 1954, a number of witnesses now in this country, presented detailed accounts of these alleged disappearances of Russian soldiers to the congressional committee investigating the Soviet aggression against the Baltic States. The real intention of the Soviet Government was apparent: to seize Lithuania by first inventing fictitious motives for doing so; to sway world opinion to her side. When the Lithuanian Government tried to clear away the misunderstandings between the two governments, Moscow paid no attention whatever.

The Government of Lithuania sent its Prime Minister, A. Merkys, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, J. Urbsys, to Moscow to try to settle the matter directly. The Kremlin disregarded completely all explanations and efforts.

Finally on June 14, 1940, the Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, V. Molotov, presented to the Lithuanian Government the Soviet ultimatum in which the following demands were set forth:

(A) To bring to trial the Minister of the Interior, K. Skucas, and the Director of the Department of Security, A. Povilaitis.

(B) To form a new government in Lithuania, satisfactory to the Soviets.

(C) To assure free entry into Lithuania of unlimited numbers of Soviet Russian armed forces.

The deadline for the reply of the Lithuanian Government was set at 10 a. m. of June 15; thus, scarcely 10 or 11 hours was allowed to consider the ultimatum.

MILITARY OCCUPATION OF THE COUNTRY

On June 15, 1940, at 2 in the afternoon, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, J. Urbsys, sent a telegram from Moscow explaining that the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars and Foreign Commissar of the Soviet Union, V. Molotov, had presented a detailed plan as to how the Soviet army units, with the purpose of occupying Lithuania, would proceed.

Among other things, the Soviets demanded that the Lithuanian authorities should instruct the Lithuanian armed forces and people not to interfere in any way with the movements of the Soviet army in order to avoid possible misunderstandings and conflicts. The Soviet Government also stated that General Pavlov of the Soviet army will meet with Lithuania's General Vitkauskas, June 15 at 8 p. m. in the railway station of Gudagoj, to arrange for the orderly operations of the Soviet army.

As the Lithuanian delegation prepared to meet with General Pavlov, Red army troops were already on Lithuanian territory speeding in the direction of larger cities and communication centers. The previously established Soviet garrisons in Lithuania, also moved out to occupy certain localities. In full combat formations, the invaders arrogantly disregarded completely the Lithuanian Government authorities and the native inhabitants. About 12 complete divisions, from two hundred to two hundred and fifty thousand soldiers, swamped Lithuania whose peacetime armed forces comprised only about 28,000 soldiers.

The President and the Minister of Defense of Lithuania left the country. Mr. A. Merkys, as Acting Prime Minister, remained to head the government.

In its negotiations with Moscow, the government of Lithuania acted at all times in conformance with the obligations under the treaties with Soviet Russia. Thus, this sudden and surprising Soviet ultimatum came as a shock to the Lithuanian people. It was utterly impossible to organize in so short a time any substantial resistance against the

masses of Russian armed forces already on Lithuanian soil.

A number of eye-witnesses before the congressional committee of the 83d Congress told of the behavior of the Soviets in Lithuania. The following facts were established without a doubt from documents and interrogated witnesses:

1. In complete disregard of the sovereign rights of Lithuania and even in violation of agreements which they themselves had forced on Lithuania, the Soviets employed unlimited numbers of armed forces for the occupation of Lithuania.

2. The Soviet military attaché, Major Korotkich, was placed on the General Staff of the Lithuanian Army to carry out purges in the higher ranks of Lithuanian officers on the first day of the occupation. He ordered the disarmament of the Lithuanian National Guard (Sauliu Sajunga) and the dismissal of a number of officers. The Chief of the Second Department of the General Staff, Colonel Dulksnys, was arrested and on July 18 deported to Soviet Russia.

3. The entire Lithuanian Army was immediately put under the control of the occupation authorities. As soon as the Soviets arrived on June 15, an order grounded all Lithuanian airplanes. The hangars were closed the following day and placed under guard of Soviet armored detachments.

4. Military quarters had to be vacated to billet Soviet Army personnel. Soviet demands were harsh and instant. Lithuanian military units were often ordered to leave their quarters almost immediately and in many instances personal belongings were hastily left behind, and nights were spent in the open.

5. Military installations of the Lithuanian army (radio and telegraph transmitters, telephone switchboards, railway depots, etc.) were seized for the Soviet Army without any notification to Lithuanian authorities.

6. Immediately upon the occupation of the country, the Lithuanian frontiers with Germany were placed under rigid control, in an attempt to seal Lithuania off from the rest of the world.

7. Strong-armed guards were placed at the state bank and government office buildings. The Ministry of the Interior agencies were placed under strict control.

8. Lithuanian Army newspapers and other literature, published during Lithuania's independence were suppressed and banned from military libraries. In their stead appeared Communist propaganda literature besmirching the government and the institutions of independent Lithuania in an effort to antagonize the Lithuanian soldiers against their officers.

9. The Soviet military authorities soon forced the Lithuanian Government to extradite all Polish officers and men who had been interned in Lithuania after the defeat of Poland.

This same pattern of occupation was followed by the Soviets in their aggression against Latvia and Estonia.

PREPARATIONS TO ABOLISH LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Many Soviet civilian officials, predominantly specially trained members of the Communist Party Soviet Secret Police (NKVD) charged with the final incorporation of Lithuania into the U. S. S. R. accompanied the Soviet occupation forces. One of their main objectives was to conceal the real intentions of Soviet Russia. In numerous statements in the press and in public speeches they reiterated that the Soviet Union had no intention of destroying the independent status of Lithuania, and that the presence of Russian forces in Lithuania had in no way constituted a peril to Lithuania's freedom. However, they worked feverishly to bring about the annexation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

Meanwhile, the special emissary, Vice Commissar for Foreign Affairs V. G. Dekanozov (liquidated following Beria's execution in 1954), came by plane to Kaunas and set up headquarters in the office of the Soviet Legation, and assisted by the Soviet envoy, Pozdniakov, began to rule the country. Orders now came from Dekanozov.

His first task was the formation of a new government, obedient to Moscow. He dictated the names of new ministers to the Acting Prime Minister, A. Merkys. Justas Paleckis, who had previous contacts with the Soviet Union, was to become the President of the Republic. To allay the fears of the native inhabitants, several prominent Lithuanian patriots were purposely included in the list of new ministers.

June 18, 1940, Paleckis delivered a message to the Lithuanian nation:

"The new government will continue to maintain normal relations with all countries. The first task of the government will be the establishment of sincere and friendly relations with the Soviet Union with which Lithuania has a close alliance based on the mutual assistance pact."

The new government was controlled by the Kremlin bosses, whose orders were carried out by their chief emissary, Dekanozov, and the Red army. Step by step, everything that had been achieved during her days of independence was turned to ruins in Lithuania. Practically all organizations, political, social, cultural, and economic, were suspended. Great numbers of employees of the various government agencies and economic enterprises were jobless overnight.

It was to be expected that the Communist emissaries would lift the ban on the Communist Party which during Lithuania's independence days was illegal. An order of the Minister of the Interior on June 25, 1949, placed the Communist Party of Lithuania on the official register of societies and associations.

Pursuing the plan of Lithuania's subjugation still further, the Kremlin agents made Paleckis's government proclaim on July 6, 1940, an electoral law to govern the elections to the so-called People's Diet to be held on July 14.

An order of the Director of the State Security Department, dated July 7, dissolved all non-Communist parties and most of their leaders and active members were arrested. The Communist Party remained the only recognized party which to mislead the people, assumed the name of "the Union of Working People of Lithuania." The "Union" alone was given the right to nominate candidates for the elections.

Seventy-nine members were to be elected to the People's Diet. The same number of candidates were nominated and, as the nomination was reserved for the Communist Party and its affiliated organizations only, predominantly Communists and their sympathizers, persons without any reputation or any standing at all, were put on the list. Some well-known Lithuanians became candidates against their will as their names were included without their knowledge or consent. This was done to mislead the voters.

The fictitious Union of Working People proclaimed to the Lithuanian nation its political platform which, among other promises, contained the following:

"On this historical day, July 14, we must go to the polls in united and closed ranks and elect the worthy candidates able to express the real will and aspirations of the people and to strengthen the true friendship with the great Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, which is the one and only guarantee for the prosperity and free development of our country."

The union further declared that it stands—

"For the friendship and the strong and indestructible alliance of the Lithuanian Republic and the Soviet Union.

"For the cancellation of bank debts of poor people and small holders.

"For all possible assistance by the government to the landless peasants and smallholders and for the allotment of sufficient land for them.

"For freedom of speech, press, and associations for the defense of interests of the working people."

The platform denounced as false the rumors anticipating the enforcement of the Soviet system in Lithuania:

"Enemies of the Lithuanian people and their stooges, supporters of the old regime, are circulating provocative rumors about terror against those who are faithful to their religion, about the closing of churches, about the alleged forced organization of collective farms, etc. These rumors are thoroughly unfounded and willfully fabricated."

Among the numerous slogans concluding the text of the platform the following are most significant:

"Long live free Lithuania."

"Long live the brotherly friendship and strong alliance with the great and invincible Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics."

These promises were meant to fool the people and entice them to the polls. During the short "election campaign" no mention was made regarding the intention to destroy the sovereignty of Lithuania and its incorporation into the Soviet Union. Numerous speakers, including members of the new government repeatedly referred to a "free Lithuania," "friendly relations," or "alliance with the Soviet Union."

The elections took place on July 14, 1940, under the close supervision of the Kremlin emissaries and the Red army. The Lithuanian people resisted passively by abstaining from voting or, if they went to the polls, they replaced the ballot with a blank piece of paper.

The duty to vote was especially emphasized. The voters were watched in polling places, and since each voter had to present his identification papers to be stamped, an abstention could not pass unnoticed. Those who had no stamps on their passports risked severe consequences later on.

Absenteeism on the day of elections was so evident that the Communist Party decided to take additional measures. President Paleckis, by a decree, extended the voting another day, at the same time warning the people of their duty to vote. The results were poor. Moscow announced that, according to figures published by the Supreme Electoral Commission, 95.51 percent of the voters presented themselves at the polls. But, it appears from reliable statements made by the Minister of the Interior, M. Gedvila, that only 16 or 18 percent of the ballots deposited were valid.

The new Diet elected under such circumstances, convened on July 21. The only business on the agenda was the passing of a resolution requesting that Lithuania should be admitted into the Soviet Union. That the entire show was directed by Moscow, is also proven by the fact that similar decisions, on the same day and exactly in the form described, were made by the People's Diet in the other two Baltic States, Latvia and Estonia.

The manner in which the Diet was elected and the measures undertaken by the Kremlin to accomplish the annexation of Lithuania were bared before the Congressional Committee on Communist Aggression by many witnesses of different professions and places of residence in Lithuania. Their testimony revealed the tricks of deception the Communists employed.

When the Soviet-German war broke out and the Communists were driven out of Lithuania, a number of members of the Peo-

ple's Diet and the government made public a joint statement disclosing the true facts concerning the distortion of the will of the Lithuanian nation.

Their statement is quoted here:

"Meeting at Kaunas, on August 30, 1942, we, members of the former Lithuanian Government and the People's Diet, state publicly:

"1. In violation, by use of force, of the solemn obligations given to the Republic of Lithuania to respect, in all circumstances, her 'sovereignty and also integrity and territorial inviolability' (paragraph 2 of the Treaty of Nonaggression of September 28, 1926, between the Republic of Lithuania and the U. S. S. R.), the Government of the Soviet Union, on June 15, 1940, occupied Lithuania by its armed forces.

"2. The Lithuanian Government which was created according to the provisions of the Moscow ultimatum and which had obtained assurances that the independence of Lithuania will be respected, later, under pressure from Moscow, was reorganized, without any knowledge or consent of the Acting Prime Minister, Prof. V. Kreve-Mickevicius, by securing its majority for the Communists, headed by M. Gedvila, for the purpose of making it a tool in Moscow's hands.

"3. The Moscow Government ordered the Lithuanian Government, thus reorganized to carry out elections to the People's Diet in order that it should later on, request the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

"4. The People's Diet could not and did not proclaim the will of the Lithuanian people because:

"(a) The composition of the People's Diet was made up in advance by the Communist Party, directed by Moscow's representative, V. G. Dekanozov, and by the Soviet Minister to Lithuania, N. G. Pozdniakov. Only the Union of Working People of Lithuania was allowed to select candidates who were nominated by the Communist Party. The number of candidates was exactly the same as the number of members elected to the People's Diet.

"(b) As the composition of the Diet was made up in advance, it declared, in order to enhance the effect, that 95.51 percent of all the electorate had voted, while actually, as confirmed by the Supreme Election Commission and by the statement made by the former People's Commissar, M. Gedvila, and by the President of the U. S. S. R. Supreme Soviet, J. Paleckis, at secret meetings, only 16 to 18 percent of valid voting cards were submitted at the polls.

"(c) A number of members of the Diet, who were not members of the Communist Party, were compelled by threats to become members of the Diet and to vote for incorporation into the Soviet Union.

"(d) When the voting on the incorporation into the Soviet Union took place the votes of the members were not counted; all strangers present at the meeting voted together with them.

"5. Not a single member of the People's Diet could express a protest against the use of force as, under the circumstances, such protest would have involved danger to his life. Moscow's representatives and the members of the Soviet Legation openly threatened all those members of the Diet and their families who would have dared to announce their intention not to vote for incorporation into the Soviet Union.

"6. We, former members of the People's Diet, raise a public protest against the methods of violence and of falsifications which were directed by the Bolshevik Government against the Republic of Lithuania and the Lithuanian nation during the elections to the Diet as well as during its session. Neither we nor the other members of the Diet could express and did not express the will of the Lithuanian nation for incorporation in the Soviet Union.

"7. The People's Diet itself stated in its declaration of July 21, 1940, 'Now the people, helped by the mighty Red army, did away with the yoke of Smetona's oppressors and established in their own country the Soviet Government. If the people have been able to establish in their own country the only just order, the Soviet order, it is all due to the Soviet Union.' In this way the People's Diet itself admitted the Red army's influence in its decisions and the decisions of other government authorities.

"Former Members of the People's Diet:
Dr. A. Garmus, L. Dovydenas, H. Kacinskas, R. Juknevicius, V. Birzietis, P. Mickus, Mrs. S. Vainekiene, Miss P. Milanciute, the former Acting Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's government, Prof. V. Kreve-Mickevicius, the former Commissar for Social Care and Forest Industry of the L. S. S. R., Jurgis Glusauskas.

"KAUNAS, *August 30, 1942.*"

The procedure of elections to the People's Diet was described, among many other witnesses, in a deposition by the former People's Commissar, J. Glusauskas, who escaped from bolshevism and is now residing in Australia, he stated:

"On July 14, 1940, I was appointed to watch the voting to the People's Diet in the district of Mariampole. At that time I was the chief of police of the city of Kaunas and its district. The task assigned to me was to render help wherever necessary.

"When I arrived in Mariampole, I found everything ready for the election. I learned that the supervisor of the election there was a high-school official of the Soviet secret police (NKVD), a Russian, who had at his disposal a number of Russian soldiers and some army trucks. Therefore, all that was left for me to do was to observe what was going on.

"Several hours before the closing of the polls, it was announced that only 5 or 10 percent of those eligible to vote had cast their ballots. The NKVD officer was greatly concerned over such a situation. Finally, the following instructions were given: 1. All chairmen of electoral districts were ordered to record higher percentages of votes than actually were cast. As a result of this order, in an hour, all reports showed a 40 to 60 percent vote, and when the polls were about to close the percentage suddenly leaped to 99. 2. The NKVD personnel had instructions to tour villages and bring in voters by force. But because only a few trucks were available, this measure did not prove successful. Also, there was very little time left for voting.

"I consider the elections to the People's Diet were a deception for the following reasons:

"1. Actually only 5 to 15 percent of electors voted, and therefore did not represent the will of the Lithuanian people.

"2. Candidates for the People's Diet were nominated by the central committee of the Communist Party without their knowledge or consent. The list of candidates was presented by the Working People's Union which was the Communist Party itself. There were exactly as many candidates as members of the Diet to be elected. There was no choice but to vote for those nominated by the Communist Party.

"3. No lists of electors had been prepared so that it was impossible to determine the percentage of the votes cast. This circumstance offered a good opportunity to falsify the results of the elections.

"4. It was publicly made known that persons failing to appear at the polls will be regarded as 'enemies of the people.' Everybody knew that such a branding meant deportation to the forced labor camps in Siberia or other remote places in Russia.

"Conclusion: All decisions of the People's Diet are null and void as the Diet itself could not and did not represent the will of the Lithuanian people.

"J. GLUSAUSKAS.

"ADELAIDE, *November 15, 1953.*"

The Communist information agencies reported that the table of the election returns was prepared "in conformity with the data on population of Lithuania compiled by the Central Bureau of Statistics of Lithuania."

The former director of this bureau, Domas Micuta, now in the United States, submitted a statement which says: "The elections were directed by Pozdniakov through the Supreme Electoral Commission. The Central Bureau of Statistics of Lithuania never had anything to do with this commission and did not participate in the preparation of the table of election returns or its publication."

Adolfas Klimas, now residing in the United States, member of the staff for computing the election returns, stated the following in his deposition: "I was employed, as many other former employees of the old Lithuanian Diet were, to work on the technical staff of the so-called People's Diet. I was to prepare for publication stenographic transcripts of the sessions of the People's Diet, to supervise their publication and distribution, to translate into the Russian language and to prepare Lithuanian translations of various Russian orders, instructions, etc., which were sent from Moscow.

"On July 14 and 15, the election days to the People's Diet, I was assigned, together with a number of other employees, to receive telephone reports of election returns coming from various electoral districts. Seventy-nine members of the Diet were to be elected in 8 electoral regions. There was only one list of candidates, all nominated by the Communist Party. The election commissions did not pay any attention whether the votes cast were valid or not. They took for granted that everyone appearing at the polls was in favor of the candidates listed on the ballot.

"While taking the election reports over the telephone, I, as well as my colleagues, recorded several instances when the vote in a particular locality exceeded 100 percent. I learned that soldiers of the Soviet army had the right to take part in the elections and voted together with Lithuanian citizens. However, we were instructed to keep the percentages in such cases somewhat below 100 percent when computing the election returns.

"I often received from Andrius Bulota, an attorney in the office of the Diet, all sorts of orders and resolutions sent from Moscow, and my job was to translate them into Lithuanian. Then A. Bulota would read the translations, make corrections to adjust them to the specific conditions in Lithuania. As a rule, such orders and resolutions passed the People's Diet without any discussion. Though there were some non-Communist members in the Diet not one of them dared to question the propositions; they remained silent."

The falsification of election returns was witnessed by the Chief of Information and Statistics Department of the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania, Pranas Valiulis, now in Western Germany, who stated:

"The election commissions did all they could to increase the percentages of the ballots cast trying to please the omnipotent Communist Party and the People's Government, as well as the Moscow masters. Alterations in the election results could be made easily by simply marking the ballots for those who failed to appear at the polls. To make up for the shortage in the ballot box, as many ballots as were necessary could be stuffed in. Members of the election commissions were all persons devoted to the

Communist Party. When the votes were counted nobody, except members of the official commissions were present, which means that there was no control at all of the commission's work. The fact that falsifications in computation of the returns were made was confirmed to me by the assistant attorney general, Vytautas Balciunas."

Thus, it is evident that this so-called election had in no way expressed the will of the people of Lithuania. Moreover, even if the election had been conducted in a way prescribed by the laws of the country or in accordance with the principles of democratic procedure, this so-called People's Diet would not have any power whatsoever to make decisions affecting the sovereignty and independence of the Republic of Lithuania because no proposition of this kind was submitted to the voters. For the same reason, this so-called election cannot be considered a plebiscite on the question of Lithuania's incorporation into the Soviet Union.

Moscow's resolution forced upon the so-called People's Diet to request Lithuania's admittance to the "family of nations of the Soviet Union" was an act of violence and coercion against the Lithuanian nation.

SOVIETIZATION OF LITHUANIA

And yet, the delegation of 19 persons appointed by the People's Diet was taken to Moscow to petition the Soviet Government to incorporate Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

On August 3, 1940, the Supreme Soviet of U. S. S. R. decided to "receive favorably the petition of the Lithuanian Diet and to admit the Soviet Socialist Republic of Lithuania into the Union."

Then, step by step, the Soviet system was introduced in Lithuania. Land, industry, business enterprises, and private property were nationalized, people's right subverted, the standard of living reduced. Lithuania was entirely shut off from western civilization and culture. Arrests and deportations gradually took on such dimensions that there was no doubt but that Lithuania was doomed by the Kremlin masters to total physical destruction.

The attitude of the United States Government in regard to the present status of Lithuania is universally known. The United States has never sanctioned the forced incorporation of Lithuania and the other two Baltic nations, Latvia and Estonia, into the Soviet Union, and continues to recognize them as sovereign states. Many other free democracies also regard the Baltic nations as temporarily deprived of their independence by an act of aggression which has neither legal nor moral justification.

On this occasion, and as we approach a Four Power Conference, let us all remember these historical facts. The conscience of the free world will not be clear until Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia are free.

United States Health Units Cover Vast Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article from the New York Times of May 29, 1955. This article explains the functions of the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda, Md. It touches on the work being done by the various Institutes and contains information on the hopes and aspirations of the groups attempting to find the causes and cures of the present killing and crippling diseases afflicting mankind. I commend the article to the attention of all my colleagues.

UNITED STATES HEALTH UNITS COVER VAST FIELD—SEVEN NATIONAL INSTITUTES ATTRACT SCIENTISTS BY THE FINEST RESEARCH FACILITIES

(By Bess Furman)

WASHINGTON, MAY 28.—The National Institutes of Health, scene of the recent scientific conferences on Salk vaccine, loom up before a Washington visitor as 16 major buildings on 300 landscaped suburban acres in Bethesda, Md.

The Institutes, seven in number, together constitute the largest medical research organization in the world.

They are the National Cancer Institute, the National Microbiological Institute, the National Heart Institute, the National Dental Institute, the National Mental Health Institute, the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, and the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases.

They are a unit in the sense that they all function under one director, Dr. William H. Sebrell, Jr., as the research arm of the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

And while they were individually set up by acts of Congress dating from 1937 to 1950, all were outgrowths of earlier public-health research laboratories.

FIRST LABORATORY HERE

Dating back to the one-room Laboratory of Hygiene started in 1861 at the marine hospital, Staten Island, N. Y., Public Health Service research was successively conducted on Capitol Hill here, and on a site near the Lincoln Memorial on the Potomac.

It was moved to Bethesda in 1939 on a 90-acre tract given to the Government. That tract has been more than tripled.

The annual research program of the institues now totals $90,000,000, more than half of which goes out in grants and fellowships to universities.

Ten of the sixteen buildings of the institute are laboratories. The most impressive of these is the great Clinical Center, erected and equipped at a cost of $45,000,000. One third of this building is research hospital; two-thirds is devoted to laboratories studying the highly-selected disease problems presented by the patients.

Delegates of the World Health Organization, which has been in session in Mexico City, will meet Monday in the impressive auditorium of this center for postassembly technical studies.

The visiting health experts from all nations will find more than 600 independent scientific investigators with M. D. or Ph. D. degrees at work on more than 100 clinical sutdies and more than 400 basic laboratory studies.

The salaries of these scientists are relatively modest, ranging from $6,000 to $15,000 annually, with very few in the upper brackets. Some of them left jobs in private industry paying $30,000 to $40,000 annually. The incentive at the Institutes is the freedom to do research with fine equipment and trained help.

Some of the outstanding projects now in progress in the several institues suggest the scope of the Health Institutes' scientific investigations.

The effect of new chemical compounds on cancer, with special emphasis on lukemia, is under research in the National Cancer Institute. These tests are on cancers induced in animals and on human cancer cells growing in tissue culture in test tubes.

Among hundreds of chemical compounds tested, a few have proved to be killers of human cancer cells and are being clinically tried in certain kinds of human cancer.

Only a small segment of the National Microbiological Institute is the Laboratory of Biologics Control which passes on more than 30 separate kinds of serums, toxins, viruses, antitoxins, whole blood and blood derivatives as well as on Salk vaccine.

This institute conducts basic studies on influenza, poliomyelitis, encephalitis, and tropical diseases. Using tissue-culture methods for growing virus, it has identified a whole new family of viruses associated with the upper respiratory region, including the common cold, grippe, and influenza.

A whole series of studies are in progress in the National Heart Institute on the role of cholesterol, the fatty substance found in the blood, in hardening of the arteries.

After many years of concentration in the National Dental Institute on the use of fluorides in preventing dental caries, emphasis has now shifted to diseases of the soft tissues, such as pyorrhea and trench mouth.

The nervous pathways of schizophrenia are being studied on human volunteers in the National Mental Health Institute. Very tiny doses of the drug lysurgicaciddiethylamide, commonly called LSD, induce in a few minutes a condition very similar to schizophrenia in these volunteers, without damage to the individual. It lasts 6 to 8 hours, during which physical and psychological studies are made.

The Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness has opened up a whole new area of work on the biochemical structure of the brain. As the result of work with two substances, glutamine and asparagine, scientists there found and announced the biochemical cause of epilepsy. Trials with these drugs on patients with hitherto uncontrollable seizures have shown good preliminary results.

The Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases is evaluating new steroid compounds similar in effect to cortisone in an effort to find methods of treating rheumatoid arthritis which have the same good effect without bad side effects. Some spectacular results on patients who could not be given cortisone have been recorded on motion-picture film.

Retirement Benefits for Panama Canal Pilots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced H. R. 3946, a bill which has been referred to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. In my opinion the passage of this bill by the Congress is essential if we are to do justice to a group of maritime employees of our Government. I refer to the Panama Canal pilots who safely navigate all vessels through the Panama Canal. These men have an outstanding record of experience, safety, and skill. Nowhere in the world today is there a body of water which requires all of the skills of the navigator for such an extended passage as the Panama Canal. Nowhere is there a more complicated system of locks. And nowhere has the safety record for passage of all types of vessels, in-

cluding our mammoth air carriers, been excelled.

The group of men who have complete and full responsibility for the movement and navigation of vessels in Panama Canal waters are all employed as pilots by the Panama Canal Company. These employees are subject to the retirement provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930. The bill I have introduced would permit present and future employees who serve as pilots in the Panama Canal to derive the same benefits under that act as are presently granted to certain investigative personnel. In other words, an employee of the Panama Canal Company, would be eligible to retire after rendering 20 years of service if he has reached the age of 50 and if at the time of making application for retirement he is employed as a Panama Canal pilot.

There are many reasons why I attach importance to this proposal and I shall enumerate a few of them:

First. The average starting age for a qualified Panama Canal pilot is 36. This is because of the long years of experience in navigation, including a period as master of an oceangoing vessel, that is required for these jobs. Because of this high entrance age and the hazards of his duties it is now almost impossible for these people to reach the present retirement age without first becoming disabled.

Second. A Panama Canal pilot must navigate vessels of heavy tonnage through particularly precarious and narrow waters for passages that extend up to 20 continuous hours and which are often at night, all of which subjects him to long periods of excessive strain and tension.

Third. The duties of these pilots require that they work under the extensive glare and heat of a strong tropical sun. The reflection from the water and direct glare and heat of this tropical sun causes severe sunburn sores to develop around the mouth and lips. The incidence of skin cancer among these pilots is very high.

Fourth. Eminent medical authorities have commented on other hazards of life in the tropics. The whole oxidation process of persons from temperate zones slows up, resulting in a condition of chronic fatigue, headaches, and faulty elimination of toxins from the body. Life there is a constant race between heat production and heat dissipation which produces the effects first mentioned because of an increase in unburned wastes of the body-toxins.

Because of lack of muscle tone in the tropics there is organic deterioration and consequently shorter life. This is supported by insurance company statistics on life expectancy in the tropics and by the increased rates which they charge Americans on the Canal Zone.

This station in the tropics is also unfavorable for tuberculosis and there is a high incidence of rheumatic conditions and chronic nephritis. In addition due to the tropical climate there are innumerable parasitic fungi and almost all of these pilots are suffering or have suffered from disagreeable and sometimes dangerous skin conditions.

Fifth. The incidence of skin cancer, tuberculosis and other diseases represents a great hazard for these American pilots. Moreover, the strain and tension of their duties which must be performed for long hours both night and day in excessive heat and humidity adds to the perils of their jobs. The fact that they are engaged in hazardous and perilous duties is evidenced by actual statistics. From this small group of approximately 80 men, and not including men who left for personal reasons before age 50, there have been 26, or 32 percent, who have left their jobs since 1949. Thirteen of these 26 retired for physical disability; 4 died; 4 retired with reduced annuities before reaching age 62; and only 5 of the 26 were able to reach the retirement age of 62 without physical disability. Thus it can be seen that of those pilots who have given up their jobs at 50 or above, 80 percent were unable to reach the full retirement age provided by present law.

I believe these statistics and the reasons I have set forth here justify legislation to protect this group of fine public servants who are giving of their health and their very lives to serve their Government in this strategic tropical area.

Mr. Speaker, I might also add that the Marine Director of the Panama Canal Company some time ago expressed the view that legislation to effectuate the purposes of my bill would not meet any objection from the company.

I hope that this bill will be favorably considered so that this small but vital segment of our maritime staff can attain fair retirement to which they are so justly entitled.

A United Nations Police Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in the fall of this year the United Nations General Assembly will consider whether to hold a conference for a review of the United Nations Charter. It is almost certain that such a conference will be held. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been conducting extensive hearings to find out if the United States should propose any revisions of the charter at that time.

It seems to me that the question of a United Nations police force should loom large in any review of the charter. It is one of the major problems in organizing the nations of the world to provide for the security under which all could live in peace.

Under the charter, all members of the United Nations assumed the obligation to make armed forces available to the Security Council, in accordance with a special agreement or agreements. The agreements were to be negotiated between the Security Council and individual members or groups of members and to be subject to ratification. Negotiations were initiated in the United Nations soon after its establishment to determine what forces the Big Five Powers should make available, but a deadlock soon developed between the Soviet Union and the western countries as to the balance of forces to be provided by each major country. It soon became apparent that the Soviet Union had no intention of approving any agreements and would use its veto to block approval, and that further negotiations in the Security Council would be fruitless.

In 1950 at the height of the Korean war the United Nations General Assembly passed what has become commonly known as the "uniting for peace" resolution. In it the Assembly recommended that each member maintain within its armed forces elements so trained, organized, and equipped that they could be made available, in accordance with its constitutional processes, for service as United Nations units, upon recommendation of either the Council or the Assembly. This marked a step forward in providing that the Assembly should exercise concurrent jurisdiction with the Council in recommendations on the creation and use of armed forces, but progress along the path opened up by the resolution has been slow—indeed, almost negligible. It was to be expected that there would be no response from the Communist bloc to such a recommendation. Even among the free world nations, however, a demonstrated willingness to contribute forces to the United Nations for the maintenance of peace has been almost totally lacking.

The United States was called upon to furnish a grossly disproportionate share of the manpower and equipment toward the winning of the Korean war. Even taking into consideration the economic difficulties and military commitments elsewhere which kept many of the free nations from joining in the common effort, much more could and should have been done by the other members of the U. N. It is inequitable and unjust for many U. N. members to bask in the security provided by belonging to the United Nations and not to fulfill the responsibilities which membership imposes upon them. Moreover, if one member-state shirks its responsibility and is able to do so with impunity, then another may do the same thing and soon the whole system of collective security disintegrates.

Perhaps there should be an amendment to the charter which would provide that members would contribute a certain quota of their forces based on population for use by the United Nations. If this were not acceptable, maybe some system could be devised whereby members making decisions on war and peace in the United Nations could be limited to those which are willing to contribute forces for carrying out the decisions. This could have the effect of inducing some members to contribute which might not do so otherwise. Since the Communist countries would almost certainly refuse to join in a U. N. police force, this

would bar them from sharing in the decision-making. In Korea, the Soviet Union aided the aggressors, and at the same time participated in the decision-making in the United Nations, involving the organization in paradoxes of principle and procedure which placed a severe strain on cooperative efforts to resist the aggression.

There are many knotty problems of policy and method which would be encountered in a serious attempt to establish a United Nations police force. Would a two-thirds vote in the Assembly be an effective procedure for deciding to use the police force? Should there be a definition of aggression in the Charter so that it would be unmistakably clear when it was lawful to use such a force? These are examples of the questions which would have to be answered. However, one thing is clear: until overwhelming power is put behind just law there will be no lasting peace. And in the atomic age peace has become sheer necessity for the survival of mankind.

Although regional arrangements, such as the North Atlantic Pact, are effective within their limited range, it is important to go further and devise an international framework within which all nations of good will could be allowed, and would be expected, to do their share in sustaining the forces of international law and order.

Distribution of Polio Vaccine in Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include in the RECORD a detailed summary of the distribution of polio vaccine in Canada, our good neighbor to the north.

Everyone concerned with this problem will be interested in how Canada prepared last year to meet the distribution problems without delay. It is appropriate to emphasize the advance thought which went into the Canadian program which has rolled along uninterrupted.

This material was prepared by the Canadian Embassy in Washington, and I wish to express my appreciation to the Ambassador, the Honorable A. D. P. Heeney and his staff.

The summary follows:

The following information on the distribution of polio vaccine in Canada has been provided by the Department of National Health and Welfare in Ottawa:

In Canada the federal government joined with the 10 provincial governments in a program providing for the purchase from the Connaught Medical Research Laboratories of the University of Toronto enough poliomyelitis vaccine to give three doses to 600,000 children prior to the onset of the 1955 poliomyelitis season. Under this plan the federal government is paying half the cost and the provincial governments are paying the other half.

As part of this scheme the vaccine so produced has been allocated to each of the 10 provinces on the basis of population. The vaccine becomes the property of the provinces and each has undertaken to distribute to selected age groups. It is to be given free of charge. In 9 of the 10 provinces the age groups first receiving the vaccine are those in the first 2 grades of school comprising generally the 6 and 7 year olders, with those 8 and 5 years of age being added as supplies of vaccine permit. In one province priority was assigned to younger children.

This scheme was worked out last year at a meeting of the Dominion Council of Health. The Dominion Council of Health is a statutory body chaired by Dr. G. D. W. Cameron as deputy minister of national health, and composed of the principal health officers of each of the 10 provinces, plus 5 others appointed at large. One of the five so appointed is the director of the Connaught Medical Research Laboratories at Toronto, who participated in these discussions. The Dominion Council of Health at its meeting last month again reviewed this scheme and advised as to future plans.

An important point is that the decision to enter into this scheme was taken several months before Dr. Francis made his report at Ann Arbor. It was the view of the members of the Dominion Council that since all experimental evidence pointed to the probability of a successful outcome of the National Foundation's trial of the vaccine that it would be prudent to go ahead with the production of vaccine in order that there might be material on hand to proceed with an immunization program immediately on receipt of Dr. Francis' report. In fact, there were those who felt that barring definite evidence to the contrary, it would be wise to use the vaccine whether Dr. Francis' report was favorable or doubtful, on the basis that further trials would certainly be indicated. There was a certain measure of chance in this arrangement but not more than was thought reasonable.

The order was placed with the Connaught Medical Research Laboratories of the University of Toronto because not only were they experienced and completely trusted producers of biological products in Canada but also it was through the work of their scientists that the great National Foundation trial was in some measure made possible. It may be recalled that a sizable part of the virus material which was used in the United States to make the vaccine for last year's trial was actually produced in the Toronto laboratories and shipped to the United States. This situation arose from the fact that the Foundation in its effort to find a satisfactory method of making Dr. Salk's vaccine in large quantities seized upon the discovery made at Toronto that a synthetic solution (No. 199) which was designed to support the growth of cancer cells, in fact could be used to support the growth of poliomyelitis virus in enormous quantities.

It is inappropriate here to enter into scientific technical details of this kind. It is mentioned simply to point out that the Connaught Laboratories are not only competent operators but have made a very significant contribution to the success of the Salk vaccine trials. Having completed their assignment under the National Foundation scheme, it seemed only reasonable to members of the council to arrange a contract under which they would continue their production work to produce, as mentioned, enough vaccine for an original estimate of 500,000 children which was later increased to nearer 600,000.

It should be made clear that this arrangement is not a reflection on the commercial manufacturers. The view was taken by our council that since all of their production takes place in the United States, they would inevitably be obliged to look after their own markets first and that we in Canada should to the greatest extent possible look after ourselves.

However, in keeping with the usual generous attitude of the United States Government toward Canada, when the embargo on the export of poliomyelitis vaccine was announced there was also announced an exception in favor of Canada. As a result of this decision two United States manufacturers have been licensed to sell in Canada and one lot of the vaccine produced by one manufacturer has actually gone into circulation through commercial channels. In keeping with the recent decisions which have been taken in Washington, in fact as an inevitable consequence of them, we have suspended distribution of any further supplies of commercial material in this country. This will be maintained until the situation clarifies in the United States.

So far as legal control of quality and safety is concerned, we have a single piece of legislation, the Food and Drugs Act, which covers pretty much the same ground as the legislation administered by the United States Public Health Service. Under one act, as is the case in the United States, all biological products may be manufactured only by an establishment holding a license for the purpose. Requirements for standards of safety, etc., are prescribed. Our inspectors reserve the right to inspect establishments and manufacturers are obliged in certain instances to provide us with samples of all lots of material before release in order that we may make such tests as are deemed necessary.

Up to the present time about 750,000 children have been inoculated with one and more than half of this number with two doses of vaccine under our joint Federal-provincial scheme exceeding, as you will note, the original estimate by a considerable degree. This part of the program is carried out under the direct supervision and control of provincial and local health authorities. In addition, enough material has been placed on the market by the one manufacturer mentioned above to inoculate about 13,000 children. There is, at present, no compulsory regulation of the distribution of the latter material, and it was made available to private physicians for their use through the usual commercial channels. The Canadian Medical Association has recommended to its doctors that it be reserved for the use of children and that each doctor dispose of it as best he can and in fairness to his patients.

The cost of the vaccine produced under the joint Federal-provincial program and distributed under provincial auspices has amounted to about $1.50 per triple dose. While the price of the commercial product is independently determined by the company concerned, it is understood that this usually amounts to about $4 to $4.50 per triple dose when purchased by private physicians.

Letter From Employee in Panama Canal Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which was received from an employee in the Panama Canal Zone which congratulates Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD for his interest and suport of Canal Zone employees in the public press and at the

Panama Canal budget hearings. The name of the writer has been eliminated for obvious reasons:

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: As a Canal Zone employee for a number of years I was pleased to read in the public press and Panama Canal Zone budget hearings of your interest in Canal Zone affairs from an employee's standpoint. Your statement that the employees are motivated by patriotic as well as personal reasons in their attitude toward the operation of the canal is appreciated.

In my opinion, and I believe that of many employees, the Government policies more recently have been shaped by lobbyists and persons with selfish interests as their goal. The United States is, through its new policy of replacement of United States citizens with local citizens, gradually relinquishing its rights to a valuable national asset, constructed in largely uninhabited country, to a phantasmal government which has grown up on the fruits of its association with the canal enterprise and will eventually demand, and probably get, the Panama Canal en toto.

The latest treaty now about to be ratified follows the policy of giving away, complete with all improvements, an area formerly swamp, which cost the United States millions to develop, in return for which, among other minor concessions, we are to obtain a reduced rate on the Canal Zone import tax on whisky. This is reminiscent of the purchase of Manhattan Island from the Indians at a cost of $24 plus a few bolts of cloth and some corn liquor in 1626, and reflects the backward approach which has been applied by our negotiators.

Your interest in Canal Zone affairs may well retard the eventual loss of an area which, as illustrated in other countries recently, we may well find difficulty in retaining control of by peaceable efforts.

Relations With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following sensible editorial from the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., Friday, May 27, 1955:

FIRM BUT NOT OBSTINATE

Secretary of State Dulles must be weary of getting advice on how to deal with the Russians at a four-power conference. But it's just possible that when German Chancellor Adenauer comes over in mid-June he may have some wise counsel to offer.

Reports from Bonn suggest that Adenauer will advise the United States not to be too ready to make a broad European settlement with the Kremlin. In his view the West is getting stronger and the East weaker. He feels that if the West will be patient another year or two it can get far better terms from the Reds than in 1955.

There appears to be a good deal of evidence to support this approach. Russia's failure to develop adequate farm production is well known. Its decision earlier this year to renew emphasis on heavy industry at the expense of consumer goods output cannot have eased the Kremlin's domestic political problems.

As has been fairly said many times, we cannot refuse to sit down with the Soviet Union when there seems any hope at all it might open the way to an eventual lasting settlement.

But we need not fall all over ourselves simply because the Reds feel like talking. We know enough about them by now to realize they would not suggest such a course if they did not think there was advantage in it for them.

Elements in Britain, France, and elsewhere, naively preoccupied with the top-level conference as a device for securing peace, will be pressing their governments to insist that we take just about anything the Kremlin offers. They are always prepared to accept Russia's overtures on faith and to regard the United States with suspicion. These urgings must be resisted.

So much of the time the Russians are in a menacing mood that there is a tendency to welcome their softer gestures with uncritical enthusiasm. A feeling of relief sweeps over even cagey diplomats. They're so eager to capitalize on the altered Russian mood that they don't drive the hardest bargain they could.

The Berlin blockade negotiations were a good example. We got the blockade lifted all right, but there was later evidence we could well have won some additional concessions had we been tougher at the time.

No one dares pretend that it is easy for the West—and America particularly—to strike just the right posture in any dealings with Moscow. But somehow we must find the way to be firm without being blind and obstinate.

Testimony of Governor Clement of Tennessee on TVA Appropriations, Before House Subcommittee on AEC and TVA Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS BASS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony presented before the House Appropriations Committee—Subcommittee Panel on AEC and TVA—by the Honorable Frank G. Clement, Governor of Tennessee, Wednesday, June 1, 1955, subject, Appropriation—TVA:

Gentlemen of the subcommittee panel of the House Appropriations Committee, I count it a privilege to appear before you and I should like to thank you not only for myself but in behalf of my colleagues from the Tennessee Valley who are here and will later testify, and also in behalf of the 6 million power consumers of the valley who can't be here, for this opportunity to be heard.

Last fall in testifying before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy against the Dixon-Yates deal, I said that we, the ultimate consumers of the valley, are the anointed sacrificial goats for a burnt offering to the gods of monopolistic exploitation. In this view of it, you should not be surprised that we are taking every measure available to us that we think might be effective in avoiding such a fate.

Recently, the present chairman of the TVA Board wrote the mayor of Memphis, in behalf of the Bureau of the Budget, to find out if they were really serious about not using Dixon-Yates power.

Mayor Frank Tobey, who unfortunately couldn't be here today, responded in a 3-page letter, which began: "It is inconceivable that Memphis should be dependent upon a source of power which is clearly inconsistent with the continued growth and development of our community." And he concluded: "For the reasons we have indicated, including those relating to pending litigation, it is our position that under no circumstances would the city of Memphis ever become a market for Dixon-Yates power."

You can see, gentlemen, that the mayor of Memphis, and it may be assumed, the people of Memphis, are really serious about not wanting the Dixon-Yates power. I can think of few issues in which the people of Memphis are in greater unanimity than in their opposition to the Dixon-Yates deal.

FOR FUNDAMENTAL REASONS

The reasons the mayor indicated, gentlemen, are fundamental.

Anyone who is familiar with the relationship of public-utility service to the welfare and health of a community knows perfectly well that no community should be made to rely upon a source of power existing entirely beyond its jurisdiction and that of the State in which it is situated—foreign to it and in no wise responsible for its economic development.

The Dixon-Yates arrangement violates every recognized principle of economical and efficient operation, which is basic to the development of utility systems.

EISENHOWER PARTNERSHIPS

Official spokesmen for the Eisenhower administration have frequently referred to their public power policy as that of Federal-local partnership. What kind of a partnership is it where the Federal Government makes a vital decision affecting the power supply of a city, a State, and a whole region, without first consulting the people who have a direct pecuniary interest? And what kind of partnership is it where the vital decisions on the part of the Federal Government affecting the city's, the State's, and the region's power supply and indeed their whole future, seem to be made, not by TVA, the Federal agency with which the distributors of power in the area have contracts, but by the Bureau of the Budget and the Atomic Energy Commission, netiher of which has any interest in the region's problems nor in its point of view?

And speaking of strange partnerships, gentlemen, the Dixon-Yates deal seems to have been a fertile stimulant for them. According to a memorandum which Senator LISTER HILL has made public it seems that a vice president of the First Boston Co. served the Bureau of the Budget as an advisor during the formulative days of the Dixon-Yates deal, which relation bore the profitable fruit of a preferred position for his company to underwrite the loans for Dixon-Yates.

We, uninitiated country people down in the valley have worked up an acute curiosity about these—I suppose you would call this one a sort of silent partnership between Government and big city banks—since the Bureau of the Budget never mentioned Mr. Adolph H. Wenzell's name, till Senator HILL questioned them.

At all events we are intensely suspicious of this sort of partnership and we are hopeful that the appropriate congressional committee will investigate it.

DIXON-YATES DEAL ILLOGICAL

Now it will be remembered that, with a prospective power shortage in the Tennessee Valley the Eisenhower administration set out to relieve TVA of a part of its contractual obligation to AEC and we wound up with the Dixon-Yates deal. We set out to procure substitute power for the country's

biggest power consumer and we wind up forcing it upon the country's largest power producer—contrary to the President's announced intention.

As I said at the outset, we are taking every measure available to us to defeat the Dixon-Yates deal and these measures include legal action.

The State of Tennessee, in conjunction with the municipal and other distributors in the valley is presently fighting this irresponsible effort to serve special interests, in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, before the Securities and Exchange Commission, and before the Federal Power Commission. Incidentally, actions attacking the legality of the Dixon-Yates contract with the Atomic Energy Commission and the right of Edgar Dixon, E. A. Yates, and others to serve as officers of the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. have just been initiated. Mr. Dixon, it will be remembered, heads Middle South Utilities, and Mr. Yates the Southern Co. As you know the Federal Power Act provides that no individual can hold a position as an officer in more than one public utility company without FPC approval.

Insofar as the Dixon-Yates deal is concerned, we are confident that we will block it through the courts—and we are prepared to go to the Supreme Court with it, if necessary, to do so. And if all court action fails, we are prepared to take other recourses. We had at this time rather not reveal what these measures are but in the words of Davy Crockett, "We are in high spirits although we have had some difficulties to encounter."

In short, we intend to hold the Chickasaw bluffs against the invasion by an Arkansas squatter from Rector Street, New York City. And I would like to point out before the committee panel that our litigation is serving far more than our local interests in the valley.

It is first of all calculated to preserve the world's outstanding example of a completely integrated and coordinated utility system that continues to serve this Nation as a power reservoir for national defense and a yardstick for low-cost power that—despite the efforts of the private power lobby—remains a nationwide influence and example for low rates. And I will predict here that if the calamity of TVA's destruction should ever befall this Nation the people from one end to the other would soon suffer the unfortunate results of greatly increased electric rates.

Next we are serving the taxpayers of this Nation. We are serving them first by preventing the Government from entering into a contract for power that will cost the taxpayers $90 million more, according to AEC admission and $140 million more according to the estimate of TVA engineers. But that is only the beginning of it. Should the Dixon-Yates deal go through, there would be other Dixon-Yates deals around the perimeter of the great Tennessee Valley power system.

Moreover, there would be an immeasurable loss resulting from economic stagnation in the valley from the disruption of the TVA system and the eventual high rates. During the 20 years of TVA, the people of the valley have substantially doubled their tax contribution to the Federal Government. Who can say what loss such a backset might bring, not merely to us, but to the revenues of this Nation?

And finally we are serving the people and the economy of the whole Nation in our effort to prevent the Securities and Exchange Commission, through its approval of the Dixon-Yates deal, from making a shambles of the Holding Company Act.

SEC ignored the interlock and concentration of control provisions of the act, despite the clear statement of policy on the part of Congress that holding companies must be kept within bounds and should be allowed to expand their holdings only when a clear showing can be made that the public interest will be served.

Moreover, SEC has allowed the Southern Co. to acquire an interest in a facility which is 150 miles away from its service area—in plain contravention of the Holding Company Act—and there are other points which, in the view of our counsel, violate the law, and we are asking the Court of Appeals to reverse the SEC order.

So the effort to destroy TVA by subterfuge jeopardizes other aspects of our national welfare.

I have appeared before several congressional committees over the past 3 years to advocate adequate appropriations for TVA. I am still convinced that this is the most responsible and economical way in which to finance the expansion of this great national-regional multipurpose Federal enterprise. But the present administration opposes this method, and by majority voice the Congress, at one time or another, has supported the administration policy.

In the face of this situation, the majority of the Tennessee Valley Authority have proposed to the Budget Bureau immediate minimum measures to meet the valley's impending power shortage. As we understand it, the majority recommendations, among other things, propose that an item of $6½ million in the budget now earmarked for a transmission line from the middle of the Mississippi River to Memphis—since it can never be used for that purpose—be released to TVA for beginning the needed new generating plant at Fulton, Tenn., to build up the western end of the system.

As spokesman for the people of my State and a representative of the valley, I would like to express our approval of the recommendations of the majority of the TVA Board.

In addition, we think—out of our experience with the methods employed by the Dixon-Yates dealers—that it is important also to write a prohibition in the appropriation bill providing that none of the money therein can be used for salaries, etc., to carry out the Dixon-Yates contract.

Before relinquishing the subject, I must reiterate for you, gentlemen, that the self-financing alternative proposals made by the majority of the TVA Board meet with widespread popular approval in the valley. The valley power consumers are ready and eager to pay for revenue bond or local financing for TVA expansion on the fair businesslike terms proposed by a majority of the Board even though appropriations are the cheapest money available and it behooves the Government to finance a project of such national value as TVA by the cheapest means available; and even though appropriations would be repaid under a sound business-like schedule, also, and should in no wise be abandoned as a method of financing expansion.

Yet, I cannot mention the plan for alternative financing proposed by the majority of the Authority, without comment on the action of the Bureau of the Budget, seeking to wreck this plan and on the turncoat action of the President's general on the TVA Board, in switching his support from the original plan to this piece of sabotage.

We have been advised that the proposal of the majority of the TVA Board for the transfer of the $6½ million item to the Fulton project contemplates the enactment of additional legislation not properly before this committee that would, also, authorize the Board to employ alternative methods of financing expansion including the issuance of revenue bonds and lease-purchase arrangements with local governments to finance specific projects.

Let me say here that we fully approve the whole plan as it has been developed by the majority of the Authority. I would, also, point out, in passing, that the proposed change of purpose for the $6½ million item in the budget will in no wise increase the budget and cannot be opposed by the administration on that ground.

And I must comment on it for what it signifies of the intentions of this administration toward TVA. In the Budget Bureau's attempt to wreck the plan for self-financing, to which administration spokesmen have given such loud lipservice, we have finally a candid-camera view of their intentions. For anyone who may have clung to any shred of doubt, the real purpose of this administration has now been made cruelly clear.

Before ending my comment here, I would like to emphasize for you, gentlemen, the continued importance of support for TVA-resource development. The resource-development activities of TVA establish an essential link between river-control operations and the institutions and people of the valley. In many ways, the resource-development program is at the heart of the TVA partnership, for it binds together what otherwise might be separate Federal, State, and local efforts into a joint approach to the development of the valley.

You may ask, Has not the valley, in its development, got beyond the need of this activity on the part of TVA?

It is true that the States and local governments of the valley have taken advantage of TVA assistance to enlarge and broaden the scope of their activities concerned with resource development and use. Existing State agencies have been expanded and strengthened and in some instances new agencies have been created.

Indeed, operating expenditures of State agencies dealing with agriculture, forestry, fish and wildlife, and parks have multiplied by more than six times over the last quarter of a century.

As local governments have taken over resource-development function from TVA, the Authority has restricted and modified its activities and its appropriation for them. Yet it still remains vital to the region and to the statutory aims of TVA.

The important and necessary function that TVA now exercises in resource development activity over the valley now is as a central clearinghouse of the activities of the various States and local governments, as a coordinator among them, a leader and a source of technical advice and experience—which the States are unable as yet to achieve for themselves.

For example, in Tennessee, last year we launched, under the general supervision of the TVA, our first watershed-development project in west Tennessee in the Beech River drainage system. In other words, we are only now acquiring the technical facilities and know-how to try our hand at launching and carrying on such a project.

APPROPRIATION OPPOSED

I am going to urge the committee to disallow 1 proposal for an appropriation. I have reference to the $100,000 alleged contingency fund which I am told that General Vogel, TVA's present Board Chairman, is seeking. I am advised that the majority of the Board have said that they know of no contingency in TVA affairs that this $100,000 item is intended to meet. The ambiguous General has been quoted in the press as saying, when questioned by reporters as to what use he intended to make of the $100,000, that it would not be proper for him at the present time to describe the use to which the money will be put.

I will go even further. We in the valley intensely suspect that the use to which the $100,000 would be put would not be proper.

In conclusion, gentlemen of the committee, let me reiterate that we are here grateful of the opportunity you grant us, to respectfully urge you to support those mini-

mum measures now sought by the majority of the Tennessee Valley Authority to escape Dixon-Yates degradation and destruction, and to meet the pressing need for new generating facilities for TVA to avoid an impending power shortage in the valley.

I thank you.

Peace Talks for United Nations Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the 10th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations will be commemorated in June of this year by a special session of the general assembly in the district which I have the honor to represent in San Francisco, the birthplace of the U. N., I want to call the attention of the House to a meritorious suggestion recently advanced to further the purposes of that historic occasion. Dr. Persio C. Franco, a former diplomatic representative of the Dominican Republic now living in the United States, has suggested in a letter to the New York Times that all living recipients of the Nobel peace prize be invited to attend the commemorative sessions as a mark of our continuing devotion to the cause of world peace.

It seems to me personally that this idea has merit beyond the simple recognition of the personal attainments of these distinguished people. Should the United States officially accept and sponsor the proposal by Dr. Franco, the act would present further tangible evidence to the world of our unswerving purpose to bring peace to the world through peaceful means—the basic ideal to which the majority of United Nations are dedicated and for which it was founded. The Nobel peace prize has gained universal recognition as a symbol of man's efforts to attain that end despite seemingly endless setbacks. The outstanding citizens of many countries who have received the award have already contributed much to the cause of peace. Their presence at the coming U. N. sessions in San Francisco would certainly lend emphasis to the fact that we as a nation and the other member countries of the U. N. who honestly subscribe to its principles have not allowed the frustrations we have experienced to make us forget the goal we had in mind when President Roosevelt conceived and President Truman put into execution the plans for the establishment of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to urge Secretary of State Dulles and Ambassador Lodge to place the United States squarely behind this proposal. I can think of no better way to impress upon the world our wholehearted sincerity in clinging to the hope for a permanent peace among nations without recourse to the sword or nuclear weapons. I submit Dr. Franco's letter to the New York Times for printing with these remarks so that the Congress and the people of the United States may lend their voices in support of his well-conceived plan:

WASHINGTON, *May 24, 1955.*

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The paramount objective of the United Nations—the most important concern of all mankind—is the creation of peace among the peoples of the world. The men who have been awarded the Nobel peace prize have made exceptional contributions toward the attainment of that objective. Of them the following are still living:

Sir Norman Angell, British, born 1874, received the prize in 1933; Dr. Carlos Saavedra Lamas, Argentinian, born 1880, prize 1936; Viscount Cecil of Chelwood, British, born 1864, prize 1937; Cordell Hull, American, born 1871, prize 1945; Prof. Emily Green Balch, American, born 1867, prize 1946; Lord Boyd Orr of Brechin, British, born 1880, prize 1949; Ralph J. Bunche, American, born 1904, prize 1950; Albert Schweitzer, French, born 1875, prize 1952; Gen. George C. Marshall, American, born 1880, prize 1953.

I suggest that they be invited to attend and address the assembly to be held next June 20–26, at San Francisco in commemoration of the tenth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations; also Pearl Buck, American, and Gabriela Mistral, Chilean, who won the Nobel literature prizes for 1938 and 1945, respectively; and Emilio Bello Codesido, Chilean, who is the dean of Pan Americanists. He is the sole survivor among the delegates to the first and second international Conferences of American States, held in Washington and Mexico City in 1889 and 1901, respectively.

These eminent men and women could speak to the assembly in behalf of all peoples of the world, including those that are not officially represented in the United Nations.

PERSIO C. FRANCO.

Real Nice Holiday, Yes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted to extend my remarks, I include in this statement a copy of a timely and vigorous editorial. It interested me and I hope all Members of the House will find it worthy of serious consideration. The editorial makes two points: First, that our so-called national holidays, other than those with religious significance, be celebrated on Mondays; and, second, that we simplify and improve the calendar along the lines of the world calendar printed with the editorial.

The second point is dealt with in the bill, H. R. 3588, introduced by the Delegate from Hawaii [Mrs. FARRINGTON] and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It proposes a slightly different form of world calendar from that printed in the editorial but the difference is not substantial.

One approach to the first problem presented in the editorial appears in House Concurrent Resolution 55, introduced by the Member from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Since I desire to present to the committee a quite different treatment of the holiday-on-Monday problem, I have today introduced H. R. 6588, which reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, to all intents and purposes and in the same manner that they are now made public holidays by law, each of the holidays hereinafter named shall be celebrated on the day shown in the following list: New Year's Day, on the first Monday in January; Washington's Birthday, on the third Monday in February; Memorial Day, on the last Monday in May; Fourth of July, on the first Monday in July; Labor Day, on the first Monday in September; Armistice Day, on the second Monday in November; Thanksgiving Day, on the last Monday in November.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on January 1, 1956.

I hope all Members will give prompt and serious study to all of these bills and express their views to the appropriate committees.

The editorial follows:

REAL NICE HOLIDAY, YES?

We're assuming, of course, that things went smoothly for you throughout these past 3 days. No road accidents—no untimely squalls at your vacation spot—nobody forgot the can opener—and no seventh son of a seventh son of a sea cook talked you into just one more nibble at his special 8-to-1 martinis. Oh, brother.

So now how about us increasingly vacation-minded citizens sitting down and trying to figure out how we can achieve more of these refreshing 3-day breaks in the year's routine?

In this year of 1955, actually, we're not faring badly holidaywise.

Labor Day, of course, always falls on a Monday and thereby is the automatic windup of a triple-decker weekend.

The Fourth of July also will land on a Monday. And Armistice Day, by arriving on a Friday this year, will provide a 3-day-off spell for some of us.

But, as our present calendar operates, those 1955 breaks are just that—accidental. Next year, for instance, Fourth of July will come on a Wednesday. Try and squeeze a big holiday out of those 24 hours.

So what do we do? Well, more and more thoughtful citizens are pointing out that Congress can remedy this situation if it would, and quite simply. The setting of national holidays is one of our lawmakers' stated though seldom exercised chores.

CONGRESS CAN DO IT

Congress could do us all a handsome favor by decreeing that all United States holidays (excepting those with deep religious significance) shall hereafter and henceforth fall on Mondays. If you, too, would like to enjoy more of these Saturday-Sunday-Monday vacations per annum, why not write your Representative to that effect? Chances are he may feel the same way about it, and will welcome your support.

That's the fastest way to achieve some extra holidaying. But it still doesn't solve the whole problem of irregular and messed-up dates. That headache is basic, and its base is the obsolete, modified Gregorian calendar with which our Western world has been struggling since 1582.

Actually, today's date troubles go all the way back to Julius Caesar (100–44 B. C.). His astronomers tried their best, and so did Pope Gregory XIII's 16th century scientists, and some 1,760 adjusters. Theirs is the calendar we're using right now.

This time-measurer is not only a producer of erratic holidays, but doesn't jibe at all with modern business periods and bookkeeping methods. Its months are irregular and its yearly quarters are even more so.

On the other hand, a scientifically-streamlined time chart on the order of the proposed World Calendar, printed above, would eliminate many of our year-measuring woes permanently.

BUSINESS BENEFITS

This modern calculator would begin every year and every quarter-year on a Sunday. Each quarter would have the same number of days—91. Each month would contain 26 weekdays, plus Sundays. Once set, a holiday would stay in its proper place—none of this casual flap-landing on any one of the week's 7 days.

Congress, if it will be so kindly, can provide us with more fine holidays like the one just past, and in quick order. In due time, we hope, the UN or some more effectual international body will start the wheels moving toward a much needed, brandnew calendar for our modern business world.

The proposed world calendar

FIRST QUARTER

January							February							March						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4						1	2
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
29	30	31					26	27	28	29	30			24	25	26	27	28	29	30

SECOND QUARTER

April							May							June						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4						1	2
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
29	30	31					26	27	28	29	30			24	25	26	27	28	29	30
																				**W

THIRD QUARTER

July							August							September						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4						1	2
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
29	30	31					26	27	28	29	30			24	25	26	27	28	29	30

FOURTH QUARTER

October							November							December						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4						1	2
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
29	30	31					26	27	28	29	30			24	25	26	27	28	29	30
																				*W

*The year-end world holiday, W or Dec. 31 (365th day), follows Dec. 30 every year.

**The leap-year world holiday, W or June 31 (an extra day), follows June 30 in leap years.

Isthmian Memories and Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for many years it has been customary for the several Panama Canal societies of the United States in the various parts of the country to honor some outstanding figure of Isthmian history. At its 31st annual reunion meeting—featured by a luncheon—in New York City on May 7, 1955, the Panama Canal Society of New York had as its guests of honor former Congressman Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky, sole surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, and Civil Governor of the Canal Zone during the construction period of the Panama Canal, and Mrs. Thatcher.

Attended by many who participated in the building of the Panama Canal—some of whom came from long distances—the occasion was unique—not only for the historic contributions of its membership—but, as well, for the quality of its program. The meeting was presided over by the society's president, Maj. Roy W. Hebard, distinguished engineer and head of a construction organization that throughout the Latin American regions has built highways, railroads, and other important improvements. In addition he was one of the engineers engaged in the actual construction of the canal. The assemblage was suggestive of other notable gatherings in the long history of the great Isthmian waterway.

Among others present were Thomas H. Rossbottom, who for more than 50 years was a trusted and efficient employee and official of the Panama railroad organization, and who, for a long period, in the capacity of active vice president, now retired, rendered for it services of the highest character; William Edward Russell distinguished lawyer and transportation authority, who was employed on the Isthmus during construction days; Col. Ralph H. Sartor, George M. Wells, W. G. B. Thompson, and Lt. Gen. James G. Steese, capable engineers of that period, with participation in the actual construction of the canal, the latter serving the Panama Canal enterprise in various capacities covering a period of 40 years, including the important post of engineer of maintenance. Also present were John Frank Stevens, Jr., and Earl Harding: the former being the son of John F. Stevens, the very able chief engineer of the Panama Canal during early construction years. The son is an eminent authority on Isthmian Canal problems and commercial relations between the United States and the Far East. Mr. Harding is a distinguished writer and vice president of the National Economic Council of New York.

The principal features of the program follow:

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT HEBARD INTRODUCING THE GUEST SPEAKER, GOVERNOR THATCHER

Members of the Panama Canal Society and distinguished guests; we are honored today, at our 31st annual reunion, by the presence of Mr. and Mrs. Maurice H. Thatcher, who have journeyed here from Washington. Our guest speaker needs no extended introduction to this Society, or to any Panama Canal Society in the United States.

He is approaching the twilight of a long, distinguished career, and he can look back with justifiable pride on 6 decades of service to his country and fellowmen, both at home and abroad. Appointed in April 1910 by President Taft as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, Mr. Thatcher served more than 3 years on the Isthmus as a member of the Commission and Head of the Department of Civil Administration. Many will remember his broad, sympathetic understanding he gave to the many problems and situations which reached him from every corner of the Canal Zone during these years.

Returning to the United States he resumed his law practice in his home city of Louisville, Ky., and in 1922 was elected, as a Republican, to the National House of Representatives. During his years in Congress he fathered the legislation creating the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in Panama—a research institution of world-wide importance and fame—and provide for its maintenance and operation; and also he was the author of the congressional measure which brought about the establishment and operation of the ferry facilities across the Canal on the Pacific side, and the connecting highway to the Arraijan—both of which bear his name.

Following his retirement from Congress, he continued residence in Washington, engaged in the practice of law, and has been active in public affairs, particularly in those which related to the Panama Canal, the Republic of Panama, and Latin America in general. He made a notable contribution in and about the successful effort to bring about the enactment of the legislation authorizing payment of annuities to former Panama Canal and Panama Railroad employees of the construction era. Later, due to his masterly presentation of the case he obtained a ruling from the United States Court of Claims exempting these annuity payments from tax levies.

From these, and many other services, all freely rendered, Mr. Thatcher deserves—and I believe, has—the gratitude of all the employees who have been thus benefited.

Our honored guest speaker is the sole surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission. Both he and Mrs. Thatcher have endeared themselves to two generations of Panama Canal and railroad employees, and the people of Panama over the same period.

I take great pleasure in presenting the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher—better known to his many friends and associates as Governor Thatcher.

ADDRESS OF MAURICE H. THATCHER, SURVIVING MEMBER OF THE ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION, BEFORE THE PANAMA CANAL SOCIETY OF NEW YORK, MAY 7, 1955

Mr. President, members of the Panama Canal Society of New York, old friends, and guests; first, I must express my grateful appreciation for the invitation to address you on this occasion. I am very happy to meet all of you, and to renew old associations. I am, indeed, delighted to greet those of you that qualify as oldtimers of the Panama Canal construction days. We were members of the organization that constructed the greatest industrial enterprise of history. For this we hold a justifiable pride. We were comrades in the Isthmian task, and the bonds of that association abate not with the passing of the years. We made our respective contributions to the building of the great link between the two great oceans that wash the Isthmian shores. We were thus able to serve—not only our country—but, as well, the entire world. Ours was a most important and unique experience; and it is most fitting that we have our Panama Canal societies and our meetings where we, the survivors of that great peace-time army, may come together and renew the sacred ties of friendship; recast, in memory, the olden scenes and labors; and experience the deep emotions which these occasions produce.

On May 4, 1910, my wife and I were married in her home in Frankfort, Ky., and immediately started by rail for this great city, arriving here on the following day. On the afternoon of May 6, about 4 oclock, we sailed on the Panama Canal steamship, the *Panama*, for our first home; that is to say, Ancon, in the Canal Zone. We reached Colon on the morning of May 13, and thence on, over the Panama Railroad, to Panama City and Ancon. We thereupon became the luncheon guests of Tom Cooke, Director of Posts, Customs, and Revenues, a branch of the Department of Civil Administration of the Canal Zone, of which department I became the head—or, as popularly designated, the Governor. On that same first Isthmian day I assumed my duties as a

member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, being the only civilian thereon. The Cooke home, as many of you will remember, stood on the slope of Ancon Hill, and commanded a magnificent view of the city and bay of Panama. Next, Mrs. Thatcher and I went to the official home provided for us in Ancon, which was to be our abiding place for more than 3 years next ensuing. On the same afternoon I visited the headquarters of Civil Administration, located in the old Administration Building, and there met members of my staff, and entered on the formal discharge of my official obligations.

In passing I may say that the activities of civil administration in the Canal Zone, while not novel or unique, as were those of the sanitary and engineering departments, were, nevertheless, quite as necessary and indispensable as were they; for, unless law and order were maintained, and all civil functions fully and effectively performed in the zone, neither sanitation nor engineering could carry on or exist. Civil administration could not dramatize itself, as did sanitation and engineering; but our civil agencies there included the police and fire departments; the prisons, the mails, schools, and the administration features of the judicial setup; the collection of taxes, revenues, and customs; services in connection with sanitation, immigration, and quarantine; municipal engineering, which included the operation and maintenance of the water, street, and sewer systems of the terminal cities of Panama and Colon; steam vessel inspection; the conduct of relations between the Isthmian Canal Commission and the government of Panama and the foreign representatives accredited to the Panamanian Republic. All these governmental activities and operations were maintained in effective worth, and millions of dollars were expended without waste or graft. Certain legislation, of local character, was enacted by the Isthmian Canal Commission, and during my incumbency I believe that I drafted most of the measures thus becoming laws of the Zone.

We who were engaged in the work and achievements of the Canal Zone government, I would submit, have every right to be proud and grateful. I shall always be deeply appreciative for the cooperation given me, during my Isthmian tenure, by all those engaged in the tasks imposed by the administration of civil affairs of the zone.

Later, when I came to Congress, as a Representative from Kentucky, my Isthmian labors, contacts, and experiences enabled me to sponsor and bring about the enactment of important legislation—as pointed out by Major Hebard—for the benefit of the canal and the Isthmus; and since then, as also indicated by Major Hebard, in the Congress, and in the courts, and in the departments of the National and State Governments, the opportunities have been mine to obtain legislation and rulings of substantial character for the benefit of Panama Canal construction employees and others of the permanent canal forces. These labors I have been very happy to render.

INCREASED FACILITIES OF PANAMA CANAL

Perhaps you would like to hear some discussion of the subject of increased facilities of the Panama Canal. Sooner or later, increased facilities must be provided for transisthmian shipping, and there are pending in the Congress bills providing for the creation of an Interoceanic Canals Commission to deal with the subject.

As you know, history tends to repeat itself; and this is especially true as to interoceanic canal history. In recent years, in a remarkable degree, we have retraced the historic canal debates of the early part of the century. In the search for theoretical security many have lost sight of the prime function of an interoceanic canal for the convenient and economic transit of vessels.

Congressional debates since 1947 have brought the principal issues into focus, and the canal proposals are now better understood. These include three principal ideas, as follows:

1. Increase of canal capacity and operational facility by means of the maximum utilization of the existing waterway according to the well-known Terminal Lake-Third Locks Plan.

2. Abandonment of the present canal and construction of a new canal at sea level with tidal locks near the Pacific end of the canal.

3. Construction of a canal at another location, such as Nicaragua.

The implications of these proposals are tremendous and affect the future welfare of the United States. The problems are not merely engineering and marine in character. In addition they include grave questions of international relations, interoceanic commerce, and economics.

In these objective evaluations a broader body than an exclusively engineering group is required. Such a body is contemplated in the Martin-Thompson bills now before the Congress (S. 766 and H. R. 3335) for the creation of an independent and broadly based Interoceanic Canals Commission composed of the best qualified men this Nation can obtain.

As one who has followed this question closely for many years, I am clearly of the opinion that only by such a body can this problem be adequately resolved in the interests of the United States and world shipping.

Now, the building of an Isthmian Canal is not merely an engineering feat. Our American engineers, military and civilian—and I believe they are unexcelled anywhere in the world—given time and money, may be able to construct almost any kind of a waterway, however difficult; but there are many factors involved in a wise equation; among them navigational needs and ease of operation; cost of construction and maintenance; the just resolution of the diplomatic problems which may be encountered; and the simplest and most practical type of design.

When the existing plan of the Panama Canal was selected by action of President Theodore Roosevelt and the Congress of the United States, the so-called Battle of the Levels had been fought to a finish, and it was believed that the question had been settled for all time. The construction of the canal thereupon proceeded to a successful conclusion, and was of the lake-lock type. All the arguments then made for a sea-level design are now made in the same behalf, with the addition of the argument that such a type of canal would be in the interests of better security.

DEFENSE OF CANAL

Defending the canal is somewhat like the protection of the two eyes. The delicate organs of sight can in any moment be destroyed, if not guarded against attack or injury; yet in the general course of nature but few are, relatively speaking, destroyed, since each sighted creature guards these priceless instrumentalities with great and constant care against destructive forces. And so it is with the Panama Canal: If we are so weak, or lacking in sources of defense in wartime to keep away the agencies of destruction, it will be destroyed, utterly destroyed; and that is the simple truth about the matter. This being the fact it seems to be most unwise and unavailing—unless the necessity therefor be absolute—to build at Panama, practically a new canal at vast cost to the American taxpayer and world shipping (for construction costs must, in substantial manner, be reflected in tolls). The cost of building a canal of the suggested sea level design, under mounting wage scales, and price of materials, augmented by indemnity and increased annuity payments to Panama, if, as seems likely, additional lands and concessions are required—would probably run to a staggering total of some figure between five and ten billion dollars.

In this connection, I may add, any material increase in tolls will inevitably harm our own merchant marine more than that of any other nation, because of higher wage and benefit conditions obtaining in our own shipping systems than in those of other nations. The net outcome of such a situation, in my judgment, would be well calculated to drive our ships from the seas.

All in all, from my knowledge of the feeling and temper of the Congress of the United States—derived through association and experience as a member—for five terms, and throughout that service as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations—I cannot believe that congressional sanction may ever be given to the abandonment of the present Panama Canal and the construction, in its stead, of an entirely new waterway of unknown design and at astronomical cost, unless convinced in the most satisfactory way, that such action is the absolute and indispensable solution required.

Indeed, I believe that, rather than authorize such a course, the Congress is more likely to turn the Nicaragua or to some other Isthmian region if a new canal—to meet the growing need of shipping—is required, meanwhile retaining the Panama Canal in its present general form.

BASIS FOR OPINION

It might be asked with what authority can a nonengineer speak in these connections? For myself, the answer is that as a member for several years of the Isthmian Canal Commission, which was charged with the duty of supervising the construction of the Canal, and my labors and responsibilities in connection with the administration of the civil affairs of the Canal Zone, I had ample opportunity for observance of the engineering work and problems of the construction era. I have walked through the great cut before the water was turned through it, and saw there the problems presented by the great moving slides and witnessed—at first hand—the constantly falling stones and debris from the vast slopes wrought by excavation. I witnessed the torrential rains for the greater part of the year, and came to understand the fearful menace involved in the prolonged saturation of the massed soil and crumbling rock structures. I saw there the rains, the tremendous slides, and the heavy cost required to achieve the best possible angles of repose. I am very well informed as to the great crevice of the cut and which is now being dealt with at the cost of millions of dollars: and I know that it emphasizes anew the perils thus involved, and which will surely be repeated and accentuated with a lower canal level. I do not believe that one must be a trained engineer to realize that the deeper the excavation goes in the present canal, the greater will be the danger of slides; and that the cost of reducing that danger to the minimum will be tremendous, and without any understandable advantage over the present lake-lock system which for more than 40 years of operation has proved its worth and more than justified the judgment of its official advocates and sponsors when it was chosen.

As one who made some contribution to the canal enterprise, it is but natural that my preference is for the preservation of the present canal and the system and design on which it is based; but I would be unpatriotic and unobjective if I opposed a distinctly new type to supersede that which now obtains, if the new type would manifestly be for the best interests of our Nation and the needs of navigation.

Here, in the presence of other old-timers I am simply expressing by views—for whatever they may be worth—touching a grave prob-

lem that our Nation must face. All of us are deeply interested in the problem, and join in the hope that the best solution may be found. Some of us may not be engineers; but we have had important construction-day contacts, and, because of experience and observation, we do have our opinions regarding these matters. These opinions must stand or fall upon the reasons on which they are based.

Moreover, if professional engineers, without training or experience in the conduct of civil affairs may acceptably fill major positions of civil government, by the same token it may be urged that those whose careers have been in the fields of legislation and civil affairs may be capable of making some helpful suggestions in the overall area of design and policy in great engineering enterprises such as isthmian canals; especially so when the features of cost, legislation, and international relations are of paramount consideration; and when obvious physical conditions can be taken into account.

In general, it seems to be a matter of sound judgment to hold fast to that which is good, rather than to embark on a course, tremendously expensive in its consummation, and of results in no wise clearly certain. Only the strongest considerations would justify a departure.

LINE OF LEAST RESISTANCE

A major engineering truth—as I conceive it—is that in the accomplishment of a given purpose, other things being equal, it is easiest and best to follow the lines of least resistance and lessened costs. This must be obvious to all—both engineers and non-engineers. Even the animals of field and forest are instinctively guided by the law of least resistance in the creation of their travel ways. Thus in the early days of our eastern and central areas the buffalos laid out and traveled over their least-resistance "traces," which ripened into Indian and pioneer pathways, and in the modern era became—in large measure—the course of many of our great highways. Under the existing plan of the canal the torrential Chagres was tamed and utilized as a beneficial agency; but the great slides that obtained at Culebra could not be harnessed and utilized; they were, and ever must remain, wholly devastating and destructive. Let us not tempt them further if avoidance may be possible.

There are distinguished engineers who favor a sea-level design at Panama; and these I hold in respect and esteem. There are other distinguished engineers, just as honest in their judgments, who contend that the best treatment of the subject is through the adoption of the terminal-lake-third-locks plan; and in this latter category are practically all the surviving engineers who were engaged, in varying capacities, in the actual construction of the present canal. These latter speak from the vantage point of experience which is invaluable in character. Some of these, among them members of your society, like Major Hebard, your president and John F. Stevens, Jr., and William E. Russell, two more of your outstanding members, joined in sending to the 83d Congress a well-reasoned appeal and presentation of the case for the terminal-lake-third-locks plan. I have never met any construction era engineer who expressed his judgment in favor of a scalevel design. I cannot believe that Wallace, Stevens, Goethals, Sibert, and Gaillard, and all the host of distinguished engineers who participated in the construction of the Panama Canal—were they alive today—would favor the abandonment of the present design for one that required a deepened excavation of 100 or more feet in Gaillard Cut, with all the slides that would inevitably result. It was largely through the recommendation of John F. Stevens, chief engineer, in 1906, that the lake-lock plan was adopted; and I would pay him the highest tribute for his action. The great canal organization he established endured until the work of construction was completed.

TERMINAL LAKE-LOCK-THIRD-LOCKS PROJECT

No doubt you are generally familiar with the arguments that the so-called Terminal Lake-Third-Locks plan constitutes the best solution of the question of increased facilities of the Panama Canal; that is to say, the grouping of the Pacific locks at Miraflores (and elimination of the lock structures at Pedro Miguel); with the Miraflores Lake raised to Gatun Lake and Gaillard Cut level; and the completion of the Third Locks project—on which many millions of dollars have already been expended—with channels constructed so as to provide the smoothest navigation possible, and with locks located at Gatun and Miraflores in tandem design, with chambers of dimensions sufficient to accommodate the largest ships. Such an overall construction might well serve world shipping for many years to come, and would obviate the necessity of paying any huge indemnity and increased annuity which would be required, under a different plan. Moreover, it is likely the total cost would be small, as compared to what would be involved in the so-called sea-level type of construction, with the menace of greatly increased slides incident thereto.

FURTHER AS TO SECURITY

As for the danger of any canal from atomic attack and destruction, whatever may have been urged in this connection some years ago, has lost its force in the great advance that science has wrought in the production of the huge hydrogen bomb, with the end not in sight. As the matter stands today, no canal can be secure from destruction, if these unprecedented missiles of destructive force are permitted to strike. We can only hope that any canal used for the agencies of freedom may be spared such attacks. In the two greatest wars of history, those charged with the duty of operating and defending the Panama Canal have accomplished their tasks in the most successful and commendable manner. We can only hope that in any further armed conflicts the like results may be achieved. The only security for the canal is to prevent the atomic or other bomb from striking at all.

Proponents of a sea-level-tidal-lock design may feel—in the true American spirit—the desire to accept the challenge of great difficulties and the will to overcome them. Conceivably they might succeed; but at what cost and with what beneficial result? What about the vast national debt climbing upward to $300 billion; and the overburdened taxpayers? Will the taxpayer's Congress consider these matters as trifles? Not so, in my judgment.

Our national debt today equals the total value of all land, buildings, mines, machinery, livestock, and all other tangible property in the United States; and we yet have a national budget which is out of balance. It seems to me that if there is any "forgotten man" in the United States, it is the American taxpayer. All in all, the picture thus presented is a most alarming one.

PANAMA RAILROAD

At this point, permit me to avert a related subject.

My congratulations go to Major Hebard for his splendid brochure upon the subject of the Panama Railroad.

I note with deep regret that official action may be taken to terminate the life and activities of this historic and splendid agency. For more than 100 years it has performed a unique and indispensable service as the first transcontinental carrier in the Western Hemisphere. The Panama Canal could not have been built without its aid and assistance. Throughout its life, its career has been dramatic and of the highest degree of importance. In my judgment, it should not be permitted to die an ignominious death. I should think that there is grave need for its continued existence. Suppose by slides, or through other causes, the Panama Canal should, for an indefinite period, cease to function—would not the Panama Railroad—if yet alive—be the one great agency to provide the substantial transisthmian service required? For the purpose of insurance against disaster, can our Government afford to tear up its tracks, and junk its rolling stock? I am not fully advised as to economic considerations involved; but I do know that during my membership on the House Committee on Appropriations, and as I recall it, at the instance of our committee, the Panama Railroad began to pay into the United States Treasury its net earnings; and in the years that followed it paid into the Treasury many millions of dollars.

It appears that the Hoover Commission and chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations question the wisdom of extinction of the railroad, and recommend further study of the question by appropriate committees of the Congress.

If permitted to survive, the railroad, in times to come, might reassert its earning capacity.

The Isthmus of Panama without the Panama Railroad would be, indeed, much like the play of Hamlet without the Prince of Denmark.

It is my hope—and I believe that of all of us who are old-timers—that the Panama Railroad be permitted to survive to carry on its noble mission.

IN CONCLUSION

Finally, I would say that, with respect to increased canal facilities at Panama, the creation of an Interoceanic Canals Commission, made up of men of ability, independence, and objectivity, and charged with the duty of investigating all the problems involved, and the making of recommendations thereon, would seem to be the only wise and adequate treatment in the premises. All plans may then be presented, and considered, under up-to-date conditions, both by such a body and by the final arbiter, the American Congress; and only thus, I believe, will a satisfactory and satisfying result be achieved.

After the conclusion of the address, which won hearty approval, a number of those present made extemporaneous remarks arising from personal experiences. Effective statements were made by General Steese and Mr. Rossbottom strongly supporting the views of Governor Thatcher as to the necessity of retaining the Panama Railroad as insurance against possible emergency or disaster—the conclusion set forth at some length in the 1955 Hoover Commission Report to the Congress on the subject of transportation.

Memorial Day Brings Lots of Remembering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New Castle Courier-Times:

MEMORIAL DAY BRINGS LOTS OF REMEMBERING

(By Ed Ogborne)

"What's that there, sonny They're going to have a big parade on Memorial Day? And you say you want to be sure and see it?

"Well, I s'pose it will be a grand sight and all, and I expect I'll go down to see it, too, as they march through town and to the cemetery.

"I guess I haven't missed a Decoration Day parade in a lot more'n 60 years. Used to tag along behind the Silver Cornet Band when I was a boy smaller'n you. Yes, me and all the other little kids would go all the way from the beginning to the end.

"And we'd stick around even for a while to hear the speakin', and General Logan's order and Taps on the bugle while everybody stood with their hats off and their palm-leaf fans still.

"Yes siree, boy, I've seen many a Decoration Day parade and I used to march in 'em, too.

"But somehow, they don't seem to be quite as inspirin' as they used to be. Or maybe I'm just a little older and see things differrent now.

"I used to like to see the Boys in Blue go by, the old soldiers we call 'em then, although when I was your age they wasn't so old—just middle-aged men who didn't keep in step so well any more, and who had outgrowed their uniforms.

"Still and all, they was a sight to see—those men who saved the Union, who fought at Chickamauga and Lookout Mountain and Petersburg and Vicksburg.

"I tell you, the Grand Army of the Republic was grand and especially when they marched again on Decoration Day.

"Me? Did I fight in the Civil War? Goodness no, sonny, I wasn't even born yet.

"Fact is, I never fought in no war. They say I was lucky to be too old for any of the wars we've had since. But I don't know if that's being lucky or not. I sure would have joined up if I could because there's something about that Old Flag that makes me feel I'd do anything for her.

"Anyways, I never got to wear a uniform although I would of been proud to have looked back now and said, 'Yes, I sure did.'

"Too old, though. But I had a brother who fought in Cuba and died there of the yellow fever. And my boy, George, who lives in Wisconsin was with Patton in Africa. I guess he might be in the parade if they have one—in Wisconsin. He was a sergeant.

"What j'say there, sonny? Is Decoration Day just for the dead soldiers and sailors and marines and such?

"Why no it ain't any more. It started out that way, but not any more. So many folks thought it was such a fine occasion to remember the kin they loved so well, they sort of took up with the custom.

"I guess you'll find, when you're as old as I am, there's a lot of rememberin' to be done, too. Yes, an awful lot. Ain't nobody around here among my folks any more. George comes back every summer, but there's nobody else.

"So, you see, I kind of set a store always for Decoration Day. Always look forward to it—even—even if it ain't quite what it used to be when I was a boy. It's changed a lot—just like me, I guess."

Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include herein my statement before the House Committee on Education and Labor favoring increase of the minimum wage to $1.25:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the present minimum wage of 75 cents an hour is a law without a friend, because every sincere American is ashamed of it.

Those who do take advantage of it to avoid paying labor its just compensation don't qualify as citizens, or as human beings.

They are very close to being Communists, because they treat their workers as slaves.

It is a pity that we cannot bring them into court and sentence them to make restitution for this virtual nonpayment of wages, or, better yet, give them a 1-year term at the hard labor of trying to exist on $30 a week.

As long as the law freezes the wages of certain workers at starvation levels, the reputation of the United States will suffer from the scorn and abuse, against which there is no defense.

Economic justice, equality of opportunity, at $30 a week?

I am positive that, if every Member of Congress could acquire the rugged field experience of trying to keep body and soul together on $30 a week, legislation to increase the minimum wage to $1.25 per hour would be passed immediately, and without a dissenting voice.

And a heavy burden of guilt would be lifted from our conscience.

Seventeen years have passed since the Fair Labor Standards Act (and we wince at that misnomer) was passed, 17 years of tremendous economic progress, 17 years during which the minimum wage, against opposition that it is almost impossible to imagine in this age of economic enlightenment, Barely managed to get up to 75 cents per hour. In 1950, 5 years ago.

The great majority of employers pay their employees well. They are a credit to themselves and the Nation.

The few who pay substandard wages are being subsidized in fact, by the reputable enterprises who must make up the deficit.

Honorable business concerns must not only pay their own share in providing social and community services, but are forced to pick up the tab for the exploiters of labor. This is a rank injustice, which can only be corrected by raising the minimum wage, and thus providing some protection for both workers and responsible firms.

Any canvass of labor-surplus areas will reveal how vagrant industries search for these localities, and then start up operations with the sole intent of paying the lowest wages possible. Under the guise of providing employment, they force standards down, and depress the communities they profess to help.

They use the slave-labor minimum-wage law to cannibalize business.

They are an insult and a menace to everything that we value in our system of free and progressive enterprise.

The minimum budget necessary for a single American to support himself is $2,500 a year.

This is at the rate of $1.25 minimum hourly rate.

An average worker, with a family to support, would require more.

Anything less than this has a deteriorating effect upon the health, morale, and productivity of individuals and communities.

Compared with the steady increase in our gross national product, it is a contradiction leading to extremes and tensions that we must avoid if we are to keep our economy healthy and our people strong and confident.

An employer or a corporation claiming inability to pay workers more than $1.25 an hour has no right to hire human beings.

They can and should be made to pay a decent wage or suffer the consequences.

I am opposed to the decision that the hearings on this important legislation will not cover extension of the law to additional employers. This is a loophole that enables some irresponsible employers to escape from their obligations.

In conclusion, I heartily endorse the proposal to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act in a manner to raise the legal minimum wage from 75 cents to $1.25 per hour.

I believe that this increase should take effect just as soon as possible, and during this session of Congress because the laws of this Nation should promote the public welfare, and must never be misused as a shield to protect scavengers.

Memorial Day Address Delivered at Mountain Home, Tenn., by the Honorable John S. Patterson, Deputy Administrator, United States Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an inspiring address delivered at Mountain Home, Tenn., on Memorial Day by Hon. John S. Patterson, Deputy Administrator, United States Veterans' Administration:

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS DELIVERED AT MOUNTAIN HOME, TENN., BY THE HONORABLE JOHN S. PATTERSON, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, UNITED STATES VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

To be here today is to experience a feeling of deep humility.

If a man were to search through all of the 48 States for an appropriate place in which to turn his heart and his mind to those who died that America might live, he could find no more fitting spot than in these beautiful mountains of Tennessee.

And if a man could range across your entire State, from south to north and from east to west, he could find no more appropriate place to pay tribute to our illustrious dead than here in this lovely natural setting of Mountain Home.

To be in Mountain Home on Memorial Day is to experience the thrill that comes when one pauses at your replica of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

To be in Mountain Home on Memorial Day is to be humbly conscious of the graves of men who fought and died in battle.

Perhaps the simplest way to explain my feelings is to tell you why I was so happy to make this trip to Tennessee.

To come to Tennessee is to be among the descendants of brave men who took up arms in Revolutionary days to make us an independent nation.

To come to Tennessee is to be among the descendants of hardy pioneers who cleared the wilderness, who farmed your fertile valleys, who built your prosperous cities and towns.

To come to Tennessee is to follow the example of three men who later became Presidents of the United States.

To Tennessee came Andrew Jackson, whose life and achievements have made The Hermitage a national shrine forever.

To Tennessee came James K. Polk, during whose presidential administration a million square miles were added to our expanding Nation.

To Tennessee came Andrew Johnson, who became Chief Executive of our Nation at a time of unparalleled confusion and tragedy.

Each of these three great Americans who made Tennessee his home, also was able to make an important contribution to the development of our Nation.

Andrew Jackson believed that individual responsibility was the bedrock on which must be built the collective security of America.

The dead we honor on Memorial Day gave up their lives to help defend that principle.

Andrew Johnson, an apprenticed tailor, born in poverty, had no formal schooling whatever, and triumphed over severe adversity.

He believed that the wider the range of knowledge among our individual citizens, the more secure would be our national destiny.

The dead we honor on Memorial Day gave up their lives to help defend that principle.

James K. Polk, who presided over the Nation at the time of our war with Mexico, was convinced that a nation must think and act from a position of strength; otherwise it invites disaster and defeat.

The dead we honor on Memorial Day gave up their lives to help maintain that principle.

Today, as in the days of Jackson, Polk, Johnson, we believe that the future safety of America must be based on intelligence, responsibility, strength.

To those who gave their lives to help defend these principles our humble thanks must be given on this Memorial Day.

But let us also be mindful that millions of living veterans are continuing the unfinished work of those we honor today.

Millions of living veterans are justifying, in their daily lives, the heroic deeds of their comrades who died that our Nation might live.

In their name we must ask—and answer—three crucial questions.

First, are we keeping America strong and alert in the intelligence that free men must have and use, if they are to remain free?

Are we remaining true to the hopes of Andrew Johnson for the widest possible diffusion of knowledge among our people?

Millions of living veterans have answered that question. They have trained in school, in the factory, and on the farm.

They have given to this Nation thousands upon thousands of trained engineers. They have added to the ranks of our physicians and surgeons. They have added strength to the teaching profession, to the practice of law.

Veterans are in all of the trades. They are adding their powerful contribution to America's trained know-how in factories and shops, and on our farms.

Were he alive today, Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee, would be glad to know what a mighty force our veterans have been in the ever-widening diffusion of knowledge appropriate to free men.

They are achievements to gladden our hearts, as we stand in the presence of our heroic dead on Memorial Day.

They return a positive answer to the first of our three crucial questions: Yes, we live in a stronger America, because trained veterans have made it a more intelligent America.

But how shall we answer our second crucial question? What has been done to keep our Nation strong in the individual responsibility that free men must build and use, if they are to remain free?

Millions of home-owning veterans have answered that question in unmistakeable terms.

Home-owning veterans have put down strong roots in communities all over the Nation. Many of them are living here in Tennessee.

They are easy to recognize.

They have youth.

They have ambition.

They have optimism.

They own homes in our cities and towns. Many of them have moved out into the suburbs, in that remarkable pioneering shift of young families out to the grass and sunshine of new communities, so characteristic of the past decade.

Surburban-dwelling veterans bring with them a new vitality. Their economic needs have stimulated a new industrial expansion.

Home ownership has meant increased demand for steel—for lumber—for copper—rubber—plastics—glass.

Home ownership has meant more schools and churches, more shopping centers. It has developed bus lines, filled the highways with new automobiles.

But fundamentally—home ownership has meant more tax-paying, individually responsible citizens in every corner of the Nation.

Home ownership has added to the vast army of those in America who stand on their own two feet—who pay their own way—who carry their full share of citizenship duties and responsibilities.

It would bring satisfaction to the tough "old hickory" heart of Andrew Jackson, of Tennessee, to know that millions of home-owning veterans have contributed to the making of a stronger America.

They have proved themselves worthy comrades of the heroic dead we honor on Memorial Day.

And how shall we answer our third crucial question that thoughtful Americans must ask themselves on Memorial Day?

Have we been true to the hopes of those who preceded us that this Nation might grow to greatness by the overwhelming strength of its economic power?

Our veterans in every walk of life have answered that question.

Mechanics, carpenters, construction workers, bricklayers, plumbers, and a host of others, are contributing the massed power of their individual productive lives to the economic power of the United States.

From our trades and our professions, from our farms and shops and factories, from our cities and towns, veterans have produced a material strength in America hitherto unknown in the history of the world.

In a dangerous world where power is all-important for survival, veterans have made the United States of America a bulwark of strength.

Thanks to the brain and muscle of millions of veterans, America has become a formidable rock on which an aggressive communism, foolish enough to force an all-out war, most certainly will founder.

James K. Polk, of Tennessee, would be filled with satisfaction to know that America, thanks to the contributions of our veterans, possesses the invincible power that comes from a strong right arm.

It is an achievement to make us proud, as we meet here on Memorial Day in the presence of our dead.

It is our triumphant answer to the last of the three crucial questions we ask ourselves as we search our hearts before the graves of those who died to defend our freedom.

In the presence of our dead we can truthfully assert that our living veterans are carrying on the work that those who preceded us have "so nobly advanced."

To our three questions our living veterans return three reassuring answers:

They have helped to make a more intelligent America.

They have helped to make a more responsible America.

They have helped to make a more powerful America.

This is the message I bring to you on Memorial Day, in Mountain Home, Tenn. It is a message appropriate to every spot where we gather to pay homage to those who gave their lives for the defense of our country.

In that reassurance for the dead is our truest hope for the living.

It is our truest hope for the future of America.

In that hope we again renew—on Memorial Day—our solemn vow to our heroic dead that they shall not have died in vain.

PROGRAM

Massing of the colors: By color guards of service organizations.

O Lord Most Holy, by Cesar Franck: Johnson City High School Band, directed by Prof. W. F. Weddle.

Invocation: Chaplain Harry T. Wright.

Lincoln's Gettysburg Address: Hon. Burgin Dossett, president, East Tennessee State College.

Onward, Ye Peoples, by Jean Sibelius: Appalachian Choral Societies, directed by Prof. Virgil C. Self; Miss Ruth Clark, organist; Miss Beatrice Harmon, pianist; ensemble from East Tennessee State College Concert Band.

Recognition of Gold Star Mothers, distinguished visitors, and introduction of speaker: Lee B. Harr, manager.

Address: The Honorable John S. Patterson, Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

This Is My Country, by Al Jacobs: Appalachian Choral Societies.

Decoration of replica of Tomb of Unknown Soldier: By the Honorable CARROLL REECE, Member of Congress.

Salute to the dead.

Taps.

Benediction: Chaplain James L. Shealey.

Sevenfold amen.

Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of resolutions 1 and 5 adopted at the annual convention of the American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor, held in Boston on May 6 and 7 last, and certified to by Mr. Lewis Goldstein, national commander.

We all honor and have great admiration for the defenders of Bataan and Corregidor, and I am sure that Members of Congress will be interested to read the resolutions referred to, one of which has to do with our national- and civil-defense program, and the other concerns a proposed study of malnutrition and starvation as related to the benefits now available to veterans who were prisoners of war.

The material referred to follows:

"RESOLUTION 1

"Whereas the American defenders of Bataan and Corregidor, has been subject to the first surprise air attack in American history; and

"Whereas the result of said air attack was the only defeat of an American Army; and

"The American defenders of Bataan and Corregidor is concerned with the national and civil defense program of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor, Inc., in this 10th annual convention, That we, as veterans of World War II, endorse and pledge our sup-

port of the Ground Observers Corps program under the jurisdiction and guidance of the United States Air Force. Also, our national commander appoint a National Ground Observer Corps Committee to work with this program and for all members of the American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor, Inc. to pledge their wholehearted support toward the aim of the United States Air Force for the implementation of 24 hour coverage of all ground observer posts in the United States of America."

This above resolution was passed unanimously at the 10th annual convention of the American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor held in Boston May 6 and 7, 1955.

LEWIS GOLDSTEIN,
National Commander.

"RESOLUTION 4

"Whereas the Public Law 744 has been signed by the President of the United States; and

"Whereas the members of American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor, Inc. are greatly concerned with the projected reportable items concerning malnutrition and starvation; and

"Whereas it would appear that organizations such as American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor, Inc. should be consulted or solicited for comments and/or suggestions; and

"Whereas this project if properly conducted would erase many of the injustices as interpreted by the Veterans' Administration and restore benefits: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor advises the President of the United States of their views as expressed above."

This above resolution was passed unanimously at the 10th annual convention of the American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor held in Boston May 6 and 7, 1955.

LEWIS GOLDSTEIN,
National Commander.

The Need for Wilderness Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at the National Citizen's Planning Conference on Parks and Open Spaces for the American People, conducted here in Washington last week by the American Planning and Civic Association and its cooperators, an important discussion on the need for wilderness areas was presented on May 24, 1955, by the executive secretary of the Wilderness Society, Mr. Howard Zahniser. Mr. Zahniser not only pointed out the practical needs for areas of wilderness for recreational and other purposes; he also discussed the underlying philosophy, and proposed the establishment of a natural wilderness preservation system. I ask unanimous consent to have this significant address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The address ties in directly with the discussion which took place today in the colloquy between the two Senators from Oregon [Mr. MORSE and Mr. NEUBERGER].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED FOR WILDERNESS AREAS

(Paper by Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society and editor of the Living Wilderness, presented at the National Citizen's Planning Conference on Parks and Open Spaces for the American People, in Washington, D. C., May 24, 1955)

In addition to our needs for urban and suburban parks and open spaces, in addition to the need for a countryside of rural loveliness, a landscape of beauty for our living, and in addition to the needs for parkways and parks and well-developed areas for all kinds of outdoor recreation, there is in our planning a need also to secure the preservation of some areas that are so managed as to be left unmanaged—areas that are undeveloped by man's mechanical tools and in every way unmodified by his civilization. These are the areas of wilderness that still live on in our national parks, national forests, State parks and forests, and indeed in various other categories of land likewise.

These are areas with values that are in jeopardy not only from exploitation for commodity purposes and from appropriation for engineering uses. Their peculiar values are also in danger from development for recreation, even from efforts to protect and manage them as wilderness.

It is important to recognize these peculiar values. It is important to distinguish our need for the areas as wilderness from the needs which they serve along with our other outdoor areas of parks, parkways, forests, lakes, and streams. It is fortunate in a program so comprehensive as this one for the National Citizen's Planning Conference on Parks and Open Spaces for the American People that there is consideration given to need for wilderness areas.

I regret that you do not have someone more capable than I to interpret this need, for I feel keenly a rather narrow limitation both in analyzing the problem we face and in representing the values with which we are concerned. It would undoubtedly be better also if we could approach this discussion through testimony rather than discourse, for I see about me many whose experience in the winderness is richer than mine own and in whose variety of impressions there doubtless is the best basis for the conclusions that I must first suggest and only then submit to discussion. And there certainly are others here much more competent than I am to relate these rich values of wilderness to our programs for setting aside reservations as a means of protection. I can only plead a keen interest, a very deep concern, and an eagerness to do whatever I can to stimulate the more effective contributions of others.

I must especially rely upon this group's reservoir of first-hand experience in the great American areas of wilderness, the areas with which we are here concerned. Truly it would be hollow to discuss the wilderness except with a consciousness of its appeals and inspirations. Yet within the scope of this symposium there is hardly opportunity to evoke in the words of one speaker the experiences in the wilderness upon which depends all that is said. It is most fortunate, then, to know that we can start our thinking with so rich a resource of individual experience as is here represented.

It will also thus be the easier to escape the need to distinguish the concrete wilderness experience from the experience in other areas of the great outdoors. How differs the experience that I recall of the robin singing so marvellously and melodiously in the evening along the Lake Solitude shores of the cloud peak primitive area of Wyoming's Big Horn National Forest from that of the liquid loveliness of the wood thrush that sang from the precious patch of woodland behind my own suburban home just as I sought an illustration of this perplexity? Here I need not answer this question but simply call it up for its answers in your own minds. For it is not the concrete experience with which I am concerned in this particular discussion but rather the abstract one that relates to our concepts of wilderness and our policies of reservations.

Of course, there is a great and practical need that resides in the desires of so many people for wilderness experiences, a need that should certainly be met. There is likewise a practical need for realizing our ideal of preserving for everyone the privilege of choosing to enjoy the wilderness if he or she so wishes. These are definite practical needs for which we should, of course, provide in the programs.

I recognize these needs, yet I wish here to try to probe deeper into our fundamentals, to see if there really is a need that if unsatisfied would lead to deprivations or sacrifices that would be profoundly tragic or even destructive of our way of living.

SUPERLATIVE VALUES

But, first, I must point out another practical or immediate need, one that can be recognized as residing in our compulsion to save from destruction whatever is best. Some of our strongest determinations to preserve wilderness arise from this motive. Robert Marshall, whose memory I honor with admiration and deep gratitude, conveys such an appreciation of the wilderness as a superlative in a short essay found among his papers by his brother George Marshall a couple of years ago and published posthumously as the editorial in the summer 1954 issue of the Living Wilderness. He was essaying a demonstration of certain distinctive values that come to a person with a return for a time to the primitive life of the wilderness. I want to quote seven paragraphs, partly because they place before us so authoritatively the benefits of wilderness, but mainly to suggest the need for preserving the wilderness because it is something superlative. Note the variety of superlatives in these paragraphs—"best," "ideal," "perfect," "unique," "most perfect."

"The wilderness," wrote Bob Marshall, "furnishes the best environment which remains in the country for physical adventure. It is difficult to overestimate the importance adventure assumes in the longings of innumerable vigorous people. Lack of opportunity to satisfy such longings undoubtedly is responsible for much unhappiness, for a considerable portion of the crime which is so often committed as a means of self-expression, and, if we are to believe William James and Bertrand Russell, even for war.

"A wilderness journey provides the ideal conditions for developing physical hardiness. In the wilderness a person cannot buy transportation or services. He must provide them for himself. He cannot find machinery, to relieve him of the need for expending his own strength and energy. If he gets into trouble he must get himself out of it or take the consequences.

"The wilderness also furnishes the perfect environment for peacefulness and relaxation. Time is of no consequence in an environment which has been developing through an unbroken chain of natural sequences for millions of years. In the true wilderness there are no jarring notes, no discordant clashes with one's instinctive sense of what is fitting and proper.

"From an esthetic standpoint the wilderness is unique because in it alone immensity is a major quality of the beauty which one enjoys. The values which one gets in a view from some lofty mountain top cannot be comprehended at all if one tries to reduce them to color or form or pattern.

"All these esthetic values are present, but they are blended with the dominant value of being a part of an immensity so great that the human being who looks upon it vanishes into utter insignificance.

"The wilderness is also unique esthetically in that it stimulates not just the sense of sight, as does art, or the sense of sound, as does music, but all of the senses which man has. The traveler wandering at evening to the shore of some wilderness lakelet senses through his sight the pink sunset sky and the delightful pattern which the deep bay makes among the spruce trees which rise from its shores; senses through his hearing the lapping of the water against the rocky shore and the evening song of the thrush; senses through his smell the scent of balsam and the marsh flowers at the water's edge; senses through his touch the gentle wind which blows on his forehead and the softness of the sphagnum beneath his feet. The wilderness is all of these senses harmonized with immensity into a form of beauty which to many human beings is the most perfect experience of the earth."

ARE SUPERLATIVE VALUES ESSENTIAL?

Who that can thus see so clearly these superlative values of the wilderness through the perceptions and interpretations of Robert Marshall can fail to sense a need for preserving wilderness areas? Who in a democratic government that seeks to serve the public interest even for the sake of minorities would wish to lose an opportunity to realize a policy for wilderness preservation? Who that looks on into the future with a concern for such values would not wish to insure for posterity the freedom to choose the privilege of knowing the unspoiled wilderness?

But are these superlative values essential?

Is the exquisite also a requisite?

I think it is.

I believe that at least in the present phase of our civilization we have a profound, a fundamental need for areas of wilderness—a need that is not only recreational and spiritual but also educational and scientific, and withal essential to a true understanding of ourselves, our culture, our own natures, and our place in all nature.

This need is for areas of the earth within which we stand without our mechanisms that make us immediate masters over our environment—areas of wild nature in which we sense ourselves to be, what in fact I believe we are, dependent members of an interdependent community of living creatures that together derive their existence from the sun.

By very definition this wilderness is a need. The idea of wilderness as an area without man's influence is man's own concept. Its values are human values. Its preservation is a purpose that arises out of man's own sense of his fundamental needs.

THE WILDERNESS AS VACATION COUNTRY

Wilderness to most of us is vacation country, thought about for the most part in connection with occasional good time escapes from a civilized life which itself somehow or other seems to be reality. It is usually only after reflection that one perceives the true reality in the wilderness.

It is, of course, not surprising that recreational values are generally understood as representing the dominant importance of wilderness in our modern civilization. Only in a society that produces the erosion of human beings, the wearing away of soul and body and spirit that is so familiar in our modern circumstances, does the concept of recreation appear.

The wilderness represents the antithesis of all that produces these conditions which recreation remedies. It not only provides the kind of recreation most needed by the increasingly large number who seek wilderness, but it also affords the background for the kind of outdoor recreation for which conveniences and accommodations are provided—the frontier where those who do not wish to experience the rigors of wilderness living and travel may still know in some degree the tonic benefits of its wildness.

Recreational values of the wilderness are thus not only intrinsic but also pervasive throughout the outdoor-recreation program of a society with the tastes and resources of the United States. Wilderness preservation is a part therefore of a comprehensive recreational program—a very important part of such a program's provision for outdoor recreation—and it is the ultimate resource for that phase of outdoor recreation that ministers to the individual as such.

But wilderness vacations have those overtones that make them more than narrowly recreational. They are more likely to be joyous than merry, more refreshing than exciting, more engrossing than diverting. Their rewards are satisfactions. There is likely to be a seriousness about wilderness recreation and an earnestness among those who seek it. So philosophers of education who describe their goals in such terms as "life adjustment" and "personality development" may find in the wilderness a most valuable resource. and recreational values in such a context become profoundly educational.

THE WILDERNESS AND HUMAN REALITIES

Deeper and broader than the recreational value of wilderness, although indeed encompassing it, is the importance that relates it to our essential being, indicating that the understandings which come in its surroundings are those of true reality. Our lives seem so derivative from the wilderness, we ourselves seem so dependent on a renewal of our inspiration from these wild sources, that I wonder sometimes if we could long survive a final destruction of all wilderness. Are we not truly and in reality human, essentially, as spiirtual creatures nurtured and sustained—directly or indirectly—by a wildness that must always be renewed from a living wilderness?

Is it not with some such understanding as this that we realize the essential importance of our wilderness areas?

Is it not thus that we can explain the fact that a wilderness vacation is remembered as more than sport, more than fun, more than simple recreation?

Are not these the understandings which give such profound significance to the longer sojourns that a civilized man or woman occasionally spends in a return to the wilderness?

It is characteristic of wilderness to impress its visitors with their relationship to other forms of life, and to afford those who linger an intimation of the interdependence of all life. In the wilderness it is thus possible to sense most keenly our human membership in the whole community of life on the earth. And in this possibility is perhaps one explanation for our modern deep-seated need for wilderness.

Because we are so well able to do things, we forget that we can do them only because something else is done. We forget that we can continue only so long as other men, other animals, and other forms of life also keep on doing things. We forget that the real source of all our life is not in ourselves, not even in the earth itself, but more than 90 million miles away, in the sun. And not one of us is able alone to live on this great source. We live only as members of a community.

If for a time some of us might seem to do well at the tragic expense of other life in this community, we can be sure that it would likewise be at the expense of our children, our grandchildren, and our great-grandchildren through the generations that might live. For we know that we can live on in our descendants only if our earth community lives on with them. We not only exist but we are immortal on the earth only as members of a great community.

These are facts and understandings that have been known to us only a comparatively short time—through the observations and studies made by our scientists—and not all or us have appreciated them rightly. It is not long since man thought of himself as the center of the universe, thought even of the sun—the very source of all our life—as a light by day revolving about the earth. As our new understanding has come—through science—science also has brought us many other new and wonderful discoveries, and the new knowledge of what we are has been overlooked by many of us in our eagerness for the new knowledge of what we can do. We have become as proud over what we can do as ever our ancestors could have been over themselves as the center of the universe.

We deeply need the humility to know ourselves as the dependent members of a great community of life, and this can indeed be one of the spiritual benefits of a wilderness experience. Without the gadgets, the inventions, the contrivances whereby men have seemed to establish among themselves an independence of nature, without these distractions, to know the wilderness is to know a profound humility, to recognize one's littleness, to sense dependence and interdependence, indebtedness, and responsibility.

Perhaps, indeed, this is the distinctive ministration of wilderness to modern man, the characteristic effect of an area which we most deeply need to provide for in our preservation programs.

EDUCATIONAL VALUES

Thus, the most profound of all wilderness values in our modern world is an educational value.

As the so-called conquest of nature has progressed, men and women—separated by civilization from the life community of their origin—have become less and less aware of their dependence on other forms of life and more and more mislead into a sense of self sufficiency and into a disregard of their interdependence with the other forms of life with which they—together—derive their existence from the solar center of the universe.

In the areas of wilderness that are still relatively unmodified by man it is, however, possible for a human being, adult or child, to sense and see his own humble, dependent relationship to all of life.

In these areas, thus, are the opportunities for so important, so neglected a part of our education—the gaining of the true understanding of our past, ourselves, and our world which will enable us to enjoy the conveniences and liberties of our urbanized, industrialized, mechanized civilization and yet not sacrifice an awareness of our human existence as spiritual creatures nurtured and sustained by and from the great community of life that comprises the wildness of the universe, of which we ourselves are a part.

Paradoxically, the wilderness which thus teaches modern man his dependence on the whole community of life can also teach him a needed personal independence—an ability to care for himself, to carry his own burdens, to provide his own fuel, prepare his own food, furnish his own shelter, make his own bed, and—perhaps most remarkable of all—transport himself by walking.

In these lessons are further the lessons of history—a stimulus to patriotism of the noblest order—for in the wilderness the land still lives as it was before the pioneers fashioned in and from it the civilization we know and enjoy.

With these lessons come also the understanding that physical, psychic, and spiritual human needs are such that wilderness recreation should always be available and, in fact, should be enjoyed to a much greater extent than it now is.

Thus recreational and educational values of the wilderness merge.

In a culture like that which we call modern we can be sure that it will be increasingly important for students, of the present and of future generations, to know what the wilderness has to teach—through their own experiences; through educators who are informed and corrected by wilderness experiences; through photographs, paintings, writings, and other educational and informational materials with a validity insured by a still-living wilderness.

So long as wilderness exists in reality, providing actual resorts for human beings, giving a sense of actuality to pictorial and literary representations of the wilderness, and affording the scenes for further research, so long will the safeguards against an urban, industrial, mechanized ignorance of the facts of human life be effective.

HISTORICAL VALUES

There are monumental or historical values of the wilderness also; values which are closely related both to educational and recreational values. The wilderness has been described as "a piece of the long ago that we still have with us," and it is highly prized by many people as such. It perpetuates on our continent not only the scene of the pioneering activities of the first white men in this hemisphere but also a still more ancient scene. The areas preserved are monuments to the pioneers' conquests, but they also are samples of the natural world without the influence of modern man. They have deep values in the continuing opportunity they afford to relive the lives of ancestors and thus, with also the anticipation of posterity's similar interest, to participate in the immortality of the generations.

SCIENTIFIC VALUES

There are profoundly important scientific values of the wilderness also. These are similar to those of historical importance in depending on the preservation of areas as they existed, and exist, without the influence of modern man. These values, too, have an educational aspect, but their more precisely scientific importance is in relation to research. Their research uses are dual: They afford the scenes for fundamental investigations of the natural world of living creatures unmodified by man; they afford also "check" areas where none of the factors being compared in a particular study (land-use research, for example) have been operative.

The scientific values pertain not only to research and original investigation but also to the study and observation that are essentially educational in their purpose. Wilderness areas, including the smaller natural areas and also the extensive wild regions, should accordingly be preserved for the sake of the field study that they make possible for students in each generation. They serve this purpose for the summer camps of youth organizations, for field stations of college summer-school classes, and also for the more advanced excursions of graduate students. And Aldo Leopold exclaimed: "As a matter of fact, there is no higher or more exciting sport than that of ecological observation."

WILDERNESS NEEDS INTERRELATED

So we have various needs for wilderness that are all derived from a need to maintain an awareness of our human relationships to all life, the need to guard ourselves against a false sense of our own sufficiency. We need to draw ourselves constantly toward the center of things and not allow our eccentricities to carry us off on a tangent, toward increasing unhappiness.

We are a part of the wildness of the universe. That is our nature. Our noblest, happiest character develops with the influence of wildness. Away from it, we degenerate into the squalor of slums or the frustration of clinical couches. With the wilderness we are at home.

Some of us think we see this so clearly that for ourselves, for our children, our continuing posterity, and our fellow men we covet with a consuming intensity the fullness of the human development that keeps its contact with wildness. Out of the wilderness, we realize, has come the substance of our culture, and with a living wilderness—it is our faith—we shall have also a vibrant vital culture—an enduring civilization of healthful happy people who, like Antaeus, perpetually renew themselves in contact with the earth.

This is not a disparagement of our civilization—no disparagement at all—but, rather, an admiration of it to the point of perpetuating it. We like the beef from the cattle grazed on the public domain. We relish the vegetables from the lands irrigated by virtue of the Bureau of Reclamation—our Bureau of Reclamation, too, we should recall, now and then. We carry in our packs aluminum manufactured with the help of hydroelectric power from great reservoirs. We motor happily on paved highways to the approaches of our wilderness. We journey in streamlined trains and in transcontinental airplanes to conferences on wilderness preservation. We nourish and refresh our minds from books manufactured out of the pulp of our forests. We enjoy the convenience and comfort of our way of living—urban, village, and rural. And we want this civilization to endure and to be enjoyed on and on by healthful happy citizens.

WILDERNESS PRESERVATION

It is this civilization, this culture, this way of living that will be sacrificed if our wilderness is lost. What sacrifice.

Our only hope to avert this loss is in our deliberate effort to preserve the wilderness we have. The ramifications of our developing mechanical enterprises are such that only those areas which are set aside for preservation will persist as wilderness.

It behooves us then to do two things: First we must see that an adequate system of wilderness areas is designated for preservation, and then we must allow nothing to alter the wilderness character of the preserves.

We have made an excellent start on such a program. Our obligation now—to those who have been our pioneers and to those of the future, as well as to our own generation—is to see that this program is not undone but perfected.

In our marvelous national park system; in the wilderness, wild, primitive, and roadless areas of our national forests; on extensive tracts of Indian reservations; in certain units of the national wildlife refuge system; and in State parks, and some others too, we have areas that have either been set aside as wilderness or that are being protected in a way that safeguards wilderness.

The process of designation of areas of wilderness for preservation, however, is not complete as yet. There are still some to be added—especially grassland, seashore, and desert. There is no doubt, so far as I know, about the correctness of the designation of any of the areas now being preserved. There are, I understand, some boundary adjustments that need to be made for certain areas that were established without opportunity for adequate care as to exact boundaries. There are zoning questions in some of our parks. There are some additions that can be made to established areas. There are private holdings within these public areas that should be acquired.

These aspects of the perfection of the designations should be cared for in a persisting program. And the other potential units in this system of wilderness should be sought out as soon as possible.

For these areas of wilderness we should obtain the maximum possible degree of security. We need congressional action, to provide for their preservation as wilderness, and we should move forward as steadily as we can toward this action.

NATIONAL WILDERNESS SYSTEM PROPOSED

A bill to establish a national wilderness preservation system should be drawn up as soon as possible with the joint cooperation of the Federal land-administering agencies and conservation organizations.

It should affirm the national policy to preserve such a wilderness system.

It should define the proper uses of areas within the system and should provide for the protection of the areas from inconsistent uses.

Areas to be included might well be specified in the bill, and provision for additions to the list of areas by Executive order or formal designation by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior could be included, with the further provision that the removal of any area from the system can be effected only by Congress.

The bill should make clear that no changes in jurisdiction would be involved and that no new land-administration agency would be established. The agency administering an area designated as a unit in the national wilderness preservation system, according to this proposal, would simply be charged with the responsibility of preserving its wilderness character. National forest areas would continue as at present but with the guaranty of perpetuity that Congress can give. National park and monument areas would continue under the administration of the National Park Service. Such national wildlife refuges as would be included would continue to be administered as wildlife refuges, but these particular refuges would be preserved without developments and installations that would alter their wilderness character.

In other words, each area in the system would continue to serve the peculiar purpose that it has, or would have, in the program of its particular administering agency, but every agency would be charged with the responsibility of preserving the wilderness character of any area of the national wilderness preservation system in its custody.

A Wilderness Preservation Commission, modeled possibly after the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission that has functioned in connection with the establishment of wildlife refuges, might be set up to assist in the establishment and administration of this wilderness system—to conduct a survey in cooperation with land-administering agencies, to recommend to Congress any necessary adjustments in the program, and to prepare—or coordinate the preparation of—maps and other material for the information of the public with reference to this system.

PRACTICAL AND IDEALISTIC

Conservation is both practical and idealistic, as is well demonstrated in our concern with wilderness preservation.

It is good and sound to realize that in preserving areas of wilderness we are recognizing our own true human interest. It seems good, ethical, to consider ourselves as members of a community of life that embraces the earth—and to see our own welfare as arising from the prosperity of the community.

Yet there may be danger in too conscious, too deliberate, too intent an effort to see all in terms of our own welfare. Jesus suggested that self-seeking is not the way to self-realization; not deliberately but through indirection human beings realize their best welfare, by losing sight of themselves.

It is a great satisfaction to be able to demonstrate to another that an unspoiled wilderness is important because it serves man's need for "escape," but going to the wilderness to escape from something is no certain way of actually being in the wilderness at all. The only way to escape from

one's self in the wilderness is to lose one's self there. More realistically, the true wilderness experience is one, not of escaping, but of finding one's self by seeking the wilderness.

The sum of this moralizing may be in forsaking human arrogance and courting humility in a respect for the community and with regard for the environment. The central human importance of such experience, I believe, constitutes profound evidence of need for wilderness areas. An understanding of these fundamental needs, as well as the so-called more practical needs to meet the recreational demands of people for wilderness experience—this understanding should inspire us anew to work for the perfection of a national program for wilderness preservation—a program to serve not only our own human needs but also those of the generations to follow.

American Dairy Association Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on February 25, 1955, I included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report of the American Dairy Association's entire program in 1954. Since that report was issued, the dairy industry has continued to move forward. In the past 6 months the dairy industry has made terrific strides in marketing products. Through the work of the American Dairy Association every Member of Congress who has small children in his family are constantly reminded of Davey Crockett who is currently selling milk, butter, and cheese for the American dairy farmer over Disneyland which is seen on a coast-to-coast television program each week. This is one example of effective dairy sales promotion.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that the report of the American Dairy Association of the past 6 months be made a part of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is fitting indeed that this report should appear in the June 1 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as this is the 1st day of June Dairy Month.

The report follows:

AMERICAN DAIRY ASSOCIATION REPORT

I. OPERATION BOOTSTRAPS PICKS UP SPEED

"The June Dairy Month campaign in 1955 is another big step forward in the dairy industry's determination to use the sales tools of American business to put more dairy foods where they belong, in the stomachs of American consumers," according to Lester J. Will, Chicago, general manager of the American Dairy Association, the dairy farmers' own nonbrand sales promotion organization.

The American Dairy Association is serving as headquarters for June Dairy Month for the first time in 1955. The dairymen are using the campaign to demonstate as clearly as possible their determination to sell their way into a period of expansion for their industry.

They have developed a comprehensive advertising-merchandising-publicity program for June to blanket the Nation and make consumers more dairy-foods conscious than ever before. The June campaign is an example of how past sales promotion successes are breeding more success.

All segments of the dairy industry have joined together to put this campaign over. The industry asked for, and received, the cooperation of retail stores, restaurants, and others who are in the business of selling food. In addition the dairymen have received the support of the President of the United States, the United States Department of Agriculture, the various State governors, the mayors of just about all of the cities in the Nation, fraternal and civic organizations.

"In fact," Will says, "there probably never has been a food sales campaign where so many consumers have joined with an industry to encourage greater consumption of a food product."

What the dairy farmers and the rest of their industry have been doing and are doing might well be labeled "Operation Bootstrap." The dairy farmers have made tremendous strides forward by lifting themselves by their own bootstraps. They have followed the traditional American habit of doing things for themselves.

Russian farmers could learn a lesson

The Russian farm experts scheduled to visit the United States during the summer months could learn some valuable lessons from America's dairy industry. While the Soviet agricultural visitors are primarily interested in increasing production of food, dairymen in this country could teach them not only some ideas about more efficient production but also to use sound business principles, in a free society, to develop a growing industry that provides a decent livelihood for millions of families.

After almost a decade of postwar readjustment, the dairy industry in the United States is well on the way to taking its place as a strong and stable segment of the Nation's economy. This does not mean that the industry has solved all of its economic problems, but the patterns now common in the industry show promise of stabilization and expansion in the months and years immediately ahead.

Present Government price-support operations, born out of the need to help agriculture readjust to peacetime conditions from almost insatiable wartime demands for food and fiber, have played, and continue to play, an important role in the stabilization of the dairy industry. The price props have put a floor under farm prices during a period when agriculture had to turn its attention from production to sales.

Production was the chief problem during the wartime period. At the close of the war, when consumers once more were able to buy durable goods that had disappeared from the market during the armed struggle, it became apparent that American agriculture would have to sell the American people on the idea that they should maintain the higher standards of eating developed during the war years. Food had to compete with thousands of other products for the consumer's dollar.

Dairymen started their sales program in 1930's

Dairy farmers, who recognized the need for developing salesmanship back in the late 1930's, have now adequately demonstrated that they want to earn their livelihood in the market place and that they are willing to invest their time and money in building markets.

Current developments in the dairy industry provide indisputable proof that the American business system still holds promise for those who have a good product to sell and who are willing to invest in and use the long-established sales tools. For the dairy industry, the first step forward, though perhaps small, was when dairy farmers began to realize that production was only the beginning of their business of dairy farming and that expanding markets were even more important to those who wished to enjoy the full fruits of their productive labors.

The end of surpluses is in sight

The dairy industry is approaching the end of surpluses. This much the economists and other observers generally agree upon. The only major disagreement is whether the surplus situation will vanish in 1955 or in 1956. It is conceivable that in the months ahead there may be greater storage of dairy foods by the industry itself and little or none by the Government, which would be another indication of the optimism for sales. Under present conditions many dairy distributors have not held in reserve the normal stocks which would have been kept in private inventory without Government buying operations.

Many factors affect the sales of any product, and the same is true of dairy foods. Indications are at this time, however, that the major influence in the improved dairy picture has been and is the stepped-up sales promotion efforts of the dairy farmers and their industry.

Milk consumption per capita is up

Here are some of the highlights of the story of increased sales and lower surpluses:

1. In the marketing year which ended March 31, 1955, the American people consumed an additional six billion pounds of milk more than they had consumed in the April 1, 1953–March 31, 1954, marketing year. One third of this increase was the result of expanding population. Competent economists attribute one-third of the additional four billion pound gain to the lower prices that were prevalent. The other two-thirds of the four billion pound gain is the result, say these economists, of the industry's vastly expanded sales promotion program.

2. This tremendous gain in sales meant that taxpayers were eating more dairy foods and storing less in Government warehouses. In the 1953–54 marketing year the Commodity Credit Corporation, acting under the price support legislation, purchased the equivalent of 11.4 billion pounds of milk, in the form of butter, cheese and nonfat dry milk solids. This was equal to 9.3 percent of the total milk production. In the marketing year which ended March 31, 1955, however, the CCC had purchased only 5.9 billion pounds of milk equivalent, or 4.8 percent of total milk production. More milk was produced in 1954–55 than in the previous marketing year, yet the Government purchases declined almost 50 percent.

Sales promotion pays off in more sales

3. The major share of the gain in actual consumer buying of dairy foods came in the last 3 months of 1954 and in the first 3 months of 1955. This period of progress corresponds exactly with the increase in the dairy industry's sales promotion efforts. The dairy farmers of the Nation were leading this expanded promotion program through their own sales promotion organization, the American Dairy Association. The full impact of the enlarged program of the association began to hit the public in the fall of 1954. General manager Will says, "There certainly is great significance in what has happened in these past 6 months. At this time the American Dairy Association is half-way toward its full expansion goal, adopted in 1953. In the past marketing year, increased sales made it necessary for the Government to take off the market about one-half of the amount of dairy products taken off in 1953–54. We are convinced that this was no accident but rather is confirmation of the American belief that sound salesmanship will do a good job for a good product that can fulfill definite consumer needs and wants."

4. Another straw in the wind. In the calendar year 1954, for the first time since 1925, three major dairy products, fluid milk,

butter and cheese, all showed increases in percapita consumption. Slight declines were reported in evaporated milk and ice cream. However, ice cream sales have more than recouped their 1954 loss in the first quarter of 1955. In the first 3 months of this year, the United States Department of Agriculture reports, ice cream sales were 5 percent above the same period in 1954. A 5 percent increase in ice cream sales throughout 1955 would mean the use of about 380 million additional pounds of milk.

Must sell one glass of milk per person each week

Mr. Herrell DeGraff, Babcock professor of food economics, School of Nutrition, Cornell University, stated, in a recent report on trends in the dairy industry, "Compared to the marketing year April, 1953, through March, 1954, increased per capita consumption in the year ending March, 1955, amounted to 0.64 pound of butter, 0.58 pound of cheese and 4.3 quarts of milk. These increases definitely turned the corner on the continued down trend in dairy products consumption per capita and prevailed through the post-war years. It is these increased sales that have given new vigor and a brighter outlook for the dairy industry. They have shown what can be accomplished by producers, processors and distributors, working together. They are the promise of the future.

"On the basis of prospective milk production for the marketing year ahead," says Dr. DeGraff, "it now looks as though we will have to move about 6.3 billion pounds more milk equivalent into consumption in the year ahead in order to eliminate the surpluses in the dairy industry. Looked at one way, this is a large quantity. From another view it is not. One billion pounds of milk means the equivalent of 6 pounds per capita. Of the 6.3 billion pounds we have to sell, about 2 billion will be absorbed by the increase in population in the coming year. This will leave roughly 4.3 billion pounds to be moved through further increases in per capita consumption, or about 26 pounds per person of our population. This means about 12 quarts of fluid milk per person, one quart a month, or an additional glass per person per week."

II. THE DAIRY INDUSTRY IS OPTIMISTIC ABOUT THE FUTURE

There is optimism in the dairy industry as mid-1955 rolls around, for the industry is confident that the sales promotion program now progressing under full steam will sell the milk being produced. The Government price support operations will become less and less a factor in the industry, especially as the disposal program completes its task of emptying the Government warehouses.

As of April 30, 1955, the Commodity Credit Corporaton held 252,988,000 pounds of butter, which was slightly more than 1½ pounds per capita. Cheese holdings were 291,545,000 pounds, again slightly more than 1½ pounds per person. Holdings of nonfat dry milk solids were less than 1 pound per person.

Stocks held by the CCC have been reduced drastically during the past year through various programs, all of which have involved sales at prices less than those the Government paid for the dairy products. However, none of the Government stocks have been destroyed or wasted. They have been used for school-lunch programs, to facilitate foreign-aid plans, to provide lower cost feed to livestock (in the case of nonfat dry milk solids).

Exports offer little hope for additional sales

Export markets for American dairy products have never been an important factor in the dairy industry, except during periods of war when the Government called for added production to feed wartime allies. There are areas of the world which want and badly need additional dairy foods, but world production of milk today is up and the dairy industry has no control over the diplomatic situations which complicate efforts greatly to increase foreign trade. The dairy industry has turned its attention to its best market, that of selling more dairy products in the domestic market. Its greatest potential is in the nutritional need for more consumption of dairy foods in this country.

The rather unhappy situation which the dairy industry in this country has had to face during the past 10 years is actually a common problem in the free enterprise system. Dairy farmers responded to the Government's request for additional production of milk during the war. Increased civilian demand for high quality foods, on top of urgent needs for the Armed Forces and for allies, produced a shortage of certain dairy foods, requiring rationing of such items as butter and cheese.

At the end of the war pent-up consumer demand for new houses, automobiles, television sets and other items scarce or nonexistent during the war years led to greatly increased competition for the consumer's dollar. Because the dairy industry was not ready for this struggle in the market place at the close of the war, the per capita consumption of high protein dairy foods declined. Added to this was the decline in purchases of milk products for allies overseas. Fluid milk consumption dropped from its wartime high. Demand for butter continued to drop off rapidly. Production of milk, however, was geared to wartime needs, and there is no flick of a switch which will cut off milk production. The problem was also complicated by the fact that the dairy industry is composed of several million individual business enterprises, no one of which, nor any small group of which, has any major effect on the total market. Cutting production would have been a matter of talking to each of these millions of businessmen, each of whom had to guide his future actions by his own needs.

The problem, then, revolved itself into a simple matter of more milk being produced than consumers were, at the moment, willing to buy. There are several ways to meet this situation in any business. One is to reduce production to current demand levels. The other is to increase efforts to expand markets. Dairy farmers took the second alternative, for the most part.

Dairy farmers become salesmen

Perhaps the most significant development in the dairy industry in the past 25 or 50 years has been the emergence of the dairy farmer as a leader in the field of food-sales promotion. This trend had its origins in the depths of the depression of the 1930's and culminated in definite action in 1938 when dairymen from six States gathered together and actually formed an association, to be controlled and financed entirely by milk producers, the sole purpose of which was to expand markets. The first funds for this new program, a total of $271,000, were made available in 1940.

This step on the part of dairy farmers may well be written in American agricultural, and business, history as the forward move which began the conversion of the American farmer from a mere producer of raw material to a leading exponent of the American way of doing business—a businessman who not only produces the finest possible products but also goes into the market place and tells consumers the story of his products. This step, taken among the largest group of agricultural producers in the country, was the one which produced the necessity for the American public to take a new look at the farmer and his role in an expanding economy.

Under the growing pressure of mounting surpluses and lower per capital consumption of certain dairy foods, the dairy farmers made their second big stride into a better future in early 1953, when they decided that they would have to go all the way in the field of sales promotion. They were learning that budgets of from one to two million dollars each year would not do the job that had to be done if production of milk and consumption of milk were to be brought into balance and the industry to be in a position to expand rather than to contract. The dairy industry could not successfully compete for a larger share of the consumer's food dollar unless it could employ the same sales tactics as other businesses were using.

Thus it was that the dairy farmer, who had spent most of his time concentrating on greater efficiency in production, made the decision to go after a budget of 10 to 12 million dollars each year so that the voice of the dairy farmer, the American Dairy Association, would have enough strength to be heard day in and day out in every home in America.

III. "BE SURE YOU'RE RIGHT, THEN GO AHEAD"

As of June 1955, the dairy farmers are halfway to their goal of a $10 million sales-promotion budget. They have generated new enthusiasm among themselves and among others in their industry because they have proved that a good sales program can increase market demand for dairy foods. It's the old American story—the fellow who was mired in the mud of economic distress grabbed ahold of his bootstraps and started lifting. It has been a long and difficult pull for the dairyman, and his problems are far from solved, but now the goal is in sight and the future holds promise.

What did the dairy farmers do?

They took the advice of one Davy Crockett, whom the dairy farmers helped to bring back to life as a hero in 1954–55 by being sponsors of the Disneyland television show. It was Davy Crockett who said, "Be sure you're right, then go ahead."

The dairymen analyzed their situation. They knew, first, that the milk they produce is the basis of the most important family of foods known to man. Nutritionists agree that consumption of milk and milk products in the world's richest country is not at a level that is commensurate with good health.

The dairy farmers recognized, too, that a lot of sound educational work had been done in past years. Mothers in the United States almost universally are great proponents of milk drinking for their children. The dairy farmers could see a situation whereby a good many people were saying: "Sure this milk is great stuff," but apparently the motivation to buy more milk and ice cream and butter and cheese and other dairy foods was not yet strong enough.

Research points the way

What would move homemakers to add more dairy foods to their shopping lists? A lot of guesswork had been done. In 1953 the dairy farmers finally had enough funds put together to go out and hire market research experts. They sent these specialists into thousands of homes across the land to find out why homemakers did or did not use dairy foods, why some families use more than others, what changes these women would like to see, what additional information they wanted. This new research was added to a program of product research which the American Dairy Association has carried on through the years and for which the dairymen have spent over $1 million.

By the end of 1953 the dairy industry began to receive the first really reliable reports on consumer attitudes toward dairy foods. For the first time, the industry had some solid, scientifically gathered information. The research confirmed the high respect of consumers for the various dairy foods

and also indicated that there were few homemakers who were concerned about the problems of the dairy industry, including that thorny problem of having butter and other dairy products piling up in Government warehouses. These homemakers indicated, too, that the majority of them were pretty well satisfied with prices on dairy foods—in other words, they believed they were getting their money's worth.

Price influence has been overplayed

For many years the dairy industry has been torn by problems of pricing. Congressional and other investigations have been, and still are, carried on to determine how prices are set. Ill-informed writers periodically confuse a part of the public mind on the subject of milk and other dairy product prices. The industry is accused of many foul deeds so far as pricing is concerned.

In recent months it has been charged, for example, that health regulations governing the production of milk force unnecessarily high prices on consumers. A. C. Dahlberg, head of Cornell University's dairy department, reported recently that findings by the National Research Council "concluded that sanitary regulations were not a major cause of differences in retail prices of milk, but sanitary regulations do affect costs of milk production and should not be formulated without due respect to their influence on these costs." Dr. Dahlberg cited examples which showed that a city which had some of the most expensive producer regulations had the third lowest price of milk to consumers.

Any discussion of procing in the dairy industry must take into consideration the fact that costs of producing milk vary in different sections of the country because of climatic and other conditions. In the processing of milk there are many thousands of individual companies. Because of varying conditions, where each company must hire labor under local conditions, where freight rates may be a big factor, etc., prices will vary from one area to another. The average cost of a quart of milk in the United States in 1954 was 22.8 cents, with actual variations in various areas from under 20 cents to as high as 27 and 28 cents. The dairy industry is subject to the same economic pressures of supply and demand as any other industry. Generalizations on price structures are usually dangerous and faulty.

In his own research, as well as in that done by others, the dairy farmer learned that price was not the major factor affecting demand for milk and milk products. While the price of butter, in comparison with substitute products, might appear high, the simple fact is that butter, made from four pints of cream, cannot economically compete, on a price basis, with the cheap vegetable-oil substitutes. The dairy farmers decided that butter had enough prestige and favorable appeals to sell on its own merits as a table spread and for cooking. They decided to sell a superior table spread and to let the substitute products further boost the prestige of butter by trying to tell the public that the substitutes were "like butter."

Almost any product shows some gain in sales when a price reduction is announced, but experience has demonstrated that reducing the price of milk does not accomplish the goal of increasing consumption to the point considered healthy, and it does have the adverse effect of driving down the price received by the dairy farmer. Most consumers enjoy lower prices. If the price of milk is reduced, the pennies saved can be invested in a new television set perhaps.

The dairy farmers came to the conclusion that prices charged for milk and its products are fair, on any comparative basis. On a nutritional basis, dairy foods prices are extremely low. The Department of Agriculture estimates that approximately 30 percent of all food needs are supplied, in American homes, by dairy foods, yet these same products cost only 15 cents out of each food dollar. The decision to sell the merits of these products was made.

It should be noted that the dairy industry, from farmer to point of sale, is interested in cutting costs and has done so through the years. Today dairy foods are available at a lower cost, in terms of hours of labor required to buy them, than ever before. Milk and milk products have been leaders in the food field in giving the American people a better food basket at lower cost.

The dairymen put their research knowledge to work

Having gained new insight into what consumers were thinking about their products, the next logical move for the dairymen was to put this knowledge to work, to take advantage of the strong points the homemakers suggested, to give the additional information they asked for, to correct whatever misinformation might be fairly widespread.

For example, a sizable number of adults in the market surveys indicated they thought fluid milk was a fine food for children but did not fit into the adult needs, contrary to what the nutritionists have been telling the public for many years. It was obvious that there were certain appeals for all the dairy foods that would move consumers to buy more. These appeals were cataloged and tested and the best selected for extensive promotion. Certainly, homemakers wanted to feed their families those foods which were healthful, that would satisfy the desire for good flavor and offer opportunities for variety. The dairy foods, in spite of all their advantages, were not successfully competing with other highly promoted foods. Milk was being displaced by other beverages which were higher in price and nutritionally not comparable.

With their research information digested, the dairy farmers expanded their advertising and merchandising campaign. They put additional money into the various advertising media, radio, television, magazines, newspapers. In 1954 they increased their budget by 50 percent over 1953, but their expanded advertising program enabled them to carry their sales messages to 200 percent more people. The American Dairy Association advertising alone was reaching, by the fall of 1954, over 50 million consumers every week, placing before these people hard-hitting sales massages which, the sales records show, moved these consumers to increase their consumption of milk, butter, cheese, and ice cream.

Working closely with dairy distributors, retail food outlets and related food manufacturers, the dairy farmers increased their merchandising program, seeing to it that consumers were reminded at their doorsteps or at the dairy cases in food stores or in restaurants to buy and use more dairy products. The dairymen went to the food retailers and showed that the dairy departments could produce additional net profit with a small amount of added merchandising, and they offered the merchandising ideas. The dairy farmers, proud of what they had to sell and the sales program they were using, enlisted the support of the people in their own industry, the retailers and the people who manufacture foods that are natural partners with the various dairy products. The increase in this type of promotion became apparent in 1954 and has reached a flood stage in 1955.

A pledge for the future

A pledge for the future which could materially affect the health of the American people as well as help to establish a more stable dairy industry is the 30-day-milk-test campaign which the dairy farmers are sponsoring as one part of their program to increase milk consumption. Based on nutrition research, this idea calls for adults to drink at least three glasses of milk every day. The dairymen in the various States are vying with each other to see which State can pledge the largest percentage of its population to drink at least 3 glasses of milk every day for 30 days.

Since medical studies show that an adequate intake of milk each day has a definite steadying influence on the nerves, the dairymen took their 30-day-milk-test campaign to the Members of the United States Congress, gentlemen who have many nerve-wracking experiences everyday. The latest report is that this is one campaign that does not divide the Congress on party lines—all agree that milk drinking is a good habit.

Dairymen have developed a sales campaign that begins with research, expands through advertising, merchandising, and public relations. With a budget of slightly over $5 million in 1955, the dairymen have at last reached the stage where they can influence market trends measurably. They are in a position to take advantage of more opportunities to increase sales of dairy foods. Their campaign is having results: people are not only repeating the slogans—You Never Outgrow Your Need for Milk and Drink at Least Three Glasses of Milk Every Day—but also are acting out those slogans everyday.

IV. WHAT ABOUT THE FUTURE? SURPLUSES AGAIN?

The question has been raised: even though the dairy industry is now approaching the end of the current surplus situation, is there not a good possibility that the dairy industry may slip backward again by forgetting the lessons that have been learned?

Those who are in constant contact with the dairy farmers of the Nation don't believe this will happen. Assuming that the economy will not again soon, or ever, be disrupted by wars or rumors of wars, the future looks stable.

Merrill Warnick, who operates his own dairy farm near Pleasant Grove, Utah, and who has served as president of the American Dairy Association for the past 2 years, says, "Dairy farmers have accepted sales promotion as part of their business of operating their farms. They realize that they have an obligation to build markets as well as to produce the finest milk possible. We have moved into a period when the dairyman is just as sound a businessman, and plans as much for the future, as any other person who is interested in protecting an investment and earning a fair return on that investment.

"I have noted," Warnick says, "a steady increase in optimism among dairymen in the past year. We have come a long way from the gloom that was sweeping through out industry in the early months of 1953, when surpluses were once more piling up in government warehouses. The prophets of gloom were predicting a dire future for the dairy farmer. We have moved forward, and we are optimistic because we have learned a fundamental lesson. No one should produce a product unless he is willing to get out and sell that product to the people who can use it. We dairymen produce milk for consumption, not for warehouses, and we have fully realized that increasing consumption is not something that just happens—it is part of our job of dairy farming to carry out sales promotion programs."

Dairymen invest in the future

Perhaps the best indication that the dairymen throughout the country support the viewpoint of Merrill Warnick is the support they are giving to the American Dairy Association. Dairymen in 44 States are participating in the program, with more than 1 million individual dairymen making the investment. In 24 of these States the farmers allocate 2 cents for every 100 pounds of milk they produce for the sales campaign. In

other States the amount varies, but the trend is rapidly toward all dairymen cooperating on the 2 cents basis. This program, when it reaches 2 cents in all the States, will provide a $10 to $12 million budget, which the dairymen have set as their goal to carry out a program that will reach into every American home every day to sell more dairy foods. And this sales campaign of the American Dairy Association is a spearhead program which is generating greatly expanded promotion by the many brand dairy distributors.

V. MANY CHANGES OCCUR ON THE FARMS

The business approach which dairy farmers have used in sales promotion is another indication of the business thinking of the dairy farmer in all his operations. The postwar readjustment period has brought the dairyman face to face with the necessity for greater efficiency in production as well as for salesmanship in the market place.

All over America dairymen, in spite of lower incomes in recent years, have been investing in the future on their farms. They have been installing expensive machinery and equipment to cut labor costs. They have been adopting new ideas in herd management and in production of feed. The Department of Agriculture has reported that, as of May of this year, milk production per cow set a new record, indicating that again in 1955 dairy farmers are making further strides toward greater efficiency by increasing milk yields per cow.

In the processing and distribution of milk, the industry also continues to look forward and to make improvements. Many new ideas on ways to process and distribute the various dairy foods are under study in research projects. The industry is interested in reducing costs of processing and distribution.

Government operations have protected consumers and farmers

Government price-support operations, and other Government programs, have been very important in helping the dairy industry in its period of readjustment and preparation for the future. Without this help it is easily conceivable that in the past 10 years the industry would have gone through several violent economic fluctuations which would have caused tremendous distress among several millions of farm families and could have caused shortages of milk and higher prices for consumers. It is to the credit of the dairy industry that this period of Government price-support operations has been used to develop a program that promises a future of expansion for the dairy industry and the well-being of the Nation.

The dairy industry has been severely criticized for not having worked its way out of surpluses sooner than it has. The cost of price-support operations has been cited in condemning the dairy farmer. What many people forget is that, until a few years ago, the dairy farmer was constantly being urged to produce more efficiently. He reached a new height in efficiency during the wartime years. The dairy industry has made a rather rapid recovery from the wartime dislocation, considering that it involved reaching millions of individual business operators to tell them why they must turn their attention to market building. There has been a revolution in dairy-farm thinking in a short period of time. It is doubtful that any other industry under the same circumstances would have moved forward any faster.

The Government price-support operations have not guaranteed a profit to dairy farmers. Especially during the past 14 months, since the support level was dropped from 90 to 75 percent of parity, it has required extreme care on the part of the dairy farmer to balance his income and expenses. The income of dairy farmers in 1954 was more than $400 million below that of 1953, and this drop in income came mostly out of the net profit of the dairy-farm families since expenses did not drop proportionately.

The result has been that a large number of dairymen have turned to other enterprises, either agricultural or outside of farming. The decline in income forced dairymen to go in 1 of 2 directions, either tighten their belts and do those things which would improve the situation in the future or else leave dairying.

Dairy farmers have shown every indication that they prefer to build on a sound basis for good economic health rather than to risk strict controls over their operations. They now face the future with more confidence and much better prepared to meet the challenges ahead.

The Government programs to aid the dairy farmer in his readjustment period have also been somewhat redirected in the past year. The appropriation of funds to increase milk consumption in schools, greatly strengthening the entire school-lunch program, is one indication of this thinking. This is a program in cooperation with the States. Recent reports indicate that added milk for schoolchildren depends upon State action. Added milk in schools is reported to reach 91 percent of the children in Washington, D. C., with the lowest level being 28 percent in New Jersey. It has been estimated that in 1955 school consumption of milk will account for 1 percent of total production.

VI. EXPANSION IN DAIRYING WILL BE THE NEXT STEP

The challenges for dairying, if the people whose business it is to look ahead are right, will be in the field of expansion rather than contraction of milk production. The Census Bureau indicates that the population of this country will reach 177,500,000 people by 1960, which is only 5 years away. If consumption of milk equivalent should remain at the 1954 level of slightly over 700 ponds per person per year, without any further increases, this alone would require almost nine billion additional pounds of milk each year by 1960.

In the marketing year which ended March 31, 1955, per capita consumption of milk equivalent was up 25 pounds per person, most of this coming in the last 6 months of the marketing year. If the per capita consumption of milk can be increased by 25 pounds per person through each of the next 5 years, as it should be to meet minimum nutritional requirements and as dairymen are confident their expanded sales program will accomplish, the demand for milk would be increased by another 4½ billion pounds of milk by 1960. The combination of increased population and added per capita consumption, on this basis, would mean the Nation would be using over 137 billion pounds of milk each year, as compared with 1954 production of 123.5 billion pounds.

Dairy farmers will be able to meet this increased demand for milk because they are preparing themselves today for growth in the future. They are becoming much more efficient production engineers and will make greater progress as market demands make it profitable to increase production.

Transition period for agriculture is still underway

American agriculture has gone through, in a relatively short period of time, a change that oftentimes has not been fully understood by those outside of agriculture. Production of food and fibre has become a very highly specialized business, requiring large amounts of skill and capital combined with careful management. Not too many years ago agriculture was largely on a subsistence basis, with each farm trading or bartering its small surplus of food for nonagricultural necessities. Farms did not represent a large market for other American industries in spite of the fact that the majority of Americans lived on farms.

Today agricultural enterprises are huge consumers of products from the factories of other industries. The dairy industry, for example, uses more trucks than any other industry in America and employs millions of people to produce, process, and distribute dairy products. The transition from subsistence agriculture to today's highly specialized business-farming still continues, and it is well for the American business community to recognize that this transition is still continuing. It would be well to recognize, too, that farmers are working every day to speed that transition, to put their operations on a sounder business basis.

The dairy farmer of 1955 has proved his business ability, and he is using that ability and knowledge to put his industry in the forefront of economic progress. His industry is moving into a role of greater leadership, in the food field and in all industry, a role suitable for an industry that accounts for over $9 billion in retail food sales each year.

Take the Public Health Service and the Office of Education Out of Party Politics

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the failure of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to adopt a workable administration of the Salk vaccine program becomes more tragic each day. As of this moment, a plan has been developed by the Department, but it is very, very late even if it should prove workable. The person directly responsible for the bungling is Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Last week she made the incredible statement that "nobody could have foreseen" the demand for the vaccine. She made this statement in spite of the fact that the Government of neighboring Canada had foreseen the need and had innoculated 1 million children without any ill effects. Critics of Mrs. Hobby are being accused of partisanship by some of the Republican leaders. Surely, the health of the children of this Nation transcends partisanship, as does their education. The blunt fact is that a major Government department has failed dismally and is deserving of honest criticism.

While children all over the Nation waited for enough Salk vaccine to protect them from polio, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has bumbled around in a feeble attempt to formulate a plan which they should have had ready a long time ago. The result has been such terrible confusion that no one really knows what is going on. We do know, however, that once again distribution of the vaccine has been stopped and the children are still waiting. It is a disgraceful situation. The Department has announced a "voluntary plan" calling for a $28 million Federal fund to insure that needy children get shots. All of us applauded the suggestion, but we have seen no action on it as yet. Mrs. Hobby, Secretary of the De-

partment, has not defined "needy children." My feeling is that every child in the Nation, regardless of economic status, is needy and that the Department had better get the program straightened out and underway quickly. The question of economic status can be ironed out after all children have been immunized, at least temporarily. Polio germs do not carry Dunn and Bradstreet around with them, of this we can be certain.

It should be clear to everyone by this time that vital technical services like public health and education should not and must not be subjected to party politics.

By their very nature public health and education are nonpartisan. They belong to all the people, and not to just one political party. Today, under party domination, they are the victims of political circumstance, targets of fire by those who believe, with good and sufficient reasons, that these technical services are being capitalized for party advantage. Under the present setup this will continue to be the case.

Let us look at the situation the Office of Education is in for a minute. Because it bears the party banner, the figures of the United States Office of Education on the school-housing crisis are widely challenged. It is charged and denied that figures have been shaped to fit the needs of party politics and political expediency.

Party strife has bedeviled the Office of Education for years. Under the flag of each major party it has had troubles aplenty. John Studebaker under the Democrats and Earl McGrath under the Republicans resigned in protest over party interference.

Dr. Worth McClure, exective secretary, American Association of School Administrators, said recently that—

The present fiascos in Health and Education bear a stern lesson. For years the medical profession strove to make the Public Health Service an independent agency, only yielded to the Eisenhower administration's request for a trial of HEW. For years the education profession and friends of the schools sought independent status for the United States Office of Education, found themselves alone in opposing establishment of HEW.

The USOE (Office of Education) should be administered by an independent board appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate for long overlapping terms. The board, not a political figure, should appoint the Commissioner.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

You can write your Congressman for a copy of H. R. 5828, a bill to liberate the United States Office, introduced by Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., of New Jersey. If you like the bill, tell your Congressman so. State presidents should ask their members, their boards, their teachers, and friends of the schools to do likewise.

State conferences and community conferences on education can discuss this question. States interested in Federal aid have a very vital stake in a politically independent Office of Education.

The present sad state of affairs will continue until the Office of Education is freed from party control. Until that is done don't blame the Secretary and the Commissioner. They are caught in the web of party politics from which there is no escape until the web is cut.

The Hoover Commission has now severely criticized the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as well as the Bureau of the Budget, for not asking Congress for money for a vast backlog of medical research projects. Some of these, it indicated, might yield dramatic results, comparable to the Salk vaccine discovery. In its report to the Congress on May 31, the Commission lashed out at inadequate support of medical schools where research technicians are trained and much basic medical research is done. It said that no greater instance of university research could be cited than the work of Dr. Jonas E. Salk on the new polio vaccine at the University of Pittsburgh.

Noting that the Nation is short of both technicians and doctors, the Commission said "We cannot afford stagnation of our medical research in our medical schools or the training of our physicians."

It went on to say that a backlog of 723 important research projects totaling about $7,400,000 are lined up in the National Institutes of Health. It said, however, that the National Institutes of Health predicts it will not start any in the fiscal year starting July 1 "because funds have not been requested by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (which runs the National Institutes of Health) or the Bureau of the Budget. We are concerned over the apparent failure of the executive branch to indicate these backlog projects to the Congress," the Commission said.

For the information of my colleagues, I include here an editorial from the Trenton Evening Times, the splendid statement by Dr. McClure, a letter by Dr. Frederick Hipp, executive secretary, New Jersey Education Association, and an article by Cyril J. O'Brien, able Washington correspondent of the Trentonian, all of which discuss various aspects of one of the most important issues facing the country today:

[From the Trenton Evening Times of May 25, 1955]

MAGNIFICENT?

The American people, caught in the disgraceful snarl involving the Salk vaccine program, may be pardoned for wondering why Canada has been able to meet this challenge in an orderly and efficient manner while we have been bogged down in confusion.

Canada tested school children last year with vaccine produced in the nonprofit Connaught Medical Research Laboratories affiliated with the University of Toronto. With as much—but no more—advance notice as we had that tests of the vaccine would prove overwhelmingly favorable, Canada's Minister of Health placed orders with the same laboratories for all the vaccine needed to inoculate all school children. He then contracted with the governments of the nine provinces to purchase their shares on a 50–50 basis. The Connaught Laboratories made all its tests last year, before any clamor could develop or any demand was imparative.

More than a million Canadian children have now received their first shot and will get another before the school term ends. Not one child has contracted polio after vaccination and the government has announced that in spite of United States experience, it sees no reason to suspend its program.

Canadian authorities, who have felt no pressure and have had complete control at all times, have privately attributed some of our troubles to "pressures" generated by shortages and popular demand. A similar conclusion is implicit in the declaration by Basil O'Connor, president of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, that "when you solve a problem in research it becomes subject to politics, supply and demand, and the economic factors of competition."

In the light of the dismal record, the comment of Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Education, Health, and Welfare, that "no one could have foreseen the public demand for the Salk vaccine," becomes incredibly inane. And President Eisenhower's characterization of the job done by Mrs. Hobby as "magnificent" is fatuous.

THE SECRETARY'S LETTER

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS,
Washington, D. C., May 20, 1955.

Don't blame Secretary Hobby.

Don't blame the United States Public Health Service.

Don't blame the United States Office of Education.

Don't blame their political attackers.

Blame instead the stupid governmental setup which subjects vital technical services like public health and education to party politics.

By their very nature public health and education are nonpartisan. They belong to all the people, not to just one political party. Today under party domination they are the victims of political circumstance, targets of fire by those who suspicion their technical services are being capitalized for party advantage. And it will always be so under the present setup.

Today, because it bears the party flag, the United States Public Health Service and its charming political superior, the Secretary of HEW, are haled before congressional investigating committees. Amid a welter of accusations, the campaign against crippling polio marks time.

Don't blame the attackers. That's party politics.

How very fortunate for American boys and girls that the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis is a nonpartisan institution.

Because it bears the party banner, figures of the United States Office of Education on the school-housing crisis are widely challenged. It is charged and denied that figures have been shaped to fit political expediency. Demands have been made that both the Commissioner and his superior, the Secretary of HEW, resign. Sad thing is that, true or not, in a time of school crisis when its services are most needed, the voice of the USOE is heard with suspicion by large portions of public and Congress.

Party strife has bedeviled the USOE for years. Under the flag of each major party it has had troubles aplenty. John Studebaker, under the Democrats, and Earl McGrath, under the Republicans, resigned in protest over party interference.

WHEN WILL HEALTH AND EDUCATION LEARN?

The present fiascos in Health and Education bear a stern lesson. For years the medical profession strove to make the Public Health Service an independent agency, only yielded to the Eisenhower administration's request for a trial of HEW. For years the education profession and friends of the schools sought independent status for the United States Office of Education, found themselves alone in opposing establishment of HEW.

The USOE should be administered by an independent Board appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate

for long overlapping terms. The Board, not a political figure, should appoint the Commissioner.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

You can write your Congressman for a copy of H. R. 5828, a bill to liberate the United States Office of Education, introduced by Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., of New Jersey. If you like the bill, tell your Congressman so. State presidents should ask their members, their boards, their teachers, and friends of the schools to do likewise.

State conferences and community conferences on education can discuss this question. States interested in Federal aid have a very vital stake in a politically independent Office of Education.

The present sad state of affairs will continue until the Office of Education is freed from party control. Until that is done don't blame the Secretary and the Commissioner. They are caught in the web of party politics from which there is no escape until the web is cut.

Yours truly,

WORTH MCCLURE,
Executive Secretary.

NEW JERSEY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Trenton, N. J., May 10, 1955.

MR. CYRIL J. O'BRIEN,
Silver Spring, Md.

DEAR MR. O'BRIEN: I heartily endorse Congressman FRANK THOMPSON's bill to establish a National Board of Education that would appoint the United States Commissioner of Education.

The present status of the United States Commissioner of Education makes him a direct tool of the political party in power. Two Commissioners of Education have resigned in recent years because they could not tolerate the political position in which they found themselves. The present United States Commissioner of Education, appointed by President Eisenhower, was an eminent educator and highly respected. However, he has already lost the confidence of leading educators in the Nation because he has been attempting to carry out the dictates of the political leaders in Washington.

Education deserves something far better than this. The United States Office of Education should not be subject to the whims of a political party. Congressman THOMPSON's bill is a very good bill and deserves the support of every Senator and Representative.

Very sincerely yours,

FREDERICK L. HIPP,
Executive Secretary.

[From the Trenton Trentonian of May 26, 1955]

TRENTON GOES TO WASHINGTON—THOMPSON BILL WOULD CUT EDUCATION-POLITICS TIES

(By Cyril J. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON, May 25.—Don't blame Secretary Hobby, the United States Public Health Service or their political attackers in all of the furore of charges and countercharges in the alleged mishandling of the polio vaccine.

It all goes much deeper than that. The roots of the blame lie in a governmental setup which subjects vital technical services like personal health and education to party politics.

By their very nature, public health and education are nonpartisan. They belong to all the people, not to just one political party. Today, under party domination, they are the victims of political circumstance, targets of fire by those who suspect their services are being capitalized for party advantage. And it will always be so under the present Federal system.

This was essentially the warning this week of the high-powered American Association of School Administrators. Their premise had the backing of the National Education Association, the National Council of Chief State School Officers, and other educational associations and educators.

There was good reason for sounding off this week for finally on the records of the Congress there was a vitally significant bill aimed at changing this damaging and dangerously political pattern. It is H. R. 5828 introduced by Congressman FRANK THOMPSON to sever politics and the Office of Education by making the latter a totally independent office.

BOARD WOULD APPOINT COMMISSIONER

The Office of Education would be under the control of a general board of education composed of distinguished citizens appointed by the President with consent of the Senate for long overlapping terms. Such a board would appoint the Commissioner of Education instead of the President as is now the case. It would not be a Cabinet post, and an arm of the administration. It would belong to the people guided by the sober judgment of nonpartisan laymen, looking to a professional executive office to suggest programs of evaluation, amendment, or approval.

This national board, of course, would have no jurisdiction over State or local curriculum or other educational policies. Actually, the functions of the Office of Education would remain exactly as now defined in statutes.

Strongly endorsing Congressman THOMPSON's bill is Dr. Frederick L. Hipp, executive secretary of the New Jersey Education Association. He said:

"The present status of the Commissioner of Education makes him a direct tool of the political party in power. Two Commissioners of Education have resigned in recent years because they could not tolerate the political position in which they found themselves.

"The present United States Commissioner of Education appointed by President Eisenhower was an eminent educator and highly respected. However, he has already lost the confidence of leading educators in the Nation because he has been attempting to carry out the dictates of the political leaders in Washington.

"Education deserves something far better than this. The United States Office of Education should not be subject to the whims of a political party.

"Congressman THOMPSON's bill is a very good bill and deserves the support of every Senator and Representative."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 1, 1955]

HOOVER FAVORS RISE IN RESEARCH

(By Lee Nichols)

The Hoover Commission told Congress yesterday that the armed services have too little "daring and imagination" in developing "radical" new weapons and are neglecting "basic" research such as led to the atomic bomb.

The Commission's task force noted that research, development, and design operations "are, in general, best performed by civilian agencies." The Commission advisers proposed that some $125 million such work now performed by the military be shifted to colleges, nonprofit institutions, and industrial concerns.

In its report to the lawmakers the Commission also rapped Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby's Welfare Department and President Eisenhower's Budget Bureau for not asking Congress for money for a vast backlog of medical research projects. Some of these, it indicated, might yield "dramatic" results comparable to the Salk vaccine discovery.

The Commission, headed by former President Herbert Hoover, made public its latest report on Government reforms. It deals with the Government's vast research activities. It said this work now is handled by 29 agencies and is slated to cost some $2,400,000,000 in the fiscal year starting July 1.

MOST OF IT FOR MILITARY

Of this sum, about $2,050,000,000 is planned for military research, a vast jump from the $29 million spent on figuring out new weapons in 1940.

But the Commission, indicating it does not even think this huge sum is adequate, said United States strategy and tactics can keep ahead of those of potential aggressors "only to the extent that research and development provide superior design of weapons."

The Commission indorsed 13 of 15 recommendations by its military research task force, headed by Mervin J. Kelly, president of Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc. It said these could be put into effect by the military agencies without congressional action.

Included was a proposal to set up a committee of "outstanding basic and applied scientists" to "canvass periodically the needs and opportunities * * * for radically new weapons systems."

The committee would be appointed by the Assistant Defense Secretary for Research and Development, who would carry out its recommendations "where action is indicated."

In making this proposal, the task force said it agreed with criticism that the Armed Forces "are not sufficiently daring and imaginative in their approach to radically new weapons and weapons systems."

The task force also recommended that "basic research" by the military be "significantly increased" beyond its present $20 million yearly level. The group noted that basic research is behind all progress in new weapons, and termed the present rate of this fundamental research by the military services inadequate.

Basic research is the study of fundamental scientific principles and phenomena, not necessarily aimed at any immediate use.

Many of the task force's other recommendations involved reorganization of the research setup of the military services. It found much to praise in recent improvements, particularly in the Air Force, and much to criticize.

It called for new assistant secretaries for research in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, similar to that office already in existence in the Defense Department.

It urged that the customary job rotation of military officers be reduced for research experts. It said current practices ignore the urgent need for increased specialization.

The task force said the military arms should study their growing needs for technical officers and if need be, as the task force expects, provide generally for an expanding number of trained research officers.

The commission did not specifically endorse this recommendation, saying only that it would require legislation. The commission did recommend longer duty tours for military officers in research work, as its task force proposed, and said such officers should be given the same rights and promotions as if they were rotated to other jobs.

UNIVERSITY WORK PRAISED

The commission lashed out at inadequate support of medical schools where research technicians are trained and much basic medical research is done.

It said "no greater instance" of university research could be cited than the work of Dr. Jonas E. Salk on the new polio vaccine at the University of Pittsburgh.

Noting that the Nation is short of both technicians and doctors, the Commission said "we cannot afford stagnation of our medical research in our medical schools or the training of our physicians."

It went on to say that a backlog of 723 important research projects totaling about $7,400,000 are lined up in the National In-

stitutes of Health. But it said the NIH predicts it will not start any in the fiscal year starting July 1 "because funds have not been requested by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (which runs the NIH) or the Bureau of the Budget."

"We are concerned over the apparent failure of the executive branch to indicate these backlog projects to the Congress," the Commission said.

Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., a Commission member, said on this, however, that information on the subject is conveyed to Members of Congress during budget hearings.

"Possibly, this results from the belief that Congress will be more receptive to requests for funds devoted to projects likely to produce startling and dramatic results," the Commission said. "But it should be noted that there are also the dramatic accomplishments of basic and medical research."

County Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, the National Farmers Union's Washington Newsletter of May 6, 1955 contains an article which gives a completely erroneous impression of the changes that have been made in county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees and the reasons for those changes. A careful reading of the statement which follows will clearly reveal the false picture which is presented:

The restriction on consecutive terms of office for community committeemen has been removed by an amendment to the Secretary's regulations governing ASC county and community committeemen. This completes the reversal of the Secretary's attempt last year to prohibit the election of experienced PMA community and county committeemen. A last-minute amendment to the sliding-scale price support bill last summer by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, prevented the Secretary's new election rules from applying to county committeemen, but experienced community committeemen fell under the ban. This latest ruling erases the penalty placed on experience, but not until after a completely new slate of community committeemen had been selected under the temporary operation of the regulation that has now been eliminated. Moreover, a small, select nominating committee set up by the regulations still will choose nominees for both county and community committees. Some critics are saying that Benson put the regulation into effect just long enough to eliminate Democrats from the committees, and now that as many Republicans as possible have been put on the committee he has changed the rules so they can stay on.

In States where community committees are elected at meetings, nominations are made directly by farmers at the meeting. Where election is by mail, nominees are chosen by a community election board and through petitions signed by 10 or more farmers. Community election boards consist of three farmers living in the community. They are named each year by the county election board, of which the county extension agent is chairman, and on which the SCS, FHA, and each general farm organization operating in the county are represented. Nominees for the county ASC committee are chosen directly by delegates at a county convention, the delegates being the community committee chairmen elected by the farmers.

In view of the election process described above, it is absurd to suggest that the purpose of imposition and removal of the limit of three consecutive terms of office for community committeemen was to replace Democrats with Republicans. Membership on these committees now, as always, tends to reflect the political sentiments of the community each serves. Many committees are and have always been nonpartisan, with representatives from both major political parties serving on the same committee.

The limit on consecutive terms of office for community and county committeemen was adopted partly to answer criticism by farmers and others that there was a tendency for committeemen to perpetuate themselves in office, and partly to revitalize the committee system by assuring that fresh viewpoints would from time to time be brought to bear on local farm problems. It was eliminated after legislative action prevented application of the principle to county committeemen. Since the limit could not be applied to county committeemen who are a much more important part of the committee system, it was subsequently removed by administrative action for community committeemen. Removal of the limitation on community committeemen was not made effective at the time the legislation was passed because community committee election had already been completed in a number of States.

Thus it will be seen that the reasons for changes in the election procedure of these committeemen was not political but rather to improve the membership of the committee and the service which they can render to the areas they represent.

A Talk With Prime Minister Eden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very informative article written by David Lawrence, one of the ablest writers on governmental affairs in the United States. Mr. Lawrence is spending several weeks in Europe and this article was written after a long interview with Sir Anthony Eden, the British Prime Minister.

The article is as follows:

A TALK WITH PRIME MINISTER EDEN—BIG 4 TALKS WILL BE MOST INTENSIVE EFFORT EVER MADE TO ADJUST GREAT DIFFERENCES

(By David Lawrence)

LONDON, May 31.—Allied solidarity, which is so essential to the United States and Great Britain in dealing with the delicate problems of the world, was never as strong as it is today in the all-important period of preparation for the four-power conference between the heads of states.

This correspondent had an opportunity to lunch and then to talk alone for an hour with Prime Minister Eden at his country place over the weekend holiday, and the net impression is that the governments of the United States and Great Britain understand each other thoroughly "at the summit."

The Prime Minister doesn't give interviews, and what he says in a private chat cannot be quoted. But it isn't necessary now to reveal details or to describe plans for the future, as these will unfold in due time. What is vital is to know that the American viewpoint is understood and that there is no lack of information on the state of American opinion or on the views of the leaders in the United States concerning the possible direction that the four-power conference might conceivably take.

The pitfalls of international conferences are known only too well, and especially the danger of any formula that resembles the Yalta experience, when agreements at the top level came to such a tragic result later on. Nor is there today any thought that public opinion in any country can be ignored as heads of states reach conclusions of their own. A healthier attitude toward the idea of a four-power meeting is developing at the moment primarily because those participating will necessarily be looking over their own shoulders at the reactions back home, and this does not exclude the spokesman for Soviet Russia.

Misgivings may remain and skepticism may not be erased until deeds of good faith are consummated, but there is a significant fact which stands out above all others. This is that the heads of the Governments of Britain, the United States, and France will enter the conference with a wholehearted desire to make it succeed and to bring about as much agreement on existing issues as is possible.

There is indeed something even more hopeful. It is the decision to explore and search for solutions without a deadline that limits the duration of the inquiry itself. There will be no feeling that only 3 days or 3 weeks have been allotted for the effort of the foreign ministers to bring about a meeting of minds. For, if agreement doesn't come at once, there is a determination to try again at another conference and another and another. What it means is that the world will be witnessing perhaps the most intensive effort ever made between major governments to find a common ground for adjustment of existing differences.

Once it becomes known in Moscow that there is 100 percent sincerity behind the allied approach and that many fundamental questions, such as the future independence of the states often referred to as satellites, cannot be laid aside, the way is opened to a progressive handling of the most delicate of issues. Unification of Germany, for example, presents a problem closely related to reduction of armaments generally. This cannot be postponed, however, till the millennium comes. There have to be free elections in Germany so that a truly independent government can emerge. Certainly it is better to bring into being a unified

Germany now than to let a divided Germany remain as a source of dissension in Europe.

Once an independent and reunited Germany, resulting from free elections, is a reality, the way will be opened for the ultimate restoration of independence to the other states of Europe. It is, of course, very important for the Western allies not to leave the Eastern European countries with a feeling that they are being neglected. On the contrary, their status will inevitably be reexamined, which in itself is a source of hope.

Sir Anthony is well aware of the enormous responsibilities just entrusted him in the domestic as well as the international sense. The election was a wholehearted vote of confidence in the Conservative government which, while not presided over any longer by Sir Winston Churchill, nevertheless benefits by the constant personal contacts between the former Prime Minister and the incumbent.

To an American observer, however, it is good news to discover that there is such an intimate understanding in the mind of Sir Anthony Eden of the cross-currents of American opinion. For here is a man with a long and practical experience in the dilemmas that personal diplomacy faces. Nowadays all the world is frightened by the destructive power of the hydrogen bomb. Let nobody assume that the heads of states today—and this includes Russia—are unaware of the universal demand that a way must be found to keep war as a last resort from ever happening.

The Administration Highway Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the highway problem now occupies the thoughts of many people in and out of Government. As I have given considerable thought to this and related problems I want to begin by saying that neither the Gore bill nor the Cabinet Policy Committee report, in my opinion, will become law. The peace and prosperity the country is enjoying under President Eisenhower's leadership is not going to be disrupted by petty politics no matter who practices such. He will be just as quick to criticise his own Cabinet's action if he thinks it wrong as he will be to speak out against those who are playing petty politics.

The most recent example of his steadfast integrity occurred in connection with the postal-pay veto when many were urging him to give ground for the sake of political expediency. Ike's reply was that he had gone as far as he could go in good conscience and he would not yield 30 cents for political purposes. Whether he was right or wrong he did not budge an inch, or rather he did not budge six-tenths of 1 percent. In the history of this administration one thing stands out clearly: President Eisenhower's leadership is of concern to both parties. His policies have been so universally accepted by the electorate that the Republicans are fearful he might not seek reelection and the Democrats are shaking in their boots lest he does. Now I say, Mr. Speaker, let every Republican and thinking Democrat get behind our President particularly when we are talking about something as vital and essentially nonpolitical as our highways. My constituents are becoming increasingly concerned about the confusion that has resulted from the efforts of the administration to create the new and better highways the Nation needs. I share their concern, primarily because what has always been essentially a nonpolitical subject has, in recent months, become increasingly political. Politics, while necessary and desirable in our national life, has no place in the solution of grave economic problems relating to our national transportation system. Needless to add, no amount of politics as usual will build a single inch of new highway.

Today, we have the spectacle of politics in the highway program not only in Congress, and in the executive branch, but also in the transportation industry itself, where it is evident from the report of the President's Cabinet Policy Committee, forms of transportation that compete with interstate motor carriers are seeking to legalize selective rate cutting and otherwise tamper with our highway transportation. If, while we try to solve the problems of meeting our increasing national demands for highway transport, we allow the trucking industry to go down under the weight of the attacks on it, we will surely be indulging in foolishness. We also have the spectacle of opposition for opposition's sake here in Congress. It seems that every time the administration comes forward with a piece of constructive thinking, the postal raise, minimum wages, farm policies, to name just a few in addition to the highway program, opposition is raised and a new measure is proposed, often without any motive behind it other than sheer opposition.

Our Nation has far outgrown its highway system. We now have over 58 million vehicles on our highways. What we desperately need is less talk about this "plan" or some other "report" and more action to get the four-lane highways we must have within the next 10 years or so. We certainly could do with less politics in and out of competing forms of transportation. The trucking industry itself has not met the challenges to it with any great degree of acumen. Competition between various forms of trucking such as contract and for-hire carriers, as well as the apparent lack of interest in the other fellow's problem has created an atmosphere in which the truck industry itself is responsible, in a great measure, for its present plight. When we consider those who are concerned with truck ownership, production or maintenance, the total truck employment figure is gigantic indeed. Unfortunately, when we attempt to abscribe to this mass group any real concern for the general welfare of the motor-carrier industry, we are faced with divergent viewpoints and wasted effort. In other words, the industry concerned with its own salvation has found it impossible, by reason of internal stress and politics, to tell a coherent story to the public. If this industry were not of a major concern to our general domestic welfare, then I suppose we could say, "who cares about the future of the trucking industry?" Unfortunately, this industry is so closely tied to the public welfare that no one can say "put your own house in order before you come to Congress."

I recently had the pleasurable experience of visting in California, and a respected member of the trucking industry with many years of experience put this problem to me in substantially this fashion: There is a relatively limited number of responsible people in the trucking industry to whom Congress can look for leadership in the solution of their problems in the State and Federal jurisdictions in which they operate. Unfortunately, special groups tend to obtain special favors for themselves from legislators. These groups are not interested in the problems of their neighbors who are in the same business of hauling the Nation's commerce. They are inclined to take the attitude: "Well, we got ours, so who cares about the others?" As a friend of the trucking industry, I want to tell it publicly to get its house in order. I want to say the same thing to the Nation's rail carriers. The Nation's rail carriers ought to awaken to the needs of motor transport. Instead of trying to stifle motor transport competition, they ought to be asking Congress to do something about legislation to build new four-lane highways. Safety requires we do something. Last year, 36,000 people were killed on the open roads. National defense needs are such that if a major emergency were to befall any one of our cities tomorrow, the chances of its civilian population surviving in any great measure would be far less than 5 or 10 years from now with super highways available for evacuation.

Over and beyond the confusion and politics which seems to have taken over our highway program, we have a situation in some of the States which has placed an intolerable burden upon interstate commerce. I refer to so-called third-structure tax laws which have destroyed reciprocity as to highway commerce between some of the most important producing and distributing centers in the Nation. Here again, through confusion and the dissipation of funds for road construction, we have the serious threat that highway commerce will not be able to survive all the various operations that are being performed on it. I say let us stop the bickering and get the highways built. We can do it by issuing special bonds which will insure completion of a program in 10 years. Increased revenue from increasing traffic would go far toward retiring such bonds in record time. While we are waiting for the bonds to mature, the Federal gasoline tax would carry the burden. This would be eminently sensible for it is clear that the proceeds from the Federal gasoline tax have been dissipated in many ways not related to highway improvement. Under such a proposal, the States could devote their funds to the building of roads which are outside the scope of the Federal program. Thus we would have a State and a Federal road system growing to proper proportions side by side.

The trucking industry of this Nation, I am assured, is fully cognizant of the needs and the benefits of all our citizens

to be derived from highways which would meet the demands of our growing traffic. All it needs is to be treated fairly. It asks no special privileges, nor would I or anyone else I know grant any. In treating such a vital industry fairly, we must understand that attempts to give railroads a competitive advantage over trucking by changing our national transportation policy and virtually nullifying rate regulation in favor of rail carriers may result in a situation where the cure is worse than the disease. When we get the roads we need, will there be a strong, dynamic trucking industry around to haul the goods we use? Let us use good sense and have done with confusion. In my judgment, Congress should pass the administration highway bill promptly, reject the recommendations of the Cabinet Committee, and tell the States they cannot third-structure interstate trucking out of existence. When this is done, we will have accomplished our national highway objectives.

A 10-Year Memorial to Man's Hope for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this month the United States and the other nations of the world join together to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations. It is an occasion well worthy of celebration. The United Nations was born when World War II was still in progress. Since that time it has indeed done much to further the cause of world peace and the betterment of the conditions under which the peoples of the world live. Though the United Nations has not succeeded in its quest for permanent world peace, it can certainly truthfully be called a 10-year memorial to man's hope for peace. So long as we and the other nations of the world support and work through this organization there is hope that the world will not be enveloped in the holocaust of world war III. Therefore, it gave me a great deal of pleasure to read that President Eisenhower had decided to postpone his fishing trip to New England in favor of attending the coming celebration. As an editorial in the New York Times of June 1, 1955, said, there are bigger and more important fish to catch in San Francisco than in New England. The editorial referred to above speaks the sentiments of mankind on this occasion and I therefore include it here:

IN DEEPER WATERS

President Eisenhower has wisely decided that it will be better for him to be in San Francisco when the United Nations opens its 10-year memorial program on June 20 than to be up in New Hampshire or Maine fishing. The President's plans to make a swing through New England were made, no doubt, before it was realized that in their original form they would conflict with the San Francisco meeting. Or perhaps they were made before it was realized how important, how deeply symbolic of humanity's war weariness, the San Francisco meeting might be. At any rate he has postponed them and will go to San Francisco.

There will be good fishing in Maine when he gets there. A fisherman as well guided as a President of the United States always is, may take trout in the rivers or bass in the lakes, big and little. In the smell of wood smoke, in the scent of pine and fir, in the still sound of running water, under the drift of stars among the treetops, he may forget the torment of office. These are things an active man craves. They are healing.

But first things come first. There are deeper waters and bigger fish elsewhere. There are the deep waters of history that will be flowing at San Francisco with the tides that come and go through the Golden Gate and that will have some bearing on the fate of humanity, even though no laws are passed and no binding commitments taken. U. N.'s 10th anniversary will sadly commemorate the death of certain hopes. But it can also be made to mark the birth of new hopes. Those who thought in 1945 that perpetual peace would come automatically out of the charter were, indeed, ingenuous, though perhaps nobly so. But the 10 years have brought into being two new elements: First, in the terrible glitter of new weapons, the absolute necessity for peace; second, a move among the nations to settle their inevitable disputes by other means than massacre and suicide. These are days in which there is visibly being determined what H. G. Wells called the shape of things to come.

The President, knowing war as few men know it, representing our people by an overwhelming electoral mandate, can speak for us well and truly, if only he will say what is in his heart—and in all our hearts. His silence would have been heard around the world. His words will likewise be heard, and more poignantly. Through them we may reassure our friends, our critics, and even our opponents, as to our purposes. This is the President's opportunity. From these deeper waters he may bring up no mere trout or bass, but leviathan itself, a new determination and a new hope, that peace and justice may exist together.

The Late Dewey L. Fleming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the Baltimore Sun, Thursday, May 19, 1955, regarding the death of Dewey L. Fleming, a distinguished West Virginian who was chief of the Washington Bureau of the Baltimore Sun since 1941.

Mr. Fleming was regarded as one of the keenest political analysts of the Nation's capital. His excellence in the newspaper field was attested by the award to him of a Pulitzer prize for distinguished telegraphic reporting.

The 56-year-old correspondent grew up in Sutton, W. Va., where he received his elementary and high-school training. He was a graduate of Davis and Elkins High School, at Elkins, and a member of the board of trustees.

The article is as follows:

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun of May 18, 1955]

DEWEY L. FLEMING DIES AT 56 IN HOSPITAL

Dewey L. Fleming, chief of the Washington bureau of the Sun from 1941 until illness overcame him last August, died today at Johns Hopkins Hospital. He was 56.

Mr. Fleming, regarded as one of the keenest political analysts at the Nation's Capital, was taken ill while on a motoring vacation in Canada. He returned to Baltimore from Nova Scotia and entered Johns Hopkins, where he was a patient until his death.

WON PULITZER CITATION

Mr. Fleming spent his whole working life as a newspaper reporter, and a highlight of his career was a Pulitzer award, made in 1944, for distinguished reporting of national affairs.

His first reporting was with the Elkins (W. Va.) Inter-Mountain while a student at Davis and Elkins College, from which he was graduated in 1918. After a course in journalism at Columbia University, he came to Baltimore in 1922 as a reporter with the old American.

JOINED THE SUN IN 1923

The following year he joined the Sun, working general assignments, and later was head of the bureaus then maintained in Chicago and New York.

In 1929 came an assignment to the London bureau; 2 years later he returned to become a member of the Washington bureau. It was then he began reporting on national affairs, with special application to politics and the national party conventions, the White House, and the State Department.

In 1940, he toured the country with Wendell Willkie in the latter's campaign as the standard bearer of the Republican Party, and with Thomas E. Dewey in 1944. In the 1948 and 1952 campaigns he covered part of each tour with the Democratic and Republican candidates.

Mr. Fleming, as the Sun's White House reporter, toured the country not only with presidential candidates but also with President Roosevelt on his official trips. The presidential trips took him to Mexico and Canada as well.

BUREAU CHIEF IN 1941

In 1941, he succeeded J. Fred Essary as chief of the Sun's Washington bureau, and 2 years later won the Pulitzer award. Of quiet personality, he was noted for intense application and accuracy of his interpretations in studies of the political leaders and political issues.

In 1949, he went to London again to observe the political trends there.

Dewey Lee Fleming was born July 18, 1898, in Whitmer, W. Va., the son of Hattie Alice Bowers Fleming and the late Sidney Albert Fleming.

HONORED BY ALMA MATER

In 1932 he was married to Miss Elizabeth Walker, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Walker, of Sutton, W. Va. She died in 1938.

Mr. and Mrs. Fleming had known each other since they were high-school classmates at Sutton.

Mr. Fleming was a trustee of Davis and Elkins College, and a member of the National Press Club, the Gridiron Club, and the Overseas Writers Club. He was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws by his alma mater in 1944.

Characteristically, Mr. Fleming presented to Davis and Elkins College the $500 award which accompanied the Pulitzer prize citation for distinguished telegraphic reporting on national affairs.

In addition to being a trustee of his college, he was also at the time of the award chairman of a committee raising funds for the school.

He is survived by his mother, of Martinsburg, W. Va., and a brother, of Gary, Ind.

House Resolution 137

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, there is still pending before the Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, my resolution—House Resolution 137—calling for an investigation of the forced repatriation program carried on by United States military and civilian authorities from 1945 to 1947.

Hon. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, has now released the diplomatic note of February 1, 1945, written by Hon. Joseph C. Grew, Acting Secretary of State, to Nikolai V. Novikov, Esq., Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The text of this note reveals a policy against forced repatriation prior to the Yalta Conference.

The question to be answered for all the world is: Who was responsible for this change of policy?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Julius Epstein, which appeared in the May 28, 1955, edition of the Tablet, giving the text of Mr. Grew's note:

DULLES RELEASES TEXT OF MISSING DIPLOMATIC NOTE—SENDS COPY OF LETTER TO RED GOVERNMENT ON REPATRIATED PRISONERS TO MR. EPSTEIN—COMPLETE TEXT PRINTED—SOVIETS CAPTURED IN GERMAN UNIFORMS WERE HANDED OVER TO BE RETURNED TO U. S. S. R.

(By Julius Epstein)

The diplomatic note of February 1, 1945, signed by the Acting Secretary of State, Joseph C. Grew, which is herewith published for the first time in full, is of greatest importance, not only from a historical point of view, but also in view of the dangers still lurking for many thousands of displaced persons in this country as well as in Europe.

These dangers derive directly from the Yalta Agreement on the exchange of prisoners of war and liberated civilians, an agreement which still is—theoretically speaking—in force and still subject to different interpretations.

The Tablet was one of the first American publications which called public attention to the exchange of telegrams between Acting Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew and our Scretary of State, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., then at Yalta.

In his telegram of February 7, 1945, as published in the Yalta papers, Mr. Grew warned Mr. Stettinius against the inclusion of any agreement with the Soviets, which could be construed as in favor of forced repatriation of prisoners of war and civilians, and especially of those prisoners of war captured in German uniforms.

URGED SPECIFIC CLAUSE

Mr. Grew strongly advised Mr. Stettinius to include in any agreement with the Soviets a specific clause, extending, expressis verbis, the protection of the Geneva Convention to all prisoners of war in American hands, who were captured in German uniforms.

[Mr. Grew also referred in his telegram of Feb. 7, 1945, to Mr. Stettinius to the diplomatic note of Feb. 1, 1945, by which he had informed the Soviet Government that we could not forcibly repatriate those Soviet nationals who were captured in German uniforms.

[The Yalta papers which contain the telegraphic exchange between Mr. Grew and Mr. Stettinius do not contain the diplomatic note, although it clearly belongs to them, notwithstanding the fact that it was dispatched 3 days before the beginning of the Yalta Conference.

[The lack of this note among the Yalta papers is all the more surprising, since the volume produces not less than 67 diplomatic documents, originating before the beginning of the Yalta Conference.

[These pre-Yalta documents cover the period from July 17, 1944, until Feb. 3, 1945, the eve of the Yalta Conference.

[After Mr. Grew's reference to the diplomatic note, there is only one remark by the editors to be found: "Note not printed."

[This remark induced the writer of this article to ask the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, to make the diplomatic note available. Surprisingly, Mr. Dulles obliged by releasing the complete text of the note to this correspondent.]

Under British pressure and with the consent of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, Mr. Stettinius agreed to conclude the agreement which did not contain those safeguards, desired by Mr. Grew.

Therefore, the agreement which was signed on February 11, 1945, became one of the most dangerous agreements signed at Yalta.

DID NOT DEFINE TERM

It did not contain any definition of the ambigious term "repatriation," no rule of implementation, and not the slightest hint whether force should be used in case the prisoners and civilians in American hands did not desire to return to the Soviet Union.

Because of this astounding lack of clarity, the agreement was open to various interpretations. And it was interpreted differently by American authorities at different times.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff interpreted it as in favor of forced repatriation. If that interpretation was correct, then the Yalta Agreement violated the Geneva Convention and the American tradition of ready asylum for political exiles.

If the interpretation of the Yalta Agreement as in favor of forced repatriation was incorrect, then we violated not only the Geneva Convention and the American tradition of ready asylum, but also the Yalta Agreement itself when we forcibly repatriated millions of prisoners of war and civilians, and especially those Soviet nationals captured in German uniforms.

These remarks suffice to illustrate the specific peculiarity which distinguishes this agreement from all the other agreements signed at Yalta. It is this specific peculiarity which justifies the critic to condemn that Yalta agreement and at the same time to blame American authorities for its violation.

Today, it is a matter of record that this agreement became the source of untold tragedies, up to the present day. Only a few weeks ago, article 16 of the State Treaty for Austria threatened the lives of many thousands of displaced persons in Austria.

That article is closely related to the Yalta agreement on the exchange of prisoners of war and liberated civilians.

DULLES' CONSENT REVOKED

The fact that article 16—to which our Secretary of State John Foster Dulles had given his consent in Berlin on February 13, 1954—was finally stricken from the draft treaty for Austria is largely due to the tremendous pressure which the American press exerted, right in the nick of time.

As the readers of this article will remember, the Tablet again played a leading role in this campaign, which ended with a complete victory over the Soviets.

However, knowing the Soviets, that does not mean that all danger is over. Since we have never repealed Yalta, all Yalta agreements are still in force and may be revived any time our Government should so decide.

The diplomatic note, which will certainly be subject of debate for years to come, cannot be thoroughly analyzed in this article. Therefore, a few remarks may suffice. The full text appears below.

The note deals only with a group of prisoners who fell into American hands while serving with the Germans, in German uniforms. Those prisoners of war were brought to the United States, where they stayed at Camp Rupert, Idaho. The Soviet Government wanted them repatriated. Mr. Grew's note of February 1, 1945, informed the Soviet Government "that the clear intention of the (Geneva) Convention is that prisoners of war shall be treated on the basis of the uniforms they are wearing when captured and that the detaining power shall not look behind the uniforms to determine ultimate questions of citizenship or nationality."

The strangest fact dealt with in Mr. Grew's note is his statement that "the American military authorities have informed me that * * * persons captured by the United States Armed Forces in German uniform who claim Soviet citizenship are being permitted to return to the Soviet Union. The military authorities state that approximately 2,600 of these persons who claim Soviet citizenship have departed on Soviet ships bound for Siberian ports.

RETURNED TO CERTAIN DEATH

"Approximately 1,200 additional persons are undergoing processing at Camp Rupert by representatives of your Embassy and of the War Department. Groups of these who are found to be claimants to Soviet citizenship are going forward from time to time as Soviet shipping is available."

It is almost impossible to understand why those 2,600 Soviet nationals should have wished to return to the Soviet Union. They must certainly have known that only death was waiting for them in the U. S. S. R.

The issue deserves further investigation.

Have those 2,600 ever been told that they had the right to declare themselves as German prisoners of war and that, in this case, they were fully protected by the Geneva Convention?

If they were not clearly advised about their privilege under the Geneva Convention, the American authorities responsible for such lack of judicial advice were derelict of their duties.

We can only hope that a coming congressional investigation of forced repatriation will solve the strange riddle of those Soviet nationals captured in German uniform who "desired to return to the Soviet Union."

[We also would like to know whether the Army psychiatrists had ever any opportunity to talk to those "returners," and if not, why?]

THE DIPLOMATIC NOTE

FEBRUARY 1, 1945.

NIKOLAI V. NOVIKOV, Esquire,
Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

SIR: I refer to your Embassy's Aide-Memoires dated January 4 and January 18, 1945, as well as to our previous correspondence with regard to the German prisoners of war segregated at Camp Rupert, Idaho.

The American military authorities have informed me that, in compliance with assurances given your Embassy in our note of November 8, 1944, persons captured by the United States Armed Forces in German uniform who claim Soviet citizenship are being permitted to return to the Soviet Union.

The military authorities state that approximately 2,600 of these persons who claim

Soviet citizenship have departed on Soviet ships bound for Siberian ports. Approximately 1,200 additional persons are undergoing processing at Camp Rupert by representatives of your Embassy and the War Department.

Groups of these who are found to be claimants to Soviet citizenship are going forward from time to time as Soviet shipping is available.

I am informed that a difference of opinion has arisen between your Embassy's representatives at Camp Rupert and the American military authorities with regard to the cases of a small number of German prisoners of war who maintain that they are German soldiers and officers and demand that they be treated as such under the provisions of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention to which the United States and Germany are both parties.

Since your representatives at the camp have apparently misunderstood the motives behind the treatment that has been given to the cases of these persons, I should like to outline to you the reasons why, in the opinion of the American authorities, these persons cannot, without creating serious difficulties, be delivered for shipment to the Soviet Union.

In this connection, I can assure you that the action taken by the American military authorities in regard to these persons arises from no desire on the part of the American Government to hold Soviet nationals or to prevent the return to the Soviet Union of individuals who have established claims to Soviet citizenship.

TREATED ON BASIS OF UNIFORM

This action has been taken because the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention does not specifically provide for situations such as that which has arisen from the incorporation by the Germans of captured persons of foreign nationality into German military formations.

It appears to the appropriate American authorities, who have given most careful consideration to this situation, that the clear intention of the Convention is that prisoners of war shall be treated on the basis of the uniforms they are wearing when captured and that the detaining power shall not look behind the uniform to determine ultimate questions of citizenship or nationality.

There are among enemy prisoners of war held by this Government a number of prisoners who have claims to American nationality. This Government is not, however, screening out these persons for special treatment since it desires to avoid a violation of what appears to be the intent of the Convention and weakening its ability to protect every wearer of an American uniform who may fall into enemy hands regardless of his nationality.

There are numerous aliens in the United States Army, including citizens of enemy countries. The United States Government has taken the position that these persons are entitled to the full protection of the Geneva Convention and has informed the German government over a year ago that all prisoners of war entitled to repatriation under the Convention should be returned to the custody of the United States regardless of nationality.

In view of the fact that the United States has taken this position in regard to American prisoners of war in German hands, it is the opinion of the competent American authorities, that, if we should release from a prisoners of war status persons who claim protection under the Geneva Convention because they were captured while fighting in German uniforms as members of German formations, the German government might be afforded a pretext to subject to reprisal American prisoners of war in German hands.

RETAINS SOME PRISONERS

Your government, I am sure, will readily understand that this Government cannot justify to the American people the taking of any steps that might jeopardize the situation of American prisoners of war in enemy hands.

While we have and will turn over to Soviet control those prisoners of war captured in enemy uniform who themselves are claimants to Soviet citizenship and who do not fall into the above category, the United States Government, in view of its fundamental interest in protecting the status of American prisoners of war in German hands, must reserve the right to retain as prisoners of war persons whose detention is deemed to be vital to the protection of American personnel in the hands of the enemy.

The complaints made by Mr. (Andrei) Gromyko to me as well as those recited in your Aide-Memoire of January 4 and January 18 have been forwarded to the military authorities for investigation.

The military authorities are conducting thorough investigations in order to uncover the full facts in each incident alleged and be in a position to take such action as may be warranted on the basis of the results of the investigations.

The American military authorities have informed me that additional time must ensue before these investigations can be completed, but as soon as they are terminated you will be advised further.

In regard to the status of the Soviet nationals under discussion, I feel that I must in all sincerity remind you that they were not captured by American forces while they were detained in German prisoner of war camps but were serving Germany in German military formations in German uniforms. They are not, therefore, to be compared with American or Soviet military personnel who may be liberated from German prisoner of war camps.

Soviet military personnel found by advancing American armies on German or German-controlled territory in a prisoner-of-war status will, of course, be returned without question by the American authorities to Soviet control.

In like manner, the American Government expects that American military personnel found by advancing Soviet armies in a prisoner-of-war status in Germany or German-controlled territory will without question be returned to American control by the Soviet authorities.

CLASSIFIED AS GERMANS

The persons now at Camp Rupert were not, however, found in the status of prisoners of war held by the enemy. Instead, as pointed out above, they were taken by American forces in German uniform employed against American troops.

There was no reason to believe, until these German soldiers declared themselves, that they were anything but German military personnel.

They were therefore classified by the American military authorities as German prisoners of war and so notified to the appropriate German authorities. They were fed, clothed, and otherwise treated as prisoners of war in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention and the regulations issued by the American authorities to carry out this convention.

All German prisoners of war, except commissioned and noncommissioned officer personnel, are compelled to work. The information you received to the effect that German prisoners of war in the United States are not compelled to work is not correct.

After their preliminary segregation, some claimants to Soviet nationality continued to be employed at Camp Winchester and other places as a contribution to the Allied war effort. For such labor they were paid at the established rate of 80 cents per day.

You will recollect, in this connection, that your Embassy was asked in our note of November 8 for its views as to the general types of work upon which it would be agreeable to have these persons employed while awaiting transportation to the Soviet Union and it was stated that pending receipt of your views it was the intention to employ them in suitable civilian occupations, primarily, though not exclusively, in agriculture.

No reply was received from this communication.

In this connection it should be pointed out that upon their final segregation at Camp Rupert, your nationals were not required to perform any labor except in connection with administration, management, and maintenance of the facilities occupied by them.

As I have previously assured you, this Government has not propagandized and has no intention or desire of allowing the propagandizing of your nationals or suggesting to them that they not return to Soviet control. If any of the American personnel at the camps where they have been held have engaged in any such propaganda in violation of this policy, you may be assured that appropriate steps will be taken with regard to them.

I feel certain that your Government will agree that the comprehensive steps, taken by the American authorities to turn over to Soviet control, as soon as practicable under the circumstances, prisoners of war captured in enemy uniforms who themselves are claimants to Soviet citizenship and who could be released without contravening the United States Government's obligations under the Geneva Convention, have amply proved our good faith in endeavoring to meet the wishes of the Soviet Government.

I feel further assured that your Government fully understands, in view of the extraordinary circumstances under which these Soviet nationals fell into the hands of the American military authorities, that until their status was determined they were naturally and rightfully treated as German prisoners of war. At all times and as required by the convention, every effort was made to accord them treatment similar to that given to the American Armed Forces.

Considering the sincere and full efforts, which have been made by the American authorities to handle this complex and difficult situation in order to meet in a most sympathetic and friendly manner the wishes of the Soviet Government, "it is difficult to understand the unhelpful attitude assumed by certain Soviet officials who have been assigned to collaborate with the American authorities in this work." (Quotations ours.)

You may be certain that the United States Government will continue to do everything within its power to comply with the wishes of your Government with respect to these persons provided, as explained above, any action taken in this regard will not jeopardize the lives or treatment of American prisoners of war in German hands.

Accept, sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

JOSEPH C. GREW,
Acting Secretary of State.

Federal School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a statement made by Mr. George

E. Stringfellow, senior vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., and president of the New Jersey Taxpayers Association, before the House Committee on Education and Labor on April 21, 1955.

Mr. Stringfellow is one of New Jersey's leading citizens and has devoted himself unselfishly to the improvement of government over a period of many years. His experience in education and public finance well qualify him to discuss the vital subject of Federal school aid. His statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is George E. Stringfellow. I reside in East Orange, N. J., and appear before you in my capacity as president of the New Jersey Taxpayers' Association, an organization founded more than a quarter of a century ago, which throughout its long and effective life has been partisan only to the taxpayer. Through its 100 local taxpayer groups, our association represents New Jersey taxpayers from all parts of the State. The policies I express today are those adopted by the annual meeting of our statewide membership.

My purpose is not to discuss specific proposals for Federal school aid, but rather to express our association's firm opposition to any further extension of Federal aid to local school districts and to point out why we in New Jersey believe that such extension is unnecessary and inadvisable.

Certainly school financing presents great difficulties. But it does not follow that these cannot be handled adequately within the States, or that we should abdicate our State and local responsibiliies in favor of Federal dollars that we ourselves must provide anyway.

The current demand for increased Federal aid for schools is based largely upon the increase in the number of pupils to be cared for. However, this increase is merely one aspect of population change. For example, as population growth and dispersion create new need for schools, they also create new need for all the other services of an urban settlement. If the Federal Government is to be called upon to meet the need for new school buildings, why should it not also supply the equally necessary water supply and sewerage systems, streets, police, and other facilities and services which the growth entails? As with schools, it takes only a little arithmetic to cast these needs into impressive nationwide totals. But we are leading with the problems of a dynamic rather than a static society, and the new growth that causes school shortages also provides an expanded tax base.

This leads us directly to the school-facilities survey, which provides a collection of data and recommendations laboriously assembled from throughout the Nation. This survey has two grave defects. First, it measures needs while considerable construction is already underway and planned to meet those needs. Secondly, it represents the type of survey that an industry would label tentative, and would then subject to various types of test checks. Industry would also consider various alternatives to the recommended program. For instance, could reorganization of school districts be effected that would eliminate some of the needs? Could more efficient procedures be developed that would reduce the overall cost?

Such tests have not been systematically applied to the much-publicized school-facilities survey. Instead, the survey is but a statistical reflection of the status quo carried into the future.

As for the argument that school districts have already reached their borrowing limits and must look to higher levels of Government for funds, this is pure fiction. New Jersey's property assessments in the State as a whole are at approximately one-third of the true value of the property. Consequently, borrowing power is reduced on the average by two-thirds for no reason other than the artifice of low assessments.

However, this problem is well understood in New Jersey, where, as our law provides, some 220 school districts have alerady been permitted to exceed their borrowing limit in order to permit them to finance their needed school buildings locally.

But it is not local or State debt that is our primary concern. Our greater concern is the Federal debt. Despite highly favorable economic conditions the Federal Government is still operating at a deficit and has a debt approximating $275 billion. According to the latest available data (1953) the average State debt is $50.50 per capita. New Jersey's debt is $84.58 per capita. The highest State debt per capita, Delaware's, is $326.91. In contrast the Federal debt is $1,666.11 per capita. This, according to Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, is a greater per capita debt than that of any of the countries to which we are extending foreign aid. What business, therefore, has the Federal Government—this debt-ridden enterprise operating at a deficit—to extend "aid" to solvent States when it must borrow to finance the operations it is already carrying on, and then tax to repay this borrowing?

We in New Jersey are not misled by the promise of Federal aid. We know that the only source of funds is the people themselves. It is with considerable interest, therefore, that we learn from the New York Times of February 25, 1955, that the Education Subcommittee of the Federal Commission on Intergovernmental Relations stated:

"We have been unable to find a State which cannot afford to make more money available to its schools or which is economically unable to support an adequate school system."

And lastly, it is axiomatic that new Federal aid for schools, whether for construction or operation, will give new opportunity for Federal control. Although there may be some school-aid programs in which Federal control has been held to a minimum and has not been particularly objectionable, this is a fact of little significance. Once centralized finance is achieved, strong centralized control could be exercised at any time with the danger that our entire public-school system could become a tool of authoritarianism. Dictatorships have always harnessed the education of youth for their own ends.

If the Federal Government really wishes to help the States it will balance its budget and reduce the debt load. It is no unique condition that New Jersey's share of the Feedral debt is almost 50 percent more than the assessed value of all the State's taxable property—its farms, its factories, its homes, and its stores.

Through our State's public school system we have passed on from generation to generation a tradition of self-reliance, prudence, energy, and courage. These are the attributes which have made America great. They have carried the Nation over many difficulties and will do so many more times if we adhere to them. Shall we continue to teach our children that these are the virtues they should emulate? Or shall we, by the unfortunate example which we are here considering, teach them that whenever difficult problems arise they should transfer to Washington the task of finding a solution?

I have asked these two questions for a very solemn reason, for in answering them we shall be determining the nature of more than school finance. We shall be determining how we intend to condition the minds of our children—for generations still to come.

Archbishop Urges Good Will in Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in my extension of remarks a powerful address delivered by Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, D. D., Archbishop of Boston, at the South Shore charity dinner, held in Quincy, Mass., on Thursday evening, May 26, 1955:

ARCHBISHOP URGES GOOD WILL IN SOCIETY

There are certain virtues needed in our society to make it good. The first is the virtue called good will. The words good will have more or less lost their meaning because of the unthinking way in which they have been thrown about. The word brotherhood has had a like unfortunate handling. There never was a time when men talked more of brotherhood than they do in our day—and there never was a time when more men were murdered in one way or another.

By the same token, there never was a time when people talked so much about good will—when so many good will meetings, good will programs and good will schemes of every kind were fostered. And there never was a time when mutual suspicions were so many and public and private antagonisms were so tense.

PEACE POTENTIAL

And yet good will is the most important potential for the works of peace. Centuries ago the very angels from heaven sang out their understanding, at once a warning and a welcome word of encouragement, that peace on earth can only come to men of good will—to those whose hearts are open, whose minds are sincere, whose wills are well disposed.

The great tragedy of our time is that the forces of good will are disunited while the anti-moral forces, the forces of destruction and malice, are united. One group protests against the persecution of their people and keeps silent about the persecution of others. One race deplores the persecution of its members and appears indifferent to the persecution of others. Good will impels all men to recognize that where basic rights are concerned there is no room for special groupings—and the persecution of any group is the business and the burden of all.

So the first social virtue needed in these times of precarious peace is the much misunderstood but nonetheless indispensable virtue that the angels of Bethlehem extolled—the virtue of good will.

The second social virtue needed in times when men are trying to build peace is the virtue of honesty. Many leaders of our day use one word when they mean another or they profess not to know the meanings of the very words they use. This particular vice is "the use of words to conceal meanings." "Let your yea mean yea, and your nay mean nay" says Sacred Scripture. This moral advice is very much needed in connection with another social problem of our day. We must develop the ability to recognize things for what they are, and, having recognized them, to give them their proper names.

We must not allow reaction or bigotry or isolationism or any other narrowness of mind or heart to cloak itself in a good name like Americanism. We must not allow an antisocial thing like anarchy or an evil thing like atheism or a treacherous thing like com-

munism to get by with the name liberalism or progressive democracy. If a man likes communism—if he believes in communism—if he is furthering the interests of communism, then let him say so. Let his yea be yea and his nay be nay with regard to communism. He should not object to being called a Communist, or feel offended if we refuse to call him a liberal, a "forward looking citizen," or a greathearted friend of mankind. People who know themselves to be Communist and whom everybody else knows to be Communists, may not wish to be sincere and honest about the names they give themselves and their organizations—but the rest of us should be perfectly candid about it.

MAGNANIMITY

Summing up these virtues which are needed in every community, and in the world itself if we are to have peace, we must also develop the social virtue most of all needed in our divided days: A virtue almost never named among us because it bears a long name. I refer to the wonderful virtue of magnanimity.

More than all other virtues, magnanimity is the virtue needed to create a moral atmosphere in which peace treaties and effective world organizations can be devised. Magnanimity means greatness of soul. It has to do with honor and honorable actions; it makes noble deeds its end. It inspires us to despise the petty whether in personal opinions or public policies or social programs. It impels us to seek less the satisfaction of self and more the good opinion of mankind. It urges us to deal with enemies and to work with friends in a manner which will be not merely pleasing to men but even great before God.

The magnanimous man is a man without prejudices and devoted to principle. The magnanimous nation is a nation without political trickery and dedicated to humane statesmanship. A magnanimous people are firm in their adherence to their own way of life, but they have minds profound enough and hearts generous enough to enable them to understand and to respect whatever of truth and of greatness there may be in the way of life of others. We shall never have peace plans or peace treaties bold enough and great enough to change the world until we have big men to write them—men who are magnanimous, big souled.

In a Democracy you and I are the rulers. Every man is, more truly than we sometimes think, a king. Our part in the making of the peace may be small. We ourselves may be relatively insignificant but we must be magnanimous—we must be able, not merely to state and to defend our own interests, but take into consideration and provide for the interests of others. We must be big. If we are, then we shall have the moral fiber most needed in these evil days. We shall have minds big enough to appreciate the things upon which we agree and hearts big enough to count our blessings which far outnumber trials.

I do not think that we reflect often enough on the healthy, the good elements in our social structure. We are tempted, particularly nowadays, to dwell too much on its evil side, its defects, and not enough on its good points, the things it has accomplished.

I make no plea for lightheaded rather than lighthearted reactions to the crises of the moment, national or international, economic or political. I do not ask that we delude ourselves by wishful thinking or unfounded enthusiasm. But I do think it time to counteract the prevailing pessimism of our society and to give the spirit of optimism a chance to light up some of the good things we have to build with and point up the favorable prospects which are no less present in the world than the doubts and fears. I think we owe it to our young people, to their future happiness, and perhaps their future freedom, to stop talking misery, thinking disaster, and expecting the worst. I think we would do ourselves and them a favor if we began talking hope, thinking peace, and expecting a break. There are very real worries in the world—but they are not the sum total of creation. There are many evil men in the world—but God is not dead.

NO NEED TO BROOD

It is true that sometimes conditions beyond our control land us in national or international, economic, or political difficulties. But it is equally often true that we talk ourselves or brood ourselves or worry ourselves into trouble which we could have avoided or, if it came, could have solved if we had talked big instead of brooded, if we had lifted up our heads and hearts instead of our hands, if we had worked with the tools God gave us instead of worried about the crosses He sent us. Sometimes mere talk causes untold trouble when the talk is defeatist, discouraged, undisciplined. At the moment mere talk might be all we need to set the world on the road to peace—if the talk be constructive, intelligent, inspired.

A little parable is going the rounds which makes my point. It is the parable of the man who sold hot dogs.

"There was a man who lived by the side of the road and sold hot dogs. He was hard of hearing so he had no radio. He had trouble with his eyes so he read no newspapers. But he sold good hot dogs. He put up signs on the highway telling how good they were. He stood on the side of the road and cried: 'Buy a hot dog, mister.' And people bought.

"He increased his meat and bun orders. He bought a bigger stove to take care of his trade. He finally got his son from college to help him out. But then something happened. His son said, "Father, haven't you been listening to the radio? There's a big depression on. The European situation is terrible. The domestic situation is worse.'

"Whereupon the father thought, 'Well, my son's been to college. He reads the papers and he listens to the radio, and he ought to know.' So the father cut down on his meat and bun orders. Took down his advertising signs, and no longer bothered to stand out on the highway to sell his hot dogs. And his hot dog sales fell almost overnight.

" 'You're right son,' the father said to the boy. 'We certainly are in the middle of a great depression. And you brought it from your college.' "

BE CONFIDENT

There is fruit for meditation by all of us in the parable of the man who sold hotdogs. Again it must not make us complacent, but it should make us more confident as we dedicate ourselves to the fulfillment of our duties in building a better social order.

We have the duty, all of us, of rising above partisan schemes for the solution of problems of labor and management. We have the duty of creating an atmosphere of cordiality and of integrity in which competent men can study with calm and courage thorny problems of wages, hours, prices, and legitimate interests. We have the duty of putting aside all rancor, all political, class, or factional prejudices and, to a point, even self-interest in order to attain social peace.

We have the duty of speaking clearly, conscientiously, and charitably, whatever our judgment may suggest as the best solution of a social problem—and we have the duty of listening no less conscientiously and charitably while others do the same. We have the duty of recognizing the possibility that the other fellow may be right even though he may not belong to our class, union, organization, or other group. We have the duty of striving always to be right ourselves, while being prepared to admit that we may be wrong or that the right, especially in political, economic, and social matters, may be a combination of some of our ideas with some of the ideas of the other fellow.

I call upon you all to count your blessings and to dedicate yourselves to the social virtues I have enumerated because I am convinced that therein lies the hope of America and the hope of the world.

VIRTUE OF PATIENCE

We are living at a time which tries the patience of all those who are for God and against deceit. But patience is precisely the virtue needed—patience in clinging to our Christian hopes, patience in pursuing our democratic ideals, patience even with those among us who speak out against these and for their opposites.

That patience will be richly rewarded. One day the Iron Curtain will part again as the mist before the springtime sun. Let no one be discouraged. God is not mocked and His Will is not forever frustrated. The Iron Curtain will rise—and it is our responsibility, here in America, to see to it that when it does the liberty-loving peoples who will then rejoin us in the free assemblies of the world will find intact the Christian values and democratic institutions which now are ours for the safekeeping. I know not when the day of delivery will come—but when it does, may the people behind the curtains of communism find us more united than ever, more prosperous than before, more militantly for God and more ready to help all His children find their way back to Him in faith and freedom.

The Lithuanian American Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following statement by the Lithuanian American Council:

THE LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL

Soon after the Soviet occupation of Lithuania in June 1940, people of Lithuanian descent in this country joined forces to espouse the cause of Lithuanian freedom. They were soon fortified in their resolve by the forthright policy declaration of the then Acting Secretary of State, Sumner Welles, on July 23, 1940:

"The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or the threat of force."

October 15, 1940, is officially considered to be the birthday of the Lithuanian American Council. On that day President Roosevelt received a delegation representing various Lithuanian-American political and ideological groups which came to discuss with him the fate of Lithuania. The President voiced his conviction that Lithuania would again be free, and inspired his guests by his faith in the future of a free Lithuania. Said President Roosevelt to the delegation:

"The address mentioned that Lithuania had lost its independence. That is a mistake. The independence of Lithuania is not lost but only temporarily put aside. The time will come when Lithuania will be free again. This may happen sooner than you may expect. It was a mistake on behalf of one of the speakers to say that Lithuania is a small country. In Latin America there are states even smaller than Lithuania, but they live a free and happy life. Even the smallest

nation has the same right to enjoy independence as the largest one."

According to its bylaws, the Lithuanian American Council, Inc., aims to unite all Lithuanian Americans to the support and promotion of the principles of American democracy among the Lithuanian nationality group in the United States; to support United States military efforts against totalitarian aggressors, and all United States efforts to achieve a lasting peace founded on the principles of justice, democracy, and freedom for all peoples, great and small; to secure the carrying out of the principles of the Atlantic Charter, including their implementation in the case of Lithuania by restoring her independence within her historic boundaries; to give all possible moral and material aid to the still struggling people of Lithuania, as well as those Lithuanians who had escaped from Communist tyranny and those imprisoned in slave labor camps; finally, to furnish America and the whole free world with the truth about Lithuania to offset the lying and slanderous propaganda of the Soviets.

The Lithuanian American Council, Inc., consists of representatives of the four major ideological groups of Lithuanian Americans: The Lithuanian Roman Catholic Federation of America, the Lithuanian Social-Democratic Federation of America, the National Lithuanian Society of America, and the National Lithuanian League of America, as well as the two large Lithuanian fraternal associations, the Lithuanian Alliance of America and the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Alliance of America. The council has branches in cities and towns throughout the country. Hundreds of local Lithuanian benefit societies, political and cultural clubs, labor union locals, and other associations from coast to coast are affiliated with the council. The most popular and influential Lithuanian newspapers, dailies as well as weeklies, support its activities. It is true to say that the preponderant majority of the 1 million American citizens of Lithuanian extraction backs the Lithuanian American Council.

The council holds ordinary plenary sessions once a year. It has organized four national conventions of Lithuanian Americans.

The multifarious activities of the Lithuanian American Council are conducted by an executive board of four members, most of whom have been connected with the organization since its inception. These members are: Leonard Simutis, president of the council and editor of the Lithuanian Roman Catholic daily, Draugas; Dr. Pius Grigaitis, executive secretary of the council and editor in chief of the Lithuanian Daily News, Naujienos; Anthony A. Olis, vice president of the council and president of the Chicago Sanitary District; and Michael Vaidyla, treasurer of the council and editor of the Lithuanian weekly, Sandara. These officers are all outstanding leaders of the Lithuanian democratic movements.

Besides its headquarters in Chicago at 1739 South Halsted Street., the Lithuanian American Council, Inc., maintains the Lithuanian American Information Center at 233 Broadway, New York City. Director of the center is Mary M. Kizis, a native American with many years of experience in governmental and private information and public relations agencies. Besides developing public relations on the east coast, the center publishes the Lithuanian Bulletin and a news summary for the Lithuanian press.

During its first years, the Lithuanian American Council devoted most of its efforts to countering Soviet pressure on the United States to obtain recognition of its forcible absorption of Lithuania and the other Baltic States. Since the Soviet Union was a wartime ally of the United States, there was always the possibility that this insistent pressure would induce a shift in United States policy of nonrecognition. Even after the war the center was busy exposing Soviet attempts to cozen the great democratic powers into sanctioning the rape of the Baltic States.

War's end found tens of thousands of Lithuanian refugees in Western Europe in desperate need of assistance. The Lithuanian American Council at once moved to prevent their extradition to Soviet Russia. To relieve the pitiful plight of these refugees, the council took the initiative in the creation of a special organization, the United Lithuanian Relief of America, which is still functioning with noteworthy efficiency. When the problem of permanently settling the refugees arose, the council campaigned for legislation authorizing the admission to the United States of as many Lithuanian refugees as possible.

The council also campaigned assiduously to focus world attention on the crime called genocide, which the Soviets had developed into a bloody science in Lithuania and other nations on the borders of Red Russia. The council actively supported the Genocide Convention in the United Nations outlawing this mass extermination of peoples. It is still working to induce the United States Senate to add the United States to the majority of U. N. members who have already ratified this open condemnation of Soviet ruthlessness.

The Lithuanian American Council vigorously opposed adoption by the United Nations of the so-called Draft Code of Offenses Against the Peace and Security of Mankind," a Communist-backed project aimed at nullifying the Genocide Convention and providing opportunities for Soviet propaganda attacks on the free nations. It was not without the efforts of the council that the present position of our Government was clarified. At the beginnig of the ninth session of the U. N. General Assembly, United States Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge notified the council that "it will be the objective of the United States delegation this year to prevent adoption or any endorsement of the code by the present General Assembly."

The most recent achievement of the Lithuanian American Council in its continuing fight against international communism was the adoption by Congress of the council's suggestion that a select committee of the House be established to investigate the seizure and forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union. The council worked long and tirelessly to convince American public opinion of the value of such an investigation. The success of its public educational effort was reflected in the House's unanimous approval of the resolution authorizing the committee introduced by the then Congressman from Wisconsin, Charles J. Kersten.

Once the select committee had been appointed, the council cooperated in the most important and complicated part of its work, the discovery, gathering, and checking of evidence provided by both documents and witnesses proving the Soviets guilty of fraud and aggression against Lithuania and her people. The council devoted more than a year of painstaking work to the compilation of an impressive amount of documentation, and to the preparation of oral testimony offered at the public hearing of the select committee. At the present time the council is urging that the congressional investigation, so shockingly revelatory of Communist aggression, be continued, and that the complete findings be used as the basis for a U. N. resolution calling upon the Soviet Union to withdraw from the territories it has wantonly aggressed upon.

The Lithuanian American Council has, moreover, materially assisted in the exposure of Soviet propaganda by the information agencies of the United States. The Voice of America broadcasts in Lithuanian as well as in Latvian and Estonian came about largely through the efforts of the council. So did the inclusion of Baltic representatives in the Committee for a Free Europe, which controls the highly effective Radio Free Europe.

Frequently, during the 15 years of its existence, the Lithuanian American Council has been the spokesman for Lithuanian Americans in the councils of the United States Government, during both World War II against the Black and Brown Fascist aggressors, and in the cold war against the Red Fascist conspirators against world freedom. Besides being received by President Roosevelt, as already mentioned, delegations of the council were received three times by President Harry S. Truman, and once by President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The paramount desire of the Lithuanian American Council is that a just and permanent peace may be achieved for the whole world, a goal which includes necessarily the liberation of Lithuania from Soviet tyranny and its restoration as an independent republic. This supreme desire, the council is convinced, animates the hearts and fortifies the wills of all loyal Lithuanian Americans.

Down on Beale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Courier of May 28, 1955:

DOWN ON BEALE
(By Nat D. Williams)
EUREKA?

"Jackson, give me your han',
Don't care if it's black as tar.
For a man ain't nothin' but a man
Whether met in a bank or a bar!"
—*Swilly.*

MEMPHIS.—Beale Street has done it again. And maybe this is it.

Seems like an answer to the many questions bubbling up from the quarrel on racial integration has been discovered, hidden among Beale Street's blues, and this answer may set a pattern which could capture the serious thinking of Sam 'n' 'Em and Boss Charlie on this desegregation mess.

The Beale Street pattern has been designed by Lt. George W. Lee, Blues Avenue's syncopated symbol of sense. And the corner uses the word "sense" pointedly in referring to the perennially colorful Mr. Lee. He is Beale Street's gift to the world of letters (three topnotch books and dozens of slick-paper magazine articles). He's the Midsouth's peak-top sepia politician (seconded the nomination of President Eisenhower at Chicago and is Mr. GOP in the Delta cotton lands). Mr. Lee is a big wheel in the high echelons of Negro business leadership (a vice president of the Atlanta Life Insurance Co., biggest Negro operated business in the world, and a vice president of the Tri-State Bank of Memphis, one of the Nation's 14 countinghouses where your folks brains are trusted in the vaults). He's a nationally recognized secret order leader (educational director of the IBPOE of W. Elks to you, Joe).

Mr. Lee has attained the presidency of a $6 million business operation in which he is the only Negro. Yep, he's president, in a concern involving his own and the investments of several of the city's leading white citizens.

And he's not a figurehead president. He wasn't invited into the organization to perform the traditional role of fronting for Mister Charlie. He helped conceive the idea for the business venture. Then he helped organize it and implement it with his ideas of how it should be operated, maintained, and expanded. His cofounders of the business are southern white men who are 'way up front from 'way back * * *meaning that they're what southern Negroes respect most * * * quality white folks.

The company Mr. Lee and his two principal associates, Messrs. Edward F. Barry, a nationally known architect and authority on housing, and W. M. Simmons, veteran public housing official, is known as the George W. Lee Development Corp.

But there's a conspicuous difference in this particular venture's character. It is an interracially integrated business endeavor. And a Negro is the recognized president of it * * * accepted as such by men of another race.

Instead of doing like too many book-learned and comparatively successful Negroes, and turning a burning contempt upon the masses of his folk, as soon as possible, Lieutenant Lee took time to study 'em as well as feel 'em. He wrote down what he heard on Beale Street, and didn't bother to record the smells. His character and brains grew on Beale Street rather than atrophied.

The result is he's in the strategic position to guide questing American capital as it at long last surges into the seething Negro consumer market with its salvaging benefits.

Those White men who share the business idea with him, who laid their money on the line with his for the project, who had their pictures "took" to run in the daily prints with his'n, who made no secret of the fact that they were willing to go into business with a Negro on a basis of mutual respect, knew what they were doing.

They are businessmen in quest of profitable ventures. They are smart enough to recognize a need, and thus a market. They have respect for brains, character, and ability. Lieutenant Lee impressed them as the possessor of brains, character, and ability to help in meeting the need with its attendant market for profits, both material and intangible.

* * * * *

Moral: That could be the price of integration—character, brains, proven ability. Not only for Lieutenant Lee but for all other Negroes. For despite all contrary arguments, Sam-N-Nem, still have to prove their right to their rights.

If you ain't got brains, get quiet and talk soft like the corner do. And remember that in each human heart are a tiger, a pig, an ass, and a nightingale; diversity of character is due to their unequal activity. Whatcha doin,' Man-n-n?

Public Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a most interesting and significant address by Mr. R. Karl Honaman, then Director, Office of Strategic Information, United States Department of Commerce. Mr. Honaman has since been named Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs.

The address follows:

PUBLIC INFORMATION

(Address to the Society of Business Magazine Editors, Washington, D. C., January 28, 1955 by R. Karl Honaman, Director, Office of Strategic Information, United States Department of Commerce)

I welcome this opportunity to talk to the editors of the business press because you have an important interest in the job we have been asked to undertake.

Basically we have only one concern and that is to see what, if anything, is needed and can be done practically to help protect our country from dangers which may arise from informing our enemy about our own strategic development. The key words are "needed" and "practical," and I want to assure you that we have not and will not lose sight of them. In my book, any means of solving this problem that is practicl must be one that reasonable people in a cooperative approach would agree is proper and desirable.

There seems no reason for me to more than state the fact that we do not want to give valuable information to an enemy or that we do want to do all we can to protect our country. With few possible exceptions I am sure this would be subscribed to by all of us.

There has been concern in some quarters regarding the aims of the Office of Strategic Information, largely because in spite of definite statements to the contrary some have thought we are interested in becoming censors. I should like to state again that no form of censorship has any part in our thinking.

I have spent most of my professional life in fields of engineering, science, and publication and am thoroughly conscious of the country's needs for publication and freedom of publication. I am also conscious of the fact that we are in a cold war and those who are responsible for our security have asked us to consider the relationship of published information to the security needs. I state therefore with only two basic propositions:

One is that we should not fail to examine this problem as carefully as we can and

Secondly, that none of the answers to it can include censorship.

First, one should pose the question, "Is there danger to our security in published information which comes before the eyes of an enemy?" Many thoughtful people have considered this matter. In a recent address in San Francisco Dr. Vannevar Bush said in part, "We tell the world, voluntarily, nearly all we know; and our enemy has only to read and listen. * * * There is very little left for an enemy espionage system to find out."

Assistant Secretary of Defense Donald A. Quarles, in an interview with Chemical and Engineering News, stated:

"In keeping our people informed, I believe we overdo it. We hand the enemy important information by the publishing of vital technical material that leaves all too little to the imagination of our competitor. Time and again technology of the highest significance has leaked into print. This is of enormous value to the other side."

And, again, an editor of a large New England paper stated:

"In this country we seem to have a habit of spreading everything on the open record. The amount of information we hand potential spies is amazing. It must be a soft touch to be assigned to espionage work in the United States."

Still further, in a feature story in the Washington Post, we find:

"The one thing which American intelligence officers would like to get out of Russia is not available in a totalitarian state. It is a Russian newspaper which would tell as much about military, economic, and political matters as, say, a newspaper in New York, Washington, or Chicago tells about such matters in the United States. It has been estimated by intelligence experts that such a Russian newspaper would be worth a billion dollars."

In my own relations with industrial people working on defense projects I hear repeatedly of information which has been felt to be quite dangerous which suddenly appears in published form. Thus, we find the Security Council is far from alone in its desire to explore this situation.

You will note I have not attempted at this point to evaluate the question—whether such information is more dangerous than helpful—nor yet to evaluate the question of how such dissemination comes about.

Our country, for the maintenance of its military defensive position and for the growth of its economy, needs free interchange of ideas. In America the know-how shared by engineers, scientists, and businessmen plays a vital part in building our strength and it's an important reason for our industrial leadership. Our country can never keep ahead in a race with a potential aggressor merely by keeping secret what we know. Only by superior skills can we maintain our position. Dependence upon secrecy instead of skill would be fatal. Moreover, no secrecy can be permanent. Any attempt to block off the flow of all ideas of value to a hostile power would be to our detriment, for there is no way to bring essential unclassified information to our own people without telling the world.

This thinking has led to 2 diametrically opposite bodies of opinion, 1 of which urges that in the United States we become exceedingly restrictive and greatly suppress information. The other would urge that anything and everything that one wishes to say be freely published. It seems to me that both of these err in attempting to evaluate the balance of judgment between what is necessary and what is dangerous in one fell swoop. The problem is far too complex to do that. It seems to me therefore that recognizing these two opposing needs we will find that at a particular time it may well be wise to hold back certain information, particularly of a technical nature for a limited period until in the course of events its contents inevitably will be more widely known—this without seriously delaying the time the information can be of general value to our people. I cannot escape the feeling that if this policy of exercising balanced judgment became one that were followed by all (armed with adequate information as to the facts that bear upon these judgments), we could serve the American public without either encroaching upon a free press or jeopardizing national security. Certainly these criteria are not met when we must judge the whole case a priori by either deciding to take the whole risk or deciding to take no risk. This problem is not black and white, gentlemen; there is a great deal of gray between the extremes.

I should give you an example. Recently, we have disseminated a great deal of information about the installation of the new Nike guided missiles for antiaircraft protection. One can visualize values in disclosing to the public the presence of these installations. In some cases, however, there have been added details regarding the missiles' speed, range, and altitude. These are design characteristics. It is hard to see how they can be of help to people generally, but it is quite easy to see how they can be of value to an enemy whose total intelligence comes from fitting together bits and pieces, here and there, to strengthen his information about what we are doing.

In fact, it was this very thing which stimulated the editor of the New England paper to make the comment that I mentioned earlier in this discussion. It would appear that in many cases it would not be difficult to make decisions to leave out this kind of information. I am equally sure that,

though such decisions will not be perfect, if we did our best it would be worth a great deal.

Along this line there was a recent article about new weapons and their relationship to the whole strategic situation. In that discussion, there was a simple statement that the details of operation of these weapons are not being included because they would be of value to an enemy. Actually they were not needed but it seems to me that the editor gained prestige in the mind of the reader by that very statement.

The approach to this problem should be a positive one. Some of the criticism of the general idea has arisen because it is assumed that it can be only a negative thing. Actually there is much information which should be published and has not been because people in making decisions have in the existing atmosphere taken the view that the best course is the obviously safe course and have held back information which on balance would seem clearly to involve more importance to us than risk.

In what I have said thus far and in the paper I prepared for Editor and Publisher, I was thinking solely of action of editors and others who are responsible for the decisions to disseminate information. This is by no means the whole of the problem of strategic information, though it is the part which is of most immediate interest to editorial people. Actually there are three other aspects of this problem which are of great importance at the present time and which are inherent parts of our assignment. One is to examine the question of where and how strategic information originates and whether any suitable steps should be taken in regard to that. Secondly, the question of what information is received in return for that which goes out of our country because of its necessary publication here; and, thirdly, we are asked to be available to governmental and industry and publishing people who may desire greater information regarding their own problems. Regarding the latter activity there already have been many questions brought to us in which we have been helpful in digging up facts. Further exploration in these fields will take some time if it is done thoughtfully and with critical judgment. It must be done also with the long pull in mind for in this kind of activity there is no reason for our acting except for the long pull.

It has been strongly intimated by some editors that the strategic information problem should be solved by tightening quite severely the rules for classification. Regulations are indeed blunt instruments and in my own thinking they are poor substitutes for the judgment of well-informed people.

There is a natural desire on the part of many to oversimplify it. It is always easier to consider any question in terms of simple alternatives, but I am sure as you study this further you cannot escape the realization as I said before that this problem is not all black or all white. Hardly any problem of importance that we have to consider in our complicated social structure is all black or all white. This is the reason why it seems to me too dangerous to attempt to resolve our thinking for all cases in advance of the time that they arise.

There probably does not exist a complete and perfect answer to this difficult question. If we try to see it only in terms of a complete and perfect answer it simply appears too formidable. If, however, in a spirit of a cooperative approach all of us who generate and disseminate information can apply the kind of balanced judgments that I have been suggesting I am certain that we would make progress in the direction of our objectives that would in time amount to a very substantial contribution to our own protection without at the same time jeopardizing our freedom. Certainly no freedom, including the freedom of publication, is jeopardized just because its exercise is accompanied by wise self-restraint.

When we stop to think of it we realize that there has never been a moment in the history of publishing when responsible editors did not exercise a certain degree of self-restraint in disseminating information where the public welfare was heavily involved—this without any legal compulsion to do so. An example is the policy of some newspapers not to publish the names of children who are involved in certain types of crimes.

Such self-imposed restraint has never been viewed as a threat to the freedom of the press. And it obviously is not that in fact since the editor himself sets the restraint and since he is also the one who can remove it when he thinks proper.

I have talked to you mostly about principles. Principles are the things we live by. We apply them with patience and wisdom to the situations we meet day by day.

We are committed to study every angle of this problem and want to do so as carefully as possible. In your opinion is the kind of application of judgment I have described a practicable thing? Would it be worth a try? Certainly if any members of this group have any suggestions as to how this problem could be attacked and solved we are very anxious to receive them.

The Dairy Industry Faces the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a speech by my colleague, the Honorable JOHN W. BYRNES, of Wisconsin, in this morning's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Congressman BYRNES spoke at the Alice in Dairyland celebration at the dairy festival in Kewaunee, Wis., on May 28, 1955. Congressman BYRNES' speech shows a clear insight into the problems facing the dairy industry:

THE DAIRY INDUSTRY FACES THE FACTS

It has given us a real lift to get back here today and take part in this most magnificent program. The people of Kewaunee, and all of those who have worked so hard to make this dairy festival such a success, are to be congratulated.

I know you are all anxiously awaiting the climax of this celebration—the crowning of our regional Alice in Dairyland. I am, too. I know you will agree with me when I say that anyone of the beautiful young ladies we have seen tonight would make a splendid representaitve of our State's principal industry. I wish them all luck. Win or lose, we can be proud of them everyone.

In the meantime, while we await the decision of the judges, I hope you will be able to listen to me without too much impatience. I want to say a few words tonight about the future of the dairy industry. It is a subject which should be of prime interest to every resident of the State of Wisconsin. I'm sure it is of interest to you; otherwise you would not be here tonight participating in this program.

Sometimes, however, there are many of us who forget how closely the prosperity of our State and its people is allied with the fortunes of the dairy industry. We tend to take for granted the marvelously complex economic system we have built up around the dairy cow. Sixty-five percent of our farm cash income comes from the sale of milk, cattle, and calves. This income—close to $800 million—represents between 15 and 20 percent of our State's income from all sources. But that is only half the story. Thousands of other people, besides the dairy farmer himself, are engaged in work directly dependent upon the vast flow of milk from Wisconsin's diary cows—in manufacturing dairy products from milk, in distributing them, in transporting them and in merchandising them. Thousands of others are engaged in providing supplies, equipment, and services, not only for the dairy farmer but for the dairy processor and manufacturer. Still thousands more supply products and services to those employed directly in the dairy industry. In all its ramifications, the dairy industry is undoubtedly the laregst single industry in our State. There is not one of us in this auditorium tonight who does not have a personal stake in its prosperity.

Yet, we all know, many of us too well, that the dairy industry is going through a most difficult period. In essence, it is the same problem which faced the industry in 1949—when the post-World War II adjustment to peacetime conditions began. In 1949, dairy surpluses piled up and milk prices went down. Recovery took place only when the shooting in Korea began and a wartime economy took over. We want no more of that kind of solution for this or any other problem. We certainly are not going to rely on wartime shortages and post-war inflation to solve the problem for us. Today, we seek to readjust the dairy industry to peacetime conditions and to put it on a firm basis for the years ahead.

Abraham Lincoln once advised us, if we wanted to decide which way we're going, to look back where we'd been. What was the situation which confronted the dairy industry just a little more than a year ago?

Milk production was booming toward new highs. The Government was in the dairy business with both feet. Surplus dairy products were piling up in Government warehouses at tremendous rates. Consumption of dairy products was not keeping up. In fact, it was trending dangerously downward, particularly in the case of butter. Net income of dairy farmers had declined by more than $200 million, in spite of the fact that dairy supports were at 90 percent, the highest level permitted under the law. The dairy industry was critically sick.

Drastic measures were then taken by the Government. The Secretary of Agriculture reduced milk supports to 75 percent, as he felt the law required him to do under the circumstances. Many of us, while recognizing the need for a lower support level, felt that the step was too drastic, too sudden, too severe. Regardless of our feelings then, I believe it is time for us to ask ourselves honestly if this shock treatment was not perhaps what the patient needed. Certainly, this action has set in motion a significant reaction which has put new life into a very sick industry.

It's true that the patient has suffered much in the past year. Dairy income was down again, about 4 percent, but not so much as in the previous year when 90 percent supports prevailed and not nearly so great as the prophets of doom at the bedside had predicted. But the other clinical evidence was all good. Milk production has leveled off. In fact, it is down, the first 3 months of this year, over the corresponding period of a year ago. Government purchases of dairy products have fallen sharply. Consumption of dairy products, particularly butter, is up. Surpluses previously acquired have moved into the channels of consumption—into people's stomachs rather than spoiling in warehouses.

I certainly do not want to mislead anyone. The patient is still ailing, but all signs indicate that the invalid, instead of going down hill, is convalescing rapidly. There will be crises ahead, no doubt, but there is every hope that he will recover in the near future—if the patient and his friends continue to face the facts about his own condition.

What are those facts?

The first and most basic one, I believe, is that the industry will be sick just as long as production of milk and its products outpaces consumption, regardless of the level of Government support. It is axiomatic that milk surpluses, no matter who stores them, act as a depressing influence upon the farmer's price for milk.

If we face this major fact—that our problem is bringing production and consumption into balance, then we must go on and face other facts which are part and parcel of a sound program for the future.

These facts, in my opinion, are:

First, Government alone cannot bring permanent prosperity to the dairy industry. It can only help. It can also harm. Our program should stress helpful rather than harmful actions by our Government.

Second, the problem of surplus production, paradoxically, must be met partially by increased production on the farm through greater efficiency. This means higher volume at lower costs.

Third, the great hope, and the soundest solution, lies in the field of increasing per capita consumption of milk and its products. This responsibility lies principally with the dairy industry itself.

Let me speak first of the role of government.

There are those who want the Government, in effect, to take over the dairy industry. They call loudly for rigid, high supports for dairy products. They do this in the face of the evidence that high supports have failed miserably in the past to solve the dairy problem, and, in fact, aggravate it by encouraging higher production and discouraging consumption. These people have changed their tune somewhat in the past few months. They are still calling for a return to high supports, but they now tell us it cannot be done unless the Government controls milk production. I will discuss in a moment what that would mean, but for now, I want merely to point out the existence of this school of thought—that thinks the Government should be entirely responsible for the dairy industry.

I say to you that we cannot build a sound dairy industry for the future if that industry is dependent upon the Government for its income and its markets. The Government cannot solve the basic problem—bringing consumption in line with production. It can only take crude and costly steps, which are generally self-defeating, to remove surplus production from the market.

This does not mean that the Government has no role in helping to bring about a permanently sound dairy industry.

Government, I believe, should, as it is now doing, provide realistic supports for the milk producer to prevent drastic fluctuations in price and production. Such supports are vitally necessary for stability within the industry.

Government should, as it is now doing, take aggressive steps in the field of research for new and better dairy products and better marketing methods.

Government should, as it is now doing, encourage and promote the consumption of dairy products, both within and without the Government. Great strides have been made in increasing milk consumption in our veterans' hospitals and in the Armed Forces, while the school-milk program is growing by leaps and bounds.

Government should, as it is now doing, provide technical assistance to farmers, helping them to produce more economically, to rid themselves of dairy diseases, such as in the accelerated brucellosis eradication program, and to assist them to become better all-round producers.

Government should—and real aggressive action is needed in this field which has been neglected—help to eliminate the barriers to increased milk consumption; artificial barriers which have sprung up through marketing orders, sanitary regulations, and milk price regulation in various States and localities.

These are all proper and helpful fields for Government action. But, please note that none of them contemplate turning over the dairy industry to complete control from some desk in Washington—as the advocates of high supports and milk production controls propose. They are geared instead toward attacking the dairy problem at its source—by encouraging more efficient production by efficient producers and by increasing per capita consumption of dairy products.

The possibilities of harm through Government action are just as great as the potential for good. I need mention only one at this point. It is a sad commentary that some who purport to speak for the dairy farmer are supporting legislation which would put feed crops at mandatory, high support levels while keeping dairy products on a flexible basis. I see no good in such legislation for the dairy farmer. It is a move to increase his cost of production at a time when one of his great needs is to reduce that cost. A dollar paid out for higher feed has the same number of cents as a dollar received for milk.

Let us talk a bit about production. I have already mentioned that the advocates of milk production controls have come out of hiding and are now openly proposing that the Government tell each and every dairy farmer how much milk he shall produce in return for high Government-supported prices.

I think that the Wisconsin dairy farmer, if he faces the facts, will overwhelmingly reject such a proposal. It is a proposal for nothing more nor less than a Government-run monopoly. It is a proposal which would strike hard at the efficient milk producers of our Nation because it would freeze them in old production patterns, limiting their sales not by what they can efficiently produce but by what the Government tells them they can sell. I need not tell you that the most efficient milk producers in the country are the Wisconsin dairy farmers.

The Wisconsin dairy farmer knows the importance of volume. He constantly strives to increase production at reduced cost. A production drop, he knows, costs as much as a drop in price. Let me put it another way. He knows that a reduction in his volume of milk reduces his income just as much as a drop in the price of milk. Every advance he makes in dairying efficiency—the upgrading of his herd, improvements in feeding and milking, better handling and transporting of his milk—is designed for volume production. Production controls would end the march toward efficient production. What farmer would strive for more volume when the Government would prevent him from selling his extra milk, or penalize him for doing so?

May I point out another fact to the Wisconsin farmer? Any system of production controls would necessarily have to exempt the backyard producer—the one- and two-cow farmer, or the administrative job of handling the controls would be impossible. To us in Wisconsin, it probably seems incredible, but the fact is that almost half the farms in the Nation producing milk fall in this category. That means that the full burden of production controls would fall upon the large and efficient producers. It would fall particularly hard upon the farmers in our State where dairy herds of 20 or more account for 53 percent of the cows in our State and where we pride ourselves on efficient production of milk.

No, I say the answer to the dairy problem does not lie in production controls. Rather, one part of the answer lies in the opposite direction. It lies not in limiting efficiency, but in promoting it. The dairy farmer cannot be helped by persuading him to accomplish less with his labor. A test at Michigan State showed that milk production costs could be cut by 45 percent through the use of all available techniques, such as better-producing cows and improved practices, without increasing farm help or farm acreage. Any dairy farmer who achieves only part of this efficiency increase automatically improves his economic position considerably.

That is why I said earlier that the partial answer to the problem of too much production is, paradoxically, increased production by individual producers. For, part of the reason for too much production is too many farmers engaged in milk production, in other parts of the country, who have no economic justification for being in the business of producing milk. They have been able to operate inefficiently and get by because of artificially high prices for milk, either through Government supports, marketing orders, or local regulations. As we produce more efficiently in Wisconsin and as we break down these artificial barriers to the flow of milk into other States, we in Wisconsin can expect to capture the markets now held by inefficient producers. These other areas can then return to crops for which their farms are more suited. This is happening to a slight extent already. Wisconsin milk production is down only slightly for the first 3 months of this year, but production nationwide is down almost 2 percent.

May I point to a final fact which faces the dairy industry—the fact that our brightest future lies in increasing the consumption of dairy products. This is a fact which we have been late to recognize. I have no doubt, however, that the industry is now well aware of the need to go out and sell its products. This festival is a significant contribution to that sales campaign.

Great progress has been made already. We are increasing the consumption of dairy products through giant advertising and merchandising plans sponsored by the dairy farmers themselves. My kids are singing "Davy Crockett, King of the Wild Frontier," because Davy Crockett is selling milk, butter, and cheese on the television. Our own Alice in Dairyland is promoting the sale of dairy products. You good people here are doing more than your share. The industry itself has come alive. We can expect more and better results as this gigantic promotion program takes hold of the American people, as it has begun to do already.

We begin with a tremendous advantage. We have an ideal product to sell. It is nature's finest food. It is inexpensive. It tastes good. That is a combination that can't be beaten. The American people need to be made aware that milk and its products are the source of over 100 different nutrients—vitamins, minerals, fats, sugars, and high-quality proteins. They need to be reminded that the 15 percent of their food dollar which they spend on dairy products brings them 25 percent of their food. They need to have brought to their attention the thousand and one different ways in which dairy products can be used to better the taste of their diets. That is the road to increased per capita consumption.

These jobs—and the job of better distribution of dairy products—are the responsibility of the industry and the dairy farmer, assisted by Government. It is a job which must be done.

I am supremely confident of the future of the dairy industry—so important to all of us in Wisconsin—if the industry continues to face up to the facts.

An understanding of the basic problem, a recognition of the proper role of Government, increased production efficiency and increased per capita consumption—these are the needs. These are the facts we face.

We have made great progress from the serious situation which confronted us only a year ago. We have a long way to go. But I believe strongly that we are moving toward the time, as the Secretary of Agriculture put it recently, when the support price will no longer be the ceiling price, as has been the case too long. Our goal, he said, is to have the farm price of milk move up in the market rather than on the statute book.

I am convinced we can reach that goal—if we continue to face the facts.

Tribute to Rev. A. A. Bedikian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I present a tribute to the Reverend A. A. Bedikian by M. Martin Turpanjian which appeared in the Waldwick (N. J.) Jersey Parade on Friday, May 13, 1955. The Reverend Bedikian is one of my most distinguished constituents and is celebrating the 40th anniversary of his ordination to the ministry. This happy event took place on April 30, 1955.

The author, Mr. Turpanjian, is president of the New Jersey League of Weekly Newspapers and is publisher of Jersey Parade.

Close to 1,000 persons were present at the testimonial banquet tendered to Rev. A. A. Bedikian, of Leonia, last Saturday night in Hotel McAlpin, New York City, on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of his ordination to the ministry under the auspices of the church boards and congregation of the Armenian Evangelical Church of New York City and the Armenian community of metropolitan New York-New Jersey area.

Dudley C. Allen, mayor of Leonia, paid a glowing tribute to the guest of honor for his tireless activities. The Reverend Y. H. Hadidian, of Watertown (Mass.) Church, Stephen Philibosian, Alex Manoogian, Hagop Andounian, Rev. Robert Bruce, Bedros Terzian, Rev. Douglas Horton, Rev. Henry Leiper, and the Most Reverend Archbishop Tiran, former prelate of the diocees of all the Armenian churches in America, were the other guest speakers.

Anahid Ajemian (violin), Norman Bailey (baritone), and Virginia Kondakjian (soprano) entertained, to the accompaniment of David Garey and Fred Haley.

During the past 40 years Rev. Bedikian has endeared himself to tens of thousands of people in metropolitan New York-New Jersey area. He is popular with the masses and the classes. He is a prolific writer and forceful orator. He is also the editor of the church bulletin and was recently installed as pastor emeritus for life by the unanimous vote of the church. He is indeed the embodiment of dynamic personality. On his arrival in fall of 1912 from Europe he entered the University of Chicago, where in the course of 3 years he was granted 3 academic degrees. He later on became instructor and lecturer at the Chicago University during the summer quarters for 7 years in succession. He began his pastorate on April 1, 1915, immediately after his graduation from Divinity School of the University of Chicago. He was ordained and installed in June of the same year by an ecclasiastic council called by the New York City Association of Congregational Churches. Previous to his arrival in this country he had been on the faculty of Robert College, Constantinople, for a period of 5 years.

In the presence of Rev. A. A. Bedikian you feel the warmth and the magnetic approach of the man who is distinctively humane and fair-minded.

Certificate for the purchase of a brand new auto was presented to Reverend Bedikian together with many other citations and gifts.

I lift my hat with a salute of pride to Reverend Bedikian. May he live long and enjoy the fruits of his labor.

The Reverend A. A. Bedikian was born on May 30, 1885, in Bardizag, near Constantinople, Turkey. His father, Arakel Garabed Bedikian, was originally from Harpoot, Armenia, and his mother, Arousiag Kourian Bedikian, was a native of Bardizag. His father was a famous writer under the pen name of "Kissag."

This is the epic of the Armenian Evangelical Church of New York City. On the religious horizon of metropolitan area it tells the story of an ordinary simple and honest clergyman who lived the drama of democracy. He is indeed the modern apostle of humanity.

Church Persecution in Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include at this time an editorial which appeared in the May 14 issue of the America forcefully revealing the fact that there is a cruel persecution of the Catholic people now going on in Argentina against which all Christian Americans of every denomination should unite in protest and in prayer that it will soon be reasonably ended.

The article follows:

CHURCH AND STATE IN ARGENTINA

In a May Day address to a rally of organized labor, President Juan D. Perón, who holds virtually absolute power in Argentina, made a great flourish of democratic fevor. He would leave the whole matter of state and church up to the people. "If they decide there must be separation, there will be separation, but if the people decide (the church) must go, it will go." This was doubtless the dictator's answer to the April 22 statement of the Argentine hierarchy. That statement made it clear that the bishops did not oppose the separation of powers or a just economic separation of church and state. Recalling the command of Christ to "render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's," the bishops reminded the faithful that they could not countenance a "moral separation" that would place a Catholic in the "sad situation of having to betray his conscience in order to obey a temporal ruler." Since last November, when Perón began his open attack on "political Catholicism," he has allowed the strictly Peronist press and the police to wage a vicious campaign of vilification and repression. His clear aim is to destroy the growing influence of the church among the working masses, the main base of his power. The workers cannot be allowed more than one loyalty in a totalitarian state. Eduardo Vuletich, secretary of the Argentine Labor Confederation, stated that theme clearly last November: "Down with the enemies of the people and the enemies of God. The fatherland has only one destiny; it is called Perón. The fatherland has a single motto: 'Always with Perón.'"

Address by Robert Bolwell, Ph. D., Before Graduating Class of Georgetown University Dental School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address of Robert Bolwell, Ph. D., professor of American literature and dean of the Graduate School at George Washington University, before the graduating class of the Dental School of the Georgetown University on May 26, 1955.

The New Jersey Board of Dental Examiners and the alumni of the Georgetown University Dental School were present on this occasion.

Congressman GEORGE S. LONG, of Louisiana, was awarded an honorary membership in the Georgetown University chapter of Omicron Kappa Upsilon, national dental honorary fraternity, at that time.

The address follows:

I have been enticed into this present predicament as your speaker by my admiration and friendship for Dean Rault (C. V. Rault, dean of Georgetown University Dental School). But despite the fact that I can blame him, because of his insistent invitations, for any impending fiasco here, I must confess that I am fully aware of my responsibilities in standing before you. Because this is an after-dinner talk and a celebration, I know I'm supposed to be somewhat funny. Because this is a school affair, with university officials and other professional brass present, I'm also supposed to be somewhat academic.

Well, the funny part of this talk lies only in the fact that, as a layman, I am going to dare talk to you about how to practice dentistry, now that you have completed 4 years of training for this practice under the guidance of highly qualified professional experts. That should be funny enough, and the academic part of this talk will be found in the deadly combination of natural seriousness and dullness which I have been cultivating during my 37 years of university work.

You will soon be licensed to enter another person's mouth with explorer, burr, and forceps, and do something there upon your own judgment and responsibility. Now, because you have spent so many years concentrating on the human mouth, and because you have read the wording of the laws defining the area and the limits of dental practice, I'm afraid you may think of this

carious or impacted or edentulous orifice as your field of practice.

This, I think, is basically wrong and it cramps and belittles the high professional concept which I wish to discuss. A dental patient is not a mouth any more than a dentist is a collection of skillful fingers and expensive hardware which enters that mouth. Dentistry is a relationship between two individuals.

However, good dentistry—really good dentistry—can exist only in the combination of a good dentist and a good patient. Like matrimony, dentistry is successful only when each sides does its full part. You dentists may think it's hard to find a good patient; we laymen think it's often hard to find a good dentist. It's wonderful when these rare people do happen to meet, but it's tedious and foolish to trust in the process of discovery by lucky accident. Now, I believe that dentists can speed up the production, both in quantity and quality, of good patients, and I'll even suggest how to do this.

But first, what is a good patient? Briefly, he is one who from his own angle knows what good dentistry is, and does his share to deserve and maintain it. Primarily, he presents a dental problem only, not an economic one. He is willing to pay for good dentistry and not restrict it because of cost. He also knows that good dentistry takes time as well as money. And he makes and keeps appointments as often as the dentist requires, avoiding the need of haste and shortcuts. He knows that good dentistry only begins in the dentist's office, and that it extends to his own bathroom and personal living habits. He takes advice about diet, and follows the routines of toothbrush, toothpick, and dental floss. He (or perhaps she) should place dental function before aesthetics. Personal vanity, objecting to the appearance of gold, or the feeling of having something false or removable in the mouth, or any restoration which might reveal age or deficiency—these are all regarded as trivial when compared with the use of the teeth, natural or artificial, for the enjoyment of food and the maintenance of health. This good patient doesn't have a one-job complex. He doesn't expect his dentistry to take care of itself, but willingly reports for prophylaxis and periodic check-up, and accepts whatever revision and alternation time and use demand. He knows that the teeth, natural or restored, get old along with his back muscles, his prostate, and his shoes. He doesn't clack and whistle with a plate which was fitted to tissues some 15 years earlier. This patient also should have graduated from dental jitters; that eversensitivity, or dread of going to the dentist; that anticipation of pain; that introspective search for something wrong, which possesses so many people. But often these things are part of the disease or trouble which brings the patient to the doctor. They are symptoms of something wrong either with the mouth, mentality, and general health of the patient; or (and this is significant) something wrong in his previous experience with bad dentistry. For example, a busy dentist who is careless and ruthless with children often poisons the attitude of the patient for many years following. But nervous jitters, like caries and malocclusion, the dentist must care or accept as part of the job.

Now, I hope you like my good patient. Some may suspect that I got help from my dental friends in order to describe him. I did not, nor did I describe him in order to benefit the dentist. The function of the good patient is not to make a dentist happy; instead, the patient who has these attitudes and characteristics is merely making his own necessary contribution to the good dentistry which he expects, and may well demand, to receive. Nevertheless, dentists say, "If I could only find such a patient all my troubles would be over." But I claim that when the dentist finds such a patient his troubles have only begun. With such a patient in his charge everything else is squarely on his own nose. The chief barrier to good dentistry has been removed, except the limitations of the dentist himself. He has now a clear field and a clear responsibility. He can do good work and receive professional and personal reward; he can do poor work and risk divorce from a good patient.

Now, what is a good dentist? There's a very long and also a short answer to that question, and I'll comfort you with the short one. A good dentist is the sum total of all that you should have learned in your dental school, plus all that you still may learn by active participation in your national association, your local society, your study club, and your clinical research, plus the intelligent application of your total dental experience with your patients, plus the only item in this list which can come from inside yourself, the force of character which is expressed through your professional integrity. That's all there is to a good dentist.

But the dentist is also a human being (at least most of them are) in a personal relationship with the patient who, remember, is not just a mouth containing disease or disfunction, but another human being. Do you think this is too obvious to mention? Well, 60 years of intimate contact, professional and personal, with dentists have convinced me that this obvious fact is the one which is most neglected or forgotten. There are some sour cracks which I've heard from many other professional groups. We university professors, especially in exam periods, often say ours would be a pleasant life but for the students; our librarians who like all their books neatly in place on their shelves, feel the same way about the readers who use and disturb, and wear out these books. I suppose a priest sometimes thinks his ministry would be a pleasure but for the sinners who mess it up.

In the dental office of a friend of mine I overheard both doctors and nurses referring to many regular patients as "C. P. A.'s." I looked at these various types of people closely—surely they could not all be certified public accountants. They were not—but they had each failed somehow to be a good patient, and now bore an office label meaning a "chronic pain in the anus." I'm sure they deserve this label, but think of the nature of this human relationship shown by this critical attitude held by dentists and their staffs. The dental skill of the doctor can meet the problem presented by each of these C. P. A. mouths, but the human relationship between doctor and patient was only of irritation, dislike, and therefore of sour, critical, fault-finding. This personality conflict can only result in a mere dental job, the patient going to another office for future work, and the dentist chasing after him with a bill collector. Neither party was good, and the dentistry could not be either. A lot of these patients, as voters, ignorantly agitate for socialized dentistry, and a desire for revenge, and their foolish, sweeping generalized remarks about the "racket" of the profession soil and impair the status of dentistry won for you by generations of your predecessors.

The people who will become your patients, men, women, and children, are only as human as you are, with sensitivities, virtues, and faults like your own. They will frequently become your neighbors and friends, and generally hold the same social views and status you hold. Their chief difference from you will usually be that they are not members of a traditional profession with its ethical and moral freedom and responsibility. They can become good patients or CPA's, largely because of your relationship with them. The assumption must be that you wish to be good dentists, and to achieve good dentistry in their mouths. But I've already discovered, and declared to you, that good dentistry requires a good patient as well as a good dentist. To make good patients out of potential CPA's is, therefore, another major aspect of your practice.

In order to entice you into this additional phase of dental practice, remember I've heard your elders say, "If I could have nothing but these good patients, all my troubles would be over." How do you make this good patient? Teach him. All complaints against dentists can be put into two heads only: either the dentistry is poor, or the patient is ignorant. Teach and talk good dentistry, don't just practice it. Let me be personal: A glance at the dentistry in my mouth would prove that I have spent many hundreds of hours in dental chairs. I can testify concerning the conversations between the dentist and his patient. For years, with my mouth wide open, I've listened to monologs about the political situation, the stock market, or the way the fish are biting. Now all these and other things are worth talking about, but I never think of dentists as being expert or competent, or even very interesting, on such topics. There's one topic on which I want my dentist to talk; on which he's an expert, and every word from him has particular value; and that's my mouth and the kind of dentistry he wants to put in it. In fact, I've even paid to hear a dentist talk about this, and do no work.

Not only does every patient want this sort of thing—he's entitled to it. Talk dentistry to your patient, not just once, during the first appointment when you are laying out the job; but step by step, each time he comes in, discuss and explain the details of the problem. You'll even find yourself becoming as interested in it as the patient is. Justify the particular method you are using, and explain why you have rejected others. Give him a mirror and teach him how to use it while you're working. Take him occasionally, for a few minutes, into your laboratory, and show how much dentistry you practice for him behind his back. He doesn't know the time, labor, and material expense which you invest in his total job. Show him his X-ray pictures and his own study models. Explain the use of your appliances, machines, and waxes. When time permits, on an overlapping appointment, even allow one patient to look in another's mouth. Both will be flattered by your action; one because his is an interesting case, the other because of his superior dental understanding. Remember that all patients are predisposed in your favor—they want to believe that their dentist is tops. They will be attentive and willing students of their own dental problems; they will eagerly tell other people what they are learning, and how good you are. Good dentistry shouldn't be a closely guarded secret confined to the mind and hands of the dentist. It's silly to display your manual and mechanical skill, and give the impression that's all there is to it. Why hide the fact that scientific knowledge, intelligence, and careful judgment are also required in this important practice? You are not giving up a professional advantage by instructing patients in these details. Your own work will improve when you are concentrating upon the explanation of your procedures, instead of performing a subconscious operation along with a chat about the world series. Above all, don't get tired of this teaching assignment after a few lazy tries. Some of you patients, like yourselves, will be quite stupid about something which has never before been explained to them. If you give up too soon, that means you'd rather have CPA's for patients.

In my numerous and frequent contact with dental groups (because most of my dearest friends are dentists) I have also developed another idea for the good of the profession, which may be derived from my job as dean of a graduate school producing only Ph. D.'s. I should like to see a fair percentage of every

dental graduating class go into further graduate study in the basic biological and physical sciences. I don't mean a decorative M. S. degree usually scooped up while waiting for a practice to develop—but the Ph. D. researcher, with a dental education, who will serve his profession in the laboratory and on a dental school faculty. I am, frankly, jealous of the number of research specialists with Ph. D. degrees and millions of dollars from private and public funds who are serving medicine as a separate profession. I am not going to develop this theme here and now, but I hope some of you remember it, if your talents and ambition should direct you into this branch of service.

In conclusion, I would have you enjoy a deep and genuine pride in your profession, which in turn can give you deep and genuine gratification. American dentistry is the best in the world, and its eminence as an autonomous profession of dignity and merit is the result of more than a century of dedicated effort by your predecessors. They can rest happy if your generation leaves the profession in as favored a position as now, when you take over.

United States Patent Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following series of articles which appeared recently in the Dayton Daily News, Dayton, Ohio, written by Mr. William L. Sanders, relative to the situation in the United States Patent Office, which has reached emergency status.

The patent system is of vital importance to our country's economy and defense. It has been estimated that 75 percent of the jobs in this country today are due to inventions made within the last 50 years and a large fraction of the income of the Federal Government is based on business which exists only as a result of invention. The very outcome of any future war will also depend largely on new inventions.

The number of applications filed has been steadily rising but the length of time between the filing and the granting of a patent is becoming increasingly longer. This situation has the effect of discouraging inventors because of the risk involved in marketing a product without patent protection. Increasing the examining staff of the Patent Office is not the sole answer to this problem. The most urgent need is the development of an efficient and modern classification system and mechanized search methods for without these aids it is still an unreasonable time-consuming task to examine the thousands of previous patents in any one field.

Mr. Sanders has done a great deal of research to enable him to present this problem to the public and I would like to make his series of articles available to all who are interested in the progress of science and industry.

The articles follow:

[From the Dayton Daily News of May 22, 1955]

PATENT PROBLEMS—MORE FUNDS NEEDED, DAYTON LAWYER SAYS

(By William L. Sanders)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—A Senate committee on May 11 approved a $50,000 appropriation to conduct an "examination and review" of the United States Patent Office administration and laws. This is the first of a series on problems of the Patent Office as related by Dayton experts.)

Lack of funds to operate the Patent Office is strangling the United States patent system, Lawrence B. Biebel, Dayton patent attorney and president-elect of the American Patent Law Associaion, declared yesterday.

"The plight of the Patent Office has become critical during the last 2 years," Biebel asserted. "Work of the Office has increased 25 percent. Concurrently, the number of examiners has decreased proportionately."

The Dayton patent attorney asserted that penny-wise, pound-foolish appropriations for the Patent Office have resulted in crippling the patent system at a time when applications for patents are increasing.

According to the Commissioner of Patents, the workload has been increasing since 1952. During that year, 60,386 applications were filed. The number had mounted to 75,271 in 1954.

Meanwhile, congressional appropriations for the Patent Office were cut from $12,219,388, to $11,933,934. For fiscal 1955, the figure is down to $11,500,000.

The appropriation asked by the Budget Bureau for fiscal 1956 is $12 million, compared to the $15 million, which leaders of the association assert is essential for efficient operation of the Patent Office.

The backlog of 96,836 applications in 1952 grew to 208,566 as of January 31, 1955, the Patent Commissioner has disclosed. This means that the number of applications per examiner has risen from 134 to more than 180.

"Nearly 100 more than the 630 members of the examining corps in 1954 would be required merely to keep abreast of the inflow of new work," the Commissioner said. "The present blacklog would remain undiminished.

Biebel noted that the Patent Office had been obliged to defer action on the backlog of amended cases in order to concentrate on current applications. Simultaneously, the Patent Office reduced its printing outlay and pared other essential expenses to the bone to retain 25 examiners who otherwise would have been lost.

The board of governors of the Dayton Patent Law Association, headed by Frederick Boyer, of Hamilton, solidly supports Biebel's contention that "tomorrow's economy will suffer by reason of today's congressional parsimony respecting the patent system," in a memorandum to Members of Congress, the Dayton association asserts:

"Only a strong patent system provides the necessary incentive for the competition which results in constant improvement in the many things that we now take for granted. Many of the world's leading scientific advancements have been made in the United States as a result of the protection offered by our patent system."

The local association lists as the immediate results of the growing delay and difficulties incident to obtaining a patent:

1. Retarding technical advancements beneficial to the public.

2. Endangering the validity of patents granted because of the possibility of insufficient examinations of previous grants.

3. Entangling litigation as an outcome of possible doubtful patent validity.

During the fiscal year 1954, the Patent Office had a net income of $6,054,791 from fees, an increase of more than $434,000 over 1953 and greatest in the history of the Patent Office. By law, all of this had to be turned over to the Federal Government's general fund.

Reportedly, no other Government department returns to the general fund so large a proportion of its budget. Nevertheless, the appropriations for the Patent Office have been whittled to a point where inventors and industrialists are becoming alarmed.

[From the Dayton Daily News of May 23, 1955]

PATENT PROBLEMS—BUDGET DECREASE DELAYS PATENT OFFICE FUNCTIONS

(By William L. Sanders)

(Second of a series)

The plight of the Patent Office, resulting from the decrease in appropriations for its work, brought sharp comments from a number of Daytonians interested in patents.

Fred Hooven, Dayton inventor, observed, "The thing that is hard to see is that right now our inventors are turning out our 1965 model economy. The pennies we save now on our patent system will cost many dollars then.

"The whole American economic system depends on an expanding economy. The expanding economy depends very largely on the inventor and the inventor depends on the patent system. * * * Patents are the inventor's stock in trade, and when we add a year to the time it takes him to obtain a patent, we have taken a year's income away from him."

Hooven called patents "the seed for our future prosperity."

In somewhat similar vein, Louis Polk, president of the Sheffield Corp., said that the protection offered by patents to individuals and organizations without discrimination encourages the investment of human talents and money in the development of new products and the improvement of old ones.

"Delay in the issuance of patents because of a lack of manpower and proper facilities for the Patent Office is threatening the basic functions of the vital system," Polk asserted. "Unless steps are taken to remedy the situation, harmful effects will be felt throughout industry and the Nation."

Louis Wozar, president and general manager of the Dayton Pump & Manufacturing Co., strongly seconded Polk's comments. He described the present plight of the Patent Office as "a handicap to all companies with an aggressive research and engineering program."

As an example, Wozar cited his company's 5-year research program of developing a number of new pumps. Because of the lag in granting patents, Dayton Pump's competitors have copied its new designs and features, thereby "saving research and engineering expenses they otherwise would have been obliged to spend. In a situation like this, our competitors are cashing in on our research."

Another Dayton firm, the Duriron Co., relies on patents. R. C. Schenck, Duriron president, said: "It is important to us to be able to obtain patents with reasonable promptness. It is a serious handicap for the work of the Patent Office to be so far behind that it is 4 or 5 years before we can obtain issuance of our patents.

"This leaves a long period of uncertainty when neither we nor our competitors can determine what rights we have and deprives us of the proper protection, particularly during the earlier and introductory period of our new developments.

Charles H. Somers, vice president of the Fyr-Fiter Co., said that over the past several years his company had found it was taking an increasingly longer period for replies from the patent examiner and the issuance of patents.

"This immediately puts us in a precarious position and possibly leaves us open to patent litigation owing to infringements. * * * It is essential that anything we may submit to the patent office be examined and accepted or rejected at the earliest possible moment."

C. P. Meredith, executive vice president of the Steel Products Engineering Co. in Springfield, put it this way: "The delays we have encountered in processing patents in recent years handicaps us in furthering new ideas and also in finding out where our competition may have ideas that are conflicting or competitive with ours. * * *

"If we are to be further handicapped because of less money made available to the patent office, we believe it will be a handicap to industry generally and particularly to our company."

Hal O. Gummere, vice president and general manager of the Euckeye Tools Corp., affirmed that in the course of his company's research and development, unique systems and mechanisms are involved.

"The opportunity to realize a return on the investment made in reaching that stage lies in the protection inherent in a patent," he stressed. "Under present conditions, the granting of a patent may require 4 or 5 years from the date of the original application. During this period our protection is nonexistent. Any manufacturer is free to duplicate our products. It is even possible that by the time the patent is issued, usage requirements or demand may have changed to the extent that the patent has no value."

According to Lawrence B. Biebel, Dayton patent attorney and president-elect of the American Patent Law Association, these statements reflect the views of many other Miami Valley inventors and industrial leaders.

[From the Dayton Daily News of May 24, 1955]

PATENT PROBLEMS—PLIGHT OF UNITED STATES OFFICE DUE TO LACK OF FUNDS

(By William L. Sanders)

(Last of a series)

The Dayton Patent Law Association, and Lawrence B. Biebel, president-elect of the American Patent Law Association, are not alone in sounding an alarm over the plight of the United States Patent Office.

The New York Patent Law Association also charges that the patent system is being strangled by lack of adequate operating funds. According to this source, the situation has reached emergency status.

The New York memorandum explains that 75 percent of the jobs in this country today are due to inventions made within the last 50 years. These are cited: automobiles, airplanes, radio, television, moving pictures, automatic telephones, home appliances, synthetic rubber, plastics, electronics, business machines, aspirin, wonder drugs, cellophane, nylon, rayon, Army tanks, guided missiles, proximity fuse, and atomic energy.

The New York association also points out that a large fraction of the income of the Federal Government is based on business which exists only as a result of an invention—"and the patent system is the most important stimulus to the making of inventions."

Biebel said the plight of the Patent Office was the more serious because of the growing complexity of modern machinery. Similarly, the rise of research institutes and the establishment of industrial research departments by the Nation's corporations call for an efficient Patent Office.

Recently it was disclosed that the Battelle Memorial Institute in Columbus had jumped from a volume of $71,000 in 1930 to $600,000 in 1940, and to over $6,600,000 in 1950. Last year the research figure was $15 million.

Similar figures could be cited from other research institutions.

This is the age of electronics and growing automation (automatic production). Electronic "brains" already give great promise in directing "banks" of production and office machines.

"Further advances in these fields are tied to the patent system," Biebel said. "The situation calls not for a slowdown in the Patent Office but for more qualified examiners to handle the increased patent-application load."

At the same time, Fred Boyer, of Hamilton, president of the Dayton Patent Law Association, pointed out the developing need for introducing electronic devices in the work of the Patent Office. However, the meager appropriations do not cover the cost of an adequate staff of examiners. There's no money for modernizing the operations of the Office to cut down the time factor in processing patent applications.

Moreover, special machines would have to be developed. The cost would run into millions, and such sums are not in sight. Such an outlay, in the long run, would add not only to the efficiency of the Office, but also to the Nation's economic well-being through a stepped-up clearance of patent applications, Boyer observed.

Asked whether big corporations trample the rights of individuals in the field of patents, Biebel said that "corporations generally do not practice chicanery in the handling of patents."

He added that "the function of the patent system is to define a patent and to safeguard the inventor's rights."

A corporation that tried to take advantage of an individual could get itself into no end of difficulties—the law is very definitely geared to protect the rights of the individual respecting his inventions, he explained.

"The present plight of the Patent Office is not a question of big business institutions versus individuals," the Dayton patent attorney asserted. "It's a question of niggardly appropriations at a time when patent applications are outrunning the capacity of the Patent Office to handle them."

Small Business Throughout the Nation Asks: "When Are the Antitrust Laws Really Going To Be Vigorously Enforced?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, a veteran champion of the cause of small business, Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, recently made a statement before the House Judiciary Committee which is deserving of the attention of all of us, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Burger's remarks be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. Burger's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE J. BURGER, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, BEFORE THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, MAY 18, 1955

I am George J. Burger, vice president in charge of legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. Our national headquarters are located in Burlingame, Calif. We also maintain division offices at New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago.

I am more than pleased to have the privilege to appear before the committee and express our views on the report of the study group of the Attorney General on the antitrust laws, and I wish to state that their findings come to us as no great surprise.

It goes without saying, from the first instance, due to the earlier reports emanating, direct or indirect, that the committee would recommend the repeal of the Fair Trade Acts. If such action is ever instituted by the Congress, in repeal of the National Fair Trade Acts, it is our opinion such action would go a long ways to increase monopoly in the distribution field and result in diminishing numbers of independent business, both at the production and distribution level.

On the subject of fair-trade laws—all they do is put competition where it rightfully belongs—with the producer of trade-marked brands.

It must be understood by the committee that no officer or group of officers can speak officially for the federation unless so instructed by the nationwide poll of our membership, and the members have repeatedly taken a very affirmative position for an all-out vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Carrying out this directive of our nationwide membership, it will be found that in our recommendations before the platform committees of both the Republican and Democratic National Conventions, in Philadelphia in 1948, and then again in Chicago in 1952, the first and principal recommendation we made to protect independent business was for an all-out vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws. We have never wavered in this principal and main objective to protect small business through these necessary laws.

The federation lives with the proposition antitrust laws daily—and I mean daily—through our nationwide contacts in the field through our field forces, so that we are cognizant of the overall monopolistic trend prevailing in our economy, as our information comes from the grassroots, which is the best source of information, and far more important than coming from any so-called study group. We live with the problem daily.

I think it is necessary to call to the attention of the committee the statement I made November 17, 1948, before the House Small Business Committee, in which I stated: "In my visits in the respective cities it would appear that antitrust violations are becoming more rampant than ever before in the history of our Nation. It has reached an exceptionally low level. In most States there are laws for protection where violations are taking place, but it is my opinion that many States are deficient in carrying out the laws, and the public is being gouged through such practices. More important, small business is being misled and the free-enterprise system is falling by the wayside." Our views are no different today than they were then. In fact, we believe the condition is worsening, both in the production and distribution field, through concentration, and surely the study group must have had some information on these trends existing in our overall economy, and it will be found during the life of the study group that we have kept them regularly informed of this serious situation.

It is well to note that on April 20, 1955, Mr. Robert A. Bicks, executive secretary of the study group, wrote me—and in part I quote: "Some time ago you submitted views to the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws. Our policy was to distribute such submisssions only to committee members." That confirms our statement that the group was advised as to the trend taking place in the economy, due to what we believe, are rampant violations of the antitrust laws.

In our communications to the study group I particularly referred to the testimony I gave before the House Small Business Committee November 17, 1948, which embodies certain important recommendations to bring about strengthening and vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws, and, more important, to bring long-overdue respect to the laws. Apparently the recommendations were received and noted, because no part of the complete report carried any recommendations for the enforcement along the lines embodied in the testimony given on November 17, 1948.

In the Committee's final report, which we reviewed very carefully, we find nothing in the report that calls for vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws, nor do we find any recommendations for increased appropriations to the antitrust agencies, and particularly to that Division of the Department of Justice.

Some few years ago we discovered that the appropriations to the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice were approximately $4 million for the fiscal year. We appeared before the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and asked the question: "Would the appropriation of $4 million be good business insurance for the Government that would insure the business life of four million or more small business institutions?" In simple words, we looked upon it as "peanut" appropriations.

We had notified the study group during its existence of important testimony given by the then Assistant Attorney General before a Senate committee in February 1947. This career man in the Government told the committee that for 35 years or more the administrations had merely given lipservice to the enforcement of the antitrust laws. This in itself was an indication to the Committee in its study that something was wrong in the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and is it any wonder that small business of the Nation came to the universal comment—when it comes to antitrust law enforcement nothing will be done.

It is not our intention to burden the Committee with a long digest on the complete report and its findings, but there are some high spots in the report which we believe need careful review, and action upon the part of the Small Business Committee being on record as rejecting and opposing certain recommendations of the study group.

The fines proposed, increased from 5 to 10 thousand dollars are ridiculous on the face of it. If fines are levied for violation of the antitrust laws, and they should apply also to small business if they are found in violations, such fines would probably destroy many small businesses, where the real culprits in deliberate violations of the antitrust laws would laugh at such fines. It is true that one branch of the Congress has voted increasing penalties to $50,000. That might help or ease the situation. However, we believe more important amendments to the antitrust laws would be to stop and curb deliberate violations of many large factors in our overall economy.

We find no evidence in the committee's report for vigorous enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act, but we do find suggested amendments which small business will oppose and we hope and trust that your Small Business Committee will also vigorously oppose.

We were amazed that there was an indirect recommendation in the committee's report as it applied to the quantity limit proviso under the Robinson-Patman Act. We understood it to mean, from the committee's report, a repeal of that section of the law. It's very important for the committee to review the testimony given before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on March 18, 1953, as to the great interest members of that committee had in the quantity discount proviso, although at the time applying to only one major industry, nevertheless, the Senate committee was aware of the fact that the application of this rule could spread to other industries and they were questioning the nominee at the time to the Federal Trade Commission, as to what position he would take on such applications of the rule.

The study group was aware of this importance of the long overdue utilization of the quantity discount proviso, and probably thought it best to make the correction now before the rule could spread to other monopolistic industries, and through the application of the rule save the business life of efficient independent business throughout the Nation.

Small business will oppose any juggling or amending the Robinson-Patman Act. When the law was placed on the statute books small business looked upon that law as their Magna Carta. Unfortunately, however, we find no all-out vigorous enforcement of the act which would bring relief at the local level.

In certain industries they have deliberately violated the Robinson-Patman Act, and possibly they came to the conclusion, through cases pending before antitrust agencies, nothing would be done on the act to enforce it, and consequently, they took the least course of resistance and instituted similar policies which would be in violation of the Robinson-Patman Act.

I believe it can be stated, Mr. Chairman, that small business throughout the Nation is less interested in study groups in the Government, but they are more interested in teeth being put into the law in enforcement, and further, there can be no future for independent business of this Nation unless they get this protection and immediate protection through the enforcement of the antitrust laws.

No one knows better than we in the National Federation of Independent Business as to the trend taking place in our economy. It's a serious situation and we cannot understand how in the extensive study and time taken by the Attorney General's study group they failed to become aware of this situation, namely, the fear in the minds of many small businesses, both at the production and distribution level, where they have knowledge from factual evidence of violations of the antitrust laws, but when it comes to laying the facts on the line the usual answer from small business is "We would like to come forward and give the whole story and quote the source, but we are fearful of retaliations."

This is the actual happenings which are taking place, as we review the scene from our national operations.

A final statement expressing the grassroots sentiment of our economy is ably stated in the following short paragraph. He said: "I am disturbed that our Congressmen can become so concerned about juvenile delinquency but bat no eye over administrative delinquency—with respect to the antitrust laws. To not enforce is a violation of law and the ward cop gets bounced for it. Further, if he's in with the ring he's fined and stretches a while in the jug."

Mr. Chairman, is it any wonder that small business throughout this Nation comes to the conclusion: "When are the antitrust laws really going to be vigorously enforced"? Surely the Attorney General's Study Group must have had some knowledge of the failure to enforce the antitrust laws. If not, then their study was in vain. For example: On April 26, 1955, Mr. Joseph E. Sheehy, Director (Bureau of Litigation), Federal Trade Commission, told a subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee that the FTC had made a sweeping probe of the rubber big three, presumably since 1947. In part his testimony disclosed tiremakers pay oil marketeers override "in consideration of cooperation and assistance in making sale of TBA (tire, batteries and accessories) products to contract and leased stations. The override varies from 5 percent to 10 percent, depending on the product and customer classification. In an 18-month period combined sales of 2 tire manufacturers to filling stations of a single oil company were more than $56 million, and the combined override paid was in excess of $5 million.

What really takes place is no sale by the tire company to the oil companies. In simple words, the oil company encourages filling stations to handle approved TBA lines.

Still the record will show that the Federal Trade Commission, in a report prepared for the Temporary National Economic Committee in 1939 stated:

"The Federal Trade Commission, in a report prepared for the Temporary National Economic Committee, stated that investigations and complaints brought by the Federal Trade Commission have gone a long way toward eliminating the practice of tire companies of granting overriding commissions to the oil companies for permission to sell their stations tires and tubes, dealers feel that the major oil producers must still be receiving a quid pro quo for their efforts to induce their stations to handle only acceptable lines."

The Federal Trade Commission was aware of this situation as disclosed by the Senate Small Business Committee in the early summer of 1941.

We are sure that some members of the Advisory Committee were cognizant of the problems both in the rubber tire and the petroleum industry and must have had knowledge of these continual violations of the antitrust laws, and hence the recommendations in the report that for practical purposes would nullify the antitrust laws, including the Robinson-Patman Act.

Mr. Chairman, in urging your committee to reject the report made by the Attorney General's Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws, we further urge that consideration be given to a thorough investigation of the Federal Trade Commission as it relates to that agency's enforcement of the laws entrusted to it by the Congress, and particularly the Robinson-Patman Act.

Destroy or weaken the antitrust laws and you destroy small business and you destroy initiative for the youth of this Nation who desire to go into their own individual business.

Thanks.

Bungled by Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which I include in my remarks, Bungled by Bureaucracy, appearing in the Boston Post, properly places the responsibility for the unfortunate and confused handling of polio vaccine upon the shoulders of President Eisenhower:

BUNGLED BY BUREAUCRACY

The American people paid for the search for a safe and effective vaccine to immunize against polio. From the start of the first March of Dimes fund raising, up to the very moment that the Salk vaccine was announced to be safe and effective at Ann Arbor on April 12, the American people gave generously

in the hope of reaching the final goal—control and elimination of polio.

The fact that the late President Roosevelt was a victim of crippling infantile paralysis, and that he was instrumental in setting up the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis gave enormous impetus to the fight against the disease.

The American people were entitled to a more effective and efficient administration of the vaccine program than they have been given to date. The Salk vaccine was press-agented in such a way that word reached the ears of every parent, no matter in what remote hamlet, that the vaccine was successful within a very few hours after the Ann Arbor ceremony.

Since then there has been nothing but confusion. Only yesterday was the first nationl conference of State and Territorial health officers called by Surgeon General Scheele to meet with the National Foundation and American Medical Association representatives. They are going to try to lock the barn door after the horse has strayed.

The administration bungled the vaccine program. President Eisenhower was quick to jump in with an announcement that the vaccine would be made available to the whole world—but no effective plan was prepared to make it available to the children of America. That was left to bungling bureaucrats.

The bungling was in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and specifically was the fault of Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby. When the success of the Salk vaccine was assured, and it had such an astounding reception, Secretary Hobby hastened into the limelight to take a few ladylike bows, forgot to mention the fact that her Department was not adequately prepared for dealing with the vaccine shortage. Her Department, moreover, had no coordinated plan with State health officials or national or State medical associations.

If the parents of America want to trace the bungling back to its source it must go into the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis had raised the money. Dr. Salk had produced the vaccine. The test had been carried out. But, Mrs. Hobby's Department fell down flat on its face. And that is the concern of President Eisenhower.

Beware of the Soviet Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include at this time an editorial appearing in the May 16 issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette wisely pointing out that although we may be hopeful concerning the apparent change in the Russian attitude we must remain practically wise enough to look at the record and wait for the proof.

The article follows:

SIGNS OF A CHANGE IN SOVIET TACTICS

Signs continue to multiply that a major Soviet realinement in Europe may be in prospect and, indeed, in process. One evidence is the Big Four agreement, at long last, on the Austrian Peace Treaty signed Sunday. Another is formalizing of a unified military command by the Russians and their seven East European satellites.

Even more striking is the planned visit of Soviet Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin and Nikita S. Khrushchev, Communist Party boss, to Yugoslavia. This Soviet turnabout follows 7 years of bitterness between Moscow and Marshal Tito's Communist state.

There is speculation that the Russian leaders will seek to draw a statement of complete neutrality from Tito, their aim being to establish a chain of neutral, buffer countries from Sweden and Finland on the north to Yugoslavia on the south.

It has not been the custom for the top leaders of the Soviet Union to travel about, peddling their program in countries outside the Red orbit. That makes this visit to Yugoslavia particularly noteworthy—and dangerous to the West. Obviously, the Russians consider it highly important to lure Tito away from his present association with the free world.

These developments, piling one atop another in recent days, help explain why a Big Four Conference is to be held this summer. The suspicion is unavoidable that a fundamental change in Soviet tactics is shaping up.

The Big Four meeting, to which Russia has now agreed, should give some indication of what this change means to the free nations. On the surface, the Soviet Union is bidding for more friendly relations with the West and with the uncommitted nations.

That lends hope to the possibility that some better understanding can be achieved at the Big Four session. But the West, having been burned before, will continue to be wary.

Are the Foundations Untouchable?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the June 1955 issue of the American Legion magazine:

ARE THE FOUNDATIONS UNTOUCHABLE?

(By Harold Lord Varney)

What happens when a smart and determined congressional committee uncovers a record of stupid and irresponsible leftism involving some of the top organization executives and educators of the country?

Particularly when it transpires that the apparent leftist dupes have been operating under the irreproachable names of Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Ford?

One man in Washington knows from painful experience the answer to this question.

B. CARROLL REECE, chairman of the Special House Committee (of the 83d Congress), to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations, has just finished an X-ray operation on the big funds which has disclosed some truly sobering facts. His disclosures have brought down upon his head one of the most venomous barrages of brickbats and dead cats that Washington has witnessed for many a year. So dense has been the publicity smoke screen that, even yet, few Americans are aware of the blasting indictment of foundation practices which the committee documented in its findings.

The American Legion is directly concerned with this issue because, at its 1954 convention, it unanimously passed a resolution asking for a further investigation of the foundations by the 84th Congress.

If such an inquiry is voted, Chairman REECE's experience should be a stop-look-listen warning to the new committee of what is in store for it. The controversial foundations are past masters of the art of turning tables on their investigators. As Chairman REECE discovered painfully, some of them fight dirty.

Storm clouds hung heavy over the committee from the date of its authorization by the House on July 27, 1953. This was the second congressional look at the foundations. They had already been investigated by the Cox committee in the 82d Congress. The consensus was that the Cox probe had been superficial and timid. Chairman Cox himself had died midway in the inquiry. Others on the committee, including the staff, had appeared half hearted as the investigation proceeded. Research had been incomplete; foundation big brass, when they took the stand, were not even put under oath. As might have been expected, the probe had ended in a virtual whitewash.

Such findings were a jolting shock to informed Americans who were in a position to know how much the committee had missed. The real foundation story had not been told. Representative REECE, who had been a minority member of the committee, was of this opinion. Following up the Cox committee recommendation that "the inquiry might be continued by the 83d Congress with profit," he introduced a resolution providing for a second investigation. The Reece move caught the foundation partisans off guard. It went through the House by a rollcall vote of 209 to 183.

The controversial foundations were not caught napping again. They quickly bestirred themselves. Shrewd foundation brains went to work to devise a sure-fire technique to bring the new probe into disrepute. They came up with some highly effective roadblocks.

First, it was proposed to starve the committee for money. This was easy since the chairman of the House Administration Committee, CARL LECOMPTE, who was the bottleneck in financial decisions, disclosed an unsympathetic attitude toward the inquiry.

Obviously, to uncover the needed facts concerning the approximately 7,000 important foundations, with their $7.5 billion of resources, a wide-ranging and costly research job was called for. Chairman REECE, after receiving an initial grant of $50,000, modestly asked for only $120,000 additional. The Republican high command in the House, uneasy lest the inquiry embarrass men close to President Eisenhower or actual members of the administration, cut him down to only $65,000. Such a meager sum was not enough even to get him off the ground. Even this amount was not authorized until after months of demoralizing delay.

Another way was to stack the investigating committee with members biased in favor of the foundations, to "box Chairman REECE in," as the phrase of the moment went. This was done. Three of the five appointed members of the committee had actually voted against the Reece resolution on the rollcall.

An almost perfect hatchetman was found in the person of Representative WAYNE L. HAYS of Ohio. HAYS, an ex-high-school teacher, with some familiarity with the educational field, is a back bench left wing Democrat.

At the very beginning, HAYS stated to Norman Dodd, committee research director, and to General Counsel Rene A. Wormser, that he was opposed to the investigation (he had voted against the Reece resolution), and that he had been appointed ranking Democrat on the committee by Minority Leader SAM RAYBURN with the express understanding that he would do everything in his power to prevent the committee from going too far in its inquiry.

HAYS saw in his new role an opportunity to project himself into the political big time, and he seized the chance with alacrity.

A third gambit was the smear. With such powerful national publications as Time, the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the Washington Post and Times Herald, etc., aggressively in the foundations' corner, it was easy to put across a stereotype that the investigation was the work of crackpots and reactionaries. The slanted news spilled over onto the editorial page. There was one period when the New York Times ran an almost daily editorial of sneers and barbs directed at Chairman REECE and his staff. Such saturation anticommittee publicity had its effect in confusing uninformed minds.

In the face of these mantraps, Chairman REECE preceeded doggedly with his task.

To make certain that the investigation should be fair and unsparing, two courses were decided upon. First, there must be a thorough job of preliminary research. The failure of the Cox committee to prepare itself by such research was painfully before REECE's eyes. The Cox committee had been outsmarted by some of the foundation witnesses because it had lacked independent information by which to check their statements. In the case of the Ford Foundation, most controversial of the big funds, the Cox committee had made almost no check, relying upon the ex parte statements of its officers. The further bumble had been made in the public hearings of reversing the ordinary procedure and hearing the foundation defenders first, before a clear indictment could be laid down.

To avoid such dead-end results, Chairman REECE decided (1) to place the critical witnesses on the stand first, and thus make clear to the country what the committee was shooting at, and (2) to precede the hearings with as complete a job of independent research as the slim budget would permit.

Later, HAYS and other foundation spokesmen vociferously accused the committee of doing something unfair in not hearing the foundation defenders first. The decision to put on the critics ahead of the defenders was reached after General Counsel Wormser had conferred with counsel for various foundations and had been told that they wanted a bill of particulars. This procedure was approved by a unanimous vote of an executive meeting of the full committee, with HAYS in hearty support.

The type of men engaged for the staff indicated REECE's determination to conduct a high-minded and all-out inquiry. For research director, the committee turned to the financial world and engaged Norman Dodd, a man who had spent years in research on the foundation problem, assisted on the committee by the able Thomas M. McNiece and, for a time, by Karl Ettinger.

Rene A. Wormser, author and lawyer—a man of national legal standing—was appointed general counsel. Mr. Wormser's associate counsel Arnold T. Koch, an eminent trial lawyer, and legal analyst Kathryn Casey were exemplary choices. It was a strong team. Moreover, Mr. Wormser, Mr. Dodd, and Mr. McNiece were not novices in foundation matters: all had been closely associated with foundation problems. They were not likely to be decoyed by foundation executive doubletalk or excuses.

In view of the scrupulous effort of the chairman to conduct an inquiry which fair men would respect, it was a natural assumption that the controversial foundations would welcome this opportunity to answer publicly some of the accusations which had been widely bruited against them. Men whose record is defensible do not shun scrutiny.

Instead, some of the foundation big brains determined upon a wrecking job. It was a disgraceful performance. Every canon of personal decency was rudely disregarded in the effort to discredit REECE and his colleagues. Such an exhibition has not been witnessed in a Washington investigation in years. In most of the calculated disorder, Representative HAYS was the kickoff man.

Because Mr. HAYS is small fry in the Washington political picture, it is reasonable to assume that he was encouraged in his part by high-level prompters.

Because Mr. HAYS likes to talk, he inadvertently revealed this in offhand conversations with Research Director Dodd. Thus, at one juncture, he dropped the remarks to Mr. Dodd that he had just received a telephone call from the White House asking for his cooperation in bringing the work of the committee to a halt. The name of the alleged White House figure who was thus tampering with a congressional investigation is still a mystery into which Mr. Dodd did not attempt to pry.

On another occasion he let drop the information to Chairman REECE and Mr. Dodd that the Democratic House leaders had held a caucus at which they discussed the hearings, 6 weeks before their start. The caucus had reached the decision, according to HAYS, to leave it to his judgment whether to compel a discontinuance of the committee's activities, or to allow them to proceed.

On still a third occasion he revealed that, on a trip to New York in December 1953, he had visited the Ford Foundation. Evidently, other and more important hands than HAYS' were at work trying to choke off the inquiry.

The near-psychopathic scene which followed had to be witnessed to be believed. HAYS' technique, when the hearings started, was the technique of never allowing a strong opponent to finish or develop his statement. Again and again, HAYS cut up the witness' expositions with his questioning. With impudence he informed the committee that he would disregard its rule that witnesses be allowed to complete their statements before questioning, and that he would interrupt whenever he saw fit. In 1 session of 185 minutes, HAYS, by actual count, perpetrated 246 interruptions.

It is significant of the double standards of some of our respected newspapers that the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune, which at that very time were inveighing against Senator MCCARTHY'S alleged investigative "bad manners," broke into praise of Representative HAYS for the rowdy job which he was doing on the Reece committee.

How one witness visualized HAYS may be seen in the words of Dr. Kenneth C. Colegrove, distinguished scholar, who was for 11 years secretary-treasurer of the American Political Science Association. Dr. Colegrove said:

"On 30 or more occasions, Congressman HAYS deliberately insulted the witness (Aaron M. Sargent), and on numerous occasions he inferred that he was a liar. Throughout 3 days, Congressman HAYS was allowed to interrupt the testimony with irrelevant questions and to make distracting and insolent remarks. * * * I doubt whether the entire history of congressional investigations will show more unfair or cowardly attack upon a witness than the treatment accorded to Mr. Sargent."

Finally, on June 17, 1954, HAYS had a field day in which he grossly insulted Associate counsel Arnold T. Koch and virtually stopped him from conducting an orderly cross-examination of Pendleton Herring, the first of the profoundation witnesses. He insulted Chairman REECE repeatedly, and he even insulted Representative Angier L. Goodwin, the swing man of the committee. Chairman REECE, realizing that further continuance of public hearings would be farcical, closed them and secured the remaining statements in written form.

Because the hearings were such a shambles, the honest inquirer who wants to know what the Reece committee actually found out, must turn to the official report which was made public on December 16, 1954. Fortunately, this report is a tour de force. Prepared under the skillful direction of General Counsel Rene A. Wormser, it drives home pitilessly the frightening facts which Mr. HAYS and his prompters wished to obscure. It proved that, through tax exemption (90 percent of the foundation spendings, in the case of some foundations, through tax remission, are actual subsidies of the Federal Treasury), the foundations have built up an extra-legal force in American life of such far-reaching and compulsive effect upon public opinion as to endanger seriously our American traditional institutions.

Not all the foundations have been at fault. "Foundations are clearly desirable when operating in the natural sciences and when making direct donations to religious, educational, scientific and other institutional donees," the committee found. No one can overpraise the great contribution to public health, disease eradication and education that the strictly nonpolitical foundations have made in the last half century. Funds such as the Hayden Foundation, the Cullen Foundation, the Donner Foundation, the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research, the Pew Memorial Foundation, the Duke Endowment, the Earhart Foundation, the Damon Runyon Fund, to mention only a few, have served important areas of human need without criticism or reproach.

The problem, as the Reece committee saw it, lies with a few large foundations which see their duty as one of brainwashing the American people in furtherance of highly debatable social ends. There seems to be an irresistible itch, in large aggregations of wealth, to invade the public opinion field. The foundations begin to endow and preach "causes." They begin to take sides on controversial issues upon which the American people are divided. They get grandiose notions of their mission to remake the American people. And at this point, the foundation ceases to be a social good and becomes a vested social threat to the unity of the Nation.

A striking instance of this foundation blundering into sensitive fields in which there are sharp American public opinion differences was brought out by the Reece committee in its revelation that the Rockefeller Foundation was the angel of the Kinsey report. For some undisclosed reason, Representative HAYS was signally anxious to halt this phase of the committee investigation. Before the hearings commenced, he made a personal issue of his demand that two members of the research staff who were studying the connection between Kinsey and the foundations be discharged. In the interest of peace the chairman reluctantly complied. Later HAYS harassed the committee staff so insistently about the Kinsey matter in the files, that it was finally turned over to him. Despite the Hays efforts, it was undeniable that both of the two Kinsey books acknowledged in their forewords that the research had been underwritten by an organization financed by the Rockefeller Foundation.

Now, there can be an honest divergence of opinion concerning the truth or the untruth of the Kinsey studies. But there can be no question of their bias. They support, by implication if not by statement, a debatable point of view in regard to sex practices. Dr. Kinsey does not merely assemble statistics, he interprets them. His interpretations point to conclusions which are rejected with loathing by great religious and ethical groups in America. Since Dr. Kinsey's enthusiastic admirers have proposed that the Kinsey conclusions be used as a basis for the revision of the sex laws in the States, it is obvious that we are here on extremely controversial ground. And yet the Rockefeller Foundation saw nothing objectionable about financ-

ing the Kinsey studies, and financing them with money that did not go for taxes.

The same obtuseness was seen in the repeated grants which the big foundations have made to numerous Communist-tainted projects.

One instance stood out like a sore finger in the Reece committee evidence. As had been disclosed before, the Communist-slanted Institute of Pacific Relations received from the Rockefellow Foundation a total of $1,681,186.41 during the years 1926–44.

But in 1944, the Reece committee learned, Alfred Kohlberg placed before the foundation a documented report proving that the IPR was in the hands of pro-Communists and was engaged in perverting American Far East policy to the ends of communism. Before this warning, it could be mercifully assumed that the executives of the Rockefeller Foundation had made a bad but honest mistake in supporting the dubious IPR. After receipt of the Kohlberg information, there could be no possible excuse for further blundering.

And yet the records show that the Rockefeller Foundation, after 1944, continued to subsidize the IPR to the tune of $486,247.42. This bounty continued until 1950. It was given during the most poisonous period of IPR activity when, largely as a result of its machinations, all continental China was lost to the free world. The only conclusion permissible is that the Rockefeller officials were either too stupid, or too socially irresponsible to make the decision which would have cut off the IPR money.

The mischievous interference of one of the foundations in national military policy was instanced by Professor Hoggs in his testimony. This was the much-discussed the American Soldier episode.

In 1949, the Social Science Research Council, a Rockefeller Foundation-financed body, arranged the publication of a book prepared under the auspices of a special committee of the council. This body, the American Soldier, was an exposition and endorsement of the disputed intrusion of "social scientists" in Army policymaking during World War II. This intrusion was made through the morale section of the Information and Education Division of the Army. The Rockefeller-financed book tells approvingly of how the morale officers succeeded in forcing their acceptance of its controversial demobilization program at the end of the war, over the initial opposition of the War Department. A consequence of this demobilization plan, which the social scientists talked the Army into accepting, was to strip American strength in the Far East and in Europe, with the result that Soviet Russia (which did not demobilize) moved in and established its sway over the Iron Curtain areas.

Of the American Soldier project, the Reece committee said:

"It illustrates the influence of supposed social science on a military policy at a high level. * * * The story is interesting and in the opinion of this committee, tragic."

Repeated instances were cited of mischievous activities of the foundations designed to influence American foreign policy, almost invariably in the direction of global or internationalist ends. Spruille Braden, former Assistant Secretary of State, told the committee: "I have the very definite feeling that these various foundations * * * do exercise both overt and covert influences on our foreign relations and that their influences are counter to the fundamental principles on which this Nation was founded."

A glaring example of such foundation meddling, since the Reece report, was the December 11, 1954, report of the Center of International Studies of Princeton University, attacking the "massive retaliation" policy which had been enunciated by Secretary of State Dulles. The center is financed by several foundations, including the Rockefeller Foundation. This highly publicized brief had the effect of placing the immense prestige of apparent foundation-endowed scholarship against a positive State Department policy to halt Communist aggression.

Because its stupendous endowment ($502 million) gives it a socially dangerous power over public opinion, the committee took a special look at the Ford Foundation. What it saw was extremely disquieting. It found that sizable amounts of Ford money are going into such controversial and slanted channels as:

1. The American Friends Service Committee ($1,134,000). Sponsor of the lectures of Alger Hiss, even after his first trial, the AFSC is a tireless foe of America's foreign policy. It has advocated recognition of Red China, more trade with Communist countries, no rearmament of West Germany, and no military aid to our allies. It organized a series of "coexistence with Russia" private meetings in 1949, attended by Gromyko and Malik out of which came the recommendation that we turn over our atomic stockpile to the United Nations. It accepted $290,576 in 1943–45 from the notorious Communist outfit, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

2. The American Labor Education Service, an organization for adult education, which has attracted to its activities and officer list a curious miscellany of Socialists and ex-Communist fronters.

3. Institute for Philosophical Research ($565,000). A research undertaking, headed by the controversial figure, Mortimer J. Adler, which seeks a new classification of basic philosophical and educational issues in the modern world.

4. Intercultural Publications ($759,950) to finance Perspectives, US, which attempts to interpret America to foreigners. Eighteen of the fifty-nine advisers have been mentioned in some way before Government agencies looking into subversions. Not a single writer known as an exponent of the America Legion point of view is listed in the 59.

5. Foreign Policy Association ($355,000) for development of World Affairs Councils. The FPA has been a conveyor belt for internationalist-slanted studies since World War I.

6. National Citizens Committee for United Nations Day ($60,000).

Now there is no question that any American citizen can underwrite such polemic undertakings without let or hindrance, as long as his benefactions come out of his own pocket. But this is not the case with the Ford Foundation. The money which it gives to such one-sided causes is primarily public money, which would go to the Government in taxes, did the foundation not enjoy tax exemption. Dr. Thomas W. Riggs, a witness before the committee, pointed out that, of the annual Ford Foundation income of $30 million, $27 million represents escaped taxes. In fine, the public contributed $9 to every $1 of the foundation. To use such public money for controversy and public indoctrination seems neither ethical nor American.

Further irresponsible meddling of foundation money in issues on which the American people are sharply divided was seen in the Ford Foundation allocation of $15 million to the new Fund for the Republic. This is an agency, completely autonomous and unsupervised by the parent body, which has taken on the job of discrediting and silencing those Americans who have been in the forefront of the struggle against communism and subversion in America. In this highly contentious field, this private and irresponsible body insolently proposes to lay down an official line of effective procedure for dealing with communism, and a redefinition of American civil liberties, presumably to guide Government action.

That the fund is not seeking an objective conclusion in its studies was seen in its grant of $50,000 to a lawyers' committee to study legislative investigations. It was an open secret that this project was motivated by a desire to bring such bodies as the Committee on Un-American Activities into disrepute. Instead of assigning the study to individuals with open minds on the subject, the fund selected a committee headed by Whitney North Seymour. Mr. Seymour is vice chairman of the American Civil Liberties Union, an organization which has already taken an extreme position of opposition to congressional investigations of subversives. It is difficult to escape the suspicion that the fund, in approving Mr. Seymour, expected a predetermined verdict.

Another highly suspicious venture of the fund was a survey to determine authoritatively the actual American public attitude toward communism, civil liberties, Russia, etc. The need of such a survey in view of the frequent pollings made on such subjects by the experienced Gallup organization and other professionals is not obvious. The discovery, by the American Legion, that the survey was questioning Legion local officers in some places, to discover whether they were in sympathy with official national Legion policies on subversion and kindred issues, puts an even more questionable light upon the project. In view of the anti-anti-Communist slant of some of the fund's top officers, it is a fair preusmption that the survey was launched to obtain apparent statistical authority for the claim that the American people are not actually behind a vigorous fight on communism. To head this project the fund selected Dr. Samuel A. Stouffer, the same individual who edited the Rockerfeller-financed The American Soldier volume in 1946. Apparently, Dr. Stouffer freewheels between the foundations.

Another example of Fund for the Republic intervention in the public opinion field is a $100,000 study of the Federal loyalty-security program, which has been under fire from the left in the Oppenheimer and other recent cases. How the Ford Foundation approaches the subject may be seen in the announcement, made on Edward R. Murrow's TV program, that hour-length transcriptions of Murrow's friendly air interview with Oppenheimer had been made available to schools and other audiences by the Foundation. The Murrow interview contains a pointed attack upon the present Federal security system.

Yet another is a $160,000 survey of college and high-school teachers "to assess the degree of fear among teachers * * * as to the handling of controversial subjects in the classroom." The stress upon the supposed atmosphere of "fear" in America has been a favorite discussion topic of left-wingers and anti-anti-Communists. The appointment of Dr. Paul Lazerfeld of Columbia University to head this project, as Mr. REECE pointed out, is not a reassuring one.

Another project is a $250,000 study of the actual influence of communism in contemporary American life. Since the consistent contention of such men as fund director Robert M. Hutchins has been that the Communist danger has been exaggerated, the conclusions of this project may be foreseen. Among the announced researchers, at least three have well-known records as anti-anti-Communists.

A project which seems to suggest a directed verdict is the $100,000 appropriation for a definitive study of the Federal loyalty-security system. The fund appropriately puts this study into the hands of qualified lawyers. But instead of assigning the study to the American Bar Association (which offended the liberals by sponsoring the Bricker amendment), the fund surprisingly selected the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. The New York body, an eminently respectable organization, has had among its recent presidents Bethuel M. Webster, who is general counsel for the Fund for the Re-

public, and Whitney N. Seymour, vice chairman of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Yet another fund job was the production and distribution of a film, Freedom to Read, which is a thinly disguised and distorted attack upon the McCarthy committee effort to remove pro-Commie books from United States Information Service propaganda libraries.

The Fund for the Republic is just beginning to get up steam, but its objective is plainly discernible. That objective is to soften up the national campaign against communism—a campaign in which the American Legion has played such an inspiring role. It is to discredit the courageous men and women who unmasked Alger Hiss, who broke up the State Department-IPR ring, who drove the Communists out of the Secretariat of the United Nations, and who made possible the enactment of the overdue McCarran Act. It proposes to discredit them by holding anti-Communists up to public contempt through the fudged statistics of slanted research projects and through the plausible lubricities of college professors lured by the $15 million fund.

The files of the Reece committee are crammed with other instances of irresponsible use of money by the big foundations to further misleading causes. The instances are too many to be the result of happenstance. They indicate an unmistakable leftward bias in the thinking of many of the key men who administer the foundations.

A highlight of the committee report was its exposure of the unethical practice of Americans who, under do-gooder pretenses, set up foundations to preserve family control of properties, by evading estate taxes. Ironically, the New York Herald Tribune, one of the most vociferous denouncers of the Reece committee, turned out to be a glaring exhibit of the probe.

In 1946, says the report, principal owner Ogden M. Reid transferred to the Reid Foundation 17 promissory notes payable to him annually by the Herald Tribune Publishing Co., between 1953 and 1969, and totaling $8,500,000. The deed of gift covering the first notes indicates that they pay no interest and are untransferable and unsalable. "A frozen asset, bearing no income and with no right to sell it to produce income from reinvestment" is the way the committee described the gift. Other clauses in the deed make ultimate payment of the notes dependent upon the continuing operation of the Herald Tribune. As the report puts it:

"There was no free gift of the notes.

"They were transferred pursuant to a contract under which the foundation agreed to assist the publishing company in its financial problems and by inference, but clear inference, to make this objective superior to its presumed charitable function."

Another foundation which was apparently set up, after shrewd legal advice, to assure continuance of family ownership of the concern after the death of the principal owner, was the Ford Foundation. The committee, in its report, told some of the Ford story. Had the foundation not been established, the report declared, "it is almost certain that the family would have lost control" by payment of the huge estate taxes.

The committee discovered, as it proceeded, that all its separate inquiries marched inexorably to one hard conclusion—that the foundations, as at present constituted, have gathered into their hands too much social power to be safely exercised by any private agency. This is not to say that the foundations started out with that objective. It is something which has grown and snowballed with the years until now it has become pervasive.

In the words of the committee report:

"The power of the individual large foundation is enormous. It can exercise various forms of patronage which carry with them elements of thought control. * * * The bureaucrats of the foundations have become a powerful group indeed. They become advisers to Government in matters of science. They are often consulted before the selection of teachers in universities. They serve on international bodies for the United States Government. They become virtual symbols of prestige, responsible only to a small group of foundation trustees who have come to follow their views."

The full flower of this system is seen in the intermediate operating agency—the cartel foundation, as the committee called it. In practice, the individual foundations have become accustomed to transfer some of their functions—and their power—to the operating agency.

There are three of these superfoundations, and several of secondary rank. There are (1) the American Council of Learned Societies, (2) the Social Science Research Council, and (3) the American Council on Education.

Such great foundation-operating agencies as the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council, both with headquarters in Washington, are in a strategic position to place their imprint upon the Government, today the largest single employer of research specialists. They have prepared a directory of men who, in their judgment, are qualified to advise Government in its various fields. Their recommendation or disapproval carries heavy weight. Scholars will not willingly affront or oppose a foundation power which can exercise such a shaping influence over their careers. "Such a concentration of power is highly undesirable, whether the net result of its operations is benign or not," found the committee.

How the foundation-operating agency setup works was frankly described by Dr. Kenneth C. Colegrove.

"Today," he said, "a professor of political science who wants to conduct certain research that is costly is in a rather difficult position unless he gets a grant from a foundation or through an operating society * * * or through his university, based upon a grant from a foundation. And that means, of course, ultimately, the foundations pass upon the kind of research which shall be done, particularly with reference to the subjects of research which should be undertaken."

In effect, this means that the careers of all in the academic world except recognized scholars are at the mercy of a comparatively few foundation or operating-agency administrators. As Dr. Colegrove puts it: "Of course, there is a tendency almost to fawn on the man who gets you the research project." This picture of our Nation's scholars cringing before a few foundation big brass is not a pretty one for Americans to contemplate.

It is not surprising that the late Eduard C. Lindeman, himself a beneficiary and an adviser of foundations, wrote:

"Taken as a group, that is, as a whole, the trustees of foundations wield a power in American life which is probably equaled only by the National Government itself."

It was the conclusion of the Reece Committee that it is not a wholesome or a safe thing for America that this power should be lodged in such a private and irresponsible agency as the present foundation. While recognizing the disappointing record of incompetence and worse of some of the large foundations, the committee did not call for immediate regulatory legislation. Rather it saw the remedy for present shortcomings in pitiless publicity and in searching congressional scrutiny. It admitted that there were wide areas in the tax-exempt field which it had had neither time nor means to study, and it specified for its successors the names of nine important organizations which are under fire, and which should be thoroughly examined. It summarized its general conclusions by declaring that the foundations should have full freedom of selection of areas of operation where those areas do not lead us into politics or subversive activity. With this reservation, the committee's stand was for freedom of experimentation by the foundations.

But expenditure of funds by the foundations for political ends, either directly or indirectly, is not in the American spirit, the committee held. The instances where this is now being done, while numerically few, are too many for American ease of mind. To curb such practices, the committee advised reconsideration of the wording of the tax law to bring activity to influence legislation, as well as direct political activity, within the scope of the present ban on foundation politicking.

The feeling of the committee was that it was doing little more than ground-breaking in a long task of study of the proper relation between the foundations and the Government which needed to be done. Such a study should be welcomed by the foundations, as well as by Congress. Abuses, like foul barnacles, have been permitted to attach themselves to some of our great foundations. To endeavor to conceal those abuses, or to obscure them under a cloud of billingsgate à la WAYNE L. HAYS is a shortsighted policy on the part of the foundations. It invites continuing distrust.

B. CARROLL REECE and his dedicated coworkers have had the courage to turn the searchlight upon some of the worst of the misfeasances of the controversial foundations. Their reward for this task has been the smear and the blastings half-truth. Despite these belaborings, they have given us the first realistic picture of the foundations as they are, behind their facade. For this historic work the future will honor them. The present is still apathetically unaware of the importance of what they have done.

National Reserve Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter from a constituent who is now serving on active duty as a Reserve officer, regarding H. R. 5297, the national Reserve bill. My correspondent, whose name I have deleted, has obviously given careful study to this measure and, in my opinion, voices the opinion of a great many officers and men now on duty in the Armed Forces of the United States:

MAY 23, 1955.

Subject: H. R. 5297 (Rept. No. 457).

Hon. SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER, JR.,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CRUMPACKER: You are now considering several amendments to the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 which were introduced into the House of Representatives by Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I feel compelled to let you, my Representative, know how I and many others now serving in the Armed Forces are inclined to view these proposals.

First, I would like to consider the proposition which would select a number of young men each year for a 6-month period of

training on active duty followed by 7½ years service in the Ready Reserve. I am now a Reserve officer and have been on active duty for about 10 months. I am inclined to disagree vehemently with those who assert that any man can become an effective combat soldier in a period as short as 6 months.

Under the present efficient military-training program a period from 1 to 4 weeks is required to induct and process a new soldier. The period required to process and separate a man from the service varies from 1 to 3 weeks. During an active-duty period of 6 months a soldier accumulates 15 days leave time. Thus, it may be seen that as much as 8 or 9 weeks of this 6-month training period might be devoted to the administrative processes incumbent in a bureaucracy such as our Army. Net result: Only 16 weeks of military training instead of 6 months. There will be those who will say "but the 6 months' training is only a part of the intensive course of instruction which the men will receive; you must also consider the 7½ years of thorough training which these men must undergo." Under the proposed bill, training will be similar to the program now in effect: weekly meetings and 2 weeks training during the summer months. Although I have never participated in the Reserve program as such, having been called to active duty shortly after completing college and ROTC, I have had many informative conversations with soldiers who at one time were in the Active Reserve or the National Guard. It is my considered opinion, gathered from the comments of these men from many States, that the principal activities at these weekly training meetings are bull sessions and beer-drinking contests. The infrequent training which is done usually consists of an officer reciting information from dull, poorly written training manuals.

How are the men who are to serve this short active-duty tour of 6 months to be chosen? The Defense Department states that, if this program is to be implemented, they will still have to rely upon the draft to keep our army at the strength necessary to police the world. Therefore, some men will be compelled to serve for 2 years while other men will, at the same time, have to devote only 6 months of their lives to the armed services. Are the men who participate in these two entirely different programs to be chosen by the same agency and by the same system? Will 1 man be conscripted for a period 4 times as long as another merely as a result of the turn of a coin or the drawing of a cellulose capsule from a hat? The unfairness of this system is obvious.

Another part of H. R. 5297 which interests me and upon which I would like to comment is to be found on page 13. It reads as follows:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law a person who served on active duty in the Armed Forces prior to July 27, 1953, will not be required, unless he has agreed or may hereafter agree, to participate in active duty for training or in inactive duty training in the Ready Reserve."

This is the cutoff date which exempts from the program those persons who served on active duty prior to July 27, 1953. It will affect—adversely, most of us believe—all individuals now serving in the Armed Forces who were conscripted after July 27, 1953. Many of us who came to the defense of our country did so with an agreement or at least an understanding that we would serve for 2 years and then be free to pursue our life in a free and equitable society. We were aware of the laws which were to make conscripts of our bodies, minds, and abilities. We had to choose either to face the fate of the draft or to cast our lot toward another means of fulfilling our service obligation. In doing so, we accepted certain limitations and hardships, each of us looking for and attempting to find the program which would best suit our individual interests. We were cognizant of certain rules of the game which our elected Senators and Representatives and our President had considered and enacted into the law of the land.

Some provisions of the proposed amendments will be made retroactive to July 27, 1953, if they are passed in the form in which they were introduced. For many of us you will be changing the rules of the game while we are rounding third base and heading for home. Those of us who chose a program other than the draft individually negotiated and entered into a contract with our Government which set forth the obligations and the considerations to be observed and rendered by each party. Now we find that the Government is about to change radically the scope of our contractual obligations without allowing us to change the degree of our considerations. We will not be able to adjust or to equate the warped relationship which will arise between the two parties.

We are being discriminated against. We agreed to undergo certain hardships and, in turn, we were to gain certain advantages. After our part of the bargain was fulfilled, we were to be free so that we could pursue our lives as free citizens. If we had been aware that the proposals now before you would someday be a reality and a part of the law of the land, many of us would have chosen a different course upon which to set our sail. I am certain that I would have done this.

Another facet of H. R. 5297 which I must disagree with is to be found on page 22. It reads as follows:

"However, any such members who fail through refusal, when able to perform their obligation pursuant to the above alternatives, may by competent authority be ordered to and required to perform active duty or active duty for training, without their consent, for not to exceed 45 days annually."

Those of us who accepted the contract which the Government proposed when we looked toward the Military Establishment were aware that we would have to serve for a period of time (in my case 8 years) in the Reserve program. We were aware that during this time we would be subject to call or to recall to active duty. In my case I am serving a 2-year tour of duty at the beginning of my total obligated time of 8 years. When I am discharged I will (under the present program) be subject to immediate recall for a period of 6 years. Under the proposed amendments I will not only be subject to recall during this period of time but, furthermore, I will be compelled to attend weekly meetings and a yearly summer camp (duration—17 days) during a portion of the 6 years. I certainly would have had many reservations about accepting a commission in the Reserve component of our Army had I known that I would be compelled to divert 1 month (17-day summer camp plus time wasted at weekly meetings) out of each year from earning money to support my family and working to achieve a place in my community for the future.

What will happen to those of us who wish to labor and strive for economic security and independence in our respective communities? We are already giving 2 years from our life expectancy of 64 to our fellow citizens. It is evident, of course, that the effects of the proposed legislation will be felt the hardest by those people who will need to expend the most time and effort in order to secure themselves in their professions. Can a young man who plans to start his own business—an economic individualist launching an individual proprietorship—afford to be divorced from his struggling concern for a period as long as 1 month during a period of 12? We all know that the first few years of any small business are crucial. How many families and communities will suffer as a result of young proprietors being prohibited from directing their undiverted attentions and efforts toward their new enterprises?

If an individual plans to enter an already established concern his employers will, of course, be compelled by law to release him from his labors so that he may participate in the proposed "compulsory" Reserve program.

Will these citizen-soldiers have all the advantages which our free-enterprise system usually guarantees an individual seeking to negotiate a contract for employment? One can easily understand why an employer would be prejudiced in favor of a potential employee who, for various reasons, would not be required to participate in the Reserve program. We do not need much imagination to realize the effect of this particular amendment upon the geographical mobility of persons who are employed in fields such as: Sales, transportation (railroads, airlines, and trucking concerns), management, migrant farm workers, etc.

Many of us, upon the completion of our active duty tour, plan to commence or to continue our higher education which is so necessary in the atmosphere of highly technical competition which exists in America today. While attending school we shall have to study, seek employment in part-time jobs during the school term and direct our efforts during the summer months toward earning the money necessary to continue our schooling in the following fall and winter. How can we expect to devote our full, undiverted efforts toward our scholastics and earning the money necessary to complete our schooling if we are required to dissipate our minds and bodies upon the Military Establishment 1 evening each week and 17 days during the summer months? The only students upon whom the negative effects of this program will not fall are those who do not have to spend a large amount of time studying and those who can afford an education without having to work for it.

I am sure that you, my elected Representative, before you cast your vote on these proposals, will consider seriously the dire effects which this bill will have upon those of us who are now serving our country as conscripts. Both our Nation and the State of Indiana have had a long and an admirable record of protecting the rights of the individual citizen in all matters where Federal and individual interests come into conflict. The grave issue now before your deliberative body must be resolved in favor of the individual if freedom as we know it today is to continue in America.

Sincerely.

The Late Chief Judge Harold M. Stevens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday as I attended the last rites pronounced over my friend, Chief Judge Harold M. Stevens, I constantly thought of the great contribution this unselfish man had made to the welfare of his country through his devotion to fair and constructive interpretation of law. He was an eminent and successful practicing lawyer, but he was willing to devote the greater part of his life to the judiciary,

and he became one of the very great jurists of this age.

For 20 years he served on the bench of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Judicial Circuit, and since 1948 he has been Chief Judge. During his service he inaugurated many innovations, notably the Federal Register. This service alone is of sufficient importance to distinguish him. Many executive orders have practically the force and effect of legislative enactments, but without the Federal Register it might be difficult to locate and analyze some administrative orders.

Judge Stevens was devoted to the law at all times, but had a fine sympathetic feeling toward all parties involved. He gave unstintingly of his time to every case that came before him.

In his private life he was a most lovable man, devoted to his friends and his faithful wife and companion of a lifetime. We will not soon see his like again.

Some Problems Facing South Carolina Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

SOME PROBLEMS FACING SOUTH CAROLINA AGRICULTURE

(Address by W. B. Camp, farmer, Bakersfield, Calif., and South Carolina, before the annual meeting of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, February 2, 1955, Charleston, S. C.)

It is, indeed, a signal honor to be asked to speak to this group. And I am mighty pleased to be here, too. It always makes me feel good to get back home with my own people. And, folks, South Carolina is, and always will be, home to me.

While Charleston is not my hometown, it will always occupy a very special place in my memories.

When I entered Clemson a number of years ago from upstate, I was a very green country boy and had never been more than 20 miles out of Cherokee County. So when I met a bunch of your fine boys from this city and nearby islands, with all their friendliness—but strange lingo—I wondered what their country must be like. It seemed way far away to me, and I longed for a chance to see for myself.

In the meantime, I came to know intimately several boys from these parts, and we have continued to be close friends.

My great moment for travel and adventure came when I was a junior. That year I was sent here from Clemson to a Sunday School convention. I liked everything about this part of the country from the moment I arrived. It was, and is, truly a different world from that which I had previously known. Even though the upcountry is more mountainous, you have more wide open spaces of undeveloped land here along the coast; therefore, more challenging opportunities.

My first job upon graduation from Clemson was on the Combahee Plantation, which was then owned by Dupont. I was in charge of crop experiments for the United States Government and Clemson, trying to see what would grow on the old rice fields. This was the first job I ever had—except helping my dad on our little farm in Cherokee County.

After only one season here, the Government sent me to California to see if places could be found to grow long staple cotton. All through the years I have remembered and talked about my experience in this county. In the meantime, I visited here often; and all of this adds up to why we bought Buckfield Plantation 3 years ago. We consider it a prize possession.

You folks don't need anyone to tell you about the rapid growth of your city, your county, nor your State. You have proof of this all around you. Also, you know that the industrial revolution in cotton textile manufacturing alone has, in the last 60 years, increased the South's position in this field from 5 percent to 80 percent—and is still gaining. I'm sure you know that the real reason for textile mills and other industries coming to your section is, in simple language, people.

Manufacturing firms have learned that southern labor—southern people—turn out more work per hour, per day, or per any given period than do the workers in plants elsewhere. This is one of the main reasons why South Carolina now enjoys the lowest percentage of business failures of any State in the Nation.

It has been my privilege to see most of this country, and quite a bit abroad, and I say to you very frankly, I don't believe there is a finer place in the world than right here in which to live and enjoy the beauties of life. You have an excellent climate, rich soil, and a wonderful people. You have your own seashore for recreation and swimming, and you have right at your back door the Blue Ridge and the Great Smokies—than which there is no lovelier sight. In addition to this, just recently I read that "it takes less to stay healthy in the South."

Don't believe everything you hear about the wonders of California. Most people there go at too fast a pace—they don't take time out to really enjoy living. I have often said that people in South Carolina live much more fully than does the average family in California.

Also, before I pass on to some other things I expect to talk about, I would like to say just a word about another great agricultural asset you folks have in South Carolina. I mean Clemson College. I know you are proud of Clemson; but since it is so close to you, your people probably just take it for granted. Clemson is not just another school. Instead, it is in a class almost by itself. I have had many friends from California and other States come by to visit Clemson, and without exception, they have left with a definite conviction that there is a community spirit among the students and the faculty and their families unknown on any other agricultural college campus in America.

People make this sort of atmosphere possible. Boys can't help but enjoy themselves and learn in this sort of kindly climate. Clemson has been blessed with great leadership from its beginning. And now, under the wise leadership of Dr. Poole, the school is making the greatest strides in its history.

It has been well said—"There is nothing so constant as change." This is particularly true in American agriculture. The story is the same whether it be South, North, East, or West. Farmers are breaking away rapidly from the traditional pattern of agriculture. We are in the era of intensive mechanization and keen competition.

The transformation of our agriculture from its colonial beginnings, when 9 out of 10 people had to work the land to produce food, was a gradual process. Farming efficiency improved rather slowly at first. However, greater efficiency has been made possible by research and education. And today 1 farm worker can produce enough food and fiber for himself and 17 others.

You know that nearly everything derives from, or relates to, the soil and its products. You also know that along with, or underlying, the South's industrial revolution there is also a revolution in agriculture. No longer is this area dependent almost entirely upon one cash crop—cotton. Diversification has become the order of the day.

Newspaper cartoons still picture farmers wearing overalls and seedy straw hats. I'm sure we don't mind. Most of us do wear sturdy clothes when out working our crops or taking care of other farm chores, but the time has come when farmers must not be considered a separate or special class of the American society. No longer should we use the term "farmers and businessmen." It should be "farmers and other businessmen."

A successful farmer these days must be a combined scientist, engineer, and good businessman. He must have expert training, and it should come early. Our school authorities in this State are to be complimented for the fine agricultural programs set up in almost every school. The progressiveness of agriculture in each of our States today can definitely be measured by the training boys and girls have been receiving in agricultural courses and through their 4–H Clubs and Future Farmer chapters. This in-the-classroom and on-the-farm training, combined with the work given at our agricultural colleges, gives our young folks the finest agricultural training available anywhere in the world. Research and education are the fundamental basis for all progress, and the progress made up to now is but a stepping stone to the future—provided we are able to stop the welfare staters and Socialist plotters.

I wish I could look into a crystal ball and see just what the immediate future does hold for farmers. Not for a long time has it been so difficult for farmers to set up the year's crop program. For my own part, I anticipate considerable uncertainty during the immediate months ahead; yet I look forward to the future years with increasing confidence. Awareness of the mutual interdependence of agriculture and industry is growing generally. The present-day farm could not exist without the products of industry. It is also true that industry could not prosper without strong outlets among its farm customers.

Nationally, we have lived from the same total acreage of cropland since 1910. Our expanding food output has been attained by employing continuously improved technology and, also, by devoting to human food production those acres that hitherto were used to produce feed for horses and mules. From the latter source alone, our acreage for food production was supplemented by more than one-third since 1910. This process is about over.

There are, of course, possibilities of increasing the Nation's cropland—through reclamation, drainage, and other such means—but set off against such possibilities are the prospective losses of farmland to residential and industrial sites, highways, and airports. The net prospects of increasing the Nation's efficient cropland acreage right away are not considerable. This means that major dependence in the future will be upon ever-improved technology that will enable the restricted crop acreage to be used more effectively.

In this connection, it is my opinion that the time is not too far distant when we will see much of the rich land in the low country of this State brought under intensive cultivation. Proper drainage, coupled with irrigation, can do wonders. Our scientists have shown us how to treat the soils and how to fertilize to get maximum crops. So now, it is simply a question of crop-price incentive needed to stimulate this reclamation.

It is wonderful to have large areas for hunting and fishing, but it is my belief

that cities and communities would benefit much more if many of the low-country game preserves were reclaimed for intensive farming enterprises.

For the country as a whole, the tendency over a period of years has been toward the consolidation of small farms into larger farms. That tendency will continue if we are to have the greatest economic production.

Again I want to speak of change. The family farm of the future will be a new type of farm. It will be bigger, better equipped, better financed, and better manned. As such, it can survive. The family farm is invaluable. The best men and women the world has ever seen have come from this type of farm. It will still provide us with these men and women—if we give it a chance. I am for giving it a chance as a free, independent enterprise, where ability will find its natural and abundant reward. But what we have known as the family-size farm in the past is definitely on the way out.

Those who are close to the land should be helped to stay there if it is possible to do so, but I do not want them kept as mendicants or as slaves of the welfare state. I do not want them kept there by any sort of device that penalizes initiative or rewards inefficiency. Such devices cannot last. After all, the public interest is paramount. What is in the interest of the whole public is going to prevail if we are to remain a free people.

In spite of this, we have a bunch of so-called do-gooders running around over the country advocating higher and higher farm wages (and I am for this up to a point—I like to pay good wages). The same bunch is yelping for cheaper food (I'm for that, too, provided there is enough profit left to furnish a decent living for the farmer and his family). The very same bunch is damning the actual and inevitable trend in American agriculture and demanding a return to the old type family-size farm—which really means a return to horse-and-buggy days. In those days, modern plumbing and other conveniences were not for farmers.

This type of mouthing has its appeal to many unthinking people, but the fact is, these three things—higher and higher wages, cheap food, and smaller farms—never have, don't now, and never will go together. We all know that a pair of shoes, a tractor, or an automobile would cost very much more if they were made in thousands of little shops and if present high rates of pay maintained. And I insist that farmers are entitled to just as good wages as anyone else.

Once more I speak of the changing scene. It has not been so terribly long ago that I was plowing my bull on our small farm in Cherokee County. It has been still a shorter time that I went to California and planted the first patches of cotton in the San Joaquin Valley.

For many years it was thought that cotton would not grow successfully anywhere in the United States except in what is known as the Deep South. However, when the boll weevil destroyed the Sea Island cotton industry along the coast of South Carolina and Georgia, our Government officials became alarmed.

They felt we might be caught someday in an emergency and find ourselves without enough long staple cotton to use in the manufacture of articles then considered only possible with the use of extra staple cotton. It was then, shortly before World War I, that the search was begun to see if areas could be found in the West where staple cotton could be grown. I was given that assignment.

Thus it can be said that the cotton industry in California, and other Western States, was largely a "war baby." It was definitely sponsored by our Government, itself. The story of cotton in the West, following this early beginning, and the present position it occupies, is pretty well known. The motto of growers there is, "A larger quantity of quality cotton on the same acre."

At the start most of the top agricultural leaders in California, including the Agricultural College, insisted that it would be tragic to allow cotton to come in and contaminate the social and economic life of California. They preferred specialty crops.

Perhaps they were justified in their attitude, after looking at the history of cotton in the Southern States. When I think of my own early years on our small farm, producing and picking cotton, selling it often for less than 10 cents per pound, I can see that it was a starvation-wage process.

Based upon these standards, cotton would not have been a good crop for California nor any of the other Western States. At those prices, it was really not a good crop for South Carolina, either. At present, cotton is the highest it has been in modern times, but it is not high in comparison with other things. It is simply high in comparison with a slave-labor, slave-price past.

Progress marches on. We cannot, and should not attempt to, reverse a natural economic trend. We should not, by legislation, try to prevent the shift of crops from one State or area to another.

I have always been one of those who feels that just as surely as water runs downhill, crops and livestock are also going to flow, or migrate, toward those areas in this country where they can be most economically produced and marketed. The same reasoning also applies to industrial plants. This is as it should be—though it can only happen under a free economy. This is not the way they do it in Russia.

Today cotton is the No. 1 cash crop in Arizona, California, and New Mexico. The income from cotton in California last year was greater than the total combined income from the three major fruit crops of citrus, grapes, and peaches.

I mention cotton in these States for the purpose of bring out another point that I wish to make. Namely, that 25 years ago the percentage of cotton grown under irrigation wast mightly small, but last year 40 percent of the cotton produced in the United States was grown with irrigation. This includes the production in California, Arizona, New Mexico, and West Texas.

What does this mean to the older Cotton Belt? Simply that they have got to produce more cotton to the acre, and produce it cheaper, in order to compete with high irrigation yields—or else, which leads me right into another phase of this subject—Supplemental Irrigation in the Southeast.

During the past few years we have been reading and hearing a great deal about the fact that America is soon going to run out of land on which to produce food for our increasing population. These alarmists say that there are no longer any new frontiers for us to explore. If one is thinking only in terms of geography, this may be correct. However, from the standpoint of agricultural production, there are frontiers on today's farms all over America—and especially in the Southeast.

By intelligent and more scientific use of fertilizers, insecticides, crop rotation, mechanization, and in many areas most important of all, a greater use of supplemental irrigation, these farms can produce two or three times as much as is grown on them today. This is our great frontier.

For many years I have been interested in the possibility of our Southern farmers using the water that passes through, or by, their ofttimes parched fields. At first my friends paid little attention to this pleading. But again I say, changes are constant.

So right here I wish to state that it is my conviction, based upon my own personal experience and observation, that "supplemental irrigation is the most important single thing now offered for the improvement of agriculture in the Rainfall Belt." I say this in spite of the fact that I know there are still a lot of Doubting Thomases.

I am aware of the fact that there are certain areas in this part of the State where excess water is the problem at certain seasons of the year. Proper drainage becomes a major operation. Many of these same areas are too dry at other periods during the same year. Basically, the overall job to be done is the same—water management.

The new trends are all toward intensive types of farm production. Our irrigated acres are restricted, and farmers recognize they must get the most out of every acre. All of the intensive farming in the West is done with irrigation.

It is significant to note that only six-tenths of 1 percent of the earth's surface is irrigated; yet this small portion produces 25 percent of the world's food. The possibilities of irrigation are tremendous.

In California the average non-irrigated acre produces crops valued at $30 an acre, while an irrigated acre produces an average of $280 per acre. My two sons and I own and operate two farms in South Carolina, and we irrigate both. We definitely would not be interested in farming here if we could not irrigate.

Many farmers, and even many of our agricultural leaders in the East, immediately raise the question of the expense of installing a supplemental irrigation system. I grant you that it does cost money, but when viewed in the light of actual results, I say to you that we simply cannt afford droughts. It costs a lot of money to buy modern machinery, to buy the best seed, and to fertilize properly. Without water, every dollar invested in these things is in jeopardy. The last 4 years' droughts were much more expensive to farmers in most of this State than would have been the total cost of installing supplemental irrigation systems on their farms.

It is not a question of which crops we can afford to irrigate. Just keep in mind that higher yields are anticipated when you irrigate. So my advice is to plan, plant, fertilize, and irrigate with that in mind—and you will find that any crop worth growing will justify supplemental when needed. Irrigation is a low-cost crop insurance farmers must have.

Mind you now, I am talking only about those people who have, or could have, water readily available to their farms. I am not foolish enough to believe that there is now, or that there will be in the near future, water readily available to all of the farmland in South Carolina.

In this connection I often think of a statement made by my good friend, Jim Eleazer, that great agricultural evangelist from Clemson, who says, "In South Carolina we now have some irrigation in every county, and I have yet to find a farmer who does not like it. In many instances the difference is between a bumper yield and a crop failure."

During the past few years many magazines and newspapers across the country have had numerous articles explaining in detail the splendid results that have been obtained by individual farmers and experiment stations in every State from the use of supplemental irrigation. The Progressive Farmer, the Country Gentleman, and the Farm Journal have all been particularly extravagant in their praise of the increased crop yields and benefits that have been obtained by the use of supplemental irrigation.

A very important and far-reaching statement by the editors of the Progressive Farmer appeared in the October issue. I quote: "We announce our dedication to a real crusade for irrigation over all the 16 Southern States served by the Progressive Farmer. We call upon all southern farmers to find out whether they can use irrigation profitably

on their own lands." I am still quoting: "We know, of course, that irrigation will not do everything its most enthusiastic advocates claim. But we also know it will do far more than 1 farmer in 10 yet realizes. After making all allowances for difficulties and drawbacks, we hold fast to the faith we proclaimed in our very popular irrigation special last year in which we stated editorially, 'Irrigation is the next great forward step in southern progress and we rejoice to help.'"

I thoroughly agree with Dr. Poe and his associates, as this is precisely what I have been preaching for many years.

It takes a lot of water to irrigate and often many of our streams get pretty low during a prolonged dry spell. That being the case, one might ask, what is the solution?

I am confident we face a vast system of water conservation and storage. We do have abundant water in the course of a year all over the eastern rainfall belt. We have something like 48 or 50 inches and that is a lot of water. But the trouble is it is about all gone when drought strikes—gone back to the sea from whence it came.

Contour farming, sodding, good land cover, with trees and grass on the steep slopes, will help make that water tarry a little longer where it falls; and then, in addition to that, we face the need for a vast system of water storage in lakes, ponds, and reservoirs—lots of them. That's the immediate need.

For the much bigger and long-range program, we must also immediately begin to explore on a community, county, State, and area basis the conservation and rerouting of water that will serve—yes, save farmers throughout the rainfall belt, and make it possible for them to compete with farmers in the irrigated areas of the West.

If the arid West had access to streams such as the Mississippi or many of the other large streams in the rainfall region, they would bring in millions of additional acres. It is recognized that water means everything there.

In the West, the problem of water source and distribution has long been a major factor in economic and political development. Nationwide, the current use of water is many times what it was half a century ago, and with the indicated course of population, industrial and agricultural development, the next half century will bring new demands upon the supply. All of this indicates that not only must there be a development of new sources, but a more efficient use of the water that is now available.

I am in favor of most of the completed, and proposed, irrigation projects in the arid West—without them we probably would not have been able to feed the rapidly increasing population in the United States—but it is high time that we now devote a lot more attention, waterwise, to saving the families who are already established on farms in the humid region.

Not only the leaders of these areas, but all the people must become acquainted with what has been, and is being done, to irrigate desert lands—and then shown what great benefits can be had with supplemental irrigation in the rainfall belt. This is why I have devoted so much time to this subject here this evening.

In this connection, I wish to call your attention to a recent study made by Mr. A. L. King, meterologist in charge of the United States Weather Bureau office, Memphis, Tenn. This study covered the past 82 years. I shall not try to tell you about all of his findings, but it is significant to note that he found only 3 years during the entire 82 when no droughts occurred during the cotton-growing season.

Mr. King highlights this study by saying, "The droughts we experience, as shown by the data presented, indicate that we must irrigate if we are to keep our place in competitive markets." This is precisely the point that I have been trying to convey to my friends in the old cotton-growing belt for a number of years.

New irrigation projects are now under consideration in California and other Western States that will run into fantastic figures. One of these calls for a total expenditure of some $3¼ billion to carry water from the northern part of California to the southern end, a distance of 1,000 miles. This calls for the construction of a dam over 800 feet high, and the boring of many tunnels through mountains, and on and on through open ditches. It is a gigantic project, but water for irrigation and for domestic and industrial use is the lifeblood of that area. People there will go to almost any length to acquire additional water for these purposes. Water is the lifeblood of South Carolina, too.

The point I am wanting to make is that we must arouse everybody concerning these facts. We must demand of our lawmakers and Government agencies that if tax money is to be spent to provide water conservation and distribution for anyone in agriculture, proper consideration should be given to conserving and distributing water to our long-established families of distressed people throughout the humid area.

Previously, all large-scale plans for damming or controlling our streams in the rainfall region have been for the purpose of power development, navigation, flood control, or recreation. Not once have the authorities given any consideration, whatever, to the farmers' needs of water for irrigation. However, farming is daily becoming more competitive, and we must employ every means of reducing our growing costs. Supplemental irrigation has been proven to be the most important single thing offered us for insuring bountiful yields. This being the case, we must study with care every proposal for the use of the water in our streams.

Just recently Congress passed a new water facilities law that proposes to give farmers of the South and East the same Federal irrigation assistance now enjoyed by western farmers under the old water law.

This bill was sponsored by Senators EASTLAND, of Mississippi, AIKEN, of Vermont, and THYE, of Minnesota. In arguing the bill, Senator EASTLAND said, and I quote, "Extension of the law will reduce the cost per unit of producing agricultural products." He added, "For a hungry world, it will greatly expand the production of food and fiber and it will give the farmer some control over the elements which have always beset him."

Still quoting Senator EASTLAND, "Irrigation built the West. Western soils are no better than southern soils; yet solely because of irrigation, western agriculture is the most prosperous in the Union. Because of irrigation, the agriculture of nonirrigated areas cannot compete with western agriculture."

This piece of legislation shows that some of our legislators are becoming conscious of the great potential of irrigation in the East.

In many areas, farmers have been quick to take advantage of this legislation and are already organizing irrigation projects.

I shan't go into any further details, but this does serve to show that at long last, in the rainfall belt, farmers are finding out what can be done with irrigation.

During the past few years, our Government has spent millions of dollars on what is known as point 4 program to help so-called backward countries improve their agriculture. According to figures furnished me, the United States spent $1,729,000,000 for reclamation and waterpower projects alone in other countries during the 5-year period, July 1, 1948, through June 30, 1953.

Without questioning the wisdom or merits of this, I certainly feel that we have been overlooking another great need here at home.

In other words, we are very much in need of a "point 4 program" here in the United States to help implement irrigation in the humid region, and thus prevent a repetition of the disastrous droughts we have suffered during the past few years.

"Abundant Water for Supplemental Irrigation" should become a slogan. This abundance can't be obtained overnight, but the day will come when drought will no longer be an acute problem six or more times a year on so many of our farms in the humid region. Determination, planning, and hard work can lick the water problem.

With this in mind, I predict the time is not far distant when all the better farmers across the country will accept irrigation just as readily as they accept tractors and electricity today.

And now at this point I should like to discuss with you very briefly another matter that continually bothers me when I try to project my thinking into the future and see what the farming pattern is going to be when the time comes for my grandsons to take over. I am, by no stretch of the imagination, an alarmist. Some call me an optimistic pessimist. I prefer in this case to think of myself as a realist. But, folks, I have had some experiences that just can't be lightly dismissed from my mind.

In the early years of the New Deal I was called to Washington to work with the agricultural administration. I was assistant director of the southern region, which included supervision of the overall cotton program. I was just a hard-working country guy seeking to help farmers who were hard hit by low prices and lack of markets. I was naive enough to believe that all the other fellows in the Agricultural Department in Washington were there for the same purpose.

At first I was too busy to notice the scheming and shenanigans that set in. But as months went by some of us became suspicious. It soon became obvious that certain people were there for no good. We knew there was something sinister stalking in the background.

I shall not bore you with details, but I am proud to report that I had a personal and very satisfying part in exposing many of these people for what they were. As a result, Lee Pressman was fired from Government service, claiming all the while, of course, that he was a good and loyal American. Yet only 3 years ago he admitted having been a member of the Communist Party while he was employed by the Department of Agriculture. There were many others fired from the Agricultural Department on that same occasion. I think you might be interested in the immediate explosion that got them fired. (Recite 1934–35 cotton contract.)

In addition to Lee Pressman, we were assigned from the solicitor's office another bright, young Communist lawyer to advise on legal matters concerning the development and operation of cotton and other farm programs in the southern States—his name was Alger Hiss. It did not take us long to find out that he, too, had embarked upon a program of reconstruction for the South. Although he had just graduated form Harvard and had probably never been south of the Mason-Dixon line, he knew just exactly the right thing needed to bring prosperity to the entire South. In fact, he had a ready and positive program for all American agriculture, and society in general.

Class hatred was to be his chief weapon to bring about revolution. And then the revolution hit Alger Hiss. The name of that revolution was Whittaker Chambers and Congressman NIXON, now Vice President of the United States. Having known Alger Hiss, certainly I was not among the mourners when he departed for prison.

At that time we heard much about shades of degrees of patriotism in people. There

is no degree of one's loyalty to his country; any more than one can be just a little bit pregnant.

For my part, I want none of this so-called liberal thinking. I expect to continue to fight it with all the power at my command. More and more I am convinced we must return to those fundamental, spiritual, economic, and political principles which have brought us so far as a people, and our Nation as a nation to our present high place among the peoples of the world.

Many very prominent people in our country have committed themselves to the welfare state. And please believe me when I tell you that the welfare state is the Socialist state, and the Socialist state is the police state. Under the guise of an all-encompassing benevolence, these forces propose to take over your business and my farm, and once they take over our businesses, they will take us over, too; and you and I and our enterprises will be exploited to their own ends. And those ends will lead away from the freedoms we still know and the incentives that have made us the greatest agricultural and industrial people in the world.

Under their scheme, you and I would have the glorious privilege of sharing in the utopia of an all-wise and all-powerful bureaucracy where everything from the cradle to the grave would be free.

That was the way it was to be in England. With that in mind, here is something you will find interesting. Some time ago the late Cecil Palmer, eminent British journalist, summed up the story of socialism in Great Britain in the following manner, and I quote:

"In my opinion, socialism will work only in heaven where they don't want it, or in hell where they have it already. We are trying to legislate unsuccessful people into prosperity merely by legislating the successful people out of it."

Many Americans are yet unaware of the evil forces shaping the future for them. This is why we need today, as never before, intelligent and enlightened understanding. We must read the signs of the times. We must read them correctly and wisely. Without this wisdom and understanding, we may barter away our birthright and destroy our national security.

We have too many of our good people saying, "It can't happen here." I plead with you to please not be so blind. Just look what is happening all over the world—and for that matter, here at home, too. It may be later than we think.

When the farmer is told how much acreage he must plant—when the laboring man is told he must join a union in order to work—when the merchant or manufacturer is told how much he can charge for his product—then we are dangerously close to a controlled economy.

When the power to tax is used to redistribute our wealth—then we are dangerously close to socialism.

A way of life brought us to this high place—we call it the American way of life—and all the facts of history and all the facts of life today tell me that our way of life is the fullest, the freest, the most satisfying—the most promising the world has ever seen. The American way of life has provided us with an abundance, and the world with an example, the like of which was never seen before in all the history of the world.

That we may be better enabled to put up a winning fight, let me urge that we all review again two of our great basic instruments—our Constitution with its Bill of Rights, and the Declaration of Independence. For guidance in all our thinking, these instruments have no equal in the history of any people, for they are without parallel. We must once and for all turn back to the constitutional government, and turn away from these foreign ideologies that in recent years have so bedeviled us and have so bewildered our people.

Spared the welfare state, we can look forward to an abundance we have never known. The best years are ahead—if we are successful in preserving our American way of life.

And now as a final word, I want to remind you of the advice which Horace Greeley some years ago gave to the youth of America when he said, "Go West, young man, go West." I have no fault to find with what Horace Greeley said. In the light of things as they were then, that was, perhaps, splendid advice; but today the situation is greatly changed. Indeed, there is now a "New South!" Even so, I would still say to our young men and women, and older folks, too, "Go West, go North; in fact go many places to 'look-see' and to broaden your horizon, but before leaving South Carolina be sure and buy a round-trip ticket—and hurry back!"

The Wisdom of Acquainting Ourselves With Foreign Culture and Customs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include an enlightening article from the Scientific American Bulletin which appeared in the May 14 issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette pointing out the practical wisdom of American representatives learning and reasonably conforming to the different manners and customs of our foreign allies if we hope to successfully provide them with American leadership.

The article follows:

[From the Scientific American Bulletin]

WATCH YOUR MANNERS

Having told almost everyone else how to do their jobs, scientists have finally gotten around to the domain of Emily Post, at least that part of her specialty concerned with the manners of Americans abroad. Like space and time, polite behavior, it seems, is a matter of relativity.

"Americans are shocked," says Dr. Edward T. Hall, former anthropologist of the State Department, now with American University, "when they go abroad and discover whole groups of people eating with their fingers. Yet much of our 'polite' behavior is quite as disturbing to our foreign hosts."

EVIL EYE

"When a public health film of a baby being bathed in a bathinet was shown in India recently, the Indian women who saw it were visibly offended. They wondered how people could be so inhuman as to bathe a child in stagnant (not running) water.

"Americans in Iran soon learn not to indulge themselves in their penchant for chucking infants under the chin and remarking on the color of their eyes, for the mother has to pay to have the 'evil eye' removed.

"We also learn that in the Middle East you don't hand people things with your left hand, because it is unclean. In India we learn not to touch another person, and in southeast Asia we learn that the head is sacred."

SUCCESS OR FAILURE

Now that the United States is committed to a prominent role in world leadership, the question of what constitutes polite behavior abroad increasingly spells the difference between our success and failure in diplomatic missions. That is why the State Department called upon social scientists for help. Our frock coated specialists in Washington were mindful of Miss Post's statement, "There is not a single thing we do, or say, or choose, or use, or even think, that does not follow or break one of the exactions of taste, or fact, or ethics of good manners—call it what you will."

"The State Department," says Dr. Hall, "did not need an anthropologist to point out that it is insulting to ask a foreigner, 'How much is this in real money?' But technical advice can count heavily in the interpretation of a culture's unconscious aspects—the things people do automatically without being aware of the full implications of what they have done. To the Chinese, for instance, overloudness of the voice is associated with anger and loss of self-control. Hence, whenever we Americans become really interested in something, the Chinese are apt to get the impression that we are angry."

Even our friends south of the border find much of our behavior hard to take. Well brought up North Americans stand 18 to 20 inches apart when they converse. Latins stand 10 to 13 inches, and when we back away, we give the impression of cold aloofness, according to Dr. Hall.

DIFFERENT CULTURE

"The embarrassment about intimacy in space applies also to the matter of addressing people by name," he says. "As a rule we tend to stay on the 'mister' level too long. In addition, in the United States we use 'Mr.' with the surname. In Latin America the first and last names are used together and senor (Sr.) is a title. Thus when one says, 'My name is Sr. So-and-So,' it is interpreted to mean, 'I am the honorable, his excellency, So-and-So.'

"It is no wonder that when we stand away, barricade ourselves behind our desks (usually a reflection of status) and call ourselves mister, our friends to the south wonder about our so-called good neighbor policy and think of us as either high hat or unbelievably rude.

"The role of the anthropologist in preparing people for service overseas is to open their eyes and sensitize them to the subtle qualities of behavior in other people with a different culture."

H. R. 4627

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter which I have received from Mrs. Norma Burgess Moore, president, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Connecticut, Inc., with an enclosed petition. Under unanimous consent, I ask that the petition with the names of those signing it be also made a part of the RECORD.

The letter and petition follow:

THE WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION OF CONNECTICUT, INC.,
Hartford, Conn., May 25, 1955.

Hon. HORACE SEELEY-BROWN, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Here is the first installment of petitions for the Siler bill, H. R. 4627. These people are just as interested as if they had written you a letter. It is so easy to put off the letter writing. Certainly facts show that the liquor ads are encouraging

more or more young people to drink. This is leading to serious lawless conditions.

Please study the facts on this problem and do what is best for all concerned. The poor fellows who land in jails and asylums have a right to their freedom, too, but alcohol has ruined their lives.

Best wishes and many thanks. Please record these names in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

NORMA BURGESS MOORE.

Here are the names of 138 people in the second district who are interested in the Siler bill, H. R. 4627:

To Our Representatives in Congress:

Since alcoholism, delinquency, and mental illness have become serious health problems, we, your constituents of Connecticut, earnestly implore you to use the powers of Congress to get alcoholic-beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce and thus protect our people and the rights of States to prevent advertising of commodities which have been declared unlawful by the rights of local option granted them under State law.

Sadie C. Kimball, Eva E. Kimball, Scotland, Conn.; Marian H. Jones, Ida L. Sager, Sarah Louise Hadley, Melda S. Bailey, Canterbury, Conn.; Harold E. Kimball, Thomas E. Clark, Alice S. Clark, Violet Chesbro, Henry W. Clark, Helen B. Cary Clark, Rev. Parker Young, Bonnie Young, Charles H. Perry, Mildred E. Perry, Isabel Racicot, Harry P. Chesbro, Daisy Meyer, Scotland, Conn.; Alice K. Willoughby, Margaret W. Robinson, Canterbury, Conn.; Mrs. Lena H. Davis, Mrs. Virginia D. Hawkins, Dwight W. Ide, Emma L. Ide, Jessie W. Baldwin, Georgie B. Lee, George A. Thompson, Annie Hathaway Smith, Mrs. Ina M. Cross, Edwin T. Cross, Sr., Mrs. Mary M. Hanna, Mrs. Mary Avery Gates, Mrs. Bertha Gallup Dailey, Mrs. Mildred McLellan, Alice M. Davis, George M. Graves, Lottie R. Graves, Carrie R. Lyman, Walter R. King, Harriet M. King, Mrs. W. H. Hoar, Edna L. Russell, Shirley K. Putnam, Alice G. Kinney, Florence H. Lewis, Eva D. Ide, Austin M. Andersen, Charles W. Graham, Irene R. Smith, Jeannette Andersen, Helen K. Broun, Ethel Woodward, Anna B. Spellman, Robert J. Sullivan, Willimantic, Conn.; Nancy Garneau, Mansfield, Conn.; Audrey Hardwick, Charlotte C. Woodward, Nettie H. Riggles, Emma Holmes, Phil Graham, Louise Ingraham, Willimantic, Conn.

Elsie H. Pike, Stafford Springs, Conn.; Elsie G. Marsh, Mansfield Center, Conn.; Vida C. Weigold, Storrs, Conn.; Jane H. Aiken, Mansfield Center, Conn.; Julia S. Rankin, Warrenville, Conn.; Harriet Hodfield, E. L. Pendleton, G. B. Brendman, Arlene D. Payne, Wilbur M. Payne, M. L. Nichols, T. Arthur Barrows, Dorothy E. Johnson, Clare C. Kinney, Anne W. Buchanan, Mansfield Center, Conn.; Ada L. Renzi, Willimantic, Conn.; Harold F. Eisnor, Warrenville, Conn.; S. M. V. Sandstrom, Rockville, Conn.; Ruth Eisnor, Warrenville, Conn.; Lilly W. Wilson, Storrs, Conn.; Robert E. Anderson, Rockville, Conn.; Marion O. Johnson, Andover, Conn.; Arthur H. Arendt, Rockville, Conn.; Dorothy F. Kingsbury, Andover, Conn.; D. Washburn, L. A. Benzinger, Amston, Conn.; B. Biggs, John D. Welhelon, Willington, Conn.; H. Raymond Pike, Stafford Springs, Conn.; O. Kingsbury, Andover, Conn.; Mrs. W. C. Stiehl, Amston, Conn.; Mary E. Crouch, Mansfield Center, Conn.; Eleanor Forsythe, Storrs, Conn.; Maude M. Mitchell, West Willington, Conn.; Dorothy J. Anderson, Rockville, Conn.; Evelyn Mitchell, Hebran, Conn.; Archie L. Blair, Mansfield Center, Conn.; Marion D. Fredericks, Chestnut Hill, Conn.; S. A. Renzi, Kenneth L. Biggs, Willimantie, Conn.; Ruth Sandstrom, Rockville, Conn.; Marjorie S. Eisnor, Brooklyn, Conn.; Barbara B. Goodale, Walter Storrs, W. H. Goodale, Jr., Edwina Whitney, Elizabeth W. Torrey, Storrs, Conn.; Ella N. Bruce, Alice J. Stearns, Norma B. Hawkins, Mansfield Center, Conn.; Marion T. Stearns, K. W. Herrick, Betty Herrick, Orva Palo, Gertrude Palo, Russell Slate, Storrs, Conn.; G. W. Buchanan, Jr., Fannie L. Anthony, Ralph E. Anthony, Mansfield Center, Conn.; Paul J. Comrie, Mystic, Conn.; Ernest H. Hotchkiss, Augusta M. Hotchkiss, Mildred J. Hotchkiss, Haddam Neck, Conn.; Lorraine H. Ellis, Edith M. Day, Grace D. Bevin, Sadie W. Guinan, Alice C. McCarroll, Helen H. Bevin, Florence Griggs, Mae Hall, Lillian K. Brooks, James B. Yee, Laura D. Yee, East Hampton, Conn.; George W. Babel, Haddam Neck, Conn.; Albert T. Ellis, East Hampton, Conn.

Aluminum Companies Refusal To Sell to Independent Aluminum Fabricators Examined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Government's recent cutback of 150 million pounds of aluminum from the quota previously designated for the defense stockpile was to assist the independent users of aluminum, many of which face business disaster because of current shortages and the aluminum producers' retention of most of their output for their own plants. In spite of this, Reynolds Metals Co., as well as Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., have refused to make their shares of the cutback available in full to the independents.

The Government entered into contracts a few years ago with both Reynolds and Kaiser whereby those companies promised to sell to the independents certain amounts of aluminum produced from new plants and facilities to be established with Government assistance. One intent behind those contracts was to protect the independent segment of the aluminum industry. Instead of complying with this intent the companies are now claiming in effect that they are not required to sell the contract amounts to the independents if their normal pattern of sales to them equals or exceeds those amounts. This specious rationalization is in direct conflict with what is commonly known to have been the intent and purpose of both the contracts and the cutback.

The refusal of Reynolds to perform its duty will have a serious adverse effect upon the independents. Its policy is an anomalous one indeed in view of the fact that the Government enabled Reynolds after World War II to get started in the aluminum business by financial assistance, and, it should be noted, for the purpose of establishing competitive conditions in that industry. Yet, Reynolds now pursues policies which increase its control over the fabricating segment of the industry and thereby lessen appreciably free competitive conditions. If such control as now exercised by Reynolds, and the other primary producers as well, in aluminum fabrication is not altered, antitrust action must inevitably be the consequence.

I have advised the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Administrator of the General Services Administration of my concern in this matter and have requested them to take such action as will protect the nonintegrated users of aluminum and insure their receipt of the amount of aluminum intended by the cutback.

My letter to the Reynolds Co. reads as follows:

MAY 31, 1955.

Mr. MARION M. CASKIE,
Executive Vice President,
Reynolds Metals Co.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CASKIE: I am writing with reference to your letter to me of May 2, 1955, and particularly with reference to the refusal of the Reynolds Co. to sell to nonintegrated or independent users of primary aluminum the full increased supply of aluminum to be made available by the Government's recent cutback of 150 million pounds in its stockpile requirements.

Unquestionably, a paramount consideration in the proposed stockpile cutback was an alleviation of the very serious shortages in primary aluminum facing the nonintegrated users. The Antitrust Subcommittee has received numerous complaints from the nonintegrated users and it is apparent that many in that independent segment of the aluminum industry face financial ruin if they are not to have greater access to the aluminum production of this country.

Reynolds' contracts with the Government require you to sell to the independents up to two-thirds of the aluminum produced from the expansion facilities recently developed by the company in cooperation with the General Services Administration and the Office of Defense Mobilization. These contracts quite obviously contemplated that the independents would be benefited to the extent the Government did not take Reynolds' production from the expanded facilities for stockpiling. It is equally obvious that the independents would be little benefited if you were to discontinue your pattern of sales to them prior to the expansion and substitute sales only in the amounts that were left after Government stockpiling. Thus, even if there were to be no stockpile demands during a particular period, two-thirds of your expanded facilities could hardly equal the amount formerly sold to the independents. And if the Government took the full amount of stockpiling, the independents, under your theory, would be entitled to nothing at all.

You state in the penultimate paragraph of your letter that Reynolds has planned to sell to the independents an amount in excess of its contract requirements. An examination of available data indicates the illusory nature of your position and the inequitable effect on the independents if it were to be accepted. In 1954, Reynolds sold to the independents over 144 million pounds, or 72 million for a 6-month average. Reynolds has sold or plans to sell for the first 6 months of 1955 a total of roughly 80 million, including the 41 million cutback amount allotted your company. Therefore, if there had been no cutback, you would sell to the independents at the rate of 39 million for a period of 6 months, appreciably less than the 1954 amounts.

Whatever the precise data may be there can be no doubt that Reynolds is not selling to the independents at the 1954 rate plus the recent cutbacks. Thus a paramount purpose of the proposed cutback will be defeated and Reynolds will use for its own

purposes a substantial share of the released amount.

It is my opinion that the action of Reynolds is most unwise in view of the effect which will result to the independent nonintegrated users of aluminum and is a rather shortsighted policy, in which not all of the primary producers are in accord. The Aluminum Co. of America, I understand, has agreed to sell the amount of the cutback applicable to them to the independents in addition to the amount they already had planned to sell.

I have no alternative but to advise the proper representatives of the General Services Administration and the Office of Defense Mobilization of my feelings in the matter.

My letter of May 31, 1955, to the Office of Defense Mobilization, as well as to General Services Administration, was as follows:

MAY 31, 1955.

Hon. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: I am enclosing a copy of a recent letter I wrote as chairman of the House Antitrust Subcommittee to the Reynolds Metals Co.

The attitude of both Reynolds and Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. with respect to the recent cutbacks from aluminum stockpiling is, of course, fully apparent to you, as are the theories by which they rationalize this attitude. I wish to emphasize to you my concern in this matter. These companies should not be permitted to relegate to their own uses the aluminum cutback of 150 million pounds as proposed last April. If the Government's needs for defense purposes do not necessitate the stockpiling of that amount, then measures should be adopted to insure that the nonintegrated users get it. Reynolds and Kaiser should not be permitted by a jumbling of statistics and technicalities to acquire the metal for their own purposes to the detriment of an important segment of the aluminum industry.

I trust that the Office of Defense Mobilization will see to it that the assistance and protection intended for the independents by the contracts with the producers and by the proposed cutbacks will not be frustrated as will be the effect if Reynolds and Kaiser are not abruptly checked in their present actions.

Armed Forces Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a very timely editorial appearing in the Worcester (Mass.) Diocesan Catholic Free Press, issue of May 13, containing a forceful prayer for those who are called to the military service of our country.

The article follows:

ARMED FORCES DAY

President Eisenhower, in the proclamation designating Saturday, May 21, as Armed Forces Day, emphasizes the proper place of armed forces in the life of a free people, a viewpoint that has remained unaltered, even by the almost constant warlike pressures of more than a decade. Calling to our attention that "the Armed Forces of the United States have always served as an instrumentality of a free people who cherish peace and security with honor" and that "the members of the Armed Forces are now engaged in undertakings designed to uphold and defend the free way of life, to maintain the peace and to ensure national security," the President points out that the observance of Armed Forces Day provides an opportunity for enlarged "understanding and appreciation of our national power for peace."

Together with focusing attention upon the abilities and technological advances of the Armed Forces, Armed Forces Day is an occasion of directing prayers to God on behalf of those who serve in our military. The Armed Forces Chaplains Board has incorporated sentiments close to the heart of Americans in a prayer that serves as an appropriate reminder to ask God's blessings upon those who serve us in the Armed Forces of the United States. The prayer follows:

"God of all grace and glory accept our humble gratitude for all the boundless blessings expressed in the lives of all who have served our beloved country with loyalty and devotion so that the freedoms we cherish have been preserved for us. Thou alone knowest all the heroic and self-sacrificing deeds which they have performed.

"On this day we remember all the personnel of our Armed Forces before Thy throne of grace. Extend over these men and women who have answered the call of duty Thy protecting hand. Preserve and protect them that no harm or hurt befall them. Make them courageous and vigilant, granting them ability to perform their duties faithfully. Give them the assurance of Thy guidance and strength that they may serve according to Thy will. Keep them in honor and decency as they place themselves wholeheartedly in the service of our country for its safety and protection that the blessings Thou wouldst have us enjoy may be preserved for generations yet unborn.

"Finally, we beseech Thee, our gracious God, give Thine own leadership to those who occupy positions of responsibility that all our endeavors may be just and honorable. Give success to our undertakings in bringing to naught the forces of darkness and in maintaining a Nation which is striving to serve Thee. In Thy Name we pray. Amen."

Are We Abandoning Our Captured Fliers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a very pointed editorial written by Mr. John R. Alison, president, Air Force Association, which appeared in the June 1955 issue of Air Force, the magazine of American airpower. I want to congratulate Mr. Alison upon his fine approach to this matter.

Mr. Alison writes in behalf of these men, all of whom remain prisoners of the Chinese Communists:

Col. John K. Arnold, Silver Spring, Md.

Maj. William H. Baumer, Lewisburg, Pa.

Capt. Elmer F. Llewellyn, Missoula, Mont.

Capt. Eugene J. Vaadi, Clayton, N. Y.

Lt. John W. Buck, Armathwaite, Tenn.

Lt. Wallace L. Brown, Banks, Ala.

T/Sgt. Howard W. Brown, St. Paul, Minn.

A/1C Steve E. Kiba, Akron, Ohio.

A/2C Harry M. Benjamin, Jr., Worthington, Minn.

A/2C Daniel C. Schmidt, Scotia, Calif.

A/2C John W. Thompson III, Orange, Va.

Since Mr. Alison wrote his article, 4 of the 15 captive fliers have been released, but I see no reason for us to extend thanks to the Communists—grateful though we may be to divine providence for the fliers' safety—instead we should more vigorously press our demands for the release of all Americans held prisoners by the Chinese Reds.

The editorial follows:

HOPE IS NOT ENOUGH

(By John R. Alison, president, Air Force Association)

Last month, in this same space, we discussed some of the problems which are facing the men and women of our Armed Forces and, for understandable reasons, those of the Air Force in particular. Some of you may have noted what appeared to be a glaring omission in that editorial.

No mention was made of one Air Force personnel problem about which we feel most deeply, the terrible plight of the 15 unfortunate American Air Force fliers who have been languishing in Red Chinese prisons for as much as 2½ years.

I didn't talk about the captured fliers last month because it appeared that it might do more harm than good. The conference of Asiatic nations at Bandoeng was scheduled to begin on the day the May issue of Air Force magazine came off the press. There was an optimistic feeling at the headquarters of the United Nations, in our State Department, and in the Pentagon that the time was ripe for Chou En-lai to make a magnanimous gesture of peaceful propaganda by offering to release our airmen as a possible gambit at the conference.

Several factors combined to generate this feeling of optimism. For one thing, our State Department had granted permission for the 76 Chinese students being detained in this country to return to Red China if they wished. There had been an exchange of correspondence between Chou En-lai and the U. N. Secretary-General, Dag Hammarskjold, which seemed to hold out some hope that the prisoners might be released. It was also reported that President Eisenhower had suggested, on a man-to-man basis, that General Zhukov of the U. S. S. R., as an old soldier himself, intercede personally on behalf of the captured fliers. And there were other straws in the wind which made it appear that a strong stand on the part of the Air Force Association at that particular time might upset a delicately balance apple cart.

But Bandung has come and gone. And the American airmen are still counting the days and trying to remember what their loved ones look like. The only change in their status is the fact that the Chinese Red Cross has agreed to distribute relief parcels sent to the prisoners from their families and friends. Some saw in this a softening of the Communist Chinese attitude. But better-informed people tell me that this is more likely an easy way for the Chinese to get the prisoners equipped with warm clothing and food for a long, cold winter. So optimism has been replaced by pessimism. Even Mr. Hammarskjold, who has pursued negotiations in the patient manner of classic diplomacy, acknowledged at a recent news conference that he was beginning to feel "a certain impatience."

I'm sure I speak for all members of the Air Force Association when I say that "impatience" scarcely begins to express our feelings on the matter. I'm angry. The Air Force Association is angry. The majority of the American people should be angry about this travesty on justice and civilized international conduct.

Just recently I attended the convention of the California wing of AFA, at Fresno. There the Ladies' Auxiliary passed a resolution which was subsequently adopted by the entire convention. I think it expresses what I mean. Stripped of the "whereases," here is the gist of it.

Diplomatic efforts to release the fliers have failed. The unjust imprisonment of our servicemen for political purposes is an invasion of human rights and an act of aggression against the United States. The matter is corroding the moral fiber of our Nation and, if not corrected, cannot help but adversely affect the readiness of our young men to answer their country's call. Since Soviet Russia has armed, equipped, and assisted Communist China in her acts of aggression, it is incumbent upon President Eisenhower to place the blame for this aggression where it belongs—upon Soviet Russia. The President, therefore, should take decisive action directly with the U. S. S. R. to obtain the release of these 15 airmen and all other United States servicemen now held in Red prisons. Further, the wives and mothers of the Nation are entitled to know what action their Government will take if their husbands and sons are imprisoned under similar circumstances in the future.

This is pretty strong talk. But we've given the "sweet talk' 'approach a good try over the past several months. It hasn't worked. That it hasn't is no reflection on either the skill or the patience of our negotiators. But sitting down at a conference table without some bargaining alternatives is like going to an auction without any money in your pocket. You can bid like crazy but you can't buy anything. When the Red Chinese say "No," our negotiators have to back off and start all over again.

I'm not in favor of using human lives to bargain with. Neither is our Government. We let the Chinese students go with no strings attached. We hoped this act would solidify our moral position and that world opinion might exert enough pressure on the Red Chinese to cause a shift in their attitude. We hoped that the efforts of the U. N. Secretary-General would bear fruit. We hoped that the Bandoeng Conference would force a change. We have been living on hope. So have the imprisoned airmen. So have their wives, their children, their parents. But hope is not enough. You can't exist on it indefinitely without faith. And surely the faith of these men in all of us here at home must be beginning to totter.

There used to be a saying on our western frontier—"Talk's cheap, Mister." It was another way of saying, "Put up or shut up." It seems to me we're reaching that stage in our maneuvering with the Communists.

The nub of the whole matter, the essence of the moral clash between democracy and totalitarianism, is distilled and exhibited in microcosm in the case of the 15 airmen. On the one hand, we have a deep and basic belief in the innate dignity of the individual, of the right of every man to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." On the other hand, we find a callous disregard of human rights, with the individual subordinated to the tyrannical whims of an all-demanding state. Fifteen lives—be they Russian, Chinese, or American—mean nothing to the Communists. But if we really believe in the fundamentals on which our nation was founded, then these 15 lives should mean everything to us. And if this all be true, then hand wringing and palavering have served their purpose and more drastic measures are in order.

Last fall, in my capacity as president of the Air Force Association, I wrote a letter to the President of the United States. I would like herewith to repeat the concluding portion of it as an indication that what we said then still goes:

"We commend your interest in the release of these unjustly imprisoned American citizens and your public statements in this regard. We assure you that firm action to meet this critical situation will receive the support of the Air Force Association and, we believe, the support of other Americans."

The situation is still critical and firm action is still called for—the sooner the better.

Memorial Day, Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address I delivered on the Memorial Day observance on Campagnone Memorial Common, Lawrence, Mass., with exercises in memory of those who served as soldiers, sailors, and marines in defense of the Union, during the War of the Rebellion, followed by the traditional military parade to Bellevue and Immaculate Conception Cemeteries, where the dead of all other wars were honored. The exercises were jointly sponsored by American Legion Posts, Nos. 15 and 275, this year.

With each passing year, we approach Memorial Day with greater reverence.

The boy who stood near one of those trees in 1938, 1925, or 1907, holding on to his father's hand as he watched the uniformed veterans on Memorial Day, may be in the gallant company of the heroic dead whose sacrifices we honor in 1955.

As each generation, in turn, grows up to defend the freedoms of our Nation.

To die, if need be, winning time for us to help create a civilization that shall be worthy of all God's children.

On Memorial Day we put aside for a moment the routine tasks that make our lives seem so small in meaning and in purpose.

We think of the boy next door, who had no wealth, or fame, or position to protect, but who went forth in the splendor of his manhood to give up his whole being that we might be spared for another chance.

What inspired him with such faith and courage?

Through home, and church, and school, he learned that the finest people are those who free themselves from the imprisonment of self.

Who are not afraid to spend their energies, their minds, and their hearts, to make life just a little better than it was before.

To our soldier dead, the bright, clean flag that they followed into battle, represented all the brave men who had gone before them; it spoke of their mothers and fathers who had provided opportunities for them in this new world; and it promised all the greatness yet to be, if Americans become fully awake to the responsibilities of freedom.

Living each day, not only for material gain, but to extend our horizons in all directions, searching for the peace based on understanding and fellowship.

Every man has his shortcomings, whether he knows them or not.

And the same applies to groups, to cities, States, and the Nation itself.

We are aware of much that is cheap and shoddy in our way of life; of action for action's sake with no constructive end in view.

In our dealings with other nations, we sometimes rush in with economic aid and military equipment, thinking that these two items will solve the whole problem, instead of trying to understand the character and the culture of the nations that we are trying to befriend.

Our impulsiveness leads us to expect quick results.

This is a factor that we must also bear in mind during forthcoming negotiations with the Russian Communists, that could result in some lessening of international tensions.

Whatever may be their long-range objectives, we can be sure that their present behavior is prompted by necessity rather than a genuine desire for peace.

Things are not going too well within the Communist Empire.

This, plus the fact that the free world is steadily building its economic and military strength, as it applies the lessons of teamwork, is responsible for the sudden change in tactics on the part of the Kremlin.

Some Americans may jump to the false conclusion that the Communists have suddenly reformed, forgetting the mousetrap plays that the Soviets employ to tempt nations into moves that will weaken and defeat them.

Armed Forces Day, which was observed on May 21, stressed the theme of power for peace.

It is that power which has made some impression on the Communists.

It is a realistic force that they plan to undermine by the olive-branch technique, until such time as they can lull the free world into the careless mood where stealthy subversion may enslave us from within.

While we are duty bound to examine every Soviet proposal that might, just might lead to a settlement of outstanding problems, we should look beyond the bait and guard ourselves against boobytraps.

At no time can we ever relax our vigilance.

The menace in our time is communism.

In the future it may come in another form; through our own worship of materialism or indifference to problems right here at home.

Having freedom is one thing; what we do with it is another.

A spoiled child, wanting to have its way in all matters, believes that it is enjoying a special freedom. But that child grows up alone because it fails to show consideration for the rights of others.

Just as no free people can live in isolation.

We remember George Washington, who shared the suffering of his men during that bitter winter at Valley Forge.

Abraham Lincoln, worried by a divided nation, the inhuman lot of the slaves, and the tragedy of brother fighting against brother that burdened his heart with anguish.

Woodrow Wilson, leading the crusade to save democracy and to win the right of self-determination for all peoples.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, lifting the Nation and the world from despair by his confident leadership and his faith in the future.

Behind these Presidents, supporting and inspiring them, were the millions of unknown Americans whose sacrifices we honor today.

In every city and hamlet throughout the Nation we shall decorate their graves on this Memorial Day and in every year to come as long as man shall live. Not only in the cemeteries that carpet the western hills of our city, but in the bivouacs of the dead

from Concord to Korea; in the islands of the far Pacific; and along the hedgerows of France, that tenderly embrace the mortal remains of young Americans who fought and died in freedom's name.

Today we commune with them.

Praying that we may live up to the high standards they have set before us.

Heartened by the alert and every-ready pilots of our Strategic Air Command; by the soldiers and sailors who make tyrants hesitate to embroil the world in war.

Hopeful, as we look at our schools where youngsters are learning those imperishable truths that will nourish the future.

From university to scientific laboratory, from factory to market place, and in every activity, the eager American is pioneering, pressing forward to conquer poverty, disease, ignorance, and intolerance.

Not for himself alone, but that all men shall benefit from progress. With the dedication of a Dr. Salk, who freely offered his discovery to liberate parents and children in all lands from the fear and suffering of a dread affliction.

Soldiers for peace as well as for war.

Winning victories for mankind.

In sadness, mellowed by pride, we mourn for our soldier dead because they gave up the great gift of life, to defend us.

Wondering if we can ever justify their faith in us.

Missing their unwavering courage that we need to overcome the dangers that challenge us the living.

But wait, we do not have to reach back and recapture the past.

Our heroic dead are not separated from us, in the ever-lengthening distance between 1950, 1918, 1898, 1864, 1775.

They are the invisible host of brave men who, having done their duty, encourage us to do ours, being closer to us than we realize.

Freedom is not a passing experiment.

Courage is never dated.

On this Memorial Day we are aware of a precious heritage that lives and breathes in us.

Thankful to God for having blessed our country with men who were unafraid to open the way on which we must follow through.

Indebted to the valiant Americans who have not really gone and will never be forgotten.

Because they walk with us in spirit and forever.

Protecting the Educational Opportunities of Our Young Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have received a protest from the Washington State Bar Association which I think merits the attention of the Members of the House.

Recently in the Committee of the Whole House when we were discussing the Reserve manpower bill it was obvious Congress desires in peacetime if possible to protect the educational opportunities of our young men. Now I have a case in point which shows how rigid and arbitrary our military can be.

Three graduating law students of the University of Washington who are attached to the District of Columbia National Guard as Reserve officers applied for induction delay so they could take their bar examinations. They were ordered to report June 15 and the examinations are to be given July 18, 19, and 20. Their request was rejected and they were told either to report as ordered or to resign and be drafted.

I certainly think the future careers of our young men should be considered. To me the Washington State Bar Association is right, and I have urged the District National Air Guard to reconsider its decision. My colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. MACK], in whose district one of the young men lives, has joined me in protesting and urging that a 60-day delay be given these three students in reporting for military service. We have pointed out that the Government already has an investment in their training which should be protected, but more important they should be permitted to take their bar exams now rather than after they complete their military service. Otherwise their future careers may well be jeopardized.

Debate Over Tax Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania is now in the midst of a raging battle over State tax policy—over how the State should raise the $400 million or more in additional revenues which are needed to meet the State's requirements, including many heavy obligations created for the new Leader administration by its predecessors without the necessary accompanying revenue measures to cover those new obligations.

Gov. George Leader's tax program is a most controversial one, and the debate over it is intense. The whole thing is very much up in the air. Under those circumstances, Mayor Joseph S. Clark, Jr., of Philadelphia, has actively entered the debate and has urged adoption of the Leader program.

Because of the interest among so many Members of Congress in the Pennsylvania fiscal problem and because of the fact that the same issues involved in the State tax debate also enter into the arguments over national tax policy, I believe the Members might be interested in Mayor Clark's statement, issued on May 6, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MAYOR JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR., ON LEADER TAX PROGRAM, MAY 6, 1955

Opponents of the Leader tax program are gradually coming to admit that substantially increased taxes must be imposed by the present session of the legislature in order to enable the State government to render necessary services to the people of the Commonwealth.

Three hundred and twenty million dollars of such taxes are required by mandatory increases in State expenditures imposed by the Duff and Fine administrations without levying the taxes necessary to meet the future commitments of the State.

The remaining requirements, totalling approximately $190 million are required to bring our educational system, our hospitals and our care of the mentally ill up to decent minimum standards. The above figure also includes the money necessary for the Governor's program to bring industry back to Pennsylvania and relieve drastic unemployment in the coal fields, in the Greater Philadelphia area and elsewhere.

Opponents of Governor Leader's program are just not telling the truth when they assert that a general sales tax would impose an easier burden on the average Pennsylvania wage earner than the classified income tax recommended by the Governor.

Sales tax advocates have been comparing the impact of the present 1 percent sales tax with the proposed income tax. This is an outright deception of the public.

If a sales tax is to be imposed to meet revenue requirements it will have to be at a 3½ percent or 4 percent rate and must be imposed on sales of everything except take-home food. Such a tax would take far more out of the average pay envelope than a classified income tax.

Those students of taxation who believe in the principle of levying taxes on the basis of capacity to pay are nearly unanimously of the opinion that a graduated income with appropriate exemptions is a far fairer levy than a general sale tax which is of necessity regressive in its impact. The Leader tax plan is as close as we can get to a graduated income tax under the present archaic constitution of Pennsylvania.

Of course, those who believe that wealth, whether inherited or earned, should be taxed no more heavily than wages will favor a sales tax; but that discredited theory was discarded by the Government of the United States as far back as 1913, when the first graduated income tax was imposed.

It must be remembered that any tax on the necessities of life comes in the end out of the pay envelope of the worker who has no other funds with which to buy what he and his family need.

I am sure that the wage earners of Pennsylvania on sober reflection will agree that they will be better off under the Leader graduated income tax than they would be if those who seek to impose the heaviest burden on those least able to pay are able to reenact Governor Fine's sales tax at 3 or 4 times the original rate.

Americans Fight for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, for the past 88 years Memorial Day services have been conducted at the National Cemetery at Gettysburg. It has become one of the most solemn and traditional observances of the day.

There were two things about this year's ceremonies which were highlights to me. One was the voluntary presence in this essentially northern observation of the band of the Mount Vernon High School from Alexandria, Va. The other were the pertinent remarks of the principal speaker, the Honorable Harold E. Stassen. Under leave to revise and extend

my remarks, I include the speech given by Mr. Stassen:

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HAROLD E. STASSEN AT THE GETTYSBURG NATIONAL CEMETERY, MAY 30, 1955, AT 3:15 P. M.

Mr. President, Mrs. Eisenhower, Congressman QUIGLEY, my fellow citizens assembled for this 88th memorial service at Gettysburg, I am certain that every citizen joining in this vast assembly would wish me to express on their behalf a deep appreciation to the President and Mrs. Eisenhower for their presence and for the fact that their home address at Gettysburg has led to their attendance today at this memorial service initiated by President Lincoln. Today is an occasison that will long be remembered in Gettysburg.

Nearly 100 years ago President Abraham Lincoln, in words now an immortal part of our American heritage, helped to dedicate this final resting place for those who gave their lives during the first cruel days of July 1863. Even as Lincoln spoke, our Nation was racked by a civil war; and the outcome of that tragic conflict was still uncertain.

Today we know the ultimate victory. We know the brave men who paid the final price of freedom at this spot did not die in vain. Their cause survives. The principles they fought for have endured and prospered mightily. This Nation, under God, has not perished from the earth. This Nation, under God, has prospered and held freedom.

It is fitting that each year a special time, Memorial Day, be set apart for us, the living, to pluck the mystic chords of memory lest we forget the meaning of the distant drums. Only a few survive who hearkened to the battle bugles call in Lincoln's time, less than a platoon left who know the deeds of yesterday at first hand. For most of us the agonizing struggles of the Civil War are but pages in a history book.

Since those grim days other Americans, in other wars, in other lands, have fought—and many died—that liberty might live. The names of far-off battlefields twist our tongues—alien places undreamed of by those who lie in this hallowed earth. Yet, no matter what the changes—in time, or place, or weapons—the fundamental cause for which America has fought remains the same: Freedom.

So all may know that if need be we will fight again in freedom's cause, we bear today a great and heavy load of arms. Our partners overseas do the same. We have watched, too often in the recent past, a tyrant's armies move, first attacking weaker nations close at hand and then, emboldened by aggression's seeming triumph eventually attacking us.

We have learned this lesson: A world not safe for little nations is not secure for big ones. Until the immoral law of force gives way to the force of moral law, those who love and cherish liberty must have power to deter its deadly foes.

Liberty is not guarded by arms alone; it survives and flourishes through the spirit—the dedicated lives of those who know that liberty is worth its price. Should that price be patriot's blood and women's tears, let knowledge of this fact be more than sorrow. Man was born to be free; and will forever strive forward to fill this destiny.

Therefore, with courage and with sober hope, under the inspiring leadership of the now President, let us take up our great unfinished work. Upon the principles of liberty and justice for all, we can, with patience and with perseverance, build up a decent trust among all nations. Thereby this Nation under God, working in faith and valor with our partners across the seas, may erect the noblest monument that could be raised to those we honor here this day: A living monument of peace and freedom.

Free Trade and Free Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a pertinent editorial from the Wall Street Journal on the subject of free trade:

FREE TRADE AND FREE ACTION

Since 1934 the broad effort of this Government has been to reduce American tariffs in return for comparable concessions from other nations. That is the purpose of the Reciprocal Trade Act and its successive extensions.

Since 1948 the principal instrument of this purpose has been the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, discussed by Mr. Clark in adjoining columns this morning.

This effort, it seems to us, is unexceptionable. The broad purpose of the Reciprocal Trade Act is healthy, and we have no quarrel, in principle, with the GATT approach to it, which is mainly getting a lot of nations together for tariff negotiations. Now, however, the administration wants Congress to give it authority to join an Organization for Trade Cooperation. This would formalize GATT and establish a permanent staff and a Director to administer it. A machine would, in effect, be transformed into a pseudoregulatory global agency.

The request to authorize membership in OTC raises some serious questions. Is it necessary for the purposes of the Trade Act and GATT? Evidently not. GATT has functioned these 7 years, and OTC would confer no powers to negotiate tariffs or change trade rules not already enjoyed by national representatives meeting at GATT conferences.

More important, is it altogether wise for Congress to endorse GATT, which would be the effect of authorizing OTC? The way it is now, the very provisional nature of GATT gives this country considerable flexibility. If it decides that circumstances warrant a return to strictly bilateral dealings, or if it thinks up a better way than GATT, it can bow out without causing an international furor.

This flexibility also applies to the rules which the GATT nations try to draw up for themselves. Because of conflicting national interests, these rules are full of exceptions. The United States got, at the last GATT meeting, a waiver permitting it to discriminate against farm imports in accordance with its domestic farm price-support legislation. But the other nations knew that if they did not grant the waiver the United States would act as though they had anyway; there is nothing really binding about the rules of GATT in its present provisional state.

Solemnize GATT through congressional approval of OTC, however, and you get a different emphasis, if not something more. It is much more difficult to withdraw from a formal international bureaucracy than it is to give up a machine which is merely one machine among others.

It is also more difficult in that situation to disregard GATT rules which may conflict with domestic statutes. We do not happen to admire the farm price support legislation, but we very much admire the right of Congress to pass such laws as the Constitution permits and it sees fit. If Congress blesses GATT it may feel logically and morally bound not to pass laws in conflict with GATT and to revoke existing ones that conflict. We do not contend this would necessarily happen, but it would be rather silly, to say the least, if Congress were to approve GATT in effect and proceed to violate its rules.

Now it is true that Congress has delegated limited tariff and trade powers to the Executive through the Reciprocal Trade Act. But for Congress to authorize OTC would be to put up one more fence between the Congress and its control of trade policy. Perhaps the practical results would not be important. But they could be far-reaching.

We should, indeed, continue to work for freer international trade through the present machinery of GATT or however seems best within the meaning of the Trade Act. But we should not kid ourselves that the goal is advanced by joining one more global bureaucracy. And we should be very chary of sacrificing, in our pursuit of freedom of trade, our freedom of action.

Dark Skies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in 1922, Dr. You Chan Yang, the present Korean Ambassador to the United States, received his M. D. degree from Boston University at the same time I received my S. T. B. from the same institution.

Of course, we were not classmates, but we were schoolmates and lived in the same dormitory on Beacon Hill in old Boston. During the years as students at that great institution of learning, we became warm and steadfast friends. Since our graduation the years have brought us even more closely together, and our friendship has ripened into a priceless treasure.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address on Dark Skies, which was delivered by Dr. Yang before the Associated Dinner Clubs of Lubbock, Tex., on May 3, 1955. No comments from me are at all necessary, because the address speaks eloquently for itself, delivered by a fine Christian gentleman and by a real world statesman.

DARK SKIES

(Text of address given by Dr. You Chan Yang, Korean Ambassador to the United States, before the Associated Dinner Clubs of Lubbock, Tex., on May 3, 1955)

My dear American friends, I do not wish to appear gloomy, especially in a State where the opposite of gloom is the rule—both weatherwise and mentalwise. Here in this vast land of Texas, where you people laugh at difficulties and where "the impossible takes just a little bit longer," it is natural for a visitor to take inspiration from you. And, in my many visits to Texas, especially when the Communist war seemed to be going against us in my faraway country of Korea, I have taken and been grateful for the inspiration to which I have just referred.

Nor am I gloomy today, but I do want to sound a warning of dark skies to come. The Communists are in the process of giving the free world another runaround. They have started another talkathon, and will they, at

a time of their own choosing, when we may be off balance, end the words with another blood-drenched Korea or Indochina?

Most of my people—the most beaten-up and battered people in the world today—are realistic enough to believe that is precisely when the Communists will try to do so. I join them in this belief. I join them because I have some familiarity with the tactics of the Communists.

COMMUNIST TACTICS

I have had to study their tactics from the ill-fated truce in Korea, to the ill-fated Geneva Conference, the Conference at Bandung and now the beginnings of the trap I fear Chou En-lai is setting.

Should the time ever arise when those of us in the free world could rely on a Communist's promise or pledge, I might have to change my mind. But I cannot visualize that day as yet.

Communism thrives on tensions and since the end of World War II—10 years ago—the Communists have created one tension after another. They have brought disruption to many parts of the world. They have caused the greatest armaments race in the history of mankind. They have shown a total disregard for the rights of the individual and a complete contempt of freedom and liberty, as we know the blessings of each. They have done this with a scorn of the Nation which saved their skins, for Soviet Russia would have gone down the river had it not been saved by American military and economic aid.

So, I think I should tell you the objectives of Chou En-lai as I see them. After all, he is acting in concert with Soviet Russia and the word "peace" will figure in all his propaganda, and here are the four objectives of a "Red peace."

THE FOUR OBJECTIVES

First, he will insist on the evacuation of Quemoy and Matsu Islands by the Nationalists so the Communists may take them over intact.

Second, he will ask for a 5-year trusteeship for Formosa and the Pescadores;

Third, he will demand for Red China a membership in the United Nations and a seat on the Security Council; and

Fourth, he will call for American recognition of Communist China.

Now, if you will ponder these objectives, you will see for yourself what, if they are attained, they will lead to.

In my opinion, they will produce a situation where Communist domination of the Far Pacific will be an established fact. That would and could mean an easy way wherein the Reds could complete their conquest of Indochina, as well as Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, and the rest of the vital rice bowl of southeast Asia. It could mean that Hong Kong would hang like a ripe plum.

It could also mean that Japan would be open to Communist conquest, but one of the disturbing things to the anti-Communist Asiatics is the manner in which the Japanese are presently playing footsie with Moscow and are showing anxiety for Communist trade, so that we Koreans, at least, continue to regard Japanese activities in this connection with a great degree of suspicion.

I do not believe that a single gain has resulted from these interminable talk-feasts with the enemy, and I am fearful that the same statement will apply to the one just concluded at Bandung.

This conference, as you know, was attended not only by Communists, but neutralists, too.

The three main topics of discussion were: First, colonialism; second, racial problems; and third, economic aid.

A LOOK AT COLONIALISM

Let's look at colonialism because one of the main Communist charges is that the United States is guilty of colonialism. Now, how can they make this charge against a country which has to its record the granting of freedom to other peoples? Cuba is a free and independent island nation today because your sons fought for her freedom. The same is true of the Philippines. The same is true of my own country of Korea. Nor are these all. When the then big powers were practicing colonialism at the turn of the century and attempting to carve up bits of China—the very same China that is in the hands of the Reds today—the United States said, "We want no territory in or from China." You did even more. The indemnity you received as the result of the damage you suffered during the Boxer uprising—did you keep it? You did not. You made it a fund so that hundreds and hundreds of young Chinese students could receive an education in America.

But, my dear American friends, there is a form of colonialism existing today, but you did not hear it discussed very much at Bandung. It is the colonialism—and the very worst kind—which Soviet Russia is practicing upon her satellites. It already has ended the Baltic nations; it has taken a large portion of heroic Finland; it has engulfed Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, eastern Germany, and so on.

It is rapidly growing colonialism. It has most of north Korea under its tyrannical control, as it has half of Indochina.

Take their second point—racial problems. The civilized world has a growing realization of the doctrine of "live and let live." When your mighty military machine came almost at once to our assistance, you didn't take time off to debate that the sun of our climate had, down through the ages, given us a slightly different complexion than yours. That also was not a factor in your dealings with the Filipino people, nor with the Cubans.

Racial problems at Bandung were a subject on that agenda and many of those attending delegations learned that the subject was on the agenda for one purpose—to spread hate—Communist hate.

WILL USE ANY WEAPON

But there is no consistency to either the moves or the arguments of the out-and-out Communists. They seek the enslavement of the entire world and they will grab any weapon, fair or foul, that they think will aid their evil purpose.

Now, let me take up the third point—economic aid.

Will you tell me what was the point of not inviting the United States to the Conference? Isn't this the country that has given the rest of mankind more economic aid than any other? Why, Soviet Russia, while the war was on and until we all got hep to what the men in the Kremlin were up to, was the recipient of more than $11 billion of military and economic aid from America.

Chou En-lai, as expected, dominated the Bandung Conference, and most of the headlines were his.

If he wishes to relax tensions, as he contends, why does he not first release the American fliers in Chinese prisons? Why does he not release his other prisoners of the United Nations? Why does he not release the thousands of Koreans he still holds in custody?

Why does he not withdraw his army from North Korea and his millions of settlers from my country?

Why does he not permit the United Nations to hold free elections in North Korea instead of virtually casting it in the role of a belligerent? Why does he circumscribe the free world members of the Neutral Nations Commission, so it is forbidden to make any adequate check of the military buildup in violation of the armistice throughout North Korea?

The Chinese Communists, since the armistice in Korea, have violated its terms time after time. They have built 50 jet airfields. Underground hangars have also been built and are filled with more than 500 jet planes.

Another charge which Chou En-lai continues to make is American interference in Asiatic affairs. Nothing was said about "American interference" by any Chinese source during the war when the Japanese were riding roughshod, with their usual cruel military tactics, over most of China. As a Korean, I can say "give me more American interference." It is good for my country, just as it has been good for the rest of the world, because American interference, as I have pointed out, means freedom and when freedom is achieved it means American military withdrawal and noninterference in any other nation's affairs.

KOREA'S PLEDGE

My people will give their last drop of blood for freedom and against appeasement. We take seriously what your own great Patrick Henry stood for when he said, "Give me liberty or give me death." We believe that when freedom is endangered any place it is endangered every place.

Our ancient capital of Seoul lies only an 8-minute flight from the enemy, but neither my grand old president, Syngman Rhee, nor my people who have responded to his inspiring leadership, fears this as much as we fear that good men and women of the free world will permit themselves to be taken in by obvious propaganda, crafty promises that never will be fulfilled, and the downright lies of the Communists.

The solution of this ideological struggle cannot be found in retreat, nor confusion nor timidity, but it is in the words of your own Thomas Jefferson: "Freedom is for those strong enough and willing to fight for it."

There were at Bandung, I will admit, nations which subscribe to Mr. Jefferson's statement. Turkey, for instance, whose soldiers fought magnificently in Korea. The Republic of the Philippines was another. Thailand, a third, and it is not my intention nor desire to portray Bandung as a failure. I am an Asiatic. But it is my desire to impress upon you that if this happens in the future—namely, that the conference was a springboard for further Red promises and trickery in further futile talks, then it may justly be called just another Geneva. There were lots of free nations on hand in Geneva, yet look what happened. Half of Indochina went into the ashcan, and more than 10 million of our kind of people went behind the Iron Curtain. They didn't want to go, but the inability of our side to work as a unit against an enemy who knows the effectiveness of unit operation, permitted them to pass into slavery.

REASON FOR BITTERNESS

There may be more than a trace of bitterness in some of my remarks here today. But if the Communists racked up more than 2 million casualties, both civilian and military, in Texas, wouldn't the rest of you be bitter, too? Supposing they were responsible for 300,000 widows? And more than 200,000 war orphans? Supposing they had been up and down what would be a relatively small space in Texas (I'm talking about the size of my country) and back and forth across it so that you would have to say, "Fifty of our fifty-five cities are missing", I don't have to ask you how you would feel about it.

No, my friends, too many Texans fought alongside us in Korea and fought so magnificently that I know the answer.

Well, I am sometimes asked just what are the aims of the Korean people, now that the armistice, which we did not approve in the first place, is so long in effect.

I tell questioners that, having been the first nation to suffer the ravages of Communist aggression—and the skill to kill advances very rapidly in this modern world—

I tell them we want peace as much as any people in the world.

But I also tell them we want our country reunited and the invader out.

If this can be achieved by peaceful means, we are all for it. If it cannot be achieved by peaceful means, we are in favor of warlike means.

PRESENT SITUATION

Our situation right now is very much like a man whose house has been broken into by a desperate criminal. The latter is in possession of one part of the house. The owner and his family are in another. But in the part the criminal has, there are also other members of the owner's family.

What should be done under the circumstances? The owner, let's say, orders the criminal out. That's peaceful means. The criminal refuses to leave and says, "No, but let's sit down and negotiate."

Now, if you know that someone is a criminal, a proven criminal right before your eyes, you know what chances you'd have of negotiating with him. That's the terrible tragedy of my divided country today, and I'll repeat the plea President Rhee made, when he felt the war in Korea—after we learned armistice moves were on—could be won by Korean alone, and the plea was this:

"Give us guns and save your sons!"

We're willing to go it alone to the very end of the line because we know that peace and honor are inseparable, just as are enslavement and dishonor.

Cuts Weaken United States Information Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have stressed the importance to our country in making more readily available the classics of American democracy to the people of the world. The fact is that we are being outstripped by the Soviet, which has filled the bookstalls in many countries with many cheap editions of Communist works. Meanwhile the classics of our own democracy that have been the source of inspiration to Americans of many generations have not been translated into other languages and issued in cheap editions available to the masses.

I am extending my remarks at this point to include an article by Roscoe Drummond in the Chicago Sun-Times of May 29, 1955, which I recommend to the careful reading of my colleagues. The article follows:

CUTS WEAKEN UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Two news events of the last few days will take on more meaning if they are brought together and looked at simultaneously. They are these:

Moscow—Soviet propaganda unabated: Despite a cascade of soothing words about the easing of international tensions, there is no sign of any letup in the campaign of anti-American propaganda.

Washington—Congress urged to slash USIA budget one-third: Senate committee weighs proposals for sweeping cutbacks of America's overseas information program.

To me it just doesn't make sense to hack away at the United States Information Agency budget in light of the kind of world that exists today. It would be better to fold it up entirely and give the Communists a clear field than for Congress to keep heckling it and shackling it with reduced appropriations.

I do not at all suggest that the Information Agency has never put out a propaganda dud. Nor do I suggest that Congress should not scrutinize the professional skill and competence of the United States information operation. What I do suggest is that instead of trying to find ways of damping the zest and spirit of USIA and curtailing it almost year after year, Congress ought to encourage—even compel—the administration to come up with even more practical, concrete, imaginative, and resourceful ways of utilizing a larger budget.

The United States Information Agency budget for fiscal 1953 was $123 million. It was cut to $78 million for fiscal 1954, and to $77 million for fiscal 1955. For the coming year the USIA asked Congress to approve a budget of $88,500,000 and the House of Representatives has already reduced it to $80 million. This is supposed to cover the whole worldwide Voice of America broadcasts plus motion pictures, press service, libraries, exhibits—everything.

And what is the USIA—with $80 million, or even $123 million—up against? In France alone the Communist expeditures, mostly for propaganda, run approximately $150 million a year, and in Italy about $48 million. The total propaganda budget, internal and external, of the U. S. S. R., its satellites, and China, for 1953 is estimated to be over $3 billion. It is impossible to separate foreign propaganda from the enormous amounts spent by Communist countries to propagandize their own people, but cut it any way you want and it still adds up to a massive operation that the USIA is up against.

In at least one instance, however, direct comparison between the United States and the Soviet propaganda effort is measurable. The Soviet Union spends approximately the equivalent of $230 million on radio broadcasts outside its own borders. The total budget for the Voice of America for fiscal 1956 is approximately $18 million. The Kremlin puts nearly 13 times as much into the Voice of Moscow outside its borders as this country puts into the Voice of America. Should not Congress be asking why America is not doing more—and better?

The Senate Appropriations Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator HAYDEN (Democrat, Arizona), is now being urged by some to lop another $29 million off the relatively puny USIA budget. The biggest single proposed economy is to abolish the press service, which today literally gets the United States thousands of columns of news coverage which would not otherwise be printed. The argument behind this proposal is that the USIA press service is not needed, because the American wire services—AP, UP, and INS—are the most complete of any nation on earth.

Right but irrelevant. There are thousands of newspapers, in a large number of countries where Communist propaganda is most pervasive and virulent, which cannot afford the United States commercial services. Obviously the USIA cannot afford to leave the field to Tass.

Proposed economies in the USIA budget which rest on such false premises are not economies at all. They are proposals to dismantle the information program at a time when it is most needed.

Conceivably the Communists may be ready to lay aside the cruder tactics of aggression in the cold war, but there is no evidence that they are going to lay aside aggressive propaganda.

Limiting the Powers of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, the other day a proposal in Congress to reduce personal taxes by a meager $20 a head was called fiscal irresponsibility. That was true because of worse fiscal irresponsibility by Congress for more than 20 years right up to this minute. It has been making appropriations for grants-in-aid, loans, subsidies, and gifts. It has authorized spending, borrowing, and running deficits that make the proposed reduction in taxes impossible—irresponsible. During the fiscal year 1956 the Federal Government expects to spend about 20 percent of its budget on domestic programs with so-called economic and social objectives. Included in these programs are aids to agriculture, aids to business, aids to veterans, aids to tenants and homeowners, aids to labor and other programs providing general economic or social benefits. The total for these programs according to the Tax Foundation is $12¼ billion. It takes at least 1,400,000 Federal employees to operate our extraneous, unconstitutional functions of government. They cost in salaries and other overhead more than $6 billion. Nine hundred thousand employees could perform all the legitimate constitutional nonmilitary functions of government—and do a better job.

Americans are quick to express their displeasure of and opposition to the Communist concept of state ownership of land and resources. They would consider any comparison between our country and Russia as odious and tantamount to treason. But a look at the facts will show that such a comparison is possible and that the only difference is one of method and degree. It is common knowledge that in the last 15 years this inflation, which is directly attributable to reckless and irresponsible fiscal practices of the Federal Government, has decreased by 50 percent the value of our dollar assets, bank deposits, Government bonds, insurance policies, and social-security claims. Since the Federal Government has the power to so devalue the worth of our money, it can be said that the Government has confiscated one-half of every dollar earned and owned by every American. In the early days of the New Deal the Federal Government confiscated every ounce of gold that was being used or to be used as the medium of exchange. Future ownership of gold was declared a crime, and payment of obligations in gold was forbidden. Taxes, hidden and direct, require a third of our individual income. More than half of the net income of corporations is taken. The Federal Government owns about 25 percent of the land area of the United States. In addition are all the Government housing projects and some 2,500 business properties estimated at about $50 billion. Add to this the electrical-power projects

that will soon produce a fourth of our power. Add to this irrigation projects of $2⅓ billion. Then there is the Government insurance business, impossible to estimate, insuring farmers against crop failures, workers against unemployment, orphans, widows, and old people against want. Along with innumerable other controls and regulations, the Federal Government exercises such compulsions as to fix wages according to the judgment of that Government. Farmers are instructed from Washington what crops are to be planted and what the extent of the harvest shall be. In recent times the Government has determined the rent a landlord should charge and the profits a business could make. This was accomplished by specific controls in addition to the taxing power which deprives the owner of his rights to property and his disposition of the same. Through the borrowing power the United States Government has mortgaged every man, woman, and child in the Nation to the extent of over $1,700, or a total of $285 billion, and entered into other contingent obligations estimated at $244 billion, many of which are not on the books and not yet determinable.

Thus, what the Federal Government does not own outright, which is communism, it regulates and controls, which is socialism, American variety. So far as the individual is concerned, there is little difference between taking ownership of property and taking control of it. What value does property have to a man if he cannot manage it or enjoy the fruits of it or dispose of it as he sees fit?

The conclusion is inescapable, that the Government, through its outright taking, taxing, regulatory and controlling powers, has confiscated and transferred to itself at least one-half of the value of all private property in the United States. This is obviously a conservative estimate. When income is taken up to 92 percent, or 91 percent as at present, by Government that means individual responsibility to manage ourselves and our property is suspended.

Something has to be done about it. Or we shall have unlimited governmental irresponsibility in the management of our affairs permanently fastened upon us.

Indeed, is it not a fact that any people who tolerate mere men exercising unlimited powers over them have become themselves temporarily irresponsible? No sensible organization of men turns loose its officers to do anything they like and spend whatever they please. Their powers are always specified and limited in scope and spending to carry out the stated purposes of the organization. Congress is in that ridiculous position of being unlimited in functions and spending power.

Do we need another decade—even another day—to demonstrate that Congress is incapable of correcting its own helplessness without the people's help?

Much of our trouble stems from the Marxian system of taxation established by Congress. With its heavy progressive income tax and its confiscatory death tax, this system is fast driving us into complete socialism.

As a means of eliminating this evil, Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN and Congressman CHAUNCEY W. REED have introduced in the Senate and House an amendment to the Constitution limiting the power of Congress to tax incomes, inheritances, and gifts—Senate Joint Resolution 23 and House Joint Resolution 182.

Congressman REED, when he introduced the amendment in the House on January 3, 1955, summarized its provisions as follows:

First. As to income taxes: The amendment limits income taxes on both individuals and corporations to a maximum rate of 25 percent, but permits Congress by a vote of three-fourths of the Members of each House to exceed that rate provided the top rate does not exceed the bottom rate by more than 15 percentage points. For example, if the bottom rate were 20 percent, the top rate could not exceed 35 percent. If the top rate does not exceed 25 percent, however, there is no restriction at all on the bottom rate. It could, for instance, be 1 percent or one-half of 1 percent. Subject to the foregoing limitations, the rates on corporate incomes may vary from those on individual incomes.

Second. Death and gift taxes: The amendment gives to the States the exclusive power to impose death and gift taxes.

The Reed-Dirksen proposal recognizes some basic first principles that the Marxian tax system we now have does not. First, there is a point of diminishing returns in the collection of taxes. Low rates may produce more revenue than high rates. Second, the great bulk of income taxes in a progressive rate system is collected from the lowest tax brackets; and, third, that as between separate governmental taxing units, the one closest to the people can perform most efficiently and economically.

The first principle is best illustrated by the use of Henry Ford as an example. In 40 years Mr. Ford's fortune increased from $1,000 to $1 billion. If the Ford Motor Co. had been subjected to a 50-percent income tax during that 40-year period it could never have come into existence. We have proved to the world that mass-produced, low-per-unit-cost products yield more profits and pay more taxes than high-per-unit costs and high rates of taxes.

To illustrate: During the 1920's the high World War I tax rates were drastically lowered. The following table shows that although maximum rates were lowered and personal exemptions increased the revenue yield was greater:

Year	Total internal-revenue collections	Maximum rate (percent)	Personal exemptions
1925	$2,584,140,000	40	$2,500
1926	2,836,000,000	24	3,000
1927	2,865,863,000	24	3,500
1929	2,939,054,000	20	3,500
1930	3,040,146,000	20	3,500

The reason for this is obvious. The great bulk of revenue comes from the first and lowest bracket of the income taxpayers. About 85 percent of all taxes collected comes from the lowest bracket, viz. the 20-percent bracket. Only 3 percent, or about $2 billion, is provided by rates in excess of 34 percent.

It is obvious from the foregoing that if the Government continues to require large revenues, the lowest income producers will be required to provide by far the greatest share of taxes.

Real relief can be effected only by drastically reducing expenditures or by reducing the higher bracket tax rates so as to increase incentive and investment in productive enterprise. As Congressman REED points out, this would increase the national income which constitutes the tax base and thereby increase the revenue.

A very important effect of the amendment is the restoration to the States of the fiscal ability to meet the needs of their people. The States have lost that power to a great extent and consequently have either been forced to rely on the various grants-in-aid programs, or have surrendered to the Federal Government the responsibility for the performance of services that are primarily of State and local concern. This shift of power and responsibility is in clear violation of our constitutional concept that the unit of government closest to the people can most capably serve them. The Constitution provides for a neat division of powers, reserving to the States the bulk of sovereignty and granting only explicit and very limited powers to the Central Government.

This balance has been upset by the reckless and unsound use of the unlimited taxing power granted to the Federal Government by the 16th amendment and the Court interpretations of it. By preempting the tax sources the Central Government has been successful in arrogating to itself virtual control over the lives, property, and liberties of the American people. The States exist too much by sufferance and function too often as agents for the distribution of the Federal largesse. The extent of the shift of sovereignty is indicated by the fact that 20 years ago the States and localities collected 75 percent of all tax revenues in the Nation, while today the Federal Government collects 75 percent. The pen is indeed mighter than the sword, but the power of the purse is invincible.

The Reed-Dirksen proposal reverses this trend toward centralizing government power by restoring to the States some of the sources of tax revenues. The amendment returns to the States the exclusive power to levy death and gift taxes. These taxes constitute a small item in the Federal tax picture—about 1 percent—but represent a considerable revenue to the States. The right to control the transfer and devolution of property is one of the historical attributes of sovereignty, and clearly belongs to the States. Secondly, the amendment's limitation on confiscatory rates in the higher income-tax brackets guarantees to the States that the wealth created within their boundaries will remain there to create more wealth and consequently produce more and greater tax revenues for the States.

The amendment is a compromise, recognizing that in emergency situations

the Federal Government must have great fiscal powers. But it also assures the American people of fiscal and, consequently, political sanity in normal times. That is the least we can do for the Nation's 66 million taxpayers.

The following is an address delivered on the floor of the Senate, January 21, 1955, by Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, introducing Senate Joint Resolution 23, Reed-Dirksen amendment:

THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT LIMITING CONGRESSIONAL POWER TO TAX INCOMES, INHERITANCES, AND GIFTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in January 1953 the Honorable CHAUNCEY W. REED, of Illinois, introduced in the House, and I introduced in the Senate a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the power of Congress to tax incomes, inheritances, and gifts—House Joint Resolution 103 and Senate Joint Resolution 23.

This amendment would limit income taxes to a maximum rate of 25 percent, but would permit Congress by a vote of three-fourths of the Members of each House to exceed that rate at any time without limit. Where the top rate exceeded 25 percent, however, it could be no more than 15 percentage points above the bottom rate. For example, if the bottom rate were 15 percent, the top rate could not exceed 30 percent. If the bottom rate were 20 percent, the top rate could not exceed 35 percent. If the top rate did not exceed 25 percent, however, there would be no restriction at all on the bottom rate. It could, for example, be 1 percent, or one-half of 1 percent.

This amendment would also deprive Congress of the power to impose death and gift taxes and would leave these means of raising revenue exclusively to the States, where they belong, and where competition among the States would tend to keep the rates within reasonable bounds.

Representative REED and I are introducing this joint resolution again this year.

The proposed amendment has met with wide approval. Important national organizations have endorsed it, including the American Bar Association, the American Legion, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Western Tax Council, the Committee for Constitutional Government, the Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, the National Economic Council, and the National Small Business Men's Association.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of this amendment. Its objective is to save our American incentive system, commonly spoken of as the private-enterprise system, on which our very form of government depends.

Our present system of taxation, with its heavy progressive income and inheritance taxes, will eventually destroy this system and result in the substitution of some form of socialism.

Karl Marx, in his Communist manifesto of 100 years ago, fully recognized the importance of these taxes as a means of destroying the private-enterprise system by including in the 10 planks in his platform the following:

First. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.

Second. Abolition of all right of inheritance.

For the past two decades the Federal Government has been following the course prescribed by Marx by imposing a heavy progressive or graduated income tax, and while not abolishing the right of inheritance the Federal Government has been increasing the rates of the death tax until the top rate is now 77 percent.

The progression in income-tax rates from the beginning rate of 20 percent on incomes of $2,000 and under to 91 percent on incomes of more than $200,000 is progression of a most extreme character. It not only confiscates the larger incomes, but it bears most heavily on the middle incomes, the group at which Marx particularly aimed in his advocacy of heavy graduated income taxes.

Reason and the experience of other nations, and most recently that of England, demonstrate beyond all question that unless our policy of taxation is changed the system of society under which this country has prospered and grown great will come to an end and some form of socialism or communism will supplant it.

How, one may ask, will the proposed amendment keep the rates down? The answer is this: The amendment would make it in the interest of every taxpayer, first, to keep the top rate down to 25 percent—as compared with the present rate of 91 percent; and, second, to keep the bottom rate no higher than 10 percent—as compared with the present rate of 20 percent. It is expected that the beginning rate will ultimately be much less than 10 percent.

The proposed amendment is just as important for the small-tax payer as for the large. This united self-interest of all taxpayers is relied on as a force that would keep the tax rates within reasonable bounds. There are 66 million individual income-tax payers in the United States. Most of them vote.

It should be noted that the proposed amendment merely limits the degree of tax-rate progression. It does not prescribe the top rate that Congress may impose. Hence, it cannot be argued that the amendment impairs the Government's power to raise needed revenue during either war or peace.

The proposed amendment will reduce the burden of taxation on those with the smaller incomes. A fact not generally realized is that the great bulk of the revenue from the individual income tax comes not from the taxpayers with large incomes, but from those with small incomes. That is so simply because the small incomes, in the aggregate, constitute the bulk of the national income. For example, only 3 percent—about $2 billion—of the total estimated Federal revenue of about $60 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is produced by the individual income-tax rates above 34 percent, which is 14 percentage points above the present beginning rate of 20 percent.

Contrast these figures with the effect of an increase of only $100 in the present $600 personal exemption and credit for dependents. Such an increase would result in a reduction of 7 million in the number of income-tax payers and a revenue loss of $2.5 billion. This is one-half billion dollars more than the total revenue received from the individual income-tax rates above 34 percent.

Accordingly, if we are to have enormous expenditures and correspondingly large revenue, the great bulk of the revenue must come from persons of small and moderate means.

The only possible way to give relief to the small-tax payers is either (1) by reducing the need for revenue through cutting expenditures, or (2) by increasing revenue through a drastic reduction of the present confiscatory higher bracket rates so as to increase incentive and investment in productive enterprise. This would increase the national income, which constitutes the tax base, and thereby increase the revenue.

Any immediate loss in revenue through the elimination of the higher individual rates would undoubtedly be only temporary. Eventually, the lower rates would produce greater revenue than the higher rates now in force.

That the present confiscatory rates of the individual-income tax are not approved by a large majority of the American people is shown by Gallup polls. The vote of those having an opinion was 2 to 1 in favor of a 25-percent top limit in the September 1951 poll, and 3 to 1 in the July 1952 poll.

As I have already stated, the proposed amendment also deprives Congress of the power to impose death and gift taxes and leaves these means of raising revenue exclusively to the States, where they belong, and where competition among the States would tend to keep the rates within reasonable bounds. Under existing laws the tax on the estates of decedents runs to a high of 77 percent, and the tax on gifts to 57.75 percent. These rates are manifestly confiscatory, and they have very harmful economic effects. They not only seriously impair the incentive to work, save, and invest in productive enterprise, but they are extremely destructive of capital and, in the long run, will destroy the accumulations of capital that are so necessary for industrial activity and expansion, with the resulting beneficial effects on our economy.

Moreover, the heavy taxation of large estates compels the rich to seek comparatively safe liquid investments in order to provide for the heavy taxes that will be imposed upon their estates at death, thus further reducing the capital available for risky business ventures.

The harm done to the economy by the present high rates of death and gift taxes is out of all proportion to the revenue produced, and cannot be justified by any argument based on fiscal needs. Even with the very high rates now in force, the revenue from these taxes is comparatively trivial. In 1953 it was $891 million from the two sources. This was a little over 1 percent of the total budget of $74 billion—enough to pay the Government's expenses for about 4 days. The gift tax is merely auxiliary to the estate tax, and both should be dealt with alike.

Of particular concern is the destructive effect of the heavy estate taxes on small business. The conclusions of the Select Committee on Small Business of the United States Senate in its report published in June 1953, was that "estate taxes often lead to the disappearance of small- or medium-sized independent businesses or their merger with the dominant segment of an industry."

Let me add that this statement represents not only my own views but those of Representative REED, who joins me in making the statement.

The following is an address delivered on the floor of the House, January 31, 1955, by Congressman CHAUNCEY W. REED, of Illinois, introducing House Joint Resolution 182, Reed-Dirksen amendment:

LIMITING THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO TAX INCOMES, INHERITANCES, AND GIFTS

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the Honorable EVERETT W. DIRKSEN, Senator from Illinois, and I introduced in the House and Senate a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the power of Congress to tax incomes, inheritances, and gifts—House Joint Resolution 103 and Senate Joint Resolution 23. Senator DIRKSEN and I are introducing the same resolution again this year.

The principal provisions of the amendment may be summarized as follows:

First. Income taxes:

The amendment limits income taxes on both individuals and corporations to a maximum rate of 25 percent, but permits Congress by a vote of three-fourths of the Members of each House to exceed that rate, provided the top rate does not exceed the bottom rate by more than 15 percentage points.

For example, if the bottom rate were 20 percent, the top rate could not exceed 35 percent. If the top rate does not exceed 25 percent, however, there is no restriction at all on the bottom rate. It could, for instance be 1 percent or one-half of one percent.

Subject to the foregoing limitations, the rates on corporate income may vary from those on individual incomes.

Second. Death and gift taxes:

The amendment also gives to the States the exclusive power to impose death and gift taxes.

It should be observed that the amendment merely limits the degree of tax rate progression. It does not prescribe the top rate that Congress may impose. Hence, it cannot be argued that the amendment impairs the Government's power to raise needed revenue during either peace or war, except, of course, with respect to the revenue derived from the estate and gift taxes, which is only about 1½ percent of the total. In other words, the amendment does not limit the amount of revenue that may be raised, but limits merely the manner in which it may be raised.

Its purpose and effect are merely to eliminate in large measure from our system of taxation its socialistic features; namely, first, the heavy progressive feature of the income tax; and, second, the confiscatory death tax, which will eventually dry up the sources of private capital and lead to the establishment of socialism with the accompanying loss of the people's liberty.

In a statement to the Temporary Economic Committee prior to World War II, Adolph Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, made the following significant prophecy:

"The Government will have to enter into direct financing of activities now supposed to be private, and a continuance of that direct financing must be (mean) inevitably that the Government will ultimately control and own those activities. * * * Over a period of years the Government will gradually come to own most of the productive plants of the United States."

I am convinced that Mr. Berle's prophecy will come true unless action to prevent it is taken before it is too late.

Legislation by Congress is obviously insufficient; for the work of a good Congress may be easily undone by that of a radical Congress.

The need of reform would seem to be obvious and I know of no way of giving permanence to such reform except through a constitutional amendment.

The ultimate objective of the amendment is a top individual income tax rate of 25 percent and a beginning rate of much less than 10 percent.

In determining whether such an objective is realistic it will be helpful to consider the possible tax effect of a budget of more reasonable proportions than the present one. The budget estimate of expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is $63.504 billion. According to the Federal Budget in Brief Government expenditures for the comparatively recent fiscal years of 1948 to 1951, inclusive, were as follows:

	Expenditures in billions
1951 (which included a full year of the Korean war)	$44.058
1950	39.606
1949	39.507
1948	33.068

Prior to 1942, which was a war year, the largest expenditure of the Federal Government in any year was $18.4 billion in 1918, which was also a war year.

Let us suppose now the following changes in the budget receipts as estimated for the fiscal year 1955:

1. A reduction in the individual income tax rates to 10 percent on incomes up to $10,000 and 25 percent on the amounts in excess of $25,000; and

2. Elimination of estate and gift taxes.

These changes would reduce the budget receipts to $47 billion, which is $3 billion greater than the budget expenditures for the fiscal year 1951 which included a full year of the Korean war. It is $7.5 billion greater than the budget expenditures for the fiscal years 1950 and 1949.

A beginning rate of 5 percent, instead of 10 percent, on individual incomes would reduce the receipts to $41.5 billion. This is $2 billion above the 1950 and 1949 expenditures, to say nothing of the $33 billion expenditures in 1948.

It would, of course, take some years to secure the adoption of the amendment, since it must be approved by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

About 85 percent of the estimated revenue from the individual income tax, which produces over half of the total revenue of the Federal Government, is produced by the first bracket rate of 20 percent when applied to the entire amount of taxable income in all brackets. Only 3 percent—about $2 billion—is provided by the rates in excess of 34 percent.

Accordingly, if we are to have enormous expenditures and correspondingly large revenue, the great bulk of the revenue must come from persons of small and moderate means. The only possible way to give relief to such persons is either, first, by reducing the need for revenue through cutting expenditures; or, second, by increasing revenue through a drastic reduction of the present confiscatory higher bracket rates so as to increase incentive and investment in productive enterprise. This would increase the national income which constitutes the tax base and thereby increase the revenue.

Any immediate loss in revenue through the elimination of the higher individual rates would undoubtedly be only temporary. Eventually the lower rates would produce greater revenue than the higher rates now in force.

Another important effect of the amendment which has not been sufficiently stressed would be to restore to the States the power to be financially independent and to free themselves from Federal domination. The Federal Government should not be permitted to hog the revenue and hand back part of it to the States on conditions.

It should be remembered that with minor exceptions every dollar spent by the Federal Government comes from the same sources of revenue that are available to the States. The States should raise the revenue and spend it themselves. Responsibility for the raising of revenue is one of the best checks upon extravagant and unwise expenditures. It's too easy to spend money raised by someone else.

Moreover, the States and municipalities are better fitted than the Federal Government to perform the services which are primarily of State or local concern and they would do so at much less cost. Performance of these services by the Federal Government has meant the maintenance at great cost of a vast horde of bureaucrats on the Federal payroll, many of whom could readily be dispensed with.

To summarize, the proposed amendment—

First. Largely eliminates from our Federal system of taxation its socialistic features and thereby puts an end to the use of the taxing power as means of forcing us into socialism;

Second. Does not impair the power of the Federal Government to raise revenue;

Third. Does not shift the burden of taxation from the rich to the poor;

Fourth. Aims at reducing eventually the taxes of everyone so that the top rate will not exceed 25 percent and the bottom rate will not exceed 10 percent, with the prospect that it will be much less;

Fifth. With lower rates will increase the national wealth and over the years the Federal revenue;

Sixth. Will restore to the States the power to be financially independent and to free themselves from Federal domination.

In the final analysis, the problem resolves itself into the simple issue of whether we are to have in this country a system of society based upon, first, private enterprise and our constitutional form of government, or, second, socialism. Both reason and the experience of other countries lead to the conclusion that our present system of confiscatory income and death taxes, if long continued, will ultimately result in the establishment of socialism in place of our present system.

The changes in the impact of Federal taxes on the great bulk of the taxpayers involved in the proposed amendment are, as I pointed out, comparatively minor. Their beneficial effect, however, would be far-reaching and decisive.

The changes in the income-tax provisions proposed in connection with and partially effected by the 1954 Revenue Code, such as reductions in the tax on dividends and increases in certain deductions and exemptions, are costly in revenue and will have only minor effect on the economy. The major evil to be corrected is the one at which the proposed amendment is aimed.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that this amendment is vastly different from the amendment which has been going through the State legislatures, an amendment which limits the power of Congress to impose income, death, and gift taxes to a maximum rate of 25 percent with no right to suspend the limitation except in time of war. That amendment is altogether too rigid and would seriously impair the Government's power to raise needed revenue from the income tax in time of peace.

The text of the resolution introduced by Congressman REED is as follows:

House Joint Resolution 182

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. The sixteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration. The maximum top rate (a term which shall mean the aggregate of all top rates) of all taxes, duties, and excises which the Congress may lay or collect on, with respect to, or measured by, income shall not exceed 25 percent: *Provided, however*, That the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of all the Members of each House may fix such a maximum top rate in excess of 25 percent, for periods either successive or otherwise, not exceeding one year each, if such rate so fixed does not exceed the lowest rate (a term which shall mean the aggregate of all lowest rates) by more than 15 percentage points. Subject to the foregoing limitations, the rates of tax applicable to the incomes of individuals may be different from the rates applicable to the incomes of corporations, which term shall include also associations, joint stock companies, and insurance companies. The determination of income subject to tax shall be by uniform rules of general application which shall not vary with the size of the income.

"SEC. 3. The Congress shall have no power to lay or collect any tax, duty, or exercise with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gift.

"SEC. 4. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on, with respect to, or measured by, income for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

"SEC. 5. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight of the day of ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax with respect to any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect."

United States Reds Keep Heads Above Water (Gulp)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, Walter K. Lewis, in the publication the New Leader, has exposed the machinations of the Communists, and especially their attempts to infiltrate organizations dedicated to perpetuating and preserving our American traditions of life.

In the May 30, 1955, issue of the New Leader, he quotes from an internal Communist Party document to indicate that, while the Communists are having their own family troubles, they still remain a menace to organizations concerned with civil rights, civil liberties, and minority problems. He also shows what minority groups and other organizations have done to keep the Communists from polluting these organizations. I am including the article in the RECORD and heartily recommend it to the Members of Congress for their reading and attention:

UNITED STATES REDS KEEP HEADS ABOVE WATER (GULP)

(By Walter K. Lewis)

The United States Communist Party has been fighting a losing struggle in the past few years. With its top leaders in prison, and many of its best cadres underground, most local clubs have been steadily disintegrating. Indeed, many of them have ceased to function altogether.

These conclusions are drawn from the pages of the party's internal literature, which is frantically calling for a revival of party action through the infiltration of democratic groups.

Party Voice, a monthly party periodical which often appears only bimonthly, diagnoses and provides tested remedies for Communist illnesses. An anonymous article in a recent issue described how a club in a steel mill town was "pulled together from decay" by an astute organizer. There were 3 known comrades in the mill and the organizer sought 1 of them out:

"The first visit met with reluctance from the comrade to do anything. There was a feeling of hopelessness and passivity. What were some of the main problems as this comrade saw them?

"(1) He was an old man; he couldn't speak English very well; the company and the FBI were really making it tough for him.

"(2) The party asks him to do things he just couldn't carry out, such as picket the Justice Department to free a victim of the Smith Act—he had been threatened with expulsion if he didn't.

"(3) The party organizer comes to his house in broad daylight and parks his car in front of it.

"(4) The reactionaries in union leadership won't let him talk at union meetings.

"(5) Different shifts make it hard for the comrades to get together.

"(6) His wife and kids object to his party membership.

"(7) If he's too active and loses his job, he's too old to get another one."

But the organizer finally succeeded in winning the old man's confidence, the article tells us, because of an impending steel strike. "The club met regularly during the strike. It now met with a purpose and with some perspective. * * * Dues were collected and literature was bought without pressure."

Ways of improving the party's propaganda are also discussed. Organizer Dorothy Pearl offered this criticism of the Daily Worker:

"Our comrades are reading the Daily Worker only sporadically for the reason, I feel, that its language is sectarian. This has been a basic problem of our paper for a long time, and we feel it should speak to the masses in their own language, rather than reading like a political affairs pamphlet."

The particular problems of organization pertaining to different professional and industrial groups are also taken up. Thus, the section educational director of a club operating among hotel workers explained how difficult it was for him to contact his clients because of their uncertain hours. He finally had to operate through a third person and describes how he eventually reached one member and then another. He spoke to them about dues, informing them of the registration (the procedure now being used instead of party membership cards) and possibilities of attending classes at Jefferson School.

The party's summer-resort base, Camp Unity, has now become Wingdale Lodge, and has moved its offices from Union Square to Times Square in order to win unsuspecting recruits.

Party Voice is also concerned with infiltration of mass organizations.

"Our party must select for special concentration those mass organizations in the community which most influence the workers, primarily the Negro, Puerto Rican, and nationality groups. To carry out this program we must have every comrade in a functioning club, regular meetings with great attention and guidance so as to make the club the center of struggle in projecting and carrying out the fight for peace within the party and out into the community."

The organizations earmarked as targets in this order included Negro, Jewish, civic, political, and fraternal groups. Many of them, however, are on the alert for CP maneuvers. Americans for Democratic Action has set up special screening boards to cope with the situation. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has revoked charters where it became apparent that Communists had taken over its chapters. In 1954, the Jewish Labor Committee conducted an educational series designed to school leaders of democratic organizations in Communist methods. Parent-Teacher Associations are also on guard against Communist tactics.

These defensive measures are obviously having their effects. For Communist literature contains a great deal of wailing from members who complain that, despite their desire to coexist with democratic organizations, their efforts have been thwarted. This is particularly emphasized in a Party Voice piece by Andrew Montgomery, who tells of the mental anguish he suffered when he was "caught" in traffic while a Memorial Day parade was in progress:

"At first, hesitantly, and a little embarrassed, I started to salute each flag. At times I looked up and down the street and hoped, inwardly, that none of my 'left' friends were looking at me. But slowly, and firmly, the thought came to me: 'Why should I feel reluctant to salute the flag?'" After further describing the resurgence of his patriotic feelings, he states that "Communists are patriats" and spells out what the party is lacking:

"There exist in our party some trends of cultural and intellectual exclusiveness which border on snobbery and are a distinct liability to the progressive movement. I have no doubt that there are comrades in our movement who have not read a single American book outside of progressive literature in many moons, but who can discuss in detail the latest Soviet book or periodical from China.

"As a matter of fact, we have many comrades who have been brought up on Soviet culture and who are not familiar with the cultural life of our own people. This is wrong. It can lead to an actual contempt for America, and has nothing to do with real patriotism—the feeling of national pride which should imbue every Communist."

He goes on to sound the death knell for the Pete Seeger "hootenany" set by insisting that too much emphasis has been placed on such forms of culture as folksinging, etc., which have not yet been adopted as mass forms by the American workers. He also mourns the failure of Communists to applaud American athletes competing with their Soviet counterparts. Then, in complete sobriety, he writes:

"Take the question of Coca-Cola. It is one thing for the French people to wage a struggle against this drink which symbolizes the role of Wall Street in their country. But it is quite an entirely different thing within the United States. Coca-Cola is an accepted popular drink here, and does not symbolize the policy of the Government. Those comrades who stop drinking it for political reasons demonstrate nothing but their own inability to understand that it is impossible to substitute internationalism for national pride at this stage of the struggle."

Montgomery's analysis set off a verbal explosion at Communist Party headquarters. But all that emerged was some bitter comment in Political Affairs. Party Voice was embarrassingly muted.

Party Voice does reveal, however, a new method of deploying the party's membership. Plant and factory workers are to be transferred from local clubs to industrial clubs. The Communists, it seems, are upset because left-led unions have taken the party's place in the political arena. White-collar workers in community clubs, however, will be used to build more of such clubs by recruiting members of mass organizations. The course that this drive will take was charted by Simon Gerson.

"As the member is being approached for his dues, let us discuss two other questions with him. One is his assignment to a mass organization; two is his regular reading of the Daily Worker and the Worker."

Thus democratic organizations in fields like civil rights, housing, schools, etc., must redouble their alertness. The Communists, it appears, are determined to use them to solve their own political and psychological problems.

Public Opinion Overwhelmingly Favors Stricter Federal Election Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, a determined bipartisan effort is being made during this session of Congress to realistically revise our Federal election law—the Corrupt Practices Act. The Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections has completed its hearings on the Hennings bill (S. 636) and will, I am informed, shortly report out this legislation for action by the Senate. Likewise, on the House side the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration is giving earnest consideration to similar legislation. These bills would change the existing law by regulating primary election spending, fixing realistic spending limits for candidates and parties, tightening enforcement provisions, and by closing the committee loophole which has rendered the present law largely meaningless.

In timely fashion, Dr. Gallup has just completed a poll on this vital question and he reports that a solid majority of the American public is convinced that stricter statutes are long overdue. The results of this poll should be called to the attention of our colleagues, and I am printing Dr. Gallup's report herewith:

A solid majority of the American public is convinced that present Federal laws limiting the amount of money spent for election campaigns are not lived up to and that stricter statutes are long overdue.

The public's view is shared by the Nation's outstanding citizen-leaders, a poll of those listed in Who's Who in America shows.

Federal election legislation now permits a candidate for the Senate to spend up to $25,000 in some cases, and $10,000 in others. Candidates for the House are limited to either $2,500 or, in some cases $5,000.

National political committees are limited to $3 million in any one calendar year.

Institute reporters from Maine to California talked to representative citizens in all walks of life in conducting today's survey. The public was asked:

"There are present laws limiting the amount of money spent for campaigners for Congress. By and large do you think these laws are lived up to or not?"

The vote of the general public:

Yes, lived up to, 16 percent; no, 57 percent; no opinion, 27 percent.

The next question:

"Do you think the present laws limiting campaign expenditures are too strict, about right, or not strict enough?"

The vote of the general public:

Yes, more strict, 67 percent; no, 12 percent; no opinion, 21 percent.

Sentiment is relatively uniform on the two questions among major groups in the population. Of particular interest is the fact that Republicans and Democrats see virtually eye-to-eye on the need for stricter laws.

The Nation's top citizens were asked:

"Do you think the present laws limiting campaign expenditures are too strict, about right, or not strict enough?"

The largest group, 39 percent, said the present laws should be made more strict.

Sen. THOMAAS C. HENNINGS, Jr. (Democrat, of Missouri), chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, has introduced a bill to revise the Federal election laws in order to prevent corrupt practices in elections. One provision of the bill would require regular reports and summaries of expenditures by candidates.

This requirement has the endorsement of 3 out of every 4 of the Nation's top citizens, as follows:

"Would you favor or oppose revising laws concerning campaign expenditures to make it mandatory that the expenditures of political committees, on behalf of a candidate, be reported?"

The vote of those in Who's Who:

Favor, 76 percent; oppose, 5 percent; no opinion, 19 percent.

Old Mohammed Never Had It So Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Old Mohammed Never Had It So Good," which appeared in the May 31, 1955, issue of the Courier Journal of Louisville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

OLD MOHAMMED NEVER HAD IT SO GOOD

The Soviet mountain has gone to the Yugoslav Mohammed, but Mohammed sits unmoved. Ever since 1948, when an angry Cominform expelled Yugoslavja on grounds of nationalist heresy by Marshal Josip Broz-Tito, this one-time Soviet satellite has occupied a unique position. It is the only country to break the Soviet silver cord. Tito is the only dictator to insist that he is the faithful acolyte at the Marxist-Leninist altar, and that the Kremlin's men are faithless. His is the only state calling itself Communist that has forged strong links with the West, in both trade and defense.

It was no small thing, then, when the three top bosses of Soviet communism journeyed to Belgrade to call on Tito. They were a curious triumvirate for such a call. There was Nikolai Bulganin, Premier of the Soviet Union. There was Anastase Mikoyan, the Deputy Premier. There was Nikita Khrushchev, who has no official position in the Soviet Government, but who is boss of the Communist Party that bosses the Government. And it was Khrushchev, not the Premier, who made the strangely obsequious address to Tito when they arrived.

"Dear Comrade Tito," he said, in effect, "we were wrong in kicking you out. Come back to us, and we'll let you keep your sovereignty; every man may have his foibles."

This was no conference between heads of state. It was an invitation to a Communist hatchet-burying party, and Tito was having none of it. Tito knows the Soviet Communist dogma inside out. He was a pupil at the Lenin school in Moscow, with such other students as Rumania's Ana Pauker and Bulgaria's Georgi Dimitrov—all destined to serve as Soviet proconsuls in their native lands. It was not that they saw their roles as betrayers. As Dimitrov once said, "Who would not be the anvil must be the hammer"—to forge a new order. Tito and Ana Pauker lived to realize that the Soviet hammer and anvil forged not freedom but chains. Tito broke the chain. The chain broke Ana. Dimitrov served the new order faithfully as the agent of its bloody purges. He died, perhaps still believing that future promise justified present brutality.

But Tito lives, and looks on the sinuous Soviet line with a steely eye. Three years ago, when Western diplomats were alarmed at rumors Tito was in secret negotiation with the Kremlin, he set them straight.

"If the U. S. S. R. has softened its propaganda," he said, "that is not enough for our country to change its attitude and fall into the arms of those who have so badly harmed us. Any changes must be demonstrated by deeds, not words."

Perhaps the Soviet Union is ready to come forward with deeds—not only for Tito but for the free nations of the West. If so, we welcome deeds. But it is not enough for Khrushchev to praise the independence and sovereignty of Yugoslavia while Moscow's viceroys rule their vassal states.

More Opposition to Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, those who sponsor the vast and expensive upper Colorado River storage project seem to be so barren of factual data to support their position that they can only resort to name calling in defense of their project.

Within the past few days, and from the well of this House, they have alleged that opposition to the project is: Distortion, misinformation, false assumption, fantastic conclusions, misrepresentation, misleading, a high-pressure campaign, wrongness, neither correct or fair and selfish.

This kind of painting of your opponents with a broad black brush is neither conducive to the settlement of any legitimate dispute which may exist on the issues or the orderly process of legislation. It should be stopped.

If the proponents of the project have any possible arguments for it they think are reasonable, they should speak them out so that their reasonableness or nonreasonableness can be weighed.

Because reasonable men disagree with them and set forth sound arguments why the project should not be built they should not be subject to harassment and vilification.

I am inserting below an article opposing the project which appeared in the April 25 issue of Barron's Weekly. I asked my colleagues to judge for themselves whether or not it contains misrepresentation, is misleading, contains false assumptions or fantastic conclusions. I ask them to judge for themselves if it contains misinformation, distorts the facts, is selfish, or if it is neither correct nor fair. Does it sound like part of a high pressure campaign?

ON THE COLORADO MORE GOVERNMENT DAMS MAKE LITTLE SENSE

Of all the great river systems of the country, the Colorado is in some respects unique.

It is, for one thing, an unusually wild and unruly stream, rising in the Rocky Mountains, cutting its way in grandeur through the Colorado Plateau down to Mexico and emptying, finally, into a corner of the Pacific Ocean, some 1,500 miles from its snowcapped source. During its long, crooked passage to the coast, the river drains a large part of seven States, becoming in its lower reaches a major reservoir of water for consumption, irrigation and, not least, the generation of electricity. Its history has been almost as turbulent as its course: since the turn of the century, the Colorado has led to many a regional squabble and once it nearly touched off a small war between California and Arizona.

Time has brought a measure of change, including, in recent years, the construction of several Federal dams, but the river, metaphorically speaking, has grown no more placid. In fact, it happens to be at the bottom of another bitter dispute now raging in Washington, as well as in various parts of the West. The current controversy has swirled up over an administration proposal to build large United States hydroelectric and water storage projects along the Colorado and its tributaries. It involves water rights, and various local claims thereto, and it has brought out the conservationists in full cry against what they conceive to be a threat to the national parks. But the real issue on the Colorado today goes deeper. For the curious stand of the administration on this matter, so contrary to what it has advocated in the past, casts some doubt on both the wisdom and consistency of its power policy and its oft-stated belief in the virtues of Government economy.

The upper Colorado River project, like its counterparts on the Mississippi and elsewhere, is a vast undertaking. As outlined in a measure which sailed through the Senate last week and comes up soon before the House, it calls for the building of six Federal dams, with related power facilities, transmission lines and the like, capable of ultimately generating more than 1 million kilowatts; and 12 irrigation projects, designed to reclaim some 130,000 acres of land and increase the fertility of 234,000 more. In addition, the bill authorizes, on a "conditional" basis, some 21 other irrigation schemes. Excluding the latter, the total cost of the project (for which the budget for fiscal 1956 contains a modest $7 million) is put by its many supporters in both parties at approximately $1.6 billion, and by its critics at over twice this amount. In return, it is claimed, the upper Colorado watershed will gain greatly, and the benefits ultimately will trickle down to the rest of the United States.

Opposition to the project has necessarily been scattered, in view of its lofty purpose and the firm bipartisan support it has attracted. In the vanguard, perhaps inevitably, has been the Senatorial delegation from California, which professes to see in it a plot to steal the water supply of the Imperial Valley. The project also has aroused the ire of such groups as the Izaak Walton League, the Wildlife Management Association and other conservationists, who object primarily to the proposed Echo Park Dam in the northwest tip of Colorado, 1 of the 6 authorized by the pending measure. Building this dam, they contend, would cause the flooding of nearby Dinosaur National Monument, with its collection of fossils, and might well open the doors for further raids, in the name of reclamation, on the country's priceless scenic heritage.

Whatever the merits of such arguments, and they have been hotly debated, more than scenery and old bones happens to be at stake. This was underscored the other day by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois. In a masterful speech on the Hill, he raised for what seems to be the first time some pertinent questions of dollars and cents. For one thing, he pointed out that the land to be reclaimed through irrigation, though intended to grow nothing more valuable than hay, alfalfa, and other fodder, would in some cases cost as much as $1,750 an acre (in central Utah); on the average it would run to better than $950. These figures the Senator commented, looked a bit high in view of the fact that an acre of good rich Illinois or Iowa bottomland on which such profitable crops as corn and soybeans can be grown, is selling right now for $700 or less. Incidentally, no substantial benefits in terms of navigation or flood control are claimed for the project.

As for its hydroelectric end, the cold statistics also look unattractive. The reason is simple. While the Colorado is beyond doubt a mighty river, its actual rate of flow is relatively small compared with that of the Niagara, the Columbia, or the Tennessee. Hence the amount of power it can generate is limited and consequently, very expensive. The average cost of electric capacity at the six Colorado dams, it appears, will run to approximately $500 per kilowatt, or three to four times the prewar cost at Grand Coulee, Hoover Dam, or TVA. Such hydro installations are probably not even competitive with steam plants today, and they almost surely will be rendered useless by atomic reactors tomorrow. It's scarcely an accident that the private utilities in the region have shown little interest lately in building hydro projects of their own in the narrow gorges.

From an economic standpoint, then, the proposed development of the upper Colorado is unmistakably suspect. While it might well be a good thing for a handful of mountain States, the rest of the United States in the end would have to foot a heavy bill. Beyond all monetary considerations, however, lies another, respecting the Government's power policy. Since it took office, the GOP has tried honestly to reverse the long drift toward socialism in this realm, and for that it deserves no little credit. But if public power, whether or not it be "creeping socialism," is undesirable on the Mississippi or on the Snake, it should be no less so in the Colorado watershed. This region after all, has no more claim on Federal bounty than any other, nor should the administration, in its behalf, abandon what is proving to be sound and workable principles.

Letter From Georgia Women's Democratic Club Favoring 4-Year Terms for Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from Mrs. David S. Hogg, legislative chairman of the Georgia Women's Democratic Club, Atlanta, Ga., advising me that on May 26 that organization adopted a resolution advocating that the term of office of Members of the United States House of Representatives be changed from 2 years, the present length of a term, to a term of 4 years.

The Georgia Women's Democratic Club is affiliated with the National Democratic Party, and concerns itself with questions of national as well as local importance. I have been advised that this organization has for some time given study and consideration to the question of the length of the term for Members of the United States House of Representatives, and the resolution adopted on May 26 is the result of that study.

I take pleasure in giving to my colleagues in the House this information regarding the action of the Georgia Women's Democratic Club.

A Race With the Pace of Our Own History—Lecture by James B. Reston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly distinguished newsmen on the Washington scene is James B. "Scotty" Reston, chief of the New York Times bureau. His work is always marked by keen insight, candor, and the absence of bias. Recently he was invited to deliver the Gideon Seymour lecture at the University of Minnesota, and this thoughtful address is a clam but incisive commentary on our times. It will be of interest, I know, to many of our colleagues. Excerpts from this lecture follow:

Foreign relations are like human relations. They are endless. We tackle pestilence in Asia, improve the sanitation, and find at the end that we are prolonging the lives of more people than we can feed. Mr. Acheson is gone and Mr. Truman is in Missouri, but the Russians are still around. It is all very strange.

So, while I sincerely believe that America has just passed through one of the great decades of its history, this is a perplexing, shifting, perpetual business which demands new methods, new men, and new ideas all the time.

The first objective of the cold war was to keep the 175 Red army divisions from marching at a time when there were only about 10 Allied divisions between the Elbe River and the North Sea. It was equally important to prevent the economic disintegration of Western Europe, to build and organize the military forces of the free world into an effective coalition, and to stop the Communist resort to armed force in Korea.

SECOND PHASE OF COLD WAR

These things were done, and they were remarkable achievements. But Korea deranged our whole cold war effort. It turned our minds almost wholly to the problems of military power. In the belief that Korea was the first act in a world war, Washington concentrated on questions of force, played up military aid to the Allies, and played down economic aid to other countries though the Marshall plan and point 4 were extraordinary accomplishments.

This, of course, is a matter of opinion, but I believe we are now out of balance and a little out of date. The United States has won the first phase of the cold war and doesn't know it, and has moved into the second phase, and isn't ready for it.

The deterrent power of the Strategic Air Force and its family of atomic weapons and guided missiles has to be kept up to date,

of course. This is our shield. In the present uncivilized state of the nations, it is the foundation on which everything else rests. But we dare not allow this obvious need to prepare for the big war—which may never come if we maintain the shield—to dominate our budgets and our energies to the point where it will keep us from waging the war that is here right now.

DROP IN FOREIGN-AID FUNDS

If a country seems to be on the verge of disappearing under the Iron Curtain, there is no limit to what we will spend at the last minute to try to save it. But getting funds for a country that faces, not an immediate, but a long-range crisis is extremely difficult.

For example, the United States has poured far more into Indochina in the last couple of years than it has spent since the end of the war on the vital task of developing India.

This may very well be the race that will determine the future of that continent, indeed, of all Asia, rather than what we do in Quemoy and Matsu.

But our motto seems to be: "Billions for sinking ships, but as little as possible for Nehru." If he goes down, of course, we can always say he was a difficult fellow—and it's true, but it may be small consolation.

We are power minded, and that is all right. But a capacity to destroy all life in a 20-mile-wide belt from Chicago to Milwaukee with a single H-bomb ought to be enough to deter the Russians. Meanwhile, a great deal more of our energies in this field might be applied more usefully to the peacetime projects. In the long run, the atomic electric power race may prove more decisive than the atomic-bomb race.

The lag in our information program illustrates the same problem. It is almost impossible for any speechwriter in Washington today to write a speech without saying something obvious about the war of ideas, but I haven't run into anybody with a new idea in this field since the President produced his atoms for peace plan.

TRICKS INSTEAD OF SINCERITY

One reason for this is that we have concentrated almost entirely on ways of saying things or on psychological tricks, rather than on what to say. Almost every debate on the Information Service is dominated by discussion about transmitters on land and transmitters on sea, and how clever we are at floating baloons back of the Iron Curtain.

Meanwhile, platoons of undisciplined Senators and Congressmen and retired generals, who forget that their voices carry beyond the county line, send up clouds of banalities which frequently blur and muffle the true and generous voices of America. Somebody, sometime, should try to remind the politicians that what they say is part of the Voice of America, too.

Let us summarize: It is not surprising that we have concentrated on questions of power in the last decade. It was necessary; we have to save our lives before we can decide what to do with them. But I believe we have done that part of the job and know how to keep on doing it, and we must now concentrate a little more on this 50-year war the President talks about.

There is no escape into the unentangled world of George Washington's dreams. It is forbidden by the guided missile, the intercontinental-supersonic bomber, the atomic bomb, and an enemy who is sworn to the destruction of everything that gives meaning and purpose to our lives.

HABITS HINDER OUR PACE

Meanwhile, I hope we can be a little more hopeful and a little less flighty. A man can't stay breathless for 50 years. Where I come from, people keep wanting to jump from one extreme to the other. We need balance, but Congressmen either go fishing or go crazy.

We are in more than an arms race. We are in a race with the pace of our own history, and the pace is so swift that our habits of mind and our institutions are lagging behind.

This applies to the quality of men we are sending to Washington; to our outmoded political campaigns which paralyze our leadership for months on end; to the seniority system in Congress, where durability is put above intelligence; and to many other aspects of our national life.

To our shame, this was the year when the Chief Justice of the United States felt obliged to state in public that if the Bill of Rights were to be voted on today, it would be fiercely controversial and have a hard time passing, and he made a good point about it:

"We cannot," he said, "delegate to any or all of our governmental representatives the full responsibility for protection of our freedoms from the processes of erosion. Such protection can be had only through an understanding on the part of individual citizens."

CIO Views in Opposition to Harris Natural Gas Bill, H. R. 4560, as Presently Drawn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, at the present time the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has under consideration H. R. 4560, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended. Extensive hearings have been held and considerable time has been taken in executive session in discussing the provisions of the bill. Amendments have been offered. Some have been adopted. Some have been defeated.

The members of the committee have received a memorandum of Robert Oliver, assistant to the president and director, CIO legislative committee, expressing his opposition views with respect to H. R. 4560 with such proposed amendments, heretofore adopted by the committee, as have been brought to his attention.

The bill to regulate natural gas is of great importance to the consuming public because of the steadily increasing cost of natural gas. Therefore, it is my opinion that the views expressed by Mr. Oliver are entitled to careful consideration. They are as follows:

Amendments voted by the committee to H. R. 4560 up to and including May 26 have modified the appearance, but not the effect, of the Harris bill.

Despite language purporting to authorize Federal Power Commission control over field prices of natural gas, the bill still provides no genuine regulation of those prices.

Committee amendments can be summarized as follows:

1. The Commission is directed to determine rather than merely to consider whether prices in new or renegotiated gas purchase contracts, after the effective date of this legislation, are in excess of a reasonable market price.

2. To the extent they are in excess of a price so determined, they shall not be allowed as operating expense of the pipeline for rate making purposes. (Here is a fertile field for litigation, with the odds favoring allowance of the whole contract price as operating expense.)

3. Such determination is to be made whenever a pipeline files application for increase of its own rates or charges.

4. Such determination may also be made on the initiative of the Commission with respect to new or renegotiated contracts, and shall be made by it on application of pipeline for such determination.

5. On pipeline application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity the Commission shall consider (not determine) whether the prices it has contracted to pay exceed reasonable market price. As amended, this section does not require the Commission to deny a certificate if the contract prices exceed reasonable market price.

6. Escalator provisions in gas purchase contracts are not outlawed, but such increases above reasonable market price as they give rise to will be disallowed as operating expense of the pipeline company.

7. Contract provisions providing for specific price increases at definite dates are, by inference, approved, since they are specifically excluded from the provision applicable to escalator provisions.

8. Pipelines are told by one amendment that they need not meet their contract obligations under escalator provisions to the extent the resulting price exceeds reasonable market price. (The apparent invalidity of this provision would invite immediate court test and probably would result in its early elimination.)

9. Considerations on which the Commission is to determine reasonable market price are amended by the addition of "whether such price has been competitively arrived at" to the considerations in the original draft of H. R. 4560; namely, "the effect of the contract on assurance of supply," and "reasonableness of the provisions of the contract as they relate to existing or future prices."

EFFECT OF THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The amendments serve only to make more elaborate, and therefore more misleading, the pretense of field price regulation, although the real effect of H. R. 4560 will be to end all effective regulation of natural-gas prices in interstate commerce.

As amended, it is a thoroughgoing market price statute, which is to say that field prices will continue to be set by bargaining between sellers and buyers, sellers will continue to exploit the demand for gas by forcing prices up, and the Commission will be required to approve those rising prices by the reasonable market price standards prescribed in this bill.

The considerations prescribed for determining reasonable market price are mere paraphrases of the arguments that have been advanced for years by the oil industry in justification of rapidly rising prices for natural gas.

Prices "competitively arrived at" mean, in oil-country language, the prices pipelines are compelled to pay because of their need for gas.

"Effect on assurance of supply" adopts the preposterous oil-industry propaganda that regulated prices would necessarily destroy the incentive to discover and produce gas, despite the "just and reasonable" requirement now in the Natural Gas Act and despite the history of fabulous profits earned by pipelines under FPC regulation.

Reasonableness as related to existing or future prices, the third consideration, is a blueprint of the higher prices that are in store under this "market price" standard as the price of natural gas approaches the ceiling imposed by prices of oil and coal.

Whereas prices set under the existing "just and reasonable" standard of the act would be related to costs of exploration, discovery, development, and production of gas and to the rate of return found necessary to attract capital to these undertakings, price limits set under the standards contained in H. R. 4560 will adhere to a pattern of charging all the traffic will bear.

This is not price regulation; it is simply an elaborate procedure for allowing oil companies to name their own prices for gas.

Enactment of H. R. 4560, with or without the amendments, would end all effective regulation of natural gas prices, both in the field and in the pipelines' sale for resale. The only effect of the amendments is more effectively to conceal this fact.

Congress should be given the opportunity to vote squarely on the real issue. A 10-line bill repealing the Natural Gas Act would give the Members of Congress that opportunity.

Asking Congress to vote for that result by voting for H. R. 4560 clearly is based on the expectation that many Members will arrive at the unjustified conclusion that this bill regulates field prices of gas and will permit effective regulation of prices at which pipelines sell gas.

The real choice before the committee is between repealing the Natural Gas Act and continuing the power of the Commission to regulate field prices on the "just and reasonable" standard now in the act, perhaps exempting the 4,200 small producers who, in 1953, sold only 10 percent of the gas moving in interstate commerce.

Illinois Library Association Supports Library Services Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include a letter I received from Marguerite Giezentanner, president of the Illinois Library Association, urging favorable action on the library services bill:

ILLINOIS LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,
May 27, 1955.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRICE: The Illinois Library Association is vitally interested in the passage of the library services bill which had a hearing before the special subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee, May 25–27, 1955.

As a Member of the House of Representatives from Illinois, you may be aware that of 8,712,176 residents of Illinois, only 5,213,079 have adequate public library service, leaving 3,509,097 persons with inadequate service or with no service at all.

Of the 398 existing public libraries in the State of Illinois, only 40 libraries are able to give adequate service. This evaluation is based on standards set up by the American Library Association. Many of these libraries have a total annual income of less than $1,000. There are 410 towns in Illinois with a population of 500 or more which have no public library service.

Of the 40 Illinois libraries in a position to give adequate library services, 23 are in the metropolitan Chicago area. Only 17 communities in downstate Illinois, representing only 822,579 residents, have adequate library service. This means that, excluding the metropolitan Chicago area, most of the State of Illinois has either no public library service at all, or inadequate service.

Trailer communities, with their lack of permanence, present a real problem in library service. At the same time, they constitute a challenge and an opportunity for the development of good citizenship. Adequate library service will go far in meeting this challenge. Since they are usually outside the city limits, library service will be denied, unless it can be furnished on a regional or large-area basis.

The decentralization of population is evident in the great migrations from metropolitan to fringe areas. Increasing numbers of new communities in fringe areas are approaching established libraries to ask how to secure library service. The passage of the library services bill will make possible a program to show communities how to join on a broad base for the establishment of library service, and will furnish communities with the determination to help themselves—the objectives of the bill.

The Illinois Library Association wants to see the bill passed, because we are interested in children, in rural areas, and in the majority of residents in every community whose formal schooling ends at a relatively early stage in life. This legislation will not show favoritism to geographical sections of the State but will be for the general welfare of all the people, regardless of race, religion, or economic status.

The Illinois Library Association hopes that the library services bill will have your active support when it comes to the floor of the House. Since we are eager to know of the possibilities for the bill, we are asking that you fill out the enclosed form and return it to us. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

The Illinois Library Association will appreciate both your cooperation and your active support of the library services bill.

Sincerely yours,
MARGUERITE GIEZENTANNER,
President.

Does the Fuss Over the B-52 Hint of Defense by Slogan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Does the Fuss Over the B–52 Hint of Defense by Slogan?" which appeared in the May 31, 1955, issue of the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

DOES THE FUSS OVER THE B–52 HINT OF DEFENSE BY SLOGAN?

The episode of the B–52 has come to a weird conclusion, with Congress angrily demanding that the Defense Department spend more money, and Defense officials reluctantly agreeing to build more of the big jet bombers. It is comforting, of course, to have more B–52's. They are able to carry atomic attack to practically any point on earth, and we have had plenty of evidence in recent years that such strength is the most effective deterrent to aggression and war.

Circumstances surrounding the B–52 episode, however, are anything but comforting. For it seems that someone is playing a silly game with critical aspects of our defense program. It is further disturbing to recall that similar uncertainties, furors and false starts have plagued the aircraft planning and purchasing program for the past 7 years.

In the current case, the Department of Defense, in keeping with the Eisenhower economy program, cut back both Army manpower and Air Force plane purchasing, including the long range B–52 bomber program. This was explained as part of the effort to fit our defense forces to our long-range economic ability, and generally applauded as business-like economy on the part of the administration, though some members of Congress protested at the time that our spending should be geared to our actual defense needs rather than having our defenses fitted to economic spending.

Following the well-publicized economy cutback, it became known (as they say in Washington when important news is leaked to the press), that Russia had more and better planes in certain categories than does the United States. Columnists drummed warnings. Congress became alarmed. Defense officials were called in, questioned, and finally told to build more of the expensive planes. The Defense Department, with a pretty show of tight-fisted vigilance, promptly announced that it would continue to produce a bigger bang for the taxpayer's buck.

This is stupid stuff. If we actually need more of the B–52's, as the Defense Department now softly admits, then the economy program was dangerously short-sighted in the first place, and we cannot but wonder whether it was done for defense or for publicity reasons. And if the Air Force cutback was wrong, we must wonder whether it is not time to reconsider also the Army manpower cutback against which General Matthew Ridgway protested so strongly and which was finally the cause of his resignation.

If Mr. Wilson's Department is really giving us the bigger bang for a buck that his advertising agency assistants claim, why was Russia able to forge ahead of us in development and production of jet aircraft? What steps are being taken to assure our superiority in the air? Are we devoting enough money to research and development, as well as to production of existing types? Or are we continuing to depend, as the administration has apparently depended in the past, on defense by slogan?

Thanks To Irrigation, We're Eating Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk about a subject that is not discussed very often in the Halls of Congress. In fact, it is quite disturbing since it is a vital part of our daily lives and receives such little attention from all of us.

That subject is nutrition—the science that deals with food at work. As you may know, I am a medical doctor and will speak today not as a Member of Congress, but as your family physician.

My guess is you could not tell me what you have had to eat the past week. With many of the weighty problems we have

to discuss, I wouldn't be too surprised if less than half of my colleagues remembered what they had for lunch.

How many of us maintain a balanced diet? Before we can answer this question, we must first determine what a balanced diet is. Naturally each of us, under varying conditions, might require a different diet but nutritionists have agreed that certain basic foods should be included each day.

These are:

First. Leafy green and yellow vegetables—at least one serving, if not more;

Second. Citrus fruits, tomatoes, raw cabbage—at least one serving, if not more;

Third. Potatoes and other vegetables and fruits—two or more servings;

Fourth. Fluid milk or its protein and mineral equivalent in processed forms such as cheese and ice cream—3 or 4 cups for children and 2 or more cups for adults;

Fifth. Meat, poultry, fish, eggs, dried peas, beans—at least one or two servings.

Sixth. Bread, flour, cereals, whole grain, enriched or restored—some every day; and

Seventh. Butter, fortified margarine—some every day.

We must have at least the minimum requirements of these foods if we are to be in the best of health and vitality. If we eat the right foods, it does more than keep us alive, it can even help us to stay young longer. An individual well fed from babyhood has a more likely chance to enjoy a long life.

Getting back to the basic seven foods, the question arises as to why should we eat those foods.

We know of more than 40 different chemical substances that the body is known to require from food. It is not necessary to know all of the body's needs for you can be reasonably sure of getting all of them if your daily meals contain certain key nutrients.

These nutrients are protein, calcium, iron, iodine, vitamins in general, vitamin A, vitamin B family, vitamin C, vitamin D, and body fuels.

First, let us examine the recommended dietary allowances. The National Academy of Sciences, also known as the National Research Council, has supplied me with their figures. They have been studying this specific problem since 1940.

Now, let us examine each requirement and determine which of our many foods are rich in their respective nutrient.

The National Research Council recommends 65 grams of protein for the average man between the ages of 25 to 65, for women it is slightly less except during pregnancy and lactating when it is considerably more. Protein requirements of children between the ages of 10 and 20 varies from 70 to 100 grams.

Protein is a complex and varied substance. It is the main substance in all of the body's muscles and organs, skin, hair, and other tissues. Protein in different foods is made up of varying combinations of at least 22 simpler materials known as amino acids.

You get top-rating proteins in foods from animal sources—meat, poultry, fish, eggs, milk, and cheese. As was pointed out in the basic seven some of these foods are needed each day. Another good source of proteins are soybeans, nuts, and dry beans and peas.

The best food to supply the recommended allowances for calcium is, of course, milk. However, the quantities of calcium are so minute that you can hardly get enough without using a good deal of milk in some form.

Also rich in calcium are some of the leafy green vegetables—preferably turnip tops, mustard greens, and kale.

It is also important that we receive a good supply of iron in our daily diet. Iron is one of the essential materials for red blood cells and without it in the blood could not carry oxygen from the lungs to each body cell.

The food richest in iron is liver. However, here we have the element of taste. Unfortunately too many turn up their noses when you mention liver and surveys show that a large majority of people eat little or no liver at all.

Therefore, we must look to other sources for our iron requirements. Here again leafy green vegetables are rich in iron content. Some of the other foods that add iron are egg yolks, meat in general, peas and beans of all kinds, dried fruits, molasses, bread, and other cereal foods made from whole grain or enriched.

THE SIGHT VITAMIN

The sight vitamin, or vitamin A, is especially important for normal vision and helps to keep the skin and linings of the nose, mouth, and inner organs in good condition.

Good sources of vitamin A are liver, egg yolks, butter, whole milk, and cream. You can also get a substantial amount of vitamin A from carotenes which are yellow-orange substances that the body converts. Green, yellow, and some red vegetables are excellent sources of carotene.

The Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics of the Department of Agriculture recommends that we eat heartily of foods that provide vitamin A since it can be stored in the body and may be drawn upon if in any emergency this vitamin is wanting in the diet.

The next three substances which are recommended by the National Research Council are thiamine, riboflavin, and niacin—all members of the vitamin B family.

When this vitamin was first discovered it was thought to be just one, but later when it was found to be quite complex it was broken down into about a dozen different ones—each with a particular duty and importance.

A lack of these substances causes beriberi and pellagra. The latter of these dietary deficiency diseases once was quite common in the South and in many instances death resulted. Now, reported deaths from pellagra have declined markedly in the United States. The disease is still quite common in many overpopulated areas.

What we have in the United States are borderline cases. If you know a chronic grouch, a shiftless person, a housewife with vague complaints, or a nervous man, chances are they may be showing effects of insufficient B vitamins.

Getting enough of these helps with steady nerves, normal appetite, good digestion, good morale and healthy skin.

Unfortunately too few foods contain a real wealth of the B vitamins so it is necessary for your diet to contain many foods which contribute some in order to build an adequate supply.

As a doctor, I feel it is quite interesting to note that recently we have identified folic acid and vitamin B–12. These two substances are now being used medically with some success in treating two hard-to-cure diseases—pernicious anemia and sprue.

Since very few foods are rich in the B-vitamin group, at least 26 States have made it mandatory for flour to be enriched with this group. It is estimated that diets of city families are now 12 percent higher in iron, 16 percent higher in thiamine, 3 percent more in riboflavin, and 13 percent higher in niacin than they would have been without the enrichment of bread and flour.

THE TISSUE BUILDER

Ironically, the first vitamin separated from food was one that very few actually get the recommended daily allowance. It is ascorbic acid—more commonly known as vitamin C.

You cannot keep tissues throughout the body in good condition without vitamin C. When your diet is low in this vitamin, gums are tender and bleed easily, joints swell and hurt and muscles weaken. In advanced stages it is called scurvy.

In this country scurvy is very rare, but many people do not get enough vitamin C for their best state of health. Since it cannot be stored in any appreciable quantity, you need some food rich in vitamin C daily.

All of the citrus fruits are plentiful sources of vitamin C. Other good sources of vitamin C includes tomatoes and tomato juice, fresh or canned; fresh strawberries and cantaloupe; also raw green food such as cabbage, green pepper and green lettuce.

Much of the vitamin content of these foods is lost when it is prepared for the table by cooking and, therefore, it is best to eat them with the minimum of preparation.

THE SUNSHINE VITAMIN

Vitamin D picked up the "sunshine" nickname because the sun's rays, striking the skin, have power to change certain substances in the skin into vitamin D.

An individual should get some of this vitamin regularly and especially during childhood since it works with minerals to form straight, strong bones, and sound teeth.

Since most of us make good use of sunshine to fill our vitamin D requirements, the recommended daily dietary allowance for it appears to be a little low. However, the sun's reaction on the skin more than make up the difference.

It must be remembered that it does take direct sunlight and the sun loses its effectiveness if it is cut off by clouds,

smoke, fog, dust, or ordinary window glass.

A few foods such as egg yolk, butter, salmon, tuna, and sardines help out with vitamin D and it is added to some milk.

WE'RE EATING WELL

Fortunately we are able to produce enough of all of the crops needed to insure a balanced and varied diet. The National Research Council's figures would be sheer folly if we could not produce the food to meet its requirements.

Today half the world is hungry and the vast majority of the other half does not enjoy a proper diet.

If everyone ate the same diet as the average person does in the Far East the world is presently producing enough to feed several billion more mouths.

If everyone had the same standard of diet as the average European, the world is producing enough to feed everyone if the food were properly distributed.

But if everyone enjoyed the high-level diet that we in the United States do the world would have to produce enough more to feed an additional several hundred million.

Perhaps this is the reason for so much unrest in the world today. All one needs to do is look at where all of our trouble spots are—Korea, China, Indochina, areas in the Near East—and our intelligence reports tell of unrest behind the Iron Curtain.

These are the same areas where the people do not have enough to eat. A hungry person wants food in his belly—he does not want your prayers or promises.

Periods of starvation have not been confined to the Biblical times. As recent as just prior to World War II thousands died of starvation in China, India, and Burma.

Our national diet today can best be described as the kind people choose when the supply of food is ample and they have the money to buy it.

Each of us now eats more of the dairy products—except butter—eggs, poultry, vegetables, and fruit, but fewer potatoes and grain products than people did at the beginning of the century.

The sharpest increase in per capita consumption of food comes in fruits and vegetables. In the past few decades the use of citrus fruits has tripled, that of carrots has quadrupled, and that of lettuce has nearly doubled.

EAT MORE BEEF

I represent the Fourth Congressional District of Nebraska, and I am quite proud of the fact that this district has more cattle than any one of the other 435 congressional districts in the United States.

Not only am I proud of the number but also because of the tremendous contribution this meat makes to the American diet. The American people have always been meat eaters. Meat has been the principal item of diet for the human race from the beginning of time.

As a physician, I can tell you that the human body is especially adapted to the consumption and digestion of meat and animal products. There is no food which nature has endowed so lavishly with the necessary proteins, vitamins, minerals, and fats.

In fact, meat is the masterpiece of nature's laboratory. It contains 22 amino acids, 10 of which the body needs to keep healthy. People who are big meat eaters are large in stature and have great energy. The Hindus, Chinese, Japanese, and the inhabitants of Okinawa, who eat little meat, are small in stature.

For many years I operated a hospital in Kimball, and at that time there was a feeling among medical men that patients should be given fish and chicken instead of red meat. Recent experiments have shown that red meat is not harmful but can contribute to the patient's recovery by supplying many of the vitamins, minerals, and acids so necessary to issue repair and health.

Perhaps some of you are wondering what irrigation and reclamation has to do with producing more red meat. I can only refer you to a statement made by Dr. B. T. Shaw, who is the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture. In testimony before the House Appropriations Committee he said:

> In 1949 the Nation was consuming about 16 billion pounds of red meat, and by 1954 consumption of red meat increased to about 25 billion pounds.

He goes on to point out that, if the per capita consumption of meat continue at the rate of 1954, it will require 7 million more head of cattle, 3 million more sheep, and about 10 million more hogs to supply the increased meat that would be needed by 1962.

To provide pasture and feed for these additional animals would require another 35 million acres of land. This land is not available, but irrigated pastures could do much to alleviate this coming situation. You can pasture several times more animals on an irrigated acre than you can on a dryland pasture.

According to the Department of Agriculture, the consumption of beef has nearly doubled since 1930.

PRODUCTION INCREASES

In addition to the importance of these crops to our diet, increased production also has been a determining factor in the increase in consumption.

We would not have been able to experience this increase in per capita consumption had it not been for irrigation.

For example, about three-fifths of our fruits and tree nuts, one-half of our commercial vegetables and one-third of the potato crop are grown on irrigated land.

Irrigation has enabled growers to take advantage of the favorable soil and climate in our Western States to make the growing of fruits and vegetables one of the leading industries of the West.

To show what percent of the commercial fruits and vegetables that are produced in the irrigated West, I have asked the Department of Agriculture to give me the pertinent figures.

Here are the figures they have supplied me:

Almonds	100
Apricots	100
Asparagus	62
Avocadoes	72
Strawberries	50
Broccoli	79
Cantaloups	80
Carrots	75
Cauliflower	61
Celery	54
Sweet cherries	85
Lemons	100
Dates	100
Figs	100
Grapes	95
Lettuce	91
Honeydews	100
Filberts	100
Walnuts	100
Olives	100
Onions	56
Peaches	58
Pears	83
Peas	42
Plums	87
Prunes	100
Rice	52
Spinach	57
Tomatoes	51

Many of the crops are produced in the late fall, winter, and early and middle spring. As recently as 20 to 25 years ago these crops were not available in the winter months.

Certainly, new methods of processing, better transportation and the introduction of frozen foods has helped considerably to provide us with these specialty and seasonal crops the year around. However, without irrigation to grow these crops in the first place they would not be available.

We can be quite thankful to irrigation and reclamation for making it possible for us to have the necessary crops to give us a nutritious and balanced diet.

We in the United States eat better than anyone else in the world. Because of this we are a strong Nation.

Our youth excel in practically every international sport. They have strong, well-developed bodies which make possible the new records in athletics which they achieve.

Their bodies are strong and well developed because they enjoy a balanced diet—a diet containing plenty of fresh fruits and vegetables, milk, and meat.

There are some who complain about the cost of Federal reclamation projects. In the past 50 years, approximately $2.6 billion has been allocated to irrigation. It has been estimated that these irrigation projects have returned to the Treasury more than $4 billion in new taxes. These Federal projects have repaid about $600 million of the original cost and are returning an average of $60 million a year to the Treasury.

Water is the lifeblood of the arid West. Water, placed on good soil at the proper time, can bring a feeling of security, of confidence, and new wealth to the community.

If we are to eat well in the future, we will need to produce more crops. The population of our country increases about 3½ million each year. They will need food. Little of the food produced on irrigated lands add to our present supply of surplus foods. We should be thankful that we have a surplus.

Because of irrigation, we are eating well. We will continue to eat well if we wisely develop the feasible irrigation projects in our land.

Surrender of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. Albert Clark which appeared in a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal on the subject of the proposed organization for trade cooperation. This is highly important in view of the recommendations made by the President.

The article follows:

SURRENDER OF POWER?

(By Albert Clark)

WASHINGTON.—The administration is preparing a determined drive for what Congress now interprets as a broad new grant of power—and a surrender of its own—to conduct this country's foreign economic affairs.

The actual request is for authority to join a proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation. Technically this would merely administer the rules President Eisenhower and his predecessors have worked out under the Reciprocal Trade Act and their constitutional foreign policy powers.

The lawmakers, however, by ratifying OTC would by clear inference also be endorsing in a broad policy sense, though not necessarily in every detail, that mysterious instrument of global trade policy—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Such endorsement they have specifically withheld in a series of extensions of the Reciprocal Trade Act, including the 3-year extension they will shortly send to the White House.

Paradoxical as it may seem, the United States is and long has been a member of GATT. The difference is that the present GATT has no permanent organization, whereas OTC would set up a permanent, formal machinery, headed by a director general. Congress feels it might be morally committed to GATT if it authorizes OTC.

What is this little known GATT that OTC would administer?

Basically it is a collection of tariff rates and trade rules negotiated by the 34 member nations, which account for about 80 percent of world trade, in periodic, months-long bargaining sessions; the schedule of GATT tariff concessions now covers more than 50,000 items. To understand how GATT came about, it is necessary to look back at the way tariffs were formerly regulated and negotiated.

A DELEGATION OF POWER

Before the Reciprocal Trade Act was first passed in 1934, Congress, as a general rule, passed on all tariff rates. The legislators either passed laws fixing specific import duties or ratified treaties that specified rates. With the passage of the Trade Act, Congress delegated to the President its powers to reduce tariffs, within specified limits, and to "enter into foreign trade agreements."

This authority was used to negotiate bilateral trade pacts—agreements between the United States and one other country—for fixing tariff rates and trade rules between the two countries. Up to the time GATT came into existence on January 1, 1948, the United States had concluded such separate agreements with 29 countries.

GATT grew out of proposals by the United States for a multilateral, or many-country, approach to global trade. Under the multilateral process, each nation still negotiates bilaterally, with the principal supplier of any commodity on which it is considering a tariff reduction. Then, all of the bilateral reductions are bundled up in one schedule of new tariff rates and each concession is applied to the same category of imports from all countries. This is called the most favored nation treatment, and was already a part of the Reciprocal Trade Act itself.

Since these multilateral negotiations are basically bilateral and since the most favored nation treatment was already on the books, what, if any, is the advantage of the GATT approach? The President argued in his recent message to Congress on the subject that multilateral negotiation enables this country to obtain more tariff concessions on its exports than would be forthcoming from bilateral dealing; he said the United States, for example, gets benefits from concessions which other countries would be unwilling to negotiate except in a multilateral undertaking.

Mr. Eisenhower further declared that through GATT the United States has persuaded foreign countries to remove restrictions against imports of such specific dollar goods as coal, apples, cigarettes, lumber, potatoes, textiles, autos, petroleum, wool, and motion pictures.

It is possible, too, that getting the representatives of 34 nations together at one time in one place makes for greater volume and convenience than would be the case in strictly bilateral bargaining. And, of course, it gives at least the appearance of a concerted international attack on the restrictions to world trade. Moreover, tariff concessions are just the beginning of GATT. It also commits the member countries not to cancel tariff concessions by putting up other trade barriers.

Each member country, for example, promises not to cancel the benefit of a tariff cut by levying a domestic sales tax that would offset the tariff concession. Each country is free to tax imported items, of course, so long as the rate is applied equally to imported and domestic articles.

REPEALING DOMESTIC LAWS

The GATT also contains a general prohibition against import and export restrictions. And by inference, if not explicitly, the GATT countries are committed to repeal domestic laws that conflict with GATT and to refrain from adopting new conflicting statutes. Therein lies much of the objection in Congress to GATT.

Despite the principle of nondiscrimination, however, the heart of the agreement perhaps lies in the exceptions to the general reciprocity rules.

Thus the United States is permitted by GATT to continue its preferred tariff treatment of goods imported from Cuba and the Philippines. The British Commonwealth countries are allowed to continue their preferred tariff treatment, one with another. Under the same rule, the French Union and the Benelux countries may perpetuate their tariff preference blocs.

Though the general GATT rule prohibits export and import quotas, a member nation may regulate the export of goods important to its defense. So-called underdeveloped countries may impose import quotas or other restrictions if necessary to protect a domestic industry in arising general living standards. Any member nation may withdraw a tariff concession or apply import restrictions if the member considers such action necessary to prevent a drain on its dollar reserves.

GATT critics complain that these exceptions, particularly the loopholes for underdeveloped nations, remove much of the reciprocity from what is supposed to be a reciprocal arrangement. The reason: The United States is the most prosperous of the 34 member nations. Thus the exceptions, when applied, add up to discrimination against the United States.

LITTLE USED LOOPHOLE

The principal loophole available for relief of United States industries lies in the escape clause, which is spelled out in the Trade Act and is also incorporated in GATT. Under this procedure, member countries may withdraw a tariff concession or otherwise impose restrictions on goods being imported to the detriment of a domestic industry. Actually the escape clause is used sparingly. The United States has taken advantage of it under GATT only four times, and no other member has used it at all.

But the real basis for Congressional opposition to GATT—and OTC—lies in the age-old struggle between the legislative and executive branches of Government. How far, for example, should Congress go in delegating its powers over tariffs and interstate and foreign commerce to the Executive? And, once delegated, should the Executive redelegate its authority to an international agency that can make rules to which Congress is morally committed?

These are not altogether theoretical questions. The United States has a law, for instance, that provides for import quotas on farm products being imported to the detriment of domestic farm price support programs. This statute violates both the letter and the spirit of GATT. It is true that American representatives to the recent Geneva conference, which adopted several amendments to GATT, obtained a waiver that permits the United States to violate the agreement by limiting imports under this section of United States farm law. But why, ask the critics, should the GATT countries have authority to write rules that require such a waiver?

Right now, there is pending in Congress a bill to reclassify hardboard for international trade purposes. This measure would remove hardboard from its present paper product category and classify it as a wood product. A tariff increase would accompany the reclassification. But if Congress passes the proposed law, the legislators would be violating GATT's principles.

Suppose Congress authorizes United States membership in OTC—and by inference endorses GATT—would it not be making a moral commitment to reject the hardboard bill and to repeal the provision for restricting farm imports? It is such questions as these that lawmakers, even now, are asking themselves.

Or take the case of Czechoslovakia. A provision of the 1951 extension of the Trade Act directed the President "to take such action as is necessary" to withdraw trade-agreement concessions to imports from Communist-dominated countries. Thereafter, the United States, instead of acting unilaterally, asked—and got—GATT permission to cancel concessions to Czechoslovakia. Here again, the GATT critics want to know why the United States should ask permission of 33 other countries to carry out a law passed by Congress.

THE RIGHT TO VIOLATE

By disassociating themselves from GATT in each reciprocal trade-extension bill, the House and Senate in a broad political sense are leaving themselves a free hand to violate GATT. But would they not be surrendering this freedom by okaying OTC—even though, technically, they would still have a right to violate GATT?

There is still another basic reason for Congress' reluctance to endorse GATT. This reluctance goes back to OTC's predecessor proposal by former President Truman for an International Trade Organization. The present OTC plan bears little resemblance to the ill-fated ITO scheme. ITO would have incorporated GATT as one chapter under a preamble that would have committed member countries to follow national as well as international policies designed to foster full

employment, higher living standards, and the like.

Conspicuously missing from the present proposals are old ITO chapters dealing with domestic labor and business practices, to name a couple of examples. Mr. Eisenhower pointedly noted in his recent message on OTC that American representatives to Geneva went with specific instructions to reject all efforts to expand the functions of the new organization to fields other than trade. This mandate the OTC and the slightly revised GATT appear to follow.

Even so, the GATT countries themselves have the power to amend its rules. And once Congress ratifies OTC, could not some future GATT conference, perhaps under some future administration, rewrite the agreement to cover the explosive chapters that caused Congress to reject Mr. Truman's ITO?

These, too, are questions that Congress will want answered when administration officials journey to Capitol Hill to make their case for OTC.

Government: It's Better Than You Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, this morning I was privileged to attend the annual award ceremony of the United States Department of Agriculture, which was held at the Sylvan Theater on the Washington Monument Grounds at 10:30 a. m.

A very worthwhile and inspiring address was made by our colleague, Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas. Congressman HOPE has served on the House Agriculture Committee longer than any other Member and it was indeed fitting that he be chosen to address this annual award ceremony.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be made a part of the RECORD today:

GOVERNMENT: IT'S BETTER THAN YOU THINK

The annual presentation of the Department of Agriculture awards to those who have made an outstanding contribution to Government is an ideal occasion on which to talk about Government, about how good our Government really is. On the basis of my experience, I long ago concluded that Government is better—far better—than most realize, and I believe it is unfortunate that people generally are not aware of this fact. I am certain the cause of good government would be better served if we found more opportunities—like this one—to emphasize the good, the decent, the constructive aspects of Government.

It is all too seldom that one hears a good word for the Government or for those who work for it. I'm speaking now of Government as a whole, the executive and administrative agencies of which you are a part, the judiciary and the Congress. All are essential parts of the governmental structure set up by our forefathers. They are equal and coordinate, and one cannot be attacked and seriously weakened without affecting the entire structure.

It is not strange that we hear so few good words for Government when nearly every magazine, paper, or book one picks up or broadcast one hears trumpets the latest wrongdoing of Government. Certainly if anyone ever speaks or writes well of Government or politics he rarely makes the headlines or the front page. The Congress, the departments, and agencies can turn in a creditable performance day after day, week in and week out, with never a kind word or a pat on the back for a job well done. Yet let there be one slip, and the roof falls in.

To listen to some, you could well believe that Congress is completely under the control of sinister rightist pressure groups and their well-paid hirelings. From others you could assume that Congress is influenced only by leftist forces who deliberately seek to wreck the country by wild spending schemes and unsound economic and social reforms. That Congress might have a mind and will of its own escapes attention.

From the comments and criticism which we hear of Federal agencies, one could well get the idea that Government personnel is made up of men and women who work for Government only because they are incapable of finding a job outside of Government. I believe the greatest injustice paid to any group of workers in the country is the Nation's failure to appreciate and think well of the efforts of those who work—and work hard—for Government.

I believe that our political and governmental institutions are good and I believe this irrespective of the scandals that can be uncovered or the articles that can be written and the speeches given to the contrary. I base my conclusion on 28 years of experience in the Congress and in working with Federal agencies.

But too many people accept the idea that 1 scandal, 1 piece of wrongdoing in Government is constructive proof that all is bad. The rotten apple is assumed to have spoiled the entire barrel. Too many believe that inefficiency and corruption in politics and Government is like an iceberg—that the largest part of it is submerged and lurks beneath the water unseen.

I do not believe the analogy is relevant. Instead it seems to me that disclosures of wrongdoing is proof that the processes of Government are working well, that Government cleanses itself. Very little that is corrupt goes undetected. For this reason I believe that the disclosure of wrongdoing should give us greater not lesser faith in the goodness of our governmental institutions.

For proof that Government is better than generally believed one can look to the great bulk of work involving knotty, intricate, complex problems that gets done by Government in a routine way without fuss or fanfare. As we all know, most work of Government gets done well and only a small fraction of the total causes headlines.

While some seem to believe that the Federal service is staffed with lazy and incompetent personnel those of us who know Government see differently. We know the Government worker as a person who believes in what he is doing, who works hard to do the best job of which he is capable, who is a good citizen, and who contributes fully to the community in which he lives. My conclusion that Government is better than generally realized is based to a great extent on my personal acquaintance with hundreds of Government workers who are dedicated to their jobs and who are a credit to our Government.

I believe that anyone who has an opportunity to see the Federal Government in action will form a favorable opinion of it and its employees. Let me give you an example. Mr. James C. Worthy came to Washington early in the Eisenhower administration to take a position as administrative assistant to the Secretary of Commerce. He left an important position with one of the largest business enterprises in America. Last January when, after rendering eminent service to the Government, he resigned to return to his old company, he made this statement in the course of an address entitled "The Federal Service, Its Problems and Its Future," and I quote, "I shall always be thankful for the friends I have made here, in high positions and low; friends who have made my task easier and my life richer. I have come to have a tremendous respect, not only for the appointive officials of this administration, but for the members of the career service. I hope that as I go back to private life I will be able to help correct some of the mistaken impressions which prevail in certain quarters about the kind of people who work for Government. I can say in all sincerity that for hard work and patient devotion it would be hard to find their equal in any line of endeavor."

It is a tragedy that more people do not realize how good our Government is. I say it is a tragedy, because it keeps us from realizing the extent to which the American dream is coming true. Nearly two centuries ago the Founding Fathers established here a Government dedicated to freedom and to the belief in God and the dignity of man. It was their thought that here under freedom and self-government man would achieve his highest being, his highest standard of living, peace and contentment. An essential aspect of the dream was that man would always search for the truth and his basic tools would be freedom of speech and thought. As mankind today looks ahead into the unknown future, its greatest source of courage and hope should be the realization that it has made unparalleled progress toward making this dream come true. American self-government and freedom has been an outstanding success. Self-government has been, in fact, one of our greatest achievements, and we are making more rapid progress than the pessimists want us to believe. I believe it is important to recognize this progress, to recognize how well we have done and to turn deaf ears to the cynics.

And one of the important things we cannot overlook is that this Government, set up 175 years ago for 13 small colonies along the Atlantic seaboard with about 3 million inhabitants, is functioning well today for the mightiest Nation the world has ever known, with 165 million people and with a myriad of problems which could never have been foreseen by the Founding Fathers.

Although I believe government and politics is much better than the critics ever suggest, I must make it clear that I am not opposed to criticism—that is, constructive criticism of things that are wrong and that need correcting. Criticism has been a most essential factor in the progress we have made in government and politics. Instead of less criticism, we need more, providing it is of the right kind.

In our scheme of things the purpose of criticism is to correct and improve—to eliminate the improper so that the good can endure and develop. The purpose of criticism, like free speech, of which it is a part, is to help us as a self-governing free people to find that which we can believe in—that which we can regard as true.

Criticism, whether it is of art, of science, or of politics, should serve in the search for truth. Its end is not criticism for the sake of criticism, but truth. To a disturbing extent, however, criticism in this country is losing touch with this purpose. Today criticism too frequently is based on blind obstructionism, out-and-out appeal to emotional prejudice, irrational name calling, and a desire to destroy someone's character just because he happens to disagree, even though it can be out of intelligent disagreement the truth might emerge.

For another thing we have become overly opinionated—too sure what we believe now is the eternal, everlasting truth. The overly opinionated only search for facts and argu-

ments to prove that they are right. So we use the right to criticize to prove that we are right and not as a conscientious means to search out the truth. Said another way, I believe there is a growing tendency to place too much emphasis on proving that we are right rather than in finding what is right.

I think the growing tendency for criticism to generate into irresponsible bombast and smear keeps us from fully realizing all the good there is in our culture and in our Government and political life. Once in a while we should be able to help those who are doing all they can to improve government and its processes with a word of encouragement—a word to the effect that they are making progress and that their work is worthwhile.

For years now serious-minded people have concerned themselves with the Federal Government as an employer. I believe this objective would be helped by placing greater emphasis on the good in government; on the fact that government is good—is better than we think. People—all people—have a basic inner need for believing their work is important and their effort is appreciated.

On this point let me quote again from Mr. Worthy's able and significant address. He said, and I quote, "The Government worker will exert himself to the utmost, if necessary under severe difficulties, if he feels that those in authority recognize the importance of what he is doing and are giving him the support he needs. But if the value of his work is questioned—or worse, if he is attacked directly or by implication as an unnecessary burden on the public payroll—he is deprived of the chief incentive he has for diligent, conscientious effort."

What is a better way to raise the morale of government, improve the government service, than to place ever greater emphasis upon the great things government is doing?

You who work for the Government have every reason to be proud of your work and the country has every reason to be proud of you. The giving of these annual awards certainly is a symbol representing the good in government and for this hour at least we can all be certain beyond any shadow of doubt that government is good, is better than most think.

What I have been saying applies to Federal Government service generally. I want to devote the rest of my time to saying something about the men and women who work in the Department of Agriculture. During my more than 28 years in Washington I have been thrown in closer touch with them both here and in the field than with any other group of Government employees and I have come to have for them a feeling not only of respect but admiration.

I presume that there is no department of Government which is any broader in the scope of its activities or which touches the daily life of the people as closely as the Department of Agriculture.

I am sure there is a general feeling on the part of the public that the Department of Agriculture is primarily an agency to help farmers find a solution for their problems, and so it is. But very few realize how much the increased efficiency in agriculture which has been brought about through the Department's activities is reflected in benefits to the public.

The standard of living of any country depends upon what proportion of its population is needed to produce the necessities of life—food and clothing particularly. In the most backward nations it still requires 80 or 85 percent of the people to produce these bare necessities. Here in America the industry of agriculture has become so efficient that only about 13 percent of our people now live on farms and some of these are engaged in agriculture only part time.

This means that all the rest of our people except those engaged in the transportation and distribution of agricultural commodities are free to produce, transport, and distribute the goods and supplies which add to the amenities of life and enable us to maintain what we call the American standard of living. It has given us all the luxuries and conveniences of modern life like good roads, automobiles, air transportation, radio, television, air conditioning, our far-flung educational system, and our churches with their wide religious and welfare activities.

Let me point out also that in spite of the small number now engaged in agriculture the people of America as a whole are better fed, and better clothed than those of any other nation past or present. More than that such great advances have been made in the preservation, precooking, and improved packaging of food products that I am informed that American housewives spend about one-third as much time in the preparation of foods in the home as was the case only a few years ago.

All of these things to which I have made reference are not due entirely to the work of the Department of Agriculture. They are due in part to the fact that we have farmers who are able and willing and intelligent enough to take advantage of the great discoveries which have been made in agricultural research. They are due in part to merchanization, they are partly due to the progressive work of agricultual distributors and food processors. But all of these activities tie in with the work of the Department of Agriculture and were it not for its activities and the leadership which it has furnished, much of what has been done would not have been accomplished. So it is no exaggeration to say that although the Department of Agriculture was set up primarily to deal with the problems of farmers that the general public and the nonfarming population have received greater benefits than farmers from its work and activities.

Yours is a Department of great traditions of which you may well be proud. In the earlier days of its history its scientific and research activties constituted a greater proportion of the Department's work than now. Changes in the structure of agriculture itself, particularly in the fields of marketing and finance have enlarged the activities of the Department beyond the fields of research and education so that they now include such subjects as credit, price stabilization, crop insurance, regulatory matters, and others which are important in these times. All of which means that the Department has been kept up to date as a service institution.

No one can study the early history of this Department without getting a thrill from the work of men like Harvey W. Wiley, Peter Collier, L. O. Howard, Theobald Smith, Charles Warden Stiles, Marion Dorait, William Orton, Seaman A. Knapp, and Clifford Pinchot, to mention only a few of many.

And in passing it should be said that the research work done by some of these men while primarily for the benefit of agriculture brought about some of our greatest advances in general science as well as in the field of medicine. Thus again illustrating the benefits which the public in general has received from the Department of Agriculture.

Yes, there were giants in the early days of the Department and there are giants now in all of its varied fields of activity. Some of them are here today to receive this recognition of the great service which they as public servants have rendered on behalf of a better America and a better world. There are others here who have received well merited recognition on previous occasions of this kind and there are others whose outstanding work will bring them here as recipients of these awards in the future.

These awards recognize the achievements of men and women who have rendered outstanding and extraordinary public service. They will serve as an inspiration and an incentive to everyone in the Department for continued efficient and faithful work in the field in which he is engaged. They will bring to light in future years the work of others whose devotion to duty should receive recognition and last but not least, they furnish assurance and call attention to the fact that there is no more honest, loyal, hard working and dedicated group in our Nation than the career employees of the Federal Government.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

Appendix

Memorial Day Address by Hon. Abram H. Hopkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day, May 30, 1955, I attended a district meeting of rural letter carriers and ladies' auxiliary at Fairystone Park in Patrick County, Va., and had the pleasant privilege of hearing a very able address by the Honorable Abram H. Hopkins, judge of the 13th judicial circuit court, Rocky Mount, Va. Judge Hopkins is a distinguished member of the judiciary of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following text of Judge Hopkins' address:

AMERICA

Ladies and gentlemen, we read on the Statue of Liberty:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest tossed to me:
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Equality of opportunity which America bestows on every baby born on her soil has empowered the sons of the farmer and the sons of the laborer to attain the highest pinnacles of success, both in the fields of business and in the affairs of state.

Indeed, the god of fate seems to have been ever vigilant in searching the cabins of the poor for boys and girls upon whom to bestow his blessings.

America now marches in the vanguard of world civilization. The inventive genius of our scientists has brought to the home of the laborer and the farmer, luxuries undreamed of by kings and potentates of 150 years ago. American citizens now enjoy the highest standard of living in the history of man. Not only do we enjoy the pleasures that come from the ownership of material things, but our achievements in the arts of war and of peace have been phenominal.

The genius of our writers has enriched the literature of the world. The heroic feats achieved by our men in the late War of the Hemisphere have lifted mankind to a new dignity and will be inscribed forever on the epic pages of history.

Everywhere we see the elements harnessed by American genius and subjected to the service of man. Indeed, there is no place on the continent where the spirit is not lifted and inspired by the evidences of the dynamic force of a great and puissant nation.

Truly, when we relax from our toil and attempt to visualize the magnitude of our country's achievements, whether we view this kaleidoscopic drama from the Golden Gate, amid the wheat fields of the West, or from the banks of the Potomac.

"God's voice seems to say,
Well hast thou done,
Frail child of clay."

THE PRICE OF LIBERTY

America is now the richest Nation in the world. Wealth is important in the lives of men and of nations; it is the fertilizer of civilization. The financial genius of our country has contributed much to the happiness and well-being of our people, but there are some things more important than wealth, and among these are justice and liberty. This Nation is dedicated to justice and liberty. Our forefathers, resisting a proposed arbitrary tax on tea, defied their king and wrote into the Declaration of Independence, the creed of America:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed * * *."

The thoroughness with which the spirit enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and in the Bill of Rights has become absorbed into the conscious being of our people, is our greatest estate. It has been the pillar of cloud by day, and the pillar of fire by night, which has guided America to its present state of eminence.

It may be said without exaggeration that equality of opportunity, made possible by our Constitution, is the gods' most precious gift. It has made possible the American way of life, and the American way of life is the Archimedean lever which has lifted the world.

If we are to continue our onward march, these principles and ideals must be held sacrosanct. The right to achieve must depend on ability, and not on the will of a despot. The road leading to distinction must be the road of service and honor, and not the road of sycophancy. The door of opportunity must be kept open so that the ragged boy from the mud cabin beyond the mountains may let his spirit soar and dream dreams.

If some calamity should destroy all our material possessions, American courage, American genius and American ideals would soon build upon her ruins a greater, nobler America. But, if some subversive influence should destroy our ideals, our people would commence their backward trek to the cabins in the forest.

To preserve American ideals, the parents of 11 million men sent their sons to foreign lands to battle against arbitrary power with the silent admonition of the Spartan mother of old: "Return with your shield or return not at all." Some of these men now "sleep on fame's eternal camping ground." Some returned, old beyond their years, holding in their quivering hands the Stars and Stripes, the emblem of liberty, its beauteous folds floating in the winds, tattered, but unstained.

The price of liberty is too dear to be sacrificed on the altar of political expediency.

At this point, it is well for us to bear in mind that peace hath her problems, her victories and her defeats—no less stupendous, no less hazardous than war.

The battlefield is not the only place where liberty may be won or lost. Liberty may be won or lost at the ballot boxes, in the Halls of Congress, or in the legislative assemblies.

The battle between the defenders of liberty on the one hand, and the ambitious seeking arbitrary power on the other, never ceases. Woe unto the defenders of liberty when they slumber too long in their tents.

We should ever bear in mind that where there is liberty, there is no arbitrary power—that where there is arbitrary power, there is no liberty.

Perhaps the most perfect government that ever existed was the old Jewish theocracy. God decreed, and his servants executed. While liberty and justice reigned, Judea produced poets and warriors who will challenge the admiration of posterity by the greatness of their achievements, but the cupidity and ambitions of mankind did not suffer it long to survive in its purity.

The people surrendered their lives and self-control to arbitrary power, and the spirit of liberty took her flight from the hills of Judea, never to return. The ruthless hand of arbitrary power crushed out the spirit of patriotism, and with it the fire of genius, which had made her people the admiration of the world.

I shall not prolong this paper with historical illustrations, but when we read the history of decadent nations, we find that arbitrary power and liberty cannot live together in the same State. We find further that whenever and wherever arbitrary power reigns supreme, the people atrophy and decay.

We frequently hear it said that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. This statement is only partially true. Liberty cannot be maintained without vigilance, superb courage, superior intelligence, and the willingness to sacrifice self for something greater than self—our country.

All these are the price of liberty.

THE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

I believe the American democracy to be the greatest contribution ever made by the minds of men to the science of government. A representative government such as we have in America was unknown to the patriots, priests, and judges of the Jews. It is said that the Greeks and Romans "trembled on the verge of a representative government, but never fully attained it." In our attempt to catch the spirit of our Constitution, it is necessary that we view the scenes as they existed immediately before, during and following the American Revolution, and endeavor to understand the social and economical forces which motivated our people and inspired our statesmen in their endeavor to create a workable and permanent union.

The mechanics of our Government was designed to prevent future generations from being ruled by arbitrary power. Indeed, the studied purpose of each and every clause, each and every phrase contained in the charter was to circumvent and preclude the ambitious and the mighty from establishing arbitrary power with which to degrade the dignity of man.

The originality manifested in the shaping of our charter did not consist so much in inventing something new, as in the unique method by which the desirable features of other governments gleaned from the philosophers of the past were given life and organized into a vital force designed to promote "The fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man."

Jefferson wrote into the Declaration of Independence that "All men are created free and equal," the spirit of which is embodied in our Constitution. Jefferson never intended to say (as some claim) that all of us are endowed by nature with equal abilities, but he did intend to assert that the American Government, acting in its governmental capacity, never should do any official act which might impede or prevent any child from developing the talents bestowed on him by nature.

No man is equal in every particular to any other man; our talents differ from one another as much as our physical features. Indeed, it would be a most drab world if we were all equal. If I had no superiors, we would have no electric current, no telephones, no automobiles, no great writers. We would not be able to sit in our libraries and listen to Beethoven's Moonlight Sonata. I am truly grateful for the great benefits conferred upon mankind by the masterminds of the past. I am thankful to that all-wise Providence which has bestowed upon me the privileges of enjoying the luxuries made possible by my superiors.

I am violently opposed to regimentation, or to any system, whether State or national, which muzzles the spirit of man. More than I want life, itself, I want to preserve for posterity, a government which guarantees to every boy, an equal opportunity to develop his talents, whatever they might be, in whatever field he may desire, whether his desire be to become a bootblack, a bank president, or the President of the United States. It was a denial of these rights which brought about the bloodshed and guillotine of the French Revolution. It was the guaranty of these rights which has made America the most powerful nation in the world.

As much as we love liberty, we must realize that complete liberty is only enjoyed among uncivilized tribes. We must remember that our liberty ends where the rights of others begin and that these rights and liberties must necessarily be contracted or expanded to meet the exigencies of our changing civilization. By way of illustration, when our forefathers went west, they were permitted to drive their oxen in the middle of the road, but American genius gave to us a horseless buggy, and now our liberty has been curtailed and we are required to drive on the right half of the road. But, no one would contend that this curtailment of our liberty has not proven to be to the mutual advantage of all.

"Liberty and justice," says Plato, "must be distributed to all." Justice and liberty must not only be distributed to all, but it is the duty of government to see that justice is not denied to its humblest citizens. It, therefore, becomes the duty of government functioning within its proper domain, not only to endeavor to coordinate and harmonize the divergent interest of this country to the mutual advantage of all, but to use its strong powers to see that no one faction, whether it be in the fields of industry or politics, gets a strong hold on the other.

Truly, America's achievements during the last war is the world's miracle. Our people, from the humblest cottage, to the proudest estate, were tested by fire and emerged with their patriotism unsinged. The war was won by all our social and economical classes. The fruits of victory must be preserved and enjoyed by all our social and economic classes.

Whether we like it or not, whether we think these regulations wise or unwise, the ruthless individualism which brought about the economic cataclysm of 1932 when our economic world was without form and void has been driven from our continent.

"The moving finger writes and having writ;
Moves on and all thy piety and wit
Cannot lure it back or cancel half a line,
Nor all thy tears wash out a word of it."

Twenty years ago, when we traveled over Virginia, we saw farms spotted with broom sage, corroded hills, and evidence of poverty and dejection on every side. Now, these corroded hills and broom-sage fields are green with improved clovers, and we see white-faced cattle fattening in lush pastures.

Twenty years ago, in the home of the laborer we saw bare rooms, empty cupboards, disheartened parents; ragged, emaciated, and depressed children. Today, in those same homes, we see the modern conveniences, comfortable furniture, happy and contented parents, children well dressed, vigorous bodies, buoyant with hope for the future and the joy of living.

The rights and liberties of our people cannot be protected without a certain degree of government supervision and government control.

Indeed it is said that every segment of society is now receiving aid either directly or indirectly from the Federal Government.

Every substantial segment of society is so affiliated and correlated with every other segment that no one segment can be reduced to a mere subsistence level without impoverishing and devitalizing every other segment.

The wisdom of these socialistic features are now recognized by the best brains of both political parties.

Indeed it sometimes seems to me that the President might be leaning a little too far to the left.

I do not possess the basic facts and knowledge necessary to enable me to form a definite conviction about all of our governmental problems. When I was young I thought there were many positives. I am now convinced that God has so ordered the forces of nature that there are no positives and that everything is relative. Truly, this is a period when our lawmaking bodies are confronted with mighty problems calling for the best thought of our people. In concluding this phase of my talk I wish to leave with you the following:

We read in mythology that when the sun gave leave to Phaeton to drive his chariot he said to him:

"If you ascend too high, you will burn the heavenly mansions; if you descend too low, you will reduce the earth to ashes; do not drive to the right, you will meet there with the constellation of the serpent; avoid going to much to the left, you will there fall in with that of the altar: keep in the middle."

MUST CHOOSE RETWEEN LIBERTY AND COMMUNISM

America must choose between freedom under our Constitution or slavery under communism. Let our Government refuse to look after her own; let her refuse to enact those laws which promote the happiness and well-being of our people, let her renounce all of our social gains and return to the ruthless individualism of 1932, then the Communists will be the pallbearers at the funeral of our Republic.

In my investigation of communism, what I once saw dimly or with a blurred vision, now stands out as clearly as a steel engraving.

We find that communism is an infectious disease produced by a poisonous virus which mainly attacks people with empty bellies. The cure is to fill the bellies with food.

Hunger enfeebles the body, impairs the mind, dethrones the reason, destroys the will, and renders one as helpless to resist the will of the temptor offering food as inaminate clay is to resist the will of the potter.

No government owes to any able-bodied man a living, but every government owes to every citizen an opportunity to earn an honest living. The storms and winds will not prevail against a nation that performs well this basic function of government. The nation that neglects this function is doomed to atrophy and decay.

Not only does the above statement accord with our own observation, but history will testify unanimously to its verity.

It was the neglect of France to perform these functions of government which brought about the conditions that made the French Revolution inevitable.

It was the neglect of Germany to perform these duties that produced a Hitler.

It was hunger and want that existed in Russia during the latter part of the reign of Czar Nicholas, while under the hypnotic spell of the crazy monk, Rasputin, that brought about the overthrow of the government and made the Russian people an easy prey for communism.

What I especially wish to evince is that if a nation is to remain powerful, it must not only be ever vigilant to defend itself against the encroachments of foreign enemies, but it must be equally vigilant in the administration of justice.

History teaches that great armies and giant navies will not avail to maintain a nation's strength where the moral courage and patriotic fervor of its people are permitted to decay.

This spirit was expressed by the old barons of Arogan. "We," said the barons, "who are each of us as good as you and who are all together more powerful than you, promise obedience if you maintain our rights and liberties."

If our Government holds sacred those fundamental principles of liberty and justice enunciated in our Constitution by keeping the ballot box untainted by the poison of arbitrary power, then what Shakespeare said of England may be said of America:

"The American Nation will never lie prostrate at the feet of a conqueror."

Evolving Policy Over Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 26, 1955:

EVOLVING POLICY OVER FORMOSA
(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The war scare over Formosa, which held Washington in its grip 6 weeks ago, is now almost wholly dissolved.

This does not mean that the danger is passed, that the possibility of attack is no longer present, or that the 7th Fleet is not remaining on the alert. It does mean that the imminence of a Red Chinese strike either at the offshore islands of Quemoy and the Matsus or directly at Formosa has greatly receded and that the outlook is more and more on the side of a de facto cease-fire.

I would not at all suggest that the Formosa war scare had no foundation. To the contrary, it did have foundation, and I suspect that one of the reasons Chou En-lai is talking less about the offshore islands and making fewer military gestures toward the Formosa Strait is because the United States reacted so vigorously and so visibly as it did.

And why has the war scare receded, why have the voices in Communist China become somewhat less truculent, somewhat less aggressive? Obviously, it is not safe to offer a dogmatic answer—who can say what's inside the Communist mind? But those who are closest to the situation are convinced

that three factors exerted the greatest influence. They are:

1. The evidence at the Bandung Conference that the great majority of Afro-Asian countries were critical of Red China's aggressiveness and the desire of Chou En-lai to demonstrate to them that Red China was a reliable neighbor.

2. The influence of the Soviet Union, which appears to have been counseling the Chinese Communists not to risk getting into war with the United States—a war which would likely involve the U. S. S. R.

3. Red China's fear of the atomic bomb. This factor is not alone cited by United States policymakers. It is cited by allied diplomats in Washington who frankly say that they think that fear of the atomic bomb has been a principal deterrent against an attack on Formosa. They incline to the view that in this instance, at least, the threat of "massive retaliation"—which really means selective retaliation against particular targets—has paid off.

The fact is that while President Eisenhower never said that atomic weapons would be used to repel a Communist attack on Formosa, he never said they wouldn't. This left Red China in grave doubt as to what would happen. The consensus here is that the Chinese Communists feared that extensive atomic retaliation would set back their industrialization program at least a decade and decided not to take the risk.

The lull, of course, gives the Chinese Nationalists the opportunity to strengthen their own position and it gives the United States and Chiang Kai-shek time to try to come to an agreement over the defense of Quemoy and the Matsus. I believe that the developing attitude of the American Government can be accurately stated in these terms:

The United States intends to hold Formosa at all cost against any attack.

We believe that Chiang Kai-shek has every right and every reason to defend Quemoy and the Matsus from the Communists and we would be glad to see him use American military equipment, which has been provided to him, for the best and, we would hope, successful defense of the offshore islands.

The United States does not agree that the Nationalist retention of Quemoy and the Matsus is indispensable to the military defense of Formosa.

The United States agrees that if Chiang gave up the offshore islands without fighting, it would be a grave, if not fatal, blow to Nationalist morale, but we also believe that if Chiang puts up vigorous, meaningful resistance to such an attack but is finally forced to abandon Quemoy and the Matsus to superior strength, such a course need not adversely affect the esprit de corps of the Nationalist Government and forces on Formosa.

President Eisenhower does not wish to become involved in a war over Quemoy and the Matsus but does not intend to give Chou En-lai the advantage of knowing what we would ultimately do.

Minimum Wage Legislation This Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the privilege of appearing before the House Committee on Education and Labor to speak in behalf of a fair minimum wage bill.

I believe the House Labor Committee is making a diligent effort to bring out minimum wage legislation so that all the Members of Congress can debate and vote on a new fair minimum wage before this session of Congress adjourns:

MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION THIS SESSION

Mr. Chairman, I am indeed happy that the House Committee on Education and Labor has decided to hold hearings on increasing the minimum wage standards of the Nation. I firmly believe that it is highly essential to the economical interests of our Nation that minimum wage legislation be acted upon favorably and signed into law before this session of Congress adjourns. It is indeed unfortunate that President Eisenhower has seen fit to recommend only an increase from the present 75 cent minimum up to 90 cents per hour. This falls far short of the economic needs for low income workers, especially considering the inflationary high cost of living which all families are subjected to at the present time. An increase to 90 cents an hour does not sufficiently cover the rise in the cost of living since the present 75 cent minimum became law in 1949. A number of bills have been introduced, including H. R. 1818 which was filed by me several months ago, calling for an increase to $1.25 per hour. If the President's recommendation of 90 cents an hour is enacted into law, the full-time worker would merely receive an annual wage of less than $2,000 a year. It is apparent, considering the present high cost of living, that a man and wife with children cannot afford the bare necessities of life to his family on that meager income. It is estimated that the annual wage at $1.25 for 8 hours a day and 5 days a week, would bring in an income of $2,500. This income would afford the average family in the lower brackets a great improvement in their status of living and give them an opportunity to enjoy at least a few privileges and necessities of life which they are compelled to forego under their present low income. It is estimated that the lowest income for a family living in high cost areas of the average metropolitan city should be at least $3,600 to $4,000 per year in order to meet the necessary living expenses for a family of five.

Unfortunately, the wage scale in a number of our States is far below other States, particularly those located in the southern areas of our country. The economic situation in a great many of our Northern States today has deteriorated by reason of literally thousands of industries and factories moving into States which have a low wage scale. The Northeast Atlantic States have probably suffered more than any area in the country by reason of "runaway" industry closing their shops and factories and moving into certain Southern States in order to take advantage of substandard wages. This situation has been becoming worse during the last 5 or 6 years until today, we have cities in the North that are suffering through critical unemployment brought about by "runaway" industry desirous of taking advantage of substandard wages. Only recently, I received a letter from a metal worker located at Indianapolis and stating that the top three floors of the factory where he is employed has been closed and the machinery moved to Alabama. He also stated in the letter that over 250 employees have lost their jobs already and that it would be but a short time until the factory would be completely closed and moved to the low-wage area. He also stated that the situation as it exists in the metal factory was no different than in several other industries in the Indianapolis area. Unless the Congress takes some steps to improve this unjust and unfair distribution of wages throughout the country, our economy will suffer far more in the future than it has in the past by reason of low-wage standards in certain areas.

The greatest selling market for products manufactured in low-wage areas is in the States which have a high wage and large purchasing power. If unemployment is rampant in the high-wage States, the factories will eventually close in the low-wage States.

We should not forget that one of the principle reasons for the great depression in the early 1930's was the fact that our factories and industries turned out products and discovered that the purchasing power of the country was so low that there was no market for our production. This brought about unemployment and the most devastating shattering of our economy in the history of the Nation.

Purchasing volume among wage earners is as essential for prosperity as purchasing power among the millions of farmers in America. After 1933, when our Government took steps to improve the economy of the wage earner and the farmer, our economy started to improve until we went into the greatest period of prosperity in our history.

The great industrial areas of the 1920 period learned a costly lesson when they discovered that low wages and low consumer income throughout America did not provide a market for steel and other manufactured products.

The increase in the minimum-wage bracket was promised to the American people by both political parties in the recent election. In fact, Secretary of Labor Mitchell told the CIO convention in 1953 that he was shocked to learn that two-thirds of America's 60 million workers were outside the wage-hour law. He further stated that the position of these exempt workers was dangerously insecure, but also imperiled those covered by the 75-cent minimum-wage law. It is estimated that there are over 7,500,000 retail workers and 5 million service-trade workers who are not covered by the present low minimum-wage base. The industries that are covered are often those industries in which unions are strong enough to enforce a wage rate for higher than the legal minimum. The industries exempted are precisely those where a long tradition of low pay, plus other factors, make it difficult for the workers to organize and present their case effectively. Some folks have the false idea that if the minimum-wage rate is increased, there must be a broader exemption. That in effect, means that we must not have a minimum-wage base in any industry where the law would have a useful effect. Both the A. F. of L. and the CIO have proposed a $1.25 level and if this minimum-wage base is enacted, or something reasonably close thereto, it would have the effect of pumping an enormous buying power into the hands of consumers, aid prosperity, and prove to be an effective barrier against the reoccurrence of another depression.

The Department of Labor survey in October 1951, showed that the annual income need for an average family was $3,812 a year in New Orleans. In the city of Washington, D. C. on account of the increased cost of living, the essential family income would be $4,454. Yet, this family budget would be far more than the head of a family would make at $1.25 an hour. A full year's work of 2,000 hours at $1.25 minimum would yield only $2,500 compared to the $3,800 required for adequate family living in a city like New Orleans.

The raising of minimum wage to a just level would indirectly bring about a great reduction in disease, crime, and slums. Heads of families who are compelled to bring up children with inadequate necessities of life, when children are compelled to go to work at an early age, when the family producers must work such long hours that he has no time for his home, his wife and his children, develops into a dangerous challenge

to the state of mind of millions of Americans who live under substandard conditions. It fails to recognize our Nation's interest and welfare in human needs and the protection of the family is completely lost through poverty and lack of opportunity.

I do hope the committee will, without delay, report out a substantial increase in the base minimum wage structure and in doing so, carry out the promises that both political parties made to the American people in the last election.

It is my earnest hope that your committee act favorably so the bill can reach the House floor in the next 2 weeks. If the 435 Members of Congress are given an opportunity to debate, amend, and vote on a minimum wage bill, I am convinced they will reach a wage figure that will be fair and equitable to both employer and employee.

Why I'm Glad I Live in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, 1955, the Michigan Legislature passed a concurrent resolution proclaiming May 15 to May 21, 1955, as Michigan Week. These days were set aside for the citizens of our great State to focus their attention to the social and economic resources of our State and to think of the many things that make Michigan a good place in which to live and work.

For this celebration the Michigan Railroads Association sponsored a statewide essay contest on the subject Why Do You Like Michigan.

I am very proud and happy that a junior student, Miss Kaye Dolan, of the William G. Mather High School, Munising, Mich., won the first prize in this contest. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the essay written by my young constituent:

WHY I'M GLAD I LIVE IN MICHIGAN

Years ago the Indians had a story of how Michigan came to have its mittened shape. They believed that when the Great Spirit was forming the land, he put his hand down gently to steady the world. When he took it away, he had left behind his hand print, and that was Michigan.

I like this little story, because it signifies to me all the opportunities and advantages I hold in the palm of my hand while I live in Michigan.

Michigan is a picturesque State of hills and mountains, lowlying lands and swamps, virgin forests, rushing rivers, and thousands of inland lakes. It has two great natural regions, the slender Upper Peninsula and the mitten-shaped Lower Peninsula.

As a State, I feel that Michigan is tops and the envy of others in many ways. Sometimes I feel that I am boasting when I begin to enumerate them—yet most of us who enjoy and who matter-of-factly contribute our share to the heritage of a powerful and progressive State, take it for granted.

We are tops in making cars, mining iron and salt, growing cherries and beans, making chemicals and entertaining vacation visitors.

Ours is the biggest State east of the Mississippi in land and water area. We have the longest shoreline of any State in the Union, and we have more than 11,000 inland lakes for our summer and winter playgrounds. We're one of the fastest growing States in the Nation, and still growing strong. In fact, ours is the seventh largest State in population in the Nation.

Ours is a State of beautiful homes, cultivated fields, beautiful churches, and attractive schools, factories, and busy cities. There are acres of farms with their big barns and farmhouses. We have orchards and oil wells, salt mines, and limestone quarries. We have miles of paved highways and shining rails, and skyways along which giant air liners and transport planes fly.

Michigan is one of the most popular vacation States. Thousands of visitors come each year to its lakes, rivers, and healthful pine forests to swim, fish, boat, and relax. Michigan is often referred to as the most naturally air-conditioned State in the Union because of its cool summer breezes and even climate. There are many beaches along the Great Lakes which are excellent for boating and hunting and fishing. "Snow trains" make it possible for those who live in the cities to enjoy the winter sports—skiing, skating and tobogganing, iceboating, and fishing through the ice. Many visitors are attracted to the festivals and carnivals which celebrate everything in season—fish and flowers in spring, arts and crafts and the water in summer, fruits and other harvests in autumn, and ice and snow in winter. We stand unchallenged as the leading recreation area in the Middle West and rank fifth in the Nation in the income from our tourist, resort and travel business.

Our State has been, and continues to be, a forerunner in every advance made in American education, from grade school through college. Michigan's educational system measures up among the top three States in the Nation.

It is also one of Michigan's boasts that it has less organized crime than any other large industrial State.

Where else, then, but in Michigan could one go and find all these—a comfortable, livable climate all year round, a wealth of opportunities for getting an education and making a good living with such a large choice of industries from which to choose, and a vast area of inviting spots in which to spend leisure hours? Gratefully, I acknowledge the privilege of enjoying her rich heritage, and I proudly invite others to share my delight.

KAYE DOLAN.

Remarks of the Honorable John A. Volpe, Commissioner of Department of Public Works, at Testimonial Dinner in Honor of Rev. John M. Positano, Lawrence, Mass., December 5, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of the the Honorable John A. Volpe at testimonial dinner in honor of Rev. John M. Positano, Lawrence, Mass., December 5, 1954:

Tonight we are gathered here to pay tribute to a man who joins a former United States President, the current President, and the United States Senator from Rhode Island in becoming an honorary member of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States.

Some people might think it odd that a man who has devoted his very life to the service of the Catholic Church should be so honored because of his efforts to provide the men of our armed services with good, clean entertainment to help fill the lonely hours away from their homes and loved ones. But, such a thing is not so strange when you consider the part the Roman Catholic Church has played in entertainment as we know it today.

Those familiar with the history of the Catholic Church know that the first entertainments following the dark ages in Europe were sponsored by the church; first on the altar itself and then later, in order to provide for larger audiences on the so-called porches at the front of the cathedrals—which is mainly the reason why so many of Europe's cathedrals have what seem today to be too-large porches. We know that it was the Catholic Church which encouraged the growth and development of the so-called miracle plays which, even today, are performed in many parts of the world. A prime example of this is the beautiful cathedral in Salzburg, where, each year, during the festival there, a variation of the famous everyman theme—a miracle play—is presented on the porch.

The interest of the Catholic Church in entertainment and those who earn their living in that field is most forcibly shown in that beautiful legend which is so familiar to us and which has been retold at Christmas time for many centuries. This is the story of Our Lady and the Juggler. As you remember, this incident occurred one Christmas time in central Europe. A poor juggler, dressed in rags, stood outside a great cathedral and watched the faithful enter with flowers and other gifts to lay at the feet of Our Lady in honor of her Son. This poor juggler was heartbroken because he had no gift to add to the steadily growing pile, and he could not afford even a single blossom to lay at her feet. Completely miserable, the juggler waited in his rags until the last of the warmly dressed parishioners had left the church. Then, with his clubs, he crept into the church and up to her shrine. Holding his clubs in his hands, the juggler looked up at our Blessed Mother and said: "Dear Mother in heaven, I have nothing to give you but my talent as a juggler. I give that to you in the name of my love for Jesus Christ."

With that, the juggler went through all of the tricks he usually performed—and many more which had never been successful—and when he finished, he looked up at Our Lady in adoration and she, who had been given so many gifts from so many people that day, smiled down upon our juggler.

The juggler's devotion to Our Lady and her Son, can well be called religion with a purpose. And that is exactly what we might say to describe Father John, who is the personification of the fact that there are many ways to serve the Lord. We serve Him, of course, by attending mass and the other sacraments. But do we, as we search our conscience, serve Him to quite the same extent as Father Positano? Are we willing to give up as he does, our leisure hours to the care and comfort of the less fortunate? Father Positano is here with us tonight no less as an honored guest than he is as a challenge to our Christian spirit of service to our fellow men.

At the time I was invited to speak with you tonight, I did a great deal of research upon the activities of Father John—and, I freely confess, a great deal of searching of my own conscience. I thought: How many of us can approach this good father's record of service to our fellow men?

In my humble opinion, Father Positano's career as a priest and as a volunteer in the

field of entertaining our Armed Forces, sets a wonderful example of not only what each of us is capable of, but also what should be the minimum of our service to any common cause.

The story of Father Positano has been told many times. It was told in Pennsylvania before he was transferred here to Massachusetts. It has been told in the dozens of citations he has been given by both Catholic and lay organizations—as well as by the United States Government. But, it is a story that bears retelling over and over again because it serves as such a source of inspiration to all of us who want to perform some small service in the name of our Lord.

Most of us here tonight know that Father John started his career as a clarinetist with a popular band. We know he left that work to become a priest. Following his ordination, Father John was eventually assigned to Philadelphia, where, as we know, he first started the work which has brought him national recognition—and, more important—the affection of thousands of the young men who served in our Army, Navy, and Air Force during World War II, after it, and during the Korean conflict.

In 1942, Father Positano first formed his little troupe of entertainers from among his parishoners in Philadelphia. Immediately, they offered their services and their talents to the USO and to every service hospital in the area and as far afield as New York and Maryland. For more than 10 years this work continued. The membership of the troupe changed, but the leadership of Father Positano continued. Because of the encouragement of Father John and the opportunity he provided for frequent public appearances, many of his amateurs went on to become successful professionals with appearances on national television shows.

Having been in the Navy myself, I am very much aware of the value of service such as that rendered by Father Positano and others like him. I know, as you do, the temptations which confront a young Catholic when he is in the service far from the good influence of his family. It is unfortunate that in every war period throughout history there has been an accompanying letdown in standards of behavior and morals. That it has not been even worse, is a tribute to people like Father Positano. The club facilities and the entertainment provided by organizations like the USO have aided tremendously in curtailing lax behavior on the part of our servicemen—especially during World War II and the Korean conflict.

Something else about Father Positano's part in this effort is very worthy of attention. And that is, that while, out of necessity, organizations like the USO and others, lost touch with the young serviceman when he left their immediate jurisdiction. Father John, on the other hand, did not. The spiritual guidance and encouragement of the good Father followed the young man no matter where he went—whether to the front in Europe, to the middle of the Atlantic or Pacific, or to the jungles of some tiny island. To 18,000 of these young men went periodic letters, Christmas cards, Easter cards, and Mass cards. This type of mail assured the young soldier or sailor that he was not forgotten at home, and that the prayers of his Church, his family, and his neighbors were with him at all times.

It is not an exaggeration to say that these prayers undoubtedly gave courage to many thousands of men during the horror of battle and made better fighting men of them.

As a note of grateful appreciation for the encouragement and spiritual strength they received from Father John's letters and cards, hundreds of men fighting on the far flung battlefields, sent him photographs showing Catholic chapels in jungles and at airfields.

Yes, Father John helped the serviceman before he went off to battle and while he was engaged in battle. If, as happened tragically often, our young men were wounded and crippled, Father John sought to bring a smile to their lips and hope to their hearts when they were hospitalized in a place where he could bring his troupe to entertain them.

From service hospitals throughout the area he served, the good Father received hundreds of grateful letters of appreciation for his efforts. But, one which I have heard of, was outstanding. This was a letter from a service hospital in Pennsylvania. The medical director there who, incidentally, called the father's troupe "Father John's Medicine"—said that he had one badly-wounded boy who smiled for the first time in 12 months after watching the show put on by the small, but highly-talented group.

In tracing Father Positano's career, we can see how he combined spiritual therapy with physical therapy; how he helped to restore to a normal life those who had been maimed in battle and who sometimes were ready to give up the fight to live. I am sure that Father John not only has saved many souls, but that he has also salvaged many lives. Above all, his most notable result was that his cheerfulness and encouragement restored in bitter men faith in the Lord.

For all of these accomplishments, Father Positano has received honors from hundreds of service organizations. He was awarded a gold medal for outstanding volunteer service by the National Headquarters of the USO.

In November of 1946, then Secretary of War, Robert Patterson sent a personal note to Father Positano in which he said:

"The Honorable William A. Barrett has brought to my attention the splendid contribution of the Holy Name Society of the Church of St. Nicholas of Tolentino to the welfare and morale of our servicemen during World War II.

"Mr. Barrett has informed me of the activities of your society in behalf of our service personnel in hospitals, posts, and social centers, and of the fine contribution which you have made to the morale of your community.

"I wish to express to your society, on behalf of the War Department, my sincere appreciation for the fine service you have rendered through these activities.

"Sincerely yours,

"ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
"Secretary of War."

Still another honor which has come to Father John for his efforts, was a citation from the President's Committee on Religion and Welfare in the Armed Forces. This tribute, conferred in October of 1949, says in part:

"I am sure you need no praise from us for the wonderful job you are doing. The happy faces of the men you faithfully serve are convincing evidence that it is worthwhile.

"I am sure I speak for the Committee when I express gratitude for your fine cooperation.

"Cordially yours,

"CHARLES K. BRIGHTBILL,
"Executive Secretary."

Just these three of the many honors conferred upon Father Positano are very impressive. But, perhaps the most impressive of all was a resolution introduced in the national House of Representatives. That great deliberative body praised the father for his many good works. I quote in part:

"Whereas Father Positano, a distinguished spiritual and moral leader has devoted himself unstintingly to maintaining and promoting the morale and welfare of men and women serving in the Armed Forces and has brought happiness and warmth to servicemen aboard ships, at USO centers, and at Army hospitals; and

"Whereas the devoted sacrifices, outstanding contributions and services given by Father John to our country were gratefully recognized by the President's Committee on Religion and Welfare; and

"Whereas the Adjutant General of the Army has expressed his gratitude: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That this House of Representatives extend its deeply felt gratitude to Reverend John Positano in recognition of outstanding devotion and service to promoting the morale and welfare of the men and women of the Armed Forces."

This, indeed, is a high tribute. I'm sure that all of you here tonight join with me in the hope that some day in the not too distant future, an effort will be made by Massachusetts Legislators in Washington to have this resolution read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and thus made an official part of our national history.

In the meantime, Father John is not resting on his laurels. He is still maintaining contact with former servicemen; and is still providing spiritual hope and happy entertainment to the very large number of men still in our Armed Forces.

Perhaps Father Positano's major achievement, as far as we here tonight are personally concerned, is the example he has set for us Americans of Italian descent.

He has shown us just how much it is possible to do. He has shown us that we should devote as much time, ability, and skills as we have to public good.

Many of us these days are called upon to serve some public cause or other. We respond to these calls with varying degrees of enthusiasm or reluctance.

Sometimes we feel sorry for ourselves that the shape of human events compels us to relinquish time which would be happily spent in the family circle, to the task of helping to work out problems which effect those around us. However, if the true spirit of Christian service is to be demonstrated, the sacrifice must be made willingly and with as much good humor as possible.

If we feel, as we should, that our children deserve a decent heritage, then we must offer ourselves freely to matters involving our church, our community, and our Nation.

For many years, Father Positano and others like him have set an example we should follow. And I believe the best honor we can bestow on Father John tonight—and the one he would most appreciate and carry with him—is our personal pledge to follow his example of unselfish service to others.

After all, Father John feels, I am sure, what all of us should feel: That service to mankind is service to God.

Thank you very much.

The Upper Colorado Swindle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, certain proponents of the upper Colorado River storage project would have everyone believe that outside of California the entire West is enthusiastic in supporting this project.

The first newspaper of the great State of Nevada is the Territorial Enterprise and Virginia City News.

The editorial of a recent issue indicates that the good, thinking people of the Western States realize the unsoundness, the economic infeasibility of the upper Colorado River project. The editorial is deserving of the reading and careful attention by every Member of Congress.

The editorial follows:

THE UPPER COLORADO SWINDLE

Until now the word boondoggle has been an addition to the national lexicon with with purely Democratic connotations. It was coined during the years of Roosevelt infamy to describe a worthless extravagance of public funds through arbitrary and bogus employment of otherwise unemployable mendicants on unjustified public works. To boondoggle was to make work at public expense.

Now and very close to Nevada one of the most colossal and fantastic boondoggles of all time is being planned at fantastic expense and with no discernible justification or end result. Is it a scheme of the rascally Democrats in Washington to purchase votes and support for a bankrupted administration? Can it be assigned to the shiftless cynicism of a Roosevelt government or even to misdirected humanitarianism in lean times?

Unhappily for friends and admirers of the Eisenhower administration there is no such easy out for the stupendously wasteful and capiciously conceived program of reclamation in the States contining the upper Colorado River Basin. Here is Government waste of money at the billion-dollar level, almost on a level with the St. Lawrence seaway scandal, serenely authorized by the Senate on a scale of extravagance that compares favorably with the most crack-brained schemes of the discredited Democrats in a time of reported national emergency.

The hydroelectric power that will be generated when the upper Colorado scheme is completed to the ruin of the entire national parks project will not compete with privately manufactured power. It won't even be an experiment in Government competition since the resulting electricity will be so costly, by Government admission in advance, that nobody will buy it. Even Senator NEUBERGER, a notorious advocate of Government meddling in the waterpower picture, admits that upper Colorado power "will be produced at such cost as to preclude extensive use for manufacturing purposes."

But the great peril of the upper Colorado bubble is the precedent it will set for the ruthless invasion in the name of sheer, arbitrary Government extravagance of the entire national parks system. The Echo Park Dam, if it is built, will flood two of the finest and most precious river canyons in the entire West. It will destroy natural beauty that cannot be again created in the probable lifetime of mankind on this planet. If the project is achieved there will no longer be any such thing as a protected area of any sort in the entire United States for the Federal Government itself will have set the precedent for their pillaging, not in the name of any conceivable advantage to anybody, but of capricious and spectacular waste of the people's money.

The truth of the matter is that with the vast surplus population being spawned in America in terms of progression that are frightful far beyond the possible intimations of any atom bomb, a stand of trees or a waterfall is becoming more important than any human devising of convenience or aspect of human economy.

The upper Colorado swindle is one of which President Eisenhower's administration should be damned well ashamed. The rest of the Nation is.

William Penn and the Quakers of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story which appeared in the New York Times, Wednesday, June 1, 1955, relating how William Penn was influenced by the Quaker philosophy and later founded the great State of Pennsylvania:

FAITH OF QUAKERS BASED ON A VISION—IT INFLUENCED PENN TO JOIN SECT AND LED TO THE FOUNDING OF PENNSYLVANIA

The religious vision that came to a young Englishman 300 years ago brought into being one of the world's most influential faiths and contributed much toward founding the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The young Englishman was George Fox. The religion he founded was that of the Society of Friends, or Quakers, and the desire to create a sanctuary of religious freedom in a world of persecution motivated one of the greatest of the Quakers, William Penn (1644–1718), in the establishment of Pennsylvania, the National Geographic Society notes.

Penn was the son of a wealthy and influential admiral serving England during and before the restoration. As such, the young man could have been an important courtier to Charles II and James II, and he did spend considerable time in or near the court. But he fell early under the influence of the followers of George Fox, and became a close friend of the Quaker leader.

SPENT CONVIVIAL EARLY DAYS

As a youth Penn lived in England and Ireland, traveled on the Continent and tasted the pleasures of the French court of Louis XIV. But when he was in Ireland at the age of 22 the Quaker influence, long within him, became dominant and he was converted.

It is ironic that while Penn was on military duty in Ireland, shortly before his conversion, his best known portrait was painted. This portrait shows a man, whose Quaker principles were opposed to armed force, clad in a suit of armor.

For almost 20 years after his conversion Penn worked for the Friends in England and on the Continent, suffering imprisonment and indignity. In 1681, he pressed Charles II for an accounting of a debt owed his father, and was granted what is now Pennsylvania in payment.

The grant was what Penn desired, and he wasted little time in setting up the colony. Penn drew up a constitution that was a model of fairness and toleration. It granted freedom of religion, democratic government, and freedom of opportunity.

CURB ON DEATH PENALTY

The death penalty, applicable in England for 200 offenses, could be invoked only in cases of willful murder under the Pennsylvania constitution. Imprisonment for debt was greatly reduced, but not eliminated as is sometimes reported.

After sending representatives and settlers in ahead, Penn visited the colony and drew up treaties with the Indians so peaceful and moderate that for 70 years Pennsylvania was untroubled by the Indian wars plaguing other colonies. In addition, Penn insisted that Indians be paid liberally for all lands taken over by settlers.

Although early Swedish and other settlers had preceded them, Penn's Quakers soon became the dominant group in the colony, particularly in Philadelphia. Not all the new colonists were English. Quakers and members of other denominations seeking escape from persecution came from Ireland, Wales, and the Continent. Many Germans settled to become ancestors of today's Pennsylvania Dutch.

Penn himself could spend only 4 years, distributed over 2 visits, in his new colony. But he saw it develop into one of the most prosperous and peaceful of New World settlements.

Memorial Day Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Friday, May 27, it was my privilege to address a Memorial Day gathering in West Allis, Wis. I stressed the significance of Memorial Day in our time, particularly with respect to aviation defense.

In my judgment, our country must look to its air age laurels if we are to have necessary protection for our national survival.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MEANING OF MEMORIAL DAY IN OUR TIME—THE NEED FOR SPEEDING UNITED STATES AVIATION DEVELOPMENT

I am proud to be present with you at this outstanding patriotic assembly.

No one could be present today without a variety of deep feelings in his heart.

OUR FEELINGS TODAY

There is, first, a feeling of humility, because of the sacrifices which have been made by America's heroes in all of our past conflicts.

There is, second, a feeling of gratitude for what those who went before us did in our behalf—of gratitude for their sacrifices, their selflessness, their giving of their all.

There is, third, a feeling of proudest patriotism. This is a period when Old Glory, with all its rich meaning, takes on deeper meaning still. The red, white, and blue waves more proudly in our hearts than ever before, as it waved proudly at Gettysburg and San Juan Hill and the Argonne and Normandy and Inchon.

And lastly, there is a feeling of rededication.

There is a feeling of deepest responsibility to this constitutional Republic, a feeling that we must truly be worthy of it, that we must be faithful to it, that we must never let it down.

There is a feeling that we must show our profound appreciation for the most priceless privilege that any human being can have on the face of the earth—the privilege of being

a citizen in the grandest, freest, finest nation on earth.

And so, as you and I pay tribute to the heroes of America's conflicts, and in particular, the heroes who died that the Union might be preserved, we take upon ourselves the renewed responsibility to protect and preserve this country from those who would destroy it from without and/or from within.

AMERICA'S HOUSE MUST REMAIN UNITED

Lincoln told us that "a house divided against itself" cannot stand. America must, therefore, be united.

Labor and management must be basically united, even though they do differ on the guaranteed annual wage, or some other specific controversial subjects.

The different regions of our Nation—North and South and East and West—must be united, even though they differ somewhat on practices and customs in their respective areas.

Men of different religions and races in our land must be united, even though they worship in different temples and even though their forefathers came from different origins.

Men and women of different economic groups in our country must be united, even though some have more worldly possessions than others.

There are so many things that we share in common that we must not allow anyone to widen the gap on those few issues on which we are apart.

VIGILANCE TO PRESERVE WESTERN CIVILIZATION

This house will not be divided, and therefore it will stand.

This Republic, which was saved at Antietam, at Gettysburg, at Vicksburg, will not fall, must not fall, in some Pearl Harbor-like attack in the future. The fate of western civilization rides with Old Glory and the banners of Allied Powers.

So, the significance of Memorial Day 1955 is that we must be alert. We must be vigilant. We must be strong. We must, as the Good Book tells us, "be wise as serpents and harmless as doves."

The fact of the matter is that we face the greatest menace in American history today. It is, of course, the menace of international communism: Aggressive, atheistic, imperialistic, with a hungry appetite to take over the rest of the world.

PEACE WITH HONOR

We all know that the Soviet Union is currently engaged in a tremendous peace offensive. We know that it would like to lull the free world to sleep. That must not happen. We must remain on our guard.

Of course, we do not desire war with Russia, particularly in this atomic day and age when war could result in the most savage nuclear devastation of the victor and vanquished alike.

We desire peace with Russia, and all other peoples; peace with honor, peace with justice.

It must not be, it cannot be, a peace of appeasement.

It cannot be a peace in which we sell out the rights of so much as a single citizen.

That includes the rights of the imprisoned United States airmen—the airmen whom we will never forsake, whom we will never abandon, and whose return we will continue, with all the peaceful efforts at our command, to insist upon.

Neither will we abandon any ally, including Nationalist China, which bravely fought and bled in the long struggle against communism.

WE ARE LAGGING IN AIR PROGRESS

But to preserve peace with honor, we must be strong, particularly, as Billy Mitchell so long warned us, in the air.

At this Memorial Day occasion, our eyes and our thoughts lift inevitably toward the sky—toward the great ocean of air which washes 3 million square miles of the North American Continent.

We look to the air, which can be the great highway for peace, or the channel of destruction surpassing anything in man's history.

Within the past 2 weeks, men have shattered more aviation speed records. A National Guard flyer has flown from coast to coast and back again, between sunrise and sundown. He has streaked through the air at more than 7½ miles per minute, and this was in a somewhat obsolete Sabrejet plane.

Man has shattered the sound barrier.

He is shattering the heat barrier (which would otherwise melt metals at highest speeds).

Aviation designers and developers are planning for still faster speeds and still higher altitudes—5 miles high in the stratosphere.

Under these circumstances, we must look to our aviation laurels. We are still probably ahead in air superiority, but our margin, our edge, is shrinking fast.

The unfortunate fact of the matter is that the Soviet Union has made alarming progress in her own competitive aviation development.

Recently, the Defense Department belatedly released grim information concerning formations of Soviet intercontinental jet bombers. The Department seemed to indicate that this was new information. But the fact of the matter is, as attested by such noted observers as Hanson Baldwin, that for many, many months, aviation experts have known about the so-called new developments. These experts knew about the Soviet medium bomber type–39 and heavy bomber type–37—equivalent to our advanced B–52's and B–47's. Experts have known, too, that Soviet engines seem to have even more modern thrust than United States jet engines. All this was not new; it should not have come as a surprise or shock. It was the grim handwriting on the wall for a long, long time.

The only relatively new information which has come out is the data concerning a Soviet all-weather fighter, a design so relatively new that some experts say we may have to change some of the concepts of our own Strategic Air Force.

This all-weather fighter is even newer than the Soviet Mig–17 fighter. It, in turn, was a more modern version than the tough Red Mig–15, which our flyers encountered in vast numbers over Korea.

More than 15,000 Mig–15's have been manufactured, a tremendous production total.

Unfortunately, it is estimated that the United States has manufactured a far smaller number of our most advanced combat fighters than the Soviets have, of their advanced combat fighters.

Thus, our F–100 is reported to have been produced only in a few hundreds. On the other hand, the comparable Soviet plane—the Mig–17—already has been manufactured in over 7,000 units.

Now, of course, we are not striving for mere quantity; we are interested in quality.

To pile up vast numbers of planes which quickly grow obsolete, would be a mistake.

But, at the same time, not to have a sufficient quantity of modern aircraft, at hand at all times, may leave us open to a single airborne sledge-hammer blow, from which we might not recover.

WE MAY NOT HAVE TIME TO MOBILIZE

We cannot assume that in the event of war, we will have several months in which to leisurely mobilize and tool up for mass production.

The planes that we start with, may be the planes that we have to finish with, or the planes that we are finished with.

If we don't have sufficient planes on hand the first day of a war, we may never have any planes at all, and we may not have a country left at all.

Right now, the Russians have 20,000 aircraft in combat formations. We have 12,500 in the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps. And we have around 4,000 additional aircraft among our allies.

Much of our aircraft, however, is not available for global missions, as in the instance of Marine Corps planes used in support of the ground units, or naval aircraft which must be used simply to protect carriers.

SOVIETS BUILDING ON A CRASH BASIS

What this all adds up to is this fact: The Soviet Union has been developing her intercontinental aviation on a crash basis.

She has not been going at it leisurely. She has been going at it—with fullest industrial resources—apparently as if every single day counted in the technological race for superiority.

On the other hand, we have been building—with only a fraction of our factory potential—"for the long pull." We have been developing our intercontinental missile program, too, as though we had a good many years in which to experiment.

While I don't think that war is around the corner, while I don't think that war is imminent or even inevitable in the long run, neither do I think that we can afford to arm at this leisurely pace.

WE MUST NOT BE SMUG

I think that we must, therefore, speed up our development.

I think that there is too much of a tendency in this country to become smug and self-satisfied. There is too much of a tendency to boast vainly that we have the "best," the "biggest," the most "modern," the most "advanced" and to use all the other high-sounding adjectives.

There is too much of a tendency to assume that anything which we Americans do will necessarily be best simply because it is American. That is very definitely not the case.

In the past, our American production genius has proven the balance of two major world wars. But it is only because we had sufficient time to develop it. Now, we may not have time if we squander it any more.

And even in the Second World War, we found absolutely indispensable the genius of Allied peoples—scientists and inventors.

That doesn't mean that we don't take pride in our own American talent and ability.

But it does mean that unless we really exert our genius, our manpower, our factory ability, we cannot stay ahead.

There is no automatic rule which says that we Americans will be ahead of the Russians, simply because we are free and they are slaves. To be sure, over the long run, free men will out-produce what slave laborers perform.

But the fact of the matter is that the Soviet Union apparently developed her H-bomb at an even faster rate than we did. And there is evidence that she is developing other weapons at a faster rate than we are, considering the late time at which she began her advanced programs, and the somewht earlier time at which we began ours.

In other words, even slave laborers, working on a "crash basis" can sometimes outproduce free men, working on a relatively leisurely basis.

And so, we must look to our laurels. We must not become smug and self-satisfied. We must devote to the task of survival for fuller energies, or else we may not survive.

That does not mean that I am assuming a gloomy, pessimistic outlook.

On the contrary, I have faith and confidence in our future. But I know that we cannot be adequate to that future unless we work hard—hard in aviation, hard in nuclear development, hard in inter-continental missiles, hard in every means of United States defense and deterrent striking power.

CONCLUSION

This, then, is the message—this is the significance for all patriotic Americans in observance of Memorial Day, 1955.

Who Should Blush Over Echo Park?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a recent incident emphasizes how deeply felt is the Echo Park issue involved in the upper Colorado River storage project. So intense is the feeling, so deeply has the issue of invading the National Park System touched the conscience of the American people, that a great newspaper has gone out of its way to attack an innocent action of conservationists who are defending Echo Park against spoliation.

So touchy has this Echo Park subject become that an innocent letter of invitation to membership in the Wilderness Society, in which no mention is made of Echo Park, has been interpreted by the Denver Post, in an editorial entitled "They Should Blush," as a sinister attack on the upper Colorado River storage project.

Psychologists tell us that when we are insecure about our beliefs, we do irrational things. Can it be that the Denver Post, for which I have the utmost respect, is not very secure in its position that Echo Park Dam should be built and thus forever ruin the Dinosaur National Monument and pave the way also to other invasions of our National Park System?

Can it be that the Denver Post's tortured misreading of the conservationists' simple little letter or invitation to membership is an indication that those who are pressing for the proposed Echo Park Dam need the solace of believing that those who are opposing it are dishonest and sinister and that therefore the proponents' position—however uneasy—is justified?

It requires a very touchy conscience indeed to read into the straightforward general invitation to membership sent out by the Wilderness Society, a highly respected conservation organization, the kind of meaning which led the Denver Post to say editorially that conservationists "should blush" to send out such material.

It needs a very touchy conscience indeed to say of the photograph printed with this membership invitation that "it looks suspiciously like Mount Rainier in Washington." As a matter of fact, the photograph is of Mount Adams in the Mount Adams wild area, in the Gifford Pinchot National Forest in Washington, chosen for no other reason than that it is an unusually fine picture of a wilderness area, illustrating all in one photograph: water, forests, and mountains.

Why should the Denver Post think the mere publication of a photograph—whether of Mount Rainier or of Mount Adams—is "suspicious"? I can think of only one reason: The Denver Post was implying that the Wilderness Society was trying to mislead people into thinking the photograph represented the Dinosaur National Monument.

If so, how foolish can people get? Only an uneasy conscience would suggest that an organization which knows the parks, monuments, and wilderness areas in the way that the Wilderness Society does, would be witless enough to try to pass off a photograph of Mount Adams—or Mount Rainier—for a photograph of Dinosaur or its Echo Park—areas so unlike each other than any novice can recognize the difference.

The Wilderness Society has answered the Denver Post's attack and has pointed out that the conservationists' opposition to Echo Park Dam is on the record in statements fully explaining their position and made in the deepest sincerity.

Says the society's executive secretary, Mr. Howard Zahniser, addressing the Denver Post:

> However you or others may differ from us as to conclusions, it seems to us that a full understanding of our position and our statements must lead to a respect for our sincerity and for our competence. We have based our recommendations on first-hand observations in the area involved, and on a searching examination of the principles with which we are concerned and the policies involved, and we feel that we have arrived at conclusions that are in the public interest from a national point of view and that also are considerate of the interest of our fellow citizens in the region most immediately concerned with the proposed upper Colorado River storage project.

Far from blushing over their stanch and earnest insistence that the Echo Park Dam is unnecessary to the upper Colorado River storage project and over their presentation of evidence that such a dam would not only ruin the Dinosaur National Monument but would be also the entering wedge for the invasion of other national parks and monuments, the conservation organizations should, in my opinion, be proud.

They deserve the plaudits of the American people for their efforts to prevent the exploitation of our parks and monuments for the purposes contrary to those for which they were established.

With facts and figures, carefully worked out and presented to congressional committees, the conservation organizations have shown that the water needed by the upper Colorado States can be supplied without destroying the Dinosaur National Monument.

The conservation organizations have stood four-square—and continue to stand—as the bulwark against the invasion of our national parks and monuments. They represent the public conscience on conservation questions. They grind no personal axes.

Attacks on their integrity are without foundation in truth and will not turn them from their honorable purpose of protecting the public interest.

The editorial entitled "They Should Blush" from the Denver Post for May 2, 1955, is as follows:

> We have discovered recently, with more sorrow than anger, that some of our best people are not above using trickery and exaggeration in their campaign to stop the Echo Park project.
>
> We refer to the members of various organizations devoted to protecting nature from nasty human beings who are constantly in search of more water to drink and more water to put on crops.
>
> We knew these people would not approve of Echo Park Dam which would drown out a couple of canyons in a semiarid region which may look prettier to them than to the rest of us, but we expected them to keep their opposition within the realm of the factual. We were fooled.
>
> Suddenly more nature-protecting societies than we ever heard of have sprung into the battle with reckless propaganda which would make an old-time circus press agent blush.
>
> There is, for example, the recent pamphlet put out by the Wilderness Society. Its front cover is a picture of a mountain lake, a dense forest and a snow-covered peak in the background. (It looks suspiciously like Mount Rainier in Washington.)
>
> Opening the pamphlet the words that first strike your eye at the top of page 3 say, "Here they propose a dam which would substitute a 'millpond' for the waters which now plunge between walls of glorious canyons. There they would substitute stumps for our already pitifully small remnant of virgin forest."
>
> Of course, there is no direct statement that the scene on the cover is the one that would be despoiled by Echo Park Dam. But we believe any reader not acquainted with the site of the proposed dam would get the impression that calamity was about to befall an area comparable to Mount Rainier.
>
> Then there is another pamphlet just received from the Emergency Conservation Committee. This pamphlet has an actual Colorado River scene on its cover. But it outdoes the California opponents of Echo Park in its scare technique.
>
> Californians are shouting the upper basin storage project, of which Echo Park is a key part, would cost $4 billion. The Emergency Conservation Committee has raised the cost to $15 billion. We won't be surprised if the next pamphlet to come in will say $50 billion.
>
> According to the emergency committee, "Not one teacupful of water from the dam at Echo Park would reach the water-impoverished people." That argument, of course, is pure chicanery and we are sorry to see our best people using it. Such tactics can do a lot of harm to the cause of legitimate nature protection in the long run.

The pamphlet referred to is a "Dear Friend" letter from the Wilderness Society, 2144 P Street NW., Washington, D. C., signed by its president, Dr. Olaus J. Murie, as follows:

> DEAR FRIEND: If you are like most Americans, you have imagined—or even experienced—the wilderness; lofty mountains, vast carpets of forest which cover their slopes and valleys between them, white water of rushing streams and waterfalls, placid lakes, and ponds—all of these untouched, unmolested by man.
>
> Some people are fortunate enough to experience it, to walk its rough trails, climb its mountains, and paddle its lakes; to feel its noonday heat, hear the night breeze sighing in the treetops overhead, and absorb the peace and serenity of the stars.
>
> Some of us have just to imagine it, or relive past experiences in it, or hope that one day we shall have such opportunities, or that our children will have them.
>
> But all of us can take satisfaction in knowing that some wilderness is still to be found in America, even after three and a half centuries of exploitation. And we hope that we shall continue to have some of it—some samples of our original America, where forests remain uncut, streams undammed and unpolluted, the earth free of the pockmarks of mining, the mountain meadows ungrazed except by wild animals native to them.
>
> We hope, but we are not too sure.
>
> Shortsighted, practical men are threatening the diminishing areas of our original heritage, even those which have been set aside for preservation.

Here they propose a dam which would substitute a millpond for the waters which now plunge between walls of glorious canyons. There they would substitute stumps for our already pitifully small remnant of virgin forest, the growth of centuries, which other, more farsighted, men have struggled to hold inviolate.

Nowhere, unless we can defend it sturdily and persistently, can we be sure of handing on to our children, and to their children, any part of the wilderness. It needs a spokesman.

The Wilderness Society exists so that all of us may work together, effectively, to protect these wild lands. The society is a defender of the national parks and the wilderness areas of the national forests and of all lands dedicated to the preservation of wilderness and the natural scene.

Will you not play a part in this effort by joining the Wilderness Society? Your membership will contribute to the welfare of future generations; it will be an investment from which, we are sure, you will profit in profound and lasting satisfaction.

Incidentally, your membership will entitle you to receive the society's beautiful quarterly magazine, The Living Wilderness.

Sincerely yours,

OLAUS J. MURIE,
President.

Mr. Speaker, is there trickery in this letter, or exaggeration? After all, I wonder just who is it that should be blushing over this Echo Park incident?

California State Legislature Passes Resolution Opposing Upper Colorado River Projects

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, as further evidence of the almost unanimous opposition to the upper Colorado River projects from the State of California is the following resolution adopted by the California State Legislature, together with an editorial from the Los Angeles Times listing opposition from cities, counties, chambers of commerce, labor organizations, and others.

The attitude of all of these groups is that the Colorado River compact entered into in good faith between the lower and upper Colorado States should be upheld, and that nothing should be done to threaten the water supply for domestic, industrial, and agricultural use to the 6 million people in southern California.

The matters referred to follow:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 37

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States in relation to pending legislation affecting the waters of the Colorado River

"Whereas more than 6 million people of this State depend upon the Colorado River as an important source of water for irrigation, domestic and industrial needs; and

"Whereas the metropolitan areas of southern California, including Los Angeles, San Diego, and some 60 other cities depend on the Colorado River for water and hydroelectric power; and

"Whereas the Colorado River is the sole source of water to irrigate over 1 million acres of land in this State; and

"Whereas legislation is now pending in the Congress of the United States to authorize the construction of two major power and irrigation projects in the upper basin of the Colorado River at an estimated total cost approximating $1,750,000,000; and

"Whereas one of these projects as contemplated by S. 500, H. R. 270, and companion bills, known as the Colorado River storage project, includes (1) the construction of 6 large dams creating reservoirs with an aggregate storage capacity of 44 million acre-feet and (2) the construction of 14 or more irrigation projects known as participating projects; and

"Whereas these storage dams are not required to serve the proposed irrigation projects but would store water for power purposes under interpretations of the Colorado River compact now being defended against by California in the United States Supreme Court in *Arizona* v. *California et al.*; and

"Whereas the major irrigation participating projects are very costly transmountain diversion projects to take large amounts of the highest quality water out of the Colorado River Basin to other river basins; and

"Whereas the other project, as contemplated by S. 300 and H. R. 412, and known as the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, is also a very costly transmountain diversion project to take the best quality water out of the Colorado River Basin to the Arkansas River Basin, and is the initial phase of a project to divert 900,000 acre-feet of water per annum out of the Colorado River Basin; and

"Whereas both of these projects are based upon interpretations of the Colorado River Compact which are now at issue before the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Arizona* v. *California et al.*; and

"Whereas these projects, if constructed under those interpretations, would be detrimental to both the quality and quantity of water to which California has rights long established by prior appropriation as well as by contracts with the Federal Government for projects now constructed; and

"Whereas both proposed projects are based upon questionable standards of financial feasibility and if constructed would cost the taxpayers of our Nation several billion dollars in the form of a subsidy to the lands which would be irrigated; and

"Whereas California is the second largest taxpaying State in the Nation, and would therefore be doubly injured if these projects were authorized both by the impairment of the quality and quantity of water to which existing California projects have established rights, and by the burden of a tremendous tax load: Now therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to suspend further consideration of legislation authorizing the Colorado storage project and participating projects, and legislation authorizing the Fryingpan-Arkansas project until the Supreme Court decides the case now before it; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

The question being on the adoption of Assembly Joint Resolution 37.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

Ayes—Backstrand, Beaver, Bee, Belotti, Bonelli, Bradley-Brady, Burke, Caldecott, Casey, Chapel, Collier, Conrad, Coolidge, Cunningham, Dahl, Dickey, Dills, Dolwig, Donald D. Doyle, Thomas J. Doyle, Elliott, Erwin, Fleury, Gaffney, Ernest R. Geddes, Samuel R. Geddes, Grant, Hansen, Hawkins, Hegland, Holmes, Johnson, Kilpatrick, Klocksiem, Lanterman, Levering, Luckel, Lyon, Maloney, Marsh, Masterson, McCollister, McGee, McMillan, Meyers, Miller, Munnell, Nielsen, Nisbet, O'Connell, Pattee, Patterson, Porter, Rees, Rumford, Sankary, Schrade, Shell, Smith, Stanley, Stewart, Thomas, Unruh, Weinberger, and Wilson—66.

Noes—Clarke, Davis, Donahoe, Henderson, and Lowrey—5.

Resolution ordered transmitted to the senate.

Assembly Joint Resolution 37: Relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States in relation to pending legislation affecting the waters of the Colorado River.

Resolution read, and presented by Senator Hulse.

The roll was called, and the bill passed by the following vote:

Ayes—Senators Berry, Breed, Brown, Busch, Byrne, Collier, Coombs, Cunnigham, Desmond, Donnelly, Farr, Gibson, Grunsky, Hulse, Ed. C. Johnson, McBride, Miller, Montgomery, Murdy, Parkman, Regan, Richards, Short, Sutton, Thompson, Way, and J. Howard Williams—27.

Noes—None.

Resolution ordered transmitted to the assemby.

[From the Los Angeles Times of May 23, 1955]

MILLIONS OPPOSE COLORADO PROJECT—UNITED FRONT AGAINST BASIN BILLS INDICATED BY GROUPS IN SOUTHLAND

The more than 6 million people in southern California who are vitally dependent on Colorado River water have registered unanimous opposition through their elected county and city officials to upper Colorado River Basin and Fryingpan-Arkansas project bills now pending in Congress.

This was the announcement yesterday by Walter W. Candy, Jr., president of the Colorado River Association.

"A record total of resolutions, including 7 county boards of supervisors, 75 city councils, 29 chambers of commerce, and scores of union, management, tax, and civic associations statewide have been received to date," Candy said.

"All of the city councils in the 66 cities located in the metropolitan water district of southern California have gone on record strongly opposing the upper Colorado River project bills. The same is true for the cities of Coachella and Imperial Valleys, also dependent upon Colorado River water.

"Each resolution expresses solid opposition to the congressional proposals which threaten our rightful share of Colorado River water and would saddle the taxpayers in all of the States of the Union with a tax subsidy of over $4 billion."

Candy said that the resolutions have the support of thousands of letters which have been mailed by taxpayers from nearly every State and many recognized tax authorities to all Senators and Representatives.

ORGANIZATIONS LISTED

Names of counties, cities, and organizations that have adopted resolutions to date, opposing upper Colorado River Basin project bills, follow:

Counties: Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, and Ventura.

Cities: Anaheim, Bell, Beverly Hills, Brawley, Brea, Buena Park, Burbank, Calipatria, Calexico, Carlsbad, Chino, Chula Vista, Claremont, Coachella, Compton, Corona, Costa Mesa, Culver City.

El Cajon, El Centro, El Segundo, Elsinore, Escondido, Fontana, Fullerton, Gardena, Glendale, Glendora, Hawthorne, Hemet, Her-

mosa, Holtville, Huntington Beach, Huntington Park, Imperial, Indio, Inglewood.

Laguna, Lakewood, La Habra, La Mesa, La Verne, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Lynwood, Manhattan Beach, Maywood, Montebello, National City, Newport Beach, Oceanside, Ontario, Orange.

Pasadena, Palos Verdes Estates, Perris, Placentia, Pomona, Redondo, Riverside, San Clemente, San Diego, San Jacinto, San Marino, Santa Ana, Santa Monica, Seal Beach, Signal Hill, South Gate.

Torrance, Tustin, Upland, Vernon, Westmorland, and Whittier.

Chambers of commerce: Anaheim, California, Carlsbad, Chula Vista, El Cajon, El Centro, Escondido, Fullerton, Glendale, Hemet, La Crescenta, La Canada, La Mesa, Lakeside, Lemon Grove, Long Beach, Montrose, National City, Oceanside, Pasadena, Ponoma, San Diego, San Jacinto, Santa Ana, Santa Monica, Santee, San Ysidro, South Bay, and Thermal.

Associations: Agricultural Council of California, Altadena, Poppyfields Association, California Municipal Utilities Association, California Taxpayers Association, Chula Vista National Avenue Businessmen's Association, Chula Vista 3d Avenue Businessmen's Association, Colorado River Association, Imperial and San Diego Posts of the American Legion, and the Property Owners Association of California.

Labor: Los Angeles Central Labor Council, A. F. of L., and the Railroad Brotherhoods' Joint Legislative Council of California.

Public agency: Colorado River Board of California.

Water systems: Coachella Valley County Water District, Department of Water and Power, City of Los Angeles; Imperial Irrigation District, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, and the San Diego County Water Authority.

Water companies: Altadena Las Flores, Altadena, Lincoln Avenue, Altadena Rubio Canon, Central Basin, Chino Basin, Coastal Municipal, Eastern Municipal Flintridge Valley, Foothill Municipal, La Canada Irrigation, La Crescenta Valley County, La Crescenta Mountain.

Orange County Municipal, Pomona Valley Municipal, Proposed Otay Municipal, South Bay Irrigation, West Basin Municipal, and Western Municipal of Riverside County.

Utilities Attack Electric Co-Ops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, while reading the June issue of the Wisconsin REA News last evening, I came across an article which I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House. I know that the State of Wisconsin is not alone in having the utility interests attack the electric cooperatives. The article follows:

UTILITIES ATTACK ELECTRIC CO-OPS—FORCE CO-OPS TO SEEK LAW TO PROTECT SERVICE AREAS

The electric cooperatives of Wisconsin were forced into a fight-to-the-finish battle for protective legislation in the State capitol last month. During the next 60 days, as the legislation is considered by the lawmakers, it is expected to incite the most bitter and concerted commercial utility opposition. The question at stake is whether electric cooperatives will continue to have the right to serve all of their members.

Legislation introduced into both the State senate and State assembly May 18 will require all-out support from the 85,000 electric cooperative members in the State to avert deterioration of their organizations.

RECALLS FLAMBEAU BATTLES

In a fight which promises to be unparalled among legislative battles for the program since the Flambeau Dam fights of almost a decade ago, sparks were already flying in the State capitol building as utility spokesmen sought unsuccessfully to block introduction of the legislation.

The utility strategy—to strike during the waning days of the present session—was dramatically demonstrated April 27 at a hearing before the assembly judiciary committee.

At the hearing, an advance echelon of utility lawyers and lobbyists appeared before the committee and boldly attempted to strip the cooperatives of equal rights enjoyed by any other type of corporation, and refused to permit the removal of what the cooperatives fear might be considered a "legal cloud" over the right of electric cooperatives to serve those members whom the utilities might consider profitable for themselves as large commercial or municipal accounts.

HOTHEADED BLASTS HEARD

The utility hand was revealed at the hearing when Reuben W. Peterson, utility lobbyist in the Capitol, struck out at provisions in Assembly bill 140 A, calling for a revision and modernizing of the cooperative code of the state. In a hotheaded and intolerant blast at electric cooperatives as "subsidized organizations which have not assumed their proper obligations" it was proposed to amend the code by extensively limiting the rights of electric cooperatives.

The cooperative code had been drawn by cooperative attorneys representing all types of co-ops in the State. The portion the utilities took exception to called for elimination of hazy wording in chapter 185.24 of the statutes. The original wording had been intended to establish the fact that electric cooperatives could serve members including schoolhouses, town halls, and industries of an essential rural nature which were not receiving central station service, such as gravel pits, creameries, pea vineries and rural cold storage lockers.

WORDING WAS HAZY

The change had been proposed by the firm of Maloney and Wheeler, legal advisers for the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative Public Relations Committee. The change had been agreed to by other cooperative lawyers because the original wording was considered meaningless. That is, electric cooperatives must, of necessity as provided by other statutes, serve all people without central station service within their service area.

Utility spokesmen objected to eliminating this wording. At the request of Peterson, Assembly Speaker Mark Catlin, Appleton, had introduced an amendment to the code, restoring the hazy wording. He also singled out the cooperatives for treatment different than for other corporations by providing that any citizen, whether a member or not, could harass the cooperative with legal suits to challenge the legality of any cooperative action.

CATLIN SEEKS COMPROMISE

Prior to the hearing, when the electric cooperative arguments for removal of the hazy wording had been called to his attention, Catlin requested that both sides work out an acceptable compromise. Electric Cooperative Attorney Norris Maloney then proposed an amendment providing that neither electric cooperatives nor utilities could bring new service into areas already served. It was this provision which aroused the commercial utility spokesmen at the hearing.

Not only did utility spokesman refuse to compromise, but J. S. McMillen, vice president of Northern States Power Company of Wisconsin, proposed, apparently in behalf of his company, a further amendment intended to place electric cooperatives under the jurisdiction of the public service commission in all matters. The legislature has long exempted cooperatives from this type of regulation in recognition of the fact that cooperative policy is subject to review by the membership, and ownership of the cooperative rests with those receiving service.

In the face of utility refusal to accept what Maloney described as a perfectly fair compromise which merely makes the knife cut both ways, he quizzed Peterson during debate at the hearing:

WANT FULL ADVANTAGE

"What you commercial utility people want then," Maloney asked, "is that the law restrict us to be sure we don't ever steal any of your customers, but you want the legislature to protect your right to go out and steal our members; is that right?"

"Yes, that's just exactly right," Peterson snapped back at Maloney.

It was evident at this April 27 hearing that utility strategy had been to stage a prepared attack on the co-ops with their lawyers and lobbyists working in relays in an attempt to pick the cooperatives apart. This attempt, however, was shut off by Judiciary Chairman Nicholas Lesselyoung, Fond du Lac. (EDITOR'S NOTE.—Lesselyoung's appointment to the public service commission has been confirmed effective at the end of the present legislative session.) Lesselyoung told cooperative and utility spokesmen the committee didn't have time to listen to full-dress testimony.

CAUSES STALEMATE

Because all other previous objections that had been expressed to the cooperative code revision had been ironed out, the stalemate threatened to indefinitely delay its passage. In the face of this serious threat, Maloney proposed a compromise which included removal of these controversial provisions. He warned, however, that it would be essential to the existence of electric cooperatives that separate legislation to attain the objectives would have to be introduced in separate bills.

On May 18 both the senate and assembly agreed to permit introduction of the new proposed legislation. Special action was required because the time limit on new legislation has already expired. The new senate bill is 573 S, while the assembly bill is 773 A. As this issue of the Wisconsin REA News goes to press, neither bill had been scheduled yet for public hearing, although this was expected momentarily.

MANAGERS URGE SUPPORT

The urgent need for immediate passage of the new legislation was expressed by the electric cooperative managers of the State at a meeting in Madison May 17. The Managers Association called upon Maloney and the WEC Public Relations Committee to arrange for full-dress testimony at all scheduled hearings. A resolution was adopted requesting that passage be pushed to the utmost.

The managers agreed it must become law, or the success of electric cooperatives to build stable systems would be seriously jeopardized.

THOMAS IN STATEMENT

W. V. Thomas, general manager of WEC declared in a statement that "the evident attempts of the commercial utilities of this State to place a cloud over the ability of cooperatives to serve larger users among their commercial members is obviously no more than the opening gun in an attempt to destroy our organizations.

BIG PURCHASERS HELPFUL

"A major factor in the ability of electric cooperatives to operate so successfully in

areas commonly acknowledged to be 'too thin to be profitable' for commercial utilities, has been our success in encouraging development of substantial commercial and municipal utility purchasers of power. The Public Service Commission has never recognized the validity of an attack on our right to serve these people. They are an essential part of our local cooperative systems. To seek at this time to cast a cloud over our ability to service certain of our members cannot possibly be interpreted as anything more than the opening gun in a battle to impair the financial soundness of our organizations. If commercial utilities can step in and take over service to our members whenever they consider them to have developed into potentially profitable accounts, the result is to relegate us to second-class citizens. It can only mean that eventually we will have to charge higher rates for power on the farm and it will result in steadily decreased economic stability for our organizations," Thomas stated.

"We urge," he added, "every one of the 85,000 rural electric cooperative members to rally to their local cooperatives by contacting their assemblymen and senators to urge support for 773 A in the assembly and 573 S in the senate. We urge that you send a letter or a 2-cent postal card to them at Madison as soon as possible," Thomas said.

Address by Hon. John C. Watts, of Virginia, at Democratic Dinner on May 27, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to attend a Democratic dinner in my Congressional District—Fourth District of Virginia—last Friday night, May 27. The guest speaker was the Honorable JOHN C. WATTS, Member of the House of Representatives from Kentucky. Mr. WATTS is one of the outstanding Members of the House, an able legislator, a wise counselor, and a man I am honored to call my friend.

Mr. WATTS brought a real message to the group assembled and, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herein the speech delivered by Congressman WATTS:

Mr. Toastmaster, Congressman ABBITT, and fellow Democrats, a democratic meeting is an occasion of joy in itself and a pleasure for me to attend. I deem it a high privilege that you have afforded me the opportunity to visit and participate in your Jackson-Jefferson Day dinner. I can think of no finer place to pay honor and homage to those two great Democrats than in the Fourth District of Virginia, that has never failed to go Democratic except possibly at a time when Democrats were not permitted to vote immediately following the Civil War.

This section of Virginia is very much like the section of Kentucky that I have the honor of representing in that the people are alike; they generally think alike; and their economy is principally agricultural or businesses related or dependent on agriculture. I assure you that I feel very much at home and welcome in your midst. As a matter of fact, most Kentuckians do and should feel at home in Virginia, for most of us in Kentucky can trace our ancestry back to those hearty pioneers from Virginia who settled in Kentucky. I often wonder if Kentucky would ever have been settled if Cumberland Gap had not existed or been discovered. The ties of friendship and relationship between the peoples of your State and my State are very close and may be said to be as close, although not similar, as the ties between the two colored boys who discovered each other on the field of battle in Korea.

I cannot miss this opportunity to pay a sincere compliment to your splendid Representative, WATT ABBITT, and for that matter to the entire Democratic delegation from Virginia. They are as fine a group of hard-working, intelligent, honest, conscientious Representatives as any State has ever had.

I do not know for sure what first attracted me to your Representative and my friend, WATT ABBITT. It might have been his engaging personality; his willingness to help a freshman Member of Congress; his keen appraisal of legislation; his devotion to you—the people he represents; or it might have been the fact that his first name is practically the same as my last name. But irrespective of why I was first attracted to him, I want you to know that the longer I know him the better I like and appreciate not only his friendship but his ability as a competent legislator. I am sure you all know and appreciate his true worth, but I can't help telling you how fortunate you have been in your selection of a Representative. He works and fights effectively for the welfare of his people. He is in the forefront on legislation that affects tobacco and peanuts. Recently, when the House had before it H. R. 12, and the candy manufacturers undertook and almost succeeded in having peanuts declared a nonbasic commodity, it was the effective efforts of WATT ABBITT that did as much if not more to save the peanut program than any other one person. He lined up city boys, country boys, or anyone else that would listen to him and, mind you, it took an almost solid vote of the Democratic Party to save this program. You could count on your fingers the support that peanuts received from the Republicans. If Congressman ABBITT ever casts a vote that you do not quite understand, or you think you would not have cast if you were in his place, just remember that there are many things that must be taken into consideration before a Member casts his vote. Oftentimes all of the circumstances are not always known to the public generally.

We are gathered here tonight to commemorate two great Democrats—Thomas Jefferson, of Virginia, who is the founder of our party, and Andrew Jackson, who indelibly stamped it with many of its principles. The South is and has always been the backbone of the Democratic Party and, in turn, the Democratic Party has always been the home, the hope, and the sanctuary of the South. It was not until the Roosevelt era that the peoples of the North fully realized and appreciated the great principles and lofty ideals of the Democratic Party.

As we head into the important 1956 presidential election, we again see the attempts being made by certain individuals to drive a wedge between Democrats in the South and Democrats in the North.

It is true that not all Democrats are agreed on all of the issues within our party. In that respect, our political-party system differs from the British. In Britain, most issues are fought out between the two major parties. But here in the United States we debate issues within parties as well as between parties. And I think that is healthy.

Since the Democratic defeat in 1952, our party has clearly revealed that there is a far wider area of agreement between Democrats in the North and South than there is in disagreement. And even in the areas of disagreement, we have seen, since the elections last November, a closing of this gap over former party differences.

For this, we can give much credit to the able leadership of two great southern statesmen—Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, now majority leader in the Senate, and our beloved SAM RAYBURN, Speaker in the House of Representatives.

But despite this strengthened unity, we will continue to hear from those who would like to see our party split—egging us on from the sidelines.

Our Republican friends might do well to recall the words of Abraham Lincoln, who was visited by a delegation after he received the Republican nomination for President. The delegation spokesman said: "Mr. Lincoln, we don't think you need to do any campaigning. All you have to do is stand back and let the Democrats fight among themselves. They'll destroy one another, and then you'll get elected easily."

Mr. Lincoln replied: "The trouble with your argument is that Democrats are like cats. They may sound like they're fighting, but when they get through all you have is more Democrats."

But this time we Democrat's don't even sound like we are scrapping. Democrats from every section of the country have responded to the able leadership in the Senate and in the House, and we have created a new unity based on our common belief in the Democratic philosophy and in our belief in the program and policies we have enacted and support.

Since 1952, the Democratic Party has been building for the future on the solid rock of the Democratic South. Southern statesmen are leaders in the Congress, and leaders of the important committees in the House and Senate.

In the Senate the following committees are headed by southerners: Agriculture and Forestry, ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Louisiana; Appropriation, CARL HAYDEN, Arizona; Armed Services, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Georgia; Banking and Currency, J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas; Finance, HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia; Foreign Relations, WALTER F. GEORGE, Georgia; Government Operations, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas; Labor and Public Welfare, LISTER HILL, Alabama; Post Office and Civil Service, OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina.

And in the House southern Democrats are equally as imposing: Agriculture, HAROLD D. COOLEY, North Carolina; Armed Services, CARL VINSON, Georgia; Banking and Currency, BRENT SPENCE, Kentucky; District of Columbia, JOHN L. MCMILLAN, South Carolina; Education and Labor, GRAHAM A. BARDEN, North Carolina; Foreign Affairs, JAMES P. RICHARDS, South Carolina; Interstate and Foreign Commerce, PERCY PRIEST, Tennessee; Merchant Marine and Fisheries, HERBERT C. BONNER, North Carolina; Post Office and Civil Service, TOM MURRAY, Tennessee; Rules, HOWARD SMITH, Virginia; Veterans' Affairs, OLIN E. TEAGUE, Texas; Ways and Means, JERE COOPER, Tennessee.

Yet the Republicans would have us believe that our party is the party of irresponsibility; that we are Socialists and even border on the pink. If these great southern Democrats who head our committees are irresponsible or are Socialists, then in all seriousness I say that Webster better change the definition of those words. The Republicans had better stop worrying about creeping socialism in the Democratic Party and start worrying about galloping Hooverism in their own party.

The Democratic Party has gained in strength everywhere since 1952, but it has gained most in the Southern States. If the Presidential election were held today, there is no doubt that the South would be solid once again, for the true home of the South is in the Democratic Party.

We are fortunate indeed that our party is big enough to accept and welcome more than one point of view.

Now, we have often heard the South described as conservative. But I think that word has been grossly misinterpreted by a good many people. I do not mind the South being called "conservative"—for we southerners try to conserve for the people what we sincerely believe belongs to the people.

For example, we are trying to conserve the great benefits of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which we paid for out of the people's money. We fought to preserve for the benefit of our people the results of atomic research paid for by the taxpayers, while the Republicans fought to turn it over to a chosen few. We have fought to preserve from exploitation our natural resources to the detriment of our people.

We also believe in conserving our freedom through adequate manpower, an adequate Air Force, and adequate defenses of all kinds in the face of the ever-growing Communist threat.

We question the wisdom of cuts in defense, especially when we learn that the administration has changed military plans 9 times in the last 9 months; when we read that the President himself changed his mind on defense manpower cuts twice in 3 weeks; when Defense Secretary Wilson and Secretary of State Dulles publicly contradict each other on the reasons for the cutbacks; and when Army Secretary Stevens and Army Chief of Staff Ridgway disagree on the effects of the manpower cuts.

We also fought to conserve for the farmer his right to earn a living without fear of mortgage foreclosure—and we fought for a decent tax break for the majority of the people, while the Republican administration calmly gave the tax bonanza to big business and corporations.

The Republicans keep on saying that they want to cut out unnecessary Government spending.

Who doesn't want to cut out unnecessary spending? It's like defining that word conservative. We would like to know just what is unnecessary spending.

It seems that there is rather general agreement among all Americans that there is need for a new highway program. But one of the odd aspects of the Eisenhower highway proposal is the provision which would obligate the United States Treasury for $20 billion in bonds to be issued by a new Government corporation, without counting this outlay as part of the national debt. It is my information that the Eisenhower method of financing his road program would cost $2.7 billion more in interest than it would to finance the program by the same method that other governmental expenditures are financed. The Republicans may call this cutting out unnecessary Government spending, but I doubt if anyone will agree with them.

Virginia's own Senator HARRY BYRD, who can hardly be called a spendthrift, had this to say about the Eisenhower highway program:

"Such procedures violate financing principles, defy budgetary control and evade Federal debt law.

"When the Government contracts a bona fide debt, but arbitrarily removes it from classification as public indebtedness, it creates fiscal confusion and disorder, and destroys confidence in Government credit.

"You cannot avoid financial responsibility by legerdemain, and you cannot evade debt by definition."

It is perhaps a good political maxim that a party cannot live by its past alone. It must make good every day, and in every administration. And that's just what the Democrats are doing.

Democrats have given the President timely support in many contests he has had with dissidents in his own party. On the other hand, Democratic criticism, which has been aimed at policies, and not at personalities, or motives, has served to alert the President to the dangers to his own administration.

An example of this took place shortly after the Republicans took office in 1953 when they instituted the hard-money policy of higher interest rates. Democrats in Congress warned that such a policy would surely slow down our economy and even perhaps contribute to a recession. Some months later the administration reversed its policy, and even had to admit that the Democratic criticism was justified.

Similarly, when the administration abandoned the Democratic policy of maintaining a broad defense productions base, substituting a few large producers where many smaller ones had existed before, another southerner, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, called the public's attention to the dangers of the administration's new policy, and some corrective measures were taken.

Faced with the hard test of events and an alert Democratic Congress, we have brought home the truth to the people, and the administration has time and again shifted from dangerous courses it was following in the field of foreign affairs.

We have, on the whole, made a remarkable record for Democratic responsibility, through unity within our own party. But there is, in all this, no room for Democratic self-congratulation.

There is room only for increased determination to give our country the very best we have. And certainly the South has shown that it is more than able and willing to do so.

Baldwin's Analysis of Service Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Hanson W. Baldwin, of the New York Times, Wednesday, June 1, 1955, in which Mr. Baldwin takes a look at the President's reshuffle of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and its effect on the morale of the Armed Services' high ranking officers:

CHANGES IN JOINT CHIEFS—AN ANALYSIS OF PRESIDENT'S SHAKEUP WITH ITS EFFECT ON MORALE OF SERVICES

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The President's reshuffle of his Joint Chiefs of Staff was completed last week with the surprising appointment of a junior rear admiral as the next Chief of Naval Operations.

Rear Adm. Arleigh Albert Burke, whose nickname in World War II was "31-knot Burke," was promoted over the heads of almost 100 seniors to the top job in the Navy. He will relieve Adm. Robert Bostwick Carney, who will finish a 2-year term in August and will retire 18 months before the compulsory retirement age of 62.

At the end of June Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway, Army Chief of Staff, will retire at 60 to be relieved by Gen. Maxwell Davenport Taylor, who returns from command in the Far East. Gen. Nathan Farragut Twining, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and Adm. Arthur William Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have been reappointed for their second 2-year terms.

The two changes have caused much comment in the services, and a number of observations can be made about them.

In the first place, it is unfortunate that the two officers who most strongly represented the point of view of the surface forces and who most vocally upheld that point of view have not been reappointed.

DIFFERENCES CITED

President Eisenhower's differences with General Ridgway, whose viewpoint about the utility of ground soldiers the President once called parochial, and his impatience with Admiral Carney about an off-the-record dinner speech dealing with the Formosa crisis, will not be forgotten.

The emphasis in the Pentagon on restriction of information, conformity of public utterance and avoidance of any controversy—plus the failure of General Ridgway and Admiral Carney to win reappointment—will inevitably lend credence to the viewpoint that the administration is insisting on a military party line.

Such a viewpoint is not a wholly accurate expression of the military philosophy of the administration; nevertheless, many officers undoubtedly will take warning and govern their actions in the future by the code of required conformity.

General Ridgway can leave office with the great personal satisfaction of a duty well done. He proved to be a far stronger and better Chief of Staff than he did a supreme commander in either Europe or Asia. He has been, in fact, by far the best Chief of Staff the Army has had since the war.

He came to office in Washington to a depressed Army, and left it with at least the beginnings of a sound morale. This he did chiefly by virtue of two great qualities: "loyalty down" and integrity and conviction.

A SOLDIER-CHAMPION

He stated, always within the bounds of military decorum, what he believed to be true and right, regardless of the personal consequences. He gave the Army a sense that at long last they had a soldier-champion in Washington—a man who fought for the ultimate arbiter of military history—the soldier on the ground.

General Taylor, 53 years old, a younger man than General Ridgway, is bright, able, and attractive—but he will find it hard to fill—in the morale sphere—General Ridgway's shoes.

Admiral Carney has been a persistent, but never objectionable, proponent of sea power. The President's failure to reappoint him was not brought about by the admiral's now famous speech about the Formosa situation but predated that. Admiral Carney was, in a sense, the victim of the troublesome problem of civilian-military relationships in the Pentagon.

Neither Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy, nor Admiral Carney is one to yield power lightly. Difficulties between the two men—in part the product of personalities—have existed for some time, and there were some other frictions between Admiral Carney and some of the other civilians.

There also was a brief encounter between Admiral Carney and Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., Commandant of the Marine Corps, about the powers of the Chief of Naval Operations in relation to the Marine Corps. Moreover, Admiral Carney—particularly at first, more often tended to side in the Joint Chiefs with General Ridgway than he did with Admiral Radford, who as an airman often was alined with General Twining.

CROSS-CHECKING GROWS

Admiral Carney is not a difficult man to get along with. But the new Pentagon organization, with its tremendous number of Assistant Secretaries, and its new and expanded definition of "civilian control," is making, in the opinion of some experts, serious inroads into the command functions of the services.

Certainly it has resulted in double-banking nearly every major military job with a civil-

ian and the amount of "coordination," "cross-checking," and so on, now necessary, is incredible. With even the best of wills and with no personality problems involved, double purposes are inevitable.

Admiral Carney's successor—Admiral Burke, 53—appears to have been backed by Secretary Thomas, but Admiral Radford undoubtedly concurred heartily later. Admiral Burke is a "black shoe," or surface sailor, and this played a part in his appointment, for with Admiral Radford, a naval aviator, as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, a nonaviator was indicated as CNO (Chief of Naval Operations).

But Admiral Burke is heartily respected by naval aviators. He was chief of staff during part of the war to Vice Adm. Marc A. Mitscher, the "carrier admiral," who commanded Task Force 58. His championship, under Admiral Radford's leadership, not only of naval aviation but also of proper strategic concepts, in the 1949 Navy-Air Force Senate hearings has not been forgotten by naval airmen.

Angrilantes Versus Aqualantes—Upper Colorado's Civil War Over the Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker the Upper Colorado Grass Roots Committee, Inc., has registered under the Lobbying Act and admits it will spend at least $15,000 per quarter trying to obtain enactment of the upper Colorado River storage project. Allied with it are the so-called Aqualantes.

Members of Congress already have received the buttonhole treatment from this group's representatives on Capitol Hill who sport facsimile sheriff's badges bearing the Aqualante legend. They have dined numerous Members, after which they subject them to a color movie which attempts to extoll the glories of the project and lull the feasted legislators into a sufficiently mellow state to vote taxpayers' billions toward construction of the project.

In their haste to convince Washington of the alleged unassailable virtues of the scheme, however, they have overlooked convincing some of the fine people in their own backyards about it. As a matter of fact the project has such violent objectors in the very region that it would affect that they have themselves formed into an opposition group called the Angrilantes, to publicize their ire against it.

The Angrilantes explain that they have no vast sums to spend on lobbying Congressmen, but do what they can with their limited resources to point out solid reasons why the project should not be built. On May 24 Mr. Gene Guild, of Roaring Fork Ranch on Colorado's west slope, for the Angrilantes, published the following reasons why Congress, in its wisdom, should shun the upper Colorado River storage project:

1. More dams mean more rotting food, and the western slope already has $2 million of its tax money tied up in that decaying surplus, and is paying a fat $100,000 per year rent for warehouses for it to rot in.

2. More dams mean more danger to national defense, and the western slope knows that a bomb on an upper Colorado or tributary dam could scour every living thing out of the valleys with its death-dealing radioactive water.

3. The western slope receives income from tourists and sportsmen, and it knows that diverting the Fryingpan—and inevitably the Gunnison and other rivers—would leave those rivers a sportsman's desert, with trout deserting their stagnant pools.

4. The western slope is aware that Denver and the cities of the Arkansas Valley would rather steal western slope water than legitimately conserve their own supply by metering to prevent waste. They waste enough water to irrigate 50,000 acres, and wasteful eastern slope irrigators waste many times that amount.

5. The western slope knows that dams are not needed for power, because steam power is cheaper, can be protected against bombing, helps the mining industry, and is a quicker supply till the advent of atomic power.

6. The western slope knows that dams are not needed for irrigation because of the surplus, and when more food is needed in the future there are 11 million acres of wet land and 20 million acres of brushland in the rainfall east which can be made productive for $150 per acre instead of the $900 to $5,000 per acre proposed in the arid West.

7. Western slope businessmen are too smart to consent to the damaging of their future tourist and industrial business for a mere conciliatory small-change bribe of temporary construction employee profit as fatuously proposed by the Aqualantes—to whom progress means only fattening some promoters and the Reclamation Bureau with jobs and money at the little people's expense.

Safer Speeding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, I doubt that anyone appreciates a good editorial more than the average Congressman. It not only reflects the thinking of his constituency, but somehow leaves the impression that intellectual forces are still at work and that knowledge is possibly being disseminated among the readers.

Of the 15 or 20 publications to which I subscribe, I submit herewith the following from a recent issue of the Poughkeepsie New Yorker of the indicated address as a candidate for the editorial of the year. Who will dispute the fact that lives and property damage could be spared if every driver were to be compelled to memorize the eight wise suggestions outlined therein.

The editorial follows:

SAFER SPEEDING

For years the emphasis has been on reducing the speed as a means of producing safer driving. The obvious question now has arisen—how do we reduce speed on the high speed highways, of which more and more are being built?

One insurance company has come up with an answer. We don't reduce speed, because that would increase the danger of accidents. Instead we change our way of driving to meet the changing situation.

Here are eight rules for high speed driving which the insurance company says might save some lives:

1. Adjust driving habits to high-speed travel. It takes longer to stop, pass, or change direction.

2. Enter and leave expressways with caution. Be sure you're traveling with the traffic, not against it.

3. Pick a lane and stay with it. Weaving is dangerous.

4. Leave plenty of room between you and the car ahead.

5. Drive smoothly at a steady speed. Keep pace with the traffic.

6. If something goes wrong with your car, get completely off the road before you stop.

7. Look far ahead for signs of trouble. At high speeds, it takes longer to slow down or stop.

8. Prepare well in advance to turn off the expressway. Make sure you're in the correct turn-off lane and signal your intentions. Slow down before starting your turn.

Joint Resolution Designating the Second Full Week of October in Each Year as National Week for Nursing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution to designate the second full week in October of each year as National Week for Nursing.

I am sponsoring this resolution because of the great success of the first National Nurse Week, proclaimed by President Eisenhower last October. This national observance was authorized by a joint resolution introduced by me and passed by the 83d Congress. It dramatized as never before the important role of nurses in every phase of our health programs.

Hospitals, health agencies, military installations, health organizations, women's auxiliaries, schools, and churches chose the occasion to pay sincere tribute to nurses. Generous cooperation was given by the press, radio, and television. Civic organizations, businessmen, mayors, governors, and other public officials gave splendid support.

The first National Nurse Week also received the full acclaim of nurses themselves. I would like to mention a few of the ways they told the public about the progress being achieved in hospital and public health nursing and in nursing education. Nurses in the hospitals were hostesses to high school students, Future Nurse Clubs, and Girl Scout troops, showing them the interesting things about their work and the broad vocational opportunities. Many nurses and friends of nursing spoke at civic club

meetings and appeared on radio and television programs to tell how they are helping protect the Nation's health and how their profession has risen to its present usefulness and importance. Schools of nursing in the hospitals, colleges, and universities held openhouses for the public. Nursing students and student organizations cooperated with enthusiasm.

Mr. Speaker, it is most appropriate that the Nation observe a similar occasion each year. Nurses are performing a magnificent service for their fellow man. Because of the remarkable progress of medicine and the development of new health programs such as rehabilitation of the handicapped and prevention of mental illness, their responsibilities are increasing rapidly. Community interest and support will help them meet these responsibilities.

A National Week for Nursing also will call public attention to the current need to improve our schools of nursing because of new demands for nursing service and highly specialized nursing skills. It presents an opportunity for nurses and other citizens to work together for an important cause and to establish the basis for cooperation in other actions in which professional and civic interests each facilitate the other. And it will help maintain and increase enrollment in the schools; there is no more effective way than an annual event of this kind to keep young people alert to the unlimited opportunities for satisfying careers in the field of nursing.

It is my hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will take immediate action and that the joint resolution will be passed by Congress without delay.

Dairyland Power Cooperative Expands Ranks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to Dairyland Power Cooperative, La Crosse, Wis., on the occasion of the admission of a 26th electric distribution cooperative to the organization. The addition of People's Cooperative Power Association, Rochester, Minn., will add approximately 5,200 rural consumers, making a grand total of about 93,000 consumers. I especially want to compliment my good friend, John Madgett, general manager of Dairyland Cooperative and the board of directors of Dairyland for the fine record made in the past year when power sales reached a high of $6.3 million with power costs reduced to the lowest point in the history of the cooperative. Dairyland Power Cooperative held its 14th annual meeting yesterday, June 1, and I am just sorry that I could not have been there in person to extend my greetings and best wishes to the group. At this time, I would like to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article in the June issue of the Wisconsin REA News. The article follows:

DAIRYLAND POWER EXPANDS RANKS ON EVE OF JUNE 1 ANNUAL MEETING

LA CROSSE.—On virtually the eve of its 14th annual meeting, Dairyland Power Cooperative here has announced completion of final steps in the admission of a 26th electric distribution cooperative to its ranks.

General Manager John P. Madgett announced that People's Cooperative Power Association, Rochester, Minn., has been officially admitted as the third Minnesota cooperative to be served by the large generation and transmission cooperative. People's will begin receiving service from Dairyland upon completion of approximately 33 miles of transmission line from the Alma Steam station in Buffalo County to the newly admitted co-op's lines outside of Rochester. The line will probably be completed by mid summer 1956.

TO SERVE 93,000

Dairyland serves 19 Wisconsin distribution co-ops, 3 in Iowa, and 1 in Illinois. It is the first new cooperative to join Dairyland's network since 1948. The addition of the co-op will add about 5,200 rural consumers to Dairyland to achieve a record total of approximately 93,000 consumers.

The annual delegate meeting of Dairyland, to be held June 1 at the vocational school auditorium here, will officially admit an additional director to the Dairyland board. The board consists of one director from each member cooperative.

MUTUALLY FAVORABLE

Madgett explained that the favorable location of the People's system in relationship to Dairyland makes the new connection mutually favorable to both.

"The Rochester area is actually a thumb that extends into the present Dairyland system inasmuch as we are now serving two neighboring rural areas," Madgett pointed out. "We will be able to tie our system in with that of People's with a minimum investment, and assure them the very best quality of service," he explained.

OLDS TO SPEAK

Leland Olds, former chairman of the Federal Power Commission, will be the principal speaker at the Dairyland meeting. Several hundred delegates from member cooperatives will gather to survey record accomplishments achieved by Dairyland last year. Power sales were a record $6.3 million, with power costs reduced to the lowest point in history. Preliminary figures show Dairyland retired over $2.3 million in regular and advance payments on its loans from REA, and paid more than $1 million in interest and tax payments.

The People's system has been served by the city of Rochester. This arrangement will be terminated by mutual agreement as the People's load requirements have grown at a rate which taxes the generating capacity of the Rochester facilities. People's cooperative is in sound condition, with average member consumption high, and it is in very sound financial condition.

BLUMENTRITT IS PRESIDENT

President of the cooperative is H. C. Blumentritt, Chester, Minn. General manager is Ray E. Krofchalk. Headquarters is in Rochester.

At the Dairyland meeting reports will be heard by delegates from President John E. Olson, Chetek; W. E. Rabe, Tomah, secretary; H. O. Melby, Westby, treasurer, and from Madgett. A dinner will be served at noon in the school auditorium. The program gets underway at 10 a. m. A tour of the Dairyland headquarters will be arranged following the meeting.

Keep the Office Open

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Standard-Times, New Bedford, Mass., of May 27, 1955, entitled "Keep the Office Open." The editorial points out that the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service plans to close its New Bedford office July 1, 1955. While New Bedford is not in my congressional district, news of this sort is nevertheless most distressing to me and my constituents as it shows the prevailing attitude toward our very grave immigration problems.

This plan to close the New Bedford immigration office points up again the fact that the Washington officials are still affronting large groups of Americans who are interested in a sensible, humane immigration law equitably administered. Only last April the people of Massachusetts, whether Democrat or Republican, were incensed and aroused over the State Department's unwarranted action in dismissing Edward J. Corsi, the State Department's expediter of immigration. At the time I felt such action was not only a mistaken act, demonstrating poor leadership, but also that it stemmed mainly from highly opinionated men in high positions in our Government.

Now we see the administration is planning to close the immigration office at New Bedford. I feel that if this contemplated action is effectuated it will unquestionably cause not only inconvenience but a real hardship to a large number of foreign-born inhabitants of that area. I am in complete agreement with the sentiment and reasons expressed in the editorial and will join others in urging the proper authorities most strongly to reconsider the proposed plan to close this office.

The editorial follows:

KEEP THE OFFICE OPEN

Plans by the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service to close its New Bedford office July 1 undoubtedly were made without full knowledge of the great need that exists here for services the office provides.

The large number of foreign-born inhabitants of this area—of whom persons of Portuguese, French, and Polish extraction comprise a large part—creates a demand for immigration office facilities far greater than that which exists in many cities of much larger population.

As the second largest United States fishing port on the east coast, New Bedford also needs the immigration office to fulfill the requirements of the numerous Canadians and other aliens who are crewmen on vessels operating out of this port.

Elimination of the New Bedford immigration office would result not only in inconvenience but in genuine hardship for the hundreds of persons who use its facilities every year. These persons, many of them unable to speak or understand the English language clearly, some enfeebled by advanced

age or poor health, will be required to travel to Boston or Providence for immigration services if plans to close the office here are carried out.

Statistics furnished by the Immigration and Naturalization Service show the inadvisability of its own decision. During the fiscal year ending last June 30 the immigration office here handled 438 applications and petitions of various types, many of which involved personal interviews. In addition, 227 investigations were conducted by the office during the year, and 61 vessels entering this port were boarded for alien inspection.

Plans to close the immigration office here come at a time when the port of New Bedford is embarked upon an ambitious development program. Through the efforts of a full-time State pier traffic manager and with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, this city is about to become a regular port of call for maritime shipping. With the growth of the port, as its excellent harbor and pier facilities become more widely known, the demand for services of an immigration office will increase.

The indignation that has arisen in this area as a result of the Immigration Service's decision is wholly justified. It is a decision that this city and its people will not accept without protest because it is unfair and unwarranted.

It is reasonble to believe that United States Immigration and Naturalization Service officials responsible for the decision will recognize their mistake and rectify it when all the circumstances are made known to them. The duty of this community's civic and political leaders is to get the facts in the case before the proper authorities in Washington.

The people of New Bedford know it is essential to the well-being of hundreds of persons in this area that the immigration office here remain in operation. This knowledge needs to be transmitted to the Nation's Capital without delay.

Criminal Prosecution of American Servicemen Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, two more American servicemen have fallen victim to the nefarious status of forces treaty, deprived of the protection of their Government because of infractions of foreign law.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of an Associated Press item that appeared in the Canton Repository on Saturday. Members will note the extreme severity of the sentences imposed upon these American GI's for offenses that would be considered minor if committed here.

The article follows:

TWO YANKS GET JAPAN TERMS—GUILTY OF ATTACKING, ROBBING TAXI DRIVER

YOKOHAMA.—A Japanese court sentenced two United States Army privates Friday to 7 and 4 years at hard labor on charges of assaulting and robbing a Japanese taxi driver.

Pvt. Paul A. Lesperance, 20, Woonsocket, R. I., was sentenced to 7 years. Pvt. Richard W. Haviland, 19, Stamford, Conn., was sentenced to 4 years.

An Army spokesman said investigation indicated Haviland hit the driver with a piece of cordwood February 6, and Lesperance robbed him of about $13.

The U. N.—Credit and Debit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inclined to set down my conflicting sentiments concerning the United Nations, but feel that Mr. Graham Patterson, the publisher of the Town Journal, has done such a splendid job in that direction that I could do no better than to include his able editorial as the major portion of my statement.

The record will show that I have consistently supported the United Nations, insofar as appropriations are concerned, although on numerous occasions I have also supported cuts in funds for many of the subdivisions of the organization in the belief that such obviously socialistic objectives as are frequently espoused are not consistent with our national aims and ideals. I am also bitterly opposed to the various attempts being made by agencies of the U. N. whereby international law would supersede our constitutional guaranties.

In the face of these misgivings it would seem hardly logical for me to continue to lend my support to the United Nations, and in explanation of why I do so I have concluded, with Mr. Patterson, that it continues to serve a useful purpose as a world forum and on that ground alone should be maintained. The Town Journal article in full is set forth as follows:

REVISE U. N. CHARTER?

Ten years have passed since the U. N. was established, with great fanfare and an upsurge of hope and faith in the hearts and minds of peace-loving peoples everywhere. It was hailed as the long-looked-for remedy with which international disputes could be settled without resort to war, an organization that would insure justice for small, weak nations, as well as their big, powerful brothers. It was felt that the U. N., with the United States as a member, could and would do what the League of Nations was unable to accomplish without our participation.

The U. N. has not been completely ineffective. It did succeed in getting Russian troops out of Iran, settling disputes in Palestine, Kashmir, and Indonesia, and bringing an end to aggression and an uneasy peace in South Korea.

But the U. N.'s record has not lived up to the high hopes held out for it in 1945, mostly because Soviet Russia has flouted the basic high principles on which the organization was founded. When South Korea was invaded by a Russian satellite in 1950 (at Russia's instigation and with the Russian-supplied arms), the U. N. proved itself an impotent body. Indeed, the decision to resist the Korean Communists' aggression was possible only because the Kremlin representatives were not present to cast their veto.

The anemic state of the U. N. was revealed by its lack of sufficient moral courage to condemn the Soviet Union for aiding the Communist armies of North Korea and China in their aggression. And its sorry pretense as a peace-preserving body was further disclosed by the fact that only 16 of the 60 member nations made any major contribution in the U. N.'s fight to protect South Korea. The rest were willing to let the United States do most of the fighting and pay most of the cost—in blood as well as money.

The U. N. Charter specifies that this fall the General Assembly must consider calling a conference to review the charter and make any revisions deemed necessary. But if such conference is held, all members of the Security Council must approve any charter revisions recommended. The action must be unanimous.

It is a foregone conclusion that Russia will hardly agree to any changes in the charter that would deprive her of the advantages she now enjoys under the present set-up.

There are various weaknesses in the charter that were not recognized when it was first written. There is no precise definition of aggression, for instance. Nor is there any answer to the question of what to do if 1 of the 5 big powers should be guilty of aggression or instigate or encourage aggressive action by 1 of the smaller nations.

Perhaps the biggest bone of contention is the Security Council veto, a power that the Soviet Union has used time and time again to thwart the genuinely peaceful desires of the United States and others of the Big Five. Russia has used—or misused—her veto power more than fifty times. Many Americans—including even some in high circles of our Government—feel that something should be done about the veto privilege.

But the cold fact of the matter is that nothing can be done about it. Any limitation of the veto power would have to be authorized by unanimous action on the part of the Security Council—and, ironically enough, Russia could use the veto to veto any proposed change in the veto power.

There are those who favor our leaving the U. N., and others who think we should create a new organization without the Communist nations. But many Asiatic countries, and perhaps even some European countries, would hesitate to join, and without them it would not truly be a world organization. And, in any event, it would give us no advantages we do not already have with NATO and our various alliances for our protection in the Pacific.

Since no changes in the U. N. are possible without the Kremlin's consent, it is more realistic to accept the U. N. for what it actually is—merely a world forum—perhaps Tower of Babel would be better—and in the meantime maintain our armed strength and that of our allies against future contingencies.

Award of Government Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which will prohibit Government agencies from awarding contracts to companies which have been found guilty of an unfair labor practice

by the National Labor Relations Board where the violation remains unremedied.

At the present time the Department of Defense and other Government agencies have taken the position that there is no authority for refusing to award a contract to a low bidder solely because of his violation of Federal labor law. This position is bolstered by the fact that the Comptroller General in the past has ruled on several occasions that contracting agencies cannot consider such facts as compliance with the National Labor Relations Act in awarding Government contracts.

While it is entirely proper for the procurement agencies of the Federal Government to remain neutral in private labor disputes where both parties are exercising their rights in conformance with law, this policy has no basis in a situation where one party to a labor dispute has been found by an appropriate tribunal to be in violation of Federal law.

My bill, which is substantially the same as the one recently introduced by Senator NEELY, does not seek to disturb the proper balance between labor and management. Barring from Government contracts those companies which have been found to be in violation of the National Labor Relations Act and which persist in these violations is not a position which can be represented as favorable either to labor or to management. What this bill does favor, however, is fairness.

For is it fair, Mr. Speaker, to place employers who do obey the law at a competitive disadvantage by rewarding violators of the Federal law who may be able to underbid their competitors exactly because of their unfair labor practices?

The Department of Defense has taken the position that its procurement agencies must remain neutral in private labor disputes. But what sort of neutrality is it when a Federal agency awards a Federal contract to a violator of the Federal law?

The general rule established by Congress that an advertised contract must be awarded to the lowest bidder has been interpreted by the Comptroller General to mean the lowest responsible bidder. But how can a company which has been found by one Federal agency to be in violation of the Federal law be considered by another Federal agency to be responsible?

One of the most flagrant examples of how this administration has rewarded the lawbreaker is the famous Kohler Co. case. This company produces home fixtures and other products, including shell cases for military purposes, at a plant at Kohler, Wis. On April 12, 1954, during a strike called by the United Automobile Workers, CIO, the National Labor Relations Board handed down its decision on charges filed during an earlier dispute in 1952.

The Board found that the Kohler Co. had engaged in a number of unfair labor practices, including several acts of illegal interference during an NLRB election campaign, restraint and coercion, and discrimination. The Kohler Co. took no action to comply with the NLRB order, although, of course, order has the effect of Federal law.

Mr. Speaker, in November of 1954, just 7 months after the NLRB order, the Department of the Army awarded the Kohler Co. a $2 million contract for the manufacture of shell casings. The award came at a time when the company had still not complied with the Board order and was still a violator of the Federal law.

The procedure whereby a company is found guilty of unfair labor practices by the National Labor Relations Board is a lengthy and tortuous one and no element of due process is denied the employer. The proceedings might commence, to take an instance, with the filing in a regional NLRB office of a charge by a union against an employer. A field investigation and attempt at settlement follow. If this attempt fails, the issuance of a complaint may be recommended. This recommendation is reviewed by the regional director. Hearings follow. There is an intermediate report to which the employer, if the report sustains the allegations in the complaint, may file exceptions with the Board in Washington.

The Board then analyzes the case, affording, if it wishes, the opportunity for oral argument. At the conclusion of its deliberations, the Board issues its decision and final order requiring the employer to correct the unfair practices it may have found.

Yet the fact that the National Labor Relations Board finds a company in violation of Federal law after so lengthy a process as this has not deterred the administration from awarding that company a handsome contract.

Mr. Speaker, my bill is a moderate bill. It does not ask that companies which may at some time in the past have been found guilty of unfair labor practices but have now corrected those practices shall be prohibited from receiving Government contracts.

This bill asks only that companies which have been found guilty of violation of Federal law and of the national labor relations policy established by Congress and which persist in such practices be denied Government contracts. This is not an unreasonable proposal. It seeks only that the Federal Government shall not reward the violator of the Federal law.

Condemns Hoover Commission Report on REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Buffalo Electric Cooperative held at Nelson, Wis., on May 25, 1955.

The resolution expresses critical opposition to a recommendation of a Hoover Commission task force with respect to Federal policies and the rural electrification program. Following is the full text of the resolution:

Resolved by the Buffalo Electric Cooperative at its annual meeting of members held at Nelson, Wis., on May 25, 1955, That the so-called Hoover Commission report relating to REA cooperatives be condemned in its entirety as being the handiwork of a firm of auditors primarily hired and paid for customarily in its usual practice by the private-profit utilities of this country, and that such Hoover Commission report reveals on the face of it that it is intended to be the liquidation of REA upon the basis of having the Government unabashedly repudiate its fundamental partnership agreement with the farmers forming the rural electric cooperatives throughout the United States for the purpose of promoting the general social welfare of the entire country by bringing electricity to the rural folks; that the Hoover report is obviously a first step toward forcing a sellout of the cooperatives to the private-profit utilities, all of which is especially attested to by the fact that the report recommends that in addition to the Government withdrawing its support from the partnership with the cooperatives that the cooperatives furthermore be restricted and prohibited from any electrification projects which any private-profit utility prefers to engage in; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Members of the Wisconsin congressional delegation imploring each of them to steadfastly stand in the position of sustaining with integrity the completion of the original undertaking jointly between the Government and the cooperatives to provide on a permanent basis rural electrification and to that end support any and all legislation which will continue and further the welfare of REA on a permanent basis.

Sincerely yours,

BUFFALO ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,
RAYMOND GROB, *Secretary.*

Opportunities for June Graduates in Medical Social Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, a little more than a year ago it was my privilege to call attention to the importance of decisions being made by college students as they ask themselves, "What next, after graduation?" I pointed out at that time the growing opportunities for young people to prepare themselves for useful and interesting careers in the health field.

I had hoped that my message would be of special interest to June graduates, parents, and professors in my own State of Ohio. The response far exceeded my modest hopes. Almost 30,000 copies of my statement have been requested by college students, college counselors, recent college graduates, and other persons interested in counseling young people. Many of the requests came from Ohio but thousands came from other

States and Canada. I find this especially gratifying because it confirms my faith that our young people do want to use their talents and their education to serve mankind wherever they are needed.

And certainly we need more young people in the health professions. Many of us understand the Nation's desperate need for more doctors and nurses, but not all of us are aware of the fact that hospitals and health agencies also need medical social workers—men and women who are especially trained to work with doctors and nurses to help sick people and their families handle the personal, economic, and psychological problems which complicate illness or hinder recovery. Medical social work has been rightly called a unique profession in the world of medicine because it combines knowledge of medical care for the sick and disabled, with the skills of social work.

According to a study by the United States Public Health Service, we will need 3,500 newly trained medical social workers by 1957. Many of those will be needed in my own State of Ohio.

The art of healing, we now know, often calls for more than medicine and surgery. The doctor asks the medical social worker to help him work with a patient when the social, psychological, or economic upsets connected with the patient's illness hinder recovery. The medical social worker is skilled in helping the patient and his family handle personal problems resulting from illness or disability. With the doctor, the nurse, therapists, and other allied professionals, the medical social worker is an important member of the modern medical team.

We also know, now, that we must give more and more attention to the rehabilitation of the patient, to his restoration as a useful and productive member of his family and community within the limits of his abilities. Medical social workers play an important part in the work of rehabilitation.

In Ohio, we have one of the Nation's best educational centers for medical social work at Western Reserve University's Graduate School of Applied Social Sciences, in my own city of Cleveland. Western Reserve graduates have made splendid records as medical social workers in Ohio and throughout the country. They are eagerly sought by hospitals and health agencies.

A close working relationship between the Schools of Medicine and Nursing and the School of Applied Social Sciences at Western Reserve makes it possible to combine excellent classroom and practical work experience. Further collaboration by the faculties of these graduate schools now also makes possible some of the best rehabilitation training in the country. Some scholarships are available for future medical social workers under grants from the United States Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Medical social work, like all professions, requires special training beyond college graduation. There are no short cuts. However, unless we are to find our health services dangerously undermanned in the future, at least 800 to 1,000 college graduates this year, and for the next several years, should enter graduate schools of social work for medical social work training. Already there are three times as many medical social work jobs available as there are qualified applicants to fill them. Our expanding medical services mean that the trained medical social worker has a choice of jobs now and excellent prospects for future advancement.

From long years of association with health work as a lay person and as the sponsor of much health legislation in Congress I know how important it is to have our hospitals and health agencies adequately staffed with trained and dedicated men and women. Medical social work offers both young men and women opportunities to serve their communities in many ways. It is the right career for young people who like the medical atmosphere, have a genuine interest in all kinds of people and want to grow with a growing profession.

More details about the requirements and opportunities for medical social work training are available from the School of Applied Social Sciences, Western Reserve University, Cleveland 6, Ohio, or from the American Association of Medical Social Workers, 1700 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.

House Joint Resolution 309

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the infamous treaties that permit American soldiers to languish in foreign prisons, deprived of the protection of the Government they are sworn to protect and uphold, have aroused the indignation of good Americans everywhere.

Letters applauding the action of the House in accepting 174–56, my amendment regarding the status of forces treaty, and supporting House Joint Resolution 309, directing the President to modify or denounce this treaty, have come to me from many parts of our land.

Under leave to extend, I include herewith several examples of the mail received in my office since the status of forces amendment was accepted 10 days ago. Today I shall confine myself to letters from the State of Texas.

A Houston attorney writes:

The writer is a member of a local draft board. It is hard enough on these boys to take them into the armed service—but when we subject them to these foreign courts wholly without their own willingness it is an entirely different matter.

There is a very definite feeling against the status of forces agreement of parties to the NATO in Texas * * * I appreciate your efforts, and believe the Senate as a whole will give some thought to your amendment. We appreciate your efforts.

Here is a folder showing a severed hand under a court order in the East. Another picture I have showed 2 hands and 2 feet dangling on a street corner—the offense was a minor theft. * * *

The chairman of the American Legion Americanism committee in one Texas district telegraphed:

Appreciate your stand to bar use of American troops in countries where GI's are subject to prosecution under foreign laws. The nefarious Status of Forces Treaty under NATO must be rescinded.

A Houston mother says:

As the mother of two sons, may I express my appreciation for your stand on the NATO Status of Forces Treaty in connection with the military Reserve bill.

From another Texas lady:

Thank you for your wonderful stand against use of our troops in foreign countries where they would be subject to prosecution under foreign laws. It is good to see that we still have some representatives of the people who will put America before political gain.

An Air Force colonel writes from El Paso:

Although I know you only through the patriotic fight that you are waging to protect the constitutional rights of every American citizen, as well as those serving our country in uniform today, I wish to congratulate you and offer my humble support. Your amendment to prevent treaty law from depriving the citizens of the United States in uniform of their constitutional rights must not be lost.

I note with pleasure the amendment passed with the majority vote of 174 to 56.

I have written the able Senators from Louisiana, my home State, in an effort to encourage them to support your program to save the Constitution of the United States of America once and for always.

We have failed to save those who have fallen prey to the Status of Forces Treaty and now the case must go to the court of final arbitrament, the court of American public opinion.

Mr. Speaker, this is only a small sampling of the mail that has been received. At a later date I propose to quote additional letters, telegrams, and post cards, so that Members may know how widespread and enthusiastic is the support for abrogation of the Status of Forces Treaty.

Democracy at Its Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending before the House Committee on Education and Labor a bill known as the library services bill, which would provide Federal aid to States for the provision of public library services in rural areas.

Testifying in behalf of the bill last week was Mr. Harold S. Hacker, director of the Rochester Public Library and Monroe County library system, and formerly associated with the Erie County Public Library in Buffalo. Mr. Hacker testified as chairman of the committee

on library legislation of the American Library Association.

Because of his outstandingly successful experience in developing rural library services, Mr. Hacker's testimony is of interest far beyond the bounds of the committee room, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from it in the RECORD.

Mr. Hacker said, in part:

The major purpose of the library services bill, as I understand it, is to encourage the States and local communities to develop programs to extend quality library service to all of the citizens of this great nation who do not now have access to such service. The emphasis of this bill is on the rural population of the United States—the people living in towns of less than 10,000 population.

I am particularly pleased with section 2 (b) of the library services bill in which the basic philosophy of this legislation is stated. It reads: "The provisions of this act shall not be so construed as to interfere with State and local initiative and responsibility in the conduct of public library services. The administration of public libraries, the selection of personnel and library books and materials, and, insofar as consistent with the purposes of this act, the determination of the best uses of the funds provided under this act shall be reserved to the States and their local subdivisions."

I believe that library service is the responsibility of the local communities and the State, in that order. I do not believe that Federal aid is needed on an indefinite basis to assist in the financing of library service because the cost of a good library program in any State is not, in my opinion, beyond the capacity of the State and local communities to finance.

On the other hand, I believe that the Federal Government does have an important stake in encouraging the extension of good library service to all Americans. Other speakers undoubtedly will emphasize that all of our fellow citizens should have access to educational and informational materials provided by public libraries—if we are to continue to maintain a democratic society. The Federal Government should, in my opinion, alert the States to their responsibility for good library service and should spur them on to immediate action through the procedures outlined in the library services bill.

As chairman of the American Library Association's committee on library legislation for the past 2 years, I have been in a position to observe the library legislative trends in all 48 States. There are many people working on the problem of extending library service to all of the people in the States and the passage of the library services bill will, in my opinion, have a very salutary effect on the outcome of much State legislation still under consideration.

But I wish to tell you today of some of my personal observations made during the last 7½ years which I have spent in extension activities in two counties in New York State. From 1948 through 1953 I was associated with the Erie County Public Library in Buffalo. Since January 1, 1954, I have been director of the Monroe County library system, with headquarters in Rochester.

County library systems recently have been established in those two counties thereby extending free library service to all county residents whether they be urban, suburban, or rural. The Erie County Public Library was established on January 1, 1948. It is a federation of independent city, town, village, and school-district libraries, financed by local and State-aid funds. The county pays for the cost of bookmobile services. These two systems have revolutionized library service in their counties.

Now every resident of those two counties has free access to all libraries in the county systems. The reader can use his county-wide borrowers card in any library. He can use the Buffalo or Rochester city libraries and his nearest town library interchangeably. He can borrow books from one library, e. g., Rochester Public Library, and return them to his town library in Honeoye Falls. Nor does he have to seek out the city library for a book he needs that his town library doesn't own. The town of Ogden resident can tell his librarian in the Farmers Library in Spencerport that he needs information on fruit-tree sprays and the book will come out on the next semiweekly delivery from the Rochester Public Library. If the Rochester library doesn't own it, the State library in Albany is tried. This is our interlibrary loan service.

I saw this service grow from 1,000 to 15,000 per year in a 5-year period in Erie County. In Monroe, interloans jumped 60 percent in the second year, and are running 177 percent still higher in this, our third year.

For those people who live in rural and suburban areas where there is no convenient town library, Monroe and Erie Counties operate bookmobiles—traveling libraries on wheels. As integral parts of the county systems, these mobile units provide the same services to their patrons as the town libraries, on a regularly scheduled basis. A resident of Bushnell's Basin, in Monroe County, can get a book on hydraulic engineering from the Rochester Public Library when the Monroe County bookmobile stops in his community. He can, if he wishes, return the book later to the Fairport Public Library, and it will get back to Rochester. Truly, the rural reader has almost all the advantages of a city library user.

Town libraries benefit from participating in county systems, too. After they select their books, the books are ordered and processed centrally for them along with the books of all libraries in the county system. Thus, the town librarian is freed from many clerical operations and can concentrate on book selection and public service—her two main jobs. The help and advice of a trained fieldworker is hers for the asking. The town library also benefits from rotating collections of books offered by the county library as supplements to the local book collections.

Readers in the towns appreciate this extension of library service, too. Neither Erie nor Monroe County has any record of how many books are borrowed by town residents directly from the city libraries. But use of town libraries has skyrocketed. During the first 5 years of the Erie County Public Library, book circulation in the towns outside of Buffalo increased 850,000 volumes—a gain of 176 percent. In 2 years, town library circulation in Monroe increased 91,000 volumes—a 33-percent increase. And it is up another 25 percent in this, its third year.

The Monroe County library system, which I have been describing, would not exist today if it were not for the New York State library program, adopted by the legislature in 1950 upon the recommendation of Governor Dewey and the board of regents. I had the pleasure of serving on the Governor's Committee on Library Aid that studied the statewide library situation and drafted the State-legislation that encourages the establishment of county and multicounty library systems.

New York's is the most advanced State program in the Nation. An even newer system is the two-county unit in Clinton and Essex Counties in the Adirondack north country—an entirely rural area. And county library planners are at work in about 15 more counties right now. The main features that I like about the New York plan are its flexibility (every county system in the State is different), its emphasis upon local planning and initiative, and the absence of State bureaucratic control. It may be a bit slow that way, but it is democracy at its best.

False Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, there is a matter now pending in the Illinois State Legislature, in my home State, that involves a principle with which the Congress itself often must deal. It is the question of when a so-called economy move is really an economy move and when the only way money can be saved is at the expense of cutting urgently needed and valuable public interests.

We have no direct concern here with the matter before the Illinois State Legislature. That matter involves a relatively small sum to support operations of a full-scale State program to safeguard the lives of premature babies. But one of the three premature-baby centers concerned is in my own district in East St. Louis. And a young colleague and associate of mine, State Representative Alan J. Dixon, of Belleville, is leading the fight to persuade the State legislature that funds are justified for the three premature-baby centers.

The Governor's State budgetary commission refused to approve a relatively small sum, less than $1 million, to help these three premature-baby centers extend modern medical care to the infants born prematurely and their mothers, even if the parents lack the means for expensive special care.

Representative Dixon and others are fighting to get the legislature to override the budgetary commission and vote the funds the premature-baby centers must have, in the next 2 years, for a first-class program. I hope Mr. Dixon and his colleagues are successful. I hope they save the program. And I again call your attention to the fact that the issue they are dealing with—false economy at the expense of the general welfare—is exactly the issue we so many times are compelled to face in the Congress.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer an editorial on this subject, commending Representative Dixon and his associates, from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

FALSE ECONOMY

A determined and worthwhile effort seems to be in the making in the Illinois House to save the State from indulging in an act of false and dangerous economy in the case of prematurely born infants.

Representative Alan J. Dixon, of Belleville, and seven of his house colleagues are sponsoring a measure which would give the department of public health the $780,000 it must have in the next biennium for operation of a first-class premature-baby program. This is conducted now at centers at Christian Welfare Hospital in East St. Louis, as well as in Peoria and Springfield. Earlier the State budgetary commission declined to recommend the appropriation.

If the budgetary commission's views were to prevail, all of downstate Illinois would suffer. Christian Welfare Hospital serves some 31 downstate counties in which local hospitals generally have inadequate facili-

ties for this specialized type of care. While Christian Welfare has pledged to continue caring for premature babies from its immediate area with costs being met by parents, it is unable to do more.

Care for babies prematurely born is an important and legitimate field of public activity. Every downstate representative ought to join with Mr. Dixon and his cosponsors in seeing to it that the State meets its responsibility to save new lives wherever possible.

Billy Graham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What Is Billy Graham's Secret?" The article was written by the noted columnist, David Lawrence, and was published in the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS BILLY GRAHAM'S SECRET?—THRONGS GO TO HEAR HIM BECAUSE THEY THINK HE CAN BRING THEM PEACE

(By David Lawrence)

LONDON, June 1.—The big news of the month of May in Britain was not the general election. It was the phenomenon of the Billy Graham meetings, as hundreds of thousands of persons sat in Wembley Stadium in cold weather and listened to his simple and direct exposition of the doctrines of Christianity.

For a full week Billy Graham had audiences every day far in excess of those that attended the political meetings. At times it rained, but the people stayed on.

What is the secret of the man who is awakening England? He was invited to Windsor Castle to preach in the private chapel, as Queen Elizabeth and the members of the royal household listened with intense interest. He has attracted the largest crowds in all history, even exceeding sporting matches. Maybe the best answer is the one given by the London Daily Star:

"Here is a man who knows the innermost need of his fellows and can abundantly satisfy it with his old but ever new evangelical answers.

"No one can doubt that when they see, while great political leaders bemoan election apathy and empty meetings, people flocking to Wembley—nearly half a million of them—to stand in rain and blow to hear an old, old story told punchily and sincerely by an up-to-date American.

"Elections are concerned with a man's bread and Wembley usually with his games. But one lesson to the observer of this week's crusade is that men and women do not live by either or both alone. As spiritual beings they are hungry for something more."

The London Daily Telegraph had this to say: "This closing meeting had a cup-final crowd without the roar and hysteria, a crowd whose silence and attention gave the impression more of reasoning than emotion."

The London Evening News, the world's largest evening newspaper, made this comment: "Never before have so many people come to one place to hear in so short a space of time as a week the Word of God. It can truly be called the phenomenon of the mid-century—one which is all the more remarkable because 15 months ago it would have seemed impossible. It may not be too much to hope that it may be the start of a spiritual renaissance."

Billy Graham is not the usual sort of evangelist who depends on elocution and gestures to win his audience. He talks in simple, easy-to-understand sentences. He doesn't preach about questions of politics and economics, as do some clergymen who justify their digressions into such subjects by arguing always that some moral issue is involved. Billy Graham doesn't talk politics at all. He talks about the Bible in terms that mean something to the individual. He has a good voice and an easy manner. It is, after all, the thought he expresses that counts most—not his method of delivery. He has learned how to teach people the meaning of the things that Jesus said centuries ago and which remain a basis for guidance in human affairs today.

There is no doubt that the people of Europe are hungry for a deeper understanding of God's influence in their lives. They are shell-shocked by wars and frightened by threats of more wars. They are searching for a means of living which shall bring satisfaction and peace of mind. They go to hear Billy Graham because they think he can give them a cue to a way of life that will be better than what they have experienced. So he appeals, not to the emotions of his listeners, but to their common sense and their instinctive respect for the spiritual power that has changed the lives of many persons.

Always at the end of the meetings Billy Graham asks those who are willing to make a commitment for a better life—he calls it a "decision for Christ"—to step forward. Thousands of people have done so—in fact, the number counted for the big crusade in London was 77,348. Naturally the question arises as to whether they maintain their changed position of dedication to a new way of life. Recent surveys have been made and the number who have slid back or away since the meetings a year ago is a very small percentage.

It isn't this number of changed persons alone but the hundreds of thousands who took the trouble to go to the Billy Graham meetings which is so impressive—about 3,140,000 persons in England and Scotland. How, it may be asked, are they attracted to the meetings in the first place? How do they hear about them? The churches, of course, cooperate by making announcements in advance. The newspapers carry front page articles about the meetings right along. But the fact is the story is conveyed by word of mouth from one end of the country to the other.

Already the people on the continent of Europe are begging for a chance to attend some of these crusades. Billy Graham moves shortly to France and Germany. He has been told by some ministers from eastern Europe that he might have an opportunity to preach behind the Iron Curtain. This could result from a Soviet gesture for propaganda reasons. It would be more important and helpful if all the Christian churches in the Communist countries were opened to their ministers and not just one evangelist admitted. This would be true religious freedom instead of the token representation which is permitted today.

Billy Graham feels deeply that communism has misled many innocent persons in the world, but he prefers to talk about Christianity as a positive force. For this, he thinks, can change the lives of men everywhere when they put into practical application in their daily relations with other human beings the principles that Jesus taught 2,000 years ago in an era not less turbulent and not less dangerous to human life just because there were no atom bombs.

The 9 Years of the Italian Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, since World War II the remarkable singleness of purpose which has existed among the Western democracies has become increasingly evident in their planning together for the security of the free world. The focal point of this planning has been the creation of institutions which are now serving the free world as instruments of cooperation—militarily, economically, and in many other important ways.

Among those nations with which our own country in recent years has been most firmly allied in carrying out these purposes has been the Republic of Italy. For some years after the war Italy was hardly in a position to contribute any material strength to neighbors or allies. However, even in that early period the people of Italy, in a public referendum, expressed their overwhelming wish for a democratic form of government. This in itself gave considerable strength to the cause of the free world. Leaders in many countries considered it one of the most important events in Europe following the war.

The new Government of Italy has functioned well for 9 years; the parliamentary system which the Italian people set up has proved to be one of the most stable in Western Europe. This has been true despite the alarming strength of the leftist parties. During the early years of Premier de Gasperi's leadership of the Christian Democratics the Government was handicapped by the growth of Communist organizations. Although de Gasperi, a stanch supporter of Western ideas of government, acted vigorously in numerous ways to try to curb the Communists, leftist gains in Italy in the years 1950, 1951, and 1952, while not spectacular, were clear-cut. The drift away from the center parties toward the extremes of both left and right was disquieting. Since 1953, however, with an improvement in the economic picture, there has been no substantial gain made by the Communists. Italy's leaders since De Gasperi's resignation have been no less vigorous in the fight against the Communist menace. Like his predecessors, the present Premier, Mario Scelba, has met head-on the challenge of Communist subversion in Italy. He has expressed time and time again his Government's stand with the Western democracies. In March he paid a visit to the United States and thereby strengthened the close bond that exists between our two countries. In recent weeks when the Soviet Government called upon Italy to become a part of neutral barrier zone between East and West, Scelba categorically denied that Italy would take such a position.

Italy has much to be proud of in the agricultural and industrial advances

which the country has made in 9 years. Land reform and new industry have provided new jobs for large numbers of unemployed. This is not to say that the serious problems of unemployed and land distribution have been completely solved. They have not; but the standard of living is slowly rising and the whole economic picture is improving.

And so on this June 2, 195, we take great pleasure in extending our own congratulations and best wishes to the Italian people, congratulations for the remarkble past 9 years, and best wishes for the more favorable future for which they are continuously striving.

Immigration Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

IMMIGRATION TODAY

(Address by Mr. Frank L. Auerbach, Special Assistant to the Director, Visa Office, Department of State, before the meeting of the American Immigration Conference, held at the annual form of the National Conference of Social Work, at the Palace Hotel, San Francisco, Calif., Tuesday, May 31, 1955)

In less than a month, on June 27, it will be 3 years that the Immigation and Nationality Act became law. It is fitting therefore that we review tonight immigration to the United States and the effect the new law has had on its volume and makeup. In speaking of immigration I should like to apply this term in its broader sense to include not only the movement of those who are coming to our shores to remain but also the flow of visitors and other nonimmigrants who return to their countries after the purpose of their visit has been completed.

If we first examine immigration in its narrower sense which includes the movement of those who come to stay we see that during the last decade the volume of immigration has risen from a low of 38,000 in 1945 to more than 208,000 in 1954. Only twice during this 10-year period the number of immigrants exceeded that of the year 1954. This was in 1950 and 1952 when special legislation authorized the issuance of visas chargeable to future quota years.

The flow of nonimmigrants to the United States has also continuously increased during the last decade and in 1954 reached the high point for this period when the Immigration and Naturalization Service counted more than 59 million entries of nonimmigrants, including those of agricultural laborers, seamen, and Canadian and Mexican-border crossers.

If we first attempt to analyze the movement of immigrants to the United States we recognize that the interplay of three major principles underlying our immigration laws has determined its volume and makeup. These three principles are the national origin's system of our quota laws, the good-neighbor policy according nonquota status to natives of independent Western Hemisphere countries and the principle of family unification.

Under the national origin's system the roughly 154,000 quota visas available each year among the various countries are allocated in proportion to the composition of the American population in 1920. Under the national origin's system which has remained substantially unchanged since 1929, except for the mathematical formula for its computation, some 125,000 quota numbers are annually made available to countries of northern and western Europe, while some 24,000 are available to aliens chargeable to quotas of southern and eastern European countries including, among others, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Italy, Poland, Rumania, Spain, the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, and the Baltic countries.

During the last decade the volume of quota immigration climbed from a low of 11,623 in 1945 to 94,098 in 1954. The 1954 volume of quota immigration was exceeded markedly by that of the 4-year period from 1949 through 1952 when 661,300 quota immigrants entered the United States. This peak in quota immigration during the years 1949 through 1952 was due to the provision of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 which required that visas issued under it, except those to orphans, be charged to future quota years if the appropriate quotas were exhausted in the year of visa issuance. This is best illustrated by the fact that of 679,940 quota immigration visas issued by American consular officers abroad during this 4-year period, 355,971 had to be charged against future quotas. As a result of this requirement of the Displaced Persons Act and of other provisions of the immigration laws requiring that future quotas be charged, for example, if an alien's status is adjusted in suspension of deportation proceedings, the future quotas of some 25 countries have been preempted up to 50 percent of their annual volume. This means that in the case of these countries only 50 percent of the annual quota is available for visa issuance. This is the case for example with regard to the Polish quota until the year 2000; in the case of the Yugoslav quota until the year 2015; the Greek quota until 2017; the Estonian quota until 2146, and in the case of the Latvian quota until the year 2274. Unless Congress should decide to wipe out these charges to future quotas it is safe to predict that quota immigration from these countries will remain at a low level.

The second principle which has significantly influenced the volume of immigration today is that of our good neighbor policy under which the law accords nonquota status to natives of independent countries of the Western Hemisphere, their husbands, wives, and children. This provision which permits immigration from these countries without numerical limitation, has led in recent years to an increase in the immigration from the Western Hemisphere from some 22,000 in 1945 to close to 79,000 in 1954. This trend has been most marked during the last 3 years with an increase from 48,000 in 1952 to 59,000 in 1953, and to almost 79,000 in 1954. This recent increase it is believed is at least in part due to the fact that the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 does not carry over the contract labor law provisions of the Immigration Act of 1917 which prohibited the immigration of an alien who had contracted for or had manual employment promised to him. Consequently, during the last 2 years many immigrants, particularly from Mexico, could enter the United States on the basis of contracts of employment who without affidavits of support from relatives would have been barred from admission under the old law.

The third principle which has affected the volume of our immigration and praticularly nonquota immigration is that of family unification. While this concept of not separating families, or of reuniting them when separated had already found expression in various provisions of the immigration laws of 1921 and 1924 and their amendments, it has gained considerable momentum under the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 in that the Asian husband, wife, and child of an American citizen is now accorded nonquota status on the same basis as the non-Asian husband, wife, and child of an American citizen.

The effect of this significant change brought about by the Immigration and Nationality Act in the case of Asian nonquota immigrants is most dramatically illustrated by the fact that during the 5-year period from 1950 through 1954 the total number of Chinese, Japanese, and Philippine immigrants increased from 1,865 in 1950 to 8,312 in 1954 although the annual quotas of these countries add up to only 390. The total number of husbands, wives, and children of American citizens of all races admitted as nonquota immigrants during 1954 amounted to 30,689.

Summarizing the trend in the volume of immigrants we see that the number of nonquota immigrants is on a steady increase. Since visas issued to aliens under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 are nonquota immigrants it can be expected that for the duration of that act, the increase in nonquota immigration will be even more pronounced. On the other hand, in the absence of legislation eliminating charges on future quotas prescribed by the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, it may be expected that quota immigration, particularly from southern and eastern Europe, will remain on a low level.

Two other provisions of our immigration laws which were introduced by the Immigration and Nationality Act merit examination. They are the defector clause permitting the admission of former members of proscribed organizations and the provision giving first preference quota status to aliens who have skills which are urgently needed in the United States.

Under the old law as you will recall a former member of the Communist Party could not be admitted to the United States as an immigrant, and as a nonimmigrant only upon the exercise of discretionary authority by the Attorney General. Under the new law a person who after the termination of his membership in a proscribed organization has for at least 5 years been actively opposed to the ideology of such party may be admitted to the United States as an immigrant or nonimmigrant. Visa issuance to 35 defectors was authorized during the fiscal year 1954 and to 47 during the first 10 months of the fiscal year 1955. A considerable number of such cases is now pending for consideration in the Department of State. The relatively small number of aliens who so far benefited from the new defector provision is, at least in part, due to the fact that this liberalizing provision of the law has been given little public attention. Also, there seems to have been some misapprehensions that only prominent former members of proscribed organizations could benefit from the defector clause. This view is in error and the Department of State has made it clear that any former member of a subversive organization whether prominent or unknown may qualify as a defector if he meets the requirements of the law.

The Immigration and Nationality Act as you know, provides that 50 percent of each quota is made available first to skilled aliens whose services are urgently needed in the United States. During the fiscal year 1954, 2,456 skilled immigrants were admitted to the United States. In evaluating this number it must be borne in mind that if a skilled alien is chargeable to an open quota his prospective employer will most likely suggest that he apply for a readily available nonpreference quota visa rather than apply for a first preference quota visa which in the case of an open quota would be of no benefit to

the visa applicant but would entail additional procedures and expenses for his sponsor. The first preference quota provision is of considerable importance, however, in the case of small and oversubscribed quotas since it enables an American employer to expedite the admission of a skilled alien whose services are needed in the United States.

If we examine the movement of visitors and other nonimmigrants coming each year to the United States we can either count the number of visas issued to them by American consular officers abroad or the number of entries made by nonimmigrants at ports of entry as reported by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. We gain a full picture of the volume of the nonimmigrant movement only if we look at both figures. In so doing we must remember that a nonimmigrant visa frequently is valid for 2 years and for an unlimited number of entries into the United States, so that a visa issued in 1 year may be the basis for several admissions within a 24-month period. On the other hand, in evaluating the data on entries by nonimmigrants we must remember that they constitute a count of each entry even if made by the same person. In evaluating the figures on visas issued we must also remember that a large segment of nonimmigrants are exempted from the visa requirements. With this in mind, let us examine the available statistical data. The number of nonimmigrant visas issued abroad by consular officers during the last decade increased from 205,901 in the fiscal year 1945 to an all time high of 400,001 in 1954. The 400,000 visas issued during the fiscal year 1954 constitute an increase of more than 50,000 over the year 1953 and of more than 80,000 compared with 1952, the fiscal year before the Immigration and Nationality Act became effective. Thus, it appears that the Immigration and Nationality Act stimulated rather than restricted the flow of nonimmigrants to the United States. If we examine the number of entries made by all classes of nonimmigrants, we find that it has also continuously increased during the last 10 years, and during the fiscal year 1954 reached 59,714,754 entries, the high point for this period. This number of entries includes some 24 million entries by Canadian citizens and some 34 million entries by Mexicans who either entered with border crossing cards or were exempt from any form of documentation.

The Immigration and Nationality Act emphasizes the doctrine of reciprocity as an important factor in the formulation of our policy regarding nonimmigrants. It means that certain controls on the movement of nonimmigrants are governed by the way in which foreign countries treat American citizens visiting them. For example, the law requires that the fee charged an alien for a nonimmigrant visa should correspond to the fee charged an American citizen for a comparable visa by the country of the alien's nationality. If a given country charges an American citizen $75 for a visa as a temporary worker the law requires that we also charge $75 to a national of that country coming to us as a temporary worker. If that country decides to lower or eliminate the visa fee for American citizens we will automatically by administrative action lower or eliminate the fee charged to its nationals.

The principle of reciprocity also applies to the period of validity of a nonimmigrant visa and to the number of entries to which its bearer is entitled. If a foreign country issues to American citizens visas valid for 24 months and an unlimited number of entries, we will do likewise for nationals of that country who wish to visit our shores. If the foreign country, however, limits the validity of a visa to an American citizen to 1 month and to a single entry, so will we do to that country's citizens. Existing regulations limit the maximum period for which a nonimmigrant visa may be issued to 24 months. Consistent with the President's directive that international travel be facilitated, the Department of State is actively considering various steps by which this goal can be achieved. Among others the question is being explored whether the maximum period of the validity of nonimmigrant visas may be extended beyond the present 2-year limitation. Also, the Department is again inviting foreign countries to lower or eliminate nonimmigrant visa fees charged to American citizens so that we may reciprocate in relation to their nationals desiring to come to the United States.

If reciprocity exists the Secretary of State and the Attorney General are authorized by law to waive the nonimmigrant visa and passport requirements in the case of nationals of foreign contiguous territory and of adjacent islands. Under this authority the visa and passport requirements have been waived for the benefit of citizens of Canada, and the visa requirement in the case of certain British subjects residing in Bermuda. The Department is presently exploring whether under existing statutory authority it would be in the best interests of the United States to waive, on a basis of reciprocity, nonimmigrant visas with respect to nationals of other countries.

In guiding American consular officers abroad in their visa work the Department of State follows a policy of flexibile administration and reasonable interpretation of the immigration laws. Visa procedures, instructions, and forms used at some 225 consular posts abroad are undergoing now a searching study in the Visa Office to determine whether they can be simplified. Representatives of the Visa Office participate regularly in consular conferences held at our missions abroad, which gives a welcome opportunity for an interchange of experience concerning the administration of the immigration law. Plans are under study in the Department which would call for the setting up of an extensive training course on immigration law and practice for new visa officers and also for advanced courses for those who have considerable experience in the field.

In its efforts to simplify the administration of the immigration laws, the Department of State enjoys the closest cooperation of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Ever since the Immigration and Nationality Act was enacted regular conferences have been held between the two agencies and we have been able to discuss and resolve innumerable problems of interpretation and administration of the law. We also much welcome the constructive criticism and cooperation from the interested public in general and particularly from the organizations which you are representing. Of course, our work is guided by the law. We cannot take liberty with its language or intent. But whenever the law vests us with discretionary authority we have made and will make every effort to give it the most reasonable interpretation.

Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by the Commissioner of Reclamation, W. A. Dexheimer.

Mr. Dexheimer's reply is good reading for those who have some doubts about the value of reclamation in the arid West. It is good reading and an answer to those who have raised questions about the upper Colorado River project.

It seems to me that those in the lower Colorado River area, particularly California, who are complaining about the upper Colorado River States using their water, under the compact that was entered into 33 years ago, do so in rather poor grace. The Colorado River compact, entered into 33 years ago, gave about one-half of the water in the River to the Southern States, mostly California. This area has grown and prospered under this compact. While the representatives from southern California claim they do not want to interfere with the upper States using the water, nevertheless, every action they take is one to block the upper States from using the water that was given to them under the Colorado River compact.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that powerful lobbies are working on the emotions of people, people who are not living close to the area, telling them that the scenery will be ruined and the bones in the Dinosaur National Park area will be covered up forever. These lobbies are using all sorts of half-truths and some outright misinterpretations in trying to tell their story about the upper Colorado River project. These lobbies, and those associated, have selfish interests and, in my opinion, are trying to acquire the rights by use of that share of the water which was reserved by compact to the upper basin States. It seems to me the southern California group wants not only their share of water given to them under the compact but, by right of use, as of now, want also the water that legitimately belongs to the upper basin States.

I commend reading of the statement by Commissioner Dexheimer. It is clear, concise, and informative:

STATEMENT BY COMMISSIONER OF RECLAMATION W. A. DEXHEIMER

The Bureau of Reclamation expects and welcomes thoughtful and constructive criticism which is based on solid facts and knowledge of what has been accomplished in the past half century and what is proposed for the future.

However, it is time to take a close look at the indiscriminate attack of those critics who are attempting, by every means at their command, to destroy public confidence in our efforts to assist the arid Western States in meeting their water needs. The attacks are currently centering on the proposed upper Colorado River storage project which was worked out under the terms of the Colorado River compact and in cooperation between the Federal Government and the States of Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico to enable the States to utilize their apportioned share of Colorado River water. These critics are much less careful in their handling of the facts than those individuals and groups who have opposed virtually every major project ever undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Yet, who is there today who will challenge the worth of such facilities as the lower Colorado River development, Hoover Dam, Imperial Valley, the Central Valley project, Grand Coulee Dam, Boise Valley, Salt River project, or the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

Leslie A. Miller, who is a former Governor of Wyoming and who should be aware of the

importance of reclamation work in that State as well as elsewhere in the West, has repeatedly cited the increased cost of the Colorado-Big Thompson project as a reason it should not have been built and why other projects, such as the upper Colorado River storage project, should not be undertaken.

Let Mr. Miller repeat his accusations, as made in the Reader's Digest and other periodicals, in front of any group of Colorado farmers who were saved from almost total drought disaster last summer by the successful functioning of this project. Or, let him put his accusation in proper perspective by quoting the correct original estimate of costs and then point out that World War II intervened between the time this estimate was given and the time the bulk of the project was constructed. He conveniently neglected to mention the 250-percent increase in the construction cost index during the 18 years between authorization and completion of construction.

Like Raymond A. Moley, in his multitudinous dissections of reclamation in Newsweek magazine, Mr. Miller neglects to mention that reclamation, unlike other water resources work undertaken by the Federal Government, is on a hard cash repayment basis. They choose to ignore the fact that out of a total reclamation expenditure of $2,850,146,288 in the last half century, $577,822,640 has been repaid and that $60 million is flowing into the Treasury annually at the present time. This includes interest on the Federal investment in hydroelectric and municipal water facilities.

It should be remembered that more than half of reclamation's annual appropriation is now coming from the revolving reclamation fund which was established by the Congress by the Reclamation Act of 1902. This same Congress established the principle that funds for irrigation development should be loaned without interest as a means of advancing the national economy. The same principle has been followed by every Congress since 1902.

The facts are that this investment is paying off, not only in the cash repayment to the Treasury, but in its positive contributions to the national economy and well being.

The records are replete with instances of reclamation project areas pouring into the Federal Treasury in income taxes alone, more each year than the total Federal investment in project facilities. Buying power of more than $750 million annually is contained in the crops the farmers take from their irrigated fields on Federal reclamation projects.

The Federal Government, over the years, has spent millions and billions for flood control, navigation, transportation subsidies, drought relief, crop support and crop insurance without expectation or hope of reimbursement. But these areas of disaster continue to plague us while the irrigated oases in the arid West remain solid units of stabilized agricultural production. I have no quarrel with the Federal policy but why pick on western irrigation?

It was interesting to note in the Saturday Evening Post of April 30, an editorial supporting an increased appropriation of $18 million for a channel deepening project in the Delaware River which would benefit particularly the United States Steel Corp. by permitting ocean-going oreboats to unload at dockside for the new Fairless plant. Will this investment be paid back by local beneficiaries? The Saturday Evening Post editorial is proposing a writeoff of this local harbor improvement in the Delaware River. Reclamation investments will be returned to the Treasury. The West only asks for a loan and a reasonable time to repay.

Specific criticism of the proposed upper Colorado River storage project by Mr. Miller, Mr. Moley, et al., concerns three main points: (1) An incredible bill from the nonpayment of interest on irrigation features of the project, (2) compounding of the crop surplus problem by the addition of new irrigated lands, (3) the construction of Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument would be an opening wedge in the desecration of our national park system.

Mr. Moley's description of an incredible bill for interest is just that—totally incredible. The facts are that 63½ percent of costs are chargeable to power and municipal and industrial water and will be repaid with interest at 2½ percent which is the same interest paid by the United States Treasury.

The upper Colorado River project report, as approved by the Secretary of the Interior, proposes an expenditure of about $300 million for irrigation phases of the project. These funds will be spent over a period of more than 25 years and repayment on each irrigation unit will start soon after it is completed. A few years are allowed before repayment begins to permit the farmer to establish himself on the land.

Current national troubles with crop surpluses have been used to becloud the reclamation picture and particularly to delay the authorization of several projects which are now before Congress. Completely ignored by the critics is the fact that most products of western irrigated farms are not under price support or acreage control and are not surplus. Seventy-five percent of land irrigated by the upper Colorado River projects would be for livestock production.

More important in the agricultural production picture is the long-range population estimate. The Bureau of the Census fixes our national population at 200 million in 1975. Byron T. Shaw, Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service in the Department of Agriculture, is authority for the statement that, "If the average American is to continue to have as much meat to eat as he did last year, all acreage that is currently idle will have to be put back to work by 1960. By 1975, even if all marginal lands are used, there might be a deficit of more than 100 million acres. To meet this, livestock production alone will have to be doubled on the land at hand." Few new lands in the upper Colorado River basin would receive water before 1975 if the project was authorized tomorrow.

The Bureau of Reclamation makes no pretense of expecting to solve this approaching national food production crisis by the construction of reclamation projects alone. We believe that in the decades ahead there will be a continued increase in per-acre production and also in total acreage under production, both by irrigation and the drainage of present swampland. However, at the present time, according to Department of Agriculture statistics, we are fighting a losing battle to maintain our present cultivated acreage.

Urban inroads are claiming more acreage than we are placing in production by irrigation. We must plan now for the future. To do otherwise would be criminally shortsighted.

The so-called invasion of national parks should be considered in the light of a careful documentation of dam sites and reservoir areas withdrawn specifically for power and reclamation purposes along the Green and Yampa Rivers and events leading to the subsequent enlargement of Dinosaur National Monument to encompass the same area by Presidential order on July 14, 1938.

One reclamation and 10 powersite withdrawals (land and damsites set aside by Federal action) were made along these rivers between 1904 and 1925, covering, among other areas, the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dam and reservoir sites. The National Park Service, by letter dated August 9, 1934, to the Federal Power Commission, observed that the proposed proclamation (to enlarge Dinosaur Monument) would protect all existing rights, and inquired as to whether the Echo Park and Blue Mountain sites might be released. The Federal Power Commission replied on December 13, 1934, that "the Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource is too great to permit its impairment by voluntary relinquishment of two units in the center of the scheme. The Commission will not object, however, to the creation of the monument if the proclamation contains a specific provision that power development under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted."

The request was renewed in a letter dated November 6, 1935, over the signature of Harold L. Ickes, then Secretary of the Interior. The Federal Power Commission again rejected the request on January 6, 1936, quotinng the identical language of the previous letter to the National Park Service. The Presidential proclamation of 1938 made the enlarged Dinosaur National Monument subject to all existing rights. Therefore, it would appear that there is actually no invasion of the national park system but merely the exercise of a previously established reservation. The original 80-acre Dinosaur Monument contains all known fossils and is 20 miles downstream from any proposed reservoir. It would not be disturbed.

Despite this previous withdrawal of the Echo Park and other multipurpose damsites for reclamation purposes, we are not anxious to construct a reclamation structure in this area if alternate sites are feasible. Conclusive investigations over 20 years have ruled out any of the suggested alternates because they would provide less storage space, involve greater evaporation losses and reduce the power output from the Upper Colorado Basin system. The large reservoir storage is essential to hold flood waters in years of excess runoff for use in drier years and seasons of low-river flow. Maximum power output is essential because power revenue will repay the bulk of project costs.

Development and conservation of a maximum supply of water and power is essential to the continued economic growth of the area. There is and will continue to be a market for the six-mill power which will be produced. All 10 private utility companies serving the area have testified before the committees of Congress that they would take all available power at the 6-mill rate. Preference agencies have also expressed a need for the power output.

Reclamation engineers have established a worldwide reputation in water conservation by the investigation, design, construction and operation of the numerous reclamation projects which now dot the western scene. We do not take lightly the challenge to our integrity by those critics who prefer the scattergun attack to a careful adherence to the facts.

Increase Minimum Wage to $1.25

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, legislation to increase the minimum hourly wage now holds the spotlight. This vitally important question is being considered by the Committee on Education and Labor. Millions of underpaid workers are looking hopefully to Congress for relief and for a decent living wage.

As early as 1949 I introduced a bill to establish a $1 minimum hourly wage; in 1953 I introduced a bill providing for $1.25, and reintroduced it in 1955. The fact that a minimum wage of at least $1 per hour was needed to meet living costs in 1949 points up the futility and worthlessness of the President's proposal that the minimum wage be increased to only 90 cents, for living costs have steadily increased.

The workingmen of our prosperous country should be given a minimum wage of at least $1.25 per hour in order that they can maintain a decent standard of living.

I appeared before the committee today and made my plea in behalf of our low-income workers, and am inserting in the RECORD a copy of my statement:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Education and Labor, on January 5, 1955, I reintroduced my bill to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak in behalf of the underpaid workers of our country, for they need our help.

The President of the United States has recommended a 90-cent minimum wage. This is grossly inadequate. Decent living standards cannot be maintained on less than $1.25 per hour.

Living costs have increased 14 percent since January 1950—but for the lowest income group, which suffers the greatest price rise, living costs have increased by at least 18 percent. During this time that the 75-cent level has remained, productivity has increased at least 20 percent. The gap between what a man is paid and a man produces widens and the glaring injustice of the 75-cent minimum wage is apparent.

The low-wage earner has been staggering under an overwhelming burden of high taxes and ever rising living costs and no relief by way of increased earnings has been given him. Low-income families have been suffering privations; they cannot afford adequate medical care or many of the necessities that we have come to take for granted as part of the American way of life. During the past 2 years, under the Republican administration, the rich have become richer while the poor man's lot has become more and more intolerable—low-income families have had to battle for a meager existence.

Although corporation and stockholder profits are up, labor is called upon to pay most of the tax bill. Corporations and those in high-income brackets were provided loopholes in the tax law under this administration, but the wage earner has not been granted an increase in personal income-tax exemption. On the other hand, hidden taxes have increased and in most States people are now called upon to pay sales taxes. Thus the tax burden is being shifted more and more to the shoulders of the low- and middle-income families.

We must come to the rescue of the laboring people of the country. The wage earner should be adequately paid for his labors and efforts; this is only his just share of the profits reaped as a result of his labors.

An adequate minimum wage would mean a boost to the health, morale, and general economic welfare of millions of workers and their families; it would bolster the purchasing power of the low-income groups where the need for higher living standards is the greatest. This, in turn, will increase the demand for goods and services throughout the Nation and benefit all.

I urge your committee to take a realistic view and to recognize the plight of the workingman. Justice demands that you set a minimum wage of $1.25 per hour. I trust that you will favorably report legislation providing for that sum. Anything less would be wholly inadequate, futile, and a betrayal of the workingmen who must rely upon us for protection.

Regional Elections in Sicily: June 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the impending elections in Sicily on June 5 are of great importance at this juncture in the national politics of Italy. Under article 116 of the constitution of the Italian Republic, Sicily enjoys a special self-governing status. The regional parliament in Palermo, Sicily, has considerable legislative power in matters having to do with local government, agriculture, mining, police and other matters, so long as its decisions do not conflict with the fundamental laws of the state.

The vote in Sicily, on June 5, is so important because it may well influence future party alignments on a national scale. The number of voters on the island of Sicily is about one-tenth of the national electorate. The Christian Democrats in Sicily have maintained, so far, a slight lead over the other parties. The Communist party is second strongest. The Communist party, moreover, having reached a so-called saturation point in northern Italy, has recently given increasing attention to its propaganda in the South. The Christian Democrats in Sicily are troubled by the strength of the Communists and of the rightist parties, both of which are campaigning strongly to capture and harness a new regional consciousness which is developing in Sicily and which is now demanding better social programs for the island.

Christian Democrats in Italy's National Parliament, now holding only a bare majority of seats, are also apprehensive lest an unfavorable vote in Sicily make more difficult the delicate balance they are seeking to maintain. This is a particularly urgent situation since a vote of confidence in the national government is scheduled for June 15.

This is also, of course, of very great concern to our own country, and indeed to other democratic governments of Western Europe. Since the end of World War II, Italy's leaders have been strong supporters of the ideals of the Western democracies. They have taken numerous measures to weaken the diabolical force of communism in Italy. Two of Italy's most active leaders in this respect have been the late Alcide de Gasperi and the present Premier, Mario Scelba. Indicative of the stanch friendship between Italy and the United States was Premier Scelba's visit to our country in March. I had the great honor to make a statement for the Voice of America on the occasion of Premier Scelba's visit to the Capitol. This message was transmitted by the Voice to Italy. The message was as follows:

To Representative PETER W. RODINO, JR., of New Jersey. We want you to know that your American friends are most happy to welcome Premier Mario Scelba on his visit to the United States.

Prime Minister Scelba has just been presented to our House of Representatives in Washington and I am glad to say that I had the honor of being a member of the official reception committee that greeted him. This event is symbolical of the position which Italy and the Italian people occupy today in world affairs. Now that the recovery is complete, we note with satisfaction the contribution that Italy is making to the cause of peace and the unity of the free world.

We also note with pleasure that with the recent agreement making a quantity of heavy water available to Italy, Italian scientists will now be able to contribute their skill and technical knowledge to the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Along with their struggle against Communist subversion, Italy's leaders have not neglected the economic development of the country. Great strides have been made. The progress in Sicily is an excellent example of what is happening in other parts of Italy. In Sicily there has been vast development in public works, substantial beginnings in industrialization and progress toward modernizing agriculture. The standard of living has gone up. The regional government has not disappointed the Sicilians. But progress is necessarily slow and this is why the people sometimes become discouraged and seek some kind of panacea by embracing the ideas of either the extreme right or the extreme left.

We in America will watch eagerly for the returns from these elections. Since the end of World War II we have been close to events in Italy—her fight against the Communists, against unemployment and for economic recovery. Italy has received from our country very substantial amounts in the way of economic aid. Perhaps the greatest thing we can do for her at the time of these important elections is simply to reiterate our friendship and our recognition of the important place which Italy has made for herself in the family of nations, and in particular the great contribution she is making now to the western alliance.

Attacks on Gaza Border Continue; Mine Kills Three Israel Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following news item which appeared in the May 26, 1955, issue of the Israel Digest:

ATTACKS ON GAZA BORDER CONTINUE; MINE KILLS THREE ISRAEL OFFICERS

JERUSALEM.—Attacks upon Israel patrols from across the Egyptian border in the Gaza

Strip area, and the mining of Israel roads, were resumed again last week after a brief period of relative quiet. On May 17, three Israel officers were killed and a fourth wounded when an Israel patrol car was blown up by a mine west of Kissufim. Several hours earlier, another patrol had discovered a mine in the vicinity.

On May 18, an Israel Army unit destroyed an Egyptian military position near Kissufim, from which Israel patrols were fired at on a number of occasions. Upon the approach of the Israel patrol, the Egyptian soldiers maning the post fled. There were no casualties.

On May 18, an Egyptian position opened fire upon a group of Israelis traveling near Nitzana. On May 20, Egyptians fired upon United Nations observers investigating the Israel complaint concerning this attack.

On the same day, another attack was launched upon an Israel patrol southwest of Kissufim and on May 21, Egyptians fired on an Israel unit northwest of Kissufim.

On May 23, a truck from K'tziot got stuck northwest of Nitzana. Two armored Egyptian vehicles crossed the border and attacked the riders and two other Israel trucks which came to their rescue.

Israel has referred these incidents to the Israel-Egyptian Mixed Armistice Commission.

A series of attacks upon Israel life and property by Egyptian and Jordanian marauders and military personnel took place earlier this month. A partial list follows:

On May 1, an Israel observation post near the Gaza Strip border was fired upon by Egyptians.

On May 2, Egyptians attacked a combine working fields near Hirbet Tewfik.

On May 3, an Israel patrol found explosives set in two roads north of Kissufim.

On May 4, Egyptian soldiers attacked an Israel patrol which had encountered a marauder north of Kissufim.

On May 7, Jordanians fired upon harvesters in the Valley of Jezreel. An Israel patrol came to their rescue and when the attack was renewed, several hours later, four Israelis were wounded.

On May 7, Jordanians attacked an Israel patrol in the Jordan Valley.

On May 12, Jordanian marauders fired upon wtchmen from the Jerusalem corridor settlement of Bar Giora. One of the guards was wounded.

On May 13, Egyptians fired on an Israel patrol near Mefalsim in the Gaza Strip area.

Why Not?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Northwest is the natural airline terminus for world trade and travel routes. Of great interest to me, as a Representative from the city of Seattle and Kitsap County, is the application of Pan American Airways for a certificate to fly from Seattle to Europe over the polar route.

Already such service is available to Los Angeles through a service inaugurated a year ago by Scandinavian Airlines System. That this polar route offers unlimited possibilities for swift and safe operation is indicated in a statement by the president of Scandinavian Airlines System, welcoming Pan American into the field and assuring them that the traffic potential is so encouraging as to justify two carriers over this route.

Pan American's application asks for CAB authority to operate from Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, and Los Angeles to London and other European capitals via the top of the world. It is important that the United States continue to build a strong civil air transport system in the interest of both national defense and an expanding commercial economy. I hope the Civil Aeronautics Board acts promptly to put Pan American in competition with our enterprising and resourceful Scandinavian friends.

The Seattle Post-Intelligencer of May 24 carried a thoughtful and illuminating editorial on the Pan American application. Under unanimous consent, I include this editorial with my remarks:

WHY NOT?

Seattle has a chance to have a direct connection to Europe over the Polar Route—and we are for it.

We see no good reason why a route from the west coast to Europe, and now exclusively in the hands of foreign flag carriers, should not have a little United States competition.

Furthermore, the present Arctic flights from the coast do not include Seattle. The Scandinavian Airlines System presently operates between Los Angeles via the Polar Route, and a British airline operate between San Francisco and London and beyond. Also, there will soon be Canadian service between Vancouver, British Columbia, and Amsterdam.

Now Pan American Airways has asked the CAB for permission to fly from four coast cities—Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, and Los Angeles—to London and European points via the top of the world.

Pan American says it is all set to go in experience, equipment, and stations manned and operating in Iceland, England, and other north countries in Europe.

It now wants to put Seattle on the route. It sounds good to us because, as we've said here before and often, we want Seattle to have everything it can reasonably claim in the way of air transportation.

Back to McKinley?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I have said repeatedly that this administration is turning back the clock with its partnership program of water resource development. How far back—back to McKinley—is shown in the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of Tuesday, May 31:

BACK TO MCKINLEY?

(By Harlan Trott)

AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM THE PACIFIC COAST

SAN FRANCISCO.—The hot debate being waged in Washington and throughout the West as to whether the country's waterpower resources should be developed by public or private means is no new thing.

Neither is it a partisan issue.

Today's fights are no hotter than the controversy over the Hoover Dam project back in President Coolidge's time, and the basic issue is the same.

The question breaks down into three parts. Where vast multipurpose reclamation projects involving the development of by-product electricity are essential, which of these three Government methods should be adopted?

1. Permitting the installation of powerhouse and power-generating facilities under license in accordance with the Federal Power Act, with adequate annual charge for the use of the Federal property?

2. Leasing the generating facilities and the right to use the falling water?

3. Selling the power at the powerhouse under long-term contracts without discrimination as to price?

Then, as now, a Republican administration was trying to reach a decision on policy. After a year of debate, Secretary Wilbur adopted the third course. The Government invited bids for the power output of Hoover Dam. The Southern California Edison Co., a private concern, bid for 9 percent of the rights to the power output and the city of Los Angeles and the States of Arizona and Nevada bid for and got 91 percent.

To be sure, Democrats exerted strong political pressure to help bring about Secretary Wilbur's decision. But Democrats were not alone.

Late in the Harding administration, Herbert Hoover had said here in San Francisco: "I am not and never have been in favor of anything but Government construction of the irrigation, reclamation, and hydroelectric projects on the Colorado, of whatever magnitude."

Six years later, as Republican candidate for President, Mr. Hoover declared in Madison Square Garden: "I do not wish to be misunderstood in this statement. I am defining a general policy. It does not mean that our Government is to part with one iota of its natural resources without complete protection to the public interest.

"I have always stated that where the Government is engaged in public works for purposes of flood control, of navigation, or irrigation * * * it will at times necessarily produce power * * * as a byproduct. But it must be a byproduct of the main purpose, not the major purpose itself. * * * The very essence of the equality of opportunity and of American individualism is that there shall be no domination by any group or combination in this Republic, whether it be business or political."

Owen D. Young, then chairman of the board of the General Electric Co., evidently held no fear at the time of "creeping socialism." In 1924, he told the National Electric Light Association convention at Atlantic City that the Hoover Dam controversy raised "a new kind of question which is wholly unrelated to the old controversy of Government versus private ownership, and that if the dam really serves the great purposes of flood control, irrigation, and navigation, which are clearly governmental activities, then public ownership of them cannot be objected to."

The late Senator George Norris, Republican of Nebraska said in that era: "In bringing about what I believe to be the proper development of our streams and control of water, it will be the byproduct that will bring about the greatest conflict. * * * That is the way with the power question. If we had a power plant that had to be operated at a loss, then all these power people would be in favor of Government operation. But wherever there is a profit, they want the opportunity.

"I have no fault to find with any power man if he wants to put in a dam, sell the water to the farmers and then sell the electricity to the rest of us. That's his right. But when we build it, when we take out of

the general Treasury money to put in the machine, and generate electricity, I will never consent that the Government turn over the product that already belongs to the people to some private corporation to sell it back to us."

Americans can go all the way back to President Theodore Roosevelt—back to the changeover from the McKinley era—to trace the continuity of public policy now in dispute. Back almost to the turn of the century, in his first message to Congress, wherein he asserted: "It is right for the National Government to make the streams and rivers of the arid region useful by irrigation works for water storage, as to make useful the rivers and harbors of the humid region by engineering works of another kind. The reclamation and settlement of the arid lands will enrich every portion of our country."

In 1932, the year the Republican Party last went out of power, it adopted this plank at its national convention: "The wise use of all natural resources freed from monopolistic control is a Republican policy, initiated by Theodore Roosevelt. The Roosevelt, Coolidge, and Hoover reclamation projects bear witness to the continuation of that policy."

The policy, however, has been shaped by vigilance and debate, which still continue.

Enrico Fermi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is very fitting that the new Atomic Energy Building to be erected in the District of Columbia, or in this vicinity, should be named in honor of the late nuclear physicist, Dr. Enrico Fermi. As one of several cosponsors of a measure to bring about this desirable result, I wish to call to your attention those achievements of Dr. Fermi's career which forever connect his name with the development of atomic energy for war and for peace.

Upon Dr. Fermi's untimely death in Chicago, November 28, 1954, the country's leading newspapers referred to him as "the Columbus of the atomic era" and the "architect of the atomic age" and "the father of the atomic bomb."

Dr. Fermi was one of a long and ever-increasing line of Italians who have come to this country and have become benefactors of America and of the world. He was born in Rome, Italy, September 29, 1901. He was educated at the University of Pisa and in Germany and the Netherlands. He lectured at the University of Florence and was professor of theoretical physics at the University of Rome for 12 years.

Dr. Fermi received the Nobel prize in physics in 1938. This was awarded largely because of Dr. Fermi's success in producing artificial radioactivity by bombarding substances with slow neutrons. When he went to Stockholm to receive this prize he took with him his wife and two young children and never returned to the rule of Mussolini and fascism. He arrived in New York January 2, 1939, and was welcomed to a position on the physics faculty at Columbia University. There he had the advantage of associates with similar interests and skills. In less than 1 month from his landing in New York the first splitting of the uranium atom in America took place in the basement of Pupin Hall on the Columbia University campus. Within 3 months he was trying to convince the Navy Department that an atomic bomb was practical.

Dr. Albert Einstein reported Dr. Fermi's work to President Roosevelt and persuaded him to allow the far-reaching and costly experiments which resulted in the atom bomb and in the vast peacetime uses of atomic power.

Research activities were transferred to the University of Chicago, and there, under the west stands of Stagg Field, the first experimental nuclear reactor was built. The atomic age opened with the success of this atomic pile on December 2, 1942. Many scientists worked on this experiment, but, more than any other one man, Dr. Fermi has been credited with its success. He later was made chief of the advanced physics department at Los Alamos, N. Mex. He received the Medal of Merit from President Truman, and shortly before his death, last November, Dr. Fermi was given the first $25,000 special award by the Atomic Energy Commission.

His fame is secure and he will never be forgotten, whether we name the new Atomic Energy Building for him or not. But this seems to me, and to many others, the most logical and fitting way to erect a permanent memorial to him who led the way to the successful production and use of atomic power. A building devoted to that phase of science to which his whole life was dedicated would be his most appropriate monument; and would long serve as another reminder of the contribution which Italians have made to America.

Deferred Stockpile Aluminum Should Be Distributed Fairly Throughout Aluminum Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, when aluminum has been in short supply, the Government has released the primary aluminum producers from their commitments to make deliveries to the national stockpile until a later date. Such a diversion occurred earlier this year. Distribution of the aluminum so diverted was made by the primary producers and some question exists as to the manner of distribution.

The Industry Advisory Committee of the Business and Defense Services Administration of the Department of Commerce has recommended a further diversion of deliveries to be made of stockpile aluminum, the amount of which has not yet been made public. In testimony before our Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Committee on Small Business Arthur Flemming, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, indicated that he would approve such diversion.

It is necessary before it is too late that serious consideration be given to the pattern and nature of distribution of the Government metal in order to assure fair treatment to all segments of the aluminum industry. Accordingly I have today written letters to Aluminum Co. of America, Reynolds Metals Co., and Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Co. requesting their cooperation in outlining the manner in which they propose to distribute the stockpile aluminum if and when it is made available. I attach a copy of my letter to the companies:

JUNE 2, 1955.

DEAR SIR: At the conclusion of the first phase of its hearings on May 25, 1955, Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Small Business Committee issued a preliminary statement recommending "that a sufficient amount of the delivery scheduled to the stockpile for the second half of 1955 be temporarily deferred" and also, "that the Office of Defense Mobilization and the General Services Administration be charged with the responsibility of assuring the equitable distribution of such aluminum to nonintegrated users."

The committee's recommendation that stockpile deliveries be temporarily deferred was considered to be an extraordinary relief and made most reluctantly. In our view, the stockpile is intended to assure the immediate availability of a sufficient quantity of strategic and critical materials in the event of national peril. The minimum levels of many strategic metals, including aluminum, have not yet been achieved and it is essential that such goals be met as promptly as possible. The practice of treating the stockpile as a metals bank or warehouse for deposits of surplus materials in times of lagging demand, or for withdrawals in a period of shortage, is not in accordance with congressional intent or national safety. The assertion by the primary producers that the current shortage exists because of overpurchasing by the stockpile is not entirely accurate when it is recalled that stockpile purchases were scheduled in accordance with estimates submitted by the producers themselves.

In view of the severe shortage of aluminum throughout the country and the need for protecting the economic well-being of many small business firms, the committee saw no other immediate alternative than the recommendations it made. In approving the diversion of stockpile deliveries, the committee deems it important to remember that the aluminum industry consists of more than its primary producers; that the thousands of small enterprises must be protected. The committee is not satisfied that the 150 million pounds of aluminum diverted from stockpile deliveries early this year were allocated fairly to such small enterprises, and it would not favor distribution of any further amounts through the primary producers unless there is definite assurance that it will be made on an equitable industrywide basis to all segments of the aluminum industry.

The committee does not want the introduction of a system of Government controls for allocating aluminum at the present time, if it can possibly be avoided. We believe the primary producers can formulate a program of distribution which will deal fairly with nonintegrated users throughout the industry. However, in view of the haphazard distribution of the aluminum diverted from the stockpile earlier this year, the committee believes that the nature and pattern of distribution to be employed should be known before the primary producers are authorized to divert further deliveries of

aluminum under commitment to the stockpile.

The Aluminum Industry Advisory Committee of the Business and Defense Services Administration of the Department of Commerce yesterday recommended the amount of aluminum to be deferred from delivery to the Government stockpile. That amount is known to the primary producers. Assuming that the Advisory Committee's recommendation is approved by the Office of Defense Mobilization, the committee would like to know the manner in which the producers propose to make distribution, and requests them to answer the following questions:

1. Your company has already scheduled a portion of your production for nonintegrated users. Will all the diverted stockpile aluminum be made available to nonintegrated users in addition to the amount you have already scheduled?

2. In what amount will sales be made on a first-come, first-served basis to all good credit risks?

3. In what amount and in what manner will sales be made in accordance with a historical pattern?

4. In what amount and in what manner will relief be accorded users having no historical pattern?

5. (a) In what amount will existing nonconfirmed orders be given priority?

(b) In what amount will canceled orders be reinstated?

6. Will you fulfill your existing firm contracts from your own supplies rather than from stockpile diversions? If not, what amount will you use?

7. In what amount will sales be made to customers who use your facilities for fabrication?

8. What amount will be delivered to other primary smelters in (a) United States? (b) Canada? (c) Mexico?

9. What amount will be exported?

10. What amount will be allocated to (a) foundrymen? (b) extruders? (c) diecasters? (d) secondary smelters? (e) sheet rollers? (f) others?

11. Is there a minimum order which will be accepted? What amount? How many such orders will be accepted? Is there a maximum order which will be accepted? What amount? How many such orders will be accepted?

12. What will be the sale price for (a) billets? (b) pot-line alloy? (c) refined alloy? (d) pure pig? (e) pure ingot?

13. What will be the dates for delivery of the diverted metal?

14. Please state any additional factors upon which your distribution will be made.

The present situation requires the earnest assistance of all members of the aluminum industry. Your prompt consideration and cooperation in formulating an orderly and equitable program of distribution will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 3, Select Committee on Small Business.

The Struggle for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch is carrying a notable series of articles under the general title of "The Struggle for Peace."

These articles, written especially for the Post-Dispatch and copyrighted by the Pulitzer Publishing Co., offer a fresh analysis of the present world situation, and the choices that lie before us, by many men and women of distinguished reputation and experience.

I believe that the articles deserve wide attention. Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the introductory article, preceding the series, written by Thomas B. Sherman, a member of the Post-Dispatch staff:

THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE—WHAT ARE THE WORLD'S CHOICES?

(By Thomas B. Sherman)

Ten years ago the atomic age was ushered in when "a light that never was on land or sea" spread its glare over the New Mexican flatlands. The laboratory test near Alamogordo was soon given its practical application at Hiroshima and Nagasaki; and in the following decade the lethal power of a single bomb has been multiplied a thousand times.

It is not surprising that the responsive power of humanity has faltered and lagged under the successive shocks of these events. The call to appropriate action seems so enormous in its demands that the collective as well as the single will may be enfeebled by a sense of inadequacy.

Where the feeling of futility is in command, the natural reaction is to close the mind to all the horrid possibilities of a still indefinite tomorrow and take refuge in the daily task and the daily round of pleasure. It would be useless to deny that such an attitude is widespread, and it would be meaningless to deplore it. It is better, in any case, than a constant state of hysteria; and it is less immediately dangerous than the active response that springs out of mental habits formed in the preatomic era.

OBSOLETE, SUICIDAL IDEAS

Anyone capable of momentary detachment must be impressed by the fact that much that is said and done by some men in high places is either obsolete or suicidal.

To Americans it appears that the Russian and Chinese leaders are the worst, if not the only, offenders. Having brought a botched kind of Communist society into being, they offer it as a prototype for all future political organization, and they further affirm that their system must prevail over the entire earth or perish in the attempt. This attitude proceeds quite logically from Lenin's often quoted statement that communism and capitalism cannot live peacefully together.

Lenin, of course, is preatomic. So are the belligerent gestures and the hard conditions that their successors offer the non-Communist world. They make sense only if a general war is considered feasible as a means of achieving the purposes of high policy.

The only other alternative, unconditional surrender, is also the only alternative to disaster that the free world could not possibly accept.

But if Communist policy, from its visible signs, seems to be founded on an irrational and obsolete premise, what of our own? From our point of view, it seems much more flexible and generous. The President is obviously a man of peace and prepared to make honorable accommodations that would lessen the chances of a general war. In moments of crisis his view has prevailed against those who would have resorted to military action in the seeming belief that a limited war was possible.

Unfortunately these advisers are still in a position to continue their persuasions and they are supported, in effect, by a vocal group of men in and out of office. A magazine of national circulation has pointed out that regional wars have been fought before—and in recent times—without spreading into a general conflict. So, without questioning the good faith or the humanity of these official and voluntary advisers, it is relevant to consider the probabilities of a limited war.

BOMBS SETTLE NOTHING

The first factor to be taken into account is the decision, already made at the highest level, to use "tactical" nuclear weapons in any military engagement where United States forces are involved. Presumably the peoples of Asia would make a moral distinction between a "junior" and a "senior" bomb. If they did, it would show an extraordinary tolerance on their part. A more likely result would be a wave of indignation that would not be confined to the backward peoples of the earth.

Yet it is conceivable that the United States could endure its loss of moral stature, ride out the storm of disapproval and recover standing with its allies, if whatever enemy we chose could be finished off quickly.

But if the end were deferred, if the war were drawn out with long casualty lists and more to come, one side or the other would be tempted to use larger and more decisive weapons. It is irrelevant to say that the Chinese have no bombs. They could borrow them; and the lenders might be happy to oblige if they thought they could keep clear of the holocaust.

At the minimum, then, the risks incurred by a limited war would be enormous. Its conceivable benefits, if it were a war against China, would be a temporary neutralization of Chinese military power and 100,000 or more dead Chinese. As China is not yet considered a first-rank military power, the gain would be negligible, to say the least, if nothing were settled.

And what could be settled? Would the Chinese masses be so affected by the blow that they would immediately start a peace movement? Would the future aggressive potential of China be measurably changed? Would communism be dismantled or even substantially modified?

The questions are raised and must be answered in a context of realities—a Chinese population of 600 million, a continental land mass, a still primitive system of communication, a nonexistent public opinion in any political and western sense. Chester Bowles once said that if every large city in China were bombed, it would be 2 weeks before millions of Chinese heard about it.

What emerges here is the probability that a regional war would become a general war.

Even if the probability were reduced to a mere possibility, there is something preatomic in the whole idea that the best way to preserve peace is to start a war. It might have been true in a former stage of history, but it is no longer true when war has lost all validity as an instrument of national policy.

WAR DEFEATS ITS OWN ENDS

In the classic conception, war is an extension of diplomacy by force of arms. The main objective was to punish the enemy nation enough to force its surrender and a subsequent conformity to the high policies of the winner. The loser was also required to pay the bill. Neither would be possible if the enemy were destroyed, so the stronger nation would defeat its own purpose by a war of mutilation. Even the last two wars proved, in part, that wars had become obsolete. The losers did not pay the bill, the high policies of the winners were not realized, and peace was not made.

The proof is now complete. Thermonuclear war allows for no victor; and to suggest that its survivors might be less fortunate than the dead is not the outpouring of a morbid fancy. It merely repeats the sober estimates of men who have applied the laws of probability.

War then is finally obsolete; and it remains for history to determine whether man is not also obsolete.

Biological survival in nature has been determined by the capacity of a species to cope

with changes in environment. Applying this principle to the response of the human species to the conditions it now must face and master, we must admit that a complete adjustment has not been made. Some of us are still affected by a time lag. The meaning of the bomb has reached our brains without affecting our behavior. Public statements are made that could only be premised on outmoded assumptions.

NEGOTIATION WAY TO PEACE

Fortunately most of them have been repudiated, in effect, at the top. The decision to hold a conference "at the summit" is evidence of the fact that "no negotiations with the enemy" has finally been discarded as a guiding principle. Fortunately, too, the longing for peace is a growing force in American life.

In itself it is hardly enough but at the least it is a kind of directive to our leadership to seek honorable arrangements of a tangible nature; and it implies that something less than a total extermination of our enemies might be acceptable.

World events have also made it possible to hope that the rigid attitudes of the Communist leadership have also been relaxed. Chou En-lai's behavior at Bandung suggested that he and his associates may be working on a formula that would reconcile concessions with oriental pride. Soviet initiative in promoting an Austrian peace treaty may be a propaganda move or an act of necessity, but it removes a source of friction and sets the stage for a more realistic discussion of further changes in the European scene.

And the European conference at the top, to be followed by a more detailed exploration of points of dispute at the second level, was mutually agreed upon. President Eisenhower says that the conference could be fruitful and Secretary of State Dulles announced his determination to approach the bargaining table, not tentatively, but in an affirmative frame of mind.

What may be responsible for the apparently softened attitude of the Communist leaders is necessarily speculative. Suspicion and cynicism still have plenty of material to feed upon. But if the failure of the agricultural program in Russia has been a spur to action, the act itself could still be more significant than the motive. The same reasoning would apply if the Kremlin had decided that it is no longer safe to maintain the discipline of a Spartan camp.

Moreover, it is also possible that the Soviet leaders have awakened at last to the facts of life in the atomic age. Much Western thinking about the future behavior of Russia has been postulated on the belief that the guardians of communism are dedicated to the point of death. Consequently—or so the argument runs—they can yield nothing because to do so would be to surrender their sacred mission.

REDS MAY ACCEPT OWN LOGIC

Yet Russia has yielded to some extent in the field of action and its basic doctrine has been reinterpreted often enough to suggest that interpretation is the effective equivalent of opportunism; and that Russian politics, like any other, is the art of the possible. Assuming, however, that communism or death is the watchword of the guardians, this, too, is obsolete. When the defenders die their cause dies with them. Communism as a principle, a discipline, a way of life or an economic system, would command no more deference in the radioactive wastelands and rubble heaps than the ancient cult of the Assassins.

In short, the Russian leaders may have finally accepted the logic of their own classic doctrine which says that communism will ultimately dominate the human scene because of its rational perfection. In that case, they would not abandon the struggle; they would merely transfer it to the field of ideas.

The Western World can welcome such a challenge. It is the goal, in fact, that high policy consciously and instinctively seeks, because the classic doctrine of free peoples is the doctrine of free choice for individuals and communities.

In the sometime tedious processes of democracy there is often a lag between the formulation of considered popular opinion and its translation into policy; yet the Western World has a record while the Communist prophets are still counting on the future to make their dreams come true.

From the record it appears that only free men can be moral because slaves, by definition, cannot consult their own wills. And if it is factories, dams, roads, parks, playhouses, automobiles, airplanes, fish, flesh, and fowl that count, the expanding abundance in the world of free men should be a sufficient guaranty of their capacity to produce a continuing abundance.

The power first unleashed near Alamogordo holds the promise of destruction quite as cataclysmic and more inglorious than a celestial collision. It holds too the promise of a life and a culture that would make all history seem like the hour before dawn.

Decisions made in the near future may decide which gifts we will take.

At the moment, man is not yet obsolete.

Limited Peace Objectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the first article in a remarkable series carried by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch under the general title, "The Struggle for Peace":

(By Henry M. Wriston, president, Brown University)

Everybody wants to ease tensions and assure peace. The problem is what road to take toward those goals. My thesis is that, having failed to arrive at global solutions for the major problems following the war, we should establish as many limited objectives as possible and direct our diplomacy to the achievement of those useful ends, however undramatic they may appear.

Before 1914 such a proposal for limited action would have seemed natural; now it requires a real effort to comprehend it.

The century between Waterloo and Sarajevo saw more evidences of progress toward a peaceful world than any other period in modern history. It was by no means a quiescent or stagnant era; indeed, it was one of the most energetic in human history. Nor was it free from war. On the contrary, hardly a year passed without some manifestation of the use of force for international purposes somewhere in the world.

Progress toward the goal of peace consisted in the multiplication of devices to keep wars small, to quarantine fighting with a view to preventing its spread.

LESSONS OF 19TH CENTURY

The idea of limited war for limited objectives gained such headway that it came to seem normal. The first great war of the 20th century was miscalled World War I because men had forgotten that before the 19th century general wars were common; the Napoleonic wars and earlier struggles had been as extensive as the political world.

Our generation did not realize that the failure of these global struggles to produce global peace was one of the prime reasons for the reversal of emphasis during the 19th century and for the effort to limit war both in space and in objectives.

World War I represented not only an abandonment of attempts at spatial containment of fighting; it was global in its objectives, also. At the Paris Peace Conference statesmen sought not only to solve all the territorial, economic and political issues; they wrote a constitution for a world government to perpetuate their work.

One might suppose that, when peace was not achieved after the employment of these new concepts during the First World War, men would have been persuaded that such grandiose assumptions were incorrect. Yet, despite the collapse of the structure of reparations, the failure of the prohibitions of Versailles, and the breakdown of the League of Nations, the basic notions of total global war and an integral world peace continued to dominate international life.

The unfulfilled promises of the Atlantic Charter illustrate this global perspective. The United Nations Conference at San Francisco likewise had a world ideal. The notion that the 19th century could teach the atomic age anything was rejected. Everything was "globalized"—health, welfare, nutrition, culture, economics, finance and politics. World-embracing institutions were established to unify all problems under one aegis.

NEW SET OF ABSOLUTE TERMS

A new set of terms has been tailored to fit the new structure of ideas. They are usually stated as stark absolutes. One such phrase is "total war." The slogan leaves no room for any different or competing idea. Yet even a few moments of serious reflection make it clear that history shows no instance, ancient or modern, of total war. Indeed, if every thought, word and deed were completely engrossed in war, there would be no room for even thoughts of peace; thus war could never end; peace could never come.

"Unconditional surrender" was another verbal absolute which misled even those who gave it currency. It is the proper objective of the military to induce the enemy to yield with a minimum of bargaining. Civilian leaders, however, should never employ as a political concept an idea appropriate only to the military—to do so is to lose touch with reality. If a great power is actually rendered politically impotent, the politician faces an impossible task in making peace. When a political vacuum is created, new forces will rush in to fill it. Unconditional surrender simplifies an armistice; it complicates peacemaking.

A third absolute also captured the public mind. Wtih advertising fanfare we were given the phrase "one world." But the neglect of racial, religious, cultural, economic and 1,000 other differences, the suppression of all inconvenient characteristics of reality, made the one-world dogma a mirage.

As a kind of reaction from one extreme we are likely to lurch toward another. The one-world concept has now been superseded by a two-world dogma. But biaxiality is as false as its predecessor. Because the United States and Russia are the strongest protagonists, there is a tendency in the United States to forget that neither power dominates large sections of the world, and that they influence other sections in varying degrees. The Asian-African conference at Bandung should have taught us that much.

The biaxial dogma refuses to admit that a nation can be at peace with both parties and not an active participant in the cold war. This is contrary to history. India, for example, stands today in somewhat the position of the United States in 1793. It is young in years of independence, it faces daunting domestic problems—economic, social, political, religious; indeed, it is in more

parlous condition than the United States 162 years ago. Consequently, we should have some realization that a measure of isolation from the intensity of the struggle may be essential to its survival. What is unquestionably true of India applies in greater or lesser degree to other nations.

The habit of thinking in political absolutes culminates in the incapacity to make wise political decisions. Under absolutist principles, there is no way to deal with Russia except by total war. That is a simple, direct conclusion and accounts for occasional demands for a so-called preventive war.

Analysis proves such an idea to be self-defeating for after force has been employed to the ultimate, politics must still supervene. The effort to substitute force for reason can be successful only in a transient sense. Ultimately reason must be the principal implement of political action. From this hard fact there is no conceivable escape.

Recently the limits of political action in dealing with Russia have been very narrow. Experience shows the hope that we could now negotiate a general settlement with Russia to be unrealistic. But again we must beware of absolutes. Because we cannot settle all our problems with Russia, it does not follow that we can settle none. That notion is just as dangerous to sound policymaking as its opposite. It has proved possible, even during the cold war, to relieve some tensions. The Russians withdrew their threat to Iran; they were stymied in Greece, they lost control of Yugoslavia; they modified their stand in the face of the Berlin airlift. There has been an extraordinary gesture lately—the peace treaty for Austria.

Merely to state the proposition, "because we cannot do everything, we can do nothing," is to reveal its absurdity. Yet sometimes public opinion, nurtured on false absolutes, borders upon that attitude. In fact, sentiment of that sort may prove so strong as to damn all efforts at negotiations as "appeasement" and doom them to failure at home even should they succeed abroad.

SOUND, IMMEDIATE PROGRAM

The sound, immediate program is to substitute specific efforts to achieve limited goals for the ideal of global settlement. The British Prime Minister, Sir Anthony Eden, has accepted the thesis that limited objectives are valid. With restraint and good temper, but firmness and clarity, he has dedicated himself to the solution of as many problems as possible, leaving to time and better fortune the resolution of others that can be dealt with successfully only as tensions are relieved. There are clear indications that President Eisenhower is not allergic to such a method.

TWO KINDS OF ACTION NEEDED

Progress along even so modest a line requires action of two sorts.

First, negotiation must be undertaken wherever there is a chance that it may be fruitful. The objective should be to nibble away in order to reduce the size of problems for which a tolerable solution seems presently unattainable. That process may not produce dramatic headway toward a general settlement, but the useful is often not dramatic. It may be possible to take only a short step toward peace with long intervals before another step can be taken; yet every advance is worthwhile.

Simultaneously another sort of action is essential. The free world should be strengthened in order to extend the area of negotiation. That involves continuation of "foreign aid"—in our own itnerest. There is ample hsitorical evidence that negotiation from "situations of strength" is more likely to succeed than dickering from a condition of weakness.

Here we must be aware that tension between the military and the political branches of the Government is normal. The military must try to be ready for any eventuality; that requires more preparedness than the political arm of Government is usually willing to undertake. One reason for the tendency of the political branch to go more slowly with rearmament than the military desires is the danger that, instead of producing a situation of strength as a basis for effective negotiation, too large an armament program may eventuate in an arms race, the effect of which might be to postpone negotiation until after war had come and been completed.

MAKE ENEMY RESPECTFUL

It is essential to make the potential enemy respectful of our power, but it is unwise so to stimulate fear as to precipitate rash action on his part. That is why it is the inescapable function of political authority to determine how much preparedness is necessary for negotiation from situations of strength, and how much more preparedness would eventuate in so sharp an arms race as to bring on war. No rule of thumb has the least utility in deciding how much is too much.

The practical course is to combine strengthened armament with alert seizure of every opportunity for useful negotiation. If more and more irritations are ameliorated by negotiations, the evidence of adequacy in armament becomes cumulative.

It is true that angry discussion over the partition of Korea and over Quemoy and Matsu shows that some Americans feel no confidence whatever in the validity of limited objectives. Nevertheless there are indications of a tendency to revive some useful 19th century concepts. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, despite its vast sweep, attempts to handle a limited range of problems in a specific area with which the United Nations could not cope effectively; in the same way, the mutual-defense agreements between the United States, Australia, and New Zealand made a limited approach to a defined objective. Other neighboring nations are members of the recently organized SEATO.

These are evidences of a dawning realization that many of the world's problems are like food: they cannot be taken all at once or in too large amounts. As with the items in a well-balanced diet, it is necessary to take one bite at a time. The simple truth is that there is so much diversity of interest, even among cooperative nations, that the attempt to deal with everything at once is almost certain to break down.

History strongly suggests that limited action is more conducive to peace. Bismarck offers the classic example of a statesman who followed the doctrine of limited objectives. He abhored total war, not on moral grounds, nor for humanitarian reasons, much less upon sentimental bases. To him, all-out war was the height of stupidity because it would prevent reaping the fruits of victory. "War," he said, "should be conducted in such a way as to make peace possible." We do not have to admire everything that Bismarck did to be willing to accept one of his ideas which proved sound.

EVERY PEACE IS NEGOTIATED

The reality is that in the long run every peace is a negotiated peace. That the treaty must be acceptable to the defeated nation is reenforced by the nature—and the cost—of modern warfare. After victory is won, the triumphant nation is virtually exhausted. For many other reasons, the moment of victory is brief and the settlements made in that moment are brittle unless they are satisfactory, not superficially but fundamentally, to the defeated, for politics is continuous, while war, even a world war, is episodic.

This is evidenced by the fact that nothing is writ larger upon the pages of history than the reversal of alliances. Within the few years since the last war we have seen a reversal of orientation regarding Italy, Japan, Yugoslavia, and Germany—and toward Russia, in the other direction.

What of Russia? Is there no hope of attaining, if not peace, at least a mitigation of the cold war, a tolerable modus vivendi?

It will be urged that the ideological barrier is insuperable, that the contrast between the democratic West and the totalitarian East is so great that no accommodation is conceivable.

When that is said, we do well to remember that history is long and memory short. For many years Mohammedans and Christians carried on religious wars. Their enmity was so profound and so implacable that no middle ground seemed available. Now Moslems and Christians manage to live beside each other by curbing their religious intolerance. They no longer use force for purposes of proselyting; neither vows the extinction of the other. Indeed, Turkey has demonstrated its capacity for democratic government and is a member of NATO. This is clear enough evidence that an ancient barrier has fallen; coexistence between Moslems and Christians is a modern reality.

RUSSSIA CAN CHANGE

Today we tend to regard the Russian state as is now exists under the Bolsheviks as permanent; but it is scarcely more than 35 years old. In the course of those years it has gone through several phases, during some of which it was, for a time, cooperative. It would be as grave a mistake to regard the current phase as ultimate as it would be to say that it is likely to pass in a brief period of time.

Meanwhile we must be patient with the burdens imposed by essential rearmament until the attainment of situations of strength makes our enemy see the wisdom of negotiation upon a broader base than has so far been possible. For the present a policy of limited objectives can ease some tensions and help reserve us from all-out war which time, and a change in Russia or her satellites, may make wholly unnecessary.

United States Must Regain Morale Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the second article in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch series on "The Struggle for Peace":

(By Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., professor of history, Harvard University)

In the last year, the foreign policy of the United States has evidently been plunged into a state of basic doubt and irresolution. Our leaders have veered from a stance of menacing toughness one day to one of sober responsibility the next.

Our conduct of foreign affairs has been studded with alternations of bluff and backdown—the fantastic "massive retaliation" phase, the vacillation before Dien Bien Phu, the administration's blank check resolution on Formosa, the march-up-the-hill-march-down-again policy on Quemoy and the Matsus, the weekend reversal over negotiation with Communist China.

Our recurrent tableau in foreign relations has been the rescue of world peace by

the President of the United States from the bellicosity of his own appointees.

DEEPLY ROOTED BASIC CONCEPT

Yet it is important to understand that this record of irresolution, reversal and incoherence is not a series of accidents. It is, I believe, deeply rooted in a basic conflict of views within the administration, and within the Nation as well. It will continue until this basic conflict of views is faced and resolved.

What is the basic conflict of views?

It is the result, I would suggest, of differing interpretations of the position of the United States in the hydrogen age, for this decade's developments in the weapons field have revolutionized the whole basis of foreign policy. The achievement by the United States of nuclear weapons was extraordinary enough; but the achievement of these weapons by the Soviet Union has wholly altered the dimensions of warfare.

It means that the world will soon be entering an age where each of the great powers has the capacity to obliterate the other, and where a contest between them is likely to obliterate most of the rest of the world, too—even perhaps to destroy all life on this planet.

We have not yet reached the stage of nuclear equality, but we are approaching it all too rapidly. A good guess is that the Soviet Union is building its nuclear stockpiles at such a rate that we will enter the era of standoff in 2 to 5 years. This will usher in a new phase of human history in terms of which all our problems of strategy and diplomacy will have to be recalculated.

FUTURE SAFETY OF THE UNITED STATES

What will the era of nuclear equality mean for the future safety of the United States? It is this question which has provoked the basic conflict of views. Two influential schools of thought have reached diametrically opposite conclusions as to what nuclear stalemate will mean to the future of civilization.

One school has been most powerfully represented by Sir Winston Churchill, the former Prime Minister of Great Britain. In one of his last and greatest speeches, Sir Winston argued that the age of nuclear plenty might well diminish the danger of total war, because all nations would be on an equality of vulnerability, and both sides would realize that war would result in mutual annihilation.

"Then it may be," he concluded in a noble sentence, "that we shall by a process of sublime irony have reached a stage in this story where safety will be the sturdy child of terror, and survival the twin brother of annihilation."

Judging by his somewhat fragmentary utterances on this subject, one is justified in counting President Eisenhower a member of this school.

SENATOR KNOWLAND'S CHALLENGE

But the Churchill-Eisenhower view has been vigorously challenged in the United States. Unfortunately for public understanding of the issues, this challenge has often been oblique and private. Thus, one of the main critics of this view, Admiral Radford, the Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, has confined his objections to off-the-record talks and to exchanges within the administration. Yet there has been one significant instance of public challenge. That instance was the speech delivered in the Senate by Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, of California, the Republican leader, on November 15 last.

KNOWLAND's speech had its cryptic and enigmatic passages, but its main drift was important and unmistakable. His prediction of the future was totally opposed to Churchill's.

"Coexistence and atomic stalemate," KNOWLAND plainly said, "will result in ultimate Communist victory."

Why should this be so? Because a period of atomic stalemate would be a period of "inevitable Communist nibbling aggression." Soviet nuclear capability, posing the threat of atomic obliteration against those who would attempt resistance, would paralyze and immobilize the Free World.

As Communist nuclear power canceled out our own, we would lose our own capacity to deter piecemeal aggression. If the Communists should bite off West Berlin or Belgrade or Tehran, would we be prepared to retaliate against the Soviet Union at the price of trading New York or Washington or Detroit in exchange?

No single challenge would be likely to seem sufficiently clearcut to justify the slaughter of 20 million Americans.

If atomic stalemate thus would mean ultimate Communist victory, what should the United States do?

Here Senator KNOWLAND became less forthright, but he asked a significant question: "How many years remain when we still have some initiative left?"

The entire logic of his position was obviously that the United States, while it still retains its shrinking margin of power, must act to prevent the Communist world from achieving nuclear equality.

BRUTAL LOGIC OF PREVENTIVE WAR

Now the brutal logic of this position is preventive war. But it is evident that the American people—not to speak of President Eisenhower—are firmly opposed to preventive war.

Yet, when one deeply and honestly feels that we are finished as a nation if we permit the Communists to achieve nuclear equality, the only hope for survival remains that of engaging the enemy while we still retain superiority. And the only hope of engaging the enemy with the support of our own people is to find a plausible pretext for fighting a small war and to parlay that small war into a great one.

This, in my judgment, was the essential significance of the debate over Quemoy and the Matsus. These small islands off the China coast were important, not at all in terms of the defense of Formosa, but in terms of precipitation of atomic war while "we still have some initiative left."

At the very least, it could be argued, such a war would permit us to knock out Communist China. And, if the Soviet Union were rash enough to intervene, we could then clobber the Russians while we had more nuclear weapons than they.

"Time is running out," said Senator KNOWLAND, "and I would remind the Senate that in this day and age of the airplane and the atomic weapon time is not necessarily on the side of the Free World."

To many this will be a shocking line of thought, yet the point to be remembered is that this is a serious argument made by high-minded people profoundly concerned over the fate of their Nation and of freedom in the world.

To point out that the policy they recommend would not gain the objectives they cherish is only a partial answer. It is also necessary to answer their contention that atomic stalemate would infallibly mean Communist victory.

Is KNOWLAND right? Or can Churchill's optimism be justified in terms of something other than rhetoric and wishful thinking?

The answer to these questions depends on what we ourselves are ready to do in the period of atomic stalemate. If we follow one kind of policy, we are all too likely to fulfill KNOWLAND's gloom. If we follow another kind, we have more than a fighting chance of fulfilling Churchill's hope.

The concrete problem is how to make sure that atomic stalemate will not expose the world to Communist nibbling aggression. The broad answer is clear enough: We can check Communist aggression by building strength and unity in the free world—enough nuclear strength to deter the Soviet Union from total war, enough conventional armed strength to deter the Communists from local aggression, enough social strength to hold our own in the battle for the uncommitted peoples, enough moral and diplomatic strength to maintain and develop the unity and dedication of the free nations.

The words are simple enough. But the deeds are difficult.

Let us consider for a moment the gap between what we are doing and what we must do if coexistence is not going to be the prelude to the isolation and encirclement of the United States.

THE PRICE OF STRENGTH

In the field of air-atomic power, our first line of national defense, we should, according to former Secretary of the Air Force Thomas K. Finletter, be spending in the neighborhood of six to eight billion dollars more a year than we are spending today.

In the field of conventional weapons, we should, at the very least, be maintaining our Army at its present strength, if we wish to have the capability to discourage local aggression. Instead, the Eisenhower administration proposes to cut the size of the Army.

In the social and economic field, we should be launching a massive program of economic and technical assistance to the underdeveloped areas. The more effectively we maintain our military strength, the more decisively we shift the contest with communism to the social and economic battlefield.

And the problem whether the uncommitted third of the world will ultimately throw its weight on the side of communism or the side of freedom may very well be the most important issue of the last half of the 20th century.

A minimum program in this area would probably be a commitment of about $2 billion a year for the next 5 years. Instead, the Eisenhower administration has offered a program with barely more than $700 million for economic and technical aid.

In the moral and diplomatic field, we should be bending all our efforts toward the revitalization and a strengthening of our alliances.

We should be doing everything we can to devise world policies which will have a firm juridical basis, which will win the support of our allies and which will strengthen collective action through the United Nations.

We must repudiate go-it-aloneism, remember that Providence has not endowed our country with any special measure of infallibility, and play our part as a strong, self-respecting but humble partner in the community of free peoples.

MORAL LEADERSHIP ABOVE ALL

Above all, we must do something to restore America's moral leadership.

This is partly a question of simple honesty. It may not be in the best taste to say so; but the harsh fact is that the unassisted word of the Secretary of State is no longer believed in most of the capitals of the world, including Washington. Mr. Dulles has cut so many corners, uttered so many contradictions, sponsored so many false impressions and behaved with such consistent self-righteousness and hypocrisy as to have long since ended his usefulness in official position. The first step in restoring the credibility of America in the world is to stop having Pecksniff as Secretary of State.

Beyond this, we must abandon the policy of tough talk and saber-rattling which has created the image of bellicosity we have presented to the world in recent years.

Let us have more real strength, by all means; but let us talk much less about it. Let us never forget the wisdom of Theodore Roosevelt: "Never draw unless you mean to shoot. I do not believe in our taking any position anywhere unless we can make good."

Above all, let us recover world leadership by developing policies proportionate to the size and the terror of the hydrogen age. The policies I have enumerated above, good so far as they go, do not go far enough. We have thus far failed in the job of recalculating our strategy and our diplomacy in terms of the age of nuclear plenty. If we pursue this calculation with severity and rigor, it becomes evident that all the other issues pale beside the single issue of bringing military force under some kind of effective control.

This means that the quest for effective enforced disarmament of all weapons, instead of being a propaganda gesture, or a tedious ritual, or a springboard for ambitious politicians, or a sop to idealists, must become the top priority in our foreign policy, commanding our best talent, our highest energy, and our deepest dedication.

Yesterday the world resisted enforced disarmament—the Russians did, so did we. But yesterday's was a different world. The world today is beginning to glimpse the meaning of the hydrogen age. As that meaning sinks in, the world will be ready for an unprecedented attempt to control, to limit, and ultimately to abolish war. Let the United States place itself at the head of the movement for peace. More than ever today we face the issue which H. G. Wells defined a generation ago—the race between education and catastrophe.

The world—with American leadership and support—can win this race, but it will require a quality of leadership which we do not currently have.

To repair the gap between what we are doing and what we must do, our Nation must undertake unprecedented commitments of time, energy, money, and men. It must have leadership which undersands the crisis of our age and can mobilize us all to do what must be done.

This will not be a part-time leadership, 3-days-a-week leadership, business-as-usual leadership. It must be leadership of passion, conscience, and total commitment.

A world of enforced disarmament, it should be added, must not be mistaken for a world of peace. So long as totalitarian governments control great nations like Russia and China, so long will the world be torn by deep and bitter differences, so long will values of human dignity and decency and freedom be in peril.

The cause of peace will never be served by a revival of illusion concerning communism. That cause will only be served by a revival of realism of will and of faith in the free world—a determination, at whatever cost to comfort and complacency, to do the things that will unite coexistence with strength, peace with honor, and sacrifice with hope.

Man's Hope for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the third article in a notable St. Louis Post-Dispatch series of articles on the Struggle for Peace:

(By Edward F. Woods, a Washington correspondent of the Post-Dispatch)

Mankind's hope for enduring peace in this atomic age lies in the support of the United Nations Charter by the free world, and if the leaders of the free world fail to make the charter function, millions of us will be destroyed, former President Harry S. Truman told the Post-Dispatch today.

Discussing in an interview here the aspirations of men of good will everywhere for a free and happy life, the former Chief Executive recalled what he had told the San Francisco Conference which drafted the U. N. Charter nearly 10 years ago. At that time he said:

"If we had had this charter a few years ago—and above all, the will to use it—millions now dead would be alive. If we should falter in the future in our will to use it, millions now living will surely die."

BASES OF WAR AND PEACE

Drawing on his rich, experience in 18 years as Senator, Vice President, and President, Mr. Truman said he does not believe that just and lasting peace can be accomplished by diplomats or by military combines. Agreements made by diplomats and military men have to be based upon the whole-hearted support of the people for whom they are made, he said.

History, he continued, is rampant with evidenice that wars grow from seeds of economic hostility and social injustice, and the U. N. charter is aimed directly at eliminating these evils. In the success or failure of this instrument, then, lies the key to lasting peace, he said.

The Charter, he added, is dedicated to the achievement of, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the best efforts of statesmen cannot bring about lasting peace and security unless these objectives are attained for all men and women without consideration of race, creed or color.

Sixty nations, he noted, now make up the United Nations and all but a handful are free to practice international cooperation in the interest of helping to correct the economic and social causes for war.

A firm economic base for democratic aspiration of citizens of underprivileged countries must be established, Mr. Truman went on. The U. N. could do even more to strengthen itself in this area as an instrument of economic and social progress than by debating of differences among nations and through police action against aggressors.

POVERTY GREATEST CHALLENGE

As he has contended frequently, Mr. Truman stated that the grinding poverty and the lack of economic opportunity for many millions of people in the economically underdeveloped parts of Africa, the Near East, the Far East and certain regions of Central and South America present the greatest challenge to the world.

Nevertheless the spread of industrial civilization, a better understanding of the concepts of modern government and the impact of two world wars have stirred these people to great expectations, he said.

Frustration and disappointment could cause them to turn to false doctrines, which preach that progress can be achieved only at the price of tyranny.

The United States and the other free countries of the U. N. should do everything possible through technical assistance and advice to bring the underdeveloped countries close to the free community in terms of friendship and commerce, he said.

If that is not done, Mr. Truman warned, the unsettled state of the world could only be prolonged indefinitely and the achievement of permanent peace frustrated.

ESSENTIAL BULWARK OF PEACE

The preamble to the U. N. Charter, he pointed out, recognizes that the economic and social advancement of all people is an essential bulwark of peace, and under article 56 of the charter this Nation is pledged to taking separate action or to act jointly with other nations in promoting higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development.

It is important in the face of Communist propaganda, he went on, that the development of the poorer nations take place under international cooperation. Communist propagandists might well exploit exclusive American operations within a nation as colonization, and so frighten away the beneficiaries. This would not occur if several nations were associated in the project.

He stressed the importance of the fact that the world's leaders, if they are to save their people from holocaust, must continually resort to the negotiations tables for talks directed toward peace rather than war.

Leaders of the free world must never by word, deed, or act leave suffering and uncertain people anywhere in the world with the impression that they must one day in the long run fight with the free world or against it.

He added that discussion and exchanges of opinion and viewpoints must be maintained within flexible bounds. Then the masses of people around the world, if the truth reaches them, will readily recognize the forces of peace as compared to forces which would brutishly subject them to conflict, he said.

Whether at the negotiating table or in an international political arena, the free world must show itself through its leaders as dedicated to the ideal that political problems can be solved by men of good will through discussion and without devastating war, he added.

In this connection, Mr. Truman said, he is opposed to expulsion of the Soviet Union from the United Nations despite the obstructionist tactics employed by that nation and its satellites.

ADVANTAGES OF RUSSIA IN U. N.

It is his belief that through the medium of open debate the Soviet Union may be held up to the mirror of world opinion in a fashion not conceivably possible outside of the U. N. Thus the U. N. can serve as the conscience for mankind when it chooses between the free world and those hostile to human freedoms, between the warlike and those who have demonstrated by the peaceful approach that their goal is international friendship among people, and that freedom to them means common freedom.

Soviet membership in the United Nations has been advantageous to the cause of peace because the peoples of the world have been able to compare the Soviet's conduct to the standards of international peace laid down in the charter and to determine that it is the Soviets who violated the basic ideals of mankind, he said.

This basic comparison has more than once enabled the free world to keep the peace where it was seriously threatened, as it did in Iran and Indonesia, Mr. Truman said; and in 1950, when the aggressor broke the peace of the world in Korea, the United Nations met the challenge and for the first time an international organization organized effective collective resistance to armed aggression.

The former President said he very much favored regional security arrangements such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, but he emphasized that they are temporary devices to deter aggressors and do not in themselves serve to secure the lasting peace.

They are necessary to national safety so long as the potential aggressor is building strength, just as are a large standing army and a stockpile of nuclear weapons.

Disarmament, as a move toward peace, has been discussed for generations, Mr. Truman said, and he would like to see it take place. If a disarmament plan is to be worked out, it will have to be through the U. N., he said, and it will have to include not only nuclear weapons, but all other weapons as well, and manpower.

AGAINST "GO IT ALONEISM"

He expressed dismay at suggestions that the United States should withdraw from the U. N. and go it alone. He described the U. N. as the "baby" of the United States and said that if the United States should leave the world body this country might just as well make up its mind to get into the third world war.

This third world war, the former President stressed, would spell the end of civilization.

Emphasizing again his convictions that permanent world peace is hinged to the free nations making friends, he said that more than half the people in the world are living in conditions approaching misery, the victims of disease and participants in an economic life which is primitive and stagnant.

It is the manner with which the free nations deal with those people as human beings, he said, whether they shall become our friends or the friends of those who are not bent on achieveing peace, as we are.

He said that for the first time in history, humanity posesses the knowledge and the skill to relieve the suffering of these people. The United States, he went on, is preeminent among the free nations in the development of industrial and scientific techniques; and while there is a limit to the material resources which we can afford to use for the assistance of other peoples, our technological knowledge and skills are vitually inexhaustible.

Mr. Truman said that he believed that the United States and the United Nations should make available to all peace-loving peoples the benefit of our store of technological knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a better life.

"We should," he said, "in cooperation with other nations, foster capital investment in these areas for their development.

"Our purpose," he continued, "should be to help the free peoples of the world, through their own efforts, to produce more clothing, more materials for housing, and more mechanical power to lighten their burden." He added that we must insist on and encourage other countries of the free world to pool their technological resources in this undertaking.

"This has to be a cooperative enterprise," he said, "in which all the free nations will work, it has to be a worldwide effort for plenty and freedom and, therefore peace.

"Business, private capital, agriculture, and labor in this country must cooperate in this program to greatly increase the industrial activity in other nations and raise substantially their standard of living," Mr. Truman said.

KEY TO PROSPERITY, PEACE

"Greater production is the key to prosperity and peace," he said, "and the key to greater production is a wider and more vigorous application of modern scientific and technological knowledge.

"These new economic developments will have to be devised and controlled to benefit the people in the areas in which they are being established," he said.

He said also that the old imperialism, which he interpreted as exploitation for foreign profits, is out of step with modern civilization. What he said he had in mind was a program of development based on the principle of fair dealing.

"Only by helping the least fortunate of its members to help themselves can the human family achieve the decent satisfying life that is the right of all people," he said.

"Peace with freedom and justice cannot be bought cheaply," Mr. Truman said. "No single nation has all the answers. It can be assured only by the combined efforts of people throughout the world who want to secure peace. They are our friends and we must keep them our friends."

We Must Change Attitude of Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the fourth in a series of articles in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, running under the general title of "The Struggle for Peace":

(By Ernest T. Weir, chairman, National Steel Corp.)

The recent developments in world affairs create a more solidly-based promise of peace and normal international relationships than anything we have had since the end of World War II.

I refer to such things as the generally favorable outcome of the Bandung Conference, the indications of a somewhat more flexible attitude on the part of Communist China, the restoration of German sovereignty, the Austrian settlement, and, finally, the agreement to hold the four-power meeting "at the summit" to examine the causes for tension between the Communists and free areas of the world and the measures which might be taken to reduce that tension.

An additional factor and one which has a bearing of utmost importance on this general situation is the great growth of confidence, economic progress, and political independence in all the nations of Western Europe.

This is a moment of opportunity which should be exploited to the full. Things have been happening which would have been considered highly improbable a short time ago. I believe that now the western nations, and particularly the United States, should lay aside attitudes of suspicion and distrust. They should not prejudge Russia's new position as a false front assumed for tactical or propaganda advantage and, on that basis, enter discussions halfheartedly in the expectation that nothing worthwhile will come of them.

Instead, they should proceed on the premise that Russia now wants peace and more stable international relations and continue to do so unless and until there is irrefutable evidence to the contrary. This attitude should include readiness on our part to do everything reasonable, honorable, and compatible with our basic principles to come to agreement on outstanding differences.

I can see nothing to lose in such a course and a very great deal to gain. It would be tragic to miss an opportunity for peace because the alternative is not, as some may think, a permanent condition that will be neither peace nor war. The alternative is ultimate war—a war of horror beyond the capacity of our imagination.

Actually, the basic conditions of the world today are conducive to peace and not to war—hot or cold. For some years, a great tide of popular sentiment for peace has been building up throughout the world despite contrary and unresponsive conduct on the part of governments. This sentiment can be ignored no longer. I was in Europe 2 years ago when Winston Churchill made his first proposal for a meeting of the heads of the four principal nations and observed the enormous enthusiasm with which that proposal was received. The popular pressure for peace has continued to mount in the meantime and it is because of it, in my opinion, that the meeting at the summit is finally being held.

THREE FUNDAMENTAL FACTS

The existence of a true basis for peace is due to three great fundamental facts which far overbalance the opposite pull toward war that is set up by the differences between governments and ideological differences between the Communist and free worlds. They are:

1. The active hatred and fear of war that is shared generally by the rank-and-file peoples of all countries. At no time in history have there been so many individuals who know the real meaning of war from bitter, firsthand experience. They shrink from the thought of another even more terrible war. We know this is true throughout the free world. We have evidence that it is also true in the Communist world. Visitors behind the Iron Curtain report that the word they hear most frequently and on all sides is peace. It comes not just from government leaders but from ordinary persons of all kinds under circumstances which reveal it as a genuine sentiment and not the parroting of propaganda.

2. In all nations there is an urgent demand on the part of rank and file people for better living conditions than they have had in the past and have now. They know this goal can be attained only with peace; that cold war postpones realization indefinitely; that actual war will not only destroy all hope of betterment but result in much lower standards of living.

3. No nation has ever started a war unless its leaders felt sure of victory and also felt sure that the fruits of victory would be of great material benefit to themselves and far outweigh the costs of war. At no time could the leaders of any nation feel less sure of victory than they can today or feel more sure that the cost of victory would be so high as to render it worthless and, in fact, would mean their own destruction.

These three factors combine into a powerful and universal deterrent to war and establish the foundation for the building of genuine peace.

SUPPORT OF PEOPLE NEEDED

It may be contended that they are not a restraining influence on the governments of Communist countries, and particularly Russia—that the peoples of those countries are entirely devoid of influence and respond like automatons to the commands of their leaders. Against this widely held belief is the fact that a Communist government never undertakes any major move without careful preparation of its public. And, certainly, it is fundamental that no country, regardless of its form of government, could wage war successfully without the sanction and support of its people.

According to competent observers, there is no public support for war in the Communist world. They report that the peoples of Russia and the satellites are now so definitely peace-minded that nothing short of conviction that their countries were to be attacked would develop a war spirit.

We may be sure that the Communist leaders know the real sentiment of their people better than we do and the limitations that sentiment places on aggressive action. They know that there is a substantial, if submerged, opposition to Communist control in the satellite countries which would make them most uncertain allies in the event of war. They are also as fully aware as we are of the consequences of nuclear war. In addition, there can be no doubt that they have exceedingly difficult internal economic conditions. For these reasons, among others, it is logical to assume that peace would serve the interests of the Communist countries much better than continuance of the present tension, with its continuing danger of war. In any event, Russia has recently been acting as though that were the case.

The big question is how should the United States respond to the new Russian position?

It is obvious that even if Russia is willing to aid in the establishment of world peace, that peace can be made only with the collaboration of the United States. And if peace is to be achieved it must be approached with a different attitude and methods on the part of the United States as well as Russia.

The dominant theme of our international policy in most of the past 10 years has been fixed hostility to Russia. Influential persons in and out of our Government have hammered on this theme incessantly. They say Russia's ultimate goal is world domination and the universal imposition of the Communist system, to be won without war if possible but with war if necessary. For this reason, they argue, it is impossible to negotiate, agree, or compromise with Russia—that our only possible course is to develop and maintain sufficient military strength to discourage or repulse Russian expansion and aggression.

SHOWDOWN IMPLIED

If we are honest we must admit that this has been the sum and substance of United States policy. It is policy which states, in effect, that the systems of the United States and Russia "cannot exist together in the same world and that one or the other must finally prevail." The implication is that at some point there must be a showdown. That, of course, means eventual war.

It is significant that there is not a single other nation in the world that has this viewpoint on Russia and communism. Our principal allies, England and France, definitely disagree with it and ascribe to it, as well as to Russia's conduct, partial responsibility for the continunce of international tension and the danger of the war nobody wants.

Would it not be wise for us carefully to appraise these views of other countries? In my opinion, it is both wise and necessary. The one thing that would most certainly give the Communist world the relative strength of position which the United States fears would be disunity between the United States and its allies—and the one thing which will create that disunity is persistence of the United States policy of non-dealing with Russia advocated by so many influential but short-sighted Americans.

NEW CONFIDENCE IN EUROPE

Western Europe has made a remarkable recovery from the war, particularly in the past 2 years. With it has come a new spirit of confidence and independence. Europe stands solidly with the United States on basic aims but it will not blindly follow our country in methods it considers both wrong and dangerous. In European countries, leaders and people see no necessity for a showdown war. They believe thoroughly that through negotiation and better understanding all around, tension can be eased and a start made toward normal international relations.

They want to move from the environment of the battlefield to that of the conference table. Unless the United States joins in the effort to bring that move, and not with tongue in cheek but sincerely, I am positive that there will be a growing disaffection between our country and the countries of Western Europe.

What then should we do? First, I believe we should change from an attitude of conflict to attitude of civility. We should accept any Russian overtures toward peace at face value for the purpose of examination and consideration. The United States and other Western nations should make overtures of their own. Our leaders in Government should establish the tone of the new attitude by using restraint in all official and unofficial statements on international matters, avoiding expressions of suspicion, distrust, and hostility which have been all too frequent in the past.

We should wage peace as we would wage war. This means that we should not expect peace to be delivered overnight in one neatly wrapped package but pursue peace persistently over a period of years if that should be necessary. We should be prepared for setbacks and disappointments. But we should refuse to accept failure as permanent and maintain a continuous pressure for settlement of issues through negotiation.

We should take for granted that there will be some basic positions on which compromise will be presently impossible for either side. We should devise a way to live with them without fighting about them and continue to work toward eventual solution.

We should realize that peoples of other countries, with their different histories, experience, customs, and traditions, are not always able to see things in our light any more than we can always see things in their light. The Bandung Conference revealed with something of a shock to many that even the nations most friendly to us were not in accord with United States thinking in many respects. We should work much harder in the future to obtain a better understanding of ourselves.

We should accept the fact that the Governments of Russia, China, and other countries are Communists just as we accept Yugoslavia as a Communist country and Spain and Argentina as Fascist countries.

The form of government of other countries cannot properly be a moral issue with us. We should follow the precept of our history and leave determination of the forms of government to the peoples directly involved. This applies particularly, in my opinion, to China. We do not like its Communist government, nor its attitude nor methods. Nevertheless it is the de facto government and is in full control of an enormous land area with a population of more than 600 million people.

Our present position with regard to China is one that is supported by no other nation and one which maintains a constant risk of a war which could expand into world war III. Our position is unrealistic. If the present government retains control of China, and there are no present signs it will not, we will have to deal with it eventually for the simple reason that China is too big a country to be ignored permanently.

In short, I believe we should substantially modify our national attitude on world problems, take a more flexible position with regard to them and, specifically, shift emphasis from military strength to negotiation for achievement of our objectives in international relations.

Many persons, of course, object to any negotiations with Russia on the ground that they will merely repeat Yalta and Potsdam—that Russia will outsmart our representatives and, in any event, keep or break agreements as it suits her convenience. I, for one, do not share this fear. The representatives of the western nations have learned much from the hard experience of the past 10 years as was shown in the Austrian negotiation. I am confident that they know the difference between compromise and appeasement; that there will be no concessions without adequate return, and that agreements will be protected with provisions to assure performance.

The most constructive effect of negotiations, at least initially, would not be so much their practical results which probably would concern secondary matters. It would be the intangible but very real contribution they would make to the development of a new world climate. Little by little there could be an abatement of hostility and tension until once again the world would feel that it was breathing the air of peace it has not known in more than 40 years.

As negotiations progressed, I believe an earnest effort should be made to reestablish the former patterns of trade between countries not only because of its economic benefit but also because trade in itself is a strong generator of peace through the interdependence it creates and the natural interrelations it brings about between peoples of different nations who are thus able to know and deal with each other as normal human beings rather than as men in uniform.

If the threat of war can be removed, the hostility between Russia and the United States may be watered down into a peaceful competition between radically different political, economic, and social systems. For my part, I have no doubt whatsoever about the eventual outcome of such a competition. I feel perfectly confident of our ability to demonstrate to the world that ours is the better way.

Our choice in this whole situation is not a choice of dealing or not dealing with Russia and the other Communist governments—as so many Americans seem to think. We cannot wish them out of existence. They are in the world and are likely to remain in it as powerful influences for a long time to come. We must deal with them in one way or another. The only true choice is whether to deal with them with the instruments of war or the instruments of peace.

If we choose instruments of war, ultimately we will have war—the most terrible and devastating war in all history. If we choose the instruments of peace and through them actually achieve peace, I am confident we will enter an era of worldwide progress and well being that will far surpass anything we have known in the past. Certainly, with these as the alternatives and considering the basic and enormous importance of their meaning to every human being everywhere in the world, the total power and influence of our great United States must be thrown into the balance on the side of peace.

Learn About Other Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the fifth in a series of articles in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, running under the general title, "The Struggle for Peace":

(By the Right Reverend Henry Knox Sherrill, presiding bishop, Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States)

The present situation is complex and confusing. As a result of the experience of two world wars plus Korea, in addition to the unquestioned power of the hydrogen bomb, it is certain that no sane person would wish for war, for there can be no victor—only destruction, tragedy and loss for all. The great mass of our people, though often inarticulate, are one in their conviction on this point. However, despite this universal fear and hatred of war, we hear daily the constant talk of war, comparison of our military strength with that of potential enemies—sometimes optimistic, again pessimistic, depending upon the person and the circumstances—threats of retaliation, massive and otherwise, and advice as to what to do if an enemy attack comes.

I am of the opinion that as a result we have greater emphasis in addresses, articles, and interviews upon military action and its

results than upon the building of a world at peace. Because of this, in the eyes of many neutrals we have allowed others who have aggressive aims to preempt the word peace.

The question in the light of these factors is raised: "Is there danger that we drift into war?"

The answer must be that of course there is real danger. I am not a pacifist and believe that our strength is essential in keeping the peace. I think that, of course, we must prepare for possible catastrophe in case of an attack upon us. But these are negative factors. Military strength and civilian defense by themselves are not the ingredients of which to build a more stable social order.

NEGATIVE TALK UNDERSTANDABLE

Much of this negative talk is understandable. Those who have the responsibility for specific tasks inevitably stress their own needs, and view with alarm or point with pride. Politics, of course, play a part. Not all men in public life are either wise or restrained. There is always a temptation to seize the headlines, and, unfortunately, talk of war accomplishes this more readily than long-range programs for peace. Such preoccupation with war could allow us to drift into war, for such, without exception, is the lesson of history. But if we drift into war—with emphasis upon drift—it will be because of deeper reasons. In time there is a vast reservoir of popular common sense which debunks demagogues and self-seeking and correctly evalutes the narrow viewpoint of some technical experts.

In this comment I wish to discuss some of these deeper reasons, rather than to argue political concerns or the most immediate decisions before us.

As a people we are vulnerable to a war drift because of historical factors. We are a young Nation and have not had the experience of many centuries as compared with many other nations. We are therefore impatient and expect immediate and favorable results. For example, much of the discussion as to the situation in China ignores the fact that we are in the process of a transition period, an era of tremendous upheaval. To understand this requires a knowledge of the history, the outlook of Asian, as well as European peoples. To pinpoint the responsibility for these conditions as well as to expect a quick solution in accordance with our desires are impossibilities. It is well for us to recognize the magnitude of events. Patience is demanded.

We are a people who have been spared the threat of invasion because of our geographical position. Until recently there has been much talk of our impregnable fortress, with the advice that all we need to do is to tend our own business. It has been difficult for us to realize that whether we like it or not we are a part of the world. With the advent of the airplane, the guided missile, the bomb, we face for us a new and frightening situation to which other nations have long been accustomed. For the first time since the early years of our history we find ourselves vulnerable to attack. It is no wonder that there has been in the light of these factors a certain amount of fear, nerves, and confusion.

PROUD AND BRASH

We are a people who, being young, have had characteristics of pride and braggadocio. We were convinced for many years that any American could thrash 4 or 5 of any other nation. To learn that this is not necessarily so has been a shock and a cause for apprehension. The threat of communism has driven us further in this direction. We feel that we must exalt ourselves, our way of life. We have lost the values of self-criticism, which often is confused with disloyalty. This fact is an evidence of uncertainty rather than an assurance of strength.

Lastly we lean to an absolutism which breeds extreme positions which are unrealistic and untenable. The stock in trade of political parties is to claim all correctness and virtue for themselves and to blame all failures upon the stupidities, even the evil intentions of opponents. It would be a corrective, though a painful one, to read all campaign speeches 2 years afterward, to realize the danger of the partial truth and of partisan bias.

The truth is that all of those with the responsibility of governmental decisions are caught in the net of a complex and unprecedented world situation. There are no easy solutions and panaceas. The political outs soon learn this when they have the responsibility of the ins, and this factor is soon forgotten by the onetime ins, when they in turn are out. But the great danger is that the majority of our people demands the impossible. When this is not forthcoming confidence turns to disillusionment and hope to despair.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

These are some of our national characteristics which make possible a drift toward war despite our universal opposition to such a course. What we must do is to develop our deepest resources of mind, of heart, and of soul. We possess these in abundant, if not exclusive, measure. Many times we present ourselves in an unfavorable light and one not true to the facts. We are not a materialistic people though we often seem to be so. We do not believe in threats, and saber rattling to achieve desirable goals, though we often appear to do so. In reality we long for peace, and we must beware of opinions and actions which tend to disprove these facts. What then can we do positively to halt any drift toward war?

We can all of us make a sincere and earnest effort to find the truth in any situation. Too many of us are more anxious to find support for our own preconceived prejudices and partisan views than to know the facts. The present situation is no political game in which we are participating but a matter of life and death, even survival.

We can by reading, study and sometimes by personal association learn more of the background and point of view of other peoples. Because those of other nations do not speak our language, or follow our customs, or agree with all our opinions does not mean that they are ignorant or necessarily mistaken. There is much for us to learn from others as we have a great deal to give. We must never forget the individual. Speaking in condescension of hordes of Asians condemning other peoples en masse is not the way to build a stable social order. We must realize that nations are made up of men, women, boys, and girls with the same problems, longings, aspirations as ourselves.

We must be willing to confer with those who differ from us. We are faced today with the stern reality that there are millions upon millions of those who are fearful of us and of our power. What are the possibilites? To conquer them by force is an impossibility, is against our principles and could lead only to ultimate world destruction.

Somehow we must live with and improve the situation. To withdraw within ourselves is to lose touch with reality. To be unwilling to confer is to indicate fear of our ability to do so successfully, is an indication of weakness rather than of strength and loses an opportunity to impress countless millions throughout the world with our sincere desire to achieve a world at peace.

We talk much of our Christianity but we must have a deeper understanding and practice of the religion we profess. There is a universalism characteristic of Christianity. All nations and individuals stand in judgment before God, including our own. We believe in our way of life but we dare not wrap ourselves in a mantle of perfection and of self-righteousness. The notes of a Christian nation are not power and self-esteem but understanding and service.

These thoughts are not new. They are held by many of us when we are at our best. It is our task to put our ideals into action. Too often we allow the exponents of other viewpoints to exert pressure upon our officials, while we remain silent. To prevent a drift toward war demands reasonableness, farsightedness and compassion. Such qualities do not mean appeasement, retreat, or cowardice. They are manifestations of strength—physical, moral, or spiritual. This is the ministry to which God calls us and all peoples.

Let's End Colonialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the sixth in a series of articles in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, running under the general title of "The Struggle for Peace":

(By George N. Shuster, president, Hunter College, New York)

What can be done in Europe to substitute political agreement between East and West for both appeasement and the cold war? The question can be discussed with reasonable intelligence only if one bears in mind that Western Europe is an area in which we are relatively strong, while the Far East is a region in which we are relatively weak.

It would, therefore, be foolhardy to surrender assets we possess in the West unless compensatory advantages could be gained elsewhere. Nevertheless, there may be ways in which we could agree to an accretion in our favor of one kind of power in Europe in exchange for some sacrifice of another kind of power. In other words, it may not be wholly unrealistic to suppose that the development of a free and stable European society might be linked with a measure of disarmament.

I have said, "not wholly unrealistic." The stakes are the greatest in history and cannot be played for in a frivolous mood. We have suffered so gravely from romantic sentimentalism in the conduct of foreign affairs that any further softening of such diplomatic brains as we possess might well be fatal.

SUPPORT FOR RUSSIA

As the summer of 1945 dawned, the facts were these. Russia, which had been the victim of aggression by a brutal power and had fought stubbornly and long, could count on formidable support in virtually every part of Europe. Part of this was attributable to the popular assumption that, victory having been gained, the United States would withdraw from the continent as it had after 1918. Thus, there would be no power available which could resist Russian arms; and in addition there existed a widespread feeling that Stalin was committed to peace, freedom, and progress.

Mayor Reuter, of Berlin, was wont to say that if the Russians had entered his country offering good will and earnest support of democratic institutions, nothing could have prevented the whole of Western Europe from accepting their leadership and rendering at least lip service to their ideology. The evi-

dence in favor of this contention is convincing. This opportunity the Russians lost, and by the time of the Berlin blockade of 1948 it was irretrievably gone.

More important still, the United States did not leave Europe. Instead, during the summer of 1950, acting under the impact of events in Korea, President Truman made the momentous decision to defend the eastern boundaries of the West German Federal Republic, and thus to back up the change of heart which had taken place in Europe with the full might of American military power.

What has happened since—the creation of NATO and the planning for a new German Army, for example—is only the logical outcome of that brilliant and timely decision. In 10 years, therefore, the situation has changed so radically that if we could see it in the right perspective we should undoubtedly consider it as incredible a feat as any in history. It is, of course, true that the Russians can still muster not a little support in Western Europe. But the strength of the Communist movement has been sapped and this the Kremlin assuredly knows.

Yet a great Nation like ours, mindful of the well-being of its own people and that of all free mankind, cannot assume that a decision very wisely taken in 1950 will continue to be immutably right for all time to come. Nothing is more disadvantageous in diplomacy than nailing flags to the masts of obsolete ships.

Only two basic principles apply in the conduct of international relations. The development of Federal and legal international institutions is the ideal to be sought. Short of that, a balance of power must remain the sole guaranty of peace. To bind oneself to any other concept, the value of which must in the very nature of things remain transitory, is to lose all elasticity as surely as a baseball team which tries only for home runs loses it. Fortunately, it now appears that the tendency so to bind the United States for domestic political reasons has been halted, and the benefits of the resulting freedom are already obvious.

DECISION OF 1950

Let us look at the decision of 1950 in the light of present-day conditions and objectives. As has been noted, the Russians have lost the struggle for Western Europe, in terms of propaganda and intimidation alike. There is also good ground for believing that the 10 years since the war have not brought about the subjugation of Eastern Europe to the extent for which the masters of communism had hoped. Meanwhile, another factor of incalculable importance has appeared, namely the necessity for the industrialization of China, which must be pressed if the Red regime there is to maintain itself in power.

The potential drain on the Russian economy which this demand for machines and technical assistance represents is not something Western experts are able to determine precisely, but there is ample reason to assume that it will be extremely formidable, if not impossible to offset. Accordingly, it is at least conceivable that the Kremlin may prefer to feed a bird well in hand to fussing around with others which remain very decidedly in their bushes.

In short, the time may be near at hand when some kind of overall European settlement can at least be proposed. None of us knows, of course, whether it actually is at hand. But certainly the almost dramatic readiness to withdraw from Austria, which the Russians have recently shown, cannot be written off merely as an awkward maneuver to prevent the rearmament of Western Germany.

We may then ask—what sort of European settlement would safeguard the interests of the United States and of the free world?

Assuredly such an agreement would not be one which merely assented to the neutralization of Germany in exchange for the union of the Federal Republic with the Russian occupied zone. To indorse that would simply mean that we were surrendering most of the good fruits of the decision of 1950. On the one hand it would reduce to virtual meaninglessness strategic plans for the defense of the Continent. On the other hand, it would to all intents and purposes isolate Germany from the European community and subject its economy to very grave strains simply by reason of a diminution of American interest.

Conversely, desirable though it undoubtedly would be from every humane point of view, a proposal to withdraw all American troops and installations from the continent in exchange for a Russian agreement to reestablish the prewar boundaries, thus liberating the Baltic States and Eastern Poland, would undoubtedly remain on paper. One is inclined to believe, however, that some such bold suggestion might well be advanced by the United States, on the basis of treaties entered into and since violated, for the sake of the moral and in part possibly practical effect it might have. If in this manner the liberation of Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland could at least be placed on the agenda of international discussion, a new and momentous political objective would be indicated.

I believe that such an action might well be correlated with another, which at first sight may appear to be remote but which has long since been a topic of conversation among thoughtful men in Europe. Africa has emerged as the "Continent of Destiny" for the Old World. It has the people and the raw natural resources out of which the great counterforce to China can be created. The cultural lag is of course far greater, but the latent wealth is by comparison almost unlimited. Why should not the United States propose, after careful diplomatic preparation, a conference with its allies to map out a 10-year plan for the elimination of colonialism and the building of a cooperative African-Western World economy? From such a conference no European nation, including Italy and Germany, should be excluded.

The Germans have refused, no doubt wisely, to be drawn into an agreement with the French to participate in the development on a colonial basis of northern Africa. But I am sure they would find it greatly to their advantage to share in such a plan as is here suggested. The impact of it on all the dependent peoples of the world would be tremendous. And the moral dignity which would thus be conferred on the concept of a united Europe might well determine the course of history for a century.

Certainly no harm can come from thinking boldly and in world-wide terms. If we let ourselves get bogged down in compulsory discussions of German reunification or of Vietnam we shall keep on playing the lamentable role of somebody attending a party who would rather not have been invited. Meanwhile, however, it is well to bear in mind what we can and cannot accept within the narrow framework of a discussion about Europe. Here the German situation is of crucial importance.

THE GERMAN PROBLEM

Very many people feel that if we could settle for German reunification, at whatever cost in terms of European strength, it would constitute a major victory. But this is not at all the case. Suppose we look at two aspects of the problem only. First, the East German state, under Russian tutelage, has built up a fairly powerful army. It is true that this is probably not characterized by fanatical adherence to the regime. But it is made up of former soldiers, many of them ex-Nazis, who have been drawing their salaries and making the most of their uniforms. In short, they are professional troopers.

Even if they were neutralized and returned to civilian life, they would constitute a perennial threat to a West German state no longer protected by American troops. For this reason if for no other, the Bonn republic should have time to build up a pro-democratic army before reunification as an isolated issue gains our assent. It would require some effort, no doubt, to explain all this to the Germans, because the yearning for unification is for various reasons strong. Yet I have no doubt that if the effort were made it would succeed.

ARMAMENT CONVENTION

Secondly, we must always bear in mind that the German people remain in a unique way dependent on the prosperity of their economy because they cannot eat unless their food requirements are met from outside the country. So far the presence of American troops on German soil has created a favorable dollar balance. But if we were to withdraw at the same time that the subsistence-level economy of the eastern provinces was added to the unaided German economy as a whole, a crisis would undoubtedly occur, the outcome of which no man can predict.

To be sure, an overall European settlement would require not merely the withdrawal of American and Russian troops but also an armament convention that would preclude the possibility of aggression from within Western Europe. But though this would be difficult to accomplish it is not impossible. I therefore conclude by repeating what was said at the beginning of these remarks. For better or for worse, we live in one world. The Communists would like to have us think of each part of it separately. To some extent they have compelled us to do so. Perhaps the time has come to steal a little of their thunder and offer a blueprint for the next decades of human history that would be so simple, sensible, and enticing that nothing the Kremlin could devise would seem at all comparable in value and in promise.

Toward Total Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the seventh of a series of articles in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, running under the general title "The Struggle for Peace":

(By Thomas B. Sherman, a staff correspondent of the Post-Dispatch)

Total disarmament should be the goal of all peoples and all nations, said Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt in an interview given to the Post-Dispatch, and it would cause a great upsurge of hope in the world if President Eisenhower would propose it in just such terms. Meanwhile she subscribes, without reservation, to the disarmament program advanced by the Western nations which calls for a "balanced reduction" in military personnel and all type of weapons, including conventional weapons, after an effective system of inspection has been adopted.

All thinking about disarmament, she said, of about peace and war in general, should start with the assumption that nuclear weapons would certainly be used in another war. To believe anything else is to be guided by a delusion, a dangerous course in any situation and a disastrous one in the present state of world affairs.

Since war means destruction on a scale unprecedented in the history of the world its alternatives should be examined with as much freedom from instinctive prejudices as possible. Though the desirability of inspection, with controls, was one of the conditions of the Baruch plan for nuclear disarmament and though it was freely discussed at the London Disarmament Conference, many persons doubt that it would be accepted either by Russia or the United States.

Mrs. Roosevelt admits that "inspection" would be a psychological stumbling block to many people, as it has been in disarmament negotiations.

"But it must be worked out," she said, "if we are to have a begining of disarmament. It would be ruinous for any nation to disarm if it were protected only by a paper agreement. Inspection is logical and essential and it must be directed by the United Nations. No multilateral agreement would set at rest the general fear of an atom war.

"The adoption of an adequate means of inspection, affording reasonable guarantees that disarmament promises will be kept by all nations, necessarily means that each of them must relinquish some degree of sovereignty so that impartial surveys can be made by members of a truly international enforcement agency.

"I have been asked if either the Russian people or the American people will ever tolerate a system of controls whereby foreigners will be permitted to pry into factories, mining operations, military installations, and the like. The answer simply is that they must do so or spend their lives in fear of extermination. Nuclear weapons are considered decisive weapons."

As for the general policy toward Russia Mrs. Roosevelt said that it should be so broad and flexible as always to keep channels open for negotiating disputes as they arise between the free world and the Communist nations.

"The posture of the United States toward Russia is understandably wary," she said, "but regardless of our suspicions we cannot allow the impression to get abroad that we have renounced every solution of our differences with the Communist countries except a violent one."

A willingness at least to negotiate is not only appropriate to a nation with peaceful and constructive intentions, she said, but is also necessary for a clearer and closer understanding of Communist intentions. Moreover recent events have proved that negotiations could bring constructive results. That was made evident, she pointed out, in the long-frustrated but never abandoned United Nations disarmament talks in which some seemingly unbridgable gaps have been narrowed.

Though Mrs. Roosevelt favored a give-and-take policy, she added that "we must always be alert to the danger of giving in a degree that will encourage totalitarian ambitions."

"By the same token, some concessions can be made which may enable us to achieve peace without surrender of safety or democratic principles," she said. "Just what can be conceded and precisely where the line of no retreat is to be drawn is naturally subject to what the Russians are after in each given instance. This can be determined only through negotiations."

Mrs. Roosevelt agreed with opinions expressed elsewhere that Moscow's approval of the Austrian peace treaty was seemingly designed to prevent or at least minimize the rearmament of Germany and to bring about a reunified and neutralized Germany. It must be assumed, she added, that the Kremlin would attempt to create a "New Germany" in its own image.

"Only negotiations will disclose if that is the inflexible aim of the Kremlin," she continued. "In some parts of the world the acceptance of the Austrian peace treaty indicates a genuine desire for compromise in the interest of international stability. Elsewhere, it is viewed as a tactical move toward the Communist goal of European domination.

"Before we decide which of the two is more likely we must know the full Russian offer. If Russia proposes to evacuate Eastern Germany in the supposed interest of a unified Germany, will it also agree to withdraw genuinely and completely from several of the satellite states? Such proposals must be examined thoroughly before they are even interpreted.

"This does not mean that the political initiative must remain with the Soviet leaders. If we have a completely clear policy, with enough elasticity to prevent Soviet coups and enough firmness and confidence to advance proposals conforming to our aspirations, the West can attack at the council table as well as defend."

If negotiations resulted in a liberated East Germany, Mrs. Roosevelt thought that free elections should be held and freedom assured East Germans by the supervision of a United Nations commission. West Germany should remain in NATO as long as it was armed. She also thought it might be possible to create a neutralized area between East and West if Germany continued divided.

As to the Communisth threat in Asia and the danger that Red China might invade Formosa, Mrs. Roosevelt agreed that negotiations with Peiping must be preceded by a withdrawal of Red Chinese troops from Korea, Indochina, and other spots where they are fomenting war. Another condition must be the release, by Peiping, of the American flyers now being held as hostages, she declared.

"If those conditions are met," Mrs. Roosevelt continued, "certainly then, I think, we should enter negotiations, through the United Nations, with the Peiping government, to find out definitely what are its aims.

"As of now, Red Chinese motives are certainly not clear. We do not know, for instance, whether Mao Tse-tung is purposely trying to make China a satellite of Russia or not. So again we cannot determine what concessions we might willingly make to Mao until we know what he wants. Perhaps some solutions may be found in expanded trade if it were preceded by assurances of peaceful intentions. Another factor that might figure in an understanding would be Red China's admission to the United Nations.

"As for the Formosan problem we should not agree to any definite settlement of its future without a plebiscite, conducted, of course, by the United Nations. The people of Formosa should have a voice in determining their own sovereignty. As an alternative course Formosa should be placed under a United Nations protectorate or mandate. Even though both Mao and Chiang Kai-shek have said they would not accept such a solution, an approach to it may be found if it is considered in connection with other Asian disputes."

Mrs. Roosevelt said she was convinced that the Bandung conference, which showed that the large majority of Asian nations were cold to communism or opposed to it, had had a salutary effect in Peiping.

"Perhaps Peiping would now like to create warmer relations with the West," she said, "as a protection against the possibility of becoming more dependent on Moscow. But we cannot know this unless negotiations are conducted."

Mrs. Roosevelt speaks from a long experience with international affairs. That she was an unofficial aid to her husband during the Franklin D. Roosevelt regime was no secret; and she subsequently served as a member of the United States mission to the United Nations. Out of this experience she concludes that events are favorable to the making of progress toward peace and disarmament within the next 10 years. Such progress, however, would not mean a wholly pacified world; and the United States could still not afford to lower its defense against economic and ideological attacks.

Father's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, with pardonable pride, I take the floor of the House as Father's Day approaches this year, in support of a joint resolution asking our President to set aside a day as an official tribute to the millions of fathers in America.

This day should stand as a symbol of the important role of the head of the family, not just on Father's Day, but every day throughout the year.

It has often been said that the home is where democracy begins. This is true because the home is not a place where democracy is merely talked about. It is not a mere word. It is a way of life that is practiced day in and day out. If every member of the family is treated with respect and love; if every member of the family honors his responsibilities, shares the burdens as well as the pleasures of family life, then we have built a group of citizens who will have respect for the rights of others and will approach their responsibilities toward their fellow citizens and their obligations in a democratic society with a cooperative spirit and a willing hand.

Since children look to their father as an example for their conduct and a guide to follow over the rough road of growing up, it is his responsibility to set a standard of conduct in his relations with the family that will be worthy of emulation. Fatherhood is the highest fiduciary relationship. It demands that he set aside the time and develop the patience that will make him the kind of father that is always available when his children have a problem, when they feel the need to talk over some little difficulty—no matter how small this problem may be. A small problem to an adult mind may be a huge burden in the mind of a child. It is the father's heavy obligation to be available to help resolve this problem.

When I read the tragic stories that appear daily in our newspapers of delinquent juveniles I often think to myself, how different this story might have been if there had been an understanding heart and a guiding hand when the early signs of that child's frustration, hostility, and insecurity first became

evident in his belligerent or perhaps withdrawn conduct.

A child does not turn into a juvenile delinquent overnight. There are many danger signs to the observant father. But the danger signs will go unheeded unless that father is an astute and sensitive observer. So many of us in the hustle and hurry of modern living attempt to compensate for our failure to provide time, companionship, and society by giving our children material gifts and a questionable higher standard of living.

It is almost impossible for a loving father who spends time with his youngsters, who plays with them, who discusses their school problems, their friends, and their daily experiences with them, to fail to observe that something is troubling a child. If his attitude toward his schoolwork, toward his brothers and sisters is an unhealthy one, this is the time to set the course straight again. When the problem is just developing, the solution is fairly obvious and quickly achieved.

Family life is actually the child's first experience in group living, in learning the joys that come from working together as a team, in experiencing the rare pleasure that comes from understanding that it is truly better to give than to receive. Family life is the child's first contact with discipline. It is where he begins to appreciate and understand that you learn to rule by being ruled.

Under the guiding hand of the father and mother working together as a parent team, the child comes face to face with what is expected of him in his relations with the other members of the family and society. Here the child will acquire the spiritual values which will develop into his philosophy of life.

The father's role is not an easy one. With 10½ million married women employed in the new social structure, the amount of time available for supervision and rearing of children of necessity has become limited in a number of homes. Many additional chores of family upbringing have now in the new order fallen to him.

While his obligations to his family are heavy, the reward are rich indeed. The father who has fulfilled his responsibilities as a loving and understanding parent is truly helping to build a mature and worthwhile adult. He has helped to build a family relationship that is a full and rewarding experience for every member of the family and is the bulwark of a democratic society. He has respected the individuality of every member of that family unit so that together they are a team, and individually they will become democratic adults who can face any decision, or challenge that life will present to them.

For all of these sacrifices fathers make in giving their children emotional security, spiritual guidance, compassion, and understanding of their fellowmen, I propose that we set aside the third Sunday in June of each year as a justly earned tribute to the Nation's fathers.

Tabulation of Postwar Aid Rendered Other Countries by the United States, Status as of December 31, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to offer for the RECORD a tabulation of postwar aid rendered to other countries by the United States starting July 1, 1945, and ending on December 31, 1954. The information I am submitting has been prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Mr. Hermann Ficker, of the International Finance and Trade, Economics Division of the Library of Congress has again rendered an invaluable service to the Congress of the United States by preparing this material. I am indebted to him.

I call attention to the fact that the United States has extended almost $100 billion in military, economic, and technical assistance to foreign countries during the period July 1, 1940, through December 31, 1954. A breakdown of these figures is clearly set forth hereafter.

The first section sets forth a summary of foreign grants and credits for the postwar period beginning July 1, 1945. Table I covers foreign grants in the postwar period; table II, foreign grants by country and program; table III shows foreign credits utilized by program; table IV, foreign credits utilized by country; table V, foreign loans and other credits. This last table shows the net authorizations, utilizations, repayments, and balances outstanding on December 31, 1954.

TABULATION OF POSTWAR AID RENDERED OTHER COUNTRIES BY THE UNITED STATES—STATUS AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1954

War period July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1945; postwar period July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1954.

The United States has extended $98,221 million in military, economic, and technical assistance to foreign countries during the period July 1, 1940, through December 31, 1954. Disbursements comprised $49,223 million during the war years and $48,998 million since July 1, 1945.

Our capital investments in the International Bank ($635 million) and International Monetary Fund ($2,750 million) are not included in these totals, although they contribute additional foreign-aid measures underwritten (reclaimable) by the United States Government.

Since the end of the war the United States has disbursed foreign aid per calendar year as follows:

	Million
1946	$4,999
1947	6,221
1948	5,465
1949	6,545
1950	5,109
1951	$4,837
1952	5,006
1953	6,405
1954	4,669

When discussing the net total of foreign aid reverse grants (expended largely on behalf of United States forces overseas by foreign governments) should be acknowledged, not as an offset to the overall totals, but merely to note that other countries have tried in a reciprocal attitude to assist the United States in discharging its worldwide responsibilities.

During the war period July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1945, the United States rendered grant aid worth $48,128,297,000. During these same 5 fiscal years reverse grants amounted to $7,872,637,000.

During the postwar period July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1954, gross new grant aid amounted to $41,749,000,000. Reverse grants and returns totaled $1,467,000,000.

Grant aid is mentioned first because in general no repayment is requested except insofar as these grants may give rise to a possible reciprocal obligation to extend some aid to the United States of America or other countries to achieve common objectives.

On the other hand, credits are loans on other agreements which give rise to specific obligations for repayment. For the period July 1, 1940, through December 31, 1954, the United States of America extended net credits amounting to $16,075,528,000, of which total $15,402,972,000 have been utilized. Repayments of these utilizations have amounted to $3,622,972 so that on January 1, 1955, the total of principal still to be collected amounted to $11,780,000,000. Incidental to the repayment of principal the United States of America also collected $1,397,296,000 in interest and commissions on the loans extended.

During the last 2 calendar years reverse grants and returns were as follows:

1953	$165,972,000
1954	69,991,000

Repayments on loans during the last 2 calendar years amounted to:

1953	$479,183,000
1954	503,201,000

The question of carry-over totals often arises in discussing the totals to be added to available aid not yet shipped. On July 1, 1954, estimated aid still to be furnished from prior authorizations amounted to $12.3 billion. Most of this total has, however, already been committed in orders placed but not yet delivered. Additions provided by the 83d Congress totaled $3.6 billion as follows:

Emergency famine relief (title II, Public Law 480), $0.3 billion.

Expansion of Export-Import Bank lendings (Public Law 570), $0.5 billion.

Mutual security (Public Law 778), $2.8 billion.

Thus on July 1, 1954, the estimated availability amounted to $15.9 billion. During the last 2 quarters of 1954 utilizations amounted to $2.2 billions, so that on January 1, 1955, total availability for foreign aid amounted to $13.7 billion.

Notes: All totals are rounded so that apparent discrepancies in adidtions are due to rounding.

Sources are: Foreign Grants and Credits, Office of Business Economics, United States Department of Commerce, April 1955. Survey of Current Business, October 1954.

Summary of foreign grants and credits, by program—Postwar period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1954, calendar years 1953 and 1954

[In millions of dollars]

Program	Postwar period	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954
Gross grants	41,749	6,339	4,855
Mutual security:			
Military aid	12,075	4,231	3,169
Economic and technical aid	16,067	1,734	1,561
Civilian supplies	5,821	137	25
UNRRA, post-UNRRA and interim aid	3,443		
Lend-lease:			
Military (China)	679		
Postwar pipelines	1,227		
Greek-Turkish aid:			
Military	530		
Other	122		
Philippine rehabilitation	635		
Chinese stabilization	120		
Chinese military aid	120		
Military equipment loans	220	174	41
Other	692	62	59
Less:			
Prior grants converted to credits	2,256	1,000	
Mutual security counterpart funds:			
Military	32	8	8
Economic and technical aid	754	103	62
Reverse lend-lease	133		
Cash lend-lease settlements	120		
Return of lend-lease ships	423	53	
Return of civilian supplies	1		
Return of military equipment loans	4	3	
Net grants	38,026	5,172	4,785

Program	Postwar period	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954
New credits	11,892	712	387
Export-Import Bank	4,338	647	276
British loan	3,750		
Mutual security	1,758	54	94
Surplus property	1,487		
Lend-lease	71		
Other	488	11	17
Plus prior grants converted into credits	2,256	1,000	
Less:			
Export-Import collections	1,781	311	346
British loans collections	183	46	47
Mutual security collections	25	14	10
Surplus property collections	398	73	49
Grants converted into credits	98	17	18
Lend-lease payments	60	6	14
Other repayments	631	12	20
Net credits	10,972	1,233	−116
Net grants	38,026	5,172	4,785
Net credits	10,972	1,233	−116
Total	48,998	6,405	4,669

TABLE I.—*Foreign grants, postwar programs—Postwar period, July 1, 1945–Dec. 31, 1954, calendar years 1953, 1954*

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Postwar period	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954
Grand total	41,749,474	6,338,592	4,854,863
Mutual security	28,141,774	5,964,996	4,729,732
Military aid:			
Military supplies	11,841,714	4,140,175	3,099,925
Construction contributions	232,732	90,550	69,008
Other aid:			
General security support	15,290,544	1,581,060	1,067,765
Wheat for Pakistan	67,403	66,535	868
Famine and other relief	45,490	1,897	43,593
Direct forces support	386,799		386,799
Chinese-Korean students	7,363	448	301
International agencies			
Migrants	23,553	6,790	7,813
Multilateral technical assistance	53,451	12,792	17,133
Palestine relief	108,450	9,000	18,000
U. N. Korean Reconstruction Agency	84,276	55,750	18,526
Civilian supplies:			
Relief in Korea	409,766	127,983	21,477
Relief in liberated and occupied areas	5,276,718	8,975	3,024
Lend-lease supplies	134,444		
International agencies:			
UNRRA	2,588,659		

Program	Postwar period	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954
International agencies—Continued			
Refugees	240,766		
Children	97,231	9,814	
Post-UNRRA	298,748		
Interim aid	555,684		
Lend-lease:			
Military (China)	679,073		
Postwar pipelines	1,226,516		
Greek-Turkish aid:			
Military	530,202		
Other	122,484		
Philippine rehabilitation:			
Private claims	397,540		
Surplus property	100,000		
Reconstruction	137,035	39	55
Chinese stabilization	119,594		
Chinese military aid	119,732		
Military equipment loans	219,508	174,154	41,390
Donations of agricultural products through private relief agencies	148,031	37,460	55,901
Foot-and-mouth disease eradication	93,685	2,314	3,284
Technical assistance	51,378		
Yugoslav aid	37,560		
Aid to American Red Cross	10,435		
Berlin investment fund	12,857	12,857	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	53		

TABLE II.—*Foreign grants, by country and program—Postwar period, July 1, 1945–Dec. 31, 1954, calendar years 1953, 1954*

[In thousands of dollars]

Foreign country	Postwar period	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954
American Republics	481,940	110,613	80,332
Mutual security	330,391	107,802	76,515
Lend-lease	5,770		
Agricultural commodities	1,039	496	533
Foot-and-mouth disease eradication	93,685	2,314	3,284
Technical assistance	51,003		
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	53		
Argentina	198		
Technical assistance	193		
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	5		
Bolivia	20,852	2,511	14,424
Mutual security	17,934	2,270	14,424
Agricultural commodities	249	240	
Technical assistance	2,645		
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	25		

Foreign country	Postwar period	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954
Brazil	17,557	2,892	2,242
Mutual security	7,562	2,892	2,242
Lend-lease	3,616		
Technical assistance	6,050		
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	329		
Chile	8,439	1,581	1,116
Mutual security	3,736	1,581	1,110
Agricultural commodities	6		6
Technical assistance	4,697		
Mexico	103,685	3,007	3,965
Mutual security	21,170	693	681
Lend-lease	553		
Foot-and-mouth disease eradication	93,685	2,314	3,284
Technical assistance	7,277		

TABLE II.—*Foreign grants, by country and program—Postwar period, July 1, 1945–Dec. 31, 1954, calendar years 1953, 1954*—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Foreign country	Postwar period	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954
Nicaragua	2,436	518	624
Mutual security	2,041	518	624
Technical assistance	395		
Panama	4,145	946	1,102
Mutual security	3,518	930	1,051
Agricultural commodities	67	16	51
Technical assistance	560		
Paraguay	6,327	1,416	1,043
Mutual security	3,753	1,416	1,043
Lend-lease	2		
Technical assistance	2,571		
Peru	10,888	1,915	1,673
Mutual security	5,830	1,755	1,617
Lend-lease	237		
Agricultural commodities	216	160	55
Technical assistance	4,605		
Uruguay	1,740	219	234
Mutual security	827	219	234
Technical assistance	903		
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	10		
Venezuela	1,963	119	152
Mutual security	469	119	152
Technical assistance	1,493		
Unspecified	266,691	90,139	46,816
Mutual security	263,171	90,139	46,816
Technical assistance	3,836		
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	Cr. 316		
Colombia	4,869	1,124	1,221
Mutual security	2,631	1,124	874
Agricultural commodities	348		347
Technical assistance	1,879		
Lend-lease	11		
Costa Rica	5,407	596	781
Mutual security	3,217	596	781
Technical assistance	2,190		
Cuba	1,022	145	242
Mutual security	576	145	242
Technical assistance	446		
Dominican Republic	1,464	347	275
Mutual security	965	347	275
Technical assistance	496		
Lend-lease	3		
Ecuador	6,603	1,052	1,116
Mutual security	3,680	1,052	1,116
Technical assistance	2,923		
El Salvador	3,210	699	698
Mutual security	1,969	699	698
Technical assistance	1,242		
Guatemala	4,977	131	339
Mutual security	888	131	332
Technical assistance	2,734		
Lend-lease	1,347		
Agricultural commodities	8		8
Haiti	6,179	738	1,268
Mutual security	2,888	658	1,202
Agricultural commodities	146	80	66
Technical assistance	3,145		
Honduras	3,288	519	1,001
Mutual security	2,566	519	1,001
Technical assistance	722		
Afghanistan	1,720	187	1,228
Mutual security	1,702	187	1,228
Technical assistance	18		
Albania, UNRRA	20,444		
Austria	1,048,816	39,508	17,134
Mutual security	725,973	37,909	13,195
Urgent relief	2,052		2,052
GARIOA	89,318		
UNRRA	72,696		
Austria—Continued			
Post-UNRRA	86,055		
Interim aid	68,291		
Agricultural commodities	4,431	1,599	1,886
Belgium-Luxembourg and Congo	578,093	4,882	3,488
Mutual security	517,421	4,874	3,469
UNRRA	1,137		
Lend-lease	59,480		
Agricultural commodities	38	8	20
American Red Cross	17		
British Commonwealth	3,856,775	422,221	203,480
United Kingdom	3,656,478	301,418	163,149
Mutual security	3,306,469	301,416	163,111
UNRRA	8,369		
Lend-lease	341,462		
Agricultural commodities	130	2	38
American Red Cross	49		
Australia	12,539		
UNRRA	239		
Lend-lease	12,300		
British Guiana	23		
Mutual security	19		
Agricultural commodities	4		
British Honduras, agricultural commodities	62		16
Canada, military equipment loans	3,964		
Ceylon	55		9
Mutual security	50		
Technical assistance	5		
Federation of Malaya	59		
Mutual security	1		
Agricultural commodities	49		
Technical assistance	9		
Federation of Rhodesia, technical assistance	1		
Gold Coast, agricultural commodities	4	3	
Hong Kong	289		
Mutual security	11		
Agricultural commodities	278		
India	83,995	37,395	28,009
Mutual security	77,721	36,093	26,402
Lend-lease	3,000	1,302	
Agricultural commodities	3,254		1,607
Technical assistance	20		
Jamaica, American Red Cross	3		
Malta, agricultural commodities	205	24	51
New Zealand, lend-lease	2,300		
Nigeria	2		
Agricultural commodities	1		
Technical assistance	1		
Pakistan	96,795	83,364	11,905
Mutual security	27,866	16,205	10,180
Wheat for Pakistan	67,403	66,535	868
Urgent relief	397		397
Agricultural commodities	1,119	625	461
Technical assistance	11		
Sierra Leone, agricultural commodities	1		
Burma	20,506	5,323	1,551
Mutual security	20,501	5,323	1,551
Agricultural commodities	1		
Technical assistance	4		
China-Taiwan (Formosa)	1,898,073	91,756	89,627
Mutual security	502,622	91,109	79,119
Chinese-Korean students	7,297	433	297
UNRRA	362,897		
Post-UNRRA	43,919		
Lend-lease	729,418		
Chinese stabilization	119,594		
Chinese military aid	119,732		
Military equipment loans	9,380		9,380
Agricultural commodities	1,325	215	831
American Red Cross	1,889		
Czechoslovakia	184,079		626
Famine relief	626		626
UNRRA	183,374		
Lend-lease	2		
Agricultural commodities	2		
American Red Cross	75		

TABLE II.—*Foreign grants, by country and program—Postwar period, July 1, 1945–Dec. 31, 1954, calendar years 1953, 1954*—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Foreign country	Postwar period	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954
Denmark	247,353	9,092	1,117
Mutual security	247,349	9,092	1,117
UNRRA	4		
Egypt	7,085	2,341	3,335
Mutual security	5,713	2,141	3,071
UNRRA	342		
Agricultural commodities	1,030	200	265
Ethiopia	4,852	1,407	1,666
Mutual security	4,409	1,407	1,666
UNRRA	439		
Agricultural commodities	3		
Finland	2,054	18	
Mutual security	18	18	
UNRRA	1,840		
Agricultural commodities	32		
American Red Cross	163		
France and possessions	3,881,644	350,447	461,512
France	3,880,898	350,317	461,287
Mutual security	3,164,744	324,813	460,487
UNRRA	3,061		
Post-UNRRA	60		
Interim-Aid	311,388		
Lend-lease	372,441		
Military equipment loans	25,345	25,345	
Agricultural commodities	1,714	159	800
American Red Cross	2,146		
Algeria	107		
UNRRA	97		
American Red Cross	10		
French Morocco	444	107	171
Mutual security	5	2	1
Agricultural commodities	439	105	170
Tunisia	196	23	53
Mutual security	12	7	5
Agricultural commodities	184	16	48
Germany, East: Mutual security, relief	14,743	8,304	6,439
Federal Republic of Germany	3,734,428	74,264	72,889
Mutual security	1,473,431	48,898	59,697
GARIOA	2,205,781	203	
UNRRA	3,616		
Post-UNRRA	2,086		
Agricultural commodities	36,657	12,306	13,192
Berlin investment funds	12,857	12,857	
Greece	1,600,804	79,558	55,597
Mutual security	780,115	78,992	52,386
UNRRA	279,755		
Post-UNRRA	37,255		
Lend-lease	5,956		
Greek-Turkish aid	493,630		
Agricultural commodities	4,058	566	3,211
American Red Cross	35		
Hungary	3,825		1,466
Famine relief	1,466		1,466
UNRRA	2,359		
Iceland, mutual security	29,200	6,322	831
Indochina	127,414	32,191	57,999
Cambodia, mutual security	12		12
Laos, mutual security	4		4
Vietnam	29,040		29,040
Undistributed	98,359	32,191	28,944
Mutual security	97,729	32,159	28,347
Agricultural commodities	630	32	597
Indonesia	106,749	5,200	5,321
Mutual security	102,535	5,258	5,263
GARIOA	4,106		
Agricultural commodities	88	32	56
Technical assistance	20		
Iran	138,657	56,666	65,217
Mutual security	137,720	56,666	65,168
Lend-lease	750		
Agricultural commodities	147		49
Technical assistance	40		
Iraq	4,458	1,747	2,201
Mutual security	4,456	1,747	2,201
Agricultural commodities	2		

Foreign country	Postwar period	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954
Ireland	18,346	13	
Mutual security	18,324	13	
American Red Cross	22		
Israel	218,495	44,885	57,193
Mutual security	180,379	35,470	46,797
Agricultural commodities	38,116	9,415	10,397
Italy	2,468,514	144,850	110,210
Mutual security	1,488,114	138,388	88,340
Civilian supplies	244,391		
UNRRA	409,754		
Post-UNRRA	117,414		
Interim aid	176,006		
Military equipment loans	10,670		10,670
Agricultural commodities	21,975	6,462	11,200
American Red Cross	191		
Japan and possessions	2,533,239	136,598	3,766
Japan	2,314,151	127,807	617
Mutual security	24		24
GARIOA	2,184,569		
Post-UNRRA	178		
Military eqt. loans	127,469	127,469	
Agricultural commodities	1,910	338	593
Ryukyu Islands	219,076	8,791	3,148
GARIOA	218,869	8,772	3,024
Post-UNRRA	12		
Agricultural commodities	183	19	124
American Red Cross	13		
Miscellaneous Islands—GARIOA	13		
Jordan	12,796	3,940	6,800
Mutual security	11,333	3,648	5,768
Agricultural commodities	1,463	291	1,032
Korea	1,022,843	204,097	126,441
Mutual security	316,868	75,015	102,651
Civilian supplies	701,856	127,983	21,477
UNRRA	546		
Post-UNRRA	72		
Agricultural commodities	3,502	1,100	2,313
Lebanon	8,336	2,996	3,594
Mutual security	6,488	2,225	2,608
Agricultural commodities	1,847	769	986
Technical assistance	1		
Liberia	4,542	1,407	1,293
Mutual security	4,372	1,407	1,280
Agricultural commodities	37		13
Technical assistance	133		
Libya	5,924	1,403	2,679
Mutual security	5,908	1,403	2,679
Agricultural commodities	16		
Nepal, mutual security	921	278	428
Netherlands	913,278	43,716	15,644
Mutual security	825,582	22,376	15,644
UNRRA	1,899		
Lend-lease	64,334	21,340	
Military equipment loans	21,340		
Agricultural commodities	2		
American Red Cross	122		
Norway	231,924	10,199	15,047
Mutual security	230,952	10,199	15,047
UNRRA	771		
Agricultural commodities	30		
American Red Cross	171		
Palestine, agricultural commodities	175		
Philippines	734,858	27,255	14,719
Mutual security	63,969	27,168	14,547
GARIOA	28,345		
UNRRA	7,700		
Philippine rehabilitation	634,576	39	55
Agricultural commodities	202	48	117
Technical assistance	55		
American Red Cross	11		
Poland	364,978		
UNRRA	364,031		
Lend-lease	-92		
American Red Cross	855		
Portugal	14,525	108	2,948
Mutual security	14,524	108	2,948
Agricultural commodities	1		

TABLE II.—*Foreign grants, by country and program—Postwar period, July 1, 1945–Dec. 31, 1954, calendar years 1953, 1954*—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Foreign country	Postwar period	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954
Saudi Arabia	3,903	1,170	764
Mutual security	2,290	1,170	764
Lend-lease	1,591	----	----
Technical assistance	22	----	----
Spain	14,280	1,479	12,759
Mutual security	10,272	1,479	8,793
Agricultural commodities	4,008	----	3,966
Sweden	87,135	Cr. 227	----
Mutual security	86,536	Cr. 227	----
UNRRA	549	----	----
American Red Cross	49	----	----
Switzerland, UNRRA	1,803	----	----
Syria	743	41	245
Mutual security	107	----	19
Agricultural commodities	636	41	226
Thailand	21,043	6,470	4,274
Mutual security	21,018	6,470	4,274
Agricultural commodities	1	----	----
Technical assistance	24	----	----
Trieste	47,194	525	468
Mutual security	32,046	176	37
GARIOA	3,008	----	----
Post—UNRRA	11,047	----	----
Agricultural commodities	1,093	349	430
Turkey	388,846	48,788	69,431
Mutual security	208,848	48,788	48,013
Greek-Turkish Military Aid	158,575	----	----
Turkey—Continued			
Military equitable loans	21,340	----	21,340
Agricultural commodities	83	----	78
U. S. S. R.	465,434	----	----
UNRRA	186,380	----	----
Lend-lease	277,254	----	----
American Red Cross	1,800	----	----
Yugoslavia	643,861	109,679	47,823
Mutual security	291,628	108,759	47,539
UNRRA	298,054	----	----
Lend-lease	76	----	----
Agricultural commodities	15,824	----	----
Yugoslav aid	37,560	920	284
American Red Cross	719	----	----
Trust Territory of Pacific Islands, GARIOA	4,444	----	----
International organizations:			
European Payments Union	238,084	----	----
European Productivity Agency	500	----	----
Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration	23,553	6,790	7,813
Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees	3,650	----	----
International Refugee Organization	237,116	----	----
Organization of American States	3,414	921	976
United Nations	158,486	20,871	34,158
United Nations Children's Fund	97,231	9,814	----
UNRRA	273,505	----	----
Unspecified areas:			
South Asia	14,527	----	13
Asia and Pacific	2,163,991	652,497	763,837
Europe	8,789,396	3,181,738	2,039,705
Near East and Africa	1,183,480	329,836	321,945
Other areas	336,357	44,317	56,337
Total	41,749,474	6,338,592	4,854,863

TABLE III.—*Foreign credits utilized, by program—Postwar period, July 1, 1945–Dec. 31, 1954, calendar years 1953, 1954*

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Postwar period	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954
Total	14,147,769	1,711,716	387,318
Export-Import Bank	4,338,126	647,040	276,497
British loan	3,750,000	----	----
Mutual security loans	1,758,010	53,847	93,908
Surplus property sales	1,487,251	271	----
Prior grants converted to credits	2,256,266	1,000,000	----
Lend-lease	70,572	----	----
Strategic materials development	31,758	10,559	16,914
United Nations headquarters loan	65,000	----	----
Philippine funding loans	37,498	----	----
Institute of Inter-American Affairs	32	----	----
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	70,102	----	----
Occupied areas commodity programs	229,113	----	----
Natural fibers revolving fund	54,043	----	----

TABLE IV.—*Foreign credits utilized, by country—Postwar period, July 1, 1945–Dec. 31, 1954, calendar years 1953, 1954*

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Postwar period	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954
Total	14,147,769	1,711,716	387,318
American Republics	1,167,219	399,440	114,962
Argentina	101,675	2,888	1,612
Bolivia	37,209	1,861	2,004
Brazil	507,929	337,718	53,544
Chile	121,046	4,850	2,500
Colombia	60,917	4,919	5,045
Costa Rica	85	----	----
Cuba	24,513	5,694	2,023
Ecuador	20,945	1,212	3,612
El Salvador	576	----	----
Haiti	10,075	2,484	7,020
Honduras	223	----	----
Mexico	224,621	23,630	37,230
Nicaragua	600	123	----
Panama	4,000	----	----
Paraguay	795	----	----
Peru	21,596	9,691	82
Uruguay	11,554	254	----
Venezuela	13,301	3,339	----
Unspecified	5,558	777	290
Afghanistan	21,934	3,527	1,607
Austria	30,107	3,372	1,842
Belgium	234,972	2,760	----
Luxembourg	3,000	----	----
Belgian Congo	1,550	----	----
British Commonwealth	5,366,295	59,311	64,403
United Kingdom	4,782,476	----	6,740
Australia	14,120	1,701	4,169
British East Africa	2,324	1,391	42
British Guiana	128	----	----
British Honduras	13	----	----
Canada	163,119	5,251	8,194
Federation of Rhodesia	33,335	7,337	11,713
India	234,212	----	----
Jamaica	20,930	----	----
New Zealand	4,333	----	----
Nigeria	754	400	354
Pakistan	15,136	8,442	----
Union of South Africa	95,414	34,789	33,191
Burma	5,043	----	----
China	229,357	----	----
Czechoslovakia	29,583	----	----
Denmark	54,341	----	----
Egypt	17,934	----	----
Ethiopia-Eritrea	3,399	----	----
Finland	126,102	----	----
France and possessions	2,486,864	129,148	4,470
France	2,461,977	126,282	4,470
Algeria	680	----	----
French Equatorial Africa	4,368	746	----

TABLE IV.—*Foreign credits utilized, by country—Postwar period, July 1, 1945–Dec. 31, 1954, calendar years 1953, 1954*—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Postwar period	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954
France and possessions—Continued			
French Morocco	18,338	1,440	
New Caledonia	1,501		
Germany	1,345,578	1,001,905	1,786
Greece	114,639	269	379
Hungary	15,917		
Iceland	5,659	271	
Indonesia	143,886	13,200	19,100
Iran	34,384		
Iraq	889		
Ireland	128,200		
Israel	134,817	11,982	2,770
Italy	441,478	1,498	2,661
Japan	460,506	39,950	80,169
Korea	24,928		
Lebanon	1,550		

Country	Postwar period	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954
Liberia	23,287	435	998
Netherlands	436,032		
Norway	140,604	9,875	1,109
Philippines	130,525	7,555	6,083
Poland	77,720		
Portugal	50,723	5,387	9,674
Saudi Arabia	19,112		
Spain	77,587	20,178	16,078
Sweden	24,200		
Thailand	7,255		
Turkey	128,100	761	128
U. S. S. R.	222,493		
Yugoslavia	55,900	893	
International Organizations:			
European Coal and Steel Community	59,100		59,100
United Nation's headquarters	65,000		

TABLE V.—*Foreign loans and other credits—Net authorizations, utilizations, repayments, and balances outstanding on Dec. 31, 1954—Period, July 1, 1940, through Dec. 31, 1954*

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Net authorizations	Utilizations	Repayments	Outstanding on Dec. 31, 1954
Total	16,075,528	15,402,972	3,622,972	11,780,000
American Republics	1,887,841	1,558,516	632,267	926,250
Argentina	104,585	102,065	10,795	91,270
Bolivia	42,115	41,720	7,258	34,462
Brazil	737,255	603,622	145,661	457,960
Chile	144,836	143,513	66,815	76,698
Colombia	85,212	83,353	52,125	31,228
Costa Rica	8,160	7,360	1,389	5,971
Cuba	80,168	70,192	56,169	14,023
Dominican Republic	3,284	3,000	3,000	
Ecuador	34,970	26,511	7,327	19,184
El Salvador	1,476	1,476	1,173	303
Haiti	24,891	20,395	7,059	13,336
Honduras	1,118	1,118	1,118	
Mexico	281,845	240,388	107,782	132,605
Nicaragua	5,250	5,250	4,745	505
Panama	6,488	6,488	5,275	1,213
Paraguay	13,400	6,200	5,146	1,054
Peru	128,396	21,596	3,684	17,732
Uruguay	21,813	18,640	7,395	11,245
Venezuela	18,445	18,445	12,445	6,000
Unspecified	144,135	137,002	125,541	11,461
Afghanistan	40,934	21,934		21,934
Austria	30,107	30,107	18,908	11,199
Bahrein	17,048	17,048	17,048	
Belgium-Luxembourg	239,528	239,523	85,254	154,269
Belgium	234,978	234,972	83,931	151,041
Luxembourg	3,000	3,000		3,000
Belgian Congo	1,550	1,550	1,322	228
British Commonwealth	6,076,093	5,973,756	825,494	5,148,262
United Kingdom	5,216,757	5,216,757	624,186	4,592,571
Australia	22,492	22,492	2,969	19,523
British East Africa	2,394	2,324	82	2,242
British Guiana	128	128		128
British Honduras	482	482	482	
Canada	199,759	195,904	181,332	14,572
Federation of Rhodesia	60,713	33,335	1,789	31,546
India	365,767	365,767	4,607	361,160
Jamaica	20,930	20,930	5,265	15,665
New Zealand	20,333	4,333	1,092	3,241
Nigeria	799	754	6	748
Pakistan	15,136	15,136	136	15,000
Union of South Africa	150,404	95,414	3,549	91,865
Burma	5,043	5,043	2,312	2,730

Country	Net authorizations	Utilizations	Repayments	Outstanding on Dec. 31, 1954
China	347,858	347,858	192,481	155,377
Czechoslovakia	30,377	30,377	25,507	4,870
Denmark	54,341	54,341	5,416	48,925
Egypt	17,934	17,934	12,859	5,075
Ethiopia	7,757	7,757	3,701	4,056
Finland	152,313	152,313	48,841	103,472
France and possessions	2,493,803	2,486,864	618,000	1,868,864
France	2,463,407	2,461,976	607,245	1,854,731
Algeria	680	680	54	626
French Equatorial Africa	9,826	4,368	182	4,186
French Morocco	18,389	18,338	9,018	9,320
New Caledonia	1,501	1,501	1,501	
Germany	1,345,582	1,345,582	152,492	1,193,086
Greece	116,832	114,639	37,630	77,009
Hungary	15,917	15,917	3,198	12,719
Iceland	6,249	6,249	622	5,627
Indonesia	180,886	143,886	8,107	135,779
Iran	87,846	34,846	10,609	24,237
Iraq	889	889	889	
Ireland	128,200	128,200		128,200
Israel	134,998	134,817	12,102	122,715
Italy	454,854	454,854	165,049	289,806
Japan	500,206	460,507	375,490	85,017
Korea	27,428	24,928	3,978	20,950
Latvia	11	11	11	
Lebanon	1,550	1,550	1,550	
Liberia	29,773	26,621	4,516	22,105
Netherlands	472,169	472,169	163,008	309,161
Norway	140,830	140,731	38,345	102,485
Philippines	141,887	130,525	52,230	78,295
Poland	81,268	81,268	13,145	68,123
Portugal and possessions	59,530	52,059	1,990	50,069
Portugal	59,465	51,994	1,957	50,037
Angola	65	65	33	32
Saudi Arabia	31,826	31,826	8,900	22,926
Spain	102,261	91,268	25,983	65,285
Sweden	28,311	28,311	7,911	20,400
Thailand	7,255	7,255	5,689	1,566
Turkey	134,597	128,100	34,543	93,557
U. S. S. R.	222,493	222,493		222,493
Yugoslavia	55,900	55,900	1,889	54,011
International organizations:				
European Coal and Steel Community	100,000	59,100		59,100
United Nations	65,000	65,000	5,000	60,000

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the statistical information above is timely because this body will soon have for consideration another request for foreign aid.

Red China's Overture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following thought-provoking editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., Wednesday, June 1, 1955:

RED CHINA'S OPENING GESTURE

Four United States airmen long held prisoner by the Chinese Communists now are free. This is all Americans really know as yet regarding the general intentions of the government in Peking.

President Eisenhower says the message announcing the release implies a disposition to relieve world tensions, but observes that the situation needs to be watched carefully. His attitude of cautious receptiveness may well be widely adopted.

The four are fighter pilots who allegedly flew over Manchurian territory during the Korean war. There still is the question of the 11-man bomber crew charged with having flown espionage agents into China. And of 41 civilians, 27 of them in prison, who have been refused permission to leave that country.

Americans will not be happy over the matter until those other prisoners or detainees also are freed, plus possibly other prisoners of war not yet accounted for. But there is reason to give credit, as American Chief Delegate Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., has done, to the United Nations and its Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld, for obtaining release of the four and hope for the 11.

It is possible to speculate, of course, whether a more militant course by the United States would have resulted in an earlier release of such prisoners—or in a longer impasse. To have imposed a blockade, as Senator KNOWLAND proposed, would certainly have made Red China more dependent on economic aid from Soviet Russia and probably stiffened the temper of the Communist officials. It would, moreover, have added a danger of war and the imprisonment of many more men.

On the other hand, it is possible that had Washington been willing to let relatives of the 15 fliers visit them when Chou En-lai first extended the invitation their repatriation would have been hastened.

At any rate, the situation now seems to be easing. And it is the present situation with which the world is concerned. The Chinese Communists evidently have reasons, probably both internal and external, to wish a breathing spell. They have a hard task in rehabilitating a war-exhausted country and improving its standard of living. They are under pressure probably from their Soviet allies and certainly from their neighbors to be less belligerent.

This may lead eventually to negotiations of some kind over the hostilities between Red China and Nationalist China in the Strait of Formosa—which seem lately to have subsided into an informal cease-fire.

The release of the four American airmen is unmistakably an overture (as, for that matter, was Washington's earlier removal of restrictions on the return of stranded Chinese students in the United States). It should be accepted as such and acted upon with caution. The United States has ample reason for doubts as to the sincerity of Communist offers to negotiate. But an action such as the release of the four fliers we must accept as a token of interest in pacification until proved otherwise.

A Tribute to Our Heroic Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the East Side News, a local newspaper which is published in my district, the 19th Congressional District of New York. The editorial is entitled "A Tribute to Our Heroic Dead" and was written in commemoration of the annual observance of Memorial Day:

A TRIBUTE TO OUR HEROIC DEAD

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Monday is Memorial Day.
It is a day of sacred memories.
It is a day of contemplation and meditation.

Memorial Day is a day when we bow with reverence at the shrines of our dead.
To the aged the day brings a picture of the past.
To the young it brings a challenge of the future.
To all it is a day of reverence.

The flag will be at half-mast.
The loom will be hushed.
The wheels of industry will stand still.
The Nation will decorate the graves of its heroic dead.
They beam upon us from the heavens above, and, like celestial luminaries, shine forever on our pathway.
Let us crown in our hearts those heroes of ours, and cover them with beautiful flowers.

We will cast poppies into the sea in loving memory of our sailors who sleep in the depths of the deep.
We will decorate the graves of our unknown soldiers.
We will remember our sainted souls who lie buried here and in foreign soil.
To them we bring our homage, the best we have to give.

Who they were, few know,
What they were, all know.
But in whatever land their graves, marked or unmarked,
They are ours still.

They have all won a hero's niche in God's heavenly temple of fame.
Their deeds unite to light up the fire on the shrines of human glory which will ever spread its illumination throughout humanity's story.
We feel the compulsion of their presence.
We realize the signficance of Memorial Day.

It is a day which Lincoln meant when he said at the graves of the heroes at Gettysburg:

"It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced."

It is a day which Woodrow Wilson meant when he said at the graves of the heroes at Arlington:

"I envy these men whose memory we honor today, because their's is the great work of liberty accomplished, and we are in the midst of a work unfinished."

If ever America needed the wholehearted love of her citizens, it is today.
If ever America needed to prepare against danger which threatens her, it is today.
It is a danger all the more insidious because traitors don the cap of freedom and clothe themselves in the garb of the Guardians of Liberty.

Too much blood has gone into the soil for us to let it be barren.
Too much pain has fertilized the earth.
Out of our heroes' suffering,
Out of their sorrow must come the birth of a new freedom for the children of men everywhere.

If we are true to ourselves,
If we are true to our traditions,
We cannot but fulfill our rightful destiny.
The eyes of the world are focused on America.
In it rests the hope of mankind.
On it rests the fate of civilization.

The laws and rights shall equal entwine.
And hearts and hands in peace combine
To make all earth, one temple of the free,
Where men shall dwell in chainless majesty.

To the fallen heroes we say—
The morning sun will gild with light,
The stars will keep holy watch at night,
The winter will spread soft palls of snow,
The summer flowers about you will grow,
The birds will sing their sweet springtime call,
God's love and mercy guard you all.

Address of Hon. Joe L. Evins, of Tennessee, Before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a very able and scholarly address made by our colleague, JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee. This address was delivered before the 42d annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held May 31, 1955, in Washington, D. C., and was roundly applauded by a very large attendance on this occasion. It is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, members of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, I am deeply honored by the invitation to join with the great Rivers and Harbors Congress, in annual session here in Washington, and to talk with you on the subject most dear to the hearts of all of you—and, I may add, most dear also to the hearts of those in Congress and elsewhere who hold high the principles and interests of water resources development in our country.

You have been in this continuing battle to conserve and develop our water resources for more than half a century. The members of your organization have, over the long years, striven hard and faithfully to bring about the proper use of water resources in our great Nation—this in a manner which would bring about the greatest benefit for the greatest number of people and the greatest benefit for our Nation's progress.

While you have met with great success in your efforts, you still recognize, as many of us in the Congress recognize, that there is still much to be done and much yet to be accomplished.

You are engaged in a battle against the elements, so to speak, which seemingly will have no end. But the marks and evidences of progress stand out as beacons of national enlightenment. Nowhere on the face of the

earth exist any programs which demonstrate such progressive and enlightened attitudes regarding natural resources as exist in America—and nowhere can be found programs which can measure up to or equal our national programs for navigation, flood control, reclamation, power production, soil conservation, and related activities in the public interest.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress is one of the most striking examples which we have of the effectiveness of citizens united in the public interest. Your cooperation is strong—it is worthwhile—your work is a source of great good for our national resources programs.

As a member of the Public Works Subcommittee on the House Appropriations Committee, I am acquainted with your programs. Recently this subcommittee has heard testimony in behalf of your organization from your able and distinguished president, Congressman OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana, and from my other colleagues, Congressman SID SIMPSON, of Illinois, and Congressman FRANK SMITH, of Mississippi, and others among your roster of officers and directors. All have spoken forcefully in your behalf, and their testimony will be of great value to the committee.

The approach which the National Rivers and Harbors Congress traditionally makes to matters concerning projects proposed is a sound and businesslike approach. Proposals numbering some 73 projects, I understand, have been sifted and carefully considered by your projects committee and have been reduced to 39—this being the number which study shows to be sound and worthy and most deserving of early consideration by the Congress.

As one who believes, firmly, in the soundness of public policy of development of our Nation's water resources, I need not tell you that all worthy projects have my support and interest. The adequacy of funds to cover essential projects is, however, a matter which has the overwhelming power to alter the outlook of even the most ardent water conservationist—and this, I am sure, you as experienced gentlemen can appreciate.

As veteran champions of the cause of water resources for navigation, flood control, power programs and allied programs for the benefit of all the people of our country—most of you, I am sure, are familiar with the difficulties encountered in the past in the matter of securing appropriations because of the large number of committees and subcommittees of the Congress—dealing separately with appropriations for various activities in which you are interested.

Appropriations for civil functions of the Corps of Engineers have been handled heretofore by the Military Affairs Subcommittee; many irrigation and reclamation projects by the Interior Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee; other programs by the Department of Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee; funds for TVA as a multipurpose program have been considered by the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations, and so forth.

It has been difficult, if not impossible, in the past to coordinate the total picture until the end of the session of Congress and upon completion of the entire appropriations requests.

At the outset of the new Congress—the 84th—an entirely new and functional approach was made with respect to the overall public works programs. An effort has been made to bring the extensive justifications hearings of the Appropriations Committee—for all of these public works programs—in line with corresponding activities of the respective legislative committees on Public Works of the House and Senate.

The reorganization of the Committee on Appropriations of the House in the present Congress has effected significant functional changes in the consideration of budget requests for water resource, power and atomic energy projects.

The effect of this reorganization will, no doubt, be far-reaching and will serve to effectuate not only savings and economies in these programs but bring about improvement and also efficiency in their administration.

The committee, under the leadership of the distinguished and able chairman of the committee, Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, established a separate subcommittee on Public Works. This new subcommittee was given authority to consider budget requests and activities on the Atomic Energy Commission, the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers, the programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the reclamation, power and water services of the Department of the Interior—including the Bureau of Reclamation, Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, and Southwestern Power Administration.

For consideration of estimates, the committee has divided its work for these agencies into the major drainage areas of the country. For example, consideration is now given to the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and other agencies in a given drainage basin. This has been accomplished through four hearing panels of the subcommittee: One to consider the eastern section of the country, with Representative MARSHALL, of Minnesota, as chairman; one to include the central section, with Representative RILEY, of South Carolina, as chairman; and the third for the western section, with myself as chairman. A fourth panel was established to hear testimony on the estimates of the TVA and the Atomic Energy Commission, with Representative RABAUT, of Michigan, as chairman.

The purpose of this reorganization, as I have endeavored to indicate, was to provide for consideration of the various water resources and power programs on a functional basis and to allow, for the first, a consideration of these programs of the Federal Government by the same group of Congressmen, the members of a single unit, the Public Works Subcommittee.

You will undoubtedly be interested in how this new approach to a very complex problem has worked out.

I can certainly speak to you on behalf of the panel for the western section of the committee, of which I am privileged to serve as chairman. I think I can say that the experience of our subcommittee has been duplicated by members of the other panels.

During actual hearings justifications were presented to the committee in support of the budget estimates. These were arranged by drainage basins, so that we had before us for our study prior to actual hearings all of the activities and programs of these agencies for a given drainage area. Members of all agencies concerned appeared before the panel at the same time.

And as a further effort to functionalize the hearings, one of the agencies concerned—as prearranged and predetermined by the agencies themselves—presented a detailed general statement of all of the activities of the particular basin. This was a coordinated statement presented in one instance by, perhaps, the Bureau of Reclamation—this on behalf of itself and the Corps of Engineers. In another instance, the Corps of Engineers presented a statement on behalf of itself, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration.

The result of this effort to coordinate and simplify procedure was that before the actual justification of the individual budget items began, the committee had before it a clear, concise picture of the entire water resources and power problems of the area under study.

Following this overall explanation, the committee examined in detail, next, the estimates of each of the individual agencies involved. At all times, members of all agencies concerned remained in the hearing room for questioning—this was of particular value as questions arose from time to time in the minds of members of the committee as to coordination of programs, or as to duplication of efforts and the efficiency of methods employed in estimating costs, and so forth. Thus, there was ample opportunity for full discussion of details with principal witnesses of all operating agencies.

The end result has been that the committee had a balanced, more complete understanding of the various projects and the interrelationship of these projects.

This method so recently employed, to my mind, has proved of great value and assistance in getting to the core of the problems confronted in the proper assessment of the budget estimates, requests and, finally, the appropriation approved.

There is another aspect of our hearings which is often overlooked, and I should like to mention this briefly.

It is our privilege each year to hear hundreds of local witnesses, Members of Congress, and citizens on projects or problems in their particular areas. This year our panel—the western section of the Public Works Subcommittee—heard more than 200 witnesses from the local areas concerned and more than 50 Members of the House of Representatives.

The results of this method of examination of witnesses through executive hearing has resulted in expedition of work, coordination of effort, and a more clear and concise and complete picture of the problems from every available point of view.

In the Columbia River Basin in the Pacific Northwest, for example, the committee had under consideration requests for funds for water resources and power projects estimated to cost in excess of $2 billion. For the fiscal year 1956 the President requested $163 million in additional funds for further engineering and construction.

In past years testimony—as far as continuity is concerned—stopped with the Corps of Engineers. A different group of Congressmen heard and acted upon the requests of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration agencies which used and distributed the water and power from these projects constructed by the Corps of Engineers.

This year, however, under the functional plan, the committee heard witnesses of the Bureau of Reclamation describe to us not only their great Columbia River developments but also justify how they were using and were going to use water from the McNary Dam and Chief Joseph Dam, for example, for irrigation purposes.

This was then followed by testimony from the Bonneville Power Administration—the agency which actually distributes the power from these projects.

Later, we were able to hear from Congressmen, Senators, and local representatives from this area—including also representatives from public and private utilities—as to the needs and plans for use of water and power resources in this area.

The result has been that there is available to Members of Congress and to the citizens of this country a concise, full picture of what is going forward in the Columbia River Basin.

The same is true with respect to the great Central Valley Basin of California where, for years, conflicts have raged between certain Federal agencies. It is true also in the Colorado River Basin, in the Rio Grande and Gulf Basin, where the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are working together on the same rivers.

I do not mean to imply that this newly adopted approach to consideration of the programs of these agencies is a panacea for

all the ills which exist in our national water-resources programs. Such is not the case.

Nor would I wish to leave you with the impression that merely by the reorganization we have eliminated all of the duplication and conflicts which exist among the agencies working in the field of water resources.

We have not achieved this, but we most certainly have made great strides toward eliminating duplication, and the committee, through its able chairman, has provided a vehicle which, if properly used in the future, should do away with many of the evils which are prevalent and of which you are aware.

But we may say this, pridefully perhaps but also as a fact of accomplishment—the public works bill to be reported by the House Appropriations Committee this year presents for the first time an overall picture of our water-resources program of the Nation.

I cannot tell you, at this time, the overall total of projects to be approved by the fiscal year of 1956. The committee will work up the bill about the first week in June.

I can tell you, however, that for the next year and the years ahead—based on approved studies for advanced engineering planning—that our Nation is to move forward and proceed at a greater speed on a great many internal developments within our country than at any time during this administration.

The water resources of our country are among our most precious and valued possessions. Our ability to turn the God-given water of this land to its proper and natural use for travel, power, and support has contributed beyond measure to the growth and greatness of our country.

If we are to attain greater heights—for which we all strive—even further steps of development of water resources must be taken.

I am confident that working together we will be able to promote policies and programs for the benefit of all the people and our common country and not just for the benefit of selfish and special interests. In so doing, we will be serving our future best interest and conserving our great American heritage.

Fred Digby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I hope I will be granted the indulgence of personal references on a short walk down memory's lane.

The older we grow the more we desire the luxury of reminiscing. It is because we all have this same human failing that I ask this indulgence for these few minutes. The things which I want to say are indeed personal to me but the lesson to be learned is applicable to all of us. That is why I ask this indulgence. There is not one among us who will not see in this recitation just a little bit of our individual selves.

It was many years ago that I served as an altar boy at St. Joseph's Catholic Church in New Orleans. During all my service I served at only one wedding. It was the wedding of a young sports writer named Fred Digby.

The years came and went and Fred Digby became the sports editor for the New Orleans Item. And a good sports editor he was. In the meantime, fate took me by the hand and led me up the stairway of the New Orleans Times-Picayune to the sports desk where I remained for several years before transferring to the New Orleans States in the capacity of assistant sports editor.

The sports editor, Harry Martinez, married shortly after my arrival and departed on his honeymoon, leaving me in charge. The rice had not been swept off the floor before I was entangled in a hot controversy with the sports editor of the opposition, Fred Digby. I thought I was doing all right in the tangle until I got too flip and attempted to display my superior education over my opponent, which resulted in complete exposition of my inferior knowledge. I got spanked, and good.

But Fred Digby and myself have always remained friends.

I wandered away from the sports pages and Fred Digby became a sports editor of national repute.

He fathered the now famous Sugar Bowl and today is the general manager of the New Orleans Midwinter Sports Organization which sponsors this great carnival of sports in New Orleans. Without Fred Digby there would have been no Sugar Bowl.

The other day Fred Digby, of all things, was asked to make the commencement day address at Dominican College, one of the finest Catholic colleges in the Deep South.

It was a new role indeed for a sports writer, much less Fred Digby.

The address which he made was so chuck full of humanity and good common down-to-earth, heart-to-heart stuff that I decided to bring it to your attention. Good, solid, homespun talks like these are good for all of us because in them we can all gain benefit.

But back to the reason why I asked this indulgence and to demonstrate how these simple, straightforward talks leave their imprint on all of us.

Now, I want to say something else about another newspaperman, a contemporary of mine—Herman Deutsch, of the New Orleans Item.

When I escaped from the sports field and walked into the political arena as political editor of the New Orleans States, one of the toughest and most resourceful political reporters working against me was Hermann Deutsch. We clashed frequently and pulled out all stops in trying to outmaneuver the other on a story or news beat.

Hermann Deutsch today is the associate editor of the New Orleans and writes an independent column with emphasis on the adjective "independent." His paper supported Adlai Stevenson for the presidency while Hermann Deutsch supported Dwight Eisenhower in his column. That's an example of independence.

Hermann Deutsch and Fred Digby worked side by side on the same paper for many years.

All of which brings me to the point which I am attempting to make.

I read Fred Digby's homespun address to the graduates of Dominican College and thought so much of it that I decided to bring it to your attention without all this expansive comment.

Before I had an opportunity to do so, however, I received a copy of the New Orleans Item and as usual turned to Hermann Deutsch's column. Imagine my surprise to find his subject—Fred Digby's address to the graduates of Dominican College.

When something affects two individuals, one independent of the other I do believe it worthy of cognizance.

Of course all of this is not world shaking but little things are ofttimes really more important than the big things.

Thus I have decided to bring to your attention Hermann Deutsch's reaction to Fred Digby's address as well as my own.

First is Hermann Deutsch's column and next, Fred Digby's address to the graduating class of Dominican College in New Orleans.

I again emphasize the realization that this is all personal and provincial but is not human nature, after all, terrifically personal and provincial. Sophistication is mostly a veneer in most of us.

[From the New Orleans Item]

TIMELESS TRUTH

(By Hermann Deutsch)

When you've known someone for nearly 40 years, and for most of that stretch of time worked side by side with him, you'd think there were no more surprises. You are so familiar with his reactions to beer, cravats, dogs, food, books, music, company, amusements, and what have you that under any conceivable set of circumstances you know what's coming.

But that doesn't apply to Sugar Bowl GM Fred Digby, the toughest man I ever met—and the gentlest. He was a young sports writer when we first made contact before World War I. In the years that followed he was also, occasionally, a part-time prize-fight manager.

Another prize-ring figure, a promoter, who outweighed Fred by at least 30 pounds, decided one night to push him around. The police finally imposed a cease-fire, and the case was ultimately settled in second recorder's court in the old building on Elysian Fields Avenue.

From that court I accompanied Fred to his home, where he was greeted rapturously by his daughter Doris, then 2 years old; she couldn't wait one more instant to show daddy her new ballet slippers.

I think I referred some time ago to the classic column Fred wrote for his sports page in the Item on the day when little Freddie (now Father Digby, head of the Catholic charities organization) was ordained to the priesthood.

In a word, where Fred Digby is concerned, I felt reasonably sure that I had seen all the contrasts, and was immune to surprise. But I got a new answer on that one when I read what this former sports writer, fight manager, and present Sugar Bowl executive had to say in addressing the honor graduates of St. Mary's Dominican College for girls last week. Here's part of it; I only wish there were room to print it all:

"Some time ago I saw a cartoon in a magazine showing three girls in baggy jeans, shirts hanging out, slouched around a record player. A worried mother was peering through the door. One of the girls is asking, 'Say, Mom, did you have any fun in the gay nineties?'

"It occurred to me then that possibly the gay nineties might still have something to say to our times.

"Maybe long skirts, tight-fitting trousers, high collars, and chaperones have gone out of date, but there remain ideals and values that are as valid today as they were a thousand years ago.

"Integrity is as vital today as it was in the gay nineties. Or in the first century, for that matter. Whenever a thing has genuine quality, it never goes out of date.

"Bach and Beethoven will be played and enjoyed long after the current hit about Davy Crockett, King of the Wild Frontier, has been forgotten.

"Shakespeare and Milton will be read long after current best sellers have gone out of print. In fact, the all-time No. 1 book on the best-seller list is the Holy Bible—the greatest story ever told.

"Moses was by no means an old fogey. On the contrary, he had the wit to see that ancient moral laws cannot be ignored with impunity.

" 'Honor thy father and mother'; 'Thou shalt not kill'; 'Thou shalt not steal'—put these down in any era, and they are relevant.

"When it comes to spiritual values, 'what was good for our grandmothers and grandfathers should be good enough for us.'

"None of us wants to go back to the horse and buggy. We prefer our automobile. No one would exchange his television set for a magic lantern.

"But we should all be grateful to our grandparents for their love of truth.

"We should be grateful, too, for their faith in God—a faith that carried them through different days.

"We can use that love of truth. We need that faith perhaps more than they did in the long ago."

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY FRED DIGBY TO HONOR GRADUATES OF ST. MARY'S DOMINICAN COLLEGE, NEW ORLEANS, LA., MAY 23, 1955

Reverend fathers, reverend sisters, distinguished guests, honorees, parents, and friends, Sister Mary Louise's gracious invitation to be your speaker was quite a compliment. I appreciate it very much. I tried to tell her that she should invite Father Digby to speak to you but she said she wanted a layman and me. You know how persuasive she can be. So as George Gobel would say: "Here I am. And there you are."

I only hope I won't disappoint Sister Mary Louise and you.

I know my limitations as a speaker. I am like the Indian chief who, when asked what he did for a living, replied: "Me preacher." And when his friend said: "You can't make much money being a preacher," the chief said: "Me make ten dollar." The friend then said: "Ten dollars. That's mighty poor pay for a preacher." The chief nodded in agreement and said: "Me mighty poor preacher."

Since I have never addressed such a learned group of scholars, and young ladies at that, I hardly know where to begin.

None of the friends to whom I turned for suggestions were of much help.

I did learn one thing—everyone I spoke with had a new awareness of the important part women are playing in the world today.

One said: "Women are smarter—much smarter today than ever before."

To illustrate his point he told me about his little girl. It seems she was giving her mother a rather bad time.

"How do you ever expect to get into heaven," asked the mother. The little girl replied: "I'll go up to the door, run in, and out, and slam the door. Then I'll go in and out and slam the door, in and out and slam the door, until St. Peter says: "Quit slamming the door. Come in or stay out. Then I'll go in."

Sometime ago I saw a cartoon in a magazine showing three girls in baggy jeans, shirts hanging out, slouched around a record player, with records scattered about the floor. A worried mother was peering through the door, obviously displeased with what she saw.

One of the girls is asking: "Say, mom, did you have any fun in the gay nineties?"

It occurred to me then that possibly the gay nineties might still have something to say to our times.

Maybe long skirts, tight-fitting trousers, high collars, and chaperons have gone out of date but there remain ideals and values that are as valid today as they were a thousand years ago.

There are some things that never are passé.

There is integrity, a quality of honest and moral wholesomeness that makes a woman or a man thoroughly dependable.

Integrity is as vital today as it was in the gay 90's. Or in the first century for that matter.

Sometimes our young people today have a habit of lumping all of the past, its values and ideals, along with high-button shoes and marking it down as out of date.

But these ideals and values have quality and are more valid than some modern notions.

Whenever a thing has genuine quality it never goes out of date.

Bach and Beethoven will be played and enjoyed long after the current hit about Davy Crockett, King of the Wild Frontier, has been forgotten.

Bach and Beethoven have an abiding quality.

Shakespeare and Milton will be read as classics long after current best sellers have gone out of print. In fact, the all-time No. 1 book on the best-seller list is the Holy Bible. The greatest story ever told.

The priceless ingredient called quality makes the difference.

Moses was by no means an old fogey. On the contrary he had the wit to see that ancient moral laws cannot be ignored with impunity.

"Honor thy father and mother," "thou shalt not kill," "thou shalt not steal"—put these down in any era and they are relevant.

When it comes to spiritual values "what was good for our grandmothers and grandfathers should be good enough for us."

None of us want to go back to the horse and buggy. We prefer our automobile.

We do not want to use oil lamps when we have electricity.

No one would exchange a Frigidaire for an old icebox.

Nor his television set for a magic lantern.

But we should all be grateful to our grandparents for their love of truth.

We should be grateful, too, for their faith in God; a faith that carried them through difficult days.

We can use that love of truth. We need that faith perhaps more than they did in the long ago.

Recently in a pessimistic mood, unusual for him, Bishop Fulton Sheen said: "When you look at the world's condition today, you sometimes wish Noah had missed the boat."

Another famous author said: "With the world the way it is, who envies the youth of today?"

Men have viewed with alarm since time began.

Anybody can see, of course that the future appears more than a little grim and uncertain, and the older we get, the more troubled we are when we look at the road ahead.

Yet no matter where you stop along the corridors of time, you will see that the future was unpromising.

Even in Noah's day, it is recorded, the earth was corrupt and the earth was filled with violence.

That sounds almost like the news we read in our newspapers every day.

When we begin to see our times in perspective, it is fairly obvious that our era, like every other era, looks toward a grim future.

But no matter how black the picture might seem to you today, something good can come out of it we can find enough women of high character, spiritual strength, and unfailing faith to see us through.

Note that we say women to see us through.

Men have tried, and for the most part can be said to have failed to make this a better world in which to live. They talk of friendly neighbors and coexistence while the peoples of the world continue to yearn for peace.

We are not now trying to flatter women when we say they must see us through. But we do hope we can make you conscious of the fact that in this changing world it is your responsibility to see that the change is for the better.

You honorees are very fortunate. You have something that few of your grandmothers and your mothers enjoyed.

This is a college education. More importantly, a Catholic college education.

You have had the benefit of the teaching and the spiritual guidance of Revered Sisters. You go forth from Dominican College well prepared to make your presence known and your influence felt in this changing world.

In many lands today women are little more than beasts of burden. Indeed, it wasn't so very long ago that in this country women moved and lived in a small sphere.

Woman's place, men said, was in the home.

Today women have gained prominence, even leadership in all of the professions and in our national and State governments.

We must admit there is a lot we don't know about women.

Any man who claims to know and understand them is either a psychiatrist or in need of one.

However, there is one thing we do know—women are here to stay.

And men who are wise will learn to appreciate them more.

Kathleen Norris once wrote this about women:

"From birth to 18, a girl needs good parents.

"From 18 to 35, she needs good looks.

"From 35 to 55, she needs personality.

"From 55 on, she needs cash."

We have some statistics to show a lot of women, young and old, get their hands on a lot of money in this changing world.

Women today own 70 percent of all the private wealth in this country.

They have 55 percent of all savings accounts.

They own 50 percent of the stock of all industrial corporations.

They own 50 percent of all real estate.

They are beneficiaries of 80 percent of all life insurance policies.

In the last presidential election women cast 52 percent of all the vote.

And finally, there are two and one-half million more women than men in the United States, over the age of 14.

These figures indicate clearly that women hold the balance of power in this country.

So much for the material side of things.

Their influence on youth is indisputable.

As mothers in the homes and teachers in the schools, women can exercise the greatest influence in molding and shaping the opinions and actions of our youth.

But their influence is not now confined to the home and classroom. It reaches out into every walk of life.

And here we must make another admission:

Women also exert great influence on men.

Like the girl who learned her boy friend wasn't a Catholic and asked her mother what she could do about it. Her mother said: "The next time you go out with Johnny tell him all about the Catholic religion. I am

sure he will become a convert and you can marry him."

After her next date with Johnny, the girl returned home and went sobbing to her mother. "My dear, what happened?" asked the mother. "Did you tell Johnny all about the Catholic religion?"

"Yes, I did," sobbed the girl, "and now he wants to become a priest."

At this point I might give our honorees, who are contemplating marriage, an observation on husbands. "There are three kinds of husbands. The prize, the sur-prize, and the consolation prize."

Everyone accepts sports as an important part of our educational system.

St. Mary's Dominican has been very much in step with this procedure, as you all well know.

This fine gymnasium was the first girls' school gym built in New Orleans.

The recreation and physical education program directed by Catherine Kehoe is one of the finest anywhere.

All New Orleans shares Dominican's pride in Mary Ann Villegas and her accomplishments on the golf links. And we of the Sugar Bowl were happy to have your Janet Kerne as the very first Sugar Bowl queen.

But it wasn't so many years ago that sports for women and girls were frowned on even in this country.

The Olympic games were revived in 1896 but it wasn't until 1932—64 years later, that women were permitted to compete in the track and field events.

In 1932, at Los Angeles, a Texas girl named Mildred Didrikson won the hurdle race and the javelin throw.

The same Miss Didrikson is now known all over the world as Babe Zaharias, the greatest woman golfer of all time. She was also one of the finest basketball players we ever saw. Three times All American.

A year or so ago the world in general and sports fans in particular were shocked at the news that Babe would have to undergo an operation for cancer. Doctors doubted she would ever again play golf.

But women have more courage than men.

Within 3 months Babe Zaharias was back on the links, again winning championship tournaments.

Her courage is an inspiration to all.

The participation and success of women in sports provided new incentive to women in all fields of endeavor.

With all of these honors and positions of importance has come greater responsibility and greater opportunity to women than ever before in history.

Women can become the greatest force in the battle to insure a peaceful world. A lasting peace.

Not only can they help convert Russia by prayer, but they have the power to put an end to war, and to any evil in this country, including juvenile delinquency.

Indeed, it appears as if it is up to the women of today, and particularly the women of the United States of America, to make this changing world a better one.

You graduates of St. Mary's Dominican College should remember that they share this challenge—this opportunity—this responsibility.

You are among the elect upon whom the Catholic Church relies to set the good examples—to show the way.

You are the ones who must help to give this great Nation a new surge of spiritual strength—the power to conquer every enemy of all that is good.

May God grant each of you His blessing of a holy, happy, and healthy life.

May Mary, the Mother of God, be ever at your side, your helpmate and your guide.

I thank you for your patience and indulgence, and this opportunity to be with you.

Continuing National and Individual Self-Sacrifice Is the Price of Honorable Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to include a Memorial Day address I delivered on Monday, May 30, at the commemorative exercises held on the Worcester (Mass.) Common, sponsored by Willie Grout Camp, SUVCW. The address follows:

It is a high privilege to join with you this morning in commemorating the heroic war dead of our community and our country.

As we prayerfully reflect upon the patriotic deaths of comrades, friends, and neighbors who once walked among us, we cannot escape a deep sense of humble gratitude. With that feeling of gratitude comes the clear realization that even the most prosperous of nations can never fully repay the debt we owe to those who gave up their lives for us.

There is nothing of materiality that we can give them now, but it is within our power to make sure that widows and children do not suffer economic hardship because a valiant father or son is a forgotten military hero.

We must also never forget the material obligations we have to assist those veterans who escaped the finality of death but will carry the disabling scars of military service throuhout their lives. To afford them just compensation for their disabilities, to provide rehabilitation facilities, hospitalization treatment, and opportunity to pursue their interrupted education is not charity, but merely carrying out the national promises that were made. While we are spending billions of dollars for the practical purpose of gaining dubious foreign friendships, it wisely behooves us to beware of the danger of fostering disillusionment and despair among veterans and their families, who are the greatest national asset we have against attempted Communist subversion from within, or open military attack. If we ever foolishly neglect our obligations to these veterans it will be the beginning of a dark era in American history.

To those who sacrificed their lives in the service of this country, we have, indeed, much more than any mere material obligation. They left their land and homes to endure terrible hardships, suffering, and death to retain for us the godly dignity of individual life and the Christian principles of personal liberty and impartial justice for all.

Today, these principles are being threatened with extinction here and in the free world by atheistic communism. A study of the plan and program persistently pursued by the Kremlin leaders since the end of World War II clearly warrants the assumption that their eventual objective is to reduce America and the rest of the Christian world to barbaric slavery. While there have been recent superficial signs of an apparently changing attitude, we would be tragically unwise to embrace any fanciful hopes of complete conversion in the light of their past conduct. Let us pray God for their sincerity, but let us remember their frightful record of devilish duplicity and deceit and remain prepared.

These, then, are the two high duties we have in remembrance of our war dead—to perseveringly seek the honorable peace for which they fought and to be perseveringly prepared to successfully resist any forceful attempt to take away the personal liberties for which they died. Such persistent preparation against the insidious enemy we face may well mean long continuing burdens upon private ambitions and personal pursuits. The victorious road ahead for us is paved with the demands of Christian unselfishness and patriotic sacrifice, but there is no other way. The road our comrades were asked to take led them to their deaths.

This would be an empty ceremony if we did not recognize the challenge and consciously rededicate every remaining day of our own lives to the honorable preservation of the god-given liberties our dead comrades retained for us. That is all the personal tribute they would want, and we can do no less without betraying their trust. Let us, therefore, pray God for the moral strength and character, as individuals and as a nation, to keep faith with these honored dead, and let us pray God's mercy that their souls may forever rest in peace.

Apathy and Lack of Leadership Defeat Military Reserve Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have reprinted hereinbelow an editorial appearing in the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky., on Sunday, May 22, 1955, entitled "Apathy and Lack of Leadership Defeat Military Reserve Bill." I commend this editorial to the attention of all Members of the Congress. The editorial is as follows:

APATHY AND LACK OF LEADERSHIP DEFEAT MILITARY RESERVE BILL

The plight of the national military reserve plan—battered almost to death, and with action on it indefinitely postponed by the House—reflects no credit either on the White House or Congress.

The former watered down its original plan even before submitting it to Congress, then failed to give it the vigorous support mandatory for a program the President earlier described as urgent. The House, unpushed and unimpressed, reacted predictably if irresponsibly. It talked the plan almost to death, loaded it with one incredibly crippling amendment that invaded the foreign policy field, and then threw up its hands in despair over a racial-segregation quarrel.

Meantime, if we are to believe the White House, the danger from abroad has not diminished. Preparedness to defend ourselves remains the most urgent issue of the day. An integral part of the administration's preparedness program, given as the basic justification for successive reductions in our regular military manpower, was to be the quadrupling of our Reserve forces by 1960 with a revamping designed to yield a younger, better-trained establishment.

The watered-down program proposed by the administration was poor enough, though it promised improvement. It shied away from any compulsory-service principle once advocated by President Eisenhower and De-

fense Secretary Wilson. The latter admitted it would be "better" to retain draft authority to set up the Reserve program, but weakly sighed that "it doesn't ruin the bill if you go the other way."

Congress went the other way in a hurry. Among the amendments tacked on by the House was the incredible one specifying that no troop personnel be assigned for service in a country that—by treaty with the United States, mind you—subjected it to the processes of local criminal law. This provision not only would upset delicate agreements painstakingly reached with our allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It would make it almost impossible to deploy troops abroad in an emergency, with the Regulars in an integrated unit free to go but the Reserves or guardsmen alongside them bound only to home defense.

Another amendment, tentatively adopted by the House but deemed so likely to defeat the final bill that Representative Vinson saved it temporarily by putting the whole thing on the House shelf, prescribed that no personnel be assigned to military units practicing racial segregation. This would simply further establish Federal practice in the Regular Military Establishment, but its potential impact on National Guard and some Reserve units in the South was what led to the maneuver of postponement.

There the matter rests, with House strategists planning to revive it within perhaps 3 weeks. Whenever they do, they would do well to write a better bill—one that would require all fit young men to undergo a definite period of training followed by a definite period of compulsory participation in the Ready Reserves. That is the only adequate, relatively inexpensive, democratic and fair way to do a job urgent to the national safety—and we believe the American people would support it if only the administration and Congress have the courage to spell it out.

If that courage is lacking, the administration and Congress had better quit saving money on the regular Defense Establishment with the paper-promise of a strong Reserve to come. It isn't in being today, and it won't be by 1960 at the rate Washington dawdles now.

The United States Army Field Band Is Outstanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a copy of a letter from a constituent who has great praise for the United States Army field band stationed at Fort Meade, Md., under the direction of Maj. Chester Whiting and Capt. Robert Bierly. The letter follows:

KENOSHA, WIS.

DEAR MR. SMITH: It is not often that I take the time to write to our Representatives, but a recent event in our city of Kenosha, Wis., impressed me so greatly that I want you to know about it.

The United States Army field band from Fort Meade, Md., under the direction of Maj. Chester Whiting and with Capt. Robert Bierly assisting, played an afternoon and evening concert here in Kenosha. It is difficult to put into words the marvelous impression they made on the citizens here. I am sure the people of Kenosha have never heard such an outstanding musical organization before. The United States Army field band is without doubt one of the finest bands, if not the finest band, not only in our country, but in the entire world.

Not only are Major Whiting and Captain Bierly musicians and conductors of the very finest type, but they are also gentlemen of the highest type and masters of the important element of public relations.

One of the things that impressed me most was the wonderful esprit de corps which the enlisted men in the band had. Each was a perfect gentleman and conducted themselves in a manner most becoming to the uniform they wore. This band and their leaders were marvelous goodwill ambassadors for both the United States Army and the Government.

I do hope that you do all in your power to further the great work that they are doing in bringing not only the very finest in music, but an impressive glimpse of the United States Army to the people of our Nation.

Cordially yours,

G. LEBLANC CORP.
DON MCCATHREN,
Director, Research and Education Services.

Address by Hon. Maurice Simmons at Soldiers and Sailors Monument, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address given by the Honorable Maurice Simmons, justice of the court of special sessions of New York City, retired. Justice Simmons is past commander in chief of the United Spanish War Veterans, past national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, and honorary chairman of the United War Veterans Committee.

The address was given at a meeting held under the auspices of the United War Veterans Memorial and Executive Committee of New York County, Inc., at the Soldiers and Sailors Monument, New York City, in commemoration of the 87th anniversary of Memorial Day.

The address follows:

On this sacred day of remembrance we bow in homage to our heroic dead. Each grave is a pulpit of patriotism. It preaches that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Never in our annals has there been greater need for moral and military strength. We are menaced by the cruelest of foes, entrenched behind the largest of armies, with the terrifying prospect that the H-bomb may make ours a lifeless planet.

Again in the remorseless cycle of history, savage hordes have been unleashed against the civic and cultural institutions of Western civilization, whose Judeo-Christian spiritual heritage is the seed of the "Brotherhood of Man and the Fatherhood of God." Have we forgotten the internal disunity and the moral disintegration that brought about the collapse of the thousand years of Roman rule that was followed by the thousand years of the age of the barbarians? Pacts of peace, purchases of appeasement and covenants of coexistence did not halt the barbarities of the Huns, the Vandals, and the Mongols. Miraculously the cultural treasures and traditions of the West were safeguarded in the monasteries of mediaeval Europe.

As we are about to sit down at the council table with the ruthless masters of Moscow and the arrogant overlords of Peiping, woe unto us if we are blind to these lessons of the past. How much longer shall the soft-hearted and the soft-headed be lured by the chimeras of the Kremlin? Can the leopard change its spots? Whoever dines with the devil needs a long spoon. Cold war or no cold war will the Russian bear forego his infiltration, subversion, and treacherous wreckage of the free nations?

The Russian Communists have drawn the blueprint of a brave new world with its phantom promises of social, political, and economic salvation for the underprivileged. But on its reverse side, lies hidden, in Soviet, brainwashing, invisible ink, their diabolical design for the enslavement of the body and soul of mankind.

On this day of memoriam, let us highly resolve that the leadership of our invincible Republic shall bring peace and freedom to all the peoples of the earth.

South Shore Area Plans $4 Million in Buildings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of local pride with me to report to my colleagues that the beautiful seventh ward in the city of Chicago, wherein I have made my home for several decades, is to be further improved by the construction of a number of new apartment buildings. By unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include an article on the real estate page of the Chicago Sun-Times of May 29, 1955, as follows:

SOUTH SHORE AREA PLANS $4 MILLION IN BUILDINGS

More than $4 million in new construction will be under way by the end of this year in the South Shore neighborhood.

Richard D. Jaffe, executive director of the South Shore Commission, said it is the community's greatest building activity since before World War II.

OGLESBY TOWERS

Largest project will be a 20-story, 140-apartment structure at the southwest corner of 67th and Oglesby. Sponsored by Simpson-Peck, Inc., it will cost $2 million.

Alfred Simpson, vice president of the architecture firm, said it will be known as Oglesby Towers. It will have four 5-room and three 4-room units on each floor renting for about $40 per room. Air conditioning is planned.

Ground will be broken late in the summer and completion is expected in 18 months. Parking space for tenants will be provided inside the building.

Two apartment houses on South Shore are planned by Harry A. Zisook & Sons, one at 7255 and the other at 7420.

At 7420, the firm plans a 33-unit structure costing more than $500,000. Ground will be broken about October 1 on the 5-story building.

Rentals in the 5-room units will average $190 a month. A first-floor parking area is

included in the plans of architects George Fred Keck and William Keck.

MAISONETTE APARTMENTS

The Zisook firm plans to start construction at 7255 South Shore by the end of this year on a $450,000 maisonette apartment house. It will contain 22 5- and 6-room units, each of which will occupy 2 floors. Rentals will be from $180 to $200. A parking lot for tenants will adjoin the 4-story building. Architect is Harry Weese.

Beth Am Congregation will build a synagogue at Coles and South Shore for $600,000. Ground will be broken in the fall.

On June 5, ground-breaking is scheduled for a $100,000 addition to St. Margaret's Episcopal Church at 73d and Coles.

Already under construction and scheduled for completion late this year is the new $556,000 South Shore YMCA building at 1833 East 71st.

Address by Hon. Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine, Before National Womens Press Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on April 21 it was a pleasure to be a guest of the National Womens Press Club. There I heard a very remarkable address delivered by our associate, the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH AT NATIONAL WOMEN'S PRESS CLUB, ANNUAL EDITORS' DINNER, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 21, 1955

Madam President, members of the National Women's Press Club, editors and guests, I always enjoy the dinners of the National Women's Press Club. I have enjoyed speaking at some of them in the past—although I enjoy listening much more than speaking.

This is the first time that I have had the honor of addressing the bosses of the ladies of the Press Club. It is my first opportunity to speak to the editors.

I have mixed feelings about this. Rarely does one have such an opportunity to reply to the editorial pages. But then, rarely have I ever had an occasion to be tempted to do so. For the vast majority of the editors of the country have been quite generous to me in their editorial remarks. I want to take this occasion to express my sincere thanks to you. After all, when the going gets tough, all of us are human enough to like a pat on the back.

I have not been immune to editorial criticism. I'm not perfect and readily admit it. So that I have not resented the relatively few unfavorable editorials because they have, for the greater part, been constructive criticism by which I can improve. Rarely have I found an editor or editorial writer taking advantage of his position to give vent to his personal dislikes or to assume the role of a stern teacher meting out discipline.

And so tonight I want to pay my personal tribute to the editors of our Nation—to the editors of a truly free press dedicated to jealously guarding the freedoms of our people.

I speak from considerable personal experience about editors. I have known them as personal friends. I have known them as critics. I have known them as bosses from the time when I worked on a Maine weekly newspaper in my hometown to a few years ago when I was writing a nationally syndicated column.

From that experience over the years, I say that nowhere will you find men and women who are more fair, conscientious, hard working and loyal to their convictions and their country than American editors.

I am glad that I can say that. I am glad because the editors hold at the tip of their typing or scribbling fingers a tremendous power to do good or evil, justice or injustice, in influencing, shaping and leading public opinion. To that extent, they possess the opportunity to guide the destiny of our great country. And in the possession of such power and opportunity, I am sure that you editors feel the gravity of the awesome responsibility that accompanies such power and opportunity.

You have a freedom of action that is not enjoyed by a public official. You do not have to make an accounting to the people. You do not have to justify your position with the people because your position is not dependent upon the people. You do not have to say why you write the editorials you do. You do not have to give justification for your editorials to the people.

In short, the only thing that you are accountable to is your conscience. And that is god enough for me—because I am confident that living with your conscience is far more important to you than being accountable to the people. Because the editors of America are men and women of conscience, our country is a free nation.

That is true in a decreasing number of nations around the world. I know from what I saw in some 2 dozen nations that I have visited in the past 6 months. Some of those nations were behind the Iron Curtain like Russia and Czechoslovakia.

When I talked with Foreign Minister Molotov in Moscow last October 26, he charged that American newspapers did not print news about Russia—that specifically the American newspapers would not publish anything about the Russian Government's note of October 23 to the United States, Great Britain, and France in reply to our note of September 10.

I made three points in my reply to his charge. The first point I made was that I regretted that I was not in a position to discuss the Soviet note of October 23 because I had been unable to find an American newspaper for sale at newsstands in Moscow and therefore had not had a chance to read it or be aware of its contents.

The second point I made was my expression that I had full confidence that American papers would not only publish the full text of the Russian note but also that American papers would give prominence to the note.

I made these first two points during the talk with Mr. Molotov. It was not until the next day that I made my third and most effective point in reply to Mr. Molotov. I wrote him a short letter in which I stated:

"Late yesterday afternoon, approximately 3 hours after the conclusion of our talk, I asked the American Embassy for a copy of the latest issue of any American newspaper it had. In response to my request, the Embassy gave me the enclosed copy of the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, October 25, 1954, which not only gives the full text of your Government's note of October 23, 1954, but also accorded it prominence. I am pleased to send this copy to you as it corroborates the assurance that I gave you of the nonsecrecy policy of American newspapers."

Here was living proof not only of the freedom of our American press but as well of its conscientiousness in printing the news. The story on the note was on the front page. It has been suggested to me that I frame the copy of my letter to Mr. Molotov and put on it the caption "Touche."

I shall never forget the 2 trips that I made during the past 6 months. I am confident that I shall never again learn so much in so short a time. One reason that I won't is because never again will I have the opportunity to talk and confer with practically every leader in the world; not only government leaders but leaders of various political parties.

Another reason is that in such a short period of time—4 weeks on each of the trips—I talked with more of the common people in the various countries I was in. I spent parts of days with families in their homes. I attended community meetings in small villages. I sat in the classes in schools and heard the schoolchildren recite. I tramped through refugee camps. I attended sessions of parliaments; I inspected soldiers in the field; I talked with patients in hospitals and with children in nurseries; I talked with a Fascist leader and a Communist leader.

Even my assistant did some involuntary research work behind the Iron Curtain where he was held prisoner in a Communist jail.

These are a few of the things I did on my trips which brought down upon me bitter denunciation from the Communist press in Russia. They called me an Amazon warmonger hiding behind a rose. Apparently they haven't changed their opinion of me from 6 years ago when they called me a warmonger but did not award me the degree of Amazon warmonger or associate me with anything as lovely as a rose. I must have done some good for my country on these trips for the Russian press to make such bitter denunciation of me.

Your president, Elizabeth Carpenter, asked me to talk about my trips. But I do not want to bore you with a travelog. You have been to these places yourselves. You don't need me to tell you about them. You know more about them than I do. And you certainly are better experts on the subjects than I.

Perhaps you would be interested in checking my opinions and my impressions from my trips. I shall make them brief. These are by no means all of my impressions.

1. Is America liked or disliked? The answer is that America and Americans are liked. What may be even more important is that we are respected. We may not be liked as much as we would like to be in nations throughout the world—but America and Americans are much better liked and respected in these foreign countries than I think we realize. I did not find the defeatism, dislike, and resentment that I had been led to believe existed for America and Americans all over the world, instead, I was surprised at the warm feeling and friendship shown me by the little people as well as the leaders in every non-Communist country that I visited. And even in Russia the little people were warm and friendly to me.

2. There is too much unjustified pessimism here at home—almost to the point of it becoming fashionable, either politically or journalistically, to be excessively pessimistic. There is a great deal for us to be optimistic about—we have fairly well secured Western Europe and the Mediterranean area against the threat of communism—and we are making headway in southeast Asia. Our position in southeast Asia is somewhat like our position was in Western Europe before the Marshall plan. We have a long way to go but we are starting even belatedly. We had a long way to go in Western Europe but we have come through successfully there—and we are respected and liked there.

3. The past few days of the Bandung Conference have proved that we are liked and respected in many areas of southeast Asia; that we do have friends there. The basic problem in Asia is the Asian hate of colonialism and the tendency to accept communism as the foremost foe of colonialism. We have been failing to use the most effective means of combatting this problem. We are failing to drive home to the Asians that communism is nothing less than Russian colonialism. I am gratified that some of our allies like Iraq are driving this point home at the Bandung Conference. We should convince the Asians that we feel that the decisions on Asians should be made in Asia by Asians rather than in London or Paris, as they have been in the past.

We must point out to Asians that unless they oppose communism, the modern drastic form of colonialism, those decisions in the future will be made in Moscow rather than in New Delhi, Rangoon, Saigon, or Jakarta. We must point out to them that the decisions for Peiping are being made in Moscow instead of Peiping, for Hanoi in Peiping and Moscow instead of Hanoi, for Budapest in Moscow instead of Budapest, for Prague in Moscow instead of Prague, for Warsaw in Moscow instead of Warsaw.

We must call their attention to the Communist colonial empire in which Russia's Kremlin masters rule over the slave colonies of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Albania, Red China, and Viet Minh. We must drive home the fact to them that Russia seeks to make a slave colony out of every Asian country and every country of the world.

4. We are liked and respected in Spain. Spain should be taken into NATO without further delay. The past prejudices against Spain because of her neutrality in World War II, which seemed to be benevolently on the side of Hitler and Mussolini must be discarded. After all, NATO is for the purpose of mutual defense against aggressive communism—Spain is a bitter foe of communism—and if we can take a Western Germany and Italy, who were our active enemies in World War II, into NATO, then there is no excuse for barring Spain.

5. It would be wise for us to concentrate our aid on such countries as Spain and Turkey instead of gambling that aid with such question marks as Yugoslavia. It would be wise for our aid to be made on the businesslike basis of loans instead of gifts—if only for the respect it would bring us.

6. Even in Communist Russia the common people want to be friends with us. We should answer the coexistence talk that Russia puts forth by simply pointing out that their foremost form of coexistence is inside Russia where the attitude of the common people of Russia with communism is merely one of internal coexistence—where they merely coexist with communism—where they are simply resigned to it—with no enthusiasm to resist it or defend it.

We should counter the Communist coexistence talk with the question of "If you really believe in coexistence, why then don't you let the rest of the countries of the world exist with their free governments—why have you destroyed the free governments of your slave colonies?"

7. In the future our foreign policy must be based on confidence in our own demonstrated strength and rightful objectives instead of stemming from fear of Russia. We must accentuate the positive, eliminate the negative, and latch on to the affirmative more. We must shift from a policy of defensive countermoves to bold and confident maintenance of the initiative.

Now your members who invited me to speak here tonight, asked me to say something about Quemoy and Matsu. So many people have had so much to say on this subject that I think it has just about been exhausted. Surely there is nothing I can add to what the really great minds have already said about it.

But lest you think I'm attempting to dodge stating my position on the issue I will say something on the subject.

My position on Quemoy and Matsu is this: Back in January of this year, the Members of Congress by an overwhelming margin voted to give full authority for the decision on whether to defend Quemoy and Matsu to President Eisenhower. They did for more than one reason. Such a decision has historically and constitutionally been the prerogative of the President of the United States.

Thus, from a constitutional standpoint his request for the Formosa resolution was unnecessary. Rather he made it from a psychological standpoint of unity between the Congress and the President on whatever action he should take.

The Congress made that overwhelming decision for another very important reason—the Senators and Representatives realized that no one but the President could be in possession of the necessary facts with which to make the decision, much less 435 Representatives and 96 Senators in an area of unlimited debate.

The President asked for advance congressional commitment to support whatever decision he made. The great majority of the Senators, however reluctantly, voted to give him that advance commitment. I did—and I expect to keep that commitment. I think every Senator who voted against the amendments that were offered concerning Quemoy and Matsu are bound by that commitment and estopped from trying to force the President to a commitment either for or against defense of Quemoy and Matsu.

I don't think that they are estopped from voicing their personal opinions—but I don't think they can in good conscience try to pressure the President into a commitment prior to such time as he decides to make his decision.

You may say that such a position would be tantamount to the Senate delegating away its authority and responsibility. But that is not the case. In the first place, the authority is already vested by the Constitution in the President. In the second place, the Senate and the House for that matter, did not shirk its responsibility on expressing such confidence in the President to make the decision—for the Senate and the House only specifically responded to the request of the President for the Formosa resolution.

Had the Congress rejected the Presidential request, the repercussions around the world would have been obvious.

For example, who would accuse Senator WALTER GEORGE of dodging responsibility in the Formosa resolution. Who would accuse him of abjectly surrendering and delegating power that he should not to the President? Yet, it was Senator GEORGE who led the fight for passage of the Formosa resolution.

Yes; and it was Senator GEORGE who rose above partisanship and said that the decision was rightly that of President Eisenhower and that both sides should stop trying to pressure the President.

Yes; my position on the Quemoy-Matsu issue is simply this: The decision is properly that of the President, not only constitutionally but also from a practical standpoint. There is no Representative or Senator who knows as much about the facts and conditions surrounding the controversy as does President Eisenhower. No Representative or Senator could possibly know. There is no Representative or Senator as equipped with the objectivity and freedom from future political ambitions as President Eisenhower for making a nonpolitical decision on the issue.

Finally, I ask you if there is anyone who can match the military genius of Dwight D. Eisenhower, the man who led us to victory in World War II? Would you pit the evaluation and judgment of anyone on this military situation against the judgment of Dwight D. Eisenhower? Would you pit the judgment of anyone on the foreign-relations consideration of this issue against that of Dwight D. Eisenhower?

Well, I wouldn't. And I certainly wouldn't presume to say that I have access to enough information to second-guess the President and commander of our victorious World War II forces.

Instead, I say that he is best equipped to make the decision—to make it whenever he deems it wisest to—that I place full confidence in him and that I shall support him in his decision and the timing of it.

WALTER GEORGE, the dean of the Senate and a member of the opposition party to the President, has said it so frequently, abundantly, and eloquently that frankly I think it needs no elaboration.

Now, that leads me into a point that I do want to make with you. First, let me observe that the 15th of April has come and gone—and the Chinese Communists have not made an attempt to take Quemoy and Matsu, contrary to the gloomy military predictions that we heard a short time ago. That doesn't mean they won't at any time.

But here is demonstrative proof of the wisdom and knowledge of the President. He disagreed with the militarists who were making that prediction. Time has proved he was right and the militarists wrong.

I, for one, am weary of either militarists on one side or politically motivated groups on the other side trying to pressure the President to their concept of foreign policy, a field in which they obviously are not qualified. I am weary of the Quemoy-Matsu matter being made a political football.

I do not mean that the President is immune to criticism and political attack from political opponents. Nor do I mean that the militarists are barred from making vigorous suggestions and recommendations to him. But I do mean that this is no time for politics, under the guise of patriotism, on the part of civilians and civilian groups. And I do mean that it is not for militarists, on the other side, to usurp policymaking powers. Their mission is to carry out the policy decisions of the President—not to formulate them.

This is a time for cool heads—not hotheads. This is a time for calm, considered judgment—not bellicose talk. This is a time for realistic optimism—not belligerent pessimism. This is no time for militaristic badgering of the civilian head of our Government.

Now is not the time for making political hay on such a vital 1955 national security issue in and out of Congress with partisan speeches aimed at the 1956 political campaign.

Now is not the time for all good men to come to the aid of their political party.

Now is the time for all good men and women to come to the aid of their country with nonpartisan, optimistic, and positive thinking—like Senator WALTER GEORGE.

And there is no better time for you editors to respond to such a call than now. I am fully confident you will, as you have in the past.

The Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party Schism of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have just read with great interest the account

in the spring, 1955, issue of the journal, Minnesota History, of "The Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party Schism in 1948," by Dr. G. Theodore Mitau of Macalester College in St. Paul. This struggle in which the Junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and his loyal associates so completely and successfully thwarted the determined efforts of the so-called Progressives and their Communist Party allies to take over the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party in their State is an important milestone in the drive of true American liberals to expose and to block the maneuvers of the Communists for power in America. The account of these events confirms the basic good sense, loyalty, and devotion to democracy of the vast majority of Americans. But it also serves as a timely reminder of the need for vigilance, discernment, and positive action like that displayed by the Senator from Minnesota and his associates, to defeat the agents of the foreign tyranny and their misguided party-liners whenever they try to infiltrate political parties or other legitimate organizations.

Mr. President, in order that others may read of this significant 1948 battle in Minnesota, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Dr. Mitau's article from Minnesota History be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEMOCRATIC-FARMER-LABOR PARTY SCHISM OF 1948

(G. Theodore Mitau)

Behind the lively events of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party schism of 1948 a long and complex background of political protest can be traced. As one writer has put it, Minnesota through most of its history has shown symptoms of political schizophrenia. On the one hand, it was the staid dowager, as reliably Republican as its down-east Yankee sisters; on the other, it had skittish moments during which it produced a brood of third parties or helped raise the radical offspring of its neighbors. Especially in periods of economic depression, voices of agrarian and urban protest, often discordant and intense, have risen from the mining pits of the Mesabi Range, from the slaughterhouses and railroad shops of the cities, and from the debt-ridden farms of the Red River Valley to find expression in the platforms and conventions of Minnesota's third and minor parties. Through the Antimonopolists and the Greenback Party of the 1870's, and the Nonpartisan League and the Farmer-Labor Party of the present century, this tradition of protest has continued to exert pressure on State politics.

Along with other Midwestern States, Minnesota witnessed the well-known patterns of protest, genuinely active, rich in condemnation of the railroads, monopolies, and Wall Street, and proud of the righteous blasts from such tribunes of the people as Ignatius Donnelly, A. C. Townley, Magnus Johnson, and Floyd B. Olson. The quest for success at the polls, which would translate platform and program into actual public policy, caused leaders of the Populist movement to experiment with various types of political tactics. At times it led them to support a major party contestant, such as John A. Johnson, who ran for governor on the Democratic ticket in 1904, and Charles A. Lindbergh, Sr., candidate for the Republican nomination for governor in the primaries of 1918; at other times it led them to advocate fusion with emerging national parties, as in 1912 and 1924; and in other campaigns, like that in 1892, all fusion attempts were spurned and Donnelly was called upon to head a State Populist ticket as that party's candidate for governor. During the dark, unhappy days of the depression in the 1930s the voices of protest rose to a crescendo. In their commitment to left-wing radicalism, the Farmer-Labor platforms of that period are perhaps unmatched by those of any other American party which has been successful at the polls.

But even in the perilous 1930's, when the party had the popular Governor Olson to argue on its behalf, Farmer-Labor policies seemed to have reached the limits of their acceptability. Olson's legislative program encountered major modification, some features incurring intense hostility and some meeting with outright defeat. This happened, moreover, in sessions like those of 1933 and 1937, when Olson's party had control of the lower house of the legislature. Then in 1938 the electoral fortunes of Farmer-Labor protest reached a new low. Governor Elmer Benson was swept out of office by Harold Stassen, the relatively unknown county attorney from South St. Paul, after a campaign which stressed charges of administrative incompetence, corruption, and blindness to Communist infiltration. The wave of popular indignation left Benson with a mere 387,263 votes to the amazing and overwhelming total of 678,839 for the Republican Party's nominee.

The Farmer-Labor Party lost its one-time broad popular support, according to one scholar, largely because it could not combat the undermining tactics used by internal quarreling factions, and because it failed to provide necessary policy direction through executive and legislative leadership. The same writer concludes his analysis of the great debacle of 1938 with the observation that "the next 6 years were to see the final disintegration of the Farmer-Labor Party, culminating in its virtual extinction when it was fused with the Democratic Party in the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party"; and he describes "the fusion of 1944" as "simply the requiem for a death that had occurred in 1938."

What, in retrospect, can be inferred from these events? Most populist movements have been motivated by an urge to broaden the base of sociopolitical and economic privilege through such state interventions as a particular grievance seemed to demand. What these movements lacked in the doctrinate qualities of a European pattern of challenge was counterbalance by the American tradition of practical and selective state intervention.

Most of this protest, then, was genuine, necessary, creative. Especially relevant in a study of the fortunes of the protest tradition after the Democratic-Farmer-Labor fusion in 1944, however, is the fact that some of the protest lacked these qualities. Largely through union infiltration, the long arm of the Third Internationale seemed at times to reach all the way to the North Star State when efforts to exploit real grievances and to confuse, disrupt, and subvert the democratic processes were made in Minnesota. The fusion of the Democratic and Farmer-Labor Parties in 1944 did not, and perhaps could not, eliminate this numerically small, but quite vociferous, segment of left-wing Marxist radicals. As a matter of fact, the very presence of some of these radicals within the ranks of the Farmer-Laborites had caused many old-line Democrats and independents to oppose earlier attempts at fusion.

The attitude of the Democratic Party, and more particularly its so-called liberal New Deal wing, toward the political far left presented a major ideological problem not only for Minnesotans but for the Nation as a whole. The problem was intensified after the congressional elections of 1946. Two mutually antagonistic groups crystallized into organizations by the spring of 1947. On the left, the Progressive Citizens of America emerged from a fusion of the National Citizens Political Action Committee and the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions. On the right appeared the Americans for Democratic Action.

With spokesmen like Henry A. Wallace for the left and such well-known New Dealers as Leon Henderson, Chester Bowles, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., on the right, the issues soon became clearly drawn. The rightwing non-Communist liberal Americans for Democratic Action supported the Marshal plan, and President Truman's Greco-Turkish aid program; the Progressive Citizens of America held these to be unwarranted circumventions of the United Nations, conceived in support of European forces of reaction and fascism. Whereas the Americans for Democratic Action approved most of Truman's domestic, security, and defense measures, the Progressive Citizens of America considered them entirely inadequate halfway measures of a party which was doing little better than the Republicans. This clash of ideology and policy, debated at great length throughout the Nation and in Congress, was personified locally by Mayor Hubert Humphrey of Minneapolis, a national leader of the Americans for Democratic Action, Orville Olson, chairman of the Independent Voters of Minnesota, and ex-Governor Elmer Benson, a leading figure in the Progressive Citizens of America.

Wallace himself left the National Democratic Party after a now famous declaration on December 29, 1947, in which he denounced Truman and his program. Nevertheless, Benson and his Minnesota friends apparently decided early in 1948 that it would be politically wiser to work through the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party than to revert to the more traditional pattern of third-party politics. Speaking in Chicago at the second annual convention of the Progressive Citizens of America, the former Minnesota governor declared, "if we retain control of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party at the State convention, Wallace will be the nominee and we will present him at the National Democratic Convention. * * * If President Truman runs in Minnesota, he'll have to run as an independent, or however he wants to label it."

Thus plans were made to push Wallace in Minnesota not as a third-party candidate, but as a regular Democratic-Farmer-Labor nominee whose name would go on the party ballot after his faction had captured the State party machinery. When the Democratic-Farmer-Labor State central committee met on February 20, the battle for control of the precincts began to take shape. The Humphrey-led rightwing asserted its 3-to-1 lead over the Benson faction by appointing exclusively from its own ranks the steering committee which was to make arrangements for the precinct caucuses and the county and State conventions.

The hostility which the left wing felt for Mayor Humphrey and his followers is expressed in an editorial in the Minnesota Leader, then the organ of the pro-Wallace Democratic-Farmer-Labor Association. "Your association," it reads, "with the unsavory Americans for Democratic Action created nationally to serve as liberal window dressing for the Wall Streeters and militarists behind Truman and created in Minnesota as a heaven for reactionary elements in the Democratic and Farmer-Labor Parties, is another indication of the character of your associations." It also accused the Minneapolis mayor of close and friendly relations with the Cowles press and General Mills, and of conducting a reactionary administration of city affairs, and it told the mayor that "by your associations and your record you have

ruined any chance of your being an acceptable progressive candidate in the 1948 elections." In the same paper the State chairwoman of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Association charged Humphrey with the disruption of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor party in the 1944 and 1946 elections, with disloyalty to the party chairman, with red baiting and with giving support to Churchill's foreign policy.

The leaders of the right wing answered in the Minnesota Outlook, where they published this indictment of the Wallace-Benson faction: "We are convinced that if the DFL is to win support, it must remove from positions of leadership all those who have represented or who have otherwise aided and abetted the program and tactics of the Communist Party which believes—and in progress toward a free world—but in the reaction of totalitarianism and suppression of individual freedom."

A bitterly contested battle of the two factions was to develop in the ranks of the Minnesota Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party in the spring of 1948. The party workers who were preparing for caucuses and conventions knew that the survival of their respective factions was at stake. The right wing made a strong offensive move on April 18, when its steering committee, under the leadership of Mayor Humphrey and the present governor, Orville Freeman, announced that Wallace's third-party supporters were disqualified from taking part in the regular Democratic-Farmer-Labor sessions. All county chairmen who identified themselves with Wallace were asked to turn their credentials over to the next ranking Democratic-Farmer-Labor leader. In the meantime, the State chairman for the Wallace group countered this right-wing declaration by telling 2,000 Wallace fans who met in the St. Paul Auditorium that "regardless of talk about keeping them out," they were, in fact, "legally entitled to participate in all DFL caucuses and should do so en masse."

As the factional fight grew in intensity, charges and countercharges raised Democratic-Farmer-Labor tempers to the boiling point. Mayor Humphrey was quoted as saying that the third-party movement was part of a deliberate international pattern to confuse honest liberals and to hobble the functioning of democracy; that it was being used to serve the purposes of the Russian police state; and that, although most Minnesotans in the Wallace movement were non-Communist, Communists and party-line followers in all States were seeking with religious fanaticism to promote a third party as part of Moscow's strategy to split Americans into ineffectual groups fighting among themselves.

Wallace supporters, in the meantime, continued to attack the Marshall plan, Truman's cold-war strategy, universal military training, and the reactionary nature of domestic legislation passed by the 80th Congress. Theirs, they claimed, was a fight for peace through supporting Wallace as an independent candidate. Wallace himself was quoted as saying at Albuquerque that the Communists "support me because I say we can have peace with Russia." He further clarified his position by stating: "I will not repudiate any support which comes to me on the basis of interest in peace. The Communists are interested in peace because they want a successful socialist experiment in Russia."

The factional battle reached its first significant parliamentary stage in the precinct caucuses of April 30. Aside from the customary citizenship and residence requirements, all that is needed for participation in such a caucus under Minnesota law is the assurance of a past vote (with the secret ballot precluding any external verification) of the promise of future affiliation with the party which is holding the caucus. When the results of these caucuses were finally tabulated, the right wing claimed a clear numericial majority throughout the State. This claim was loudly protested by leaders of the Wallace-Benson faction. After the county conventions of May 14, the right wing claimed still another victory, pointing out that only 161 of 402 State convention delegates had faced any contest at all, and that out of 76 county delegations, 59 were definitely anti-Wallace, 5 probably pro-Wallace, 4 uncertain, and 8 contested.

On May 23, members of the Wallace-Benson faction, which was still very active, telegraphed Harold Barker, State chairman of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party, demanding that its delegates be allowed to participate in the State convention called for June 12 and 13 at Brainerd. Unless this demand was granted, they said, they would call their own convention in Minneapolis and would repudiate the Brainerd convention as illegal and irregular. While the delegates were assembling at Brainerd, a temporary preconvention committee on credentials submitted a report giving a clear majority to the right wing. It showed that of 402 authorized delegates, 216 had been uncontested. Of the latter, 186 actually were present and ready to vote on the seating of the delegation.[15] The committee arrived at these figures even before contested delegations from Hennepin, Ramsey, St. Louis, and other counties were seated. The Brainerd convention was to serve as a "political court of last appeal" at which the results of the bitter struggle between the right and left wings were finally determined.

One left-wing leader, Orville Olson, protested the convention's opening proceedings and denounced what he felt to be its unlawful and arbitrary conduct of business. A member of the incoming Hennepin County right-wing delegation replied by branding the Wallace "fringe" as "the Communist Party in action, a movement of revolutionary character," by asserting that the "Wallace movement is not a third party in the true American sense [and by] inferring that it is serving the interests of Moscow." Whereupon the convention voted "with an almost unanimous road" to seat the right-wingers from Hennepin County.

The Wallace leaders thereupon held a hasty conference and decided to use the microphone in calling for a rump convention. When they were greeted by loud laughter and derisive cries, five of the group gathered on the sidewalk in front of the convention hall and solemnly held a meeting, with Francis M. Smith, of St. Paul, acting as chairman. He appointed a secretary to keep minutes, declared the meeting a rump convention of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party, and then adjourned it to the American Federation of Labor Temple in Minneapolis, where a gathering of the left-wing faction was already in session.

According to leaders of this group, 500 delegates from 51 counties assembled for the Minneapolis convention. They listened eagerly as Benson termed the "program of Marshall, Forrestal, Dulles, Vandenberg and company the most gigantic international swindle of all time * * * intended to suppress common people in every part of the world." The convention then organized itself into the Progressive Democratic-Farmer-Labor League and endorsed James M. Shields, of Minneapolis, for the United States Senate and Walter Johnson, of New York Mills, for governor. In addition, 5 nominees were named for the National House of Representatives, 11 presidential electors pledged to Wallace were agreed upon, and delegates were chosen to attend the convention of the Progressive Party in Philadelphia in July. As a final offensive stroke, the Minneapolis convention promptly presented its slate of presidential electors to the Minnesota secretary of State, claiming that since its group represented the true Democratic-Farmer-Labor ruling body, it was entitled to have its name placed on the ballot pursuant to the provisions of the Minnesota election code.

Attorneys for the right-wing Brainerd convention then prepared a petition urging the Minnesota State Supreme Court to order the secretary of state, as the respondent, to reject the slate of the Minneapolis group as false and fraudulent and to substitute that of the petitioners as the true and legal one of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota. The secretary of state, speaking through the attorney general, insisted that he had no facilities or authority to investigate or determine the truth or falsity of the conflicting representations, and asked the court to ascertain the facts and determine what course of action he should take with respect to accepting one or the other of the two certificates.

If certain factional and legal complexities which have no direct bearing upon the problem under discussion are overlooked, the case of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor State Central Committee, right wing, and others, versus Mike Holm, secretary of state, raised and answered three fundamental questions: First, are the qualifications of members of a legally called political delegate convention subject to judicial determination and review? Second, is the legality of such a convention's actions affected by improper floor decisions? Third, does such an allegedly illegal action entitle disaffected members to withdraw from a convention, to terminate its legal life by so doing, and to resuscitate in a newly assembled convention such former authority as did exist?

On September 2, 1948, the Minnesota Supreme Court handed down a unanimous decision in favor of the second slate, the Brainerd right-wing convention thus receiving negative answers to the three main questions raised.

The language of the court leaves little doubt that it was the intent of the Minnesota judiciary so to construe applicable statutes that the affairs of party conventions, if correctly convened, are to be placed squarely in the hands of their duly elected delegates. Theirs, and not the judiciary's, is the responsibility for conducting the business of the party fairly and soundly. Legal theory at this point found itself in complete harmony with the well-established democratic principle that political power should always be centered in those whose actions are subject at least theoretically to popular scrutiny and accountability. And this faith in popular sovereignty was destined to be reinforced and mathematically underscored by the results of the primary election of September 1948, when the rightwing nominees were victorious in all the important contests except that in the Seventh Congressional District. Even more significant were the results of the final election in November, which saw President Truman, then heading the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party ticket, garner 692,966 votes to the mere 27,866 cast in Minnesota for the Progressive Party's candidate, Henry A. Wallace. The successful rightwing struggle for control in the precincts, and in county, district, and State conventions provided President Truman with the type of major party instrumentality without which Minnesota's 11 electoral votes might well have gone to the Republican nominee. Not only the President's Minnesota victory, but Mayor Humphrey's election to the Senate and the addition of three Democratic-Farmer-Labor representatives to Congress, were hailed by rightwing leaders as direct results of the 1948 party struggle.

The outcome of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party schism of 1948—showing as it does that the will of the majority can be made to prevail over the concerted efforts of even a better disciplined, numerically small,

but closely knit party segment, serves to reaffirm faith in the vitality of the major party system. Most assuredly, lack of vigilance there as in other political activities can rob a free people of its treasured political heritage, should they ever grow weary of freedom or supinely take their liberties for granted. The intensity of the 1948 factional struggle within the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party and the resulting schism well illustrate vigilance and a willingness to do battle for the sake of political conscience.

Annual Memorial Day Exercises—Revere Ladies Auxiliary Post, No. 940, Revere, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address which I delivered at the annual Memorial Day exercises on Monday, May 30, 1955, Revere Ladies Auxiliary to Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Post No. 940, Revere, Mass.:

On Memorial Day, through the miracle of remembrance, the dead seem to live again. So near, it seems, that we might almost touch them.

The smile, the voice, the mannerisms of a loved one.

Faces from the past that are with us today.

Visitors from eternity.

Side by side with us, as surely as there is everlasting life beyond the grave.

Through the tender and moving ceremonies of Memorial Day, we feel the presence of those who once lived and breathed as we do.

Joining with us for a few steps along the way, in the mystical reunion that gives us greater strength to face tomorrow.

They come, whispering to us: "Be unafraid to live up to the best that is in you. For brave men never die."

The bugle sounds "taps" over their graves, but the echo comes back to us like an answering voice. As if the dead were waking us from our earthly trance. Asking us to make each moment count, for God and humanity.

We pause and listen.

"Once we were like you, the living.

"And then we left for distant battlefields where we fought the fight from which there is no return.

"In our last moments on this earth, we yearned for the country of our birth.

"Reaching out a hand as if we might bridge the thousands of miles, reaching for home.

"We who were about to die, remembered—friends and families and happy times.

"Then, knowing we could never come back to the life that was, our last thoughts on earth were of you.

"Of how you might fulfill our plans that somehow went astray.

"Serene, at that final moment, knowing that you would go on building the house where freedom dwells. A house of prosperous cities and farms where every child can look forward to a life of greater opportunity to serve himself and others. Furnished with the love of home and neighborhood that makes a people strong and good.

"For we the dead have faith in you who live."

Their voices fade away like the gentle breeze that whispers among the leaves, and then is gone.

But they did speak to us a moment ago—as they do, on every Memorial Day—ever reminding us of the great truths that gave birth to out Nation, and have nourished it through its young and wonderful history, up to now.

The truths now in our keeping, for us to perpetuate with honor, or cast away—if we break faith with those who died.

Not many miles from here, the first pioneers stepped ashore to build a brave new world out of the wilderness, enduring every hardship for the chance to be free.

They suffered and died for this faith, that first grim winter in 1620.

Slowly but surely, never yielding to doubt or difficulty, they worked hard to make a dream come true.

They were men and women who wanted to succeed by their own efforts.

Because they respected themselves, and respected their neighbors, they began to develop a system of government that would always be responsive to the will of the people.

From the Minutemen of Concord and Lexington, to the career men of our Armed Forces today, the voluntary spirit is the key to our Nation's greatness.

From the Tories in the Revolution who sided with Britain; through the rebels and the carpetbaggers of the Civil War era, the profiteers of World War I, and the draft-dodgers of World War II—there were always a few who failed us, but they were a lonely few.

The United States is strong, not because of the material things it inherits from the past, for there were no things left to them by others to help the men and women who landed at Plymouth Rock. Only their heads, and hands, and hearts. With these, they conquered the wilderness.

Even as their more fortunate descendants of today must build character before all else.

Honesty, truthfulness, intelligence, courage—these cannot be bought in the market place.

They can only be developed, from within.

In every emergency, our people can draw from this great reservoir of strength.

Because the men and women who are so close to us in spirit on Memorial Day, were brought up in homes where examples inspired them with deathless devotion to the principles of freedom.

Where parents taught their children that the honor of their immortal souls should never surrender to material temptations.

In 1955, there is national concern about the problem of juvenile delinquency; of boys who have become cowardly bullies, and of girls who disgrace themselves. Bringing heartache to their parents, and danger to the life of the community.

And we ask, "Where, and how, did they lose themselves?"

Running away from the sound traditions that have moulded youngsters into good citizens since the beginnings of our Nation.

Perhaps we must share part of the blame, because, in our pursuit of material ends, we have neglected to provide them with the right example.

Too busy to be the living embodiment of those virtues that we remember today.

As the dead would say: "To you we pass the torch. Be yours to hold it high."

Most of our youngsters are strong and true, building the wholesome lives that are a continuation of all that is best in our past. Trying to guide the delinquent few of their own generation to the right road again.

A nation may become rich and powerful, but if it is careless of its moral fiber, the dry rot of decay has already set in.

On Memorial Day we pay tribute to those who shunned the easy way, they met and conquered the sternest test of manhood.

Some we knew by name, because they once lived in the neighborhood where we grew up.

Others we memorized from our study of American history.

One—who is the symbol of all—rests in the tomb of the unknown soldier—at Arlington National Cemetery close to the Nation's Capitol.

We bow our heads in reverence to their immortal faith and courage.

For the miracle cord of memory unites them with us, and with the children of today, who will grow up to become the responsible Americans of tomorrow.

And we pray that we may become worthy of our kinship with the heroes of Bunker Hill, Gettysburg, the charge at San Juan Hill, Chateau-Thierry, Bastogne, Iwo Jima, Heartbreak Ridge, who gave beyond all giving that freedom might live.

So close to us in spirit on this day, whispering to us: "Be unafraid to live up to the best that is in you, for brave men never die."

Scope of Communist Activity in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a broadcast of May 23, 1955, by the distinguished Commentator, Edward P. Morgan, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Mr. Morgan broadcasts over the network of the American Broadcasting System for the American Federation of Labor.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Where were you on the night of June 13, of the year say—1942? What was the name of the outfit that sponsored the lecture of that European public health expert you attended several years ago? Under certain very real circumstances, wrong answers to such questions could cost you your job or keep you from getting one. People have lost or have been denied employment because, somehow, by attending a lecture, by contributing to some cause, or by outright membership, their names have been linked with organizations comprising a black book called the Attorney General's list.

In 1947, under the Truman administration, the Attorney General was directed to compile a list of organizations supposed to be Fascist, totalitarian, Communistic, or in any way subversive. The idea was to use this in checking the loyalty of people working for the Government and people applying for Federal jobs.

Tonight before a convention of B'nai B'rith on Lake Kiamesha, N. Y., a member of the Eisenhower administration who has become its own severest critic on security policy, Harry P. Cain, made an elaborate attack on the Attorney General's list as vastly misleading and dangerously undermining the very security it was supposed to strengthen. This is the third time in 4 months that Cain, a Republican and ex-Senator from the State of Washington, has attacked the Government's security program. This is the first time that any administration official has publicly attacked the Attorney General's list. Cain's latest blast is significant for at least three reasons: He is in a position to know what he is talking about. An Eisenhower appointee, he is a member of the

Subversive Activities Control Board, one of whose functions is to help determine whether an organization is subversive or not, so he has an open window, so to speak, onto the operation of the Attorney General's list. In the Senate, Cain was one of the young Republicans of the extreme right, along with Senators McCarthy and Jenner; he says his control board job has reoriented his thinking. As the third point of significance, his remarks tonight sharpen attention on the issue just 3 days before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee is due to launch an investigation of the whole security risk program.

The Attorney General's list, Cain charges, has become a tool of busybodies, superpatriots, and vigilante groups, and in its present form its information is unintelligible, misleading, and a threat to the Nation's internal security. There are now 275 organizations on the list, giving the impression, Cain says, that a host of subversives are working day and night, like termites, against the Nation's good. In fact 150 of those 275 are now extinct and Cain estimates that of the 125 left, not more than 20 or 30 can be reasonably assumed to be part and parcel of the Communist conspiracy.

He doesn't discount the treachery of communism but he makes the point that we are needlessly overrating the scope of organized Communist activity in the United States. The result: hysteria. As an example of the resulting excesses Cain cited the vicious pending legislation in Illinois called the Broyles bills making membership in listed groups subject to penalties approximately four times as severe as those the Federal Government meted out to convicted Communist conspirators. "By what means," Cain asks, "has the State of Illinois found that mere membership in a listed organization is an evil or subversive thing in itself?"

Cain also makes the shattering revelation that to his knowledge—and he's in a position to know—no group on the Attorney General's list has ever actually been given a hearing by the Attorney General, either before or after being listed. We must look for a better way of doing things, he argues, than that.

We shouldn't have to look far. The rules are spelled out pretty well—not in a black book—but in a little tract called the Bill of Rights.

This is Edward Morgan, saying goodnight from Washington.

Sugar for New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Worcester Telegram, Worcester, Mass., May 11, 1955:

Sugar for New England

Geographically it is a long way from a Cuban sugar plantation to New England, but economically they are close together. This region looks to Cuba as the cheapest and most reliable source of sugar for its candy-making, which employs 11,000 persons in Massachusetts alone.

The United States uses a total of about 8 million tons of raw sugar a year. Of this amount, Cuba supplied in 1954 about 2,723,401 tons. The remainder came from Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Isles, Philippines, and from this country's own beet- and cane-sugar producers in the South and West.

American sugar growers are again restive. They are trying to increase their own quotas under the Sugar Act of 1948, and to reduce the Cuban quota. Year after year the domestic producers have used political pressure to accomplish this. The supply of Cuban sugar imported here has been steadily dwindling.

Cuban sugar interests quite properly are pointing out that destruction of their market simply means that Cubans won't have the dollars to buy American-made goods. And Cuba, believe it or not, has been Uncle Sam's sixth best customer, buying $425 million worth of our goods every year.

This is the two-way-street concept in foreign trade. The subpect also poses the same old dilemma. American beet and cane sugar interests want Uncle Sam's protection from foreign competition. New England sugar users don't like that idea at all; they want to be able to buy plenty of Cuban sugar. But, at the same time, New England candy-makers don't like the competition of foreign candy, made principally in Great Britain. They'd like a good high tariff on these candy imports.

The Road Bill and Tribute to Senator Johnson of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the Record an editorial printed in one of Texas, most influential newspapers, the Wichita Falls Record-News Times. This editorial pays a well-deserved tribute to our Senate Democratic leader for his fine work on the road bill and sets forth the most important reason for the passage of the Senate measure on that subject.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

More Acceptable Road Bill

The Democrats have come up with a far more acceptable highway bill and its passage in the Senate on voice vote should help the House make up its mind.

Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas, has pointed to two defects in the administration's proposal: It is strictly limited to urban roads and it represents a windfall for bond houses through its financing scheme.

"The measure which the Senate passed was a fair bill and a just bill," Senator Johnson said. "It took into account the needs of all elements in our population, including the farmers. Instead of 'bonds for boulevards' it would provide good, hard-surfaced roads for our farmers and our urban population."

In time of war, it would not be difficult to say which roads would be of more service, superhighways linking cities as proposed in the Republican bill, or modern highways and excellent farm-to-market roads, as proposed in the Democratic version. The whole economy, not one segment of it, is of greater importance when the Nation has to defend itself.

The Democratic bill offers the best solution for highway improvement, for peacetime traffic and wartime needs.

Address by Hon. Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine, at Overseas Press Club Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there came to my attention recently an address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. Smith] before the Overseas Press Club annual awards dinner on April 19, 1955, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City. In this address she gave an account of what she found on her trip around the world. It is an interesting and illuminating address. I recommend it as good reading material for all.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Hon. Margaret Chase Smith at Overseas Press Club Annual Awards Dinner, April 19, 1955, New York

Mr. President, officers, directors, and members of the Overseas Club, and guests, there is the biblical saying of "The first shall be last and the last shall be first." That saying is most probably prophetic of this phase of your 1955 awards dinner. For I am told that I have the honor of being the first woman to ever give the principal address at this famous dinner of yours. I shall probably be the last for I fear I shall be a disappointment to such a brilliant array of journalistic pundits and foreign correspondents. I beg of you not to let your disappointment prejudice you against having women speakers in the future.

Your very genial and affable president, Bob Considine—with whom I have served several times on the panel of "Who Said That"—in extending to me the honor of addressing you tonight suggested that you might be interested in my observations from two recent trips I made overseas.

It is with considerable misgiving that I do so. For me to tell you of the overseas press, what I saw, and my impressions overseas, is like Gravel Gertie telling Marilyn Monroe how to be glamorous—or Republicans telling Eisenhower how to win elections.

During the past 6 months I made two overseas trips—the first last October, the second this past late February and early March—to 23 countries covering 50,000 miles. I made the trips in search of first-hand knowledge—knowledge that I wanted to get with my own eyes and ears instead of through the eyes and ears of someone else. They were unofficial, personal trips.

Perhaps it was the adopted strains of journalism in me—perhaps it was the fascination some politicians have for getting down to the grassroots and feeling the pulse of the public—but I wanted to try to get even a slight bit of that knowledge a Senator can't get on an official committee trip.

For example, I talked with a Communist leader in France because I wanted to try to find out why he, a former Catholic, became a Communist. I thought I could get a better insight of how great might be the danger of France going Communist by talking to this man than in just receiving the official briefings that a senatorial committee would ordinarily get.

And in these past few years when too many of us have been afraid of our shadows and live in mortal fear that someone might call us a Communist or pro-Communist merely

because we had known at some time anyone who was even slightly nonconformist, what chances are there of a Senatorial committee officially talking to a French Communist?

In Germany I talked to an alleged Nazi—considered by many to be the political heir to Hitler—because I felt such a talk would give me a better feeling about the chances of fascism or nazism rising again to rule Germany. I am sure that I would not have had the opportunity to do it if I had been on an official committee trip.

In talking with Molotov in Russia I stressed the fact that I was not in Russia on any official committee mission—I did so because I did not want anything I said or did to be interpreted or seized upon as a commitment by the United States Government. In all of my contacts there, both I and the American Embassy took great pains to see to it that the American Embassy had nothing whatsoever to do with my contacts with the Russians.

In these two trips I think that I saw nearly all of the leaders of the world. But I talked with others than Government officials. In London I debated with radical Laborite Aneurin Bevan and Punch editor Malcolm Muggeridge as well as talking with historian Arnold Toynbee and Churchill and Eden.

In Paris I talked with the leaders of all of the French major political parties, Socialist Mollet, General de Gaulle, Catholic Bidault, Communist Bonte as well as Mendes-France and Faure.

I went to the common people spending parts of days with farm families in Russia, Japan, and France, a middle-class working family in London—the father of the family being a Turf accountant. I went through the stores in East Berlin. My assistant, Bill Lewis, inadvertently and involuntarily accommodated my search for knowledge when he spent a short time in an East Berlin jail on an unjustified arrest for which the East Berlin authorities later apologized.

I went to schools in Russia, Thailand, and Turkey—to food markets in Thailand and Russia—to a refugee camp in Vietnam—to libraries in Burma and the Philippines—to nurseries in Formosa and Russia—to villages and community meetings in India, Spain, and Turkey—to sessions of legislatures and parliaments in the Philippines, Italy, and India—to a political convention in Great Britain—to a textile mill, a farmer's rice mill, a medical dispensary in Formosa. I inspected Chinese soldiers in the field in a whipping, dusty wind in the southern part of Formosa.

These are a few of the things I did on my trips which brought down upon me bitter denunciation from the Communist press in Russia. They called me an Amazon warmonger hiding behind a rose.

America and Americans are far better liked and respected throughout the world than I thought. Perhaps we are not liked as much as we want to be liked. But I am sure that we are much better liked abroad than the American public realizes.

Many people and many nations may have some concern about us. They may fear that we are impetuous, immature on world diplomacy, too impatient and too inclined to fly off the handle, so to speak. But they still respect and like us.

They do because they recognize that while our impatience can be a weakness, it has surely been a great source of strength in the past. They know that it was partly on impatience that we built our Nation into the greatest and most powerful country in the history of the world. We were not content to let nature take its course at a slow speed.

They know deep down in their hearts that tied inalterably with our impatience has been our generosity. We were impatient with the rate of recovery in Western Europe, but we were generous. So our impatience and generosity produced the Marshall plan that literally took Western Europe up off the flat of its back and on to its feet so that it could begin to stand alone.

They know that this combination of impatience and generosity defeated communism and stopped the Communists dead in their tracks in Western Europe.

They know that if we had not been impatient for Western Europe to get off the financial crutch we have provided until she could walk again on her own feet that she would never have learned to walk on her own feet again.

They can see now that our refusal to give the unlimited patience to Russia they advocated, that our adherence to impatience has produced NATO, the London and Paris pacts—and more recently literally forced Russia into the position of at long last agreeing to an Austrian peace treaty.

They know that our impatience with France's rejection of the very EDC she originally proposed—that such impatience on our part finally brought France to her senses and to ratification of the proposed rearmament of Western Germany.

They know that our impatience with Italy's procrastination on the goal of self-reliance and less dependence on American economic aid is gradually bringing Italy toward the self-respecting position to which she aspires.

They know that our impatience with the way things were going in the eastern end of the Mediterranean led to the Greek and Turkey aid programs—one or the boldest and wisest acts in all of the history of our foreign policy.

They know that on the western end of the Mediterranean our impatience has led to the establishment of bases in Spain and that we have realistically taken Spain as an ally.

In short, they know that our impatience in the form of the Marshall plan, aid to Greece and Turkey, the London and Paris pacts, NATO, and association with Spain has literally secured Western Europe and the Mediterranean from the once seemingly overwhelming Communist threat in those areas.

And they know that our growing impatience with developments in Asia has led to the commitment of the defense of Formosa; to the building up of the strength of Japan, the Philippines, Pakistan, and Thailand; to a heroic, if seemingly hopeless, task of salvaging what is left of Vietnam, and to the formation of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

What they really fear is that we may become so impatient with the cold war that we will start a hot war. Their fear is not surprising. It is understandable when one reads the various bellicose and contradictory public statements made here almost every day.

But what they don't understand is that our President himself is impatient, impatient with such bellicose talk. Recently he gave them a demonstration of that not by mere words but rather by his specific act of cracking down on those in his administration who were indulging in war talk.

Perhaps it is this sort of thing which explains the way that leaders and people in foreign nations regard President Eisenhower in a separate light from the bulk of the other leaders in our country. They are convinced of his dedication to peace; of his patience with trying everything to achieve peace; of his intolerance with everything that smacks of war.

But they themselves have evidenced a type of impatience with President Eisenhower. They want him to exercise more world leadership. During my October trip people repeatedly said to me that they wished President Eisenhower would give the world more vigorous leadership and that they were almost hungry for him to do so and that they would quickly follow.

During my February trip I found a change in this attitude. Now people in the various countries are encouraged by the manner in which President Eisenhower has been asserting world leadership. They want him to continue to do it and in even greater degree.

I, too, have my points of impatience—justified or not—based upon what I saw and heard on my trips. But before I get to those, I would like to give you some of my capsule comments on some of the nations.

WESTERN GERMANY

The brightest spot for us in Europe is Western Germany. The free German people have done an amazing comeback job. Western Germany will steadily become the backbone of our resistance to communism in Europe.

BRITAIN

While Britain is a trusted ally, she is a tired ally whose shrinking empire creates an economic weakness that makes her more vulnerable to economic compromises with that modern colonial power, Communist Russia, and all of her satellite colonies.

FRANCE

France's heart is good—but her will is weak. She has not toughened up under adversity like Western Germany has.

ITALY

Italy's people are perhaps the most friendly of all to us. But Italy's Government is not learning fast enough how to throw away the economic crutch of American aid and stand on her own feet.

RUSSIA

If there is any perceptible change in Russia, it may be in her recent reversal of stand on the proposed Austria Peace Treaty—an indication that Russia feels we have gotten so strong in Europe that her tough talk, bluffs, and dilatory tactics will no longer produce the results she desires—but rather that she will have to start giving in a little in the future.

The most important thing about Russia is to distinguish between the Russian common people and their rulers in the Kremlin. The common people of Russia are neither for nor against communism—they are simply resigned to it—with no enthusiasm to resist it or defend it.

Actually the position of the common people of Russia on communism is a policy of coexistence—they merely coexist with communism. In other words, the status of communism with the great mass of Russian people is summed up simply in two words "internal coexistence."

JAPAN

Coming out of the occupation status, Japan is like the teen-ager anxious to show his independence from his foster parents. Unless Japan sells her goods to us at the sacrifice of our higher-waged labor and industries, she will turn to her historical and traditional enemy, Russia, and her cultural cousin, China, for trade.

Japan is clearly the industrial pearl of the Orient most coveted by agricultural Red China and Russia.

FORMOSA

The hope of the free Chinese is in the pulse beat of Chiang Kai Shek. When Chiang goes, all their hopes go for retaking the mainland. But Chiang will never have the chance to retake China unless the Chinese Communists attempt to take Formosa and the United States is drawn into an expanded conflict. The question is what will happen to Formosa when Chiang is gone—and more pointedly what will happen to our personalized foreign policy on Nationalist China?

INDIA

India is Nehru—at least for the present. His neutralist policy on communism is confusing. Nehru successfully fights and de-

feats the Communists internally in India. But externally he is quite friendly with Communist China and Communist Russia—and he says he admires Communism but deplores its methods.

We have vacillated too much between the extremes of lavishly catering to Nehru and bluntly offending him. Neither approach will win his respect or friendship. He aspires to be the leader of Southeast Asia and he has realized his aspiration to a certain degree—at least enough for us to be smart enough to seek his opinion and advice about Asian matters. If we should show him that courtesy on the Presidential level as well as Ambassadorial level, I feel he would cooperate more with us.

BURMA

In a smaller edition, the same things can be said about U Nu of Burma that are said about Nehru. He has fought and defeated the Communists inside Burma—despite his relatively friendly attitude toward Red China and Russia. Some people make the mistake of considering him a puppet and disciple of Nehru. He is not.

He is an independent little man—just as Burma is an independent little nation that has come through the greatest internal strife of any of the Southeast Asia nations with growing strength and with having rejected communism.

EGYPT

For the time being Egypt is Nasser, an alert, intelligent young soldier who has had a successful career of conniving. I do not mean connivance in a disparaging form—for surely his internal conniving has been for the great improvement of Egypt.

But he now find himself in a political arena larger than Egypt—he can be a powerful leader in the Middle East but not through external connivance.

I think he ultimately wants Egypt to be aligned with the United States but that he feels he will have to lead his people gradually away from their suspicions about American foreign policy being designed to take over where Britain leaves off on colonialism.

SPAIN

Spain is a source of strength to our side on the western end of the Mediterranean. We never have to worry about Spain being opposed to communism. But prejudice against Spain's neutrality in World War II has blocked her admission to NATO because some believe her neutrality was benevolently in favor of Hitler and Mussolini.

This doesn't make sense. It is not realism on mutual security. Western Germany under Hitler and Italy under Mussolini were active enemies in World War II against us and our western allies—but that has not prevented Western Germany and Italy from being admitted to NATO. If we can do that with former active enemies like Germany and Italy, then why can't we do the same in the interest of real mutual security with a Spain that was not an active enemy but rather a neutralist?

TURKEY

In some respects the biggest inspiration of all that I saw and heard on my trips came in Turkey. That tough little country that neighbors on to Russia and lives under the very threatening shadow of the giant Russian bear. The Turks have refused to let the Russian Communist freighten or intimidate them. They have defied Communist threats.

Our past aid to Turkey was one of the wisest foreign policy investments we ever made in mutual security. It paid off real dividends in combatting communism in that part of the world where Europe meets Asia. It is in sharp contrast to the uncertain results with countries like Yugoslavia. In our foreign loans we had better concentrate more on nations like Turkey and less on nations like Yugoslavia.

Now to my points of impatience. First, I am impatient with all the talk of gloom and pessimism. It is true that in these troubled times we must be realistic and face unpleasant facts. But should we permit such realism to degenerate into a phobia of pessimism? Should we permit such realism to blind us to justified optimism? Have we reached the point where it is fashionable, either politically or journalistically, to be excessively pessimistic?

I have listed some accomplishments in overseas areas which justify considerable optimism on our part. I have spoken of achievements which should create great confidence in our Nation and our allies. In our adherence to realism, it is only realistic to remember the causes for optimism as well as the causes for pessimism. For pessimism is not the synonym for realism.

To put it one way, realism is nothing more than a proper balance between optimism and pessimism. But today there is too much of a misconception of realism—not enough consideration given to justified optimism for a proper balance.

I am impatient with the manner in which we just wring our hands and fret about the way in which the Communists exploit Asian and African hate of colonialism instead of doing the obviously most effective thing in combatting communism in Asia.

You know what that obvious move is—merely to show to the Asians that communism is, as I stated last month in my report to Maine weekly newspapers, actually Russian colonialism—that communism is the modern day colonialism—that Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, Estonia, Latvia, and Red China are nothing less than Communist colonies of Russia—and that Russia seeks to make a Communist colony out of every Asian country and every country in the world.

I am impatient with the manner in which we seem to be unable to cope with talk of coexistence. We could throw such talk right back at the Communists with one simple observation. We could observe that the little people of Russia knew most about coexistence since their own attitude about communism at home in Russia is merely one of internal coexistence.

We could say to them, as Menderes of Turkey has said, "If you really believe in coexistence, why don't you stop trying to grab off country after country? Why don't you let them coexist instead of demanding that they exist only as you dictate?

I am impatient with the greatly professed fears about the Afro-Asian Conference at Bandung. Instead of muddling in pessimism about that conference, let us look at the opportunities we actually have on this conference. After all we do have a few friendly countries attending that conference—Thailand, Turkey, the Philippines, Vietnam, Iraq, Pakistan, Ethiopia, and Japan.

They will not be mere mutes there. They will talk realistically and constructively. They may be outnumbered—but they will be heard.

We should not stop with reliance upon them to carry the responsibility for the free half of the world. The point is that we should not be trembling mutes ourselves. We should seize upon a golden opportunity of taking advantage of this conference.

We should broadcast a message beamed directly at Bandung that we approve of the conference in the objective of raising the world prestige and position of the people of Asia and Africa, that we are in full accord with their opposition to colonialism; and that we support their aspirations for independence and self-reliance.

Yes, instead of pouting and fretting with a negative attitude, we should seize the initiative with such a positive and direct approach. We should show them that we are the opponents of colonialism; that the Communists are the present-day advocates of colonialism; and that such Russian colonialism would have decisions concerning New Delhi, Rangoon, Cairo, Jakarta, Saigon, Adis Ababa, and Johannesburg made in Moscow by the men in the Kremlin instead of each of those cities.

We should warn them that attempts by the Communists to have this conference result in banding brown men together to hate and fight white men are but another step in the Communist evil design and pattern of "confuse, divide, and conquer." For proof we need only to point out the obvious fact that through the "confuse, divide, and conquer" pattern, Moscow now makes the decisions for Prague, Budapest, Warsaw, Hanoi, and Peiping.

I am impatient with the continued blocking of the admission of Spain to NATO. When we take Western Germany and Italy, who were our active enemies in World War II, into NATO and exclude Spain, a bitter enemy of communism, one wonders if NATO really is for the purpose of mutual security and defense against aggressive communism.

The time has come when our leadership in world affairs must increase in boldness and firmness if we are to cope successfully with the threat to the freedom of the world.

The time has come when the very basis of our foreign policy must change. It must shift from the past negative basis of fear—fear of Russia—to a positive basis of confidence in ourselves and nations friendly to us. We have every reason for confidence in ourselves. We should start acting that way instead of induling in pessimism.

We must start charting our course in the confident realism that we are the greatest Nation in the world—and the world's greatest hope for peace—that we are through with letting Russia scare us—that we are plenty capable of taking care of ourselves—and that we must strive for positive construction instead of fear-minded, negative defensiveness that stresses countermoves instead of maintaining the initiative.

Academic Freedom Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on April 22, 1955, the students of Columbia University observed National Academic Freedom Week. I have received a letter from the chairman of the Academic Freedom Week committee telling of this observance. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 10, 1955.

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: April 22, 1955, marked the conclusion of the celebration of the first National Academic Freedom Week on the Columbia University campus.

The week was sponsored by 16 campus organizations. The activities of the week included a forum sponsored by the coordinating committee, discussions sponsored by the individual participating organizations, and a reaffirmation of the Bill of Rights.

We sent the following letter to President Eisenhower:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Two weeks ago the students and faculty of Columbia University celebrated Academic Freedom Week under the auspices of the National Student's Association. One of the highlights of the week was the signing of a scroll reaffirming our faith in the Bill of Rights. Over 1,200 students and faculty put their signatures on the scroll.

"Only if these rights are preserved may members of the educational community inquire, explore, and discuss without hesitation or fear.

"As president emeritus of the university and President of the United States, we feel that you would be gratified to know of the response to our activities. We are, therefore, enclosing the petitions. The larger scroll will be sent under separate cover.

"Sincerely yours."

Because of the importance of our activities and the interest they generated, particularly the signing of the scroll, we would greatly appreciate your reading this entire letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

JUNE FISHER,
Bernard College NSA Representative,
Chairman, Academic Freedom
Week Committee.

Decline in Racial Bias in Western States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Gladwyn Hill, which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, May 29, entitled "Survey Reveals Marked Decline in Racial Bias in Western States."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURVEY REVEALS MARKED DECLINE IN RACIAL BIAS IN WESTERN STATES

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, May 28.—While controversy seethes about desegregation in public schools below the Mason-Dixon line, unspectacular but marked progress is being made toward elimination of racial discrimination in the West.

This was indicated this week in a New York Times survey of interracial relations in 13 far western States.

In few sections of the West can it be said that all the principal minority groups—Negroes, Indians, and people of Oriental and Spanish lineage—enjoy full equality with other people in public activities.

But in a few of the States and many localities the situation comes remarkably close to full equality. And there are widespread indications of steady improvement.

Among the 13 States, 8 legislatures in their current sessions have enacted measures aimed at reducing discrimination.

Washington strengthened its fair employment practices law and eliminated racial questions on drivers' license applications.

California outlawed discriminatory automobile insurance terms. This week, for the first time in many attempts, an FEPC bill won approval by the State assembly, although its enactment is considered unlikely.

Arizona passed an FEPC law covering public works only.

Wyoming repealed an old, unused statute that permitted Negro segregation in some public schools.

New Mexico and Montana both enacted measures ordering racial equality in places of public accommodation (hotels, restaurants, taverns, theaters, etc.), although they carried no enforcement machinery. Colorado strengthened its 4-year-old FEPC law.

North Dakota repealed a law against interracial marriage.

On the negative side, bills guaranteeing equality in places of public accommodation failed in Nevada and Arizona and measures to repeal bans on interracial marriage failed in Idaho and Colorado.

The survey found that—

Racial discrimination generally is worse in hinterland areas and small towns than in more developed districts.

In progressive areas first-class establishments, such as hotels and restaurants, tend to take the lead in racial tolerance while the second-rate institutions cling to prejudicial treatment. In discriminatory areas the situation is the reverse.

Discrimination does not always go hand in hand with large minority populations. (In Nevada, where there are less than 10,000 Negroes, discrimination is much worse than in California, where there are more than 500,000.)

The West does not bear out the saying, "You can't legislate tolerance." A State's statutory expressions on discrimination are not necessarily an indicator of actual conditions. But where efforts are made to enforce such laws discrimination has lessened, and some of the most conspicuous progress against discrimination has been made in States where there has been strongest legislative pressure.

The 13 States contain about one-eighth of the Nation's population. The area has some 20 million people. In it are about 600,000 of the Nation's 15 million Negroes (as of the 1950 census), about half of its Indians (some 200,000 of them), and about 180,000 people of Chinese and Japanese lineage. A large portion of the Nation's approximately 3 million Spanish-speaking people (of Spanish and Mexican lineage) are in this region.

The minority group population is distributed unevenly among the States. California has about 500,000 Negroes, while North Dakota has less than 1,000; Arizona has 70,000 Indians; Colorado less than 2,000.

Since World War II, people of Japanese and Chinese lineage, who in the west coast States used to be the targets of the most systematic discrimination, have moved into a status close to first-class citizenship.

The most regular victims of discrimination are Negroes. But it is also applied occasionally with greater emphasis to Indians and Spanish-speaking people. The latter are habitually referred to in some districts deprecatingly as Mexicans, even though some are not even Mexican-Americans but are of Spanish descent.

In most of the 13 States there is nominal endorsement of racial equality, if only in constitutional provisions. A number of the States have fair-employment-practice laws and statutes prohibiting discrimination in public establishments. Some of these laws have no enforcement machinery.

Virtually the last vestiges of overt, sanctioned segregation in public schools in the region have been eliminated in the last few years.

The remaining pattern of discrimination is found to be irregular and inconsistent.

In places of public accommodation, the situation ranges from general acceptance of nonwhites in Washington, with only occasional prejudice in small towns, to a degree of Southern-style Jim Crowism in southern Arizona, where "no Negroes allowed" signs are displayed in restaurants.

A major factor in antidiscrimination progress has been intensified legal and legislative pressure and public relations activities in the last few years by organizations fostering tolerance. These include the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Urban League, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the principal labor organizations, the League of Women Voters, and various church organizations.

An important foundation for this work was laid by World War II. Correspondents near large military installations report that while influxes of Negro troops brought friction in some cases, the sight of Negroes in uniforms also has lessened local prejudice.

In respect to people of Japanese and Chinese lineage, an important additional factor was that the prewar legal sanctions and prejudice against them had been so extreme that they collapsed, in the face of organizational campaigning.

The Communists' proclivity for exploiting minority treatment is said to have both helped and hindered the antidiscrimination cause. In the State of Washington, a correspondent reports, "a substantial factor in getting legislation has been a desire to keep Communist organizations from capitalizing upon instances of discrimination." A factor in the defeat of a 1948 California FEPC initiative measure, according to the regional NAACP director, was that the "Communists' agitation put their label on it and damaged the campaign to a tremendous extent."

Racial relations in the region are, at worst, static in some sections. In more sections than not, relations are improving.

This is the consensus of both Times correspondents and spokesmen for antidiscrimination organizations whom they interviewed.

Professional advocates of tolerance are much happier about growing equality of acceptance in public places than in respect to "deeper questions" such as discrimination in housing and employment.

They see full equality as a long way off. But, as one summarized the situation, "things are moving, and the obstacles seem a lot lower than they used to."

Here is a State-by-State summary of salient features of the interracial situation:

WASHINGTON

The FEPC law, enacted in 1947, is administered by a five-member commission. It investigates discrimination complaints and can seek court injunctions. In practice it has worked mainly by conciliation. It receives about one complaint a week and has never gone to court with a case. This year the commission was given power to reinstate workers discharged for racial reasons and to collect their back pay.

The 1953 public accommodations law provides for civil action by aggrieved parties and criminal action by prosecuting attorneys. One action of each type has been brought, resulting respectively in a $500 fine and a $50 fine.

What is generally regarded as the commission's most important action to date was its distribution in 1953 of a brochure to 100,000 employers explaining both the FEPC and antidiscrimination laws and the actions that could be taken under them.

OREGON

A 1951 FEPC act, administered by a special division of the State department of labor, has been applied generally through conciliation.

An equality in public establishments law was adopted in 1953.

The influx of Negro shipyard workers in Portland, Oreg., in World War II led to some friction, but it has dwindled to almost the vanishing point.

Several years ago some Portland parents protested against sending their children to school with Negroes. School officials took a firm stand—including optional assignment of Negro teachers to all-white schools—and the complaining stopped.

CALIFORNIA

California has had a law prohibiting discrimination in public establishments since 1905, a civil service nondiscrimination law since 1945, and a public works FEPC law for several years. Up to this year no general FEPC bill got anywhwere.

The public accommodations law provides civil penalties of $100 or more. It has been invoked many times with results.

The California attorney general, in connection with a controversial school blackface minstrel show last year, issued an opinion denouncing any and all entertainments which for any reason reflect adversely on a citizen because of race, creed, or color.

NEVADA

According to Franklyn Williams, regional director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, "Nevada is a misplaced Mississippi—a Negro can't even lose his money at the gambling spots." To rectify this situation a group of Negroes, including Joe Louis, the former boxer, this week opened a multi-million-dollar casino hotel in Las Vegas, welcoming the patronage of all races.

Nevada has no antidiscrimination laws. The 5,000 Indians among its 200,000 inhabitants are subject to little, if any, public discrimination.

ARIZONA

Arizona's new limited FEPC law makes it a misdemeanor for any State or local governmental subdivision or agency, or contractor to them, to discriminate in employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

In contrast to the little Dixie atmosphere in some southern sections of the State, first-class hotels in central Arizona have accommodated nationally prominent Negro personalities. The State has a Negro legislator. But in Phoenix there is segregation in most of the leading movie theaters.

UTAH

About 70 percent of Utah's 700,000 inhabitants (5,000 of them are Negroes) are Mormons. According to Mormon doctrine, rooted in slavery days, Negroes are "black because of the curse put on Cain," and must do menial work and will never go to heaven. Many Mormons of "the new generation" are embarrassed by this bigotry, considering it in manifest conflict with Christian tenets of their faith. But little has been done about it legally.

Utah has no civil-rights law or antidiscrimination law, except an old, inoperative statute forbidding hotels to discriminate against nonwhites. Both Marian Anderson, the singer, and Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of Manhattan, have had trouble getting first-class hotel accommodations in Salt Lake City.

But there has been a general informal decrease in prejudice in Utah in recent years. Spanish-speaking people are no longer considered nonwhite in many communities. Negroes and Indians are increasingly numerous in Federal jobs. And Negro spokesmen report an easing in trade-union membership barriers.

NEW MEXICO

New Mexico has a dual Anglo-Spanish culture.

Spanish is a second legal language. In public life there are about as many people of one strain as the other, including the State's congressional delegation.

New Mexico adopted an FEPC law in 1949 and a public-accommodation law this year. Both lack enforcement provisions.

Discrimination against Negroes is so prevalent that, according to a correspondent, "it is as difficult to get a Negro a meal in Albuquerque, of 100,000 population, as it is in Ruidoso, a small mountain resort." In predominantly Anglo-Saxon southeastern New Mexico, near the Texas border, even Spanish-speaking white people and Indians from other parts of New Mexico are subject to considerable discrimination. Generally, however, the reception accorded Spanish-speaking people has improved greatly over pre-World War II days.

Today's Problems Can Be Tomorrow's Accomplishments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. George C. McConnaughey, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, at the annual convention of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., May 24, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY'S PROBLEMS CAN BE TOMORROW'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS

(Address by George C. McConnaughey, Chairman, Federal Communication Commission, at the annual convention of the National Association of Radio & Television Broadcasters, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., May 24, 1955)

Mr. Fellows, ladies and gentlemen of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters. First of all, I want to congratulate this 33d annual convention of your association for the recognition received this morning by the appearance here of the President of the United States. President Eisenhower, I believe, is the first President to address your association, and I feel this recognition comes to you because of the very vital part your industry is playing in the lives of all Americans. I consider it a great honor to be a part of the Eisenhower team, and I can assure you it is a team dedicated to rendering a public service. I suggest that this precedent be adopted as the standard order of procedure and that you bend every effort to have President Eisenhower address you for the next succeeding 5 years.

When I was asked to address you, I inquired of one of my contemporaries at the Commission what I should say. His reply was: "Why don't you be yourself and not say much of anything. All these people want to do is just see what a funny looking bird you are." Well, here I am and there you are.

Since this is the first opportunity I have had of appearing before you folks I will briefly give you my philosophy of government as related to the individual. This is not a newly acquired philosophy on my part and I will underline statements which I have previously made on this subject.

Traditionally, freedom of the individual in the United States was an outgrowth of the political, religious, and economic oppression of the European nations. The earliest colonists who settled here were dedicated to freedom of the individual. The demand for political freedom was the major factor in the American Revolution and was clearly expressed in the founding documents of the new nation—the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

Support for the desire for economic freedom was found in the new economic philosophy of Adam Smith and other members of the so-called classical school of economics. This philosophy, known by such names as laissez-faire or competitive free enterprise, emphasizes the independence of the individual from the State in the determination of his own economic fortune.

Thus, under those philosophies, the United States became the world model for economic and political individualism. The rights of the individual and the rights of property were relatively unrestrained. The functions of government were limited to certain specified activities necessary to avoid anarchy. The economic system was predicated on the belief that the maximum production of wealth and the greatest social welfare would be achieved when men were free from all forms of control except those of police power.

Under this system, competition became the guiding hand which regulated economic activity by turning the self-interest of individuals into channels that would result in the production of the maximum goods and services, and therefore, at least in theory, the greatest social welfare. The rapid development of industry and the concurrent improvement in the American standard of living were nurtured by the freedom of economic action allowed under this system of free enterprise. Even today, after 176 years, the philosophy of the freedom that was a cornerstone of our Nation's foundation still holds a predominant place in the ideology of the American system.

Let me say at once that I believe in having as few government controls as possible. My own experiences as a controller and regulator, both as a member and chairman of the Ohio Public Utilities Commission over a span of years, and more recently as Chairman of the Renegotiation Board, and also my experience as a practicing attorney for 30 years, all confirm that as my credo.

My conviction is that government should exert a minimum of interference with the lives and fortunes of its citizens. Our form of republican government is dedicated to that principle. It emerged in this country as a natural and profound reaction to a tyrannical English sovereign. Thus, among the grievances enumerated in the Declaration of Independence we find the following: "He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance."

Bureaucracy is as old as government itself. The problem has always been, and still is, to keep government within its proper bounds. Assuming that some sorts of controls of business, as few as possible, are necessary, what are they? That's the heart of the matter.

In the field of communications by radio and television, the Congress of the United States established the Federal Communications Commission and made your industry a truly open, competitive free enterprise, delegating to the Federal Communications Commission as an arm of Congress certain functions necessary for orderly operations of this enterprise.

Your industry should not be, in my judgment, regulated, but should be kept healthy by open, free competition so long as it operates in the public interest.

Every license granted by the Federal Communications Commission is a public trust to be used in the public interest. This cannot be overemphasized. Broadcasters, in their efforts to solve their financial and technical problems, may at times tend to forget that their license to operate is like a determinal grant—"to be used so long as it is used in the public interest and no longer." So you can see that a licensee does not have an absolute property right, but holds his privilege to broadcast so long as his enterprise is conducted in the public interest and no longer. In other words, his license should

terminate when he ceases to operate in the public interest.

This is not a sermon on public service but is a statement of the criteria which will enable us all to see how well we measure up to the ideal standards. There is no one who appreciates more the fine work that the broadcasters have done in the past than myself. This is evidenced by the fact that the people of the United States are the recipients of the finest programs in all the world. Indeed, I want to salute and congratulate you on an outstanding job admirably done. Certainly one of the purposes of this meeting is to devise means and methods for increasing your ability to furnish better public service. This tends to promote refinement and progress in your art.

Shortly after I was appointed by President Eisenhower as a member of the Commission, I received a congratulatory letter from Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, who hails from my section of southern Ohio. In the letter, Dr. Peale, as a friend, pointed out to me what he considered a great opportunity to render a truly worthwhile public service to the people of this country in a most vital industry. I trust I will be able to make some worthwhile contribution in this important field of communications. It would be presumptuous for me as a newcomer to attempt to lecture you concerning the operations of your business. That I do not intend to do.

With your permission, however, I would like to address myself to some of the problems facing the Federal Communications Commission and report to you on our operations. Considering the tremendous responsibility placed upon the Commission with a relatively small staff, I feel my fellow Commissioners and the hard-working personnel of our Commission have performed an outstanding public service. To be sure, mistakes have been made but they have been honest mistakes. I wonder how many of you realize how devoted many of our people are to public service. It has been my privilege in the past 6 months since coming to the Commission, to observe how many of our people work long hours attempting to keep abreast with the daily operations of the Commission for the good of the public. It has likewise been my privilege to be able to place some new people in positions of importance at the Commission and they have done an outstanding job. I personnally know that some of our employees have no regard for a time-clock operation. Many of them work not only 5 days during the week but very often 6 and 7 days and many nights.

You are entitled to know what this Commission is doing in attempting to meet your problems and to render an outstanding public service. Let us be specific and face up to some of these problems confronting the Commission. One of the most difficult is to devise ways and means of enabling UHF stations to be able to operate on a comparable basis with VHF stations. We have taken the following steps in that direction:

(1) We have recently put out rulemaking proposals looking to the possibility of deintermixture of UHF and VHF in certain cities.

(2) Further rulemaking proposals have been put out for low-power stations which may serve small cities. It is apparent that if an appreciable number of small communities are to have their own stations, they must be in the UHF band.

(3) We have proposed a booster plan which should go a long way toward improving the coverage of UHF stations where nature has put obstacles in the path of the signal.

(4) We are carefully studying the special needs of stations in communities far removed from network lines. One possibility under consideration is to extend the use of private intercity relay stations so that programs may be obtained at lower cost and so that stations that do little or no local programing may connect with other program sources such as large stations originating their own programs.

(5) We have instituted a rulemaking proceeding which looks toward the setting of a 5-mile limit from the boundary of the city to be served where a television station may place its transmitter, with provision for exception upon a proper showing of public interest.

(6) We have recommended to Congress that all-channel receivers be relieved from excise tax in order to encourage greater circulation in all-channel receivers.

(7) Last week the Federal Communications Commission instructed its staff to initiate a rulemaking proceeding looking toward increasing the maximum radiated power output for UHF stations to 5 megawatts. The Commission also suggested to the staff that it obtain information concerning the possibility of improving the sensitivity of UHF receivers and the tuning mechanism of UHF sets. This was authorized in an effort to explore the practical possibilities of making UHF and VHF comparable. This rulemaking proceeding will offer industry the opportunity to provide practical assistance. These proposals, if successful, offer a potentially more efficient use of the authorized spectrum space.

In the preliminary report which the majority of the Commission submitted to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee last month concerning VHF-UHF and television network problems, we emphasized the need for an overall study by the Commission of the economic structure and operation of the television industry. We have requested funds for such a study from both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. As you may know, the House has included in the pending independent offices appropriation bill for 1956 some $80,000 for our study of radio and television network broadcasting. In my statement before the Senate Appropriations Committee, I pointed out that it was the Commission's view that to obtain optimum benefits from such a study it should not be limited to networking but should be concerned with the entire economic structure and operation of the television industry. We recognized that this would be a big job and would require more staff and more time than contemplated by the House bill. However, we expect that this initial $80,000 appropriation will enable the Commission to establish the staff necessary to initiate the study, draw up the detailed procedures, and make substantial progress in the first, or factfinding, phase of the study. After we have obtained comprehensive information concerning the respective roles played by the networks, advertisers, agencies, talent, film producers, and distributors, and other major elements in the television industry, the Commission will be in a position to identify and evaluate the problems affecting the further expansion of television outlets and make appropriate recommendations to the Congress or, if we already have the requisite authority, take steps directed toward their solution. This study, I hasten to assure you, will in no way retard other steps which we are taking to aid in the solution of your problems.

Not the least of the television matters with which we are now concerned is subscription television. From the volume of comments received by the Commission and comments in the public press, it is no exaggeration to say that this is one of the major issues facing broadcasters today. And I am sure that I do not have to tell you that people have very strong feelings on this matter. It seems that almost everyone is adamantly on one side or the other. The authorization of such a service involves a basic change in the system of broadcasting which we have known for some 34 years. In our notice of proposed rulemaking we urged all interested parties desiring to file comments regarding the proceeding to direct their attention to a series of questions we sent out in the notice. In this matter there are many vital questions and issues relating to public interest considerations. Would it encourage a larger and more effective use of the radio spectrum? What impact would it have on advertised sponsored broadcasts? What safeguards would be required to insure the broadcast of well-balanced programs to the public without charge? What safeguards, if any, are necessary to prevent the possible monopolistic control of subscription television operation? Should a way be provided so that all stations will be able to utilize subscription television broadcasts on a nondiscriminatory basis? These are tough questions but they and many others will have to be answered.

Now let me make a few brief observations about license renewals. Here, it seems to me, we are applying what may be outmoded tools to a contemporary problem. As you know, we do not monitor your programs or check your scripts. And I am sure it will never come to that in America. What we try to do when license renewal time comes around is to make a general appraisal of a station's overall performance in the past as a guide to its probable performance in the future. For this purpose we've had to devise the program log analysis, the counting of spot announcements, and other techniques designed to provide in quantitative terms a limited measure of quality of performance.

I said these tools may be outmoded, I had in mind particularly the program log analysis. Since introduction of this device, television has made its mark and radio has adjusted itself to the impact. But is the program log analysis, originally designed for radio, suitable for television, or should it be retailored for television? Is the traditional concept of a commercial program realistic in the face of a trend in radio away from sponsored programs to commercial announcements? Is length of announcement more significant than frequency in appraising program quality?

Until recently our big job has been processing new applications and major changes in station licenses. From here on out the emphasis will have to shift to license renewal. Our problem is how best to discharge our responsibilities in this critical area. Your suggestions would be most welcome.

Judging from the volume of correspondence at the Commission the daytime skywave proceeding is second to none in public interest. We are now reviewing the record in this proceeding so as to make a final determination as to the standards to be used in allocation to give explicit recognition to the phenomena of daytime skywave and as to the manner in which these standards should be applied. Ever since I have been at the Commission I have understood that daytime skywave is related to clear channel, both are related to the Mexican agreement and NARBA. I have further heard much discussion that one of these questions cannot be decided alone and that it is extremely difficult to consider them together, but if there is one thing that I want to see done it is a complete, final, and simultaneous disposition made of all these questions which will take into consideration the interests of all parties concerned and finalize these proceedings so as to eliminate confusion, uncertainty, and enable the parties concerned to use the facilities involved for the benefit of all.

It is exceedingly important to you, to the general public, and to us in the Commission as well, that the work of the Federal Communications Commission be carried on with maximum efficiency and that our procedures be as simple and effective as possible. Those of you who have been involved in hearings before the Commission know of the con-

structive changes made in our rules to simplify and expedite hearing procedures. One of these changes, the expanded use of prehearing conferences, has proved to be of real benefit to all parties concerned.

Recently, I appointed a committee from the Commission to work with a committee of the Federal Communications Bar Association to draft a manual to be used as a guide for hearing examiners. I am confident that their efforts will bring about more uniformity in rulings on basic evidentiary matters and thus cut down on the delay and confusion that sometimes arise.

We have done many things to improve our operations but it is not always possible to take the steps, which in our opinion, would result in maximum efficiency. One reason why this is so is the complex and detailed requirements of the Communications Act. We have studied these requirements which cause problems to you and to us and we have submitted to the Congress several recommendations for amendment of portions of the act.

One of our proposals concerns the provisions of section 309 (c), adopted in 1952, which established the so-called "protest rule and procedure" applicable to grants without hearing. In my opinion, and I believe my fellow Commissioners will agree with me, this provision has been used in many cases solely as a device to delay broadcast station grants and to keep competitors off the air as long as possible, rather than to raise substantial questions as to the validity of the Commission's action. We have recommended to the Congress that this section be amended to give the Commission discretion to deny a stay in those cases where it cannot find on the record reason why the public interest requires such action.

We also intend to ask the Congress in the near future to amend section 5 (c), which creates the review staff, so that there will be no question at all as to its role in assisting the Commission in adjudicatory matters. We also intend to propose changes which will permit us to consult with staff officers such as our General Counsel, Chief Engineer, and Chief Accountant when they are not engaged in the investigation or prosecution of an adjudicatory case. I think that both these changes will enable us to handle our work more efficiently, more effectively, and more quickly.

In closing, I am aware that I have only touched on a few of our common problems. Working together we can face up to these problems and lick them. And until they are satisfactorily resolved, the American people will not have the best broadcasting service which our American system of free enterprise can provide. I am optimistic about their solution. You broadcasters were beset with many baffling and complex problems in the infancy of broadcasting and you solved them—in most cases without the intervention of Washington. And I am sure you will continue to do so in the future. In those areas where we in the Commission have been given the responsibility of assisting the industry for the public good, we pledge our wholehearted cooperation and assistance. With very little help, you have come a long way toward reaching the common goal of all of us—of providing a broadcasting service that fills the needs and desires of the American people.

Yours is a young, virile, rapidly changing industry. Your opportunities to render a great public service to the people of America are fabulous. I am positive that I bespeak the sentiments of the members of the Federal Communications Commission and the staff, when I say that we not only consider it our duty but a privilege to work with you to the end that this country will continue to enjoy the greatest broadcasting service in the world.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

Appendix

Foreign Affairs Address by Hon. William E. Jenner, of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the Magna Charta Dames, at Washington, D. C., on April 19, 1955, on the subject of our foreign policy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT

(Address of Hon. WILLIAM E. JENNER, of Indiana, before Magna Charta Dames, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., April 19, 1955)

Edgar Allen Poe tells a story of a beautiful house, whose fine lines and perfect proportions stood out against the landscape, and brought a sense of dignity and strength to all the neighborhood.

Nothing happened to the house, that is, no outward blow or injury. But it was affected by an inward decay. The change was imperceptible, nothing one could grasp or measure. But slowly the great house changed. All its strength and beauty disintegrated until it became only a corpse of a house, ready to fall into dust.

This story, called the Fall of the House of Usher, is a symbol of American foreign policy over the last 7 or 8 years.

Even a few years ago, our country stood like a tower of strength, bringing security not only to our own people but to those who loved freedom everywhere.

Nothing has happened to our country, at least not outwardly. No one has attacked it. No blow has been struck. But it has suffered an inner decay. The change is almost imperceptible. No event or act marks a clear turning point. It is almost impossible to grasp what has happened. But the beauty and dignity and strength of America are slowly dying. The noble edifice of constitutional liberty is silently disintegrating, into a crumbling ruin.

How dare I stand before you and make such a statement, when no single injury or weakness is visible, no single event marks the moment when the sickness struck?

I am going to remind you of the various foreign policies of the American Government over the last years, but I shall have to make two lists. First, I shall describe the bold new policy that was pronounced at each successive stage. Then I shall describe the pitiful craven policy that replaced it in action.

This continuous silent disintegration of every policy we make is due to the most important political fact in the world today. We have in the United States not one center of government policy but two. One center I shall call the collectivist one worlders. The other is the legal constitutional government.

The collectivist bloc has been operating now for 20 years. It has the strong root system that comes from 20 years of unhampered growth. The chief characteristic of this collectivist bloc is that it operates above the Constitution and above the law. Its members are carrying out a secret revolutionary purpose, without any attempt to tell the American people what they are doing, or asking their consent.

I say that there is an irrepressible conflict between this elite which operates above the Constitution and the laws, and the American people, and those Members of Congress, of the courts, and of the executive branch, who operate under the Constitution and the law.

I am taking foreign policy as the best example of the tug-of-war going on constantly within the United States, between these two forms of government.

In the Teheran-Yalta period, roughly 1942 to 1946, the Big Three dominated world policy-making. The American elite, working with the Communist leadership, dominated the Big Three. The elite gave the Soviet Union the great heartland of Central Europe from the Baltic States to the borders of Greece. They let East Germany fall to the Reds. They gave the U. S. S. R. the keys to the heartland of Asia, Mainland, China.

You will ask why did Britain and the United States agree to this remaking of the world when there was no profit in it except for Stalin and his friends? Recent publication of the Yalta papers, and the much-needed publication of the Teheran and Potsdam records will show how the elite were dizzy with success from exercising their fantastic war powers.

I am concerned with a later, and I believe a far more dangerous period.

The American people were never foolish enough to accept the Soviet Union as an ally. We did not accept the Czar's government as our ally in the First World War against Germany. The idea of our alliance with the U. S. S. R. is a myth, invented by the political elite and spread by their docile press.

Many in the Government, in the military service and in the press, had grave doubts about the postwar conduct of the Soviet Union but they could not be heard in the din of victory.

Slowly the true Americans began to point out the danger to our security. The first victory of the pro-American group was signalized by the Forrestal proposal of military support for Greece and Turkey. President Truman told the Congress on March 12, 1947, "At the present moment in world history nearly every nation must choose between alternative ways of life. * * *

"One way of life is based on the will of the majority, and is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guaranties of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression.

"The second way of life is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedoms.

"I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure."

Isn't that the recent Formosa resolution? There is no appeasement here.

We made one serious mistake in understanding this pronouncement.

We believed that the American Government could reach a policy decision by constitutional means, and make it stick. We took for granted that resistance to Communist attack would remain our national policy.

If the President had stated what was official policy, what could hinder us from following the new course? We did not believe the one essential fact—the collectivist, global, pro-Soviet elite never quits. It only goes underground, until the conflict is forgotten. Then it surfaces again, ready for action, while we sleep. It puts on a new cover of pro-Americanism, but it is unchanged.

From 1947 to today the collectivist elite has let the pro-Americans win the public victories, but it has promptly pulverized the true American policies in secret.

It may help to call the globalist-collectivist-pro-Russian group the Acheson group. We are, however, dealing with something much stronger than personalities. Forrestal is dead, but his policy has been revived again and again. Acheson is gone, but the evil that he did lives after him.

The important point is that we did not have a united American Government which could, after debate, set a final American policy. We had two centers of policymaking competing for mastery.

The globalists made no attempt to attack or debate the Forrestal policy of rearming. They set out secretly to undermine it, so that it would sink slowly, silently into the ground, and collapse in a heap of dust.

As soon as they thought it safe their tame columnists began to beat the drums. Their friends in the State Department and other Government agencies came forward piously with their loaded proposals—always under a carefully innocent surface, proposals to sabotage hard military resistance and go back to the Teheran-Yalta policies.

You know what happened to Forrestal. You may not remember what happened to his successor, Louis Johnson. He tried desperately, with reduced appropriations, to get American military forces in readiness in 1950. A few weeks after the Korean war began, the columnists who worked with the elite began a bitter attack on him. He was let out summarily. He learned from the newspapermen of his replacement by General Marshall.

On the foreign-policy front the collectivist one worlders diverted the Truman doctrine for hard military aid against communism into the Marshall plan for economic aid for for the people in the line of march of the Communist legions. I have said again and again that the Marshall plan was Greek-Turkish aid with its claws pulled. It could roar fiercely at Soviet Russia but never hurt it. In fact, it was setting the table for Stalin, enriching the countries the Soviet Union intended to take without conquest.

Was President Truman to blame for abandonment of the hard Truman doctrine and its replacement by the soft policy of economic aid? I do not say so. So long as two competing centers of power battle for

control of the American Government, any President is nearly helpless. The elite was stronger than President Roosevelt. It was stronger than President Truman. Early in 1952, in describing the Colossus on the Potomac, I said I did not want President Truman to head up such powers. I did not want any Democratic President to head up such powers, and I did not want any Republican President to head up such powers.

Neither am I criticizing the Democratic Party. This supraconstitutional elite is stronger than any American political party.

Slowly our security deteriorated on every front.

In June 1948, Senator Vandenberg had introduced the resolution authorizing a regional pact with European nations. He did not suspect this was one of the interchangeable parts in the plan for NATO. Our security was tied to nations in which nearly one-third of the electors voted Communist, and where the trade unions, seaports, rail lines, and other services were under tight Communist control.

Secretary Acheson drew a line in the Pacific leaving Korea to the Communist Empire. Our troops were withdrawn and Formosa was solemnly excluded from the territory necessary to make the Pacific a peaceful lake, and to keep the west coast of the United States secure.

When the Communists struck in Korea, the collectivist one worlders talked victory, but they set out secretly to undermine it, to belittle it, to tie it up in a legal maze. You remember the steps.

The one worlders put our troops under the United Nations, but the U. N. included Soviet Russia and her satellites. They pretended we were fighting the war in Korea for Korea, though the war actually was for all Asia, and it should have been fought on the territory of the real enemy—Red China. The elite diverted badly needed American troops to Europe in spite of bitter opposition in Congress. Then when victory was in sight, they agreed to a cease-fire on terms the Soviet Union had proclaimed 6 months before.

Our pro-American military and naval officers pulled us out of the cease-fire negotiations with honor. They refused to return the anti-Communist Chinese prisoners of war to the Communists to be murdered like the hostages surrendered at Yalta.

That success, however, was not to last. In December, 1952, at the U. N., Krishna-Menon, in league with the American one worlders, rewrote the cease-fire agreement, and provided for a new brainwashing of the pitiful prisoners, so the Communists could be saved from the disgrace of losing most of the Chinese soldiers, who found a chance to get away.

In the election of 1952 the American people voted overwhelmingly for pro-American foreign and military policies, but that meant nothing to the globalist elite. They went underground again.

President Eisenhower replaced an obsequious Joint Chiefs of Staff with a vigorous pro-American body. Secretary Wilson and the new Joint Chiefs set out to repair the damage from our "accordion" defense policy, which by running appropriations up and down has kept our military program in turmoil.

President Eisenhower also rescinded the shameful order by which the 7th Fleet had been sent to defend the Red China coast against the Nationalist blockade.

Peace was imminent in Korea. The American military were aware of our obligation to make sure the battle-hardened Chinese armies in North Korea were not moved to another place on the chessboard, like Indochina, to capture more millions of human slaves.

Americans breathed easy for the first time in many years. That was our mistake. It was the moment the elite were waiting for.

The one-world collectivists knew they could soon surface again, and reduce to dust the courageous policies of the President and the Joint Chiefs.

In Berlin in February 1954, the Red Chinese were given de facto recognition as the legal Government of China, on equal footing with the United States.

The siege of Dien Bien Phu, which had some of the earmarks of a planned disaster, focused the world's attention on the difficulties of jungle fighting. In a theatrical atmosphere of defeat the Western nations surrendered at Geneva half of the richest section of Asia, the military key to the South Pacific.

Our military were caught napping. Suddenly they talked of entering the Indochinese war by sending Americans to fight on the soil of Indochina. The only sound strategy would have been to equip both the South Koreans and the Nationalists to the highest point of efficiency and then say to Red China—"The instant there is a Communist uprising in Indochina, the Koreans and Nationalists will move in on your railroads and airfields."

We can have confidence in the patriotism and intelligence of our military men. It was from them I learned of the pitiful transportation lines from North to South China. From them I learned of the ease with which railroads and airfields can be bombed from sea and air, without landing a single American foot soldier on the mainland of Asia.

Why did we fail to release Korean and Nationalist planes against the supply lines that led to Indochina? I am certain from reading the columnists that our military officials had the right plans but were outwitted by the collectivist elite.

Our military leaders—like most Americans—have not yet accepted the fact that we have two centers of policymaking within our Government, one under the Constitution, the other above it. One works for American security. The other would put an end to American independence. We can have no rest until one or the other of these power centers is destroyed, and the American Government is unified again.

I have not even begun to list the brave and dignified pro-American policies which saw the light for a little while, and then were turned to dust by this secret undermining. Our European policy is tied in with plans for Atlantic community, in which a supranational agency in NATO will have superior control over our troops, our foreign policy, our funds, and our right to withdraw.

Our German policy has been subordinated to plans for one world through the knitting together of the Atlantic community in NATO.

Our Asian policy is tied to the hated colonial powers through SEATO. We are allied with everybody except the nations which have fought communism. The Nationalists are permanently leashed, in the China Defense Treaty. The Koreans are going to be allowed to die on the vine.

The brave showing of the Formosa resolution has already been replaced by a series of proposals meant to let it disintegrate into a heap of dust. The countermoves include appeals for a cease fire, intervention of U. N., confusion over Quemoy and Matsu, appeals to bring our allies into the defense of Formosa, recognition of two Chinas, trusteeship for Formosa, and a plebiscite of the inhabitants.

Let us remember one thing. The issue in the Formosa Strait is not Formosa. It is the whole free world. At Formosa Strait, all the free nations are lined up face to face with the Communist empire. We cannot retreat an inch at Formosa without endangering Korea, Indochina, Germany, Italy, and California.

The strait of Formosa is the danger spot in the long line that encircles the Communist empire, and keeps it from world conquest. If Quemoy is abandoned, the whole line falls back. The strait of Formosa is the Korean battleline, it is the Berlin airlift, it is the Battle of Britain. It is Valley Forge. It is Thermopylae.

The elite will work incessantly to undermine, to corrode, to pulverize the Formosa policy, because it is the Truman doctrine, of Greek-Turkish aid, the military intervention in Korea, the landing at Normandy. It is the doctrine that there can be no compromise morally with communism, that the only answer to force is readiness to use force, and that America cannot stand by and see her friends the free anti-Communist nations, ground to dust, so the road will be clear for a Soviet attack on us.

I am not going to discuss a plan of action for this crisis. It is more important to understand the nature of the crisis.

The contest between the one-world elite and our constitutional government is an irrepressible conflict. The American Government cannot operate half under the law and half above it.

We cannot take care of any other business, including national defense, until this conflict is decided. There is no way by which foreign nations can trust our public statements if they do not know whether the one-world elite or the constitutional officials will have the final word.

If the contest continues much longer, the elite have won. We cannot defend our country or help other nations to remain free, if our policies shuttle back and forth from one power center to another. The elite does not have to win. Their purpose is destruction. Every move they make helps their final victory. They can send our defense appropriations up and down, arbitrarily increase and decrease the number of members of our Armed Forces, make treaties with other nations in which the fine print gives away our position. No matter how hard the true American resistant may work, our policy will look faltering and feeble. Our word will be without value. We shall antagonize all our friends and build up the strength of our mortal enemies. Like the House of Usher, the dignity and strength of America will deteriorate from invisible hurt.

The task of uprooting the elite cannot be left to any one person or group. The President alone cannot do it. Congress alone cannot do it. Neither party alone can do it. It is a task for all Americans, in Congress, in executive office, in the courts, among the press, the scholars, and the people.

Second, while the elite is in power, nothing can be settled by agreements. The American Government and political system have always operated under a kind of gentlemen's agreement—that no one seeking office or in office would do a single thing to weaken the Constitution. Limited government is government by mutual trust. In a happy family we do not frisk each member to be sure he does not carry hidden guns. In a happy country we do not have to investigate each officeholder to be sure he does not carry a deadly weapon with which to slash at the Constitution.

We shall never go back to that world of mutual trust, until we drive out of office and positions of power the men who are not playing the game according to the rules, the men who desire power even when it means the sacrifice of honor.

The elite keep no agreements, whether it is the Truman-Forrestal doctrine, or the Korean ceasefire or the Formosa resolution.

They regard agreements as a play to fool the innocent, behind which they can constantly chip away at any program which would strengthen our country.

The principle burden of removing the elite falls, I believe, on Congress. Congress must take back the money it has given the elite to consolidate its influence. Congress must take back the loose powers which it has carelessly surrendered. Congress must rescind any legislation which commits us to the collectivist one-world supergovernment which is so rapidly taking over the world. Congress must strengthen every official and every sector of our Government which operates under the Constitution and adheres to the ideals of the founders of our Nation.

We must plainly tell other countries that if they do not wish to get rid of their own collectivist elite we are through. I said "through." We cannot give economic aid or military aid to nations governed by a collectivist elite friendly to communism. We must build American policy on firm agreements with nations which have cleaned their own house.

If the American people will recognize their real enemy, and their real danger; if they will work together to destroy every vestige of collectivist supergovernment which has grown up since 1933, I have no doubt of the outcome.

This is the only road to peace. The Communists in Russia are not strong enough or smart enough to destroy the free nations without help of their supporters from within other countries. If we join hands with any nation working to rid itself of a fifth-column elite, we can build a ring of steel about the Soviet Empire. When it is shut off from new conquests, from the resources it must get from its secret allies in the free countries, the Soviet Government will wither away, and the people who live under slavery can once again be free.

If we fight this one battle, we can look forward to a world of peace, of law, of decency, of honest agreements. This world can be built on a firm foundation of government under law, obeying the desires of decent moral people.

The American people know we have inherited the most perfect design for a government under law and serving the ideals of harmony and truth. We do not need to seek a new way of life. We need only be true to our own great ideals. Then we shall emerge from the shadows strong and clean and free, and give to the world the glad tidings that America is true to herself once more.

Beyond Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Beyond Formosa," delivered by me before the Foreign Policy Association, at Pittsburgh, Pa., on May 4, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEYOND FORMOSA

(Address by Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, delivered before Foreign Policy Association, Pittsburgh, Pa., on May 4, 1955)

During recent years the United States has been confronted with a succession of crises in Asia. None has been more complex than the one which we now face in Formosa. I should like to begin this discussion therefore by reviewing the background of our present involvement in that region.

When the Chinese Communists came to power on the mainland in 1949, the Government of the Republic of China moved to Formosa. The United States continued to recognize that Government and only that Government. Since the outbreak of Communist aggression in Korea, almost 5 years ago, our military forces have been committed to preventing the Chinese Communists from seizing Formosa. This policy, instituted by former President Truman, has had the continuing support of Congress. It has also had the overwhelming support of both great political parties.

Last year, in December, the Secretary of State concluded a defense treaty with the Republic of China which had the effect of formally acrknowledging this policy. For some reason, which in my opinion has never been satisfactorily explained, the President saw fit not to wait for the Senate's consent to ratification of that treaty. Instead, in the interim, he sent to the Congress a joint resolution on the defense of Formosa. The resolution neither added to nor subtracted from the terms of the defense treaty which was subsequently ratified.

In debating the Formosa resolution in the Senate there was no question of the determination of that body that Formosa should be defended. That was never at issue. The debate, rather, centered on two other questions. One was the question of whether Congress should endorse in advance a possible American military action in the Formosan Straits and on the Chinese mainland, acts over which Congress could have no control and the validity of which it could have no way of determining. I stated at the time that in my judgment under the Constitution only Congress had the power to declare war but that short of war the President had powers as Commander in Chief and in the execution of foreign policy. I further stated that his powers and his responsibility in the latter connection could not be diluted, obscured, transferred, or divided, resolutions of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding. After the President gave assurances, in effect, that he alone would assume responsibility for any use of force in the Formosan region, without a declaration of war, the resolution was accepted by the Senate. Had we not had those Presidential assurances, that resolution would have been an open invitation to irresponsibility and might very well have been rejected by the Senate.

The second side issue in the Formosan debate was the relation of the coastal islands of the Quemoys and the Matsus to the safeguarding of Formosa. In this discussion the Senate was attempting to place the defense of the coastal islands—in the perspective of our national interests rather than those of the Chinese Nationalist Government. In consequence, it was clear by the time the resolution passed that Congress supported the defense of Formosa and nothing more. We were not approving any military crusade on the mainland of Asia or any defense of the offshore islands for the sake of the offshore islands. I know that my own vote was cast with that understanding and I so stated. Many other Members of the Senate expressed similar sentiments.

The responsibility for carrying out the defense of Formosa—and it is a heavy burden—remains the responsibility of the President. It seems to me that the best way that Americans can lighten that burden is by refraining at this time from attempts to whittle away at his responsibility. The President is entrusted with the defense of Formosa. It is for him to decide whether to defend the coastal islands or to engage our forces in their defense. He is accountable to the American people for whatever action he may or may not take. But to attempt to tie his hands now in advance, either for or against their defense, will serve only to deepen the difficult crisis in which we find ourselves.

It is unfortunate, in my opinion, that the Formosan resolution, if it had to come to Congress at all, came in the vague fashion that it did. Once having been made public, however, Congress was faced with little alternative but to accept it in that form or weaken the President's position in dealing with the Far Eastern crisis.

My concern today is not with predicting the outcome of the Formosan crisis. I do not know whether the vagueness of our position on the coastal islands will either avert war or plunge us into war. No one can make a meaningful prediction of that kind. I believe that remains the case despite the growing prospects of peace talks between the United States and the Communists. These talks, in my opinion. should not be ruled out but they should be approached with the greatest caution.

I would address the main body of my remarks today to the proposition that the difficult situation in which we find ourselves, respecting the Quemoys and the Matsus is merely an external sympton of our problems in the Far East. The underlying causes for these problems are to be found in forces and pressures which exist inside the body of Asia. They are also to be found in pressures and forces which are exerted from outside Asia. If there is to be peace in that part of the world—if there are to be long-term solutions in Asia, it is to these causes that our attention must be turned. It is of importance that we understand not only what these forces are but what happens in Asia when the pressures from outside the continent collide with those from within. In particular it is of importance that the role of military force in our policy in Asia be examined—not so much from the standpoint of its use as an ultimate recourse in war but its role as a deterrent before war breaks out. That is the way we have been called upon to use it, except in Korea, since the end of World War II.

The crisis in the Formosan Straits is not an isolated incident. It is part of a chain reaction identified with last year's crisis in Indochina and before that with the crisis in Korea. In dealing with the crisis in Formosa our attention is easily diverted from developments which next year may result in a crisis in Laos, Thailand, and Indonesia. By the following year, if not sooner, the crisis of Japan may be full upon us.

The interrelated problems in Asia include the conspicuous threats of Communist territorial expansion in Korea, Indochina, and Formosa. It also is interwoven, however, with less-evident threats. There is pressure within Japan for an expansion of trade. To the extent that this pressure seeks an outlet in closer economic and cultural relations with the Chinese mainland, it affects the unity of policy among members of the free world with respect to Communist China. There is also a mounting pressure among the so-called neutral states of South Asia for peaceful relations with Communist China. The attitude of these states toward developments in Formosa must be seen in the context of that broader consideration. In considering the totality of our situation in Asia, moreover, we cannot ignore the possibility that the outbreak of hostilities in the Chinese coastal islands could signalize a resumption of hostilities in Korea and Indochina. Finally, behind the complex of these factors in Asia we must also reckon with the relationship between the actions of Communist China and the policy of the Soviet Union.

During recent years we have been attempting to deal with these various pressures largely by economic and military means and sometimes in a seemingly disconnected fashion. We have contributed to the economic development of the free countries of Asia.

We have attempted at the same time to strengthen the defenses of the free-Asian countries. These positive efforts have been dimmed, however, by the recurrent crises. From the Korean crisis we rushed too late to Indochina to quench a fire which had spread beyond control. We now have rushed to the fire in Formosa. We may be blinded by the glare in Formosa to the fire which is being kindled in Japan. We have exercised in recent years a kind of "chain reaction" diplomacy, a kind of crisis-foreign policy. We have jumped from the effects of one crisis to its successor. We have, in short, never been ahead of the game. That the crises continue to occur seems to me evidence that either our positive measures have been insufficient or the situation has been beyond our control by measures which we could support at that time. I think it is probably a little of both. There are limits to what we can do to control the flow of events in Asia, short of war and even with war.

That does not mean our answer is to pick up our marbles and go home. Asia is too important to us, to our security, and to our other national interests to permit that kind of response. That would simply amount to postponing the day of reckoning.

We have not exhausted our possibilities of dealing with the situation when we employ measures of economic aid and military aid. It seems to me we have overlooked another which costs far less and yet can be more far-reaching in its effect.

That ingredient I believe lies in the realm of attitudes and ideas. I am not talking about psychological warfare which holds that you can win with tricky words and slick advertising slogans battles which cannot be won with infantry rifles. I think the lesson of the unleashing of Chiang has put to rest that fallacious concept. But if the battle in Asia is essentially a struggle of ideas it is in the spirit as well as in the economic and military arena wherein peace and long-term solutions may possibly be found.

What I am suggesting is that we examine the Asian attitudes or states of mind which give rise to many of the basic pressures with which we must deal. I am suggesting, too, that we examine Asian reactions to our own state of mind and our actions. Perhaps, then, we will find some of the answers to the peace we seek. Such answers will not lead to a purchased peace, or a power peace. They could, however, lead to a peace based on mutual understanding and common interest.

We have grown too accustomed to wrapping all the ills of Asia into the single package marked "militant communism." Of course this threat exists; we have seen over 500 million Chinese brought under the potential influence of that ideology. Countless millions more are threatened with it. We have spent blood to prevent the conquest of Korea by Communist aggression. Too late, we saw Vietnam north of the 17th parallel brought within the orbit of communism. We have seen militant Communist expansionism accompanied by political penetration, by organized propaganda, by the activities of disciplined cadres of intimidators and by calculated economic penetration. Military offensives have been alternated with the allurements of the peace offensive with its offers of trade, industrialization and cultural exchanges. Today in free Vietnam we see Viet Minh agents using backmail, bribery, and intimidation in attempting to undermine the Diem government. We see the Communist created shadow government of Pathet Lao in northern Laos and another Communist penetration headed by a former premier of Thailand, Pridi, in Southeast Asia.

We see the new maps of China which brazenly incorporate territory from its southern neighbors. We see new military highways under construction in south China. In Indonesia the Communist Party has recently been reorganized and its activities accelerated. The trade offensive directed at Japan is beginning to cause a wavering in that country. In North Korea the truce has been violated and the area has been placed within a stranglehold of Communist control. And now, the Communist sword is pointed at Formosa. It is all too evident that militant communism is a force in Asia. But why, we may well ask ourselves, has it not met with more resistance? Why hasn't Asian nationalism which in great measure was stimulated by our own revolution interposed a more formidable bulwark to the Communist advance? We have assumed in recent years that by taking measures to alleviate the extreme poverty of Asia, we might guide Asian nationalism toward our own precepts of democracy. We have also assumed that by arming it heavily we could prevent a Communist penetration. These efforts have not been conspicuously successful. Perhaps, in part, the difficulty lies in the failure to recognize the spiritual basis of Asian nationalism.

The peoples of Asia, looking out on the West, see the high material standard of living which has followed in the wake of the industrial revolution. Asia was left in the backwash by the sweep of Western industrialism. The surge of democracy which spread through Europe and the Americas following our revolution and the French Revolution bypassed Asia at that time. In consequence, as the decades passed the differences between Eastern and Western standards of living widened, as did the gap between the political controllers and the controlled in Asia. For more than a century these differences burned deeper and deeper in the hearts and minds of the peoples of the Orient. The bitterness was fed not only by the desire for the material achievements of the West but also by the demands of pride and prestige. Although the West brought some benefits, the era of colonialism was widely viewed in Asia as hampering the development of the peoples of Asia in their own right. Colonialism was backed by Western force and in the minds of many Asians, force is indelibly identified with their ancient and deep-seated grievances against that system.

Although the era of colonialism is almost over in Asia, its after effects remain. There is extreme sensitivity among Asians and especially among Asian leaders about being recognized and dealt with on a basis of absolute equality by the West. There is an urge to express their new-found independence in independent action. An enthusiasm also exists for rapid economic development—a desire to bridge the wide economic gap—between the East and West. At the same time, however, dependence upon the West for economic aid contradicts the underlying urge of the Asian nations to prove their independence and equality. There exists most of all an ever-present sensitivity, an often unreasonable sensitivity, to any action which resembles a return of the colonial relationships of an earlier era.

In this context it is understandable that Communist China's defiance of the West finds considerable emotional support from many Asians including those who stanchly oppose communism. It explains in part the support of some Asian governments for the recognition of Communist China and for its admission to the United Nations. It is an important element in explaining the initial successes of the Viet Minh in Indochina. The deep-seated attitudes of Asia toward the West form an emotional and psychological base which is readily exploited by Communist propaganda. An understanding of this fact is pertinent to any understanding of the behavior of the uncommitted states of Asia, behavior which sometimes appears and is hostile to us.

As Asians look at the West from these attitudes, and particularly as they view the United States, there is a tendency for many of them to interpret present United States policies as a policy of force. To them we exaggerate the value of force.

And they identify force with the era of foreign domination in Asia against which present Asian nationalism rebels. When we announce a policy of massive retaliation it places force in the forefront rather than in the position of an ultimate recourse where it should rightly be. In the minds of many people throughout Asia our emphasis on force rules out of the foreground the normal and accepted processes of negotiation in human relations. It undermines our dignity and our prestige. For the mightiest power on the face of the earth to flaunt its strength in this manner is readily interpreted in Asia in the light of a man who threatens to shoot his neighbor if the latter's cow comes into his pasture rather than to discuss the problem of mending the fence. To be sure, the reactions vary in different parts of Asia, but I think it is correct to say that Asians in general, including the Chinese people—in spite of the recent actions of their rulers—are a peaceful people and they tend to admire the strong who are also peaceful. Much of the great respect which this country enjoyed in the past derived from that fact. President Theodore Roosevelt's admonition to "speak softly but carry a big stick" won us a great backlog of good will in Asia. This sensible advice seems to have been forgotten by a great number of Americans who otherwise have every cause to admire Theodore Roosevelt.

Those who know the peoples of Asia can attest to the great emphasis which they place on negotiation. A spirit of negotiation permeates their everyday life; it involves adjustments and give-and-take and inevitably is accompanied by prolonged discussion. Those who know Asia will also attest to the lack of the visible use of force in the everyday relations among Asians.

Closely related is a concept found in many parts of Asia which in effect holds that there is a positive force in a negative action. We see this in the philosophy of Chinese Taoism—we see it in what often appears to us to be the retiring or reticent traits of many Asian peoples—we see it in the Chinese concept employed even by the Chinese Communists, of "advancing by withdrawing"—we have seen it in India in the passive resistance doctrine of Mahatma Gandhi. It is reflected now in the arguments of the Asian neutrals. We see it in the jujitsu sport and the doctrine of judo in Japan in which one utilizes the offensive force of his opponent to his own advantage. There are, of course, counterdoctrines in Asia which place great emphasis on force, and we should not forget them, but examples serve to illustrate an attitude which is of the highest importance in understanding the international policies of the Asian nations.

The mention of the possible use of atomic tactical weapons in the defense of Formosa is often interpretated there as further evidence of United States reliance on force. Instead of enhancing the strength of our position it has the effect of an admission that we are incapable of coping with the situation on a plane of reason and have been driven in the first round to dependence upon an ultimate recourse.

If there is any one factor responsible for disagreement in our relations with India, Burma, Indonesia, and Ceylon it is the view of their leaders that primary reliance on force is not the best means of gaining solutions in Asia.

They advance the view that we can prevent Communist aggression but in preventing the aggression it is not necessary to exercise pressures which rule out a climate of negotiation. We may find this attitude

unrealistic and in some cases, I believe, correctly so. What is important, however, is to recognize its existence and, if we are not intent upon isolating ourselves, to accommodate our policies, wherever possible, to it. There is no sense in getting furious about it or losing our temper over it. To do so may give us a momentary sense of satisfaction but it is not going to serve our national interests.

Most Asian nations acquiesced in the action of the United States in neutralizing the Formosa Strait at the beginning of the Korean war. At the beginning of 1953, however, neutralization was replaced by a boastful policy of unleashing the Chinese nationalist forces. With few exceptions this second step was interpreted by the free states of Asia as provocative—as putting the United States in position of reliance on force to the exclusion of other means.

What then should be the role of force in our policy in Asia? We know that in all realism no great power, least of all the United States, can afford at present to abandon or weaken its military power. We must continue the system of military alliances in the western Pacific, southeast Asia, and the Near East.

Let us by all means continue to maintain and strengthen our military defenses in the Far East. Is it not, however, in the interest of peace in Asia, and in our own national interest, that we relegate the use of force to the background? Is it not in our interest to explore measures which offer some hope of leading to long-term solutions? Are there measures which will obtain these solutions? I believe there are.

As a first measure it seems to me essential that we keep clearly in mind that our national interest in the Formosan area is the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores not that of the offshore islands of the Quemoys and the Matsus. Any defense of the coastal islands, which always have been a part of China and so involved in the Chinese civil war is incidental to our primary aim. President Eisenhower, in submitting the Formosa resolution to Congress, only hinted at a possible defense of the coastal islands while urging that a cease-fire be negotiated. That should remain our immediate objective and there are signs now that we may be moving toward its achievement.

We cannot fail to recognize in this situation that threats to peace are posed by the Chinese on both sides of the Formosa Straits. The Republic of China on Formosa has repeatedly avowed its intention of regaining the mainland. The United States must come to grips with that threat since we are linked in a defense alliance with the Republic. Assuming that liberation of the mainland by force were militarily feasible—and it is not even conceivable short of committing this country to an all-out war on the Continent of Asia—would the people of the United States support the use of force as an instrument of national policy for the liberation of China? I think not. Is it beyond our imagination to conceive of China being ultimately freed from totalitarian communism by other means? Have we so little faith in the power of freedom? The Chinese people have turned out their oppressors many times. Is it inconceivable that they will not do so again?

The National Government of China deserves every reasonable consideration from this country. First consideration must be given, however, to our national needs and our needs are not served by an embroilment in a war to liberate the Chinese mainlaind. I think it is time to recognize the tragic blunder of unleashing Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and building up his expectations that we would return him to the mainland. That was a cruel and misleading thing to do and I think we ought to acknowledge the error. I do not think we ought to compound it.

Once we have returned to the policy of neutralization, the policy adopted in 1950, we will have laid the groundwork for international action to counter the threat of the Chinese Communists.

The United States can then and only then, on sound moral and legal grounds, insist that other free nations join with us in opposition to the use of any aggressive force in the Formosa area. Such a declaration made perhaps by the United Nations Assembly could call on both the Chinese Communists and the Nationalists to abstain from the use of force. Once our own purposes are clear, I believe that many, if not most countries outside the Communist bloc would support a declaration condemning an attack by either side in the Chinese conflict. Such a declaration would unite those nations who now oppose Communist military action against Formosa but who are unwilling to give either moral or actual support to the defense of the island so long as the Chinese National Government continues to threaten to invade the mainland. Such a declaration having been made, the question of the defense of the coastal islands would become a question for international determination. It would no longer be a responsibility for the President of the United States alone. By taking this action the peoples of Asia would be given a clear and forthright commitment that our position respecting Formosa involved resort to force not in a trigger-happy fashion but force as a last recourse. At the same time, we would not have budged 1 inch in our determination to prevent Communist seizure of Formosa.

Neutralization of the Straits, however important, is only a first positive step toward a solution of the problem of Formosa. A determination of the status of Formosa is complicated not only by questions of international law but by considerations contained in the regrettable but realistic fact that the Republic of China on Formosa is not now and short of total war has little hope of becoming the government of the mainland of China. So long as two Chinese governments, one on Formosa and one on the mainland claim jurisdiction over all of China, there exists not only civil war but a threat to world peace—the seeds of total war.

A number of possible solutions to this problem have been advanced. The establishment of an independent republic on Formosa by declaration of the present government would be realistic but is not a likely development. A plebiscite of the people of Formosa has been suggested to determine their wishes in this matter. Further proposals have been made to the effect that Formosa be placed under a trusteeship with its integrity guaranteed for a designated period of years. These envisage a trusteeship either by a single Pacific nation, by a consortium of powers or by the United Nations. In addition to these proposals there are undoubtedly solutions as yet unexplored. All such proposals require patient and thorough examination.

A settlement of the status of Formosa would permit our full energies to be directed toward the many problems of our peaceful relations with the Asian nations. For many years now we have thought of the world as being divided into two parts—the free world and the Communist world. These words have become a part of our everyday language. Yet we are now coming to recognize the width and depth of the chasm which exists within the free world. There is a gulf which may be of greater long-range significance than the immediate threat of communism. In terms of economics the gulf is between those states which have a high material standard of living and those which are struggling to rise from the level of recurrent famine; it is an abyss which separates automation from the man-drawn plow.

It is not enough that we build a wall to contain communism, for while we build the wall the chasms within the free world deepen. I am suggesting that we continue to maintain our defense system in the Far East but that in the foreground our energy and intellect and resources be directed toward building bridges across the chasms in the free world.

It will take more than what we now call technical assistance and economic aid. If the gap is to be bridged the concept of "aid" must be replaced by a unity of purpose. The challenge is to move into spheres of economic and cultural cooperation in which the common progress of all free nations becomes possible. If we are equal to that challenge, and if we have the patience and understanding to stay with it, we need have no fear of the outcome of this contest between totalitarian communism and freedom—in Asia, in Europe or anywhere else.

Completion of Great Lakes Connecting Channels: The Story of Accomplishment Under the Wiley Seaway Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is my hope that before the end of this session of Congress, a bill will have been passed to authorize final action to deepen the Great Lakes connecting channels. If that shall be done, the 30-year-old fight for the deep water Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway will have been brought to a completely successful conclusion.

There is now pending on both the Senate and House sides legislation to deepen these connecting channels—to a uniform controlling depth of 27 feet.

The first bill offered on the Senate side for this purpose was S. 171, by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

It is most fitting and appropriate that action be taken on his initiative, in view of the fact that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway law itself, Public Law 358, of the 83d Congress, bears his name—the Wiley law.

It is often said that some segments of the public may tend to forget some of the accomplishments of their legislators in the Congress. I believe, however, that the fine record with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway should not be forgotten by the people of our country. In particular, it should not be forgotten by the people of Wisconsin, who, like the other Lake States, will reap tremendous dividends from the seaway down through the years.

I have before me now a compilation of the various comments which have been made over a period of time by our colleagues regarding the contributions made by the senior Senator from Wisconsin. Except in the instances where noted, these statements were originally made in the May 7, 1954, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, following the final passage of the seaway bill by this body.

I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a fitting reminder of what was in effect the first anniversary of the Wiley law a few weeks ago—a law generally regarded as the greatest single milestone in the history of the Lake States in this century.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENDATIONS OF SENATOR WILEY

Senator KNOWLAND, California, Senate Republican leader, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"I should not want this opportunity to pass without paying my tribute to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. WILEY]. Over a period of a great many years he has diligently worked for the enactment of this legislation. It has been a rather heartbreaking job over the years, because of the obstacles of one type or another which have been thrown in the way."

Senator DIRKSEN, Illinois, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"So, Mr. President, today I pay tribute to the man who has so consistently sat upon and hatched the ideal that has at last come into fruition in the legislative measure about to be acted on finally by the Senate. I pay tribute to the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY. His great humility and fine self-effacement have, of course, caused him to omit mentioning his own name. However, all his colleagues pay testimony to the persistence, vigor, and great vision with which he has pursued this great cause. Today we salute him for his victory in connection with this great ideal."

Senator POTTER, Michigan, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the leadership shown by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY, throughout the work on this momentous piece of legislation.

"This is the first Congress in which the bill has received favorable consideration by either House of Congress. I wish to join the other Senators who have spoken in expressing my appreciation for the leadership shown by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY.

"So, Mr. President, this occasion is a momentous one which the people of the great Midwest will cherish for many, many years to come."

Senator HUMPHREY, Minnesota, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"Mr. President, I cannot help notice how much joy and happiness there is in this Chamber. In victory there is great joy. There is today no Member of the Senate who deserves to feel a sense of accomplishment and fulfillment of purpose more than the Senator from Wisconsin.

"I was highly honored to be privileged, through the good advice of the Senator from Wisconsin, of being a cosponsor of S. 2150."

Senator KEFAUVER, Tennessee, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"Mr. President, I cannot let this occasion pass without adding a word of commendation of the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin and the other Senators who joined him in bringing about the fulfillment of the long-time dream of a St. Lawrence River seaway.

"The senior Senator from Wisconsin has exercised a great deal of statesmanship in bringing together the Senators and the interests of various sections of the country and finally accomplishing the passage of the proposed legislation."

Senator SMITH, New Jersey, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"ALEX WILEY, my pal on the Foreign Relations Committee, has worked strenuously in connection with this legislation."

Senator FERGUSON, Michigan, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on this subject in praise of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. At times it can be said that, after all is said and done, there is more said than done. I believe this is an exception. The exception is that, in this instance, we have finally done more than we said."

Senator LEHMAN, New York, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"Mr. President, I take great pleasure and satisfaction in congratulating the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY, on the final enactment by both Houses of Congress of the St. Lawrence seaway bill.

"I wish to express my satisfaction and appreciation for the efforts of the senior Senator from Wisconsin. Without his interest, without his determination, and without his continued agitation for this legislation, particularly after he became chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the final enactment of the bill would have been impossible."

Senator DOUGLAS, Illinois, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"I think that at long last we are nearing the final step in the legislative history of the St. Lawrence seaway proposal.

"I should like to add a word of congratulation to the eminent chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations for the part which he has played in securing the passage of the bill. As a somewhat junior Member of the Senate, I have watched his very effective work, not only in committee and on the floor, but off the floor; and I would say that his has been perhaps the greatest effort toward getting the bill passed. We of the Midwest owe a debt to the Senator from Wisconsin. I am sure the citizens of his State are grateful.

"I want to express the appreciation of the members of all parties for the very effective and untiring work which the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin, who is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has devoted to this task."

Senator CASE, South Dakota, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 4, 1954:

"The remarks of the Senior Senator from Wisconsin remind me that the present favorable position for the passage of the St. Lawrence seaway bill is due in large part to his persistence and effective leadership and sponsorship of that measure. I hope the bill will be passed as a further tribute to the work of the Senator from Wisconsin."

Senator CASE, South Dakota, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"The present favorable position for the passage of the St. Lawrence seaway bill is due, in large part, to his persistent and effective leadership and sponsorship of that measure. I hope the bill will be passed by the House and approved by the President promptly, as a further tribute to the work of the Senator from Wisconsin, as well as a gesture, a very appropriate gesture at this time, of our comradeship with the people of Canada."

Senator AIKEN, Vermont, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"Next, let me say that for the past 2 years it has been a great pleasure to be a cosponsor of the St. Lawrence seaway bill, under the able, sincere, and enthusastic leadership of the senior Senator from Wisconsin."

Senator Cooper, Kentucky, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in expressing admiration for the successful fight which the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has made in connection with the passage of the St. Lawrence seaway bill.

"It was the long-continued insistence and the fine and convincing arguments of my friend the Senator from Wisconsin which removed any doubt I may have had about the bill. I congratulate him for the successful outcome of his efforts in connection with the great St. Lawrence River project."

Senator THYE, Minnesota, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"Mr. President, when I came to Washington I found such Members as the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] working vigorously to accomplish the development of the seaway."

Senator THYE, Minnesota, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 17, 1954:

"Mr. President, I was pleased to see that a great many of the newspapers of Wisconsin commended the great contributions made by our colleague the senior Senator from the Badger State [Mr. WILEY] in achieving the passage of the Wiley bill, S. 2150, to complete the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway."

Senator Cordon, Oregon, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 25, 1954:

"Mr. President, I have been glad to note that the newspapers of Wisconsin have given well-deserved credit to the senior Senator from that State [Mr. WILEY] for his valiant and successful sponsorship of the St. Lawrence seaway law.

"I ask unanimous consent that several editorials which have appeared in Wisconsin papers be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD."

[From the Two Rivers Reporter of May 10, 1954]

SEAWAY AT LONG LAST

There was general jubilation expressed by people in the community about the seaway after the House last week had approved the measure, thus ending more than 40 years of anxious waiting.

The seaway represents a triumph for the administration, which has been actively supported by President Eisenhower. However, no man deserves more credit for the success of the project than Wisconsin's Senator ALEXANDER WILEY. It was he who, more than any other legislator, worked unflaggingly to engineer the undertaking through both Houses.

While Senator WILEY was, of course, thinking of benefits for his State, he was nonetheless an exponent of the seaway for the Midwest and the Nation as a whole. He wanted United States to have a voice in it with Canada, since that country was determined to build with or without the United States.

His efforts have borne preliminary rich fruit, and there are confident predictions he will watch the entire country bear even richer results in the years ahead when the seaway becomes a reality. The St. Lawrence seaway may someday stand as a monument to a man who would not admit defeat so the entire country would benefit.

[From the Sturgeon Bay Advocate of May 11, 1954]

OUR MAYOR SAYS

(By Mayor Stanley R. Greene)

THE WILEY BILL

After many years of struggle it now appears as though a jointly sponsored United States-Canadian Great Lakes, St. Lawrence seaway will become a reality.

The bill that makes the seaway a reality will be signed this week by President Eisenhower. The bill was sponsored by Senator WILEY and has become generally known as the Wiley bill. Senator WILEY in his efforts on behalf of the bill has displayed genuine statesmanship in the service of both his country and the State which he represents in the Senate.

Both senatorial Democrats and Republicans recognized this fact and paid the Senator an unusual tribute in recognition of those services.

[From the Chilton Times-Journal of May 13, 1954]

PASSAGE OF SEAWAY BILL A MAJOR ACHIEVEMENT

The passage of the St. Lawrence seaway bill after 59 years of bickering is a real achievement for the Eisenhower administration.

Wisconsin's Senator WILEY played a leading role in getting the measure past the stiff obstacles interposed in the Senate.

[From the Wausau Daily Record-Herald of May 10, 1954]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Whatever the Republican administration in Washington may accomplish, its success in winning congressional approval of the St. Lawrence seaway will stand out as one of its great achievements.

Wisconsin's Representatives and Senators, it may be noted, were in unanimous support of the legislation, but special credit belongs to Senator WILEY who sponsored the seaway proposal in the Senate and played a leading role in obtaining its passage.

[From the Burlington Standard-Democrat of May 13, 1954]

HIS WORK PAID OFF

Our congratulations to Senator ALEXANDER WILEY for his successful labors toward the passage of the St. Lawrence seaway project. Our Wisconsin senior Senator worked hard for this State for many years, being the only man, at times, who would stand up and be counted.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal of May 10, 1954]

A VICTORY FOR WISCONSIN

Wisconsin and the Midwest won what we believe is an important economic victory last week with passage of the St. Lawrence seaway bill. It should go to President Eisenhower, who favors it, soon.

This State also can be proud of its many hard-to-lick citizens, public and private, who have fought for the seaway for more than 20 years.

In that category must be included Senator ALEXANDER WILEY.

It was WILEY, perhaps more than any other individual, who kept the seaway issue alive during its darkest days.

[From the Wisconsin Rapids Daily Tribune of May 12, 1954]

WILEY AND THE SEAWAY

Principal spokesman for the administration in steering the St. Lawrence seaway legislation to final enactment was Senator ALEXANDER WILEY. He led the fight in a manner which gained for him the admiration and respect of all his colleagues, Republican and Democrat alike, regardless of whether they favored or opposed the project. He deserves a great part of the credit for bringing the seaway close to realization. Wisconsin should be proud to acknowledge his splendid work and thank him for it.

[From the La Crosse Tribune of May 6, 1954]

For his leadership in winning Senate approval of the St. Lawrence seaway alone, Senator WILEY is deserving of the plaudits of this State, and most of all by the Republican Party.

For his position as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he has been outspoken in his support of President Eisenhower all down the line. The respect he has earned from his Republican colleagues in the Senate as a result is as enduring as are his achievements.

* * * * *

Whatever support and commendation flows to President Eisenhower for his position in international affairs—and properly a great deal has from Republican sources—must in all fairness inure to Senator WILEY as well.

[From the Eau Clair Leader-Telegram of May 9, 1954]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY GETS UNITED STATES BACKING

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Chippewa Falls, has been in the forefront of seaway battles during his three terms as United States Senator and it is fitting that the legislation finally passed bears his name—the Wiley-Dondero bill. WILEY led the fight in the Senate and Representative DONDERO, Michigan Republican, was floor manager of proseaway forces in the House.

Mr. Charles E. Broughton, station WHBL, Sheboygan, Wis.:

"We want to commend Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, who lone-handed, out here in Wisconsin, has continued his fight. He has never wavered in that respect and it must be a great source of pleasure for him to know that the fight looks more encouraging than ever."

FROM SENATORIAL OPPONENTS

Senator BEALL, Maryland, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"Mr. President, as a member of the opposition, I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin for the tremendous job he has done.

"I think the Senator from Wisconsin is to be congratulated for his generalship in the handling of parliamentary matters in connection with the bill. I cannot refrain from congratulating the Senator from Wisconsin on his victory today."

Senator BUTLER, Maryland, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"May I say that I congratulate my very worthy adversary, the Senator from Wisconsin, not only on behalf of myself but of others who participated in the opposition."

Senator STENNIS, Mississippi, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1954:

"I recall that when I first came to the Senate, more than 6 years ago, the Senator from Wisconsin was working on a bill on the same subject matter. He has spoken on this subject many times since then, always with great sincerity, earnestness, and persuasion. I know he has worked very persistently for the bill, both among his colleagues in the Senate and elsewhere.

"As one who did not vote for the bill, I wish to commend him very highly.

"I feel that at times his work made the difference between abandoning the bill and continuing with it. I salute and congratulate him on his fine achievement, which I know will prove to be most worthwhile for a great many people, even beyond his own State."

MAY 25, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Congratulations on your wonderful work in getting through the St. Lawrence seaway.

You have had your teeth in this matter for many years and it has been your persistence and your statesmanship that has brought about the results.

I congratulate you and your State.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
United States Senator.

Can Mankind Endure Half Slave and Half Free?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege yesterday to deliver an address in Bement, Ill., the place where Lincoln and Douglas met to arrange the time and place of the Lincoln-Douglas debates, which took place 100 years ago. I spoke on the subject, Can Mankind Endure Half Slave and Half Free?

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN MANKIND ENDURE HALF SLAVE AND HALF FREE?

AMERICA'S CHALLENGE: FREEDOM AND SURVIVAL WITHOUT GLOBAL NUCLEAR WAR

I am pleased to be present at the inauguration of this Town Meeting series on a site which holds such deep meaning to the people of our country.

The tradition of the Lincoln-Douglas debates is one of the historic hallmarks of American political life.

No single series of political exchanges have marked themselves so indelibly in the memory of the American people.

Here was a great period in American history—the stormy period preceding the War Between the States.

Here were two masterful figures in American life, notably the man who was to become the Great Emancipator and Douglas the Little Giant. And here was a great issue being debated in the American manner—with sincerity, with openness, with candor before the bar of public opinion—without mudslinging and personalities.

Abe Lincoln didn't go thereafter to the Senate, but he did later go to the White House and he did become enshrined in mankind's heart.

May we be worthy of his everlasting inspiration.

Today we turn to another great historic issue.

Today I address myself to the vital question: Can mankind endure half slave and half free?

OUR ANSWER AND NECESSARY RESERVATIONS

I believe that the answer to that question is "Yes," but with certain reservations.

"Yes," if we are viligant; "Yes," if we are strong. The answer is "Yes" if we definitely do not—I repeat if we do not—give moral sanction—moral approval to Communist slavery simply because it is entrenched, even though we reject war as a means of abolishing that slavery.

The answer is "Yes," in summary, if we remain true to our own ideals—to Lincoln's ideals. He wanted to save the Union. We want to save the Union—with strength, but without war, if it can possibly be avoided.

As you can see, as in the case of most important questions, we must bear in mind a great many factors on the world scene, a great many necessary reservations.

AMERICANS REJECT SLAVERY IN ANY FORM

In the first place, let it be stated emphatically that the United States rejects the institution of human slavery today, just as we rejected it almost a century ago on the field of battle, even when brother had to fight brother on this continent in 4 bloody years of Civil War.

Ours is a moral people. We live by the moral law.

We know that slavery, whether it be the slavery based on the color of a man's skin, or the class-slavery imposed by a Communist dictatorship, utterly outrages the conscience of mankind.

WE CAN NEVER BE SILENT ABOUT SLAVERY

We will never be silent in the face of slavery.

Abraham Lincoln pointed out in the course of his great career, that to be silent in the face of evil is to take part in that evil.

We cannot be silent, therefore, before the slavery of Eastern Europe. We cannot—must not—ignore the suffering of the Russian people themselves who, since November 1917 have been shackled under the cruelest despotism in the history of the earth. We cannot ignore the plight of the 550 million people of China, mercilessly tyrannized by the despotic clique of Peking. We cannot ignore the plight of the suffering people of North Korea, nor that of the unfortunate population of Communist-controlled northern Vietnam.

Wherever there is slavery, that is where the conscience of America asks for freedom.

As once, the North could not ignore the moans and suffering of the enslave Negroes of the South, so today, the peoples of the free world hear the moans and groans from the concentration camps of Siberia, the forced labor camps everywhere behind the Iron Curtain. We can see in our mind's eye the persecution the suffering, the torment of the enslaved hundreds of millions.

We will never acquiesce to their permanent enslavement.

As a matter of fact, we oppose slavery in every shape, manner or form—political slavery; economic slavery, intellectual slavery; military slavery.

We oppose the principle of colonialism. We ourselves emerged to independence through the fortitude of 13 colonies which appealed to the conscience of mankind in our own Declaration of Independence.

OPPOSING SYSTEMS HAVE CO-EXISTED IN THE PAST

Now, the second factor to keep in mind is that all of history is full of instances where opposing systems did exist side by side in relative peace.

It may have been uneasy peace—a peace occasionally broken—but it was peace, nonetheless. Opposing religions learned to live alongside one another, even though but a few centuries ago two of the great religions of Western civilization were relentlessly engaged in the bitterest type of national and civil wars.

Men of these two great faiths literally burned each other at the stake in the mistaken notion that they were performing God's will. But today, the great Christian faiths have learned to live in peace with one another and in harmony and in so doing have learned religion.

So, too, history is full of the record of rival economic systems which contested with one another and which nevertheless managed to live in a relative state of peace.

The great historian, Arnold Toynbee, has constantly reemphasized and documented this point; that opposing systems have learned to live with one another—whether it be Christianity with Islam or feudalism with capitalism, or republicanism with monarchy.

If contrasting systems can coexist and have coexisted, wherein arises the current problem?

THE IMPERIALIST NATURE OF WORLD COMMUNISM

The problem arises from the third factor. That factor is, of course, the aggressive imperialistic nature of international communism.

The current situation exists not because we want to conquer the world. On the contrary, we desire that all men shall freely work out their own destiny in their own way.

We hope that they will work it out in a manner of freedom. We hope that they will recognize the light of limited power—of separation of powers—which has come from this Republic and from other beacons of freedom.

We are proud of our way, but we do not want to impose our way on others. We know that mankind is stratified today, with parts of the human race at different levels—economically, socially, politically, culturally, religiously and otherwise. We do not want to "make over the world in America's image," though we believe it would be good for the world.

But the Kremlin does want to make over the world in the Kremlin's ugly image.

It is the Kremlin which for 37 years in callous violation of its pledges, has been engaged in above-the-ground and under-the-ground conspiracy.

It is the Kremlin which has constructed the most diabolic Trojan horse movement in history, using internal armies of saboteurs, seditionists, traitors, and others to destroy nations from within.

It is the Kremlin which insists in accordance with its Marxists dogma, that the world must be all Communist or else "the capitalists will take it over."

LENIN-STALIN QUOTATIONS ON CONFLICT

Listen to these quotations:

"* * * The existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and bourgeois states will be inevitable."

"As long as capitalism and socialism exist, we cannot live in peace; in the end, one or the other will triumph—a funeral dirge will be sung over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism."

"We must say that either those who wanted to cause our destruction must perish, those who think we must perish—and in that case our Soviet Republic will live—or the capitalist will live and in that case the Republic will perish."

Who said that? Nikolai Lenin.

"Who will conquer whom? That is the whole question * * * The world is divided into two camps."

Who said that? Joseph Stalin.

Have those militarist dogmas been repudiated by the Kremlin—in fact and in deed?

Definitely not.

Therein lies the challenge to the free world.

That, then, is the third factor: the merciless intention of the Kremlin to control the word, an intention which has not been fundamentally changed in spite of the so-called Soviet "peace offensive," now in full blast.

THE TERRIBLE NATURE OF A THIRD WAR

But now we come to the fourth factor in answer to our question. We ask again, "Can mankind endure half slave and half free?"

And the answer is that mankind must—it must—learn to endure the present division without resorting, if at all possible, to force of arms.

Why? Because the nature of modern superweapons is such that a third world war could be a thing of utter horror to mankind. A third world war would leave not victor and vanquished, but 2 rubble heaps, 2 charred continents or more—of radioactive ashes, where once there were cities and farms.

One side might be less destroyed than the other, but the victory would be barren indeed.

And what conditions would follow such a so-called victory? Would the world be freer, more prosperous, happier? Of course not. Would all slavery be ended? Probably not. Chaos and disaster breed only more problems. So, this evil legacy of a third world war—a nuclear Armageddon—could continue for a period of further time that no man now living could measure.

To talk lightly of the possibility of war is, therefore, an act of highest irresponsibility. To engage loosely in hurling ultimatums, in blustering threats from one side or the other, is inexcusable.

Somehow, no matter how serious the crisis, we must find peaceful means to try to settle it. This does not mean appeasement, because we know appeasement is self-defeating.

But it does mean exhausting every last alternative in every last situation in the interest of peace.

Too many Americans lose patience too soon. Too many Americans are too willing to throw up their hands in dismay, and to ask for final action.

THE DANGERS OF ARBITRARY ACTION OVER UNITED STATES AIRMEN

When the Peking government outregeously imprisoned United States airmen, the suggestion was made that we unilaterally hurl an ultimatum with an early, fixed deadline; that we ignore the contrary opinion of the United Nations; that we, if necessary, unilaterally impose a blockade against Red China.

Such a blockade could have meant the death of the very airmen we have been trying to save. It could have meant the starting of a chain reaction which might conceivably have led to world war III.

The motives of those Americans who made the suggestion were high and patriotic. Their zeal in the defense of American nationals was understandable, and commendable; no one would quarrel with their deep feeling for our imprisoned countrymen.

But we who disagreed did have a legitimate case against what was, in effect, loose suggestions whose ominous consequences had not been sufficiently thought out.

Now, there will be more crises to come in the future. Each year will offer new challenges, new pitfalls, new dangers.

Soviet tactics, now relatively soft, may return to the belligerent Stalinist line overnight.

We cannot pierce the veil of the future, nor for that matter can even the leaders of the Kremlin today. Khrushchev, Bulganin, and Zhukov themselves do not know if they will be in power tomorrow, and how the trend of world events may shape their own thinking and action.

But as for ourselves, we must go ahead with courage, with confidence, and with faith—with readiness to fight, if need be, but with determination to avoid fighting, if possible, and with honor, with justice.

The forthcoming meeting at San Francisco on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter offers real possibilities for new exploration by the foreign ministers of East-West problems.

The meeting at the summit which will follow thereafter, possibly in late July, offers still more possibilities for some progress in resolving East-West tensions.

But no single meeting, at San Francisco, or Lausanne or anywhere else, will solve the basic problem.

In 10 years, we have literally had tens of thousands of meetings with Soviet negotiators on hundreds of issues, and we know the pitfalls of negotiating with them.

We recall how time after time they cruelly disappointed the hopes of the world; how they build some of us up for "an awful letdown."

This time, we are wary. This time we are not "oversold" on the possibilities of successful negotiations. But neither should we allow our hope and confidence to fade so that we become filled with fear or doubt or anxiety.

AMERICA'S MAGNIFICENT RECORD OF GENEROSITY

We have seen the heights to which men could rise to win a war, and we have seen the heights to which men could rise in peace.

This Nation rose magnificently to the challenge of World War II and the Korean conflict. It rose just as magnificently to the challenge of healing the wounds of World War II.

The aid program which the people of the United States generously extended—through the Marshall plan, through point 4, through Mutual Security is one of the great chapters in the history of mankind.

It is a chapter now being supplemented by the sound Mutual Security bill for the fiscal year 1956, which is now reaching its final stages in the current session of the Congress.

TO THE VICTOR BELONGS THE RESPONSIBILITY

I recall the words of a great statesman, Dr. Konrad Adenauer, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany. Dr. Adenauer stated that in every war when the German people were victorious, they applied the rule that "to the victor belonged the spoils."

He said they had expected that same rule would be applied when American occupation troops entered defeated West Germany. "We waited," said this great German statesman, "days, weeks, months, years. We were astonished," said he, "to see that the American people applied a totally new historic formula. And that formula was: That to the victor belongs the responsibility, the job of helping to rebuild, to reconstruct, to heal wounds."

We have helped to restore West Germany to the family of nations. And the German people, a great people, has industriously risen to the challenge, has come back with economic vitality and political strength and courage.

The people of West Germany are overwhelmingly anti-Communist. And their enslaved fellow nationals of East Germany would likewise vote overwhelmingly anti-Communist if they are ever given a real chance to do so.

The people of West Germany are irrevocably a part of the Western alliance. They will not fall for the seductive lure of so-called neutrality, in return for unification. They know that neutrality for West Germany could be suicide for West Germany and could contribute to fatal weakness for the West.

Over on the other side of the world, another former enemy nation has likewise come back with vigor and determination. The people of Japan, a conscientious, hard-working, able, alert people have been responding to the challenge which is theirs. They, too, will not fall for the siren song of the Communist betrayers.

The Communists would like to see Japan remain a military vacuum, just as they would like to see West Germany remain a military vacuum. The Red plan must and will fail on both sides of the world.

ASIA IN FERMENT OF IDEAS

Meanwhile, freemen in other areas of the world are coming to a rebirth. There is ferment throughout the vast arc of free Asia and throughout Africa as well. Underdeveloped peoples are coming into their own. Peoples are rising from age-old conditions of poverty, malnutrition, disease. The progress may seem slow, but everywhere there is ferment in the East—a search for sound ideas—and they are finding them.

Just a few days ago, I had the privilege of hearing one of the great spokesmen of free Asia, one of the fine leaders of the free world—Gen. Carlos Romulo, former president of the United Nations General Assembly. He told the story of the Bandung conference. He told how free Asia is filled, not as we have been mistakenly told with enmity for America, but with a great reservoir of friendship for us.

To be sure, the Communist firebrands are seeking to ignite more flames of nationalism and racialism against us. But free Asia is not being fooled. And the Bandung conference proved that we have great and good friends among other peoples who are still in colonial status, as well as the peoples who have emerged to full sovereignty or the people like the Thais who have been free. The Philippines, Pakistan—we hail their contributions. Ceylon, Burma, Indonesia—we welcome the opportunity to work with them for a brighter era for all.

SINCERE RESPECT FOR INDIA'S NEHRU

And while I am in this area, I say, that in spite of our often wide differences with a distinguished leader like India's Prime Minister Nehru, there is every good reason to work with him for peace on the continued basis of sincere, cordial, deep respect. He is a great leader of a great people; an eloquent, earnest, dedicated, democratic leader.

I have no time for ill-tempered Americans who go "off the beam," completely exasperated because of our differences with Prime Minister Nehru, just as I hope, thinking Indians will have no time for Indians who exaggerate and aggravate our differences. Let us narrow our area of disagreement instead of widening it. And let us note that on a great many occasions, Mr. Nehru has been outstandingly effective in serving the cause of freedom throughout the world. I hope and believe there will be many more such occasions in the future.

The peoples of the underdeveloped areas are, as I have indicated, coming into their own. Our hand of friendship remains gladly extended to them—to all of them, I add.

WE HAVE TENDED TO ACT TOO MUCH BY REFLEX

They want to hear from us a positive, constructive, imaginative program. We must not simply wait for crises to develop. We have tended far too long to simply act by delayed reflex.

The Soviet challenges the free world in place A; the free world then responds in place A. The Soviets challenge us in place B; we respond in place B. It is the Reds who have been picking the time and place of contest. Yet, we know that it is poor strategy for us always to allow the enemy to choose the field and timing of contest.

Moreover, it is definitely not enough for us to offer anticommunism alone as a program to the world. While it is up to us to get across the danger of communism in all its savage barbarism, other peoples of the world, particularly underdeveloped peoples, are not going to respond to a negative program on our part. They want affirmative hope in the future. They want specific and constructive suggestions and assistance. We cannot, of course, do for them what they should be doing for themselves. But neither should we keep accentuating the negative—what we are against—instead of what we are for.

THE TRUE NATURE OF FREEDOM

Now, my friends, I would not want us to leave this occasion with a narrow concept of the fundamental idea of freedom itself.

Freedom is simply not a matter alone of the formal traditions of freedom which we have known—freedom of the press, freedom of worship, freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, freedom of employment, freedom to own property—great as these blessings are. Freedom is basically a spiritual thing.

There have been great men and women who have literally been slaves in the sense that they have been the chattel of others. And yet they have been free.

Why? Because their minds have been free. Their spirits have been free.

You cannot shackle the human spirit, as you can the human flesh.

There have been people who are free, and yet who are slaves in the sense that they have sold their spiritual birthright for a mess of material pottage.

On the other hand, there are men and women living in abject poverty today who are free and who enjoy riches that the wealthiest man, enslaved by the lust for power or money, does not know. The poor man who is free in spirit can scale heights which the man enslaved by greed can never mount.

Nobility of mind makes men free. Clearness of vision to what is real, what is lasting, what is truly good—the things of the Spirit.

What matter if Abraham Lincoln never had wealth? What matter if he never completely rose from poverty but constantly lived with meager resources? He was a free man. He was a man whose spirit could not be downed. Why? Because he drew upon the Eternal Spirit: the all-knowing, the all-present, all-seeing Creator when difficulties mounted for him.

The poet said: "He is the free man who the truth makes free—and all are slaves besides."

The people behind the Iron Curtain may be chained in bondage, but not even the cruelest master of the Arctic forced labor camps can quench the fire of freedom which burns in the human breast, nor the spirit of man which material power alone can never wreck.

Abraham Lincoln had said, "I believe that this Government cannot endure permanently half-slave and half-free." He was right, human beings are not property—to be bought and sold, and no society should endure on that basis.

OUR ANSWER TO THE BASIC QUESTION

So, today, we answer the basic question before us by saying: May all this world one day be free. Toward that end, we pledge our best efforts in peace and in justice.

And too, we state emphatically, we reject all despair that the Soviet Empire will last indefinitely. Rather, we believe that empire is subject to terrific internal stresses and strains which may one day rend it asunder from within and thus permit the subject peoples to regain their freedom—for the Spirit that makes free is abroad in the world, even in Russia.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it has been a great joy to be with you today, and I hope that this forum series will produce the type of food for thought, food for mental stimulation and progress and for national and international progress and stimulus which were the fruits of the great Lincoln-Douglas debates of a century ago.

Vital Technical Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator

from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I ask unanimous consent that a statement by him regarding technical-assistance programs abroad, together with an editorial, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Our technical-assistance programs abroad take on their most importance when we find private United States industries willing to partcipate with skilled personnel.

One example of this kind of cooperation comes to me through an editorial carried in the Seattle Times of Thursday, May 19, entitled "Doing Unto Others," which I present for printing in the RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

"DOING UNTO OTHERS

"Deliberations at the recent Bandung Conference convinced the world—including Soviet Russia—that leaders of most of the remaining free Asian countries are strongly anti-Communist. It is a matter of the first importance that the United States encourage these peoples in sustaining that attitude, and to help them in preserving their free economy.

"Technical assistance is one means to the accomplishment of these ends. This has been recognized in a project undertaken by Pan American World Airways in Pakistan, in cooperation with the United States Foreign Operations Administration and Pakistan International Airways.

"In the first Government technical-assistance program to use aviation to stimulate the economic and industrial growth of an undeveloped area. Pan American will provide a team of 24 experts for 3 years to train Pakistanis in the modern techniques of airline operations.

"Development of aviation in Pakistan is peculiarly important because Pakistan is divided into two areas, 1,400 miles apart. Nothing could be more useful to the advancement and unity of this young nation than establishment of stable, independent communications between its two widely separated sections."

Commencement Address by Hon. George H. Bender, of Ohio, at McDonald High School, McDonald, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a commencement address delivered by me on last Thursday, at McDonald, Ohio.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY HON. GEORGE H. BENDER AT MCDONALD HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION, MCDONALD, OHIO, JUNE 2, 1955

I am very happy to be here with you on this wonderful occasion. Commencement time is always the most inspiring season of the year. Mothers and fathers, teachers, young men and women—you make a magnificent picture in this great country of ours. I congratulate you—and I envy you as well.

Commencement is one of the best-named exercises of the school calendar. We call it commencement because we know that nothing has ended. Everything is beginning for our young people today.

It is interesting to observe the educational pattern of American life today. A generation ago, college education was relatively rare. High school was accepted as the general rule. In 1930, 12 percent of the 18-year-old young people in our country were enrolled in colleges. By 1940, the figure had jumped to 18 percent. Today, it has reached 30 percent.

I do not know if all of our young people should be going to college, but I do know that high school is a must today. Without it, young men and women find themselves almost at sea in a complicated world.

This is one of those happy occasions for looking ahead. No one ever knows what the future holds for each individual. But we do know what the future holds for your generation.

This is the most exciting period in all world history. If I had to give a name to the next decade, I would call it Opportunities Unlimited. The atomic age is already upon us. It has not yet been transported from the scientist's laboratory to the factory, but it is here.

In every field of human endeavor new pathways are being charted. Not only in the field of atomic science but also in the areas of electronics, chemistry, plastics, television, and radar. New fields are opening almost before our eyes. We have discovered that there are no limits to the human imagination. Young men and women who are interested in their fellow human beings have also made their way in every generation. Today there is a marked shortage of nurses, social workers, doctors, and teachers.

I am particularly interested in the wonderful openings for young people in the teaching area. This month, 85,000 young men and women will complete their teacher training. This is just about enough to take the place of those teachers who retire or leave the teaching profession each year. By next September and for years to come, thousands of new students will be enrolled in our elementary schools. They will need additional thousands of teachers to train the next generation. This is a magnificent opportunity for you young people. It is something more than that for your fathers and mothers.

We know that the strength of our Republic depends upon the training which the future generation receives. Each year that I have been in Washington I have watched the boys and girls from every corner of America coming to Washington.

I read all of the stories of juvenile delinquency and I recognize the problems which they pose. Yet, as I look at the people coming to Washington, boys and girls, fathers and mothers and their grandparents, too, I cannot help thinking that America's future is still safe. I count on these fine youngsters to do their share in preserving our country for the future.

All of us in America take too much for granted. We are so accustomed to the good things of life and to our freedom, that we look with amazement at other countries that do not enjoy our liberties.

I like to tell the true story of a young girl who understands the meaning of free America better than we do ourselves. She came to my office not long ago to tell me her story. She was born in Yugoslavia under Communist control. All of her life she had been exposed to Communist propaganda. Her teachers were Communist. Her textbooks were written by Socialists. But her mother and her father were deeply religious people. Quietly, in their own way, they did their best to teach their daughter a belief in God. She understood their efforts. A few months ago she was selected as one of the top students in her secondary-school system to come to America to study dairy farming. When she arrived here she made contact with some good Americans who had come from her native village. Her mother and her father knew what she planned to do. In spite of their natural fears of what might happen, they encouraged her to make this daring escape.

She is now in the United States with a good chance of remaining here permanently. This is the greatest tribute to America that anyone can pay, to risk her life for freedom.

This freedom of ours is always called our priceless heritage. The words have been repeated so often that they have become almost meaningless. A heritage is appreciated only when it is rare. Freedom is becoming all too rare these days. Sometimes it is even frightening to look at the map. More and more places have vanished behind the Iron Curtain where freedom to worship, to think, to write, to speak, even to move about are restricted or denied entirely.

We have a duty in our own country to see that these things do not happen here.

This is the struggle of our times. All the great achievements which lie ahead of us depend upon its outcome. Atomic energy will not be used for the development of mankind unless our way of life wins this battle for the minds of men.

None of the tremendous advances just over the horizon will be realized if we blow the world to bits in a hot war. Nor will they be achieved if we allow the cold war to freeze us to death. We must go on searching for a just world peace—and a just world society.

Our job—and your job—is the exciting responsibility of building a dynamic American community. A few years ago, if someone had said that America in 1955 would produce $357 billion worth of goods, food and services, it would have sounded ridiculous. That is what our people did last year. In another 10 years there is reason to believe that the young men and women who are being graduated all over America this month will turn out $500 billion in productive wealth.

This is the promise of tomorrow. Today is good enough in itself. I look to these young men and women of McDonald High School with every confidence.

They differ in their attitudes. No two of them are alike, even if they are twins. Out of this variety of minds and abilities and determination, we shall find the Presidents and poets, the physicians and farmers, the bankers and the builders, the managers and the mechanics of the future.

I congratulate you upon reaching this milestone in your lives. May it be only one more steppingstone on your road to future happiness.

Public Power—An Investment Not an Expenditure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], that a statement by him and an editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

It seems incongruous to many of us sitting in this Senate that today we have to fight so hard for power projects which have returned so much to the American people in industrial power as well as actual dollars to the United States Treasury. Most of us realize—I am sure—that every new industrial plant located in an area served with power projects that we have authorized return much to the community in payrolls to the State in needed tax dollars, and to our Federal Treasury through income taxes as well as direct repayment for the construction costs.

I had this forcibly brought home to me when I read the editorial carried in the Saturday, June 4 edition of Labor, the national weekly newspaper. It comes at a time when public power is fighting for its very life; therefore, it should be of interest to every fair-minded Member of Congress and to every thinking citizen.

Thursday night I had the privilege of placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement regarding the high Federal dam we would like to see constructed at Hells Canyon, on the Snake River. This project, like the ones referred to in the Labor editorial, would further strengthen our Nation's industrial life, so vital at this time of world crisis.

I attach hereto the editorial, entitled "Public Power Pays, Yet Ike Would Strangle It," for printing in the RECORD.

[From Labor of June 4, 1955]

PUBLIC POWER PAYS, YET IKE WOULD STRANGLE IT

Two extraordinary developments this week threw glaring light on the issue of public versus private electric power. One was a report by W. A. Dexheimer, current chief of the Reclamation Service, which builds and manages most of Uncle Sam's power dams.

As Dexheimer was appointed by President Eisenhower, power trust propagandists wouldn't get far trying to label him as a "New Deal Socialist," yet here's what his report shows:

In the 50 years since the reclamation program was launched under a Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, the United States Government has spent $2.6 billion on public power projects. In return, Uncle Sam has received about $4 billion in Federal taxes made possible by those projects and almost $600 million electric power and water revenues. That's a total of $4.6 billion.

Thus, the United States Treasury and the taxpayers have already recovered the entire $2.6 billion cost, plus a $2 billion profit. And that's just the beginning, Dexheimer points out. Most of Uncle Sam's power systems are comparatively new, and have not yet had much time to pay back their costs. In the future, the profits will be even bigger, despite the low rates charged for public power.

In addition, Dexheimer emphasizes, the power and reclamation projects are enriching the country in other ways. For example, they have raised by $750 million a year the purchasing power of the farmers of the irrigated lands.

In the face of those facts, the private power lobby continues to shout that public power is subsidized by the taxpayers, and the drive against public power continues to get help from the Eisenhower administration. That was made clear this week by the other development.

Gen. Herbert D. Vogel, Eisenhower-appointed chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, sent to the chairmen of the Senate and House Public Works Committees an extraordinary letter that the TVA's board of directors had received from the Budget Bureau, which speaks directly for the President. Vogel gave his blessing to the letter, though he admitted it does not express the views of the other two TVA board members, Raymond Paty and Harry Curtis.

That letter came on the heels of a recent TVA proposal: namely, that as a Government corporation it be given a free hand to raise money in ways other than appropriations from Congress. It asked for this authority because the seven-State TVA faces an increasing shortage of electric power and the administration refuses to ask Congress for any money to build TVA dams and new power plants.

As one way out of this impasse, the TVA proposed to sell bonds to bankers and other private investors, as well as to the United States Treasury. Also, it would have State and municipal governments and farmers' electric co-ops in the TVA area build powerplants, which would sell power to TVA, or be leased or bought by TVA over a period of years.

The Budget Bureau's letter refused to give Presidential approval to the TVA proposals, except with so many provisos and restrictions—23 in all—that the whole new financial plan would be strangled.

For example, a low limit would be put on the amount of the TVA bonds, and they could be sold only with the approval of both Congress and the Secretary of the Treasury, who is subject to Ike's orders. Also, the letter said no TVA bonds would be bought by the Treasury, but it would direct just how, when, and to whom the bonds must or must not be sold.

Among other things, the Budget Bureau put into the TVA proposal new provisions which would raise the interest rates paid on TVA bonds, and struck out of the proposal words pledging that "TVA power shall be sold at rates as low as feasible."

"The sum total of the Budget Bureau and White House Restrictons," Congressman EVINS, Democrat, Tennessee, declared, "would amount to raising TVA rates, milking the system, and creating an atmosphere whereby private power can walk in and take over."

Senator HILL, Democrat, Alabama, called the proposed restrictions "damaging to TVA." Congressman PRIEST, Democrat, Tennessee, denounced the Bureau's terms as "wholly unacceptable." Congressman DAVIS, Democrat, Tennessee, declared "this is just another attempt by the administration to wreck TVA."

This conflict will soon break into the open at hearings before a House Public Works Subcommittee headed by DAVIS. Before the committee will be bills backing the original TVA financial plan, on one hand, and the administration's "strangling" plan on the other.

Meanwhile Congress might well ponder this question: Why does the White House propose to give a free financial hand to a new United States highway corporation, but insist on tying the hands of an old Government corporation, the TVA?

The Hidden Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Hidden Revolution," delivered by me at Minneapolis, Minn., on March 30, 1955, before the Conservative Citizens Committee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HIDDEN REVOLUTION

I am honored that your young but vigorous organization has asked me to come here and talk with you about our common concern for the safety of our Nation. You are interested, as I am interested, in bringing out into the light the secret revolution which is proceeding in our country with no attempt to win the true consent of our people.

I am especially glad to discuss this issue before an organization which represents the common interests and united talents of both our political parties.

Political parties of the American type can exist only where the citizens are in basic agreement on their political ideology—what we call our Constitution. We cannot have an American two-party system except as we have a deeply held belief in both parties, that we intend to live by that Constitution. American political parties divide over different ways to meet problems, but only within the framework of our constitutional compact.

Today, we face a quite different political issue. Today's struggle is over our Constitution itself. In such a crisis, members of both old-line parties have the same interest, preservation of our basic law. Their political action is directed against a common opponent—the underminers of our Constitution, whichever party label they use to hide their true aims.

I do not question the motives of the revolutionists. Our quarrel is with their secrecy.

They propose changes in our Government which are of revolutionary force. They follow a detailed blueprint for a new and arbitrary government. Meanwhile they smile disarmingly and say they are asking for small improvements which will bring our Government up to date, but not alter its fundamental character at all.

No revolutionary change in the American form of government is tolerable, unless it is openly stated. No revolutionary change is honest, unless all the drastic results of the change are made perfectly clear, and time is given to Congress and the people to debate every aspect of the revolutionary turn.

Americans are fighting, under the illusion of peaceful debate, a life-and-death struggle for preservation of our form of government.

Our party system gives us no means to wage such a war. The answer is the association of members of both political parties, preferably by congressional districts. There they can work together, and support those Members of Congress who defend our Constitution, and send down to defeat any nominee of either party who permits it to be weakened.

What is the nature of this hidden revolution?

In a speech on the Bricker amendment I pointed out that this country now has a fourth house of government, in addition to the three branches established in the Constitution. I said this fourth house, the planning bureaucracy, operated as a law unto itself. It has such loose powers and such vast funds that it virtually escapes control by Congress, the President, or the courts.

The inner circle, the kitchen cabinet, and crony government, we have had before. They were bad government, but bad government under the Constitution. They did not alter the mechanics of our political system. Their successors could follow the Constitution without a new revolution.

I am going to call this group the elite, although that name does not appeal to Americans. The "elite" does not mean "the best." It refers to men who have chosen themselves as the best, and who have banded together, out of self-interest, in time of crisis, to seize power and make themselves a permanent governing class.

The significant thing about an elite is that it is a small body, self-appointed, intelligent,

technically skillful, eager for power on any terms, and utterly ruthless about seizing it. The little fact Americans do not wish to face is the fact that we have been training an elite in this country for over 20 years. Under the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and the present administration, they have been learning how to handle the high-tension wires of big government, and hiding from us how much they have learned.

Americans dislike to study this new political force, because we have a distaste for chicanery. But we pay a heavy price for our ignorance.

Part of our confusion comes from calling this new governing elite Socialist. But socialism started as an honest attempt to raise the condition of the poor. Today's elite is not Socialist in that historic sense. The milk of human kindness has been watered very thin in the bitter struggle to hold the power they seized under cover of the great depression.

We cannot call it Communist, but this group is the ideal shelter for the Communists in our Government. We do not need to know exactly which of its members are Communist or pro-Soviet, though we shall get that information wherever we can. Regardless of how many individual members give their loyalty to the Soviet system, the work of the elite can benefit only the Soviet cause, because that is the ruling group today which best understands where it is going.

We are confused because there is no single "place," no agency or office, where the elite can be plainly "seen." Sometimes the members of this junta are in the new and formless agencies, helping shape them into something far more powerful, and dangerous to liberty, than old-line departments whose powers and duties are defined by Congress.

Some members of this band are hidden in the superagencies which have grown up above the Cabinet, like the National Security Agency, and that mystery wrapped in an enigma called the Central Intelligence Agency.

Others are in the U. N. or the bureaus dealing with international affairs.

Some are in the new branch of Government which has grown up about the White House—administrative assistants to the President, the Budget Bureau, and the liaison between the White House, Congress and the pressure groups.

Some members of this new governing apparatus are not in Government office at all. They are journalists and commentators who promulgate the "party line" of the elite, or lawyers or businessmen whose only interest is in high Government policy, like admission of Red China to the U. N.

We are confused because this band does not operate through established channels. Its members do not obey the chain of responsibility which governs the flow of opinions and policies through an orderly system of agencies.

I was much impressed with Whittaker Chambers' story of how Alger Hiss, then with a Senate committee, was offered a job in the Justice Department. He discussed his acceptance with his contact in the Soviet apparatus, Whittaker Chambers, knowing he would refer it to J. Peters, the Soviet "rep." Peters had more power over an American Government employee than his nominal superiors.

The new elite is not a part of our constitutional Government. It is above the legally established Government. The members are able to defy, to thwart, to undermine, established government because, through control of money, they make the law. The governmental elite today has more influence over lawmaking, over taxes, appropriations, and the shape and size of Government agencies, than either Congress or the President.

Of course the members of this revolutionary elite protest that they serve the President and defer to Congress. That is merely doubletalk. We may summarize the point very simply. Those who work for the secret revolution can have no common interest with anyone in the executive or the legislative branch who is serving the Constitution.

Our Government is now operating through two rival centers of power competing for sovereignty, one under the Constitution, one against it. Every issue and every problem of politics and government must be judged in terms of this irrepressible conflict.

You will find a vivid picture of this elite in the story in the Mundt hearings, of the famous meeting in the Justice Department on January 21, 1954, where John Adams and other employees of the executive branch planned the campaign to discredit the chairman of the Senate committee investigating malfeasance in the executive branch. Why was this little group so busy trying to destroy the reputation and standing of a Republican Senator? Because the Senator was trying to find out how Communists were boring into our Military Establishment and which unknown collaborators were protecting them. Is that a threat to any Government official loyal to our Constitution?

You will recall, also, that momentous scene in the Mundt hearings when we heard how Senator SYMINGTON, a minority member of the committee, had talked by telephone with Secretary of the Army Stevens and proposed that Stevens, a Republican appointee, seek the advice of Clark Clifford, the political adviser of President Truman, for help in undermining the Republican chairman of the committee.

Here we see no executive chain of command, no political party loyalties, no orderly constitutional process. The only possible explanation is that both conferences were guided by the revolutionary elite, who work night and day, to crush obstacles to their power, wherever they arise.

Perhaps some of the people who took part in this meeting did not know what it was all about. But what must the Soviet Union think of our Government, if important officials do not know when they are being used as dupes, to undermine our Constitution?

I should like to remind you of the story of the worker in a Nazi factory whose wife was going to have a baby. They needed a new baby carriage, but the government would not allow anyone to buy one. The man worked, however, in a factory which made baby carriages. So he suggested to his wife that he could take home, one at a time, the parts from the various departments of the plant, and put them together later.

When the time came to complete the baby carriage, the workman assembled the parts he had collected so carefully from his factory. But—when the pieces were assembled, the worked did not have a baby carriage. He had a machine gun.

"Revolution by assembly line" is the newest weapon of the elite. They devise a program in health, or housing, or foreign policy, perfectly designed to destroy our form of Government or our national security. They break their design up into innocent-looking parts, all of which fit perfectly together. They say these are parts for baby carriages.

The hidden revolutionists farm out the making and the selling of these harmless-looking subprograms to simple-minded people who believe all they hear. The parts are manufactured, but they will not be assembled until the public has been so completely brain-washed that they will believe a machinegun is a new style baby carriage.

I might mention here the blueprint for Federal aid to education. Federal control of the minds of our children is as important to the revolutionists as Federal control of the police power.

Innumerable parts of the grand design for federalization of our schools have been submitted over the years. Many of them are an accomplished fact. The Federal Government is paying over two billions a year to local and private educational agencies today.

The newest gimmick is Federal aid in school construction. What could be more pitiful than millions of little children reaching school age, knocking at the doors of our schoolhouses, but told there is no place where they can sit down?

Cold statistical facts cannot overtake that pitiful picture, but they do prove that every State in the Union can today impose taxes enough to supply all its children with schooling.

I ask you, What is happening to our States? What is happening to our Constitution, with its balance between National and State governments, when our governors go to Washington with a tincub in their hands, asking Federal bureaucrats to please give them back a little bit of their own money for their own schools?

We have then a trained revolutionary elite, working under a hidden chain of command, though nominally working under American governmental checks and balances.

We have a revolutionary new method of seizing power without arousing resistance, which I call revolution by assembly line, or, better yet, revolution by interchangeable parts which lie ready to be put on the assembly line when brainwashing makes it safe.

In the past the great victory of this elite was in foreign policy. Today the area of greatest danger is their search for domination over our Armed Forces. This is the most dangerous of all the steps in the creeping revolution of our time.

The hidden elite rely, in subjecting the fighting forces to their control, on misuse of a sound political principle. They pervert the idea of civilian control, which really means control by elected officials, to mean that the elite who were never elected, rank above our professional military men.

The duty of the armed forces in a free country is to deter or punish outsiders who threaten to attack the country. They serve the whole nation. The nation is not free if the military serve or oppose any political interest within the nation.

To make certain the armed might of the United States would never be misused, the Constitution introduced three safeguards. It gave to Congress alone the power to declare war. It gave to Congress the duty to raise and equip armies—that is, to decide on their size and their organization—by giving them the money without which they could not operate. In addition, it said that Congress could establish and finance the Armed Forces for a 2-year period only. There is no power in any Congress, for any reason, to make any commitment to raise or equip military forces for a period of over 2 years.

The reason for this is simple. The Armed Forces in action must be directed by the Executive. Legislatures cannot win battles. But the English people found out very early that rulers who raise a military establishment to deal with a foreign enemy are everlastingly tempted to use their power to deal with the unreasonable people who oppose them at home.

The British people struggled for centuries to keep their rulers from getting their own military power and setting up a tyranny at home, as the rulers of France, Spain, Germany, and Russia had done.

The British learned the hard way that the only political power which can control military power is the money power. They put the power over money for the forces safely in the hands of the Parliament.

Let me remind you what this struggle cost. When British commoners stood up in Parliament and resisted the demand of the Tudor Kings they knew their life might be forfeit.

Then Charles I determined to raise his own armies for his foreign wars. John Hampden, a country squire, refused to pay the King's

ship-money tax because Parliament had not voted it, though he knew refusal might mean the loss of his head. Instead, the nation rallied to him. The Parliament eventually raised an army to subdue the King and it was Charles whose head fell on the block.

After the Revolution of 1688, Parliament put the armed forces firmly under control of the nation by the Mutiny Act, under which the military oath of obedience was dissolved if the ruler attempted to put the military under his personal rule.

The members of our Constitutional Convention had a vivid memory of this terrible civil war. They knew there must be no doubt in the new Government that the only reason for military power was to serve the Nation. They gave the head of the executive branch, as Commander in Chief, full authority over the Armed Forces in action, but they left to the people, through their Congress, full authority over the money to keep them going.

For 175 years Americans have slept at night wholly free from fear that their own soldiery might be used by the Government against them.

This delicate balance of power, which gives clear operating authority over our armies to one branch and clear legal and financial authority to another branch, the new elite works ceaselessly to destroy.

The most important single move was the shift of our fighting forces in Korea to U. N. control.

The decision to go into Korea was taken in our name. Then the U. N., with the Soviet Union mysteriously absent from the Security Council, voted to participate. President Truman was asked to act as U. N. representative in command of a U. N. force, which was almost to a man the American forces already in the field, since Korea was not a member of the U. N.

What is the legal meaning of President Truman's acting as the commander of U. N. military forces? Was he, in his role of U. N. military agent, acting outside the American Constitution? Did he acquire powers not in the Constitution? Was he freed from limitations set in the Constitution? I do not know.

What of our men? Were the American soldiers, drafted by an American Congress, and sworn to uphold the American Constitution, shifted to a different legal setup?

Did they, as U. N. fighting forces, lose the protections which the American Constitution wraps about our fighting men? I do not know, and I cannot find out.

President Truman apparently took no action as U. N. representative which was outside our Constitution. Perhaps he never knew of any loopholes. Our men were subjected to no visible loss of their constitutional liberties. But remember we are dealing with revolution by interchangeable parts. Was this episode of the U. N. command one of the essential "parts" which was tested and then put aside, later to be assembled into a completed world military organization? Remember, this transfer was made without the consent of Congress. Is that too a precedent? I believe it was.

Congress cannot plead that, though it passed a bad law, no one has committed any crimes under it. It is the business of Congress to be certain that no legal powers are set up, by which any American President could transfer American fighting men to any international agencies, without the consent of Congress.

The mutual security law has a section which permits the President of the United States to transfer any official of employee of the United States Government to any international agency which (in his opinion) is cooperating with us.

Another provision says he may transfer members of our Armed Forces in peacetime to service with such an international agency.

How many such American civilians and military are now serving with international agencies? What part of our swollen budget goes for this invisible support to world government? What is the constitutional significance of this silent operation?

We know that numbers of foreign troops are now in the United States. But how many troops have been brought in? From how many countries? We hear that Yugoslav forces are being trained here. How many?

What rights and duties do these foreign troops acquire? Who commands their commanders? Does the Commander in Chief of the American Armed Forces command them while on American soil? Is he still limited by the Constitution? Could not their numbers be increased until a future President would have enough foreign troops under his command to settle a domestic political dispute?

Congress cannot be put off with statements that no American President would use such powers. That may be true of past Presidents, of our present President, of the next President. But is this one of the interchangeable parts in a design for Executive control of the armies, which will look as innocent as a baby carriage until it is time to uncover the machinegun? Congress has no choice but to find out.

We have all watched with deep dismay the boasts of the Red Chinese that they have imprisoned 11 Americans, 10 of them uniformed members of the American Air Force. We watched with cold disgust the humble journey of Dag Hammersjkold to the capital of Red China, to ask Mao Tse-tung to please be nice and release our men.

The U. S. News & World Report has pointed out the danger in the argument that after all these fighting men were soldiers in U. N. armed forces, and must look to U. N. for their protection.

What does our silence signify about America's sovereign right to direct her own armies, her right to demand decent treatment of them according to the laws of war? Have we made the interchangeable parts for a policy in which American forces are dependnet on U. N. for maintenance of their rights? Have we made the interchangeable parts for a policy by which America will have no Army or Navy or Air Force which responds instantly to her orders?

How many pieces of American territory have we given to international organizations? The Daughters of the American Revolution reported to their members a few years ago that the NATO flag was flying above the American flag at NATO headquarters in Norfolk, Va. When asked by what authority land at Norfolk was given for NATO headquarters, Pentagon officials said this transfer was not made by law, and the land was not sold. It was "designated" as NATO territory. By what Presidential or U. N. powers? If the President can give away enough for one flagpole, how many square miles of Norfolk or Hampton Roads or San Diego can be given to NATO or SEATO and cease to be American soil?

Some of us were shocked to hear J. Edgar Hoover say that of course he did not urge Harry White's promotion to the International Monetary Fund, so the FBI could watch him better. The fact was, said Mr. Hoover, that the buildings occupied by the Monetary Fund and the Interntaional Fund were international territory and FBI agents could not enter them on official business.

How many square miles of United States territory are no longer open to the FBI and therefore serve as potential refuges for any Communist agents who may choose to use them?

How many American soldiers and sailors within our own borders are serving on international soil today?

I do not need to tell you about the Status of Forces Treaties. But did even one member of the hidden elite envision this step as an essential "part" to make American fighting men fear to oppose political actions of the Government's civil branches?

You will say all these things are small, not very sinister in themselves.

No step is small which reduces the power of Congress to preserve Constitutional safeguards over use of the Armed Forces. If the elite really acquires control of our military establishment, its authority is complete, because if military power is not under the law, it is above it.

If the day comes when a faction within the executive branch can control the Armed Forces without restraint of law, the revolution will be complete. Congress may write laws and the courts may be open, but Government under the law is finished and Government by force will be unopposed.

Again and again, wherever the military policies of the elite have conflicted with those of the nation, the nation has been the loser. Witness the shrinkage of every military policy we have ever made for Nationalist China or Korea.

In 1953, the revolutionary elite went underground while the Republicans took over the contitutional offices.

In 1954, the elite surfaced again. They were sure we had been put to sleep.

The Berlin Conference, the Geneva Conference, the Indochina debacle, the unprotested violations of the truce in Korea, and the gyrations over EDC and German rearmament, were the "line" of the same hidden revolutionists who had seized control of the democratic party.

Military aid was hog-tied by the revolutionary bloc through FOA. Funds for military aid are appropriated not to the Defense Department but to FOA, an international welfare agency. Much of the appropriation for military aid is spent by FOA, and the rest is spent under the eyes of a body of lawyers in the Defense Department like John Adams.

Disarmament is obviously a key proposal in this revolution by interchangeable party. International plans for disarmament not only limit American sovereignty but they add to the power of civilian appointees over our fighting forces. They make our professional military men low men on the totem pole.

German rearmament is authorized in the treaty between Germany on one hand and England, France, and Benelux on the other, a treaty which does not need the consent of the Senate. In this treaty, I find a complete scheme for arms limitation by international control. They key to arms limitation is the reporting system. Under this plan Germany must report every detail about her troops and equipment to an international agency. So must the other members. They must also report contributions of men or equipment they give to NATO or receive from it. All our operations in NATO are an open book. Next comes "regulation," or the veto power over armed strength. German and other forces can be put under ceilings by an administrative board of an international agency—though it might be to the great disadvantage of the United States.

I wondered if this plan for forcing German rearmament into a straitjacket of statistical reporting was a dress rehearsal for the United States. The propaganda buildup has already begun.

Now the whole story is pulled together in the appointment of Mr. Harold Stassen, a fervent supporter of internationalism to a new Cabinet post, created not by Congress, but by the President, to handle peacetime atomic energy, international disarmament, and presumably the new Asian Marshal Plan.

This is a honey of a scheme. How Mr. Stassen must have worked to put himself in

a position where he outflanks the State Department, the Defense officials, and the American delegation to the U. N., not to mention the Congress.

Mr. Stassen is head of an administrative cluster reaching to the top of the executive hierarchy, with a program which is the climax of the programs spelled out in various forms by Henry Wallace, Dean Acheson, Leon Keyserling, and others, to divide our resources with the rest of the world, while our ablest minds are integrated with those of other nations, so they can do little or nothing for the United States.

In 1951 I said we were being governed by a blueprint for our destruction, and we were right on the timetable. Now the blueprint is so perfect, the whole system is controlled by automation. There are only a few key switches, and the members of the revolutionary elite have the switches in their own hands.

Are we helpless? No; we are not helpless. We have a truly American counterattack to this alien plan.

There is not time to describe the remedies, but I can outline the grand strategy.

We need a drastic cut in taxes. We can never dismantle the elite until we cut taxes.

We need a crusade for States rights. We can never cut taxes until we revive the 10th amendment, which insures that all powers not delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution, or prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States or the people.

Third, we need a shift from a passive to a dynamic Congress.

Congress today is bogged down in its own machinery. The wheels grind, the gears mesh, the Members of the Senate and the House work hard, too hard, to keep the mass of bills moving through the mill. But that machinery is perfectly fitted to keep Congress pressing out the bills and appropriations the elite feed into it. It is perfectly designed to keep Congress from its main duty—to make sure that all executive action is within the Constitution, by withholding money from from any activity which goes beyond the Constitution.

I hope yet to see the House and the Senate suspend all work on legislation, appropriations, treaties, and appointments, and form themselves into committees of the whole, to end the appropriating of our money to a government within the Government, whose purpose is to abolish the Constitution.

There is ability enough in Congress, there is patriotism enough in Congress, with your help, to end this now before the elite have us firmly meshed into a world state above the law, and American Armed Forces are committed to defend their secret revolution.

Pressures, Politics, and Partnerships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address in "Pressures, Politics, and Partnerships," which I delivered before the Ninth Annual World Affairs Conference, at Asilomar, Calif., on May 7, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESSURES, POLITICS, AND PARTNERSHIPS

(Address by Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, of (Montana, before Ninth Annual World Affairs Conference, Asilomar, Calif., May 7, 1955)

When your organization invited me to be with you today, I was impressed by the alliteration in the title of the subject to which I was asked to address my remarks—pressures, politics, and partnerships. There is a certain harmony in the title, but unfortunately, it is confined to the sound of the words. When pressures, politics and partnerships come together in the practice of foreign policy, any resemblance to harmony is strictly coincidental. We are more likely to get the equivalent of three high school bands in a parade, one marching immediately behind the other and each playing a different tune, as loudly as possible.

That may be somewhat exaggerated but I think it does suggest the dimensions of the problem of bringing together these divergent forces in practice.

To carry the simile a little further, if we wished to determine what tune each band was playing, we would have to space them a little apart from one another in the parade. In the same fashion, I would like to separate the elements in this subject of pressures, politics and partnerships in order to see what each is contributing to the general uproar which we identify as foreign policy.

Last August 4, in a press conference, the President stated that he thought "we should talk less about American leadership in the world, because we are trying to be a good partner." I thought that an excellent concept. The partnership concept displayed considerable vitality, as a method of foreign policy, even though it has only recently been identified as such. You will recall, for example, that last fall, progress toward the goal of German alinement with the West was at a stalemate when the French rejected the European Defense Community. Nevertheless, with the United States standing by as a partner rather than forcing its leadership, the European countries quickly devised a new formula for achieving this goal at the London-Paris conferences.

Similarly, this country refrained from any leadership of the band at the Manila Conference last September. I happened to be a member of the American delegation and I can attest to the spirit of cooperation or partnership that operated there. Its results are reflected in the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty and the Pacific Charter which were produced by the conference.

Again last April when the United States indicated that part of the American assistance program for Asia would be channeled on a regional basis, India immediately called a conference of Asian States to reconcile their individual national desires with the plans of the United States.

While partnership is by no means a new conception, it seems to me that the President, quite correctly, has given the concept a new emphasis at this time. It is more important than ever that our relations, particularly with the Western European nations, rest upon this basis. Immediately after the war, those countries were in a state of complete exhaustion. In an economic and in a security sense, their survival as free nations depended heavily on the willingness of this country to aid in their recovery. That period is now largely over and we ought to be happy that it is. The Europeans no longer are dependent on the United States in the degree which existed in the immediate postwar years. They have reached a point at which they may be expected to assert the independence of their position with considerable firmness. They will not readily be pressured into the acceptance or rejection of any particular line of policy. But what they will not do under pressure, I believe they will do willingly under a partnership concept which takes into full consideration their needs and their aspirations.

The partnership concept is the antithesis of policy by pressure. It is a policy of cooperation based on national equality, mutual respect, tolerance of differences, and free association for the pursuit of essentially common goals.

It is easier to preach partnership, however, than to practice it. Each apparent failure of cooperation sets off a new wave of criticism and impatience in large segments of the people in each of the nations involved in the partnership. That was true for example in the case of the Geneva Conference and it has been true to some extent in the case of the Formosan crisis. I think, therefore, we should be aware of some of the difficulties involved in maintaining an effective partnership with other nations. If we are, it may help us to exercise the restraint and understanding which are essential for the operation of this policy.

First, consider for a moment the difficulties in maintaining a unified approach to foreign policy even within our own borders. Here we run into the other two elements in the subject, the politics and the pressures. We have made noticeable efforts in the last few years to minimize the influence of partisan politics in foreign policy. In some years, 1947 and 1948 and again this year, for example, when Congress has been controlled by one political party and the executive branch by the other, bipartisanship has been essential. In other years it has been useful in assuring continuity of action and broad public support for actions which must be taken abroad. It has made possible in certain areas, such as Europe, consistent progress toward the goals of our foreign policy.

In spite of the evident advantage of bipartisanship to the Nation, there are still tendencies on the part of some to play politics with foreign policy problems. I do not speak now of those who out of conviction oppose a particular line of policy. Bipartisanship is not and must never become a mechanism for destroying the right of dissent. What I have in mind are those who seek to make political capital out of our national difficulties. Let me illustrate this point. As you well know, the Yalta agreement is, to put it mildly, a favorite subject of disagreement in this country. I know there are some who feel that certain aspects of that agreement are unsatisfactory. While I may disagree with them, I respect their right to their viewpoint and their right to express it. History will place the Yalta agreement in proper perspective. I think the politics are evident, however, when I am told, as I have been told, of the story of a local political leader of one of the two great parties. Prior to a recent election he castigated all candidates of the opposition, whether they were running for municipal offices or the Presidency, for being responsible for losing China in the Malta agreement. Voices of that kind make considerable noise and the noise has often hampered the ability of the Nation to cope with the real difficulties which confront the Nation.

It has become increasingly clear in recent weeks, moreover, that the conduct of foreign policy can be seriously impeded not only by interparty strife but also by intraparty dissension. You people in California would be especially familiar with that. If we have difficulty, then, in agreeing on international courses of action, as between our political parties and within them, is it not to be expected that the difficulties in agreeing with other nations would be even greater?

Added to the problems of maintaining partnership that are produced by partisan politics are those stemming from internal pressures. There is, first of all, the pressure of tradition. Partnership represents a substantial departure from what was, for a long time, regarded as established American poli-

cy. References are still frequently made to George Washington's advise "to steer clear of permanent alliances."

I do not in any way question the sincerity of the cautions and careful approach of many Americans to foreign commitments; I share it. We should be cautious and careful and we are not unique in this respect. The British people, for example, have displayed quite correctly in my opinion something very much akin to these traits in connection with their integration with western Europe.

I say at the same time, however, that we ought not to quote glibly from George Washington without comparing the world situation which existed in his time with that which exists today. I say that we should not expect George Washington's sage advice in the 18th century to spare us the necessity of making the difficult and often painful decisions of foreign policy in the 20th century.

Both political parties, as a whole, have rejected pure isolationism as a policy for the United States of today. In a world as integrated as is ours today chance seems slight that we alone can continue to make progress while the rest of it slips from the retrogression of totalitarianism. From a practical standpoint, we would have little hope for continued survival and material advance as a free people if we cut ourselves off from the economic, the defensive, the cultural and the scientific relationships which we now have with other nations. We can reach greater heights of lasting prosperity and peace only in concert with others.

There continue to be a few who cherish the short-sighted notion that the United States is a self-sufficient, invulnerable fortress. They would like for the United States to turn inward in space and backward in time. In addition, there are others who have abandoned this isolationist philosophy only with utmost reluctance. These profess a willingness to take part in world affairs and to cooperate with other nations provided in effect that other nations accept our terms, absolutely and unquestioningly. That is not cooperation. It is a form of American paternalism or dictation. It leads often to the futile attempt to buy friends and bludgeon people, all supposedly in the interest of this country.

To those Americans who think in such terms, partnership as an approach to foreign policy is particularly difficult to accept. They become distressed whenever overall agreement with our allies is clouded by a disagreement, however minor, and they are forever threatening to pick up their marbles and go home. They are not convinced that we really need cooperation with others. On the other hand, they are not sure we do not. As a compromise, therefore, they assume that cooperation is acceptable provided others talk exactly like us and act exactly like us. One result of pressures of this kind is that we face the danger that our aid programs are based not on the actual needs of our national policies but on the relative skills of foreign diplomats in the art of talking and acting in the fashion that some Americans like them to talk and act. Another result is a constant clamor to abandon important allies on the slightest provocation. Sooner or later we are going to have to learn that sweet and agreeable words alone do not necessarily make staunch friends in the international arena any more than in our personal lives. We will find, I think, that substantially common interests and objectives and give and take with equals who speak their minds is a more reliable indicator of the worth of some of these alliances.

We are bound to have differences, sometimes rather large and important differences with friendly nations. We cannot hope to, indeed should not want to, eliminate the differences which are the hallmark of freedom. Any attempt to do so will leave us in the position of the Soviet Union and its satellites. That is a monolithic system in which the most powerful member bludgeons the others into line. And it is precisely that monolithic characteristic which we expect to result eventually in the disintegration of the Soviet system. Unless we are looking for the same thing to happen to the ties among the free nations, it ill becomes us to employ the same techniques as the Soviet Union.

The points of view which I have been discussing are held by many Americans. It is their right to hold them and to express them. It is also proper, however, to discuss the impact of these views on our foreign policy. Sometimes the paramount national view becomes obscured by these conflicting voices and the executive branch finds it difficult to hold to a consistent policy. Nations abroad are also confused by the clashing viewpoints which often emanate from the United States. They may well wonder which one underlies American policy at any given moment. Each election here gives them pause to consider whether or not a new composition of the Government will result in an abandonment of free-world cooperation.

Even for those Americans who fully accept the necessity of allies and sincerely desire to cooperate, partnership is an advanced and difficult technique of policy. It requires more skill, and more understanding than a policy which does not concern itself with public opinion beyond its own borders. It requires initiative and it requires an emphasis on constructive, long-range measures. It requires much more than slick slogans or easy handouts of aid.

Perhaps the clearest example of the difficulty of practicing good partnership may be found in the economic realm. In 1947–48 the United States, for reasons of self-interest as well as out of humanitarian motives, established the foreign aid programs to help the war-torn countries of Western Europe get back on their feet. These programs involved substantial gifts and transfers of American resources to foreign countries. As American aid, coupled with the hard work of the Europeans themselves, began to restore the economy of Western Europe, the relationship of donor and recipient, inherent in the program, created dissatisfaction among all concerned. Among Americans there was a growing resentment at the prolongation of the giveaway of resources. The Europeans, on the other hand, also grew a little tired of playing the role of poor relatives. One-way aid was no longer adequate to the needs of the situation. What was needed and is needed are new methods for assuring a durable solution to the economic problems of the free nations.

The partnership concept suggests the desirability of terminating one-way aid quickly and substituting mechanisms of cooperation on a basis of greater equality of responsibility and effort among the free nations. To find these mechanisms is primarily the task of creative statesmanship. It is a much slower and a much more difficult undertaking than the doling out of dollars, and there has been a tendency to put it off. Here again, however, leadership in the free nations faces domestic counter pressures. It is handicapped in taking the road of partnership by the fact that there are specific groups in the United States and elsewhere which would be injured, at least in the short run, by alterations in present economic patterns among the nations of the world. Some, in effect, would prefer that we give away our resources rather than get back something for them in trade. Domestic considerations of this kind cannot be ignored. On the other hand, neither can we ignore the requirements for building free and peaceful cooperation among self-reliant and self-respecting nations. I do not have an easy answer to this dilemma, but the partnership concept calls for all to make a sincere attempt to find the answers.

There are many other domestic pressures which have varying degrees of influence on the partnership approach. For example, America is composed of many different racial and religious groups. These groups sometimes feel a particular responsibility for the land of their origin, and political appeals are often made to them on that basis. You will recall, for example, that before the last presidential election, we heard much irresponsible talk about the liberation of the Poles, the Czechs, and other eastern European peoples. And Sir Robert Scott, I believe, would be familiar with the vehement pressure which operates on London by way of New York, Chicago, Boston, and elsewhere in this country to end the unholy division of the Emerald Isle, particularly on St. Patrick's Day.

Moreover, if we consider the geographic span of the United States, it is to be expected that regionalism plays some part in our thinking. We in the West may tend to be especially interested in the Far East. Those on the east coast may be more concerned with our relations with Europe. Often persons from our Southern States emphasize the problems of our relations with Latin America. All these influences affect our policy. The surprising thing, however, is that there is as much of a common outlook as does exist.

So far I have been speaking largely of the politics and pressures in our own society which sometimes make it difficult for the United States to operate a policy of partnership. These same influences, or close counterparts, exist in all democratic countries with which we are allied.

Certainly we are not the only nation in which domestic politics affect foreign policy. In any country there are political groups which, if in power, conceivably would alter that country's policies respecting us. Because we are not sure what effect a change of political complexion will have, we become tremendously concerned, for example, with the outcome of elections in Great Britain, France, Germany, or Italy. Moreover, governments sometimes, in order to stay in power, may make concessions to elements of their population even though such concessions hamper their ability to cooperate with us and other allies.

Neutralist thinking in Europe in some ways parallels the neoisolationist viewpoint in America. The neutralists would like to believe that they can say "a plague on both your houses" and have it mean security for themselves. If they are not entangled with either the Soviet bloc or the United States, they say they will be exempt from attack by either side. Their difficulty, as with our own neoisolationists is that they cannot escape the fundamental reality of the 20th century, namely, that no nation or even a small group of nations is an island unto itself. The threat is to freedom and if freedom declines in large segments of the Western World, as it will unless there is unity, it will be replaced by a totalitarianism which soon or later will engulf all who strive to remain neutral.

Other nations, like ourselves, also find it difficult to attempt new courses of action even when the methods of the past have lost much of their usefulness. In Europe, for example, the advantages of integration are widely recognized. The larger market which would result, the absolution of trade barriers, customs, and varying currencies, would probably contribute much toward increasing the prosperity of the entire region. The sublimation of national groups into a regional Western Europeanism might even help to bring an end to the intra-European conflicts which have twice plunged the whole world into devastating war. Strengthening of Western Europe in this manner is regarded by many in this country as the best defense

against totalitarian communism. However, Europeans find it difficult to bring about unification even as we find it easy to urge it.

What I have been trying to do today is to point out a few of the questions involved in maintaining a united, a partnership approach among the free nations. Most of the difficulties of politics and pressures which stand in the way are shared difficulties. The problem confronting us and other free nations is to make certain that these difficulties serve as a challenge to common action rather than as a source of division or diversion from our common purpose.

Partnership requires forebearance, compassion, understanding, and accommodation. It is not an easy approach to foreign policy. If it succeeds, however, it can produce a united strength which will make each free nation impervious both to the blustering threats and the glittering allures of totalitarianism. Most of all it will provide an international environment in which individuals in this country and elsewhere will have an opportunity to develop and to prosper in peace.

Columbia University Commencement Address by Hon. Allen W. Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently there was comment on the floor of the Senate when the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] received degrees from Columbia University. At the same time Mr. Allen W. Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence, also received a degree. At that time he delivered a very interesting address, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MR. ALLEN W. DULLES, DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE, ON EDUCATION IN THE SOVIET UNION, AT 53D ANNUAL COMMENCEMENT DAY LUNCHEON AT COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, JUNE 1

It is indeed an honor to be among those to whom Columbia University is today giving degrees and to have the opportunity to address this distinguished group of Columbia graduates, as the university starts upon its third century of service.

I have other and more personal reasons to feel gratitude to Columbia. Some 35 years ago I married the daughter of the head of your department of Romanic Languages. There has been no occasion for me to regret this or any other of the many pleasant relations which I have had with this great university.

Much of the work of the Central Intelligence Agency is focused on developments in the Soviet Union, and its European and far eastern satellites and allies.

Naturally, we are particularly concerned with information on the military and industrial strength of the Communist world. However, we also follow the cultural development behind the Iron Curtain, and recently we have been giving close study to the Soviet educational system.

If, as recent events foreshadow, there is likely to be more direct human contact between the West and the Communist world, the impact of our own educational system on that of the Soviet may become a factor of real significance.

So far this has not been the case. The Iron Curtain is not merely a physical barrier. It has also obstructed cultural exchanges. Not only have human being been prevented from crossing Communist frontiers; ideas also have not freely travelled back and forth.

The Communists have willed it so, and at vast costs in the diversion of manpower and in money they have erected physical barriers and jamming stations by the hundreds to keep the ideas of the West out of the Communist world.

The key to the future of any society lies very largely in its educational system.

Scientific and technical education in the Soviet Union today presents a challenge to the free world. But mass education in the Soviet Union may well become a threat to their own Communist system of government.

The Soviet have two educational goals. First, to condition the Soviet people to be proper believers in Marxist-Leninism and to do the bidding of their rulers. Second, to turn out the necessary trained technicians to build the military and industrial might of the U. S. S. R.

In the field of science the Soviets have made rapid progress and their accomplishments here should not be minimized; least of all by those of us who are directly concerned with our national security.

Twenty-five years ago, Soviet scientific education was riddled with naive experiments, persecution of scholars, and unrealistic programs. Only a small core of older men kept alive an element of real quality on which to build. Reforms in the mid-1930's raised standards considerably, but even so they were behind our western standards when the war came.

Today, that is no longer so. The Soviet education system—in the sciences and engineering—now bears close comparison with ours, both in quality of training and in numbers of persons trained to a high level.

At the university graduate level, we find that the entrance examinations for scientific work, at the top institutions, are about as toug has those required by our own institutions.

Also, we have the evidence obtained from defectors, some of them recent, who were university graduates. Although these men have come over to us because of their detestation of the Soviet system many of them still pay tribute to the technical quality of their education and appear to look back at least on this part of their lives with some pride and pleasure.

As regards Soviet scientific manpower as a whole, the quality differs greatly from field to field. But generally speaking their top men appear to be the equal of the top men in the West, though they have fewer of them, level for level.

True, their biology has been warped by Soviet ideology, most conspicuously by heresies in the field of genetics, such as the doctrine that acquired characteristics are inherited. Also, their agricultural sciences have been backward, plagued like all of Soviet agriculture by the follies of the collective system. What farmer will go out into the middle of a cold Russian night to see what ails a state-owned cow?

In the physical sciences, there is little evidence of such political interference. Soviet mathematics and meteorology, for example, appear to be clearly on a par with those of the West, and even ahead in some respects.

Military needs dominate their research programs. We who are in intelligence work have learned by now that it is rarely safe to assume that the Soviets do not have the basic skill, both theoretical and technical, to do in these fields what we can do.

In fact, at times we have been surprised at their progress, above all in the aviation, electronic, and nuclear fields. Certainly, the Russian's mind, as a mechanism of reason, is in no way inferior to that of any other human being.

It is true that since the war, the Soviets have been helped by German scientists taken to the U. S. S. R. and by what they learned from espionage and from the material obtained during and after the war. Also, recently the Soviets have developed, and boasted of, a systematic service for translating and abstracting major western scientific publications.

But the Soviets have rarely been slavish copyists, at least where a Western invention or technique was of military importance. They have employed adaptation rather than adoption, as in the case of their improvement of the Nene jet engine. In certain key fields they have clearly shown a capacity for independent progress.

While total Soviet scientific manpower at the university graduate level is about the same as ours—somewhere over a million each—about half of the Societ total were trained by the inferior prewar standards. In number of research workers—a good index of average quality—we estimate that the United States has a 2 to 1 margin over the U. S. S. R. in the physical sciences.

We must remember, too, that the United States has a substantial number of competent engineers who have not taken university degrees but have learned their trade through experience. The U. S. S. R. has no real counterpart for this group, just as it has no substantial counterpart for the vast American reservoir of persons with high-grade mechanical skills.

But lest we become complacent, it is well to note that the Soviets are now turning out more university graduates in the sciences and engineering than we are—about 120,000 to 70,000 in 1955. In round numbers, the Soviets will graduate about 1,200,000 in the sciences in the 10 years from 1950 to 1960, while the comparable United States figure will be about 900,000.

Unless we quickly take new measures to increase our own facilities for scientific education, Soviet scientific manpower in key areas may well outnumber ours in the next decade.

These comparisons in the scientific field most emphatically do not mean that Soviet higher education as a whole is as yet comparable to that of the United States. Over 50 percent of Soviet graduates are in the sciences, against less than 20 percent in the United States. Science in the U. S. S. R. has had an overriding priority.

Another important feature of Soviet education is the growth of secondary education at the senior high school level. By 1960 the Soviets will have 4 to 5 times as many secondary graduates per year as they had in 1950. These will be divided fairly evenly between men and women. Whereas, a decade ago, only about 20 percent of Soviet seventh grade students went any further, by 1960 probably over 70 percent will do so. Their secondary school standards are high and largely explain their ability to train competent scientists and engineers. Whether they can maintain these standards in the face of a very rapid expansion is a question.

So much for the advance in material terms. Let us turn now to the thought-control aspect.

The Soviets give top priority to preserving the Marxist-Leninst purity of their students. Beginning with kindergarten rhymes on the glories of Lenin, they pass to the history of the Communist Party, a comparison of the "benevolent" Soviet constitution with the "corrupt" constitutions of the West that do not confer liberty. Soviet economics teaches why the workers in capitalist countries can never own cars, but must always live in

poverty. In the lower grades civic virtue is taught by citing the example of a Soviet boy, Pavlik Morozov, who betrayed his family to the secret police and now has statues raised in his honor.

Even though it is hard to distort the physical sciences, they are used to prove the virtues of athiesm. In ancient history, it is the Athenians who are corrupt and the Spartans virtuous. In literature courses, selected works of Dickens are read as presenting an authentic picture of the present-day life of the British workingman, while Howard Fast, Uncle Tom's Cabin and the Grapes of Wrath portray the contemporary United States.

Everything is taught so that the student shall acquire his knowledge in Communist terms and within a Communist framework. But the Soviets are not content to rely upon the lasting effects of student indoctrination. They have devised in addition a rigid system for continuing their control.

To repay the Government for his or her so-called "free" education, Soviet law requires that each student upon graduation must work for 3 consecutive years as the state directs.

They may express a preference, but in practice only a small percentage of the students—those with high Government connections or with exceptionally high marks—have their requests granted. The rest must go where they are assigned—their niche in life largely predetermined.

Even at the end of the 3-year compulsory assignment, the individual still is under the control of the Communist Party, the Young Communist League, the local union, or the factory directors. To object to further assignments is to court an efficiency report so bad that a job will be hard to find. And if a man were to refuse an assignment, he would lose his occupation and be forced to work at the most unskilled and menial tasks wherever he could find them.

Thus, the typical Soviet university graduate gains little freedom from his status as an educated man. If he is a scientist or engineer, he will probably be able to avoid the military draft entirely. He may aspire to prestige and to much higher pay than his less educated fellows. But he pays for this by being possibly even more tightly directed than the bulk of Soviet workers.

Such, then, is the system, stressing high technical educational standards on the one hand while insisting on Communist philosophy and discipline on the other. Its ultimate human result, the Soviet graduate, must be—in the phrase given me by one of the best-educated of our recent defectors—"a man divided."

In time, with the growth of education—with more knowledge, more training of the mind, given to more people—this Soviet "man divided" must inevitably come to have more and more doubt about the Communist system as a whole.

In the past, we have sometimes had exaggerated expectations of dissensions within the Soviet and in other totalitarian systems. Our hopes have not perhaps been so much misguided as they have been premature. If we take a longer look we can foresee the possibility of great changes in the Soviet system. Here the educational advances will play a major part.

There is already evidence of this. As I have said, the physical sciences are being freed of party-line restraints. Within the educational structure itself, the pressure to turn out good scientists and good engineers has caused a de-emphasis of the time spent on ideological subjects. The student engineer, while he still has to pass his courses in Marxist-Leninism, can increasingly afford to do a purely formal job on the ideological front if he is a good engineer.

In the last year there have been interesting signs of this freedom spreading to other areas, notably to the biological and agricultural sciences. Lysenko is no longer gospel—I suspect for the very simple reason that his theories proved fallacious when used as the basis for new agricultural programs. The development of corn and of better wheat strains proved remarkably resistant to the teachings of Marx and Lenin—and in the end, nature won the day. After all, Karl Marx was not much of a farmer. Now Moscow is looking toward Iowa.

So far, this is only a small straw in the wind. But it is a significant one. If freedom to seek truth can spread from the physical to the biological sciences, we can begin to look for signs of independence even in the hallowed sanctum of economics. Certainly, every year that the decadent capitalist system continues to avoid depression and to turn out more and more goods even the most hardened Soviet economist must wonder about the accuracy of the Communist version of truth in this field.

In cultural pursuits, the evidence is not all one-sided. Literature and even music are still subject to denunciation and criticism for not expressing the proper ideals. But clearly, here, too, there has been some relaxation in the past 2 years. Recently, writers once denounced as bourgeois and cosmopolitan are being permitted to work again.

It is understandable that lasting freedom will come more slowly in economics and the humanities than where scientific matters—more open to proof—are involved. Ideology gives way most rapidly where it collides with fact.

This at times has caused the Soviet acute embarrassment.

We are all familiar with the deceptions the Soviets practice on their people, particularly in the rewriting of history and the adjustment of doctrine to fit their wants. Malenkov is on the downgrade, so the Soviet press removes his name from the key wartime committees on which he actually served, and replaces him with Khrushchev. Beria falls. His name must be blacked out wherever it occurs even in a university catalog and he must posthumously bear the blame for what Stalin and Molotov did to Yugoslavia in 1948.

This often has its laughable side. In the Beria case, the 1950 edition of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia was issued with a full four pages describing his as "one of the outstanding leaders" of the USSR and the "faithful disciple of Stalin." After his liquidation a few years later, subscribers to the encyclopedia received a letter from the publishers suggesting that 4 designated pages—no mention made of Beria—be removed with scissors or razor blade, and replaced by a large added section to the article on the Bering Sea and by a new article on a gentleman named Friedrich Wilhelm Bergholz, an obscure junker at the Court of Tsar Peter the First, whose alphabetical resemblance to Beria was his one and only claim to fame.

Perhaps most of the scissor-wielders managed to keep a straight face. Yet this kind of thing, insignificant individually, typifies the kind of dilemma the Soviet must face increasingly and almost daily.

We know that some thoughtful Soviet citizens are beginning to see through these distortions, and indeed through the whole process of thought-control. Yet that process may continue to have its effect on the masses of the Russian people. Will this equally be so when the average educational level of those masses is at the 10th grade rather than the 7th or lower?

Increased education must inevitably bring in its train increased expectations on the part of the educated. Since higher education in Russia had historically been only for the few, not only in czarist times but until very recently in the Soviet era, there remains a strong tradition that a boy who graduates from secondary school will not work with his hands. Over the past 2 years the Soviet press has repeatedly printed criticisms of students who refused to take factory jobs on the ground that they were beneath them. In all probability, the system is nearly at saturation point in the rate at which it can offer professional or white-collar jobs to secondary school graduates.

Ultimately, however much the Soviets condition a man's mind, however narrowly they permit it to develop, and however much they seek to direct him after he is trained, they cannot in the end prevent him from exercising that critical sense that they, themselves, have caused to be created in him when they gave him an education.

When Wendell Wilkie visited the Soviet Union in 1942, he had a look at their school system. In a conversation at the Kremlin he remarks: "* * * if you continue to educate the Russian people, Mr. Stalin, the first thing you know you'll educate yourself out of a job." This seemed to amuse the Soviet dictator mightily. Maybe it will prove to be anything but a joke for the Soviet rulers of the future.

For the Soviets face a real dilemma between the two goals of their education system; on the one hand making well-conditioned members of a Communist state, and on the other, turning out trained people capable of taking their places in a technically advanced society.

In some degree this dilemma has been present since the Soviets took the crucial decisions in the 1930's to go all out for trained technical manpower. It must become more acute in the future. The rise in numbers of trained people is only beginning to reach its peak, at a time when the picture for all Soviet citizens is one of somewhat greater hope and expectation, and when change is in the wind in many ways.

The broadening of the educational base within, the contacts with the outside world, the uncertainty in the high governmental command, and the absence of a dictator all force the Soviet Union toward compromises.

With these compromises, comes the inevitable admission that the Soviet Marxist-Leninist system is not the only permissible way of life. If coexistence should really become the Moscow line, the western free systems must be permissible and if permissible anywhere, why not permissible in the Soviet Union itself.

If the Tito form of heresy, denounced a few years ago more ferociously even than capitalism, is now to be forgiven and approved, how can the Soviet deny the European satellites the right to a similar heresy if they so desire?

Can the Soviets give their people a better material education and still keep them from wanting more and from thinking more on lines such as these?

I do not think we can easily give the answer in point of time, but one can say with assurance that in the long run, man's desire for freedom must break any bonds that can be placed around him.

Possibly for a time the Soviets will go forward, using their educational system as a sorting device for human assets. Half-educated men—all fact and no humanity—may still be good fodder for totalitarianism.

Possibly the Soviet leaders will encounter problems for which they will seek the solutions by foreign adventures.

But there remains the possibility that newly created wants and expectations, stimulated by education and perhaps by more exposure to the West, will in time compel great and almost unpredictable changes in the Soviet system itself.

One or twice before this present peace and coexistence offensive, the Soviet seemed to start toward adjustment of its system to the facts of life in the outside world; first in

the latter years of the war, and possibly again in 1946. These starts were quickly followed by a dropping of the Iron Curtain, by repressions, purges, and a return to the rigid Stalinist line.

Then the Soviet had a dictator, and it's hard to dictate without one. Today they have a committee in which the Soviet people themselves are not clearly told who is boss. Also today, the Soviet have gone much further than before toward introducing into their system the leaven of education, which makes a return to the Dark Ages far more difficult than in the past.

I would not be bold enough to predict that the Soviet might not attempt to return to the rigidity of a Stalinist regime. I do predict that this would be no easy task. In introducing mass education the troubled Soviet leaders have loosed forces dangerous to themselves. It will be very difficult for them henceforth to close off their own people from access to the realities of the outside world.

A hard choice faces the perplexed, and probably unharmonious, group of men in the Kremlin. They lead a people who surely will come to realize the inevitability of the great precept: "And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

"I Speak for Democracy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I received from our distinguished former colleague from the State of New Jersey, Robert C. Hendrickson, now the Ambassador of the United States to New Zealand, a letter reading as follows:

AMERICAN EMBASSY,
Wellington, New Zealand, May 6, 1955.
Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR ALEX: A little lady from Auckland, New Zealand, a Miss Catherine Esther Styles, recently won an essay contest on the subject "I Speak for Democracy." She was 1 or 4 winners.

One cannot read the essay without feeling that in simple, but no less eloquent terms, she has stated the case for those who truly believe in the doctrine of free government. I think her 5-minute script is quite worthy of publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Thus, I enclose the same for that purpose.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
American Ambassador.

Mr. President, I am advised that Miss Catherine Esther Styles, the winner of this essay contest, comes from Auckland, New Zealand, and is an exchange student under our Smith-Mundt Act, attending high school in Minneapolis. She became 1 of 4 national winners of the 1954–55 Voice of Democracy contest, and she surpassed a field of 1½ million entrants. The entrants were high-school students from the 48 States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

Mr. President, in light of Ambassador Hendrickson's request, and because of the merit of her 5-minute essay on the subject "I speak for Democracy," which he enclosed, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is well worth the careful reading of all of us, and is a wonderful tribute from a young lady in New Zealand.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

I am not an American; my people are not American; and yet I, too, speak for democracy.

A NEW LAND

Not much over a hundred years ago the race that founded America began to found another nation. Surrounded by the vastness of the Pacific Ocean, a new land had been discovered. The brown-skinned people who already lived there called it Aotearoa, the "land of the long white cloud." Today we call it New Zealand.

It is a young country—a virile and growing country. It is a land of sea and sunshine, of snow on the mountains, of trout lakes and primitive fern forest, of weird pools where the boiling mud leaps and bubbles, cracks in the rock where the steam comes white from the insides of the earth.

The people who live there are a people who love freedom. The people who live there are my people, and when I speak for democracy I speak for them.

I have seen something of America. I have watched the crowds on the streets at night, seeing the advertisement signs flashing on the saw edge of the horizon saying: "Buy my product—no, buy mine, mine is finer yet."

SAME IDEALS

I have seen back home in the early morning the man with his horse and his dogs driving sheep. I remember the jostle and pattering rush of the delicate forefeet and the clean smell of the bracken and the sharp barking of the dogs.

I remember this, and I know that those crowds with their faces colored by the glow of the advertisements, and that man out early with his flock, although they are 7,000 miles apart, are people with the same ideals and beliefs, the same love of individual freedom. And I am glad that I can say this, and I speak with all the sincerity in my power.

I know that people, these people, all people, are the most terribly important thing in the world. I know that to make as many people as possible as happy as possible is the greatest ideal in the world. And I know that this is the ideal of democracy.

You people of America do not stand alone. Democracy extends further than America.

Two thousand years ago the Christian doctrine proclaimed the equality of man. Belief in this equality of man means acceptance of all races, all creeds. Belief in democracy means belief in the equality of man. It means respecting the individuality of every human being.

INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM

At home in the summer evenings near the time of Christmas, I would sit on the low verandah steps, and hear the baby owls calling in the darkness and the cows coughing and stamping in the paddock, and see the white bobs of the rabbits scuttle in the half-light. And by the gate I would hear the voices of a couple murmuring together, the young man and woman. And I would think: This is good. This is good, this life, this land, this people—all this is good, the best that ever was.

I still believe it is good, but I know now it was no single nation I was believing in, but the truth of free people everywhere. And I know that the most wonderful thing in the world is the freedom of the individual; in my country, in your country, and in every country.

Not as an American, not as a New Zealander, but as a free citizen of the world in which I have faith, I am speaking to you now. I am not remembering that you are American and I am British. I am not remembering that our voices are different and our manners, and the cut of our clothes. I only remember that together, we speak for democracy.

Address by Hon. George H. Bender, of Ohio, at Dedication of New School at Harrod, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the dedication of the new school at Harrod, Ohio.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR BENDER URGES EXPANDED COURSE ON AMERICAN CIVILIZATION IN DEDICATING NEW HARROD AND WESTMINSTER SCHOOL

(School dedication address by Hon. GEORGE H. BENDER, at Harrod, Ohio, May 27, 1955)

I am very happy to be here with you on this important occasion. The dedication of a new school is always a happy event. When it coincides with a major holiday celebration such as Memorial Day, it becomes even more meaningful.

Perhaps the strongest single factor in preserving our Republic through 180 years of continuous problems has been the free American school system. Nowhere in the world has any nation made an even remotely comparable effort to provide education for its people. The boys and girls who grow up in our country, no matter where they live, always carry with them into maturity a reservoir of knowledge which they tap every day of their lives.

I know that in this field there will always be new worlds to conquer. We shall never have enough education. We shall always provide more and more of it for every succeeding generation.

It is sometimes amazing to people who come from large metropolitan centers when they meet brilliant young people from smaller towns. They often find it difficult to understand how these young people have gained their knowledge, their poise, and their determination to succeed. I never wonder. I have seen their roots in communities like your own throughout our State and throughout America.

It is wonderful to see new schools springing up everywhere in our country, offering the best and most progressive ideas of modern education. No one who has ever gone through a great school system can fail to marvel at the facilities and the opportunities offered to our young people today. This is an age of great technical advancement.

I have checked through a list of great atomic scientists. It is refreshing to discover that many of them received their initial training in small communities from all over the world. They were stimulated to

work and to develop by inspiring teachers. They enjoyed the benefit of small classes. Out of the life and thought of young people from rural communities have come some of the most incredible achievements of modern science.

I think that there are other important considerations which the dedication of a new school should call to mind. We in America have prided ourselves throughout our history on the essential freedom of the American spirit. We believe in free inquiry, free speech, and academic freedom. To us, there are no forbidden subjects.

Today there are some people in our country who are confused by Communist propaganda. They say that America is losing its liberal approach to education and learning, that we are stifling freedom of speech and thought. I say to these people that they do not understand the basic difference between Communist doctrine and the American way of life. We believe in the right of every man to question and to probe. That right is denied by communism. The Communists have taken a leaf from the Nazi book. They have created Communist science, Communist music, Communist art. In this process, they reject the basic spirit of academic freedom. Yet, in the name of that same freedom, they demand the right to peddle their propaganda throughout the world.

Some liberals in our country have fallen into a weird trap. They are in a mental dilemma. On the one hand, they do not like communism, yet they insist upon the right of Communists to preach it wherever they choose.

If these same Communists should ever succeed in dominating American life they would immediately end all the liberal dilemma. There would be no liberals. There would be no choice. There would be no freedom to teach or to study or to conduct research. The state would take over. Those programs which followed the party line could be taught. Everything else would be taboo.

This is a significant consideration in my thinking, as we dedicate this new school. Young lives will be shaped here in ways beyond our most vivid imagination. Boys and girls, young men and women of tomorrow, will come into this building and will leave it richer by far than children anywhere else in the world. There is today a growing need for moral and spiritual guidance in public affairs. The schools must be a source from which tomorrow's generation may take new courage and new confidence.

These are questions which transcend individual differences and political controversy. American schools spend the largest single share of our tax moneys in every local community.

They are our investment in the future, to the extent that we succeed in preserving the greatest contribution which our Republic has made to world history. This is the test pattern, the proving ground, the training area. Our country is engaged at this moment in a cold war. It is a war for the minds of men. It can be won if our leadership develops educational procedures and programs which will overwhelmingly convince our people that our way of life is the greatest, richest, most satisfying system of life which man has ever created.

I am persuaded that the only way in which we can achieve this goal is through the rearing of a generation which will cherish the ideals for which Americans lived and died. On this Memorial Day weekend, Lincoln's great words of dedication are quickly called to mind. Today it is for us to be dedicated to the great purposes for which our men gave the last full measure of devotion through two world wars and on the hills of Korea. This dedication is, in truth, a rededication to the ideals of freedom, human understanding, helpfulness, and progress for all mankind.

Sometimes in the daily routine of teaching and learning our teachers and our students lose sight of the forest in the maze of trees. We forget the ideals. Nevertheless, they are there. In every task which the devoted men and women who teach in this school undertake, in every subject taught and learned within these walls, the spirit of freedom is planted and nurtured. Parents, teachers, administrators, and students are partners in this great cause.

I hope that the people of Harrod and Westminster will share for many years the great personal satisfaction which comes from knowing that you have left a great legacy for your children. This is the glory of America—that each generation builds upon the tradition, the heritage, and the foundation of its predecessor.

I have reviewed the courses of instruction offered in our public-school system, from the elementary level through our colleges. In recent years, we have begun to emphasize the humanities. We have discovered that social studies are stimulating and worthwhile courses for young people. Some 5 years ago, Lafayette College organized an interesting experimental course called creative centuries.

It was designed to cross departmental lines, and combines a study of great ideas with a survey of western civilization.

It seems to me that American boys and girls would profit from a similar effort within the framework of our elementary and secondary school system. America has built a unique civilization in our curricula. We have discussed Magna Carta, the French Revolution, and the fight against the medieval "Divine Right of Kings." I am certain that we have never fully defined or emphasized the originality of thinking, the daring innovations in political science which went into the Constitution of the United States. A course on our American civilization with all that it implies would be a splendid addition to our school program.

Our civilization is far from being an adaptation or a modification of the British tradition. It is by all odds the nearest approach to complete freedom of political choice the world has ever known. Nowhere in the world does a nation have such jealousy preserved rights to select its own leaders and determine its own way of life. We cannot overemphasize this truth in a generation which takes freedom too often for granted.

Let us resolve together that we shall do our share in the preservation of this great educational ideal. It can move mountains. It is a faith in God and man. Upon it, America will always rise stronger than any enemies who may assail us.

Commencement Day Address by Hon. Mike Mansfield, of Montana, at Marymount High School, Arlington, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a commencement address which I delivered at Marymount High School, Arlington, Va., on June 2, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD, AT MARYMOUNT HIGH SCHOOL, ARLINGTON, VA., JUNE 2, 1955

It is with a deep sense of pride that I am here today to address the 1955 graduating class of Marymount. Commencement day is a momentous occasion in the life of every young lady. If your formal education ends today or if you go on to schools of higher learning, I think that you will find that Marymount has done much to shape the lives of all of you, a realization which will be more fully recognized in future years.

I do not come here with any great words of wisdom. Anything I have to say on this joyous and yet solemn occasion can do little to impress upon you the great tasks that are before you. You are at the beginning of a new phase in your lives as adults. You will have momentous decisions to make, decisions which no one else can make. Those of you being honored here today are graduating into a complex world which needs leadership and skills of all kinds in the near future. It will be you young ladies who will be called upon to meet these challenges.

Thirty years ago the future for women was very limited. This is no longer so. Today I venture to say that many of you in this class of 1955 will find yourselves within a few short years in New York, San Francisco, Paris, Mexico City, Tokyo, Bogota, or equally cosmopolitan centers. You will be working for the Government, for private industry, or with your husbands. Many of you will have your own profession. The choice, as you can see, is much more varied than it used to be. I think it is safe to say that opportunities for capable young women are limitless.

Thirty years ago American interests were very limited. We were concerned largely about our own domestic problems. Today we live in the greatest nation on earth. American interests are scattered across the globe. We in America have been jolted into a new realization of the force of the world. We can no longer isolate ourselves from the affairs of international scope. The modern modes of transportation have brought us within hours of any point on either of the hemispheres. We have moved into a new age—the age of the atomic and hydrogen bombs. Our scientists have made fantastic advances in the realm of massive destruction. With a concerted effort these phenomenal accomplishments can be redirected to the benefit of mankind. We have recognized widespread human need and have set about through various assistance programs to assist the worthy and needy. In the postwar years the principal force with which we have had to contend is militant communism. We have preserved our freedom which has been so threatened by the rise of totalitarian communism, and we will continue to do so.

Domestically, we in the United States are enjoying a prosperity seldom, if ever, known in the past. With a little initiative and determination the future for our young people will look exceedingly bright.

I need not dwell upon the responsibilities and decisions facing you in the next year and the years to come, for I am sure you are cognizant of these things. Many of you will continue your education, perhaps others of you will marry soon.

All of that is ahead of you. What is important for you to do today is to look back over the wonderful years you have spent at Marymount. You are at a certain point in life where you should stand back and look at yourselves. You are departing today from what may likely be the happiest and most pleasant period of your lives.

Looking back over the past several years in this outstanding institution, can a Marymount graduate feel that she is ready to commence a life of full personal initiative in a world of turmoil and strife? I think so.

The graduates of Marymount are well equipped to embark on the journey of life and to meet with confidence the challenge of the coming years. Yours has been the privilege of able guidance throughout the academic period by the reverend Mothers and Sisters, competent in the arts, the sciences, and, most important, the things spiritual. The reverend Mothers and Sisters have sought to develop in you the moral and intellectual virtues and to give you a complete education. They have sought to convince you that happiness and perfection are not necessarily found in the pursuit of wealth, fame, or power, but rather in the unselfish devotion to God and His designs for all of you.

You have been trained here to be leaders in Catholic thought and action, in the service of God and country. That leadership will be a constructive one if you put into practice the fundamental principles and truths which you have learned here as students. Despite the temporary discomforts and the consistency of conduct demanded, if you fail to adhere to these first principles in your own life, your leadership will have lost its value.

Beyond the academic accomplishments of high school, I am sure that all of you have gained tremendously in other areas. Perhaps one of the most important of the extracurricular benefits is that you now recognize the value of doing things together. The young ladies enrolled at Marymount have a commendable record in community effort on the part of its students. Some of your lifelong friendships have been formed here. You will have many fond memories encompassing your efforts in drama, sports, music, writing, and the other activities which add so much to the spirit of a school.

Nothing you graduates can possibly do will enrich yourselves more or hasten the triumph of faith or make a better contribution to your country than to proclaim and demonstrate the faith and learning you have gathered here at Marymount throughout your lifetime. May each of you bring something to a world in need of light and understanding.

In conclusion, I wish to extend to each of you my congratulations and best wishes for the years to come. The reverend Mothers and the Sisters can look with great pride upon this 1955 graduating class. Your parents, relatives, and friends join with them in wishing you Godspeed and good luck.

The 1956 Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, one of the ablest writers in my section of the country is the associate editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Mr. Philip W. Porter. Mr. Porter recently wrote an article about the 1956 election. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTER ON 1956 ELECTION—IKE SEEN AS SHOO-IN REGARDLESS OF THE VICTIM DEMOCRATS PICK TO RUN AGAINST HIM

(By Philip W. Porter)

Since there's so little real news in Washington these days, the politicians and reporters are interviewing each other and playing an exciting guessing game, entitled "Will Ike Run?" It's harmless and passes the time, but perfectly useless, for nobody but Ike is going to give the answer, and he won't give it till early next year.

The boys played it on Roosevelt before he ran the third and fourth times, and on Truman before 1952. So it's not new. But this eyar it's particularly stimulating, for the situation will be so radically different for both Republicans and Democrats if Ike does or doesn't.

If he goes for a second term, he's in like Flynn, a complete shoo-in, even more so than in 1952—no matter who is the victim nominated against him. If he doesn't, the Democrats, any Democrat, will take it.

HE'LL BE DRAFTED

This being the situation, regardless of Ike's personal preference to retire to his farm at Gettysburg after an active and productive life, the pressure on him will be so terrific that he'll be drafted, and even the rightwing (or antediluvian) Republicans who have been sniping at him with regularity will eventually be down on their knees before him.

He has responded before to such pressures from people he trusts, and I'd bet that he responds again. You remember that when he was in Paris, still a soldier commanding SHAPE, and Taft was way out in front, and Ike was just being mentioned by me and a few other writers, he was sold the idea first of declaring himself a Republican, then of resigning and coming home, and finally of campaigning for the nomination.

It was not coyness; it was simple reluctance to get in. But once he got in, you know the rest. It will happen again.

The Democrats are not really in such a bad way. They can wait for Ike's announcement, and if it's yes, they can then work themselves up an enthusiasm either for (1) a guy with some dough, or (2) a guy they want to get rid of, and nominate him. No. 1 could be Harriman. No 2 could be KEFAUVER.

STEVENSON NO FOOL

Stevenson, of course, can be nominated if he wants to fight for it, but he is no fool, and should know better than anyone what it's like to run against Ike. He could easily deal himself out in 1956, and then come back in 1960, and that time he'd have a good chance. It's bunk that he couldn't sit out next year and come back in 1960.

KEFAUVER is campaigning, never stopped campaigning. As early as December 1952 he was still around muttering unctuously, "ESTES is the bestes'." Some of the regulars don't like him too well, but plenty do. So he'll be scouting for delegates soon.

Harriman, who is a political lightweight if there ever was one, has apparently been sold the idea that he's a man of destiny because he backed into the governorship of New York last year on a margin almost as thin as GEORGE BENDER'S. He's an amiable guy and has done well at some diplomatic chores, but if you think Stevenson lacked something as a candidate, wait till you see Harriman. The big city Democratic muggs would be crying their eyes out after the first 2 weeks.

Remember some months ago I wrote that Frank Lausche, Governor of Ohio, sometimes referred to as the bargain-basement Lincoln, would not figure seriously in the Democratic presidential picture? The reason was that Lausche's brand of corn has always won the Republican independents, of whom there are many in Ohio, but Democratic nominees are chosen by Democratic organization politicians.

Well, Lausche has already made that guess look good by (dramatically, of course) dealing himself out after visiting the White House 2 weeks ago. Even the Democratic national chairman, Paul Butler, took off after him. It simply brought into the open a situation that the sharpshooters around the Washington Press Club couldn't believe was possible—that a big Democratic vote-getter could be that way.

Well, Frankie's pleasant remark about Ike won't hurt him when the time comes to offer him a Federal judgeship. And don't be surprised if that happens; it would extricate everyone from the hook. Presidents do appoint members of the opposition party to judgeships; Truman appointed Harold Burton and Governor Youngdahl of Minnesota.

There are just a few off-season maunderings, so don't put any money on them. But some of them make a little commonsense.

Economy and Hurricanes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PURTELL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, last week I testified before a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee to urge favorable action on my bill, S. 1932, which provides an appropriation of $5 million for the operation of an emergency hurricane warning system by the Weather Bureau. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Economy and Hurricanes," published in the Sunday edition of the New York Times, on June 5, 1955. The editorial deals with the hurricane legislation which I have proposed and supports it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMY AND HURRICANES

The public should be deeply concerned with what Congress is doing about the weather bureau appropriations for the fiscal year beginning July 1. Unfortunately, the record so far is distinctly poor—especially in view of what may happen this summer from hurricanes that hit us with insufficient advance warnings.

The bureau requested about $49 million; the Secretary of Commerce cut that down to $38 million; then the budget director trimmed it another $5 million and the House Appropriations Committee finally recommended $32,650,000—which wouldn't have given the bureau a cent more next year than this for general weather reporting facilities. However, by stressing the extreme need for better hurricane warnings, Representative FOGARTY persuaded the House to raise the final appropriation by $2,250,000, earmarked for that special purpose—which is far from adequate.

Fortunately, however, the Senate has still to act. It has before it a bill from Senator PURTELL for a special $5 million weather bureau appropriation to be used in hurricane activities. This would provide sufficient staff to keep its offices open 24 hours a day in at least 10 coastal cities, now on a part-time basis, and to reopen offices in five or more other coastal cities which have had to close down altogether for lack of funds. It would also allow for more upper air observation stations, so essential for hurricane prediction, and for a much-needed improvement in the reporting of weather conditions by ships at sea. Equally important, it would enable the bureau to get far prompter reports from all its stations and to make instantaneous distribution of warnings through improved mechanical facilities.

In considering the Purtell bill, Senators would do well to remember that last year's hurricanes took 200 lives and did property damage amounting to at least $800 million. Probably 90 percent of the deaths and 25 percent of the damage could have been avoided by more precise and timely warnings. To spend $5 million for that purpose would seem to promise human and material benefits out of all proportion to the cost.

Soil Conservation Technical Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have reprinted hereinbelow Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 16, by Messrs. Wilkinson and Graugnard, of the regular session of the Legislature of Louisiana of 1955, which sets forth the official position of the Louisiana Legislature as to the recommended proposal of the Task Force Committee on Federal Aid to Agriculture to the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations "that the function of soil conservation technical assistance be placed on a Federal grant-in-aid basis." This resolution reads as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 16

Whereas the present national program whereby the Federal Government provides technical assistance to State-organized and locally governed soil conservation districts has proved so successful that most of the farmers and ranchers in the United States have voluntarily organized into such districts; and

Whereas soil conservation districts organized under the Louisiana Soil Conservation District Law in 1938 have demonstrated their ability to provide the local leadership and administration of the conservation program; and

Whereas the State of Louisiana, through the legislature, has recognized its responsibility by providing $375,000 annually to assist soil conservation district operations; and

Whereas according to press reports the majority report of the Task Force Committee on Federal Aid to Agriculture has recommended to the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations a proposal "that the function of soil conservation technical assistance be placed on a Federal grant-in-aid basis"; and

Whereas the reported proposal would require vastly increased State and local financial support in technical assistance and cost-sharing programs, thus requiring heavy additional tax burdens at State and parish levels; and

Whereas there is a strong likelihood that already heavily taxed State and parish governments will be unwilling to impose additional local taxes for this purpose; and

Whereas it is unlikely that any increase in local taxes for soil conservation will be offset by a decrease in Federal taxes paid by the people; and

Whereas the proposal is inconsistent with the fact that soil and water are strategic national resources, the conservation and wise use of which are matters of necessity to all people, both rural and urban: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Louisiana (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States reject the aforesaid reorganization plan, and retain the soil conservation program as a Federal service in substantially its present form with responsibility for carrying forward the programs developed by the locally administered soil conservation districts; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Louisiana is hereby directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER and RUSSELL B. LONG, Senators from the State of Louisiana; and to the Honorable F. EDWARD HÉBERT, HALE BOGGS, EDWIN E. WILLIS, OVERTON BROOKS, OTTO E. PASSMAN, JAMES H. MORRISON, T. ASHTON THOMPSON, and GEORGE S. LONG, Representatives in Congress from the State of Louisiana.

O. E. BENHOM,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate,
A. E. ASOSH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

A true copy:

WADE O. MARTIN, JR.
Secretary of State.

Tribute to Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRICE DANIEL
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the Texas Senate recently passed a resolution praising the distinguished service of Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I ask unanimous consent that a newspaper article reporting the adoption of this resolution be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN TEXAS SENATE RESOLUTION—MRS. HOBBY PRAISED FOR SERVICE TO NATION

AUSTIN.—The Texas Senate Tuesday praised Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for the distinguished service she has rendered the Nation.

A resolution offered by Senators Jimmy Phillips, of Angleton, and Searcy Bracewell, of Houston, said the country was fortunate in obtaining the services of "this brilliant and patriotic woman." It was adopted unanimously, and a copy will be sent to Mrs. Hobby and to President Eisenhower.

Pointing out that Mrs. Hobby was the only Texas woman ever to serve as a Cabinet member, the senate resolution said that she "has won the instinted praise of the President of the United States, the warm regard of her fellow Cabinet members, and the respect and admiration of the entire Nation, as well as her own beloved State."

The senate noted that she had achieved honor and renown in the fields of government, business, and journalism, and contributed to victory in World War II by her command and direction of the Women's Army Corps.

The resolving clause of the resolution said:

"*Resolved by the Senate of Texas*, That we commend and congratulate Oveta Culp Hobby for her loyal devotion to duty, her untiring efforts to improve the health and learning and promote the welfare of her fellow citizens, so that America may become a still greater Nation, for her keen intellect and the wisdom she has evidenced in the highest councils of the land."

Status of Forces Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Tablet, of Brooklyn, N. Y., is known throughout America as one of our great religious newspapers, maintained by and in the interest of the Roman Catholic diocese of Brooklyn. It is always a vigorous exponent of true American ideals, good citizenship, and good government. It is therefore particularly gratifying to find the Tablet reporting in full the significance of the House vote on the status of forces amendment to the Reserve bill, and on House Joint Resolution 309 directing the President to modify or denounce these treaties and international agreements under which hundreds of American men now languish in prison in foreign countries, tried and convicted without the protection of the American code of justice. Under leave to extend, I include the Tablet article of June 4, 1955:

REPRESENTATIVE BOW, OF OHIO, ASKS THAT UNITED STATES BOYS ABROAD BE GIVEN CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION—CITES MANY INJUSTICES—ALSO SUBMITS RESOLUTION TO SAME END; SCORES YIELDING OF TRADITIONAL IMMUNITY

(By Francis Carroll)

WASHINGTON, June 1.—House Joint Resolution 309 has suddenly become a matter of interest to the parents of draft-age boys and to all young men, a matter of concern to the White House and the State Department and a matter of embarrassment to party politicians in the Congress.

House Joint Resolution 309 was introduced by Representative FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio, on what may, without overexaggeration, eventually be called a fateful day, May 18, 1955.

It provides for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries.

CLOSE TO PRESIDENT'S HEART

The day House Joint Resolution 309 was offered, the House was debating the passage of a bill to strengthen the National Reserves forces. Representative LEROY JOHNSON, of California, after revealing that "our President is groping desperately to find a way to bring about a solution of the tensions that harass the world today," stated that the purpose of the bill was "to develop a strong military posture."

In a stirring appeal, Representative JOHNSON asked: "Are you going to herald to the world that we are not willing to stand up and support our President? That is what we will be doing if we fail to enact this bill."

Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, said the legislation was dear

to the heart of the President, was a "vital part of the Eisenhower program for peace," and was "the price we must pay for liberty and security."

Other Congressmen, on both sides of the aisle, pleaded for the passage of the legislation so that the country would be prepared to meet Soviet aggression.

On the other hand, there were some who raised for consideration the case of the individual American boy who wanted the opportunity to go to college and to take special training and who wanted the opportunity to get married, build a home, and raise a family.

ADDS SEGREGATION ISSUE

Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN, of Michigan, warned that by "legisaltion of this type we just slam shut the door of opportunity to all of the young folks of today and tomorrow.

"We give back to this country the system of military training, of military conscription, which the Pilgrim Fathers and all who came to this country seeking freedom and opportunity fought so long, so successfully, to escape."

"Rather than attempt to shape and fit a military policy to an unsound foreign policy," he said, "let us start at the fountainhead and give to this country a foreign policy tailored to our ability, to the preservation of the interests of our Nation and its people."

"The statesmen of every other nation keep the welfare of their own country and their own people always in mind. I know of no reason why we should not do likewise."

The legislation faced its first real trouble when a vote seemed in the immediate offing. Representative ADAM C. POWELL, JR., of New York, proposed an amendment guaranteeing the abolition of segregation in the State or National Guard. After a flurry of protest from Representative OVERTON BROOKS of Louisiana, the amendment was adopted by a vote of 126 to 87.

Then came the amendment that jeopardized any chances for the bill's passage.

Representative Bow announced that, in addition to introducing House Joint Resolution 309, he was also offering the following amendment to the National Reserves bill:

"No person who, after the enactment of the National Reserve plan is inducted into, or initially enlisted or appointed in, the Armed Forces, including Reserve components thereof, shall at any time be assigned for duty at any installation located in a foreign country with which (at such time) the United States has in effect a treaty or international agreement containing provisions permitting such country to exercise in any way jurisdiction over American personnel stationed within its boundaries."

EXPLAINS PURPOSE

The purpose of the amendment, Representative Bow said, was to insure that no inducted person "may be assigned to any overseas installation until such time as we may be assured that his constitutional rights as an American are fully protected."

"It is my contention, supported, I believe, by the overwhelming weight of legal principle and by popular sentiment throughout the United States," he continued, "that an American soldier drafted into service against his will and sent to a foreign nation without his consent should not be turned over to the authorities of that foreign nation and deprived of his American constitutional rights for infractions of the laws of that foreign nation."

"With rare exceptions throughout modern history," he said, "it has been recognized that the invitation of a host country for a foreign force to enter its territory carries with it immunity of the visiting forces personnel from the jurisdiction of local courts."

"I will never understand why the United States, to the great disadvantage of American citizens, should have agreed to a reversal of this doctrine," he declared.

"Yet that is exactly what we have done in article VII of the Status of Forces Agreement with the NATO nations, in the amendments of September 29, 1953, to the Japanese Security Treaty, and in other treaties and executive agreements entered into since World War II.

HITS DENIAL OF GUARANTIES

"Under these agreements members of our Armed Forces charged with the violation of the law of the country in which they are stationed are turned over to the police authorities and the courts of that country for trial.

"They are not guaranteed the right to have a public trial. There is no guaranty against cruel or unusual punishment before or after trial. There is no prohibition against a demand for excessive bail.

"In many countries there is no presumption of innocence. There is no guaranty of conviction only on proof of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. There is no guaranty of a right to trial by jury and, of course, no possibility of trial by a jury of one's fellow citizens. * * *

"The President of the United States cannot exercise his right to pardon.

"These rights and guaranties which are the heritage of every American are denied the men who are sent overseas to defend America."

Representative Bow told the House that, while few foreign troops are stationed in the United States, American troops are stationed in 40 foreign nations.

"Forty other nations," he declared, "have gained the power of life and death over tens of thousands of American men."

He also said that "several hundred Americans have been tried by foreign courts" and cited several specific instances.

Representative Bow's amendment was adopted by a vote of 174 to 56.

This week the Ohio Congressman made sure this issue of the constitutional rights of American inductees sent to foreign lands would not be forgotten by inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD accounts of a large number of young men who have been tried in foreign courts.

Critical Shortages of Engineers and Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Education in Review" by Benjamin Fine, published in the New York Times of June 5, 1955.

The article discusses the severe shortage of engineers and technically trained personnel which faces this country, and points out some of the proposals which have been advanced to improve this vital situation. In inserting this article in the Appendix, I desire to call attention to proposed legislation which I have introduced, S. 980, to provide a system of scholarships for persons of unusual ability in certain sciences, which offers a means for meeting and solving this important problem.

It is my hope that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will give early consideration to this bill. However, my chief desire is that the committee will review the entire problem, which I regard as of paramount importance, so that the Senate may soon consider legislation on the subject, from whatever source.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION IN REVIEW—CRITICAL SHORTAGE OF TECHNICALLY TRAINED AMERICANS IS CAUSING MUCH CONCERN

(By Benjamin Fine)

This country faces a severe shortage of engineers and technically trained personnel. The critical nature of the shortage was emphasized last week by Allen W. Dulles, director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Speaking before the Alumni Federation of Columbia University, Mr. Dulles said that in the decade from 1950 to 1960, the Soviet Union would graduate 1,200,000 scientists and engineers, compared to 900,000 in the United States. And he warned that unless something was done at once, Soviet scientific manpower might well outnumber ours in many key areas.

This month, for example, just about 20,000 engineers will be graduated from American colleges and universities. At the same time, the Soviet Union will graduate more than 55,000. In addition, Russia will graduate far more men in the sub-professional fields of engineering, in the technical areas that are so vital in a technological age.

For a long time we boasted that our engineers had greater technical know-how, and were superior in every way to those coming from the Soviet Union. However, experts who have studied the problem say this is no longer true. The calibre of training received by the Russian engineers is rapidly approaching ours, and in some respects may even surpass it.

CHANGES SINCE THE WAR

What is the cause of the engineer shortage? There is no simple answer. Some educators say that the Government itself is to blame. Soon after World War II, when the veterans began to flood the college campuses, the engineering courses became extremely popular. Back in 1950 about 50,000 men were graduated from the engineering colleges. Government-sponsored reports at that time, said that this was too large a number, that our economy could not absorb them. Many engineers could not find jobs.

Then came Korea, and the frenzied attempt to build up our Defense Establishment in a hurry. We found that we did not have enough engineers or technically trained men to go around. The civilian economy, plus the military needs, absorbed them faster than schools could turn them out.

Other factors entered the picture. The draft took away many potential engineers. The colleges found that it was difficult for them to compete with industry for well-trained faculty members. Somehow, an interest in engineering dipped to a new low, despite the great interest in all things of a technical nature, such as jet planes, atomic weapons, and scientific developments.

TO MEET THE PROBLEM

From the long-range point of view, educators are greatly disturbed at the sharp decline in interest in the sciences by high-school students. Figures issued recently by the United States Office of Education show that proportionately fewer students now take courses in chemistry, physics, science, and mathematics than ever before . More than half the high schools in the country do not even offer chemistry today.

Educators are seriously concerned at the apparent indifference to the engineering and scientific fields shown by college students

and high-school graduates. At recent conferences, some called for this very purpose, they have proposed certain steps that might bring the situation into better balance.

Among the most frequently mentioned proposals are these:

The creation of a Reserve Officers Training Corps in the fields of engineering and science. At present the campuses support these corps in the various branches of the Army, in the Navy, and Air Force. It is known that the Pentagon has under consideration an extension of these programs, to include ROTC units devoted to engineering and scientific students. Under this plan, if approved, the military officials would provide financial support to qualified students in the technical fields. The suggested program appears to have considerable merit. Certainly it would aid those who are interested in the scientific fields but, for financial reasons, are unable to continue in this area.

ENGINEERING SCHOLARSHIPS

Scholarships for engineering and scientific students have been frequently suggested. In effect, the State or Federal Government would subsidize potential science or technical students. It is costly to attend engineering schools. MIT, for example, has just announced that its tuition will be increased still further, and will go over the $1,000 mark. Financial support, it has been argued, should go to liberal arts students as well as those in the fields of science. This question, at the moment, is receiving the thoughtful attention of the educational authorities.

Higher salaries for teachers of science and engineering are essential if the faculties are not to be depleted. Although it is true that higher salaries should go to all teachers generally it is doubly essential in the case of the professors in engineering schools. The competition from industry is so severe that the topnotch men are being drawn off by research groups, the Government and private industry.

More adequate physical facilities are essential. The country needs more engineering laboratories, more scientific equipment, better working conditions for the scientific and engineering students.

AVOIDING THE DRAFT

It is also essential, the educators almost unanimously agree, that a more realistic attitude be taken toward the question of Selective Service. Many complaints have been registered in recent months that scientific and engineering students have been drafted before they have completed their studies. This is particularly true, the educators say, concerning graduate students. They point to men who get halfway through their graduate work in engineering, only to be called into service.

Finally, a better public relations program appears to be badly needed. The educators want their story told to the American public so that greater support will be forthcoming. It is not commonly known that the United States is falling behind the Soviet Union in the training and preparation of able scientists, engineers and technical personnel. The story should be told.

Twenty Years of REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Twenty Years of REA," which appeared in the May 31, 1955, issue of the Irvington Herald, of Irvington, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

The Rural Electrification Administration recently celebrated its 20th birthday. It was in May of 1935, that President Roosevelt signed an Executive order creating the REA and authorizing it to make loans to build rural power systems.

The best testimonial of the REA's efforts since that time is its claim that REA systems are now supplying 54 percent of the country's rural users with power. If the REA has done that job in 20 years, it certainly is a creditable record.

Of course, the REA has been a controversial agency from the outset, and private utility companies have claimed that they were being placed in the position of having to compete with a Government agency. Private industry also said it could do the same job REA was doing.

However, complaints from rural folk in the 1930's were very numerous, especially those which contended that the private companies were not making haste to bring service to rural areas where there were few users. The REA immediately attacked this problem by making loans to local units, and these units built power systems and erected lines, and paid back the loans over the years. The REA also offered financial aid in acquiring electrical equipment.

In our opinion, it is highly doubtful if private industry could have attacked the problem as rapidly as did the REA. On the other hand, it is no doubt true that private industry has sometimes been hard put by competition from this Government agency and that electric cooperatives have sometimes moved into areas where private industry could and would serve users.

The net effect to the rural consumer, however, who had little hope of getting electric power in the near future 20 years ago has been a good one, for the REA program has been a spur to private industry, and this, in addition to REA efforts, has brought about rapid electrification to those who were given service by the REA and constitutes one of the most successful programs of the Roosevelt era.

Shall We Let the Veteran Down?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, any attempt to terminate our national responsibility by throwing our aged and disabled veterans and their widows back on the States as community responsibilities should be met with unyielding resistance by the Congress and by the American people; and I have no doubt that such resistance would be immediate, for the integrity of a nation is surely found in the character of its people. Ours is the most grateful people on earth.

For a considerable time now, antiveteran elements have been sounding the waters in quest of another Economy Act. Although there is now less than 2 percent of our total population on the Veterans' Administration veterans compensation and pension rolls, scare economists falsely propagandize that the Nation is actually confronted with the care of 21 million veterans. The veterans civil service law is likewise under attack. Apparently, according to the scare economists, we can only economize at the expense of the veteran.

The great John C. Calhoun once said:

Economy is certainly a very high political virtue; but it is often made into political quackery.

That is just as true today, and whenever and wherever false economy has been practiced on an intensive scale, history shows that it has led to certain disaster. The so-called Economy Act of 1933 actually bears the shameful title: "An Act To Maintain the Credit of the United States Government." But, as we all know, that instrument was aimed at the heart of the veteran. It was false economy in the raw. Not only did that act not maintain or improve the credit of the Government, it resulted in untold misery and literally thousands of untimely deaths. Thousands and thousands of worthy disabled veterans were dropped from the compensation rolls while other thousands had their disability compensation drastically reduced—this in the midst of the greatest economic depression in world history. No. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will never be tricked into a similar debacle.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we hear talk of a scheme to put our aged veterans and their widows under State old-age assistance plans. That would probably be the first step in the disintegration of the Veterans' Administration, and the outright abolishment of the traditional national responsibility for the care of our veterans and their survivors since their affairs would thereby be transferred to some 50 States and Territories. Bearing in mind that old-age assistance as now constituted is a Federal-State partnership—wholly administered by the States and Territories—let us ask ourselves some pertinent questions.

The first question is: Would the States agree to such a scheme? Obviously before it could be erected every State would have to agree to it. Then the next important question is:

Would the States be required to foot a substantial part of the cost—in line with the present old-age assistance plans? If so, what would happen in the event a State legislature should fail to appropriate funds for such payments? Could the veteran cross over to another State and claim an old-age pension in that State?

Well he could not do so in my State. In Louisiana, to be eligible for old-age assistance, one must have resided in our State for 3 of the last 9 years with 1 full year immediately preceding date of application for old-age assistance. And, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will find that a majority of the States require similar residential qualifications. I am not critical of these requirements. They are laudatory for divers and obvious reasons.

Then what about income and property limitations?

Through thrift and industry in their younger years many old veterans have managed to pay for modest homes or small farms, but in order to obtain a Federal pension or compensation they are not required to liquidate their small

estates. To be eligible for old-age assistance under State law, however, many of the States require the applicant to convey his real property to the State with certain provisions being made for a lifetime tenure by the surviving spouse. Nor may one dispose of his property for the immediate purpose of obtaining old-age assistance. In still other jurisdictions old-age-assistance payments automatically constitute a State lien on the recipient's property both real and personal. All of these laws, for State purposes, are equally laudatory; but I submit that they were not enacted for the veteran class which served all the States and all the people.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the half has not been told. Still another plan is being toyed with. This would place veterans—such as those of the war with Spain—under the Federal old-age and survivors-insurance plan. Although all of these old veterans had entered their declining years when the Federal Social Security Act was enacted, a few of them have built up small old-age and survivors-insurance credits which, for the most part, would not purchase a bare subsistance existence. So to augment those inadequacies the payments would be increased out of the general old-age and survivors-insurance fund.

But how about the veteran or widow who has no such old-age and survivors-insurance credits?

Does it not naturally follow that they would have to be paid out of the old-age and survivors-insurance fund to which they have not contributed a cent? Would such use of this trust fund which is the lawful property of millions of working people be keeping faith with them? Under what due process of law could such expenditures be authorized? What are the great labor organizations going to say about it?

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I remind the House that the present Veterans' Administration hospital program is also under attack. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I assure the House that the whole program, with all of its ramifications will be carefully evaluated with the best interest of the veteran always in mind.

Like George Washington, the veteran must be "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his fellow countrymen."

Our New Chief United States Judge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH L. CARRIGG
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. CARRIGG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am happy to call attention to the following editorials which appeared in the Scranton Tribune and the Scranton Times on Wednesday, June 1, 1955, in connection with the retirement of Chief Judge Albert L. Watson, of the United States Courts of the Middle District of Pennsylvania, and the elevation of Middle District Judge John W. Murphy to the position vacated by Judge Watson.

The editorials follow:

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Tribune of June 1, 1955]

OUR NEW CHIEF UNITED STATES JUDGE

John W. Murphy, who once was a breaker boy at an anthracite colliery, was elevated to chief judge of the United States middle district court yesterday.

His elevation marked 1 of 3 milestones in the history of the Federal court here. Leading to the merited promotion of Judge Murphy was the retirement of Chief Judge Albert L. Watson, after 25 years of faithful service in the district. His retirement left the opening for the appointment of Judge Frederick V. Follmer to the district court from the roving judgeship which he filled since 1946 in the eastern, middle, and western districts.

Chief Judge Murphy showed that he possessed judicial timber soon after beginning the practice of law. He was outstanding as a young assistant district attorney in Lackawanna County. He was a virtual human dynamo for work. He was impressive as a trial lawyer, possessing exceptional and convincing oratorical ability, and the knack of bringing out the important facts in all the cases assigned to him.

He carried this ability to the Halls of Congress when he was elected in 1942. He represented his district well and fought ably for proper recognition for this area.

He served two terms in Congress, winning the first one as the successor candidate to the late Congressman Patrick J. Boland, who died on the eve of the 1942 primary.

His ability and his great capacity for work were recognized at Washington as evidenced by his selection among other distinguished Congressmen as a member of the Pearl Harbor investigating committee.

It was largely through his record of achievements as a lawyer and a Congressman that he was recommended by former President Truman for the United States court vacancy after the removal of Judge Albert W. Johnson. Since then he presided at many major cases. His brilliance and knowledge of the law were reflected in the masterpieces of opinions written by this one-time Avoca breaker boy.

The Tribune joins with his numerous friends in wishing him continued success in his new post as chief judge and we know he will be a credit to the district and to the Nation.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Times of June 1, 1955]

NEW CHIEF JUDGE TAKES OVER

Hon. John W. Murphy, new chief judge of the United States Courts for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, who took over yesterday, has carried on as a lawyer and jurist in the best traditions of the profession which he graces. He earned the recognition which has come to him by dint of hard work, close attention to duty, and a wide understanding of the law. Judge Murphy, Avoca native, orphaned at an early age, started life as a breaker boy. Ambitious to get ahead, he went to night school, qualified for law school, worked his way through and was graduated with honors.

First admitted to the Luzerne bar he determined within a short while to locate in Scranton. The thoroughness with which he prepared early cases attracted attention. He became an assistant district attorney and was able to get a large amount of experience as a trial lawyer. Next he went to Congress and during the nearly two terms he served won attention of colleagues and served on the commission which investigated the attack on Pearl Harbor. He wrote a considerable part of the commission's report and was warmly praised by commission colleagues, including the late former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts, chairman, who died only recently.

In Congress Mr. Murphy became acquainted with former President Harry S. Truman when the latter was a Member of the Senate. His appointment to the Middle District Courts followed the forced resignation of Judge Albert W. Johnson. As a judge of the Middle District, Judge Murphy has been an indefatigable worker. He has presided at a number of the important cases tried in the district. Now, after some 9 years, he becomes the chief judge of the courts, a record which has seldom been equaled and which could be a steppingstone to further recognition and honors. In congratulating Judge Murphy we want to add that from the standpoint of qualifications and ability the honor which has come to him is well deserved.

Judge Murphy succeeds Judge Albert L. Watson, who resigned effective May 31 after 25 years as a member of the Middle District Courts and 9 years as its chief judge. Judge Watson had previous judicial experience for a short period on the Lackawanna County bench. His long service had been marked by close attention to duty. He kept his judicial skirts clear during the period Judge Johnson was chief judge and frequently under attack. All told Judge Watson has been lawyer and judge some 53 years, a record of which any man could be proud. Judge Watson takes into retirement with him the best wishes of his colleagues, Judge Murphy and Judge Frederick V. Follmer; members of the State judiciary, and of the counties comprising the Middle District and all who have had relations with him in and out of court.

Summary of Report by Stephen S. Scopas on his Visit to Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in its issue of Sunday, May 15, the National Herald, a publication circulated among Americans of Greek descent, published a summary of a report made by Mr. Stephen S. Scopas, supreme president of the order of Ahepa, following his return from a visit to Greece.

This report asserts that American prestige in Greece has slipped dangerously within the last 2 or 3 years. I believe that the account of Mr. Scopas' observations in Greece should be read as widely as possible. It is a sober and a sobering set of observations.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in question, from the May 15 issue of the National Herald, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES LOSING PRESTIGE IN GREECE
WARNS PRESIDENT OF AHEPAN ORDER

NEW YORK, N. Y.—Stephen S. Scopas, supreme president of the Order of Ahepa, has released the following information based on

observation and experiences of a large number of Ahepans who have just returned from a visit in Greece:

"Citizens of Greece will be eternally grateful to the American people for the help we gave them in rebuilding their shattered nation, and in beating off Communist aggression.

"But Greek respect for America's foreign policy is today at a low ebb, and Greek confidence in America's pattern of world leadership has slumped disastrously within the past 2 years."

Mr. Scopas further added "Many factors have contributed to this lessening of Greek admiration for the United States, but there are three outstanding points on which most Greeks with whom I have spoken, are in full agreement.

"The national pride of Greece has been deeply wounded by the openly discriminatory provisions of the present immigration and alien admissions policy of the United States. Under the national quota provisions of that act only 115 Greek nationals can actually be admitted to the United States in any year. Only a few hundred Greeks wish to leave their country for the United States in any year. But not a single nation, with the heritage and accomplishments of the Greek people, enjoys being told that their native-born sons and daughters are 'undesirables' in the eyes of the United States.

"Secondly, the Greeks want to earn their way through increasing trade with the United States, so that they will be free of their dependence on American loans and handouts to make up their trade deficit.

"The recent American Government's arbitrary decision to limit trade with the Swiss, in violation of the entire spirit of the reciprocal trade program, shocked the Greek people, who admire and have a kindred feeling for the tough and independent Swiss people. The Greeks feel that Eisenhower's failure to stand by his principles on the Swiss watch issue presages the failure of other parts of his trade program under the assault of protectionists and isolationists.

"And finally, the Greeks feel that now the go-it-alone policy has become dominant in America, that the threat of a needless and easily avoidable war with Russia has been brought dangerously closer for the entire world. The Greeks have no doubt about their capability to again lick their share of Communists, if the need ever arises again. They object to stumbling into a war which might be avoided, but which might be recklessly and heedlessly precipitated by irresponsible American leaders."

The Reserve Bill and the Dependents' Medical Care Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Army Times of June 4, 1955:

SHABBY SHENANIGANS

Opponents of the Reserve bill used an old, obnoxious political trick to deal the plan what may have been a death blow. That trick is to so load up a bill with unpalatable amendments that even its supporters must reject it.

The House did just that.

First, it adopted, 126 to 87, an amendment by Representative POWELL, Democrat, of New York, which not only would prevent involuntary assignment of a man who has completed active duty to a unit of a National Guard which practiced racial segregation, but also would prevent enlistment of a man in any Reserve or Guard unit which was segregated.

Then it approved, 174 to 56, an amendment by Representative Bow, Republican, of Ohio, which would prohibit assignment of any man who enters service in the future to duty in a country in which the Status of Forces Treaty is in effect.

The first branch of POWELL'S amendment has some justification. Proponents of the bill recognized this, when they offered to strike from the original bill the provision allowing involuntary assignments to the National Guard of those who had a Reserve liability. But the second part was more than an intolerable attempt to seize Federal control of the National Guard by saying whom it could enlist and under what conditions. It also would prevent enlistments in any Guard or Reserve unit which, by reason of its location, may be made up of a single racial group.

When POWELL and 166 others outvoted the 143 who tried to compromise his amendment in a reasonable manner, they took on a responsibility for emasculation of the Reserve bill which they cannot shift to others.

The 167 for their own various reasons have said they prefer calling up World War II and Korean veterans again in the next emergency to trying to work out a program of insuring that nonservice personnel will get Reserve training.

As for Bow's amendment, there has been much heat and little light shed over the Status of Forces Treaty. But now the treaty is law, and operations under it have so far shown few examples of unjust or capricious punishment.

The issue is simply this: Would the American people tolerate presence of armed forces among them without retaining the right to try them for offenses against Americans? How, then, can Americans insist that our men abroad be immune to local law for off-station offenses?

The Reserve bill is not dead. Debate can be resumed at any time. One way to help insure this is for every retread and every re-retread and the organizations to which they belong to let Representatives know what they think of the type of "equal justice under law" which the House currently is dispensing.

NO MEDICARE YET

Just about 2 months remain of this session of Congress. There has been no indication in either the House or the Senate that the long-pending Dependent's Medical Care bill is going to be taken up in that period.

In fact, officials are now exploring a new approach to the problem of providing medical care for service families. An insurance plan is under consideration. Presumably it would be something like the Blue Cross Plan, with the Government picking up the tab, or part of the cost.

Frankly, we think it will be difficult to improve upon the defense "medicare" bill now in Congress.

The pending bill simply states that any service can take care of dependents of any service to the limit of available facilities. Where facilities are not available, the dependent can seek civilian aid, and be reimbursed for expenses exceeding $10 or 10 percent of the costs, whichever is greater.

Maybe, however, an alternate plan would be better.

But, pending bill or alternate plan, something must be done. Despite the services' most strenuous efforts to provide care for dependents, countless service families have had to pay big medical bills because service facilities were not open to them.

If the family of each serviceman who has had to meet such expenses or who is facing the prospect of such bills would write to its Senators and Representatives, detailing its own experience, Congress would be alerted to the need for action.

It is not too late for a medical care plan to be voted this year—if Congress can be persuaded of its urgency.

In Defense of One Who Hates Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the Long Island Press, Jamaica, N. Y., comes the following article by George E. Sokolsky:

Mrs. Manuel Miller, of Bethel, Vt., does not like me. Her antagonism is due to the fact that I am a Jew and she has issued a vicious statement to that effect. This woman has been seized, has been declared insane by Judge Ernest Gibson, whom she attacked and who therefore should not have sat in her case. She has been taken from her home in Bethel, Vt., to an insane asylum in Washington, D. C. She has been treated with a brutality to which Americans are not accustomed.

The fact that Mrs. Miller attacked me or Judge Gibson does not warrant brutal treatment nor does it explain why she should have been taken from Bethel, Vt., to St. Elizabeths Hospital in Washington, D. C. If she is ill, surely there are institutions closer to her home, to her husband, and mother, than Washington.

It seems to me that this is precisely the case that the American Civil Liberties Union ought to jump into to prove beyond doubt that it is fighting for human rights and not only for the rights of those who uphold certain causes.

Mrs. Miller started as an anti-Communist. In recent years, she has become an anti-Semite. She has issued mimeographed circulars containing violent abuse of persons and unfounded statements which, at any rate, she had no facilities to check. She finally advised young men not to register for the draft, which is an illegal act.

But for all this, she should not have been seized; her home should not have been damaged; due process should have been pursued to the very end. There could not have been due process if Judge Gibson determined on her mentality after she had attacked him anymore than it would be fair or just for me to decide her sanity after she had expressed hatred for me.

So the American Civil Liberties Union has this opportunity to see to it that this woman, who regards the ACLU as an arm of American communism, gets a square deal under our laws. If Mrs. Miller or her family does not apply to the ACLU for aid, I do and I hope that my request will be granted. If she is insane, as Judge Gibson said she is, then she should be sent to a hospital nearer home as would be fair. The United States does not want a Siberia even for those whose ideas are unpopular or unpleasant.

And there is another matter that the ACLU might consider with more relation to its stated purpose than its own mimeograph on the subject indicates; that is the broad question of the right-to-work legis-

lation passed by 17 States. On this subject, the American Civil Liberties Union said:

"* * * the history of interference with the civil liberties of labor organizations, in the areas where most of the statutes have been enacted, gives ground for concern that they carry the potential danger of being used—or misused—directly to obstruct the exercise of basic organizing rights like the hiring of halls for union meetings."

Here is a conflict between two rights: the right of the individual to liberty and the pursuit of happiness and the right of labor unions to organize workers. If an American chooses to work without joining a union, by what specific clause in the Constitution is he to be deprived of his choice? Seventeen States have passed legislation protecting him in that freedom of choice, whether his judgment is sound or not.

The ACLU says:

"As a nonpartisan organization devoted only to maintaining civil liberties, we take no position on the merits of the arguments that labor unions make in their organizing campaigns. Our interest is in keeping open the channels of communication through which both unions and employers may present their opinions."

That statement seems to me to beg the question which has nothing to do with employer-employee conversations but with the right of an individual American to determine all on his own whether, in order to work for a living, he must pay dues to a labor union. As a practical matter, he probably will have to join a union and pay dues because so many employers sign closed-shop or union-shop contracts.

But the American Civil Liberties Union cannot recognize practicality or expediency as an excuse for a violation of a citizen's rights.

Exchanges of Persons Unite the Free World—Peace Depends on People Knowing People—No.1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, when the House was debating the appropriations for the Division of Exchange of Persons in the Department of State, I took occasion to call to the attention of the Members the real need for funds for this important, positive program for world peace.

The House made a cut of $10 million in the budget request, but the Senate restored the full amount, $22 million, when it voted on the bill last week.

I would again like to reemphasize the value of this idea of working for peace by getting people acquainted on an international basis. I think that at this juncture of history, this nonmilitary peace offensive does much to enhance the position of the United States in world affairs.

The current issue of America carries an article by W. E. O'brien which outlines how peace becomes more assured when we send our citizens abroad and bring foreign students, leaders, teachers, journalists, and other specialists here. The article is aptly titled "Peace Depends On People Knowing People."

This same issue of America has a very strong editorial pointing out the need for favorable action in the House when the appropriation comes before us. I urge the members of the Appropriations Committee to give serious attention to the compelling arguments presented for restoration of these funds for the Exchange of Persons Division.

The editorial from America is included here for the information of my colleagues.

The gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] have joined me in sponsoring legislation calling for increased attention to our American arts and cultures and providing for a program of cultural interchange with foreign countries to meet the challenge of competitive coexistence with communism. These bills would carry out some of the major proposals advanced recently by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., newspaper publisher, and General Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America.

In his historic speech before the National Press Club in Washington, D. C., on February 26, 1955, Mr. Hearst pointed out that in Russia and the satellite countries sports, ballet, the theater, literature—all are shaped toward aiding communism's long-range scheme of world domination. He went on to say that "preparedness alone will not win for us the battle of coexistence. The Western program of building armed strength should be widened into a more flexible and imaginative strategy for competitive coexstince with the Communists in every field and on every front."

I am happy to be able to say here that a subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee has just been appointed to hold hearings and study the legislation before it calling for distinguished civilian awards and cultural interchange and development. The members of the subcommittee are the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] as chairman, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. DcDOWELL], the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLT], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], and myself.

With the challenging proposals of Mr. Hearst and General Sarnoff before us, proposals which have recently received the wholehearted support of Senator ALEXANDER WILEY and Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, it is my hope that the hearings will be held quickly and that legislation meriting the support of my colleagues from both major parties will be reported to the floor in time for consideration by this Congress.

General Sarnoff had this to say in a letter which he addressed to me under date of May 25, 1955:

There is no doubt that we agree on the necessity for a strong political offensive in the cold war. And, as I wrote in my previous letter to you, I strongly favor study and consideration of all practical and constructive steps to further that offensive.

It seems to me that what General Sarnoff had to say in this memorandum to the President applies particularly to the exchange of persons program and the other cultural interchange programs—such as my bill, H. R. 5040, would implement. General Sarnoff said that one of the major problems facing the country today "is one of attaining the requisite magnitude, financing, coordination, and continuity" of the programs "already being used, and often effectively."

The above-mentioned article follows:

EXCHANGES OF PERSONS UNITE THE FREE WORLD

Congress is now evaluating the United States exchange of persons program as a weapon in the world struggle for men's minds. W. E. O'Brien, administrative assistant to Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, has done us the favor of writing "Peace depends on people knowing people" in this issue to explain why a great many well-informed Americans believe this program, instead of being slashed as the House has already voted to do, should now be enlarged.

The exchange of persons program grew principally out of two important pieces of postwar legislation. As early as 1946, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, a Democrat who is also a former Rhodes scholar and former president of the University of Arkansas, had the foresight to father a bill which provided funds for Americans to travel and engage in study and research abroad, and for foreign students to travel to and from the United States for the same purposes. Under the Fulbright Act funds (restricted to transportation, in the case of foreign students) came from the sale of United States surplus war property abroad.

In 1948, Senator MUNDT, a Republican and (among other activities) former college teacher, coauthored the much broader United States Information and Educational Exchange Act. Funds for this important weapon in the cold war came from annual dollar appropriations by Congress. The interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills part of this experiment, everyone seems to agree, has been notably successful.

Now what would happen to the exchange of persons program if the House axing of the requested $22 million appropriation (including $8.3 million in foreign currencies) to $12 million (still including the foreign currencies) should become final?

Lopping off $10 million of the actual dollar appropriation would, first of all, entirely cancel the proposed expansion of the program in the increasingly sensitive areas of the Middle East, the Far East, South Asia, and Africa. Worse still, it would even further reduce our already inadequate exchanges of persons with peoples in those regions. It would, in fact, just about annihilate the program, we understand, in 31 countries, such as Hong Kong and all Africa, except Egypt. New Fulbright programs planned for Formosa and Korea, two of the most strategic spots in the cold war, would be killed.

What impression would such a deemphasizing of our cultural-exchange policy make on people abroad? The President has asked Congress for $40 billion for our own and foreign military defense in 1956. If we boggle at voting a mere $14 million in dollars for the exchange of persons program, how can we answer the charge that we are relying far too exclusively on material means of defending freedom. We hope the House conferees yield to the Senate, which approved the $22 million on May 31.

Exchanges of Persons Unite the Free World — Peace Depends on People Knowing People—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on May 31 the Senate approved intact the State Department's request for $22 million to expand the exchange of persons program, which the House had cut to $12 million.

Mr. W. E. O'Brien, administrative assistant to Senator KARL E. MUNDT, explains in the June 11 issue of America magazine why the conferees meeting this week should provide generously for this important program.

During the debate in the House on April 14, 1955, on this program I said, in part:

> I say that we are making a mistake if we withdraw from this very important activity—especially at a time when the Soviet Union is placing more and more emphasis on a stepped-up cultural offensive. It has been estimated that in 1953 the number of exchange visitors to the U. S. S. R. was more than 10,000 people. In addition, Soviet artists, scientists, dancers, musicians, and athletes are touring the world trying to create a picture of Soviet cultural superiority.
>
> It is no secret that the men in the Kremlin are active in every section of the world where there may be opportunities for making ideological inroads. We are mistaken, I am sure, if we believe we can capture the hearts and minds of men with an overpowering military machine without giving the citizens of other nations a chance to observe us and to know us better.

Mr. O'Brien's article, Peace Depends on People Knowing People, follows:

PEACE DEPENDS ON PEOPLE KNOWING PEOPLE

(By W. E. O'Brien)

A new phase in the struggle to preserve world peace has set in. Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND presaged its advent in his somber statement, interrupting the Senate's special session last November, on the atomic stalemate which he foresaw.

The rush of events this spring has largely confirmed the belief that the world has moved into a period of intensified nonmilitary competition between the Communist and free nations. It is, as the saying goes, a battle for men's minds. How decisive victories over men's minds can be was underlined at the Bandung Conference in Indonesia a couple of months ago. The courage and conviction with which leaders of non-Communist Asiatic peoples challenged the apologists for Red imperialism, masquerading as apostles of peace and anticolonialism, seems to have blunted the edge of Red China's ambitions to corral the uncommitted peoples of the Orient in its camp.

The Soviet Union's sudden agreement to an Austrian treaty, which came in the wake of the defeat of its drive to forestall West German membership in NATO, proved that Soviet policy has definitely shifted gears. Stalin's policy of antagonizing the free world at every turn had plainly backfired. The amazing buildup of anti-Communist military power, achieved through United States leadership, at least seems finally to have persuaded the tacticians of aggressive Marxism that their bellicosity was heading them into a military showdown. Their new tactic is to muffle the drums of war and to rely on nonmilitary political, economic, and propaganda measures to win the struggle of competitive coexistence with the forces of freedom.

This global shift in Communist tactics requires a reexamination of American foreign policy. Everyone is agreed that for us to drop our military guard would be to tumble into a Marxist trap. On the other hand, the time has come to go all out on nonmilitary phases of our foreign policy. Our military strength has erected a shield behind which we can compete against the Communist world for the deep-down allegiance of people's souls. The final outcome of the cold war will be decided largely by the success with which we carry through the nonmilitary phases of the postwar counteroffensive we have devised to prevent Marxists from enveloping any more peoples than they already have enveloped.

"EXCHANGE OF PERSONS" DIPLOMACY

One of the most important nonmilitary components of American foreign policy since the war has been our exchange of persons program. Under this, foreign students, teachers, journalists, social-welfare specialists, and other leading personalities have been invited to visit the United States as guests of our Government in order to become acquainted with typical American personalities and agencies doing the kind of work in which our guests are themselves engaged in their homelands. These are two-way programs, with properly qualified Americans enjoying a similar opportunity of visiting foreign lands at the expense of the United States Government for similar purposes.

During the past year 7,121 of these exchanges have been arranged. Two-thirds of the exchangees were foreigners invited to the United States to study, teach, lecture, carry on specialized research, or gain work experience. The other third were Americans who went abroad on the same types of mission.

The Department of State, which conducts these programs, calls attention to the fact that many of these exchanges were planned within the framework of projects to meet special situations in different countries. For example, a couple of years ago, Hispanic specialists in international law met in Latin America to promote the study of international law among the Spanish-speaking peoples of the world. Prof. Antonio de Luna, director of the Institute on the History of International Law at the University of Madrid, took a leading part in the discussions, emphasizing the natural-law basis of international law. The Madrid institute was named a center of the group's international project.

Dr. de Luna thereby attracted the attention of officials in the Exchange of Persons Program, who promptly invited him to visit this country in order to see for himself how American universities went about the study and teaching of international law. As a result of his visit, Dr. de Luna has agreed to join the faculty of a large American Catholic university as a visiting professor. No doubt he will contribute toward a much better understanding between the people of the United States and those of Spain and other Hispanic countries. In such concrete ways the peoples of the free world can come to understand each other much better. This common understanding of one another, of course, is essential to greater cooperation between various nations in the achieving of stable, peaceful relations between them.

HISTORY AND STATUS OF THE PROGRAMS

The postwar exchange of persons program has its legislative roots principally in the Fulbright Act of 1946, the Smith-Mundt Act of 1948, and a number of other legislative measures setting up special exchange programs with Latin American countries, China, Korea, Finland, Iran, Germany, Austria, and India. These special authorizations met special needs in sensitive areas of the world where international problems of high priority challenged our ingenuity. The programs are financed both through congressional appropriations in dollars and through the use of money that we have at our disposal in foreign currencies. These are funds which foreign governments credited to our Government from the sale of surplus war materials abroad. Under the Fulbright Act the United States Government can assign these funds to support Americans we send abroad to study or carry out other purposes of this phase of the exchange program.

There are Federal cultural-interchange programs outside those run by the Department of State, but our present interest lies in these latter. The proposed appropriation for continuation of the Department's exchange of persons program under the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts for the fiscal year 1956 is $22 million, of which $8.3 would be in foreign currencies. This is an increase of $6.5 million over the present year's appropriation, largely to cover the costs of exchanges with the Middle East, Far East, south Asia, and Africa as recommended by congressional committees, Vice President NIXON, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, and others.

Instead of expanding the program, the House cut the appropriation from $22 million to $12 million, of which $8 million must still be in foreign currencies. This would leave only $4 million for activities costing dollars and for the administration of the entire program. The Senate on May 31 approved the $22 million intact. The two bills were to be ironed out in conference this week.

It is important to note that private groups supplement the facilities provided by the Federal Government in carrying out these programs. Last year, for example, it is estimated that at least $7.8 million was contributed in this way from nongovernmental sources. This contribution helped to defray the costs of 450 projects involving 3,400 exchanges of persons.

VALUABLE RESULTS ACHIEVED

What evidence have we which would prove that the exchange of persons program in its various phases has actually achieved its purpose of creating better understanding and a greater spirit or friendlienss between Americans and other free peoples? In answering this question we must distinguish between the short-range and long-range phases of this experiment. It is too soon to judge of the long-range results. The younger people from foreign lands who have had the opportunity to visit the United States were selected because of the promise they gave of rising in influence at home as their careers unfolded. In most cases they have not yet had time to achieve much influence.

But we can tell from the good results of the short-range phases that the experiment is achieving its purposes. For example, nearly every one of the Asiatics of real prominence who spoke up at the Bandung Conference in defense of the peaceful purposes of United States foreign policy and in condemnation of the aggressive purposes of Red expansionism has been educated in one of the Western countries. In fact, the Bandung Conference went on record in favor of international exchanges of persons by adopting a resolution declaring that "the most powerful means of promoting understanding among nations is the development of cultural cooperation."

Last November, at the meeting of the National Council of Catholic Women in Boston, President Eisenhower testified that the exchange programs are "increasing intercultural understanding and thereby forging the

bonds of brotherhood and good will among men. They are thus serving the cause of peace in a troubled world." Vice President Richard M. Nixon recently told the Senate Appropriations Committee that his "look-see" tours through Asia and Latin America had proven to him the effectiveness of these exchanges. "If I had to pick one program in the foreign field which was the most effective," he said, "if I had to pick one that was indispensable, this would be it."

A survey by the Bureau of Social Science Research of American University, Washington, D. C., reported that foreign students, after visiting the United States, were favorably impressed by their experience. They thought Americans were "cordial, warm, kind, and hospitable * * * and that this was experienced as quite a surprise." The same survey indicated that foreign students credit us with a high cultural level and strong attachment to noneconomic values. In other words, their experiences here had caused them to revise the stereotype distant peoples often have of Americans as a money-mad breed of vulgar tastes.

A survey which the Department of State itself conducted of about 1,000 returned grantees in 17 foreign countries showed that the majority of them after returning home had engaged in activities favorable to the purposes which the United States is pursuing in the world at large. This was particularly true of our foreign policy, of which the visitors acquired a much better understanding during their stay with us.

Ranbir Singh, editor of the Daily Milap of New Delhi, the capital of India, has gone on record about the way his visit to America changed his attitude toward us. He said that his impressions of Americans previous to his visit—impressions gained mostly from American movies and Communist propaganda—were that most Americans were either crooks or millionaires or both. On our home grounds, however, he found Americans to be neither, but friendly and kind, much like the folks he knew at home. Mr. Singh makes as many as nine talks a day to various groups in India. The newspaper he edits is full of accurate information about us and his editorials are friendly. This kind of offset to the malicious anti-American propaganda Soviet agents pour into India is invaluable to the cause of freedom and peace.

Dr. Elizabeth Burger, counselor in the Catholic Church's women's-affairs program in Germany, has informed almost a million Germans, through her magazine articles and lectures, about her impressions of America. She keeps insisting on the fact that, though the New York skyline is picketed by skyscrapers instead of church spires, as in Europe, it is a mistake to minimize the importance of religion in the United States.

Our diplomats abroad who see the exchange programs in operation overseas are enthusiastic witnesses to its value. United States ambassadors polled on the subject agreed with Mr. Nixon's estimate: "This exchange of persons is our most effective program abroad."

Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt, director of the Department of Education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, who has had considerable experience with these programs, wrote to the Senate Appropriations Committee urging continuance of this experiment.

Finally, we know how important the Kremlin regards its own exchange programs as weapons in its cold war against freedom. All the key people in the Guatemala revolt, according to Mr. Nixon's check, had been sent either to Russia or to Iron Curtain countries to study.

MINOR CRITICISMS

One criticism of the exchange-of-persons program is that enough foreign students come to the United States to study (30,000 in 1954) without our paying their way. The answer is that the Department of State selects young foreigners of proven competence and could get many more from the sensitive areas. It gives preference to those who are particularly interested in such subjects as American history, the social sciences and law and studies which will enable them to promote the well-being of their own people through engineering, medicine, and social welfare. The ability of foreign students to come here without our help depends on many circumstances which have no relevance to the purposes of this special program such as the financial standing of their parents.

Another criticism is that we do not need to make more friends in already friendly countries. In view of the ingenuity of the Soviet Union and Red China in creating friction between us and our allies, this criticism hardly carries much weight. We cannot have too many or too well-informed friends in foreign countries. Besides, who knows whether the younger persons now working their ways toward positions of leadership abroad will be friendly to us when they wield great influence within a few years?

UNWISE ECONOMY

The desire of Congress to economize is always understandable. Before accepting such a deep cut as the House has approved, however, proponents of the program hope the Senate will carefully weigh the value of the particular phases of it which will suffer most. When we consider it a bargain to be able, by multiplying orders, to build a single intercontinental B–52 jet bomber for $8 million, is it wise to refuse less than 3 times that amount to continue in full force for another year our best weapon in the battle for men's minds? For in the end, as the Bandung Conference must have convinced us, it is what the peoples of the world think that will decide who wins and who loses the cold war. Why take chances on losing that battle merely to save a few million dollars?

Our Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very able speech delivered by the Honorable CARL ALBERT, of Oklahom, majority whip of the House of Representatives, at the occasion of the 42d annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington recently. Congressman ALBERT has a fluency and a style in delivering a speech that is enviable, and I am sure our Members would like to read his speech on this occasion.

The speech follows:

GREETINGS TO THE 42D NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS BY CONGRESSMAN CARL ALBERT, OKLAHOMA

Mr. President, it is with great pride that I appear here to bring a word of greeting from by colleagues in the Congress. I am proud that this great organization is presided over by one of my most able and distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]. No Member of the Congress and no person in or out of Congress has worked more diligently or more effectively for the development of the rivers and harbors of this Nation than my good friend, OVERTON BROOKS. I am happy to be on the program with the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, one of the great Amedicans of our time. I am happy to have been able to have served in the House with LYNDON JOHNSON and to have his valuable friendship many years ago. It is a pleasure to be on the platform with the distinguished Republican whip of the Senate, Senator SALTONSTALL, and with my able and affable colleague of the House, SID SIMPSON, who is also my colleague on the Committee on Agriculture. No one has worked harder than SID on questions of flood control, navigation, and conservation. I join all these colleageus of mine from both Houses of Congress in extending greetings from all Members of Congress to your great organization which is devoted to the development of America for the American people. I would probably leave a better impression with all of you if I merely said amen to what my colleagues have already said and sat down.

I have favored all phases of all programs designed to conserve water and soil. I have supported projects in all sections of the country aimed at controlling the ravages of flood and opening up of our waterways for the benefit of man. Conservation of water, conservation of soil, recreation, hydroelectric power, flood control, irrigation—these are things we cannot afford not to do.

We are not a Nation of agricultural surpluses, and what a blessing that is. Yet we can already see over the tops of these surpluses to a time which is not far distant when we are going to be a Nation of agricultural deficits unless we increase our productive capacity. I am proud of the steps being taken along this line in my own State. We are developing upstream flood control in the Washita Basin in a manner and on a scale that will be a model for this Nation. We are thus expanding the breadbasket of our State. This is one of the methods open to the Nation as a whole to meet the challenge which an ever-expanding population is going to place before American agriculture. I not only favor developing and utilizing our great rivers. I want to see every creek watershed in the country and every small river watershed in the country developed and controlled. I want to see dams on the tributaries as well as on the great streams of our land.

Mr. President, I favor the development of the great watersheds of the West for irrigation and reclamation and power. I have driven across our great Western States and have observed the tremendous productive capacity of desert wastelands once it is touched by water. This is one of our great food and fiber reservoirs of the future. But we cannot wait until the future to proceed with their development. We must begin now in order to finish the job in time to meet certain demands of tomorrow.

I favor flood control in the eastern and central sections of our country as I favor reclamation and irrigation in the arid West. In all sections of our country, water, which can be a dangerous enemy, must be harnessed and made the obedient servant of man.

Recreation is not the smallest aspect of our water development program. More and more of our people are leaving the farms every year and going into the cities. The small towns are becoming smaller and the large cities larger. We need more open-air recreation for our growing industrial population.

So, Mr. President, I join my colleagues in all they have said to your membership. You are to be congratulated on being the oldest and most active national organization designed to build up the river and harbor resources of our country. These things are for America. They will serve us well in peace or war. They are indispensable to the future greatness of our country.

Leaky Upper Colorado Reservoirs Can Be Salvaged at a Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the hearings on the upper Colorado River storage project I spent considerable time questioning the Bureau of Reclamation geological experts as to whether or not the gigantic proposed Glen Canyon Dam's reservoir would in fact hold water. It was admitted that the porosity of the sandstone on which the dam would be built is such as to allow seepage around the sides and under the bottom of the dam in the startling amount of 10,000 acre-feet of water annually.

This admitted 10,000 acre-feet of seepage would take place at the relatively restricted area immediately adjacent to the dam. However, the proposed reservoir would extend 183 miles upstream along the Colorado River and another 90 miles up one of its tributaries. The surface subject to seepage in this vast area is tremendous, indeed.

Learning of this point, an enterprising southern California manufacturer has written me:

> We are sure we have the answer to a problem of this kind and enclose a pamphlet describing Panelcraft.

I learned from the pamphlet, put out by the Envoy Petroleum Co., of Long Beach, Calif.:

> Due to wasteful handling * * * up to two-thirds of the total water intake for irrigation purposes is lost to seepage and waterlogging. In 1953, over a million acres of tillable land was sacrificed to waterlogging alone. Thousands of additional acres could have been made productive with the water that was needlessly wasted.

As to the cause of this type of loss, the pamphlet is equally explicit. It says:

> This staggering wastage of water and its costly consequences can be laid to a single cause: Unlined water-handling and water-storing facilities—canals, ditches, ponds, and reservoirs.

The remedy, according to the pamphlet, is equally simple, for it continues:

> Fortunately available today is a low-cost, long-lasting, California-made material—Panelcraft reinforced molded asphalt linings for all types of water-carrying and water-storing facilities.

I am certain that the taxpayers will be happy to know that if, after spending hundreds of millions of dollars for the Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir, it does not hold water, all they have to do is put up an additional billion or so for Envoy Petroleum Co. to line the bottom and walls of 273 miles of wild western canyons. Of course, the taxpayers might want to do something else with the money, like reducing taxes, or building modern highways throughout the Nation, but the proponents of the storage project do not seem to think so.

The Fuss About Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the depression of the 30's should have convinced all of us that national prosperity is geared inseparably to the welfare of American agriculture. With this in mind, all of us are striving to maintain a high level of prosperity for our Nation's farmers.

A week or so ago the House passed H. R. 12, to provide supports for our 6 basic commodities at 90 percent of parity. While high and rigid price supports are not the panacea for all of agriculture's ills, I believe such a program to be a much better approach to that end than the so-called flexible—or sliding scale—program of the administration. Obviously, as shown by the vote on H. R. 12, a majority of my House colleagues agree.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial written by Mr. Earl Beall, editor of the Mississippi Co-op News, which appeared in the May issue of that publication, and commend it to the attention of the Congress:

THE FUSS ABOUT PRICE SUPPORTS

Every day the public furor about price supports on farm commodities grows hotter. Congress is divided in opinion, the big four of farm organizations cannot agree; it is section against section and brother against brother.

What is it all about? What are the basic principals involved and what causes one group or region to have a viewpoint diametrically opposed to the viewpoint of another group or region?

First, let us make one statement with which we believe nearly every farmer will agree. That is, farm people would overwhelmingly support a return to a free economy where there are no protective tariffs to a subsidize industry; no wage and hour laws and other protective labor legislation; no "fair-trade" agreements to maintain a fixed profit for merchants; no monopolies and cartels; no price supports and production controls for agriculture; no cost-plus contracts between Government and industry; no subsidies to newspapers, magazines, and airlines; no fast tax write-offs for big business; no windfall depletion allowances for the oil business, and so on to infinity.

The farmer by nature is a rugged individual. He is willing to tame the wilderness and harness the soil. He will take his chances with flood, drought, and insects and with city slickers in the market place. But to expect him to be the only free-enterpriser in the whole economic system is the same as asking him to revert to the peasant status which was his lot in the Dark Ages. Hence, price supports.

After leaving that one area of near agreement, farmers themselves begin to differ.

First there are the no-price support followers. In national meetings they have been called the "cheap chicken feed boys." They say they want no price supports on poultry and eggs because it would stimulate production by marginal producers which would destroy the market for everyone. Since they want no price support for their product, they would like to see price supports eliminated on the grain feed which they have to buy. Sharing this viewpoint with the cheap chicken feed boys are the livestock feeders who do not have price supports.

Many producers of grain, oil seed meals, hulls and other feeds contend that a radical drop in feed prices will have the same effect on livestock production as price supports for livestock. The marginal and submarginal producers will start producing regardless of whether the incentive is price support or cheap feed. Thus, they say, both the feed grower and the livestock feeder will find themselves without profitable markets if feed price supports are removed.

Then there are those who have cut their costs of production so much since the base period of 1909–14 that they can make a good profit at much less than 90 percent of parity. Production costs have been lowered by extensive use of machinery, improved varieties, irrigation and insecticides. High price supports, they say are causing speculators to plow up the grasslands in the dust bowl and glut the wheat market. These are the sliding-scale boys. They say cut the price enough to keep the newcomers out. Included in this group will also be found the corporation farmers who have moved onto the fertile deserts now served with Government water, where 3 bales of cotton to the acre is only average. They say, everyone should get out except the most efficient. Their concern for the family-unit farm coincides with the philosopsy of Marie Antoinette when told that the people had no bread—"Let them eat cake" is just as popular a solution with farm families today as it was when the callous Empress uttered those tragic words years ago.

Then there are the world traders. They say that we must reduce the prices of our commodities to world prices or we will lose world markets. At first glance, that statement makes a lot of sense. But we must go one step further and see what the consequences will be if we follow that policy to its ultimate conclusion. Take cotton as an example. Thirty percent of the crop is exported. The world traders say that if we don't lower cotton price supports, Mexico will take our markets. Mexico has no wage and hour law. Farm labor can be hired for 40 cents a day. Mexican farmers are not being taxed to save, defend, and feed the world. The Mexican economy is not inflated by artificial stimulants for industry. Therefore, they can produce cotton very cheaply. With average United States cotton supported at about 34 cents, Mexican cotton growers, including some large American firms operating in Mexico, are having boom times.

If we follow the advice of the world traders we will cut the price of American cotton to the point that Mexican growers will no longer find it profitable to grow cotton. It has been estimated that the price will have to drop to 12 cents a pound to produce the result. This means lowering the living standard of the families living on cotton farms in the South to the Mexican peon's level. Already, in 1955, 11,000 Mississippi families have been displaced from cotton farms. Many have moved into the slums of Chicago and Detroit where some will become wards of the Government while they dream of cottonfields white with lint. There are those of us who say that our farm programs should be as much concerned with people as they are with commodities. Incidentally, the cotton-price-support program has not cost the taxpayers 1 dime. The Government has made a net profit of more than $200 million in supporting the price of cotton.

The whole American economy is artifically supported above world levels. If we are going to continue in world trade, the difference can be made up in one of two ways. Either we will have export subsidies or some segment of our economy must take up all the slack of the rest of the country. As it stands now the cotton farmers and

the wheat farmers are being asked to carry the whole load. They are not getting much help from the professional friends of the farmer. We recently heard one of the heads of one of the largest farm organizations in the country make the statement that those who disagree with his sliding-scale philosophy are only seeking to embarass the Eisenhower administration. Maybe he has formed his farm program philosophies for political purposes, but there are honest sincere people who have contrary convictions. It is tough to go into court with your lawyer conceding publicly that the other side has the best case.

Republican Cadillac Cabinet Adopts Public-Be-Damned Attittude in Awarding Antilabor Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Defense Department and other Federal departments and agencies have taken the position that there is no authority in the law for refusing to award a contract to a low bidder solely because of his violation of Federal labor law. Their position is supported, in fact, by findings of the Comptroller General that contracting agencies cannot consider such facts as compliance with the National Labor Relations Act in awarding Government contracts.

While it is entirely proper for the Federal Government to remain neutral in labor disputes where both parties are exercising their rights in conformance with the law, this policy has no basis in fact where one party to a labor dispute has been found by an appropriate tribunal to be in violation of the law. It is clear that barring from Government contracts those companies which have been found to be in violation of the National Labor Relations Act is surely as much in the national interest as denying contracts to those companies which have paid sums of money to Federal employees and contract officers to influence them in the granting of such contracts. It is not a position which can be represented as favoring labor over management.

To do otherwise would be to place employers who do obey the law at a competitive disadvantage by rewarding violators of the law who may be able to underbid their competitors exactly because of their unfair labor practices.

True to the big-business complexion of the present administration and its "Cadillac philosophy" the Department of Defense takes the position that its procurement agencies must remain neutral in labor disputes. What sort of neutrality is it when a Federal department awards a Federal contract to a violator of the Federal law? The Comptroller General interprets the law to mean that contracts must be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder, but how can a company which has been found to be in violation of the law by one Federal agency be considered by another Federal agency to be responsible.

Last winter, when the L. A. Young Co., in Trenton, N. J., and its employees needed a Federal contract to keep the doors open, the Department of Defense awarded a $2 million contract for shell cases to the Kohler Co., of Wisconsin, despite the fact that the NLRB found that the Kohler Co. engaged in unfair labor practices, including several acts of illegal interference during an NLRB-supervised election campaign, restraint and coercion, and discrimination.

I am joining today with Senator MATTHEW M. NEELY and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] in introducing a bill which will prohibit Government agencies from awarding contracts to companies which have been found guilty of an unfair labor practice by the National Labor Relations Board where the violation remains unremedied.

It is a moderate bill, Mr. Speaker, which asks only that companies found guilty of violation of Federal law and of the labor relations policy established by Congress and which persist in such practices be denied Government contracts. This, surely, is a reasonable proposal since it seeks only that the Federal Government shall not reward violators of the law.

Frank A. Nelson, of Racine, Wis., Named President of the American Baptist Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Racine Journal-Times commenting upon the fact that my very good friend and constituent, Frank A. Nelson, of Racine, Wis., was recently elected president of the American Baptist Convention. Mr. Nelson is a member of my church at Racine and the fact he has been elected to head the Baptist church on the national level is a great tribute to the Christian leadership of Mr. Nelson:

ONE WHO MADE GOOD IN TWO DIRECTIONS

This community has a special reason to be proud of Frank A. Nelson, who last week was named president of the American Baptist Convention and, in effect, the lay head of the Baptist church in the northern part of the United States and its widespread missions in this hemisphere.

Mr. Nelson's is a double success story. In one career he has blended success as an industrial manager and leadership in his church, all the way from his own congregation to the international organization of American Baptists. Moreover, he has personally demonstrated that these activities, far from being incompatible, are complimentary. He is in every sense a fine example of a Christian businessman.

With his brothers and associates, Mr. Nelson built a small business into a thriving industry and a substantial employer in this community. But he did not bury himself in that business to the exclusion of all the other developments which should be as important a part of life as a man's business. From the committees of his own congregation to the top echelons of his church, he has given willing and valuable service.

Racine has been honored by the selection of Mr. Nelson as lay head of one of the largest Christian churches in America. He deserves the congratulations and best wishes of the whole community for bringing it that honor.

United States Air Superiority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], that a statement by him on the subject "Our Air Force Must Be the Best," together with a statement from the Boeing Airplane Co., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

There is only one way the United States can achieve and maintain air superiority—that is, by inventing new ways to do new things faster and better. This, in turn, means research and development.

Research of that sort is being carried on at the moment by many great American aviation companies, and one of the leaders is Boeing Aircraft Co., makers of the B–52, which is performing so well for our Strategic Air Command.

The past 10 days have seen our Defense Department make a complete about-face. Finally, that agency decided that the production of B–52's will be stepped up $300 million, or 35 percent. This will give us more striking power in being. It, however, does not go to the root of the problem.

If Russia has overtaken us or outstripped us in air power, the obvious question is: "Why has this unhappy state of affairs occurred?"

The answer: "The civilian leaders in the Defense Establishment and the administration have not recognized, and still do not recognize, the basic cause of our weakness."

It takes trained manpower—scientists and engineers—to perform research and development—but what is the record?

One examples testifies to the attitude of the defense and administration planners on trained manpower. The National Science Foundation, for 1956, requested $22,716,000 for support of basic research. The President's budget clipped this by $4,384,000.

That is a small sum relatively, but it knocked in the head the opportunity to train 1,300 scientists.

Here's another example that goes to the heart of our weakness: In fiscal 1953 we spent $1.41 billion on research and development of new weapons; in fiscal 1955 we will spend $1.30 billion. As the race gets faster—as the threat of Russian air superiority gets greater—expenditures are slashed at the point where it hurts most.

In all this it is heartening to know that the dollars—even though slashed severely by the administration—that are spent in air-

craft production are buying as much as is humanly possible at this point to produce.

In this regard I cite a statement just received from Boeing Aircraft Co.:

"How Do Boeing Methods Help Achieve 'More Air Force Per Dollar'?

"Living in the atomic age, we find that each year makes certain facts stand out in sharper relief.

"The first such fact, now grasped by all thinking Americans, is that the power to inflict terrible destruction on an enemy is no longer ours alone. We know that nuclear weapons have been produced by the Soviets. We know, too, that the U. S. S. R. has aircraft capable of delivering them. Therefore, the major deterrent to war is now, and must continue to be, the superiority of our own air arm.

"At the same time it is clear that a free nation cannot afford to cripple its economy by wasting any of the billions of dollars being spent to maintain air superiority.

"A DOUBLE RESPONSIBILITY

"The Boeing Airplane Company, as a principal supplier of Strategic Air Command planes, has a double responsibility to the public.

"Our first duty is to build the world's most potent bombers and refueling tankers. In doing so we are making weapons for the defense of our country. The consequences of producing aircraft that would place second in the event of international conflict would be unthinkable.

"That is why the Boeing tradition of achieving the utmost in quality is more important today than ever before. Not only our management but all of our nearly 65,000 employees are imbued with the idea of building the best that can be built. Research, design, and engineering all contribute to that objective.

"The company's second and equally vital responsibility is to deliver its products to the Air Force at the lowest possible cost.

"'MORE AIR FORCE PER DOLLAR'

"That meaningful phrase is a slogan of the Air Materiel Command. And helping to make it a fact is one of Boeing's permanent objectives.

"Efficient pproduction is as deeply ingrained in this organization as the urge to build well. It was demonstrated during World War II, in the steadily lowered costs of the B–17 Flying Fortress and the B–29 Superfortress. More recently the constant drive for efficiency has broken records in reducing the number of man-hours needed to produce the B–47 Stratojet bomber and the KC–97 tanker. As a result, many millions of dollars have been returned to the United States Treasury.

"Saving dollars for the taxpayer starts with the design of the aircraft itself. It follows through the planning and setting up of tools and jigs for fast, smooth-flowing production. It is inherent in Boeing's constant emphasis on manufacturing efficiency throughout the production life of the airplane. It is supplemented by workers' suggestions for process improvement—for which scores of cash awards are made each month. Finally it is highlighted by an extreme cost consciousness throughout the ranks of Boeing management.

"MANAGEMENT TRAINING PAYS OFF

"Primary among Boeing's policies is the building of an ever-stronger management team. In an industry producing mechanisms of growing complexity the manager's role of channeling skills for maximum effectiveness takes on more and more importance. For that reason thorough training is a must for every man at the management level. Boeing has established programs ranging from a 40-hour course for supervisors to 6-week university courses for men in higher positions.

"These training programs, along with Boeing's continuing emphasis on efficiency and effective long-range planning, are paying off every day. They are playing a large part in giving America more and better airplanes at lower cost—helping to reach the goal of 'More Air Force per dollar.'

"Boeing Airplane Co."

Postal Service—Historical Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

Postal Service—Historical Development

(By Hon. James I. Dolliver, Member of Congress, Sixth District of Iowa)

The story of postal service is a fascinating tale. It goes back to the earliest days of recorded history. It covers every civilized country of the globe. It utilizes nearly every means of transport. It is used by princes and potentates—and by the humblest citizen. It is the willing and economical servant of great business enterprise and carries messages of affection between lovers. Every phase of modern life enjoys its indispensable service, and receives the benefits of its rapid communication. No instrumentality of our Government comes so close to all our people, and no other serves them so intimately and well.

You who read this, the Iowa post-office employees, honor me to admit me to your company for a few minutes. You share in a most important enterprise. Your work is an indispensable link in a nationwide and worldwide chain of communication joining every citizen with every other.

The predecessor of what has become our modern postal service amounted to nothing more than a messenger service. It existed solely for the transmission of Government orders and messages. There are examples of this type of communication back to the beginnings of recorded history. All early civilizations in all parts of the world made use of the post to some degree. Just as now, it was a vital service. An ancient ruler of the Far East once stated that his government rested on four pillars: His police, his judge, his finance, and his posts. So does our Government today—and the post office is essential.

It remained a courier service until quite late in history. Then, during the 13th, 14th, and 15th centuries, A. D., there came a transition period. The purely Government postal service was opened to the public.

Several factors made personal communications necessary. First was the increased use of paper. Second was the introduction of the printing press. Third was the increased literacy among the people. Fourth was the increasing growth of business and commercial enterprises, with a growing practice of trading abroad.

EUROPEAN BACKGROUND

One early phase of the transition occurred when the University of Paris arranged for the employment of foot messengers to carry communications from its thousands of students back to their homes, many of whom came from foreign lands. It has been suggested that the students, then, just as now, needed some quick and efficient way of sending home for money. At first the messengers were in the exclusive service of the students and teachers. History reports that as time passed the messengers began to carry letters and do errands for people with no connection to the university.

Another step in the transition toward a public service had its origin in the business world. During the latter part of the 13th century the merchants of the Hanseatic League in northern Germany organized a courier service to assist their commercial activities. Later it became customary for traveling trades people to carry letters for others. Gradually a fixed compensation for this service became established.

Historical accounts differ as to the exact beginning of the modern postal service. One historian says the first true public post began with the service originated by the family of the house of Thurn and Taxis of Germany. On March 1, 1500, Philip I, son of Maximilian, appointed Francis von Taxis, "Captain and Master of our Posts."

The historian states:

"Francis's post service ran according to schedule, but the royal treasury presently found it impossible to pay the yearly stipend due him. The resourceful postman * * * demanded that he be permitted to carry passengers and private letters in order to reimburse himself; and this privilege was granted him, provided that he did not allow it to interfere with the speed of the royal dispatches."

The year 1516 marks the beginning of the great Imperial German Post of later centuries.

IN ENGLAND

In England the earliest postal service likewise existed solely for the use of the government. King John, who reigned during the opening years of the 13th century, is the first recorded English monarch to retain a staff of messengers. Activities of the early English post included the maintenance of relays of horses at selected points for the use of persons traveling on official government business.

The transition to a public postal service in England was gradual, taking place throughout the 17th century. The act of 1657 established a schedule of rates. For letters the rate was 2 pence for distances up to 80 miles, and for packets, 8 pence per ounce. Persons riding "in post" were to be charged 2½ pence per mile.

IN AMERICA

Postal activities in the United States date back over 300 years. The first occurred at Boston on November 5, 1639, when the General Court of Massachusetts declared that the tavern of Richard Fairbanks would be the official repository for mail. The act provided for foreign mail only.

The first scheduled transportation of mail between the colonies was inaugurated January 22, 1673. At that time Gov. Francis Lovelace of New York dispatched a mail courier for Boston, following what is now U. S. Route 1, still known as the Boston Post Road. This started as a regular monthly service. Due to wars with the Indians and the Dutch, intercolonial communication was interrupted and the service ended after only a few months.

During the early years of colonization the English King had exhibited interest only in ventures which promised to yield a definite profit. By 1690 the population had grown to 214,000, and a postal system appeared to have moneymaking possibilities.

The King then granted full monopoly rights to Thomas Neale, of London, for the purpose of setting up a postal system in the colonies. Instead of being profitable the venture lost money. But it had several desirable effects. First, it brought about greater unity among the colonies. Second, it aided the development of the postal system and of communications. And third, it gave

emphasis to the growing belief that handling and transporting the mails should be a responsibility of Government rather than of individuals.

But the postal rates were high, and the service was slow and unreliable. Worst of all, the King claimed for his postal officials the right to open and read all letters, thereby destroying all privacy of the mails.

In the year 1753, Benjamin Franklin was appointed the Postmaster General. His first major act was to make an extensive tour of inspection during which he visited all stations in the North and as far south as Virginia. During the tour he took careful note of deficiencies in the service.

Since the rates were set by the King, Franklin lacked the power to lower them even though they were excessive. He therefore devoted his attention to making improvements in the service itself. New surveys were made resulting in new and shorter routes. He speeded up all routes, old and new, and increased the frequency of trips. Mail between New York and Philadelphia was put on a day-and-night basis, which meant that henceforth this mail would travel at night.

Under his guidance the service became more dependable and the use increased. Franklin's outstanding contribution to the postal service was his demonstration that more and better service results in greater use, which in turn results in greater revenues.

For the first 4 years of operation under Franklin's administration the post office showed a deficit. But for the second 4-year period he was able to report a surplus for the entire 8 years of nearly 500 pounds. When this surplus was sent to England it created quite a stir among British authorities as the first sum received from the colonial post office. Annual surpluses were enjoyed by the service in subsequent years: for 1773–74 it amounted to 3,000 pounds.

But Franklin's sympathies were entirely for the colonies in the years preceding the American Revolution. The consequence was that in 1774 he was removed from his post with the service by the British. His dismissal foreshadowed the coming break of the colonies with England.

The post office played an important part in the American Revolution. First, the postal system proved to be the best means of exchanging news, information, and official Government intelligence. Accordingly it helped greatly to unite the colonies, to establish common goals, and to coordinate and concentrate their activities. Second, the act of sending surplus revenues over to the king greatly irritated the colonists. Third, the dismissal of Franklin was regarded by the colonists generally as a seizure of their postal system by their oppressors.

One of the important accomplishments of the Continental Congress was the adoption in July 1775 of the Post Office Act which established, for the first time, an American postal system. It consisted of a line of posts from Falmouth, Maine, to Savannah, Ga. The rates were to be 20 percent below those of the older system. Franklin was named as the Postmaster General at a salary of $1,000 per year. For the rest of that year there were two postal systems in operation side by side—one American and one British. The New York Committee of Safety wrote that "the constitutional post office is now rising on the ruins of the parliamentary one, which is just expiring in convulsions." The English system ceased operations on December 25, 1775, less than a year before July 4, 1776, our Independence Day.

POSTAL SYSTEM UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

While our Federal Constitution was being formulated, due regard and consideration were given to a postal system. Many plans were offered. In keeping with the brevity of the entire document, the Constitution provided that:

"The Congress shall have the power to establish post offices and post roads."

The statement was brief, but the intent is unmistakable. To the National Government went the exclusive power to establish and administer a postal system.

On September 26, 1789, President Washington appointed Samuel Osgood of Massachusetts Postmaster General, the first to be appointed to the post under the new Government.

The following year our young Nation covered an area of about 500,000 square miles, and had a population of nearly 4 million persons. There were 75 post offices throughout the country connected by 1,875 miles of post roads. For the year, 266,000 letters were handled, and total receipts came to $37,935, of which $5,795 was surplus.

For 40 years the postal service was a part of the Treasury Department. That year there were 8,050 post offices, serving 12 million people connected by 115,000 miles of post roads. The Post Office Department handled nearly 14 million letters in 1830. However, the service was still slow. The only means of transportation available were horseback, stagecoach, and water. In some remote regions mail was carried on foot.

1830 marks the coming of the railroad and faster transportation. It was the beginning of a new era of economic development. The postal service both aided and benefited by the transportation revolution. It took at least 20 hours to cover the distance between Washington, D. C., and Philadelphia by stagecoach; the railroads reduced this time to 6 hours. Congress took due notice of the railroads and declared every railroad to be a post road, giving them full status as carriers of the Nation's mail. By 1851 mail was being transported on 10,000 miles of railroads.

Postal officials were not entirely satisfied with the speed of early rail service. The trains ran only during the day. The Post Office insisted that the trains continue on at night. There was an established precedent of nearly 100 years standing for such an argument—Franklin, in his reforms of the Colonial service during the 1750's, had ordered night movements of the mails. The railroads countered with the protests that night movements of trains would be hazardous. However, the Department refused to yield, and night train service became general.

Meanwhile the frontier was being extended westward. Wherever people went postal service followed. In New Salem, Ill., a postmaster was appointed on May 7, 1833. His name was Abraham Lincoln, age: 24; politics, Whig. His post office was located in the store which he owned jointly with his partner. It is said that he carried the letters around in his hat, delivering them as he had the opportunity. Such deliveries occasionally took him out into the country—a sort of rural free delivery on a very irregular basis. The mail arrived anywhere from semiweekly to biweekly, and the volume was never great enough to make his duties arduous or lucrative.

Three years after his appointment the New Salem office was discontinued by the Post Office Department because of lack of business. But Lincoln had since been elected to the legislature and did not mind his dismissal. When Lincoln served in the United States Congress he was a member of the Post Office Committee of the House.

The next big development in the postal service came on March 3, 1847, when Congress authorized the Postmaster General to issue the first postage stamps. It is hard to believe that the use of postage stamps is just about 108 years old. They were first placed on sale in New York City on July 1, 1847. The use of postage stamps simplified the labors of the postal workers. It greatly increased the efficiency of the postal service. You will recall that prior to the use of stamps the postage was generally collected from the recipient rather than the sender of the mail.

The act of 1851 marks the beginning of a new era for the Post Office Department. Henceforth, public service was to be the guiding force of the system. The act provided greatly reduced rates, establishing the 3-cent rate for distances up to 3,000 miles. The distance factor controling rates on first-class mail was completely removed in 1863.

Soon the Postmaster General was able to establish several mail routes to the Pacific coast. Unquestionably it was a wise policy to aid the settling of the great western lands through the maintenance of vital communication links.

No summary of the development of our postal service would be complete without some reference to the pony express. It is one of the most romantic chapters of the history of America.

The first pony express left St. Joseph, Mo., on April 3, 1860. Ten days later the run was completed at San Francisco, cutting the usual travel time in half. The route was nearly 2,000 miles long. It touched Salt Lake City, Carson City, and Sacramento. The route was served by 190 stations where the riders received fresh horses. There were 80 riders, the most famous of whom was Buffalo Bill Cody. The company used over 400 horses; the best that could be found. The service was inaugurated on a weekly basis but it was soon increased to two trips a week. It was a private venture, backed by the funds of private individuals, and it was extremely popular among the early western settlers.

The pony express lasted only 16 months. The high cost of operating the service exceeded the amount of revenue obtained. In addition, the transcontinental telegraph system was completed in October 1861, making the pony express unnecessary and uneconomical. Also the Civil War intervened. Even though the pony express lasted a little more than 1 year, it made an indelible mark on the history of postal communications, and on the history of the Nation. While it existed it served a vital purpose—the establishment of a faster line of communication between the people of the East and those of the West.

MODERN MAIL SERVICE

Another important chapter in the development of the postal service is the establishment of airmail. Experimental airmail services were conducted at Long Island in September 1911. Regular service dates from May 15, 1918, when the War Department furnished pilots and planes for flights between Washington, D. C., and New York City. After August 18, 1918, the Post Office Department took over the operations of air mail service.

By September 1920 we were flying the mail from coast to coast. But the planes did not fly at night. Here was the same problem which had confronted postal authorities on at least two past occasions—an unwarranted delay of the mail. Such a condition could not be squared with the Post Office creed that "the mail must go through." Accordingly, the Post Office Department again was a prime mover in introducing night operations—this time in the field of aviation. On February 22, 1921, the first transcontinental flight took off from the Pacific coast bearing mail. Thirty-three and one-half hours later the flight was completed at Hazelhurst Field, Long Island. Night flying was proven to be practical. A new era for postal service, and for all transportation had been ushered in. The speed of the airmail service is phenomenal. I myself received a letter in Johannesburg, South Africa only 4 days after it was mailed on the west coast of the United States.

Another modern development of postal transportation is the use of motortrucks for intercity movements of the mail. Such use has been developing gradually over a long

period. But recently it has taken its place as an important means of the mail transportion. The truck is quick, versatile, dependable, and it can deliver its load at the post office door. Department officials predict that greater use will be made of trucks in the future.

The newest phase of mail transportation is the use of helicopters in crowded metropolitan centers to get mail from the airports on the outskirts of a city to the post office in the downtown area. Once again the Post Office Department is pioneering a useful means of transportation.

VAST SERVICES TODAY

As you know so well, today the Post Office Department has grown into a vast service institution working day and night. It reaches out to every person in the Nation, supplying them with the vital service of communications. It acts as the link between the Nation's citizens and their Federal Government; between members of families who are separated, and between friends who have occasion to correspond. It is a link between business concerns and their customers. It is a service which millions of Americans take advantage of every day. It is remarkable how much service is offered for the ridiculously low amount of 3 cents. A first-class letter at 3 cents postage is the best bargain there is in America.

I need not tell you that the mail is divided into several classes. Letters and post cards are considered first class mail and receive priority treatment. Magazines and newspapers constitute the bulk of second class mail, while third class mail consists of merchandise and other matter. Fourth class is parcel post. Airmail is the fifth great class of mail.

It is illuminating to contrast the size of the present operations with those of the past. One hundred years ago the Department was handling about 85 million pieces of mail or roughly about 4 pieces for each person. In 1953 the Post Office Department handled the staggering total of 51 billion pieces, weighing over 11 billion pounds, and amounting to 305 pieces of mail for every inhabitant of the United States of America.

The list of various services performed by the Post Office Department is long and impressive. City delivery service, collection on delivery, commemorative stamps, free delivery for the blind, insured mail, internal revenue stamps, money order service, postage stamps and stamped cards, postal savings, registered mail, rural delivery service, savings bonds and stamps, special delivery service, and star route service.

Important as these services are, the public is prone to take them for granted. Each activity of the Department listed here has an interesting history. Here is a brief mention as reported to me by the Department.

The first new service, other than the introduction of stamps, was the establishment of the registry system in 1855. This was done to afford greater security in sending money and valuables through the mail.

In 1858 street boxes were introduced so that postal patrons would not have to go to the post office to mail letters.

Free delivery of mail was inaugurated in 49 cities in 1863. There were 440 carriers so employed for the first year, and the cost amounted to $300,000.

Up until 1861 all mail carried on trains was distributed in post offices. In that year the postmaster at St. Joseph, Mo., tried out a method of sorting mail on a moving train by route agents between Hannibal and St. Joseph in an attempt to avoid delays in mail departures for the West. The experiment was successful. In 1864 the first officially sponsored test of a railway post office car was made on August 28 between Chicago and Clinton, Iowa. On December 22 of that year the Post Office Department appointed a deputy in charge of railway post offices and railway mails. This marked the beginning of railway mail service.

In 1864 the money order system was inaugurated. The service was placed in operation in 139 post offices, mainly to accommodate members of the Union Army who desider to send their money home. Money order service was extended to countries abroad in 1867.

Postal cards were first used in 1873. In 1885 the special delivery service was established to accommodate patrons who wanted prompt delivery of mail upon receipt at the post office. One million special deliveries were made the first year.

One of the most far-reaching developments was the inauguration of rural free delivery on October 1, 1896. On that date five routes were placed in operation in West Virginia. During the first week, patrons on the routes selected received 214 letters, 290 newspapers, 33 postal cards, and 2 packages. Today there are over 32,500 rural routes serving approximately 35 million people.

The postal savings system was established in 1911 as a convenient and safe depository for the accumulation of savings and to encourage thrift. Originally the maximum that could be placed in a postal savings account was $500. Today the the maximum is $2,500.

One of the most widely used services today—the parcel post, was inaugurated in 1913. An early result of the service was a greatly increased exchange of farm products and goods between the rural and urban areas. Parcel post has contributed much to the economic and cultural advancement of the country. The Post Office Department handles more than one and a quarter billion pieces of parcel post matter annually. Insurance and collection-on-delivery services also were instituted during 1913.

FOREIGN MAIL

Today our postal system reaches to every corner of the earth. International postal service actually dates back to 1639. From that date until 1862 a number of agreements were made with foreign governments covering the international exchange of mail. But the general condition of international service was unsatisfactory.

In 1862 Postmaster General Montgomery Blair suggested a conference of interested nations for the purpose of formulating principles which would bring about greater order and uniformity. The following year the representatives of 15 countries met at Paris and adopted 31 principles designed to govern and improve international postal relations. These principles were the nucleus for the first treaty concerning the formation of a General Postal Union.

The first postal congress was held at Berne, Switzerland, in 1874, during which the treaty of the General Postal Union was concluded. The adoption of the treaty resulted in various postal reforms and improvements, including uniformity in rates and in regulations, a general reduction of rates, and the removal of many barriers to international postal communication.

In 1878 the name was changed to Universal Postal Union. Congresses of the Union are held every 5 years to consider necessary revisions. There is another postal union known as the Postal Union of the Americas and Spain, which represents the countries of North, Central, and South America and Spain.

Postal rates and services in the United States compare very favorably with rates and services abroad. And no other country handles anywhere near the 305 pieces of mail per capita handled by our own postal organization.

POSTAL WORKERS

You whom I address know so much better than I the scope and magnitude of our postal services. But to my mind the most important element of the postal system is the people who make it come alive and function, the group of which you are a part. There are well over 500,000 postal workers whose home bases are 41,000 post offices located throughout the land. They carry, distribute, and deliver the vast volume of our mail and perform the innumerable services of the post office.

As postal workers they are important because they are the ones who represent their Federal Government at the everyday level of Americans everywhere. The average citizen rarely sees the President or Vice President of the United States, but most persons do see the postman frequently; nearly every day. Thus he becomes the ambassador of the Government in thousands of post offices and on thousands of delivery routes through the country. At the same time he is a faithful and dependable servant of the people.

Accordingly, at home the postal employee should be treated with the consideration and respect due the members of so vital a group. You are and should be members of your communities. Your calling is a high and honorable one—a truly public and patriotic service. You are dedicated to the performance of an important duty.

We in Congress, who represent not only the postal workers but all the Nation's people in the Capitol at Washington should never lose sight of the importance of this great group of devoted public servants who handle the Nation's mail. Certainly if the home front is indebted to you, by the same token the Congress is also under deep and lasting obligation, and it should make every effort to treat you fairly and generously.

For my own part I have tried in every proper way to recognize the splendid contribution made by our postal workers to the national welfare. You have had, and so long as I continue to serve the people in the Congress, will have my earnest and conscientious support and vote.

Picking a Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the President's answer to a question at a recent press conference adds new importance to the role of the Vice President. However, it would be impossible for me to improve, in the brief space allotted, the presentation made by James Reston, of the New York Times, in his article of Sunday, June 5. The article is as follows:

A FEW THOUGHTS ON THE ROLE OF MR. THROTTLEBOTTOM

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 4.—President Eisenhower defined three rules this week for picking a Vice President, and since he may have a hand in this decision next year, what he had to say is important.

"The Vice President," he said, "should not be a 'nonentity.'

"The Vice President should be selected in relation to his capacity to govern the country in the event of the death of the President. And the presidential nominee," he concluded, "should resign his nomination at the convention if he does not get the like-minded vice presidential running-mate he wants."

This statement had current political significance, for in effect, it warned the conservative wing of the Republican Party, which has been flirting with the idea of nominating Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND for the Vice Presidency next year, that he wants a running-mate who agrees with him and not one who, like Mr. KNOWLAND, has constantly differed with him on important foreign policy questions.

THE WIDER SIGNIFICANCE

The statement had a wider significance, too, for it brought the whole question of the role of the Vice Presidency into public discussion early in the campaign when it can get the attention it deserves.

Fortunately, General Eisenhower has taken a serious view of the Vice Presidency ever since he entered the White House. Much more than Roosevelt or Truman, he has sought to train Mr. NIXON in the duties of the Presidency. He has given him a primary role in the National Security Council. He has sent him to Asia and Latin America to study the intricacies of foreign affairs. He has used him as a negotiator on Capitol Hill, and he has backed him up whenever Mr. NIXON got into trouble.

Nevertheless, the institution of the Vice Presidency is still lagging behind the pace of American history. The Vice President is not being selected with as much care as he should; he is still not set up to help the President as he could with the intolerable cememonial duties of the White House; and he is still not provided with the day-to-day staff work that would keep him constantly abreast of Government policy, particularly in the field of foreign affairs.

On the question of selection the President probably goes too far in suggesting, in effect, that he should choose the Vice President, for this would give to one man alone the power to choose the Presidential successor.

On the question of the Vice President's role in helping the President with the mounting ceremonial duties of the Presidency, both General Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON have shown a willingness to share these burdens, but the Vice President has not received the facilities to enable him to carry out the larger role.

He has no official residence and he has no official residential staff. Even Calvin Coolidge, who was not a spendthrift, recognized the need for this long before the Capital was playing host every week or so to visiting foreign dignitaries.

On the question of the Vice President's staff assistance the problem now is not that this assistance is unavailable but that it works spasmodically. When the Vice President goes to Asia, the State Department provides him with staff in preparation for his tasks. But when he goes to Chicago he is likely to go off without being carefully briefed and to develop themes, as he did on Thursday, quite contrary to official views on important subjects.

For example the official view of the coming Big Four conference is that it is merely exploratory and is not likely to settle, or even to attempt to settle, important questions, yet Mr. NIXON told the Rotary convention in Chicago, to the astonishment of the State Department, that "this conference could be the world's last chance to settle differences peacefully and avoid a catastrophic war."

AN OLD IDEA REVIVED

Finally, since it is possibly too much to expect that the American people and their politicians will choose their Vice Presidents with great care, some careful thought should be given to the old proposal, revived by Senators J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida.

This would divide the 4-year presidential term into two 2-year periods, corresponding to the congressional elections. If the President died in the first phase, the Vice President would fill out, not the full 4-year term, but merely the first phase, until the next congressional election. Thus the Nation would have a direct and comparatively prompt choice of a presidential replacement.

There is no likelihood that any of these things will come to pass, however, on the initiative of the politicians themselves. President Eisenhower is sympathetic because he understands the problem and sees the Vice Presidency, not as a consolation prize or a political device, but as a symbol of the imperative and growing need for continuity in a world that depends very largely on American leadership.

But even President Eisenhower is not likely to take action on these things without the spur of public opinion.

Mr. Speaker, in the immediate future I plan to introduce legislation to augment a number of the suggestions mentioned above. I might say that many of these ideas are not novel, although it takes an article such as Mr. Reston's to start the car. For example, my wife has constantly suggested that the Congress has been negligent in regard to adding the necessary physical properties which the role of the Vice President requires. He is called on more and more for special duties and yet he has neither the staff nor the establishment to adequately acquit himself of these functions. I am presently reviewing past suggestions on the subject prior to introducing legislation. Any Members who would be inclined to join in a sensible, non-partisan proposal will receive an enthusiastic reception.

Address by Alf M. Landon at Memorial Day Exercises in Charge of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion Post, and Their Women's Auxiliaries, Topeka, Kans., May 30, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting into the RECORD for today an address deliverd by the Honorable Alfred M. Landon, former Governor of my State of Kansas. This address was delivered at the Memorial Day exercises in charge of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion Posts, and their women auxiliaries, Topeka, Kans., on Decoration Day, May 30, 1955.

I feel that Governor Landon has emphatically pointed out the everlasting obligation and gratitude we owe the veterans of all of the wars of the United States, especially those who gave their lives that we today can enjoy all of the privileges and freedoms of this great nation. I would further like to point out that Governor Landon feels we may be entering into a new era of world peace but cautions us that we should not become complacent and unduly reduce our strength as related to national defense.

The address follows:

MEMORIAL DAY, 1955

Decoration Day is as American as baseball and ice cream sodas.

It is a medley of automobile races, double headers, parades, picnics, and loving, tender expression of memories by families and organized remembrances by patriotic organizations of those entitled by their service to their country to the flag on their last resting place.

There is not a soldier's grave anywhere in the Orient and the Occident, outside of the Communist countries, that will not have its little American flag placed there by our two great and revered veterans organizations, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion, and their women auxiliary organizations. In America most of them will be decorated with flowers also.

The older countries of the world erected statues to victorious commanders—monuments to memorialized battles won—but America is the only country in the whole world to pay tribute on a personal basis to the memory of the contribution to their country made by its departed servicemen.

In no other country in the world but America could a day that was started in memory to the living and the dead of a victorious army be adopted by the defeated army as well, as a Memorial Day to its soldier boys, and gradually become a national holiday in memory of the soldiers of succeeding wars and of civilians as well.

All over this great and beloved country of ours in practically every cemetery, from the most remote and perhaps somewhat neglected to that of the cities, there is an annual trimming and grass cutting. The families of the departed servicemen and civilians alike gather to beautifully symbolize their remembrance, esteem and affection with flowers.

All over the world, wherever American soldiers are stationed or American civilians are gathered, such meetings as this are occurring, and memories of love and affection are revived even for a few brief moments so that even though there does seem much of tinkling symbols and sounding brass in Decoration Day doings, there is also the golden cord of happy comforting memories and touch of tender hands in the decoration of the graves of the departed.

Just as the first Memorial Day marked the beginning of an era, so it might be that the Memorial Day of 1955 marks the end of an era in American political life.

The first Memorial Day marked an era when the memories of the Civil War were perpetuated for many years both in the North and the South at the ballot boxes. The memory in Kansas of Andersonville Prison and in Missouri of order No. 11 governed for many years the voting of many thousands rather than current issues of constantly expanding mighty people. That was perpetuated by the sons and daughters of Union veterans and of the Confederacy in song and story.

The last two elections in the solid South evidence voting on the issues of today, rather than that of the blue and the gray.

Decoration Day, 1955, might mark the start of another era—and that is a different note by the Soviet in international affairs.

It is not plain yet whether it is Russia's obvious interests that are behind the Soviet's new peace gestures, or whether it is another Soviet trick. It is plain that it is to America's interest and the free world's interest to find out by meeting with the Soviet.

I do not know of any 4 months since V–J Day, beginning with the serious internal conflict in Russia evidenced by the fall of Premier Malenkov, Stalin's successor, on last February 8, in which so many significant events have occurred that mark a turn in foreign affairs and give the hope of avoiding a holocaust of a third world war.

These events are: Malenkov alive and not in prison. Few would have bet a plugged nickel on that 4 months ago. The mere fact that Malenkov still has a job is a circumstance so singular in Soviet history as to suggest the weakening of rule by tyrants—a necsary prelude to government by the proletariat. Other important occurrences are the fading away of the Finnish oil tanker crisis; Iraq's mutual defense treaty with Turkey; the unexpected defeat of communism in the Andhra state election in India; the Japanese anti-Communist election results—the first meeting of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization; the West German-France and Italian ratification of Western European union; the anti-Communist attitude of the Bandung Conference; Marshall Zhukov's correspondence with the Overseas Club in Washington and President Eisenhower; climaxed by the Austrian Peace Treaty by the Soviet in which it abandons its previous position on many major items of great importance; the German vote in favor of rearmament; the Soviet abandonment of its belligerent Yugoslav policy for patching up better relations with Tito; the anti-Communist results of the British election, and the coming conference of the heads of four great Governments of Russia, France, England, and America.

In that 4-month period, Russia has completely reversed its position on both domestic and foreign matters of great import.

Whether that about face is a genuine change of policy or a mere temporary shift in tactics—whether it is caused by internal weakness or an attempt to create weakness in the free countries—only time and exploratory negotiations can tell.

I do not think anyone, for 1 minute, feels that we should let down our guard or cease to strengthen our national defense.

But at that, this is a rather impressive series of events to occur in 4 months. We must be willing to accept them at their face value, at least, for the purpose of negotiations and exploration as to their full meaning.

Are all those shifts and reversals by the Soviet simply a lure to fool hapless humanities longing for peace—as empty of fulfillment as the previous Communist official statements and commitments?

Or does the fall of Malenkov on last February 8 date the effect in the Soviet of creeping doubt and fear as to the soundness of the theories and doctrines of Karl Marx, Lenin, and Stalin?

After all, Molotov is the only original Bolshevik left in the Communist hierarchy that was willing to suffer martydom for his beliefs.

The rest of the neo-Communist members of the Soviet may well be undergoing the reaction of all dupes when they realize that contrary to the teachings of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin, the capitalistic democracies are not decadent—their "innate contradictions" predicted by Stalin do not exist—that their strength and unity has increased instead of declined—that their standard of living has steadily risen—while that of the Communist countries has steadily lowered.

Despite all the Communist palaver about communism's "fresh spiritual makeup" of man, the naked fact remains that from the start the Soviet only maintains itself in power by wholesale arrests, slave camps and executions.

Then, perhaps, the most potent factor of all in the Soviet's uneasy pause, is the rising military influence which threatens to engulf the Communist Party leadership.

The party functionaries must know and fear that a continuation of a policy of guns instead of butter ultimately means a military man on horseback.

Therefore, it is not so much the foreign policy the new and growing military leader believes in—whoever he is—as the inevitable development of that new military dictator inherent in the bellicose Communist imperialist planning for world conquest—that worries the Communist Party bosses who know their history.

The quick shifting in the slave states from heavy industry to consumer goods—then shortly back to heavy industry, and now back to agriculture—with the usual fall of official heads that is historical to all tyrannies' change in policies—certainly evidences an uncertainty approaching the jitters among the Soviet hierarchy.

So possibly we may be approaching the period of the fulfillment of the sacrifices, and the suffering, of all our servicemen of all wars, in their efforts to bring to all races everywhere Americas creed that all men are entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Memorial Day 1955, a hesitation, a pause, or an incipient stop, in a world traveling a rapid gait to destruction.

Does it mark signs of a new frame of mind in the Soviet plans for world conquest that might mean the beginning of a glowing and happy period in the life of all mankind?

Or does it mark only a temporary change of tactics by an impassive Soviet and no genuine change in its Genghis Khan objectives which ultimately mean the return of mankind to the caveman existence from which he came?

That is the crucial—the vital question. We must not for a single moment relax our vigilance or building our military strength. We must be prepared to use our tremendous power in concert and unity with NATO and SEATO—as a collective force for peaceful conditions in the world. We must be equally prepared to seize every opportunity to develop real accord among all nations having honest intentions of shaking hands—instead of the mailed fist.

I do not for one minute think that we are seeing the end of the cold war—as some of the more optimistic are hoping. I think we will continue to live for many years—in an armed camp—in a period that can neither be called world peace nor world war. It will be armed existence rather than coexistence. But it will be existence that may enable nations to develop mutual interests that will make a coexistence possible.

Needs of Mammoth Cave National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article written by Ray Gaines, the distinguished editor of the Park City Daily News, concerning the needs of Mammoth Cave National Park which appeared in the June 2, 1955, issue of the Park City Daily News, of Bowling Green, Ky.

The article is as follows:

Following a setback last year when attendance was curtailed during construction of a new access road, the number of visitors to Mammoth Cave National Park again appears to be on the increase.

Figures released by park officials show that 9,269 persons passed through the park's gates this Memorial Day weekend in comparison with 8,375 during the same 3-day holiday last year.

Of these thousands of visitors, however, it is probable that only a comparatively few spent the night within the park boundaries. The rest either made overnight stops at motor courts and hotels in the park area, motored to other sections to spend the night or returned home to sleep.

It is certain that one reason more tourists did not spend the night in the park itself is because of the inadequacy of the accommodations there. By this we refer both to the desirability of some of the existing accommodations and to the insufficiency of accommodations.

There simply are not enough guest rooms at Mammoth Cave National Park to take care of all the tourists who would like to spend the night there during much of the summer season and some of the rooms that are available just aren't of the type that invite a stay of several days.

All of which is by way of taking note of the fact that there is one new hostelry in the Nation's national park system.

This one—the Jackson Lake Lodge—is situated in Grand Teton National Park in Wyoming. Completed during the past winter, it will be open for the first time during the upcoming tourist season there.

The new lodge is described in a piece by Theodore J. Wirth in the Bulletin of the Louisville Automobile Club.

The main lodge building accommodates only a limited number of guests, but it also houses dining facilities, an auditorium and shops, as well as a tremendous lounge with an 80- by 90-foot picture window which frames a magnificent view of the Teton mountain range.

Most of the accommodations for guests are in cottages grouped near the main lodge. Altogether, some 700 guests now can be accommodated and plans call for this number to be increased to 1,000 later.

Aside from the splendid arrangement of guest accommodations, which we understand is in line with latest concept for hostelries of this type, one of the most interesting points the writer brought out pertained to how this new lodge was financed.

Apparently no Federal funds were used. Instead, the lodge was built by the Jackson Lake Lodge and Transportation Co., under sponsorship of John D. Rockefeller.

What a boon a similar lodge at Mammoth Cave would be to the nearby national park and all of southern Kentucky.

Fluoridation of Drinking Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I desire to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Miss Elizabeth F. Haswell, 233 Northview Road, Dayton, Ohio, on the fluoridation of our drinking water.

Miss Haswell's letter follows:

DAYTON, OHIO, *May 31, 1955.*

Hon. ROY WIER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my thanks to you again for your leadership in attempting to protect the Nation from the fluoridation of its water supplies. While in Washington recently I stopped in your office and spoke to your secretary who told me that one reason why the bill 2341 did not get further was that it was considered that fluoridation was a local matter since water did not travel in interstate commerce. I have been thinking that perhaps more emphasis should have been made on the fact that processed foods from regions with artificially fluoridated

water contain a higher concentration of fluorine even than does water. I have read that the Beechnut Co. has installed machinery for removing fluorides in their Rochester plant, because they thought that the concentration in some of their foods would not otherwise be safe. I am wondering how many food processors have had the conscience to do likewise.

In this connection you no doubt know that Mr. Bratton of the Anheuser-Busch Co., of St. Louis, has called attention to the fact that there is a law or regulation in the Pure Food Administration against shipping foods in interstate commerce which contain sodium-fluoride. I quote the following from the article Impact of Municipal Water Fluoridation on the Food and Beverage Industries, by George S. Bratton (technical adviser, Anheuser-Busch, Inc., St. Louis):[1]

If the wet milling of corn is carried on with fluoridated water (1 part per million), it is estimated that the concentrated steep water would contain more than 6 parts per million of fluorine and the corn sirup, more than 5 parts per million. The starches, dextrines, oil, and feeds would contain less.

When John L. Thurston, Acting Administrator, Federal Food and Drug Administration, issued a statement on July 17, 1952, that the administration would not prosecute food and beverage manufacturers for shipping interstate products made with municipal fluoridated water "unless the process involves a significant concentration of fluorine from the water," he did not make the wet corn millers feel very cheerful. The author also knows that the malt sirup manufacturers are just as unhappy over their fate, because malt sirup made with fluoridated water may contain up to 8 parts per million fluorine.

The statement of Mr. Thurston, it seems to me, is especially startling in view of the case reported by Miss Birmingham at the hearings on H. R. 2341. On page 48 of the bock of the hearings she reports the case of the *U. S.* v. *the Commonwealth Brewing Co.* (D. C. Mass. 1945), a case in which the defendant corporation was found guilty and fined $5,000 and the defendant personally was also fined $5,000 and given a jail sentence of 6 months which was suspended while he was placed on probation for 3 years. The cause for these punishments was the inclusion of only a tiny bit of fluorides in beer for a preservative (0.5 part per million). Now a much greater concentration is to be allowed in foods processed in artificially fluoridated areas according to the statement reportedly made by John L. Thurston.

It seems to me that there is certainly a basis for Federal action against fluoridation. I have read that the practice of artifically fluoridating water is now forbidden in Sweden even on an experimental basis and that Switzerland and France will also not have it.

Sincerely yours,

Miss ELIZABETH F. HASWELL.

[1] Published as a part of Journal American Water Works Association, vol. 45, No. 4, April 1953, p. 366.

Proposed for Range Reseeding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in the Great Falls (Mont.), Tribune emphasizes the need for cooperative range improvements on our national forests:

PROPOSED FOR RANGE RESEEDING

The livestock industry of the intermountain West will benefit if a congressional conference committee accepts Senate increases in funds for range reseeding and improvement programs. The need for an extensive reseeding and improvement program remains acute on millions of acres of public forest and private lands in the vast intermountain area of which Montana is a part.

Originally, only $280,000 was budgeted for the cooperative range improvement program. The sum was boosted to $400,000 by the House of Representatives and to $700,000 by the Senate. The latter figure is more in line with Federal commitments under the cooperative program formula calling for an outlay of 10 cents per month per head of cattle and 2 cents per month per head of sheep.

Approximately 300,000 cattle and 1 million sheep are grazed on the national forests of the intermountain region at least part of the year. More than 105,000 cattle and 480,000 sheep are grazed on the national forests in Utah.

Though expensive, the investment will pay out in forage yield, which can be increased 10 to 20 times. Beef cattle grazed on reseeded rangeland show tremendous gains over those on other types of range.

In addition to increasing the country's meat supply and improving the economy of an important western industry, the national forest range reseeding program improves and stabilizes vital watershed land. Members of Congress would be well advised to adopt the Senate's figure for the range improvement program, the minimum amount needed for essential rehabilitation.

The item to which this editorial refers is in H. R. 5085, now in conference.

I believe the Federal Government in its capacity as landlord is responsible for needed improvements on public property.

The need goes far beyond the $700,000 figure approved by the Senate. Recently, I asked Mr. Richard E. McArdle, Chief of the United States Forest Service, specific questions about the programs of reconstruction and maintenance of Government-owned range improvements on national forest range lands. He replied in part as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., April 15, 1955.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN METCALF: This is in reply to your letter of March 25 requesting information relating to programs of reconstruction and maintenance of Government-owned range improvements on national-forest range lands.

Current statistical information representing minimum total estimated costs * * * is summarized in the three following tables. Separate estimates are shown for Montana, region 1, and nationwide for all Forest Service lands:

1. Requirements during the next 5 years for reconstruction of deteriorated improvements now in critical condition.

2. Requirements for annual heavier than normal maintenance of rapidly deteriorating improvements to bring them up to standard during the next 5 years.

3. Requirements after the 5-year period to keep presently constructed improvements maintained to a reasonable standard.

1. TOTAL RECONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS DURING 5-YEAR PROGRAM

	Fences		Driveways		Water developments		Total requirment (amount)
	Miles	Amount	Miles	Amount	Number	Amount	
Montana	1,138	$1,707,000	----------	----------	554	$311,300	$2,018,300
Region 1	1,221	1,831,500	----------	----------	661	371,500	2,203,000
Forest Service	10,312	7,756,800	855	$196,000	6,535	1,605,000	9,557,800

2. ANNUAL HEAVY MAINTENANCE DURING RECONSTRUCTION PERIOD

Montana	1,626	$113,800	318	$19,100	1,847	$73,900	$206,800
Region 1	1,744	122,100	584	35,000	2,202	88,100	245,200
Forest Service	20,446	564,700	2,773	90,400	13,206	405,800	1,060,900

3. NORMAL ANNUAL MAINTENANCE AFTER RECONSTRUCTION PERIOD

Montana	1,626	$97,600	318	$15,900	1,847	$55,400	$168,900
Region 1	1,744	104,600	584	29,200	2,202	66,100	199,900
Forest Service	28,300	463,400	3,238	73,500	13,886	335,100	872,000

The minimum annual cost of the proposed 5-year program and annual maintenance of existing improvements thereafter would be:

Annual requirements for 5-year program of range facility reconstruction and maintenance

	Reconstruction	Heavy maintenance	Total funds needed each year for first 5 years	Annual maintenance thereafter
Montana	$403,700	$206,800	$610,500	$168,900
Region 1	440,600	245,200	685,800	199,900
Forest Service	1,911,600	1,060,900	2,972,500	872,000

The above estimates of needs do not include funds for new construction; revegetation; rodent, grasshopper, poisonous-plant and noxious-plant control; or other closely related range-improvement practices.

* * * * *

We trust this is the information desired.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD E. MCARDLE, *Chief.*

The Address of Hon. Burris C. Jackson, General Chairman of the American Cotton Congress, at Harlingen, Tex., Thursday, June 2, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following speech of my very good friend, the Honorable Burris C. Jackson, of Hillsboro, Tex., which he delivered at the annual meeting of the American Cotton Congress held in Harlingen, Tex.:

Ladies and gentlemen, distinguished guests, it has been my privilege for some years to address this congress and outline its theme. This year, in tribute to this remarkable valley and to its wonderful people who are our hosts, we have chosen the phrase "Cotton's magic valley" as our keynote.

But we will dwell only briefly on this term as it applies to this garden spot of the Rio Grande, because there are many among our hosts who are better qualified to brag about the valley and who will show us this magic valley before this congress ends.

Today I want you to consider with me another valley. I want you to view with me the valley of opportunity for cotton—a valley that is truly cotton's magic valley.

This valley lies before us first, because our fiber is the most versatile fiber known to man. Despite all research efforts of the man-made fiber producers, it has been, and is yet, impossible to incorporate into any one of them as many desirable qualities as are in cotton to begin with.

This valley lies before us because of the revolution that is taking place in cotton—because of what is happening in promotion and in research in all its phases from field to fabric.

It lies before us, finally, in the very people who are charged with cotton's destiny and in the generations who will succeed them. Many of us are so close to cotton that we have come to accept its versatility as a matter of course. We do not remind ourselves often enough of its amazing quality superiorities.

We all know that cotton is the most launderable of all fabrics, but have we stopped to consider why? Do we capitalize fully on the fact that it is stronger when wet than when dry, that it can stand vigorous agitation, high temperatures, and strong alkaline detergents? Do we recognize that it keeps its shape, strength at the seams and retains its whiteness, that it bleaches better, and that it is less likely than any other fiber to retain stains, soil, and odors?

And launderability is just one of the many inherent qualities which make up this magic valley of opportunity for cotton. Cotton has strength and stretch stability—it can be made shrink resistant and can be constructed either to stretch or resist stretching.

Cotton fabrics, more than any other, combine an excellent high absorptive rate and capacity with ability to dry relatively quickly, considering the tremendous quantity of water they can hold. Cotton's absorbency permits ready passage of water vapor which contributes so much to comfort in wearing apparel.

Many of us give little thought to cotton's quality of warmth. Yet it is possible to make garments using flannel inner linings with an outer shell of light-weight wind- and water-resistant fabric. These provide excellent warmth as well as great durability under conditions of severe usage.

Conversely, cotton is unexcelled in its quality of coolness. Cottons—sheer and porous for summer comfort—are yet strong enough to meet the demands of active wear.

Cotton is more comfortable because it isn't sticky or clammy like synthetic fibers or doesn't scratch like wool. It is free from static charges which—in the case of other fibers—provide unpleasant electrical shocks and cause clothing to cling unbecomingly.

We could enumerate other characteristics in which our cotton excels—important ones such as durability, resistance to heat, and its color fastness and adaptability to dyes.

But there is little need to remind those of you who are scientists of the overwhelming quality superiority that naturally lies in cotton. Here is the first big area in the valley of opportunity for cotton.

The second landmark in cotton's magic valley is the revolution that is taking place in cotton. Again, we are so close to some of its developments that we have come to regard them as commonplace; yet, in the span of just a few years, we have seen the pattern of cotton production change completely. In every phase—beginning with improvement of cotton varieties through breeding, and carrying through processing, manufacturing and marketing—efficiency has been stepped up remarkably and quality has been improved.

What has happened right here in the lower Rio Grande Valley is a dramatic example. Just the other day it was my pleasure to read an article in the Monsanto magazine. It described how the valley turned to cotton after the disastrous freeze of the 1951–52 season almost destroyed the citrus industry—how long rows of cotton replaced the fruit trees and a crop of 632,000 bales was produced. And today cotton remains your biggest cash crop—last year's production of over 400,000 bales bringing some $80 million to this area.

The story emphasizes that this would not have been possible without the fruits of modern research—irrigation for life-giving moisture; chemicals to kill insects, weeds, an diseases; fertilizer for high yields; and machines which have made it possible to reduce the labor requirements for a bale of cotton from about 155 hours to only 10 hours.

The past 20 years have brought about such new developments as the mechanical cotton picker, defoliation, chemical weed control, flame cultivation, organic insecticides, fungicides, and gins which can efficiently process rough-harvested cotton.

In this period, too, we have noted the virtual disappearance of the mule from the cottonfield. Millions of acres formerly required for raising livestock feed have been released to grow crops of food and fiber for mankind. Multiple-row tractor-powered equipment, airplane application of agricultural chemicals, techniques such as hill dropping and cross cultivation—all are innovations within the lifetime of nearly every person in this room.

During the period from 1936 through 1940, our yields averaged 239 pounds of cotton per acre. For the past 5 years yields have averaged 297 pounds of cotton per acre, and last year's 341 pounds set an all-time record, We have every reason to believe this trend will continue.

At the same time, some wonderful things have been happening to the quality of our fiber and to the products made from it.

Twenty-five years ago growers used some 500 cotton varieties—many of them inferior and far away from the breeder. By 1952 this number had been cut to 28. More important, about 90 percent of the acreage was planted to the 10 leading varieties. This means most of our acreage today is being planted to well-adapted, high-yielding varieties that are close enough to the breeder to retain their desirable characteristics.

In the 10-year period from 1941 to 1951 the average length of cotton fibers was increased a sixteenth of an inch. In the late thirties and early forties a good-quality cotton was expected to have a fiber strength of 70,000 to 75,000 pounds per square inch. Today, fiber strengths of 80,000 to 90,000 pounds per square inch are common. Breeders have some experimental cottons with strengths of from 125,000 to 135,000 pounds per square inch. These will become available when yield and other qualities have been improved to the needed level.

A dramatic example of what can be achieved through plant breeding is evidenced in the development of Pima S–1, a cotton that is equal to Egyptian Karnak in quality, and with a yield that enables this country to compete with Egyptian-grown cotton.

Looking at another side of the quality-improvement picture, we find that through chemical finishing, cotton can be made resistant to soil, wrinkling, mildew, and flame. It can be made water repellent. Treated cottons take on a variety of embossed, glazed, and sculptured textures, opening up new horizons for the dress designer.

With special finishes, one kind of cotton print cloth can be transformed into any 1 of at least 20 different kinds of effects—pique, taffeta, crepe, plisse, and many others.

Yes, we have made some wonderful progress in increasing our efficiency in growing, processing, marketing, and manufacturing cotton and in improving its quality. But there is another significant phase of this revolution. I'm speaking of the unparalleled popularity that cotton enjoys today in the market place.

We firmly believe our industry organization, the National Cotton Council, has been the greatest single force in bringing this about. When the council was organized back in 1939, it recognized that the job of selling cotton was just like the job of selling anything else. Customers would choose cotton if it offered the best value and if their attention was directed to it through promotion.

One of the council's first efforts was directed toward the Nation's top designers. It sold them on the remarkable improvements that were being made in cotton. The council knew that in capturing this high-style market it could generate interest in cotton in all price ranges of women's apparel and in household furnishings as well.

It was extremely satisfying to me, therefore, when I picked up my copy of Time magazine a few weeks ago and saw the picture of one of these designers on the cover—a designer who has long been a friend of cotton and who, in fact, once headed the board of judges in one of our Maid of Cotton contests.

This designer—Claire McCardell—is credited with a new trend in fashion, a trend that is termed the American look. It is best described in one of the paragraphs of the Time cover story which read something like this:

"At Manhattan's Lord & Taylor, a young housewife twisted in front of a three-way mirror, inspecting a cotton dress. 'Just what I want,' she said. 'Smart, you know, but casual'."

Claire McCardell says clothes should be made to be worn in comfort, and only comfort can create sense-making style. The Time story points out "that the demand for casual clothes has been a mainstay of the vast and complex fashion business. It is a risky business, yet all over the Nation upward of 14,500 women's apparel manufacturers are taking the risk. They employ about 450,000 people and turn out about $6 billion worth of goods a year."

To me, this story has powerful significance for cotton. What fabric best measures

up to the American look—a look that demands comfort, versatility, and value along with high style? I do not have to answer that question for you. It has already been answered in the beginning of this speech.

This is just one example of the results that have been accomplished through a continuing, hard-hitting campaign to sell the versatility of cotton to the consumers of America.

Since 1947, cotton has gained more than 300,000 bales in the women's wear market. Cotton's share of the market has increased from about 23 percent to over 35 percent. Cotton has met its competitors in this most prized of all markets and turned them back. While it was registering a gain of better than 300,000 bales, its competitors lost more than 150,000 bales.

Today cotton, besides rayon—its major competitor—faces orlon, nylon, dacron, dynel, acrilan, saran, vicara, fiberglas, and paper. The capacity of the Nation's synthetic plants is more than five times as much as it was back in 1939. The research and promotion programs of the synthetic producers are many times greater than those which disturbed us back in the thirties.

In the face of all this, cotton's total domestic market has not declined. It has expanded by 50 percent. In the late thirties it was averaging around 6 million bales per year. In the last 5 years, it has averaged around 9 million bales.

So we see that there has truly been a revolution in cotton. It has maintained its strength in the face of the stiffest kind of competition. This strength is a landmark in our magic valley—the magic valley of opportunity for cotton.

Our cotton industry is a big one. More than 12 million people depend on cotton for a livelihood. Today, however, there is a unity of purpose among cotton's people that few would have visualized 15 years ago. We have an unswerving faith in our product and are working intelligently and unceasingly to improve and promote it. You who are attending this meeting are among the leaders in this task, and as such are a part of this bright area of the valley of opportunity for cotton. Your brains, your energy, and your enthusiasm are its guideposts.

We are reminded of Moses who was led to the mountain top to view the promised land for which he so long had labored—a valley in which he was never destined to set foot.

"And he gave Joshua a charge, and said, Be strong and of good courage; for thou shalt bring the children of Israel into the land which I sware unto them."

We have come a long way to reach this valley of opportunity for cotton—have crossed some mighty rivers and scaled some stubborn peaks. Now this new land lies before us. But to claim it we must be strong and of good courage. That is our challenge to you as we stand before cotton's magic valley of opportunity.

The Work of the Commission on Reorganization of the Goverment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a copy of an address made by former President Herbert Hoover on Thursday evening, May 19, 1955, before the national industrial conference board and over a national radio hookup entitled, "The Work of the Commission on Reorganization of the Government":

Your committee of this conference toward better government asked me to review the work of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government up to now.

I wish to read you three passages from the revised edition of Aesop's Fables.

Once upon a time complications happened in the government and the young doctors were called in. They gave all the verbal injections for the viruses and the verbal antibiotics for balancing the budget. Yet the budget did not balance. So, the old family doctor was called in for consultation. He thumped about a bit and came up with an idea. He said, take two antiwaste pills every morning and night.

But the patients all moaned and said, "But, Doctor, that will destroy our morale."

The second fable is:

One upon a time a mere citizen-reformer tried to quickly reform a political mind. But, he said, "You don't know the art of being a reformer. Reforms begin after the next election."

The third fable is:

Once upon a time the Commission on Reorganization of the Government said some restraining words affecting 1 of the 1,000 pressure groups represented in Washington. That pressure group said, "We deeply respect your words. But it is only the other 999 pressure groups that are badly in need of reform and we will help you." They said our appropriations are very necessary. Our Commission opined that they could spell the words "very necessary" with less than nine ciphers attached to it. Their reply was, "Our spelling is absolutely necessary to save the Republic."

THE AUTHORITY

This is the *n*th-plus-1 Commission on Reorganization of the Government in which I have participated in 33 years. Most of such Commissions have been set up by Presidents hopeful that the Congress would listen to the words of wisdom.

In time Congress also became annoyed and concluded to express itself. The preamble of the law establishing the Commission, over which I presided 5 years ago and again today are much alike. This one says:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business in the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government. * * *"

They obviously did not wish to leave out anybody in the executive branch. Then with a certain air of suspicion, it instructs the Commission as to what it must deal with:

"Eliminating duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions;

"Consolidating services, activities, and functions of a similar nature;

"Abolishing services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of Government;

"Eliminating nonessential services, functions, and activities which are competitive with private enterprise. * * *"

That last line about Government competitive enterprises came back to roost in a report last Monday.

The Commission of 5 years ago was for various reasons unable to deal with policy questions. The authority of this present Commission is, however, wide open. This law says:

"The Commission may propose such constitutional amendments, legislative enactments and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations."

But lest you become frightened, I may disclose to you that we do not intend to toy with the Constitution of the United States.

Also, if you will sometime read the whole law, you will find that the Congress did not want our forces turned loose upon them for they state that we should look into all agencies "except the Judiciary and the Congress."

This law also contains a new authority absent from the last Commission's law. It says, "the Commission * * * may subpena witnesses and documents and administer oaths." And this applies not only to the public, but to Government officials. I presume this all means we can report inaccuracies to the Attorney General.

Just to relieve your minds, we have refrained from that form of publicity.

ORGANIZING THE WORK

Under the more limited authorities of the first Commission of 5 years ago, we restricted our efforts to straightening out the structure of the executive branch, its housekeeping and the removal of roadblocks to self-reform. That job of repairs was big enough to take 2 years of labor at that time.

Because of the many problems settled by the Commission of 5 years ago, and because of the wider demands and wider authority from the Congress this time, this present Commission undertook a different approach to the problem. This time we mostly organized our investigation and our recommendations not department by department, but along functional lines straight across the whole of the executive front.

In making this straight-across functional investigation, we, for instance, examined and reported upon and made recommendations in 1 document as to the parts of 71 agencies which give medical aid and as to the 104 agencies, parts of which make loans, guaranties and insurance.

This is no trivial job. There are about 1,400 different agencies in the Government spending $63 billions a year. To do the job, I scarcely need to tell you that we set up some 20 task forces, many of whose leaders are speaking before your sessions. More than 400 leading executives and professional men have joined in this work. All of them are men of distinguished experience in the task for which they were chosen. They have served devotedly during the last 20 months at great personal sacrifice. The Nation owes them a great debt of gratitude.

Last Monday, after some 18 months of hard work, we got around to that remark in the law about elimination of those functions which are competitive with private enterprises. You may have noted that we found them in many agencies of the Government.

There appear to be somewhere between 2,000 and 3,000 of them. We have not had the time to dissect all of them.

When we came to look into the history of these Government business enterprises, we found most of them were created in wars and emergencies for some special needed task. But when the task was completed, each had aboard it an empire-seeking bureaucracy and a large pressure group which benefited from it. With these high inspirations, they developed an extraordinary longevity. One of them lasted 36 years and lost money nearly every year. Some of these enterprises are necessary; some are noncompetitive.

Many of them in their accounts claim they earn a profit and are, therefore, a benevolent institution. But all of them are exempt from Federal taxes. Very few of them pay

any interest or amortization of the capital the Government had invested in them. And many of them do not include overhead personnel in their expenditures, or pensions and other "fringe benefits." Also, they do not mention the increased taxes the Government would receive if the business were done by private enterprise. Naturally, they are joyous in the demonstration of their great capacity to compete with private enterprise. Our Commission made the remark that this was a strange proceeding in a Government pledged to fair competition.

In a few cases, having no hope of completely recovering our national philosophy of life, we recommended that the Government competitor at least be put on a self-support basis so as to pay his own expenses. The wails of those agencies and the pressure groups have spread across the land with an accompaniment of impolite remarks.

The loss is not wholly the taxpayers' money. It is also a loss by injury to the vitality of the private enterprise system. It is a destruction of freedoms.

Initiative, ingenuity, and invention seldom come from Government business enterprises. These qualities are not stimulated by their form of accounting and the open doors of the United States Treasury.

Aside from maintaining an economic system of free enterprise which has produced the highest standard of living in all the history of mankind, this system has amply proved its virility in national defense. It provided the inventiveness and the productivity which, second only to the valor of our officers and men, won for us both World War I and World War II.

AN EXPERIMENT

As an example of one of these functional cross sections of the Government and what can be done about it, I may recite an experiment of one of our task forces. It belongs in our department of "the birth control of documents." You no doubt have heard from a number of the 4,700 different varieties of questionnaires the Government sends each year to the commercial world and also to confuse plain people.

Our energetic task force on paperwork management in part I of their report made recommendations that would have $250 million a year. In part II of their report they relate an experiment. They set up 29 committees in various business groups and secured their views on what could be done to simplify Government questionnaires and still give the Government the information it must have. With these constructive suggestions, our task force members, as a catalyst, brought these industrial committees into meetings with 32 different Government agencies concerned. These meetings have already brought about simplifications which the task force states will save the Government over $5 million a year; and save those industries over $10 million a year. We do not regard that $15 million as revolutionary, but it is 6 times the cost of this whole Commission work.

Having proved its case, the task force suggests that there is room for this catalytic action in the 4,000 forms and reports that they did not examine and a few hundred million more savings. We are recommending that the Government set up a catalyst that works 365 days a year, less holidays.

The Commission has completed and published reports on nine of these functional cross-sections of the executive branch. You will receive 5 more within the next 3 weeks and there are several more in the mill.

The recommendations in our reports are of two sorts. One is: Recommendations or suggestions to the administrative agencies which can be carried out within their present authorities. The other is: Recommendations to Congress for legislation. There are in the first 9 reports about 250 administrative suggestions or recommendations. Many of these have already been adopted. The points for legislative action are about 170 in number. It does not mean 170 bills to be passed. Possibly nine bills would cover these points. Some have already been introduced, and more are to follow.

Now, to improve your higher learning as to civil government you can buy these reports from the Public Printer at prices varying around 45 cents each. Just to indicate that they are not expensive, I may tell you that the annual budget documents will cost you about $6.75. It is no doubt a romantic document. But it weighs 5 pounds and is set up by the printer in such a way that you cannot read it in bed.

We believe our reports also relate strange things but we have had them set up by the Public Printer in pocket form for your easier homework. As a matter of fact, you can buy the whole lot so far published for less than a high-class novel, and they are a better sleeping pill, provided they do not raise your temperature.

Our job is to search out the systems of organization and administration which need repairs. Some of the ways of managing were good enough before the Government multiplied its size about 14 times in 25 years. Some of these faulty systems are due to obsolete legislation. Some are due to the sacrosanct character of bureaucratic empires. Some are due to the pressure groups that profit from the presesnt setup. Some of these systems are due to the primary human emotion of resentment to being waked up.

The problems we deal with are mostly beyond the remedy of any single officials. And I may say at once that most of the responsible officials in our Government are dedicated and able men and women who are themselves struggling to unwind these tangles.

In demonstrating the weaknesses of certain systems of organization, we, in order to prove it, occasionally presented a "horrid example" of what is happening. Here is where we depart from abstract discussion into the world of furious protest. They make an unfavorable impression on pressure groups and some agencies. So far at least we have not replied to their remarks. That may come later.

Our job is to find ways of saving money. I may tell you that in the reports which we will have completed in the next few days, our separate task forces estimate that an aggregate of $6 billion of savings could be made to the taxpayer. And beyond that there could be returned to the Treasury about $7 billion of money which could be provided otherwise. And there are still more to come.

I may emphasize that when we talk about savings, we talk about the elimination of waste and not the strangulation of either our defense or the stifling of public welfare.

Our Commisison is not always unanimous, but when you get a recommendation it is usually by a large majority. Nobody can expect that the 12 serious and eminent men of this Commission will always agree about everything.

At the time the Commission of 5 years ago finished its work, loud cries went up from most of the buildings of Washington. There was a barbershop blues incorporating such words as "Your figures are wrong." "You are ignorant. You are unrealistic." "You are reactionaries. You are radical. You seek to destroy the foundations of the Republic."

The chorus was: "It must never come to pass."

Yet 5 years later 70 percent of those recommendations had been adopted and great consequences in more efficient and more economical government have flowed from them.

I am confident that the pressure of American commonsense will secure 70 percent of our present recommendations in the next 5 years.

We have received extraordinary support from the press of the Nation. An analysis of a mass of editorials clipped from newspapers from over all parts of the country shows well over 90 percent favorable as against under 10 percent of brickbats. Some of the brickbats come from the business world.

There is an overall purpose in this work far above the chatter of upset persons. The Republic is beset by many dangers. There is one danger within our power to control. That is the waste which brings in its train our unbalanced budgets. And as sure as the sun sets, continued deficits will bring decreased purchasing power of wages, salaries, and income with all the tumults of striving of groups to protect themselves.

Our job is to show a safe road to a balanced budget. And this is no trivial job. Its accomplishment is vital to every cottage in this land.

But over and above even that, many of these reports spell out ways to strengthen the foundations of the Republic.

Suns, and Skies, and Clouds of June

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of June 4, 1955:

SUNS, AND SKIES, AND CLOUDS OF JUNE

Once more the earthly planet in its journey around the sun is approaching that wonder of the summer solstice—that season when long lines of boys and girls troop out of high school and college, newly aware that the magic word "commencement" means what it says.

We are moved to join invisibly the luminous company of very important and almost important persons upon the palm-decked platforms and add our few words of counsel to the millions that are being spoken.

Young men and women, boys and girls: The times are just as tremendous, the latent problems just as great. But you face a somewhat brighter world than did your precursors, the emerging academic generations of the past 8 years.

For one thing, and in a frankly narrow vein, you are the smallest class in several years—and for unknown years to come—to descend upon the colleges and upon the welcoming workaday world. And welcoming it surely is. For business is humming, and "short" and "insufficient" are the adjectives applied by statisticians to the supply of workers to fill the jobs. And as for the colleges—they will be seeking somewhat less frantically for beds in which to sleep you and for chairs in which to teach you.

In short, the competition by you is lessened and the competition for you has heightened—a phenomenon as fraught with ultimate dangers as it is with immediate daises. No one as yet has discovered a formula for a perpetual boom.

To you who are entering college (for whom this is still a choice), and to you who are leaving (for whom it is a "fait accompli"), let us say that for his immediate future the technically trained has the inside track. But

in the long run? A puzzled father was overheard recently. His son preferred liberal arts to engineering. "An A. B. is fine," he moaned, "but where do you go from there?"

Where? A personnel expert quoted by Fortune magazine says, "The man with the A. B. degree often ends up being the president."

The world looks a bit brighter in other ways, too. Granted willingly that international communism has changed its tactics, not its goals—those new tactics allow more room for reason, instead of force to get in its work. And at home true Americanism has found its voice. Not only have Americans become aware that the Communist conspiracy has been a peril and not a myth. They have also come to realize that it is a conquerable peril and that they need not destroy their freedom with one hand while they try to protect it with the other. You breathe a clearer, purer air today.

But these things do not merely happen. Progress in human affairs is not self-energizing and automatic. Your parents' tax dollars fought off misery-invited communism in Greece; boys you know turned back aggression in Korea, and statesmen you know about risked their futures in ordering them to do it; courageous people you have read about risked their reputations speaking out for decency despite the demagogues.

You are, indeed, the happy class of 1955. Now, hold tight your diplomas and get going!

A Bill To Amend the Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Representative ROY W. WEIR, Democrat-Farmer-Labor, of the Third District in the State of Minnesota, introduced in the House of Representatives today a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to include the employees of large interstate retail chain stores and department stores.

In introducing the bill, he said: "The proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act would remove one of the great inequities and injustices under the present act. The amendment would not apply to small corner grocery or drug stores or to similar retail establishments not doing an interstate business but engaged solely in local retailing. Neither does it apply to small department stores nor to small chain stores which do little interstate business. Furthermore, the amendment would enable these small retail outlets to complete more effectively with the larger ones which would be covered by the amendment.

"If the amendment which I have introduced today should become law, every employer who has more than five retail establishments doing interstate business, or having one or more retail establishments in such business with a total annual volume of sales of over $500,000, would have to pay the minimum wage prescribed by the statute. At the present time, the law provides for a minimum wage of 75 cents an hour. An employer covered by the amendment would also have to pay time and one-half for all hours worked in excess of 40 in any workweek or in excess of 8 hours in any one working day."

Representative WIER went on to say: "There are approximately 5.7-million employees working in retail establishments in the United States, representing about 15 percent of the total nonagricultural employment in the country and constitute a part of the employment force which should not be discriminated against under the Federal wage-hour law."

The proposed amendment would cover some 1.7-million employees in the interstate retail store industry, including variety store chains which employ about 71 percent of all variety store workers. The largest of these is the F. W. Woolworth Co. with 1,834 stores and 95,000 employees, being about one-fourth of all variety store employees.

The A. & P. Tea Co. has some 4,600 stores with an annual volume of sales of about $4,- billion. Safeway Stores, Inc., has 1,849 stores; employs about 40,000, while the Kroger Co. with 1,644 stores has some 30,000 employees. S. S. Kresge Co. with 681 stores employs about 35,000; W. T. Grant has 500 stores and works 23,000 people, while J. J. Newberry with 476 stores normally hires 32,- 000 individuals.

Department store and mail order chains account for about 37 percent of all department store employment. In this field, there is the J. C. Penny Co. (1,647 stores; 56,000 employees, annual sales volume in excess of $1.1 billion), Sears, Roebuck & Co., 699 stores; 120,000 employees, annual sales volume of about $3 billion), Montgomery Ward (568 stores; 53,000 employees), Marshall Field Co., (8 stores, 20,000 workers), R. H. Macy (26 stores, 24,000 employees), Federated Department Stores, Inc., has about 34 stores and 25,000 employees in subsidiaries, such as Bloomingdale Bros., New York City; Filene's Boston, and Fedway Stores of Texas, New Mexico, and California. The Allied Stores Corp. has about 73 outlets with 28,000 employees in Massachusetts, California, Texas, New York, and New Jersey.

"The number of employees working in retail chain drug stores," said Representative WIER, "runs into many thousands in such chains as United Cigar-Whelan Stores Corp., Peoples Drug Stores, and the Rexall Co., while clothing specialty stores, like Bond's and Lerner's, have more than 10,000 employees.

"This amendment will have little effect upon the total wage bill and profits of these large interstate retail businesses, since the number of employees (who are paid less than the present legal minimum of 75 cents an hour) is only about 85,000 or 5 per cent of the total number of their employees. In 1948, for instance, the total payroll for such stores equaled only 12 percent of total sales. Similar percentages ranged from a low of 8 percent, for retail good stores, to a high of 19 percent for retail furnishings and appliance stores.

"In the United States there are about 1.4 million retail establishments which employ some 5.7 million people, but only 37,000, less than 3 percent, are of the chain or multi-State type. This 3 percent represents about two-fifths of the total retail employment. It is estimated," said Representative WIER, "that as of September 1953, less than 3 percent of the country's retail outlets had a total volume of sales in excess of $500,000, but this same 3 percent employed almost 50 percent of all retail people in the country."

Representative WIER further pointed out that, "this amendment has full support and sponsorship of the Retail Clerks International Association, AFL, which is the largest and oldest union in America devoted exclusively to improving the working conditions of retail store employees."

He said, "I am going to do everything within my power to secure the passage of the amendment that I have introduced today to raise the standard of living of the lowest paid group of workers in the country."

Taking Bearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered last Saturday, June 4, by the Honorable James A. McConnell, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Agricultural Stabilization, before the American Cotton Congress, Harlingen, Tex.

Mr. McConnell is one of the ablest men in Government. He has taken the lead in working out a sensible cotton export program. His speech should be widely read. It is one of the soundest and finest ever delivered on the cotton question.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAKING BEARINGS

(Remarks by James A. McConnell, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Agricultural Stabilization, at a meeting of the American Cotton Congress, Harlingen, Tex., June 4, 1955)

I cannot honestly say that it is a pleasure for me to address this meeting today. In fact, I—a novice in cotton—can think of no excuse for appearing before this distinguished group, except that I said yes in a moment of weakness.

Regardless, it is a great honor to be invited to attend your conference. It is just that discussing cotton policy, when some of the important answers are not yet known, is a tough assignment.

Under no stretch of the imagination do I presume to be a cotton expert, nnd I have no license to address you as such. On the other hand, looking at the cotton situation the experts haven't been doing so well. Perhaps under the circumstances I can speak with humility as a layman.

While I am not an expert on cotton, I have spent more than 35 years in the commodity markets—both buying and selling. And never in all my experience have I seen a situation where, when you have something to sell, you announce a year or so in advance that you will not meet your competition.

But that is just what we have been doing for several years with our cotton, setting a point below which we will not sell and thus letting the competition run rampant against us, both in selling and in production.

They have known what to do all right. Foreign cotton acreage is expanding at our expense. The use of synthetics has been increasing, again at the expense of cotton.

I have already stated that we don't have all the answers, but let's do a little job of "taking bearings." We can have a good look at the serious surplus situation of the wrong grades of cotton on one hand, and the deficit of acreage for farmers on the other.

First, let's take bearings on our present cotton policy. Where has it led us with its rigid support features and its rigid export sales prices, geared to the support level?

It seems certain that if we continue this policy we will continue to give up historic American markets to increased foreign growths. You know the story better than I, and I need not cite a lot of statistics. One factual comparison will show what's happened.

Foreign cotton acreage averaged a little under 40 million in the 5 years from 1945

through 1949. It jumped to an average of more than 56 million acres from 1950 through 1954—with the total going above 60 million in 1954. Part of this, of course, was due to postwar recovery. In contrast, United States acreage went down around 7 million acres between 1953 and 1955.

Again, as we hold up prices and limit market supplies, substitutes take over a larger and larger share of the potential outlets for cotton. It is estimated that world consumption of synthetics last year was the equivalent of about 10 million bales of cotton, of which about 3.5 million bales was the United States portion. Synthetics and other competitors have expanded and will continue to do so in a situation where the cotton program holds an umbrella over the entire market.

The Commodity Credit Corporation will probably have around 8 million bales in inventory when it takes over 1953 loan stocks this summer, and 1954 loan stocks later in the year. Our past policy still in effect will insure a continuation of heavy government holdings, unless we continue to cut acreage with all its attendant evils. I judge that no one seriously thinks we can travel further in this direction.

Now let's take our bearings on an extremely important factor in the whole situation. I refer to the "cotton" Congress in Washington. It writes the laws which control our cotton programs.

Here we see definite indications of understanding and a courageous facing up to the realities of the situations. Senators and Representatives have been speaking out, some of them very boldly, on the basic issues. They are calling attention to the vital necessity of recapturing our export position, as well as realistically serving our domestic outlets for cotton. They see the great danger in drastically reduced cotton acreage. And they recognize the need for better balance and more flexibility in both price support and export programs, so that American cotton can move in the market.

While we are talking about the Congress, let's take some bearings on the law itself—the legislation which controls the operation of our cotton programs.

The first thing we find here is that the present legislation tends to freeze cotton price supports at the maximum 90 percent of parity. Even under the Agricultural Act of 1954, provisions of legislation serve to hold cotton supports at the top of the flexible range. Under the formula of the legislation, production controls take effect before any price adjustment. In fact, under present legislation, it is not likely that cotton price supports would drop materially below the 90 percent top under any probable conditions in the foreseeable future.

The shift to the new or modernized parity formula, scheduled to take effect for the 1956 crop, will bring a slight adjustment. Experience has certainly shown us that a rigid support level—regardless of its value as a temporary expedient to meet a current emergency—can lead to more real trouble if continued on an indefinite basis.

There is another problem in the present legislation which leads to unbalanced pricing and resultant troubles. I refer to the present law requiring the use of Middling ⅞ as the hinge of the price-support program.

It is generally recognized that Middling ⅞-inch has not for many years been a representative quality for American upland cotton. The situation is very different than it was when that quality was adopted as the base. Development of improved varieties and other factors have resulted in a marked increase in average staple lengths. The market calls for less of the shorter lengths and more of the others.

As a consequence of sticking to this obsolete formula, the average price support level for all cotton is thrown out of balance. The situation also serves to encourage production of shorter staple lengths—much of which, for lack of market demand, finds its way eventually into CCC stocks. Changing to a more representative base would bring premiums and discounts more in line with the true value of the cotton. Desirable adjustments could be made in support rates for various qualities.

The New York Cotton Exchange 16 years ago changed to Middling 15/16" as the base for futures trading. Its board of governors has recently recommended a current change to Middling 1"—again in recognition of changing conditions.

A comparable change in the cotton price-support law would certainly seem to be a step in the right direction.

I have already mentioned the fact that, under present legislative provisions, it is not likely that cotton price supports will drop much below the 90-percent maximum—no matter how great the need might be for changes to permit needed adjustments. The support formula as now written sets a supply level 8 percent above the determined normal supply before any adjustments in the support level can begin to take effect.

The program as now operated under the present legislation virtually sets a price level for all CCC sales—both domestic and export—at the "105 percent of support" level which legally governs the minimum price for all domestic sales. If we sell cotton abroad below the domestic price, and make no other changes, we will drive some United States cotton manufacturers out of business. Our textile men would be at a serious disadvantage in competing for foreign sales, and they would need special protection against imports of competing manufactured goods, made from cheaper American cotton than is available to them.

We must not forget that the American cotton mill is the best customer the American cotton farmer has. Therefore, in any cotton-export program, we have to bear in mind the effect of such a program on the domestic textile industry, which buys about 9 million bales of United States cotton and exports the equivalent of about 700,000 bales. This is just another of the serious problems we face in trying to work out sound answers for cotton problems.

How about the farmer in all this? The support programs were intended primarly to help him, and taking bearings on his place in the whole situation is probably most important of all.

In the final analysis, the farmer is the one who has the first and most direct stake in market outlets. If markets are dried up and lost, sooner or later the blow will come right back on the producer. Special measures cannot go on forever plugging up holes left when real markets are gone.

As already mentioned, the producer feels the effect of an unbalanced situation most immediately in the form of acreage controls—limits on his production which are mandatory under the law in the present supply situation. And the producer is already deeply hurt on this score. With present reduced acreage, he cannot operate at full efficiency. If he is one of the thousands of small farmers, he may not be able to operate at all. Producers have a considerable investment in their farm plants, and they can quickly reach the point where loss of volume more than offsets any benefits from attempts to hold prices at set levels.

The results of this taking bearings do not spell out a very encouraging situation, but I am afraid it's a true reflection of what we can expect if we continue to stick rigidly to our present policies and regulations.

It's obvious that one of our first needs is a clarified export sales policy. We need a policy which will keep our cotton in a realistically competitive position, quality considered.

President Eisenhower recently summed up the question of export policy and our international responsibilities as follows:

"The United States cannot be satisfied with the position of holding its own supplies off the market and accumulating surpluses while other countries dispose of their entire production. Accordingly, the United States will offer its products at competitive prices. At the same time, the United States will not use its agricultural surpluses to impair the traditional competitive position of friendly countries by disrupting world prices of agricultural commodities."

That's a clear expression of sound policy, but in actual practice we have not put our cotton into a competitive position. This is particularly true of certain grades and staples.

It must also be remembered that much of what we have been able to export recently has moved abroad with the help of Government financing.

Considering our export programs, and clarification of our sales policy, it is important to have a proper perspective on the size of the job. We don't need a fire sale. We are not faced with the problem of putting a price on exports to move 15 million bales next year, or 10 million bales, or even 8 million bales—the size of the probable CCC inventory.

We are thinking in terms of an export program for the coming marketing year which will move around 5 million bales. That's only a million bales or so above exports for the current year, and it isn't a goal which should scarre anyone or disrupt world prices. We want every cent we can get for our cotton, but we cannot be bound by advance price-fixing announcements which will emasculate our sales policy.

It is important to make a definite start toward reduction of the surplus, but we do not have to do the whole job in a single year. Considering the fact that this year's reduced acreage should mean a smaller crop, we think we can make a satisfactory adjustment during the year ahead by exporting somewhere around the 5 million bale figure. The carryover is expected to be a little above 10½ million bales this August 1. If we can export 5 million bales, we can hope to reduce the carryover by about 3 million bales or perhaps more during the year, depending of course on the size of this season's crop.

The changes in sales policy which might be needed to export that much cotton—and more important to put the world on notice that we are changing direction and moving back toward our normal place in world cotton trade—need not be drastic enough to be upsetting. We intend to operate on an orderly basis.

We know, as well as you do, that it is very important to get decisions as quickly as possible on cotton policy. But we also know that it would be a mistake to act without a full and careful reappraisal of the whole program.

There isn't any easy way out of our problems—no cheap package of solutions. If there had been, we would have announced it before now. As a matter of fact, it has taken time just to get at the facts of the basic situation—the problems we must try to solve.

This is a double barreled problem. It is apparent that any change in cotton policy which does not include the beginning of some fundamental corrections in the law itself, made concurrently, will fail of a long-term solution.

We also know that any program which does not recognize the needs of all segments of the cotton industry, including manufacturers and shippers as well as producers, will be likely simply to multiply problems for the future. Solutions must be for the long pull, and not just temporary expedients.

If it costs to get things straightened out now, let's be sure that it is a one-time cost, and not a continuing expense to the industry—and to the Treasury.

The administration is deeply concerned with the long-time interests of the American farmer. We intend to keep working toward this objective at all times. In line with this objective, we must avoid falling into the trap of easy answers which might look attractive on the surface—but which could do more harm than good in the long run. And we are thinking primarily of the producer, the farmer who turns out the crops upon which the entire cotton industry is built.

Aware of the need for speed in getting answers, we are working on the overall cotton questions almost continuously. We are conferring regularly with Members of Congress and with farm organization and industry representatives. As you know, early last week the Secretary of Agriculture appointed a special cotton export advisory committee. This committee has already held a preliminary meeting with us in Washington. It is coming in again in a very few days.

We are going to keep right on driving until we come up with some better answers. We hope to have them soon, and hope they will be the right ones—even though it will probably not be possible to wholly satisfy anyone who has an interest in cotton.

The situation calls for courage, sacrifice, and direct action. There is too much at stake for us to accept temporary, soothing-syrup remedies. We want the sort of sound solutions which will build strongly for the future. And I may say that we are very much encouraged to tackle this problem by the enlightened understanding shown by cotton men in the Congress during recent weeks.

In conclusion, I want to make one final point. The important thing now is to change direction, to get over on a constructive basis for long-range development. How fast we move is of secondary importance. We can make changes gradually in the detail of operations, to avoid unnecessary disturbance anywhere along the line—just as long as we are headed away from the program and policy mistakes which have caused us so much trouble in the past.

Reynolds and Union Team Up to Fight Waste and Save Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, today we hear a great deal about disagreements in the field of labor and management. I hold in my hand an article entitled "Reynolds and Union Team Up to Fight Waste and Save Jobs," which was published in the Florence (Ala.) Times of May 8. The article tells of the splendid cooperation between labor and management in the Reynolds Metals Co. plant. I ask unanimous consent that the article, which was sent to me by Judge John D. Petrey, personnel officer of the Reynolds Metals Co., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR COOPERATION IN TRI-CITIES—REYNOLDS AND UNION TEAM UP TO FIGHT WASTE AND SAVE JOBS—MILLIONS IN CONTRACTS SET AS GOAL

Members of organized labor in the tri-cities area have joined hands with the Reynolds Metals Co. and the Reynolds Alloys Co., Listerhill, in a program of cutting down on scrap and waste and improving quality of all products in the big aluminum plants.

The aluminum workers' local unions, both white and Negro, the machinist union and the Muscle Shoals Building and Construction Trades Council, including all craft unions, have adopted resolutions pledging to the Reynolds Metals Co. and the Reynolds Alloys Co. at Listerhill the fullest cooperation of all their members in a program to reduce scrap and waste and to improve the quality of all products of the plants.

The business agents of all these unions, aluminum workers, machinists, electricians, iron workers, steamfitters, laborers, teamsters, carpenters, painters, operating engineers, brickmasons, and others have said, "Let's face the facts." We know that the best way to preserve the jobs for our members is to help the companies cut costs, reduce scrap and waste, and improve quality. By doing so, the companies can get bigger orders, bigger contracts, and make profits. We know also that increased wages, better working conditions, and better welfare benefits come from profits—and we cannot expect the better things for our workers unless the companies make profits.

THE LARGEST SINGLE INDUSTRY IN NORTH ALABAMA

The Reynolds companies have the largest single operation in north Alabama, employing more than 3,000 workers at Listerhill—and the local unions here in the tricities are among the strongest and largest in the State of Alabama. The cooperative program between this strong team of labor and the management of Reynolds is setting an enviable example of truly great labor-management relations.

The unions have pledged for all their members "a fair day's work for a fair day's pay." "No loafing on the job and careful work at all times." They said: "The elimination of lost time, scrap, and waste can hurt no one, and yet it can mean contracts and orders gained and full employment instead of contracts lost and laid-off members." And these are the reasons why they have endorsed the program.

The leaders of organized labor in the Tri-Cities area are to be congratulated on this farsighted and progressive step which should benefit the entire Tri-Cities area, its people, and prosperity generally. The officials of the companies are very proud of their working force and expressed great appreciation to the labor leaders and union officials for these resolutions pledging for their members that good, efficient work would be performed by all of them at all times.

Text of resolutions unanimously adopted by all unions in the Tri-Cities area at regular meetings follows:

"Whereas the Reynolds Metals Co. and the Reynolds Alloys Co. at their Listerhill plants have pointed out to this local council the importance of improving quality and eliminating scrap and waste in the operation of their plants and how jobs for their workers may be affected by a better cooperation between the company and the workers toward this goal; and

"Whereas the said companies have informed our local unions that they are starting a campaign on Tuesday, May 10, of improving quality and reducing waste and scrap, and have requested us to join hands with them in their undertaking to produce less scrap and more metal that will pass all inspection; and

"Whereas these local unions are the largest local unions in this part of the State and are farsighted and progressive and have many of their members employed in these Reynolds plants, the continued employment, as well as the continued improvement in wages, hours, and working conditions, depend to a large degree on efficient operation; and

"Whereas we recognize fully that scrap and waste cut down profits of the companies, and we recognize also that wage increases, better insurance protection, more holiday pay, better vacation pay, higher pensions, and other benefits which our members want must come out of profits that are made; and

"Whereas, our local unions recognize that good quality and waste cutting and scrap elimination are essential in order to help the company get contracts and orders to maintain full employment, and that quality products could make the difference between getting big contracts or losing those contracts, and the loss of contracts can cost the jobs, and has in the past cost the jobs of hundreds of our members for periods of time. We further realize and agree that the elimination of lost time, waste and scrap can hurt no one, and that it can mean contracts gained and full employment instead of contracts lost and laid off members. All of us cooperating—all of us working together—can bring about conditions benefiting all—the company and their workers: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That this (name of union here) in regular meeting assembled, does hereby pledge to the Reynolds companies our fullest cooperation in the campaign for improving quality and reducing scrap and eliminating waste in the operation of their plants at Listerhill. This campaign to be initiated and put into effect on May 10, 1955. We further pledge for our membership that in addition to putting forth our very best efforts in the elimination of scrap, improving quality and reducing waste, that we will continue to insist that every member of our local unions give a fair day's work for a fair day's pay.

"This council is entering into this campaign in good faith and with the sincere desire and hope that aluminum may be produced and fabricated in the most efficient manner possible and that the company will be placed in a more favorable bidding position on orders for their products which will result in more employment at this plant site.

"The unions further pledge that they will urge every one of their members to cooperate fully in this program and authorizes and requests that copies of this resolution be placed on all bulletin boards within the plant and that copies of the same be made available to the press in this area whereby all of the pepole of the Tri-Cities area will know and realize this forward step on the part of the membership of our organizations in helping to make the area bigger and better.

"Carpenters Union, Julian Bailey, Business Agent; Operating Engineers, C. K. Thorne, Business Agent; Brickmasons, M. T. Williams, Business Agent; Teamsters, Roy Raley, Business Agent; Iron Workers, John A. Pace, Business Agent; Electrical Workers, Arnold Madison, Business Agent; Electrical Workers Operators, D. C. Mussleman, Business Agent; Laborers, Sy Bowling, Business Agent; Steamfitters, Jack Poag, Business Agent; Painters, Julian Bailey, Business Agent; Boilermakers, J. H. Hardin, Business Agent; Machinists Union, W. H. Johnson, Business Agent; Aluminum Workers Union, Claud R. Mitchell; and Aluminum Workers (Colored), Marshall Gunn."

West Virginia's Need for the Library Services Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a statement prepared by the West Virginia Library Association regarding the serious need for the library services bill presently being considered by a Subcommittee on Education and Labor.

The article follows:

WEST VIRGINIA'S NEED FOR THE LIBRARY SERVICES BILL

West Virginia is in desperate need for more public library service. In 1954 less than half of its residents had access to public library service. There are over 1 million persons who cannot walk into a library for books, magazines, and pamphlets or other library services.

Thirteen West Virginia counties have no public library service at all. Twenty-nine more counties provide service for less than 50 percent of their residents.

The present public libraries in West Virginia are giving service of a quality which, judged by prevailing standards, ranges from mediocre to very poor. The average per capita income for public libraries is 26 cents, but actual operating expenses after capital outlays is 19 cents. The per capita book supply is 0.3 book and the circulation of these few books averages 0.8 book per person. These figures as the attached chart shows, are pitifully low. Fourteen of the present public libraries are sponsored by volunteer clubs which can provide but a token type of service. These libraries represent 7 percent of the total people served.

At present the West Virginia Library Commission is attacking the problem of library service in a variety of ways. The main method is by the organization of multicounty demonstration libraries with the aid of personnel and books from the commission. At present one such region is nearing self support. The commission also serves present inadequate libraries by collections of books, professional counseling, and other miscellaneous services. Individuals are made direct loans.

The basic problems in extending library service in West Virginia are twofold. First, the residents in the many secluded mountain valleys and hills must be acquainted with the benefits which library service brings. Their isolation makes it necessary to bring the concept of service to them by a demonstration method. The second problem is the provision of financial support for the service. The support problem depends in large measure on the solution of the first problem. People do not willingly support a service which they do not understand.

The library services bill for West Virginia would supplement the present limited, but successful efforts to acquaint the residents with the advantages of books, pamphlets, records, and other materials in their lives and communities. It would make possible 2 to 4 county or multicounty demonstration libraries simultaneously in a speedup of the present program. In a period of 5 years every West Virginia county without library service could have a self-supporting library, be a part of a demonstration library, or be well informed of the value of library service.

West Virginia has as much or more to gain from the library services bill than any other State. The State's progress hinges on the catalyst of good public libraries.

Poultrymen Need Exemption From Wheat Acreage Control Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an article from the June issue of Everybody's Poultry Magazine, written by Thomas E. Moncrief, the managing editor.

I particularly invite the attention of members of the Committee on Agriculture which is considering H. R. 3232, introduced by me, and a number of other identical bills, including S. 46, which has already been approved by the other body.

This article explains very forcefully why this legislation should be adopted:

NORTHEASTERN FARMERS FIGHT WHEAT ACREAGE CONTROLS

(By Thomas E. Moncrief)

We believe it fundamentally wrong and contrary to the principles of our Constitution, to the American concept of society, and to our free-enterprise system to prevent farmers through Federal regulation from free utilization of land for the production of grain for feeding their own flocks.

This resolution, under which Neppco registered its opposition to certain phases of the national grain production-control program, was publicly announced late in 1954. It stemmed largely from the widely publicized Blattner case in which Joseph Blattner, Norristown, Pa., was fined $179.20 as a penalty for harvesting 24 acres of wheat, even though he needed all of it to feed his 6,000 layers.

In his editorial, Submerging the Farmer's Independence, which appeared in the February 1955 issue of Everybody's Poultry Magazine, Frank L. Platt referred to this case and a similar case in New York State, that of Stanley and Frances Stout, of Yates County.

These were not the only cases to rouse the indignation of eastern farmers and Neppco, however. In Butler County, Ohio, a broiler grower raising 4 lots of 3,500 broilers each per year, has a 27-acre farm of which 19 acres are under cultivation. After having the 19 acres in pasture and corn for 4 years, this broiler producer decided that for the good of the soil he would plant wheat, which he did. As a result, the Government informed him that he could not even use this wheat to feed his broilers without paying a penalty of $383, even thought it was the first wheat he had planted in 5 years.

In Cayuga County, N. Y., a dairy farmer with 100 head af cattle was allotted 11 acres of land for wheat, but planted 23 acres, as he had the year before. He needed plenty of straw for bedding his cattle. His fine amounted to $362.88.

These are just two examples showing how eastern poultrymen and dairymen have suffered because of the present acreage-allotment law.

BLATTNER PROTESTS IN COURT

Are poultrymen accepting this without a fight? No, they're not. Joseph Blattner has taken his case to court. And he has plenty of sympathizers as well as a number of financial backers. Early in February his suit to have the Federal acreage and marketing controls declared unconstitutional was dismissed on the basis of an earlier issue decided by the United States Supreme Court, but Blattner has appealed to a higher court, is going to carry his fight to the Supreme Court, if necessary.

In Carroll County Md., H. Paul Morelock has expressed his opposition to price supports and acreage controls by prohibiting USDA agents from surveying his farm. At the entrance to his farm he has placed a sign which states "No trespassing by any Federal employee." It means just that.

Northeastern farmers are not alone in this fight against wheat acreage controls. Members of the Oregon Egg Producers, with offices in Portland, Oreg., are very much in accord with the Neppco resolution and are urging their Congressmen to vote for the amendment to the present law.

BARBECUES TO RAISE MONEY

At a meeting of New York State Poultry Council members last fall, it was decided that the council should sponsor broiler barbecues for the specific purpose of raising funds to aid in conducting test cases on the constitutionality of the price support law and also that member organizations solicit individual contributions for this fund.

The Neppco office was directed by the Neppco executive committee to set up a war chest for the purpose of helping those northeastern poultrymen engaged in court actions involving the wheat acreage control provisions of the 1954 price support law. Any money which has come in from the various States has been turned over to the local area where a committee has been established for waging the legal battles. Neppco itself has not kept any of the money to pay for its participation in this multipronged attack.

In addition, all resources and facilities of Neppco were thrown into action toward bringing about a modification in the law so that grain produced for home consumption, will be exempt from acreage controls. T. C. Rothbauer, of the Neppco staff, under the guidance of Dr. Alfred Van Wagenen, managing director, has concentrated his time and efforts in that direction.

BILLS TO AMEND THE LAW

As a result of Neppco's contacting all northeastern Congressmen and Senators and enlisting their support, here's what has been accomplished thus far:

Senate bill 46, sponsored by Senators George D. Aiken, of Vermont; Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia; James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania; A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia; and John J. Williams, of Delaware, has been passed by the Senate. This bill is "to further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes."

In the United States House of Representatives, a number of bills have been introduced, all worded virtually the same as the Senate bill above. These include:

H. R. 1834, sponsored by Representative DANIEL A. REED, of New York.

H. R. 3232, sponsored by Representative JAMES M. QUIGLEY, of Pennsylvania.

H. R. 3669, sponsored by Representative T. MILLET HAND, of New Jersey.

H. R. 4053, sponsored by Representative W. S. COLE, of New York.

H. R. 4570, sponsored by Representative JOHN E. HENDERSON, of Ohio.

H. R. 5303, sponsored by Representative WAYNE L. HAYS, of Ohio.

H. R. 5372, sponsored by Representative JAMES G. FULTON, of Pennsylvania.

H. R. 5397, sponsored by Representative ALVIN M. BENTLEY, of Michigan.

Regarding bill H. R. 4570, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson recently wrote Representative JOHN E. HENDERSON, "We favor enactment of this bill, and have also reported similarly on S. 46 and H. R. 1834, other bills designed to accomplish the same general objectives as H. R. 4570.

"In the development of new or improved programs of price support for agriculture, it has been our constant endeavor to minimize Government interference with individual initiative of enterprise so as to permit farmers to operate their farms with a maximum of freedom compatible with the effective operation of these programs.

"The bill, H. R. 4570, introduced by you, would be another step towards the achievement of this objective. We have long felt that the wheat marketing quota provisions contained in present legislation are needlessly restrictive. When marketing quotas have been voted for wheat, producers who harvest wheat in excess of their allotment are subject to penalty, whether they market their wheat or whether they feed it on their farms. Farmers who produce wheat only for feed and who do not want price support on their wheat or any other crop, are thus forced to curtail their operations and are in violation of the law and subject to penalty if they fail to do so. Since such wheat does not enter any marketing channels, its production does not affect the operation of wheat price support programs and therefore, should not be subject to marketing quotas.

"The principle of enforcing compliance of minority groups of producers with a program determined by a majority of producers underlies marketing quotas. It appears that the existing legislation needlessly regiments the operation of all wheat farms, regardless of whether wheat is produced for the market or for the farmer's own use. With the present legislation providing for no marketing quotas on production of corn and price supports for feed grains other than corn being available to producers with no restrictions on production, the restrictions upon feeding of wheat produced on an individual's own farm appear to be untenable.

"Although the bill, if enacted, would become effective with the 1955 crop of wheat, it must be emphasized that it would in no way relieve or otherwise affect the liability for marketing penalties incurred by those farmers who fed, or used for seed on their farms, their entire 1954 crops of wheat.

"Enactment of H. R. 4570 would remove the dissatisfaction of many small wheat producers with the adjustment program as it must be operated under present legislation and provide more adequate feed in the areas which, in the past, have not produced sufficient feed to meet local requirements."

ACTION IS NEEDED

All of these bills are now in the hands of the Agriculture Committee of the House, and it is questionable how soon any action will be taken on them. Some Congressmen representing the large Midwestern wheat growers would just as soon see these bills "pigeonholed" in the Agriculture Committee indefinitely.

Therefore, Neppco members and all other interested poultry producers and poultry organizations are urged to write to their Congressmen, particularly if they are sponsors of any of the above-named bills, registering opposition to the present law and urging favorable consideration of the bills now pending. Many Congressmen look more favorably upon a postcard from a farmer than a long letter on an imposing letterhead. Here is a chance for our eastern poultrymen to let their Congressmen know how they feel about this wheat acreage allotment issue.

No Time for Retreat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Army Times of May 28, 1955:

NO TIME FOR RETREAT

Two developments of the past week dramatically exposed to the American people the razor-edge of uncertainty upon which their leaders were building this Nation's defenses. The first was brought about by the House of Representatives' rejection of the National Reserve Plan. The other was signaled by a sudden squall of admission and denial—with the Air Force itself—that this Nation's airpower was now second in strength to Russia's.

The Reserve plan, as its proponents were quick to say, was the keystone of the Defense Department's plan for reducing the size of our standing forces and the costs of maintaining them. With it in operation, they said, 143,000 troops could be cut away from the Army by June 30, 1956. This saving in money would permit a further buildup of what was described as already the world's best air force.

Over the strong protests of the Army's Chief of Staff, this plan was pushed to near fruition in the House. Time and again, congressional committees gave sympathetic hearing to General Ridgway's plea that the Army be not thus crippled in its training for atomic war. In the end, during hearings on defense appropriations, the lawmakers—probably swayed by the President's prestige as a soldier—approved the reductions asked by Defense.

But the bill setting up a National Reserve, which meanwhile had been marching to a vote in the House, suddenly stumbled. The rock in its way proved to be an amendment barring racial segregation in transferring to certain State units men having a reserve term to fulfill after serving on active duty. Adopted, the amendment's restrictions at one blow made the plan, in its present form, inoperable. Consideration of the whole bill was then put aside. Chances were that it would not again come up for discussion this session, though Representative MARTIN (Republican, Massachusetts), seemed to think it will.

With the Senate now working on the allotment of funds to operate the Defense Department for the fiscal year beginning July 1, the failure of the Reserve plan was enough to make the solons pause in their work. A Senate panel will again ask Defense heads whether the new situation does not call for reconsideration of the plan to reduce forces.

Almost equally perturbing to legislators was a magazine report last week that Russia not only is turning out jet fighters at more rapid a pace than we are, but they are superior to the best jets we are giving the Air Force in any numbers. The Reds' versions of our B–52 and B–47 were also said to be better than the originals. This account, based on the statements of observers abroad, was given added credence by an Air Force general who said in an Armed Forces Day speech that the Red Air Force was today stronger than our own. Gen. Nathan Twining, the Air Force chief himself, at once said that this general was "mistaken" and the general then dutifully reported that he had been "misquoted." But the damage had been done.

Three top Democratic Senators (RUSSELL, JACKSON, and SYMINGTON) immediately wondered aloud whether the President's military manpower cuts should be reversed. Their sentiments were echoed by a good part of the lay population who thoughtfully had witnessed the fall of the two principal props of the administration's entire defense program.

As we have said, even before that program was approved by the House there was a very evident feeling in that chamber that the standing forces were being cut too heavily. Since the plan has been pushed through the House, however, probably nothing can be done there immediately to rectify what seems now to have been a mistake.

But in the Senate, where the money bill is still being considered, there is a very good chance to revise the plan and send it back to the House for another vote. To that end, therefore, it seems to us important that the Senate Appropriations defense subcommittee give this matter its entire and serious attention. Its action here could well mean the difference between an adequate posture of defense and total unpreparedness.

The least it could do under the circumstances, it appears to us, would be to allow the Army to retain 73,000 of the troops slated to leave under the original plan. This would give the Army a force of 1,100,000 men on June 30, 1956.

Firm But Not Obstinate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Kendallville, Ind., News-Sun. It seems to me that this contains a very sound warning for all of us.

The editorial is as follows:

FIRM BUT NOT OBSTINATE

Secretary of State Dulles must be weary of getting advice on how to deal with the Russians at a four-power conference. But it's just possible that when German Chancellor Adenauer comes over in mid-June he may have some wise counsel to offer.

Reports from Bonn suggest that Adenauer will advise the United States not to be too ready to make a broad European settlement with the Kremlin. In his view the West is getting stronger and the East weaker. He feels that if the West will be patient another year or two it can get far better terms from the Reds than in 1955.

There appears to be a good deal of evidence to support this approach. Russia's failure to develop adequate farm production is well known. Its decision earlier this year to renew emphasis on heavy industry at the expense of consumer goods cannot have eased the Kremlin's domestic political problems.

As has been fairly said many times, we cannot refuse to sit down with the Soviet Union when there seems any hope at all it might open the way to an eventual lasting settlement.

But we need not fall all over ourselves simply because the Reds feel like talking. We know enough about them by now to realize they would not suggest such a course if they did not think there was advantage in it for them.

Elements in Britain, France, and elsewhere, naively preoccupied with the top level conference as a device for securing peace, will be pressing their governments to insist that we take just about anything the Kremlin offers. They are always prepared to accept Russia's overtures on faith and to regard the United States with suspicion. These urgings must be resisted.

So much of the time the Russians are in a menacing mood that there is a tendency to welcome their softer gestures with uncritical enthusiasm. A feeling of relief sweeps over even cagey diplomats. They're so eager to capitalize on the altered Russian mood that they do drive the hardest bargain they could.

The Berlin blockade negotiations were a good example. We got the blockade lifted all right, but there was later evidence we could well have won some additional concessions had we been tougher at the time.

No one dares pretend that it is easy for the West—and America particularly—to strike just the right posture in any dealings with Moscow. But somehow we must find the way to be firm without being blind and obstinate.

Don't Run for the Goal Line Until You Have the Ball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include a letter which has a direct and meaningful bearing on the current Echo Park Dam controversy.

I fear that the Members are becoming somewhat tired of this dam controversy, yet it occurs to me that really pertinent comment is always in order. A good bit of information has been spread in the RECORD about this proposed Reclamation facility as a part of the overall development plan for the upper Colorado River area, but unfortunately, a good bit of misinformation has also been spread in the RECORD.

I call attention to this letter because it is a letter from a well known conservation figure in Colorado to the president of the National Wildlife Federation here in Washington. In this letter, the author, Mr. John A. Cross, of Loveland, Colo., points out the view of the Loveland Wildlife Association and their reaction to the position of the National Federation. I do not necessarily suggest that this one voice is paramount, but surely this on-the-ground view should be heard by those who are still seeking decisive information on this purposely confused issue.

The letter follows:

LOVELAND WILDLIFE ASSOCIATION,
Loveland, Colo., May 24, 1955.

Mr. CHARLES H. CALLISON,
Conservation Director,
National Wildlife Federation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your circular letter sent out May 1 to member clubs of the Federation has been referred to me by Loveland Wildlife Association, a member of the Colorado federation, with the request that I give you some firsthand information about Echo Park and the views of the Loveland Association thereon. I have seen Echo Park on a trip specifically made for the inspection of that area as a site for the proposed dam as it might affect the water interests of the State of Colorado and the interests of sportsmen.

At the time of making the trip I was a member of the Colorado Water Conservation Board.

The Green River and the Yampa River, which join at Pat's Hole not far from Echo Park, are muddy alkaline streams flowing at the bottom of steep canyons, and although those canyons are spectacular they are very arid and sustain very little wildlife, consisting chiefly of gophers, rabbits, and rattlesnakes, and a very sparse population of these. A small area of wild goose nesting habitat, where not more than a dozen pair of Canadian geese have nested in the past, will be inundated at Lily Park.

The Colorado Game and Fish Department has made studies from which it reported that there would be no interference of any deer migration by the creation of the reservoir.

It is the opinion of the residents of the area, technicians of the Colorado Game and Fish Department, and other people who have seen the area firsthand and have experience in the ultimate effects upon an area of the storing of a body of water of this kind that the habitat will be vastly improved for wildlife generally, particularly for waterfowl, including both ducks and geese and fish.

The only fish which the area supports at present, other than catfish, are rough fish and a rather small population of even these, but the reservoir, when created, will be a deepwater reservoir suitable for almost all species of game fish.

Access to Echo Park, Pat's Hole, and other points of interest in the canyons will be tremendously improved in 2 ways, 1 by the construction of a good access road to the dam itself, and second, by water transportation.

A handful of people make the not too hazardous trip from somewhere near Craig, Colo., down into Utah following the Yampa River, or the more hazardous trip from Wyoming through Colorado into Pat's Hole, the confluence of the Green River and the Yampa River, and on through Colorado into Utah.

A few more make the trip into Pat's Hole over dusty, rough, and winding roads over the long distance from the nearest point on a good highway.

It is true that the view in Pat's Hole will be changed and Steamboat Rock will be about half inundated, but whether the view will be improved or damaged by the additional water is a question of viewpoint.

The construction of Echo Park Dam will add tremendously to the recreational value of the area and will distinctly be in the interests of conservation, both of wildlife and of our precious water.

Why the National Wildlife Federation, under the guise of conservation, should oppose this dam is something of an anomaly, and the manner in which this has been done, even going to the extent of overriding the agreed position of the Colorado Wildlife Federation not to take a position opposing this dam. When the representative of that federation went to your national meeting he was not authorized to oppose Echo Park Dam on behalf of the Colorado Wildlife Federation, and neither, I know, are you entitled to represent that you are speaking for the membership of the entire National Wildlife Federation when you oppose this measure.

We of the Loveland Wildlife Association are very much antagonized by your boasting about your opposition to Echo Park Dam which seems to us not only to be against the real interests of conservation, but just about as stupid as boasting of having killed the last of the passenger pigeons.

Very truly yours,

JOHN A. CROSS.

The American Promise of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mrs. Dorothy D. Houghton, Deputy Director, FOA, for the recognition program, USO–YMCA–YWCA, Des Moines, Iowa, on May 20, 1955:

THE AMERICAN PROMISE OF LIBERTY

It is a privilege for me to be present at this special recognition program honoring the many volunteer workers who have made successful the USO-YMCA and YWCA programs for the men of our armed services. It is, of course, always a pleasure for me to return to my own State of Iowa. The people of Iowa have made an unusual contribution to many voluntary efforts. And your work here in behalf of our men of the services is no exception.

In behalf of all of the people of Iowa we are here to thank you for special courtesies you have shown to our boys—thousands of them—as they have come from all parts of the State to be inducted. We are all grateful that it is not war service to which they are going. Nevertheless this is a big step for these boys. Many of them have not been away from home before, and to them Des Moines seems a long way away from Waterloo, or Sioux City, or Red Oak. The time that you spend talking with them, inviting them to dance, play cards, or go for a swim, drink a cup of coffee, and have some of those good home-made cookies may very well be the moment that Bill Brown decides the world is a friendly place after all.

Not only do we mothers of Iowa thank you but I know that mothers and fathers, sweethearts and wives throughout this Nation send you their warm greetings for caring for their boys as they are passing through our State or are stationed here.

Many people made possible the marvelous work of the USO during the war and we were so proud of all of them. It is not quite as glamorous to do the same work in peacetime. It is, therefore, our great privilege to pay tribute to the real loyalty and unselfish service of hostesses and the many volunteer workers from some 40 voluntary organizations whwo have made such a success of this program in Iowa.

I like to think of the purpose of the USO: "To serve the religious, spiritual, social, welfare, and educational needs of men and women of the Armed Forces." A cause could not be more worthy—to care for the young men of our land, our future leaders; to see that they are fed—physically, mentally, and spiritually.

My office in Washington is located across Lafayette Park from the White House. A few blocks in one direction is the YWCA; a few in the other, the YMCA—both with splendid programs. And then immediately across the park from me is the USO. You would all enjoy visiting this famous old building, originally an opera house, later the old Belasco Theater. Now it has been

redecorated and is truly an attractive place. Any person would be inspired, as I know they are here, to sit down and play the piano, see TV, have a game of cards, and spend an enjoyable evening. As I was chatting with Mr. Young, the director, there the other day, he was telling me of his USO work with the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean theater, and of its interrelation with my work as Deputy Director of the Foreign Operations Administration in Charge of Refugees, Migration, and Voluntary Assistance. Through the USO, the 6th Fleet provided gay and colorful Christmas dinners, American style, and parties for orphans and refugees. Also, several years ago when shoes were so scarce in Greece and many people were walking through the streets barefooted, the USO urged the ships of the fleet to gather up the old shoes aboard. Barrels of them were gathered and most gratefully received at refugee centers.

One of the most difficult of our postwar problems has been that of the refugee or displacd person. Since the end of the war, there have been some 35 millions of these people. Victims of war and the aftermath of war—they have been forced to flee because of persecution or fear of persecution for political, racial, or religious reasons.

The people of the United States have been generous in their aid to refugees throughout the world. In fact, American history from first to last is a story of refugees. Beginning with the Pilgrim Fathers and coming down to the present escapees from behind the Iron Curtain, men and women who have fled tyranny and oppression have looked for freedom in our land. William Penn was such a man. The first Jewish congregation to gather here 300 years ago was typical of thousands to come in later years. Germans, Poles, Italians, French Huguenots, and a score of others gave us countless citizens who found a refuge here. There is nothing new in America in the voluntary agencies who aid the opposed and help them find homes in the New World. It seems that always we have had the spirit of the Statue of Liberty and we have been saying, "Give us your tired, your poor, your hungry masses yearning to breathe free."

It has been this same spirit of liberty which has driven our scientists and inventors to develop unique machines driven by steam and electric power which have lifted the burdens from the backs of labor and have so increased their productive ability that we today enjoy the highest standards of living. Much has been said about these accomplishments, but much more could and should be said about the spirit of liberty and human understanding which have motivated these vast structures of liberty. When you see an engine, a dynamo, a turbine, you see not only the strength of its horsepower but you see also the vision, the imagination, the supreme genius which saw in their fulfillment the emancipation of those who through the ages have known nothing but to toil.

It then cannot seem strange that our people through their agencies of government and through voluntary organizations are seeking out ways to lift the level of life and work for millions of needy persons throughout the world who also would like to enjoy for themselves the fruits of liberty and independence. America is not properly understood simply as a geographical area where freedom reigns. America is a spirit which can be enjoyed and developed everywhere. It is a way of life where the democratic process makes for peace and brotherhood. It is a largeness of mind and a bigness of heart which all the world needs. It is our answer to war and tyranny. It is our hope of peace and prosperity, not alone for ourselves but for men and women everywhere.

The American Government and the people of the United States through many voluntary organizations have played a major role not only in the permanent resettlement of refugees in this and other countries of the world but have also contributed largely to the care and rehabilitation of millions and have aided in their transportation to the country of their resettlement. Out of the many United States voluntary agencies which serve overseas, 55 are today working with FOA in supplying aid. Since the invasion of Poland in 1939, nearly $2 billion have been contributed by voluntary agencies to aid distressed humanity throughout the world. This is over and above the assistance of our Government, the governments of the world, and the aid of intergovernmental organizations.

This people-to-people's program has seen the great contributions not only in money but in time, effort, and great love and care of religious groups such as Church World Service, American Friends Service Committee, War Relief Services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee; agencies established to care for specific nationality groups such as the American Korean Foundation, Boys' Town of Italy, American Middle East Relief, and American Mission to Greeks, Inc.; groups to care for special problems such as American Foundation for Overseas Blind, and Foster Parents' Plan for War Children. These are just a few of the groups tied together under the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid. The committee guides the public and the agencies seeking the support of the public in the appropriate and productive use of voluntary contributions for foreign aid.

All of you, I am sure, have personally participated with some of the voluntary agencies in your community in helping the displaced persons of the world. Perhaps you have taken clothing to your church to be sent to war victims in Korea, or have sent a CARE box of food to children in Germany, or tools to the people in the Middle East.

There are other things you can do as individuals or organizations if you would like. Four dollars will send a child to school in Korea for a whole year. Fifteen dollars a month or $180 a year will make it possible for your organization to become the "foster parents" of a child with whom you can correspond. The $180 provides food, clothing, housing, and medical care for a year. And then there is a wonderful project which should interest you people of Iowa. Two hundred dollars will buy a quality-bred dairy heifer which will go to a farm family in Germany which has been investigated. They will agree to give the first calf to another needy family. Some people now have third-generation cows from this project. I like this project because it helps people to help themselves and to help others.

Voluntary agencies have also played a significant part in the transportation program for the resettlement of migrants. The whole transportation program is a most important one in the solution of overpopulation in many areas of the world. Two weeks ago today I returned from a meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration—meeting in Geneva. You will be interested to know that this international organization with which the United States has cooperated actually moved 121,222 persons in 1954 from Austria, Germany, Greece, Italy, Netherlands, Trieste, and the Near and Far East. Of this 121,222, about 38,000 went to Australia; 29,000 to Argentina; 21,000 to Canada; 16,000 to Brazil; 7,000 to the United States; and 9,000 to other countries.

Of special interest to Americans are the 59,702 men, women, and children who have escaped from the Iron Curtain and have registered for assistance at one of our refugee centers in Germany, Austria, Italy, Greece, or Turkey since March 1952. They have been given food, shelter, medical assistance, vocational training, language instruction, and aid in resettlement. We know that a significant part in the cold war is being played by these escapees. Voluntary agencies have been particularly effective in resettlement activities which, in nearly every case, require some person in the West to take an interest in a homeless unknown escapee, to agree to act as sponsor and to provide assurances for a job and a home. Escapees naturally gravitate to groups where they will feel most at home in terms of cultural backgrounds, language, national origins, and religion. Because the voluntary agencies are organized along nationality and religious lines, they can obtain a greater number of assurances on the part of sponsors than would be possible through government channels.

More than 9,000 men, women, and children who have escaped the Iron Curtain have come to the United States. Probably the most dramatic arrival was the freedom flight, March 1954. Sixty-eight men, women, and children who had fled Soviet tyranny arrived in Washington by plane. What a glorious sight as we watched these 16 families walk down the ramp from the plane. The little children, of course, drew the most attention. There were twin girls, 3 years old, from Hungary; a 2-year-old boy from Poland; 2 children from Czechoslovakia—ages 3 and 4; and 1 family with 8 children—the youngest of whom was only 11 days old when the family escaped to freedom. Many of these people crossed borderlines of barbed wire, electrified as you know, with high towers where guards sit, with dogs that chase upon command, with traps with leaves over them, with mines that go off on contact. They had risked their lives to come to the free world.

A few weeks ago a letter came from one of the escapees who was on this freedom flight. Ivan Kirejew crossed the Iron Curtain—coming all the way from Moscow. He wrote:

"I have indeed been most fortunate in this great country in which I hope fervently that I will become a citizen. I applied for and received my first papers declaring my intention as soon as possible.

"My progress in the short time I am in this country is marvelous—a steady job, a nice apartment with modern conveniences near schools, church, stores, and transportation. My children are attending the school of our choice and my family enjoy the great freedom of religion. The firm that I am employed with is fine. My duties of porter are pleasant, the hours good, and the pay excellent. I have made many friends among my fellow workers, who have been most kind and helpful in accepting and making me one of them.

"I am attending evening school 3 nights weekly. My teacher has been very patient teaching me English and my English is improving.

"I thank God from the bottom of my heart for his goodness that my family and I were privileged to come to the United States and start a new life with no fear and the wonderful gift of freedom restored to us. We are dreaming and waiting for the day when all of my family will be citizens of the United States of America."

In closing, my heart wells up in gratitude for the priceless heritage we enjoy in America. This is the heritage of good will for people of all races, all creeds, and all faiths. Here we live together in peace and brotherhood because America has been a refuge for the oppressed of every land. My work enables me to see that never in the history of our country have American citizens given more time and money to aid the poor and the distressed of other lands than in the last few years. We can all gratefully say, "Thank God for the gracious spirit of America."

To Develop Hells Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which appeared in the Letters to the Editor column of the Sunday New York Times for June 5, 1955. The letter is from J. T. Marr, of Portland, Oreg., who is president of the National Hells Canyon Association, and points out that contrary to articles which have heretofore appeared in the Times, there is a great amount of support among farm, labor, public power, cooperative and citizens groups throughout the Pacific Northwest favoring the high Federal Hells Canyon project.

The letter follows:

TO DEVELOP HELLS CANYON—GENERAL SUPPORT IS REPORTED FOR PROPOSED FEDERAL PROJECT

TO the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I wish to comment upon the article on the power controversy in the Pacific Northwest, written by Lawrence E. Davies and appearing in your issue of May 22.

The general impression, that of general local hostility toward the high Hells Canyon Dam, is completely erroneous, and I wish to correct it. Farm, labor, public power, cooperative, and citizens groups throughout the Pacific Northwest, with membership totaling more than 2 million citizens, endorse full and comprehensive development of the Hells Canyon reach of Snake River by means of the high Federal Hells Canyon project.

These groups include all of organized labor in the region; the Oregon and Washington State Granges; the Oregon, Idaho, and Montana farmers unions; the rural electrification cooperatives; the public utilities districts of the State of Washington; a number of large farm and supply cooperatives in the region; and the thousands of citizens of every walk of life who have joined the National and the Idaho-Oregon-Washington Hells Canyon Association.

SMALL OPPOSITION

Spokesmen for these groups presented their testimony, orally or by written statements, in Boise and Lewiston, Idaho; Pasco, Wash; and Portland, Oreg., before the Senate subcommittee. Yet they were virtually ignored by your correspondent. Mr. Davies could have ascertained from the record that organized opposition to Hells Canyon Dam is numerically a very small fraction of the population of the region.

It is my belief, shared by many others, that if given opportunity to register their opinions, most of the citizens of the Pacific Northwest would vote for Federal Hells Canyon Dam, and against the three-dam proposal by the Idaho Power Co.

To treat the Hells Canyon and the general power and river development controversies on the Columbia as though their solution could be found in a certain amount of kilowatts of new power generated anyhow and available at such and such a time is to miss the point completely.

Your article describes Hells Canyon as both "perennial" and "emotional." Certainly, for a number of years we have struggled against great odds to save this great dam site for maximum development. And certainly the underlying issue at Hells Canyon is far greater than the project itself, for it represents the test of scientific use of falling water for the widest possible range of benefits versus incomplete development with restricted and narrow benefits.

The battle of the Snake has become the national symbol of the wider conflict on this very point that rages on river basins throughout the Nation.

FEDERAL EXAMINER QUOTED

The contentions we have made that high Hells Canyon Dam is in every important aspect superior to the private three-dam plan have been vindicated by the conclusions of the Federal Power Commission Examiner on May 6. He stated that "* * * the facts seem to point to the inescapable conclusion that with the marked and substantial advantage of the Government credit, the high dam would be dollar for dollar the better investment and the more nearly ideal development of the Middle Snake." In finding after finding the examiner agreed with those who have supported this great project for so long.

Energy supply, together with getting the most out of the potential multiple-purpose resources of always renewable falling waters, will become of greater importance as time goes on. Our population is pressing upon both energy sources and upon food supply. We cannot afford to waste a single kilowatt of power by unplanned, haphazard semidevelopment.

Nor can we overlook a single acre of new land which will produce food for the future.

J. T. MARR.

Dissent and Separate Statement of Commissioner Chet Holifield on the Hoover Commission Report on Overseas Economic Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the preface to its report on Overseas Economic Operations, the Commission states its concern with finding a "new method of organization" for foreign aid and a program that will increase the economic and military strength of the free world. I do not believe that either objective is furthered by this report.

In the first place, the report does not represent a serious study of organization and management of our foreign aid programs. The multiple agencies and functions concerned with foreign aid are cataloged in the report, but no attempt is made to evaluate their performance or to suggest improved organization.

Secondly, the report intrudes in the area of foreign policy by making restrictive recommendations which could hamper the Executive, antagonize our allies and thwart our objectives.

The lack of organizational study is illustrated by the fact that the report simply lists the several councils, boards, committees, and special assistants who advise the President in this field. A useful service could have been performed by a study of the Executive Office of the President and other agencies in relation to foreign aid, with recommendations to simplify the organizational maze. This the Commission did not do.

It is difficult to determine from the text of the report and recommendations where the Commission stands in relation to the recent Executive order of the President, which stresses the need for unified administration of foreign aid.

When the President issued Executive Order 10610, effective June 30, 1955, abolishing the Foreign Operations Administration and transferring its economic operations to the Department of State, he emphasized to the Secretary of State the importance of maintaining "a single organization under a single management." The President made it clear that he wanted to "avoid dispersal of operating responsibilities either within the Department or to agencies outside the Department."

In his message to the Congress on the mutual security program, the President again put it as "essential that responsibility for the non-military operations continue unified; to fragment this responsibility among several agencies would seriously detract from their effectiveness"—House Document No. 144, 84th Congress, 1st session, page 5.

The International Cooperation Administration, established by the President as a semiautonomous agency within the State Department, evidently is the result of an effort to preserve the organizational base of foreign aid functions while meeting the objections of those in Congress and elsewhere who believe that these functions should not be administered by a separate agency, such as the Foreign Operations Administration.

To prevent the Secretary of State from being saddled with heavy operating responsibilities, the President proposed that a person of great stature and administrative talent be placed in charge of the new unit within the Department.

The effectiveness of the foreign aid program will depend in large measure, of course, on the administrative ability of the new appointee, his wholehearted acceptance of our foreign-aid objectives, and his willingness to employ the available instruments and resources with boldness and imagination to reach those objectives.

The President's instruction that the International Cooperation Administration use the facilities of other executive agencies, where appropriate, in administering foreign aid, follows the pattern of Foreign Operations Administration agreements with other departments or agencies defining specific relationships and facilities or services to be utilized. These agreements took as their point of departure the instruction in the President's letter of June 1, 1953, to the heads of departments and agencies, as follows:

> The Director of the Foreign Operations Administration should take full advantage of the advice and assistance available in other agencies. He should coordinate his operations with related operations in other agencies. At the same time, I expect the Director of the Foreign Operations Administration to maintain full control and direction over all foreign economic and technical as-

sistance programs rather than turn this responsibility over to other agencies.

Recommendation No. 1 of the Commission report seems to accept the pattern outlined by the President even while the Commission suggests there is need for a "new method of organization."

On the other hand recommendations 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 propose that the Export-Import Bank and the Departments of Treasury, Agriculture, Interior, Commerce, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, respectively, administer designated categories of foreign aid, subject to the conditions of recommendation No. 1.

If these several recommendations mean only that the Director of the International Cooperation Administration should utilize other agency facilities and personnel, where appropriate, in carrying out his responsibilities, then nothing new has been added to the President's order. If the recommendaitons mean something more, then they point in the direction of fragmenting the foreign aid program and scattering the functions of the International Cooperation Administration to the four corners of the executive branch.

The text of the report indicates that further steps are to be taken beyond the organizational concept set forth by the President. In the main the report seems to contemplate that the Director of the International Cooperation Administration would be transformed from an administrator of foreign aid in his own right to a coordinatior of limited programs carried on by other agencies.

The personnel recommendations likewise are difficult to interpret. At one point the text of the report suggests that a considerable number of Foreign Operations Administration personnel might be transferred to the several agencies designted to perform foreign-aid operations. In recommendation No. 1 it is suggested that existing agency staffs in many cases would be sufficient for these operations.

The recommendation adds that if the agencies "should require additional staff, they should be free to obtain it from any quarter." Is this an invitation to bypass Foreign Operations Administration personnel, who have performed valuable services for their Nation? What about civil service and veterans' preference rights?

Another paragraph of recommendation No. 1 proposes that overseas personnel of the civilian agencies performing foreign-aid functions be subject to the line authority and direction of the United States Chief of Diplomatic Mission in each country. The text proposes that a unified personnel system for civilian service overseas should be established.

The problems and requirements of integrating overseas personnel into a single system deserve careful and extended analysis. Indeed the Commission, in its report on personnel and civil service, promised such a study. The present report contains but a brief paragraph on the subject.

Recommendation No. 2, proposing principles to guide our foreign-aid programs, in my opinion is ill-advised and beyond the proper province of the Commission. We should not wander so far afield from our concern with the organization of the executive branch as to recommend, for example, what kinds of enterprises the United States should sponsor in the Asian-African arc.

A flat injunction against technical assistance to European countries overlooks the important and diverse problems which must be dealt with in the technical assistance framework, whether they be combating communism in the trade unions, breaking down cartel arrangements and restrictive trade practices, promoting tax reform, improving the climate for private investment or developing the standardization of weapons and spare parts.

Again, an injunction against assistance to large manufacturing enterprises elsewhere, whether they be oil in Indonesia or steel plants in India, might put the United States at an extreme disadvantage in contending with Soviet influence.

There is grudging acknowledgment in the report that foreign aid of some sort should be continued. But the recommendations seem to imply that foreign aid is more the product of simple and perhaps foolish benevolence than of hardheaded concern for our own national security and survival.

It is well to remind ourselves that freedom never has been a cheap commodity. In appraising forms of aid to friendly nations, we cannot reduce the problems to the simple alternatives of safe bank loans or charity handouts.

Nor can we overlook the President's reminder that "3 out of every $4 appropriated for the entire mutual-security program will be immediately spent within the United States for commodities, services, machinery, and other items." Food cotton, coal, and other American goods in abundant or surplus supply will be bought with these dollars for use by friendly countries.

The role our Nation has assumed in world affairs brings with it problems of staggering complexity and cost. It is not surprising that we have made mistakes. But a decade of urgent effort in defense of freedom cannot be measured only by mistakes. Our progress is substantial, our accomplishments impressive.

We must take care lest this progress be halted and these accomplishments demeaned and dissipated by a resurgent isolationism impatient with, or indifferent to, the needs and aspirations of other peoples.

Continued American leadership in the free world and successful resistance to the spread of Communist ideology demand wisdom and statesmanship of the highest order.

They demand boldness and resourcefulness to cope with emergencies and to exploit opportunities which advance the cause of freedom.

Above all, they depend upon mutual respect and understanding among nations engaged in a common quest for peace and security.

I do not see how the Commission's report will aid in achieving the vital objectives we have set in foreign aid.

Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD various resolutions from municipalities and organizations in the 25th District, California, in opposition to the upper Colorado River Basin projects and the Fryingpan-Arkansas projects.

The resolutions follow:

MARCH 24, 1955.

The Whittier Chamber of Commerce today voiced solid support for the Colorado River Board of California in its fight to defend the State's rightful share of Colorado River water now threatened by pending bills in Congress.

The board is the official State agency charged with the responsibility of safeguarding California's existing contracts for Colorado River water.

"Taxpayers of this community and all other communities across the Nation can again confidently go before Congress and oppose these schemes as objectionable to our State and the Nation at large," said Herman J. Kennedy, president of the chamber's board of directors.

The resolution follows:

"Resolution supporting the Colorado River Board of California and its opposition to the upper Colorado River Basin projects as proposed in S. 500 and H. R. 270 and the Fryingpan-Arkansas projects as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress.

"Whereas increasing population, industrial growth, and economic well-being of the city of Whittier in particular and the southern coastal plain in general depends upon California's rightful share of Colorado River water; and

"Whereas this source of water, both in quantity and quality, is seriously threatened by upper Colorado River Basin projects as proposed in S. 500 and H. R. 270 and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress; and

"Whereas the aforementioned projects would inflict on all taxpayers in this city and county and the Nation an unjustifiable burden of more than $4 billion; and

"Whereas these political pump-priming schemes if authorized would furnish water to grow more surplus crops already heavily subsidized by the taxpayers; and

"Whereas the Colorado River Board of California, official State agency charged with the responsibility of safeguarding California's existing contracts for Colorado River water, has gone on record strongly opposing these measures: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Whittier Chamber of Commerce respectfully requests the representatives of the State of California in the Congress of the United States to actively oppose the enactment of these bills or any other similar proposals, and that certified copies of this resolution be airmailed to our congressional representatives, and copies be made available to press and radio news sources."

Resolution 1345

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Claremont opposing the upper Colorado River Basin projects as proposed in S. 500 and H. R. 270 and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress

Whereas the city of Claremont is vitally dependent on a water supply obtained from the Colorado River; and

Whereas California's rightful share of Colorado River water is threatened by the upper Colorado River Basin projects as proposed in S. 500 and H. R. 270, and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress; and

Whereas the aforementioned projects would inflict on all taxpayers of this city and the Nation an unjustifiable burden of more than $4 billion; and

Whereas these political pump-priming schemes, if authorized, would furnish water to grow the kind of crops which are already in great surplus in this country, and which are already heavily subsidized by the taxpayers; and

Whereas the Colorado River Board of California, official State agency charged with the responsibility of safeguarding California's existing contracts for Colorado River water, has gone on record strongly opposing these measures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the enactment of these project bills is against the interest of the city of Claremont in particular and the State of California in general and should be opposed; be it further

Resolved, That the city of Claremont respectfully requests the representatives of the State of California in the Congress of the United States to actively oppose the enactment of the above mentioned bills or any similar proposals, and that certified copies of this resolution be airmailed to our congressional representatives, and copies be made available to press and radio news sources.

The mayor shall sign this resolution, and the city clerk shall attest and certify to the passage and adoption thereof.

Passed, approved, and adopted this 12th day of April 1955.

CHESTER G. JAEGER,
Mayor of the City of Claremont.

Attest:

MARGARET F. DRINKER,
City Clerk of the City of Claremont.

Approved as to form:

WILLIAM G. BERGMAN, Jr.,
City Attorney of the City of Claremont.

APRIL 21, 1955.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The board of directors at its meeting today approved the report of the water and power committee on the upper Colorado River storage project, amended as shown as follows:

That the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce request Congress not to authorize the upper Colorado River storage project unless such authorization meets the following requirements:

1. That there be specific guaranty that the authorizing legislation in no way impair California's water and power rights under the Colorado River compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

2. That the subsidy resulting from interest-free money be limited to the interest cost of that portion of the facilities which are attributable to irrigation developments as determined by independent experts for which interest-free money is provided for periods not to exceed 40 years (plus a 10-year development period) as provided in the present Reclamation Act, and that the interest component on power features and on features for municipal and industrial water used be paid into the Federal Treasury and not used for repayment of irrigation charges.

3. That before any money is appropriated for construction of any project, or any construction work done or contracted for, the Secretary of the Interior shall make provisions for revenues by contracts in accordance with the provisions of the Reclamation Act, adequate in his judgment to assure payment of all expense of operation and maintenance incurred by the United States, and the repayment in 40 equal annual installments of irrigation construction costs as provided for under the Reclamation Act, and the repayment with interest in 50 years of all the costs of construction attributable to the development and to the furnishing of water for municipal and industrial uses, and to the development and supplying of power, but the prices determined for electric power capacity and energy in making the above-mentioned provisions for revenues should be not less than the fair market value of such power capacity and energy, as determined from time to time over reasonable pericds during the life of the power contracts.

Resolution of the Pomona Chamber of Commerce, Pomona, Calif., supporting the Colorado River Board of California and its opposition to the upper Colorado River Basin projects as proposed in S. 500 and H. R. 270 and the Fryingpan-Arkansas projects as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress.

Whereas increasing population, industrial growth, and economic well-being of the city of Pomona in particular and the southern coastal plain in general depends upon California's rightful share of Colorado River water; and

Whereas this source of water, both in quantity and quality, is seriously threatened by upper Colorado River Basin projects as proposed in S. 500 and H. R. 270 and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412 now pending in Congress; and

Whereas the aforementioned projects would inflict on all taxpayers in this city and county and the Nation an unjustifiable burden of more than $4 billion; and

Whereas these political pump-priming schemes if authorized would furnish water to grow more surplus crops already heavily subsidized by the taxpayers; and

Whereas the Colorado River Board of California, official State agency charged with the responsibility of safeguarding California's existing contracts for Colorado River water, has gone on record strongly opposing these measures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Pomona Chamber of Commerce respectfully requests the representatives of the State of California in the Congress of the United States to actively oppose the enactment of these bills or any similar proposals, and that certified copies of this resolution be airmailed to our congressional representatives, and copies be made available to press and radio news sources.

L. W. HOOD,
Executive Secretary.

Resolution 1083

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Glendora opposing the upper Colorado River Basin projects as proposed in S. 500 and H. R. 270, and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress

Be it resolved by the mayor and City Council of Glendora as follows:

Whereas the city of Glendora is vitally dependent on a water supply obtained from the Colorado River; and

Whereas California's rightful share of Colorado River water is threatened by the upper Colorado River Basin projects as proposed in S. 500 and H. R. 270, and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress; and

Whereas the aforementioned projects would inflict on all taxpayers of this city and the Nation an unjustifiable burden of more than $4 billion; and

Whereas these political pump-priming schemes if authorized would furnish water to grow the kind of crops which are already in great surplus in this country, and which are already heavily subsidized by the taxpayers; and

Whereas the Colorado River Board of California, official State agency charged with the responsibility of safeguarding California's existing contracts for Colorado River water, has gone on record strongly opposing these measures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the enactment of these project bills is against the interest of the city of Glendora in particular and the State of California in general and should be opposed; be it further

Resolved, That the city of Glendora respectfully requests the representatives of the State of California in the Congress of the United States to actively oppose the enactment of the above-mentioned bills or any similar proposals, and that certified copies of this resolution be airmailed to our congressional representatives, and copies be made available to press and radio news sources.

The city clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this resolution and the same shall thereupon take effect and be in force.

Approved and passed the 19th day of April, 1955.

LOUIS C. WOOD,
Mayor of the City of Glendora.

Attest:

R. R. BAIOTTO,
City Clerk.

Resolution 3446

Resolution of the Council of the City of Pomona, County of Los Angeles, State of California supporting the Colorado River Board of California and its opposition to the upper Colorado River Basin projects as proposed in S. 500 and H. R. 270 and the Fryingpan-Arkansas projects as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress

Whereas increasing population, industrial growth and economic well-being of the city of Pomona in particular and the southern coastal plain in general depends upon California's rightful share of Colorado River water; and

Whereas this source of water, both in quantity and quality, is seriously threatened by upper Colorado River Basin projects as proposed in S. 500 and H. R. 270 and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress, and

Whereas the aforementioned projects would inflict on all taxpayers in this city and county and the Nation an unjustifiable burden of more than $4 billion, and

Whereas these political pump-priming schemes if authorized would furnish water to grow more surplus crops already heavily subsidized by the taxpayers, and

Whereas the Colorado River Board of California, official State agency charged with the responsibility of safeguarding California's existing contracts for Colorado River water, has gone on record strongly opposing these measures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Pomona respectfully requests the representatives of the State of California in the Congress of the United States to actively oppose the enactment of these bills or any similar proposals, and that certified copies of this resolution be airmailed to our congressional representatives, and copies be made available to press and radio news sources.

The city clerk of the city of Pomona shall certify to the adoption and passage of this resolution and the same shall thereupon take effect and be in force.

Approved and passed this 19th day of April, 1955.

ARTHUR H. COX,
Mayor.

Attest:

L. B. THOMAS,
Acting City Clerk.

Approved as to form this 19th day of April, 1955.

———, ———,
City Attorney.

Resolution of the City Council of the City of San Marino opposing the upper Colorado River Basin projects as proposed in S. 500 and H. R. 270 and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project as proposed in S. 300 and H. R. 412, now pending in Congress

Whereas the city of San Marino is a member of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and, as such, has paid to the Metropolitan Water District substantial sums of money and has obligated itself for additional amounts to cover the cost of this project; and

Whereas the city of San Marino is dependent upon water supply from the Colorado River for future needs; and

Whereas this supply may be jeopardized by proposals now before Congress for development in the upper Colorado Basin, notably S. 300 and S. 500 and House Resolution 412, and H. R. 270; and

Whereas this legislation would impose a tax burden upon all taxpayers of the Nation to provide benefits to individuals and communities as contrasted to the locally financed Metropolitan Water District of Southern California; and

Whereas the proposed legislation would call for subsidies from the Federal Treasury far beyond the limits of the present reclamation law and in so doing would additionally socialize the economy of the western United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the enactment of these projects bills is against the interest of the city of San Marino in particular and the State of California in general and should be opposed; be it further

Resolved, That the city of San Marino respectfully requests the Representatives of the State of California in the Congress of the United States to actively oppose the enactment of the above-mentioned bills, in their present form, or any similar proposals.

CORSON W. IDE,
Mayor of the City of San Marino, Calif.

Attest:

E. R. KERR,
City Clerk of the City of San Marino, Calif.

Inventory Horror Stories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an article from the May 20 issue of Sales Management, a national magazine of marketing, dealing with the recent report of the Hoover Commission on inventories. The article appeared as follows under the heading "Inventory Horror Stories":

You've read in your daily newspaper and heard your favorite news commentator view with dismay the report by the Hoover Commission that:

"The Navy has on hand enough blue trousers to outfit the Navy for 8.1 years.

"The Air Force can supply overcoats out of stock for next 4.2 years.

"The Marine Corps green coats will last the corps for another 3.2 years.

"The Army has a 10.6 years' supply of women's wool serge taupe uniforms."

Before you point your finger and condemn a wasteful, bureaucratic Government, remember that what the Government bought, a great many companies sold. And the winning bidders were very happy to secure those Government orders now considered as needless purchases.

The Hoover Commission, headed by ex-President Herbert Hoover and consisting of prominent Republican and Democratic Government officials and businessmen, is trying to introduce business efficiency into Government. Its findings point to ways for improvement, but the recommendations will come to nothing unless business supports them.

It's a salesman's responsibility to bring cost-saving ideas to the attention of prospects—and that includes prospects in the Government. But how many sales executives offer the same imagination to their governmental prospects as they do to their civilian customers?

The Hoover Commission report on food and clothing in the Federal Government estimates that in the Department of Defense alone, it is possible to cut inventory by $1,350,000,000 at an anuual savings in interest of $30 million, and another saving of $3 million in warehousing and other costs entailed in storing excess stocks.

We believe you will agree that it does little good to "view with alarm" all of these horror stories of excess inventory, if every company selling to the Government has not taken more than routine steps to help the vast, sprawling Government to get the most for the taxpayers' money.

Statement by Representative James E. Van Zandt, Member of Congress, 20th District of Pennsylvania, June 6, 1955, Urging Immediate Action on Legislation To Further Liberalize the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, since my election to Congress in 1938 I have advocated liberalization of the Social Security Act.

For the past several years many of us in Congress pleaded for congressional action on bills that we had sponsored, and it was not until a few years ago that the law was liberalized by increasing benefits and expanding the coverage.

When Congress took this action it failed to reduce the eligibility age of the employee and the widow from 65 to 60 years and to permit retirement because of disability regardless of age.

In addition, Congress neglected to include coverage under the Social Security Act for lawyers and dentists. In a few words, the job of liberalizing the Social Security Act is far from being accomplished.

During the past several months it has been heartening to see so many other Members of Congress advocating what a few of us have sponsored over a period of years.

We hope that with this new-found strength we may be able to get action at this session of Congress on bills that will liberalize the Social Security Act along the lines that many of us have consistently advocated.

Early in this session of Congress I again introduced bills to amend the Social Security Act, all of which are duplicates of bills which I introduced in previous Congresses.

The bills are as follows:

H. R. 854 provides that for the purpose of old-age and survivors-insurance benefits the age shall be 60 years. This means that the eligibility age for employees and widows is reduced from 65 to 60 years.

H. R. 855 would extend social-security coverage to individuals engaged in the practice of law.

H. R. 862 is a bill prohibiting any State from taking a lien on a person's home as a means of seeking reimbursement for monies paid him in public assistance benefits.

H. R. 2212 provides that any person covered under the Social Security Act shall be entitled to the same primary and survivors benefit rights during a period of disability as he would be entitled to had he attained retirement age when the disability began. In other words, a disabled person would not be required to wait until he reached age 65 before being entitled to social-security benefits.

H. R. 4752 is a bill designed to extend social-security coverage to individuals engaged in the practice of dentistry.

Mr. Speaker, this series of bills represents a program of liberalization of the Social Security Act which I feel is long overdue.

Social-security benefits should be provided at age 60 for all Americans without discrimination and should be in keeping with the present day cost of living.

It is true that it costs money to liberalize the Social Security Act. In my contact with persons whose employment is covered by social security I have found that they are willing to pay the cost of a realistic and adequate program of social-security benefits.

Mr. Speaker, we know from past experience that amending the Social Security Act requires a lot of study. Therefore, I hope that these vital amendments to the Social Security Act will receive at an early date the attention they deserve from the House Ways and Means Committee.

Forced Inspection of Poultry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in Labor's Daily, on

Wednesday, May 25, 1955, etitled "Forced Inspection of Poultry."

FORCED INSPECTION OF POULTRY URGED

(By Sidney Margolius)

The need for compulsory inspection by Federal authorities of all poultry at the processing plant before it reaches retail stores has become more urgent than ever before.

The reason is that more and more poultry is sold "ready-to-cook," which means it has already been drawn or eviscerated at a processing plant before it gets to the stores. No longer can the retail butcher or the housewife herself tell if a chicken was diseased before it was prepared for market, because it is impossible to determine the wholesomeness of poultry without examination of the internal organs as well as the outside and inside of the bird. The internal organs may have been swimming in pus when the bird was opened, but how are you to know that when you buy it already drawn and packaged in pretty cellophane?

This is one of disturbing facts about poultry that Representative ALBERT P. MORANO, Republican of Connecticut ought to know. Representative MORANO is the Congressman who told a constituent worried about the lack of uniform compulsory Federal inspection, that he shouldn't believe everything he reads.

Perhaps his cynicism about publications stems from his familiarity with the Luce magazines, Time and Life (he served as executive secretary to Claire Booth Luce during her two terms in Congress). But he should know that the current criticisms in the labor press about the lack of nationwide poultry inspection stem from real facts. Here they are:

FOOD-BORNE DISEASES

A report by the Hoover Commission's task force on Federal medical services, has just pointed out that: "Diseases common to poultry and man—especially the salmonella infections—are almost as significant in number and severity as diseases common to animal and man. Poultry or poultry dishes cause about 1 out of 4 cases of food-borne disease. Environmental sanitation and handling in poultry packing plants is in many instances deplorable."

This Goverment-sponsored investigating committee also points out that both the United States Livestock Sanitary Association and the Conference of State and Territorial Health Offices have recommended that State and local governments strengthen their poultry inspection and sanitation programs. But—it notes—only a few States have compulsory poultry inspection, and, "we do not believe we can expect the States alone to provide the needed controls."

Now that's a significant observation, and is the key reason why labor unions and other citizens' organizations are literally begging for uniform and compulsory inspection by the Federal Government, as is provided for beef, pork, veal, lamb and other red meats.

WORKERS TELL STORY

You can buy a steak or any other red meat that's shipped between States with assurance that the animal it came from was healthy when slaughtered. You've noticed many times the round purple Government stamp on meat, giving you this assurance. Why not poultry?

Besides the Hoover Commission's experts, the men employed in poultry packing plants themselves have warned the public that sick and diseased chickens are often packed and shipped out to the stores. The Amalgamated Meat Cutters' and Butcher Workmen's Union has charged "that a cesspool of filth and disease exists in certain areas of the poultry industry," and adds: "In spite of this common knowledge and information, nothing effective has been done to stop the flow of this filthy, diseased, unregulated and uninspected poultry to the poultry market of the nation."

Besides workers in the poultry industry, a number of management representatives have spoken up about the need for improved sanitation and compulsory inspection in the poultry industry. We must give the public poultry that not only looks clean but is clean, warned W. V. Pringle of the Rockingham Marketing Cooperative, a large Southern poultry organization. He urged that poultry-packing plants maintain proper sanitary conditions, but pointed out that only a small proportion of poultry is handled under Federal or State inspection of plant sanitation. Too, Theron Brown, sales manager of the Jewell Poultry Co., one of the largest poultry packers in the country, has warned the poultry industry that compulsory inspection is inevitable.

AUTHORITIES WORRIED

One of the most impartial authorities on the dangers of sick chickens to public health are the local boards of health, who have the responsibility of guarding the well-being of their communities. You will find many local boards of health concerned about poultry. The New York City Board of Health is insisting that every ready-to-cook wrapped chicken on sale in New York stores must carry a label showing it was inspected by a Federal or State or city inspection service in the area where it was packed. A few other cities now also make this requirement.

The poultry expert of the New York health board told this writer that the board considers it urgent that the wrapped poultry now sold by most supermarkets be inspected by an impartial agency such as the United States Agriculture Department.

State and local authorities in other areas are expressing similar concern. Recently, the commissioner of agriculture of Texas urged the enactment of a State law providing for poultry sanitation and inspection by State authorities. The Federal Government itself has indicated concern over the poultry situation, by advancing the date of release of its recommended Poultry Sanitation Code.

WILL HE BELIEVE EVIDENCE?

If a Congressman asked by his constituent to take action won't believe what he reads, will he believe this impressive array of witnesses—the Hoover Commission's Task Force, workers and employers in the industry; medical, agriculture, and law-enforcement authorities?

The public cannot rely on sporadic localized efforts to police sanitation in the poultry industry. What is clearly needed is uniformed inspection all over the country, and only the Federal Government can do this job.

You'll be able to eat your Sunday chicken with greater peace of mind if you call the attention of your own Congressman to these facts.

Resolution of General Assembly of Connecticut Concerning New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have read with great pleasure and interest the Connecticut Senate's Joint Resolution 179 commending Mr. Patrick B. McGinnis for his steadfast leadership and ability in directing and guiding the welfare of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad.

The importance of this railroad is beyond conception as a New England business enterprise. In case of an emergency or international conflict it would be a major factor in the lifeline of our Nation and in particular the east coast.

I, too, want to congratulate Mr. McGinnis on his leadership ingenuity for the welfare of the people of Connecticut. The greatest compliment that can be paid a man today, in my estimation, is that he is a real American and one with American interests foremost in his heart, and certainly Pat McGinnis qualifies.

Mr. Speaker, the following has been adopted by our Connecticut State Senate and forwarded to me by our great secretary of state, Mrs. Mildred P. Allen:

JUNE 3, 1955.

Congressman JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: By command of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, I am transmitting to you a certified copy of Senate Joint Resolution 179, resolution commendation and encouragement to Patrick B. McGinnis and his fellow officers and directors of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad for the forward-looking policies they have adopted in the running of Connecticut's most important transportation system.

Sincerely yours,

MILDRED P. ALLEN,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

Senate Joint Resolution 179

Resolution commendation and encouragement to Patrick B. McGinnis and his fellow officers and directors of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad for the forward-looking policies they have adopted in the running of Connecticut's most important transportation system

Resolved by this assembly:

Whereas the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. is now entering into its second year under the leadership of Patrick B. McGinnis; and

Whereas the said Patrick B. McGinnis has succeeded, in the short time he has been in control, in infusing a new, vigorous, forward-looking spirit into this essentially Connecticut railroad; and

Whereas the said Patrick B. McGinnis has shown a fine spirit of cooperation with State and municipal officials, and has demonstrated his ardent desire to do everything possible to retain Connecticut's present industries and to encourage new industries to locate within our boundaries; and

Whereas he has with the authorization of his board of directors, placed orders for revolutionary new types of passenger equipment, has begun installation of jointless rail and of a magnetronic reservisor system for reservations, has instituted 10-ride fares, ladies' day fares, a charge-a-plate system, has inspired zoo trains and other merchandising features all calculated to give Connecticut improved transportation service, and to improve passenger service and commuting conditions to attract New York business people to live within our State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of this general assembly take occasion publicly to express their approbation of the steps being taken to modernize the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad to the ultimate benefit of our State, and particularly to commend the

wonderful spirit of leadership exhibited by Patrick B. McGinnis, its President, and to express the hope of this body that he will have continued success in his efforts which we believe will redound to the benefit of all the citizens of our State; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and she hereby is authorized and directed to transmit to the several Senators and Representatives from Connecticut in the Congress of the United States and to the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of both Houses of Congress, duly certified copies of this resolution, and that a suitably inscribed copy also be sent to Mr. Patrick B. McGinnis, president of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co.

JUNE 1, 1955.

I, Mildred P. Allen, secretary of State of Connecticut and keeper of the great seal thereof, and of the original record of the acts and resolutions of the general assembly of said State, do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy of Senate Joint Resolution 179, resolution commendation and encouragement to Patrick B. McGinnis and his fellow officers and directors of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad for the forward-looking policies they have adopted in the running of Connecticut's most important transportation system, approved June 1, 1955, with the original record of the same now remaining in this office, and have found the said copy to be correct and complete transcript thereof.

And I further certify, that the said original record is a public record of the State of Connecticut, now remaining in this office.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Connecticut, at Hartford, this 3d day of June 1955.

[SEAL] MILDRED P. ALLEN,
Secretary of State.

Freedom of Enterprise America's Passport To World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD a speech by Mr. William Jackman, president of the Investors League, Inc. This address was delivered before the 28th Annual World Trade Day program of the Los Angeles Breakfast Club on May 18, 1955.

The address follows:

The vitality and strength of our private enterprise system has carried this Nation through a series of costly wars and a depression of great magnitude, while at the same time helping other free nations of the world to regain their economic equilibrium. Today, as the greatest industrial nation, we stand as a world leader. Our people are enjoying the highest standard of living known to man.

Credit for these remarkable achievements have been due in no small measure to the millions of individual American investors. These people who, through frugality, have set aside a portion of their savings for investment in the great industries of our Nation in an effort to provide their own social security. Our Nation has flourished in an environment of freedom.

Now that most nations of the free world can once again raise their heads and adequately enter the competitions for world markets, it is our common objective to expand world trade. To do so we must encourage the lowering of trade barriers and other roadblocks to the interchange of goods. Some nonthinkers might construe the United States joining in this movement as cutting our own throats. The truth of the matter is that by such action we are allowing the nations of the world to become strong enough financially so that they will not need our aid. We are helping others to help themselves.

Approaching this goal will involve some domestic adjustments. The United States, with its high labor costs and high standard of living, must be able to compete in world markets with countries where labor costs and the standard of living are lower. To do so we must rely entirely on our advanced manufacturing techniques, our mass production, materials, and know-how.

The American investor stands ready to meet his responsibility, for he knows that under our system only he can provide business with the funds needed to build the tools and furnish the assembly line. You must have an investor before you have a customer. He is conscious of the fact that the only alternative is for Government to assume the roll of investor—a costly and politically dangerous action.

In appraising the role of the investor in our economy we must not forget that it is the individual investor who must supply an average of $12,000 to provide the machinery necessary to employ one production worker. Multiply that amount a thousand fold and you begin to get some idea of the magnitude of his role. I always like to envision our economy as a triangle: Labor, management, and the investor as equal partners. All must be functioning in order for our economy to grow. What a great step forward it would be if we had such unanimity of action.

We Americans can compete in world markets because we have reduced manufacturing costs through new advances in techniques, machinery, and methods of production and have a citizenry which will continue to carry on that same risk-taking spirit that was so prevalent when our Nation was born.

As I previously stated, a healthy environment for the free flow of capital from investor to industry is very important. I cannot emphasize too strongly this need. For only through confidence in our Government's desire to maintain and strengthen our free institutions can freedom enterprise flourish.

We cannot be the well-spring of a free flow of risk capital abroad unless we first create a healthy environment for its work in our own country. For it is the fruits of our domestic endeavors, culminating in a reasonable return on the invested capital that will make possible an investment abroad by the investor. Several factors have arisen in the past several months which have tendered to shake the confidence of investors. One such development has been the recently concluded Senate banking and currency hearings. What transpired did not bespeak much in the way of friendliness toward investors but rather of politics. From what the investor heard from many of the committee members, it is a wonder that the market did not react more violently than it did. Statements made by these men did not bespeak of confidence in the integrity of our financial institutions, the investor, or of our economy.

Congressional pressures to kill double taxation relief and their apathy toward revision of the tax treatment of capital gains also raises doubts in the minds of investors—doubts as to the Government's attitude toward them and their role in our society. I suppose it is a result of political fear that tax relief for the investor is favoring only the rich. Nothing can be further from the truth. The investor is just an average citizen, be he a bricklayer, carpenter, plumber, or banker. The majority of stock ownership, for instance, is in the hands of women. A great many of these are professional women, schoolteachers, etc.

In 1951, the last year for which official Treasury data was available, more than half of the individuals reporting capital gains had gross incomes of less than $5,000. Figures for dividend recipients show substantially the same result. I, of course, could go on and mention other recent developments which have raised doubts in the minds of the investor. The threat of Government regulation over the basic industries of our Nation by reason of such regulation over the producers of natural gas and the controversy now raging over public versus private power are just two other matters that come to mind. Sufficient to say that some soul searching is in order.

Equity capital must come as seeds from the risk capital invested in our economy. If Government persists through dividends and capital-gains taxation to allow only a little of the investors return to trickle back to him, then funds for foreign investment will not be available.

As you sow, so shall you reap.

It is therefore axiomatic that freedom of enterprise in the truest sense is America's passport to world trade, and a healthy investor environment along the lines I have mentioned can make a major contribution in this area.

National Reserve Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert a number of newspaper editorials supporting the thinkings of our military leaders:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 21, 1955]

STALLING THE RESERVE PROGRAM

The House adopted an ironical method of celebrating Armed Forces Week by sidetracking the administration's Reserve program. The trouble came over the admittedly difficult problem of segregation in the National Guard, to which men completing active service could be assigned under the plan.

The abolition of segregation in the other components of the Armed Forces has not affected the guard in some States. Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL'S amendment on this subject turned many southern Representatives against the bill, and Representative CARL VINSON was unable to to compromise the dispute. To those who differed on segregation were added a number of Congressmen who regard universal military training as a bogey and the Reserve plan as an attempt to introduce UMT through the backdoor. The result was the shelving of the whole Reserve plan, apparently indefinitely.

The tragedy of this stalemate is that it leaves the United States without a long-term military manpower policy. As men leave the active forces they are under no compulsion to keep up their skills; the initial burden of a crisis in world affairs would have to be borne by the men actually under arms, by volunteers in the National Guard and Organized Reserves, and by those who had most recently completed their active duty.

As the Korean war proved, such an arrangement requires heavy sacrifices from a small number who may be recalled repeatedly, while new men are being trained for combat. It also means that the process of

creating new formations is slower than modern war allows. The President's proposals for cuts in Army manpower (which the House accepted overwhelmingly) were based in part on recent weapon developments, in part on the expectation that trained reserves in adequate numbers would be ready for an emergency.

Without a sound Reserve plan, it is believed that more men must be drafted. Manpower requirements would have to be reassessed, and the number of troops, airmen, and sailors on duty would probably have to be increased. This is costly in terms of money and energy, it is wasteful as expensive training is forgotten in civilian life, and it is dangerous in that adjustment to new weapons and tactics will not be made by the Reserves.

The House must take up the matter again. Segregation is a problem, but it can be resolved. The United States must have Ready Reserves.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 20, 1955]

COLOR IN THE GUARD

Shelving of the Armed Forces Reserve bill in the House has placed the administration, Congress, and the country in an ugly dilemma. Passage of the bill is important to national security. Only by compulsory reserve training can the Armed Forces build adequate reserves that would be meaningful in time of emergency. At the same time it would be unconscionable as a matter of public policy to permit the use of Federal authority to compel reservists to serve in racially segregated units. In parts of the South segregation is still practiced in the National Guard, which is under State direction in time of peace. The bill is stuck on Representative POWELL's effort specifically to prohibit compulsory assignments to segregated units. This effort, in turn, has opened the bill to all sorts of crippling maneuvers.

While we sympathize with the purport of Mr. POWELL's amendments, we think he injected a distracting element unnecessarily. One of his amendments, for example, would prohibit operation of the 6-month voluntary training program in States in which National Guard or Reserve units are segregated even though there is no direct connection between the voluntary training and later Reserve assignment. No problem on this score had been anticipated by the Defense Department, which has been carrying out presidential policy of racial integration in the Regular Armed Forces. The Department expected to handle Reserve and National Guard assignments administratively in the South so as to avoid any compulsory service in segregated units.

Unhappily, what was a relatively simple problem of military legislation has now become involved in a squabble over States' rights and national policy. In some respects the squabble is ludicrous, because segregation would be eliminated automatically if the Guard should be federalized in time of emergency. It ought to go without saying that the national Government, being dedicated to the elimination of segregation in public facilities, could not in good faith enforce participation in segregated Reserve units. But the language of the amendments threatens the entire bill when Reserve legislation is paramount, and some sort of compromise must be sought. One way out might be to rely on the organized Reserve and avoid compulsory assignment to the National Guard altogether in areas where States have not yet done away with segregation. In any event, the urgent need is for the House to listen to national rather than sectional interest in passing an equitable Reserve law.

[From the Baltimore Sun of May 20, 1955]

THE MILITARY RESERVE BILL IS A MUST

After 2 days of bitter debate the House of Representatives yesterday voted to sidetrack for the time being the administration's national military Reserve bill. That action was taken by supporters of the bill to avoid the imminent danger of its being sent back to committe, which virtually would kill it for this session of Congress.

Except for professional soldiers and the relatively few civilians who make soldiering a hobby nobody in this country likes military service. Therefore the Reserve bill is not a popular measure, as the debate made clear. It came in for plenty of criticism from its opponents.

But nothing that was said refuted the soundness of its fundamental purpose. That is to establish behind the very limited Regular forces a Reserve of civilians trained and assigned to specific tasks, ready in fact as well as in name to come instantly to the defense of the country in case of war.

Theoretically we have such a Reserve; actually most of it is on paper. That is because there is at present no way to make men perform active duties with the Reserve as the law stipulates. Relatively few do so voluntarily. The Reserve bill aims to enforce that performance of duty. It attempts also to equalize the burden, as far as is consistent with efficiency, so that every individual performs his fair share. If, in practice, it is found that there are inequalities or that the bill does not operate as expected, it can be corrected by amendment.

At the moment we are facing the prospect of the Big Four meeting in which the Russians will be present. They are not reducing their forces. They are not relieving their young men of any of their military obligations. President Eisenhower has emphasized how failure to maintain our Armed Forces would weaken our position at the conference table. Make no mistake, the Russians are watching what Americans are doing.

We suspect that its opponents greatly overestimate the public objection to this measure. Insofar as it will clarify the military obligation it should be welcomed by the many young men who now are kept in suspense over when and how their duties are to be performed. And surely the vast majority of the public would approve if they realized how helpless this country would be without a Ready Reserve in time of grave emergency.

The House of Representatives could not do the country a greater disservice than by its failure thus far to pass the Reserve bill.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 20, 1955]

DANGEROUS DAWDLING

Only strong nations can negotiate with the Communists. The weak ones simply do as they are told.

This summer, probably, our President will meet with the Russians' top man.

Meantime, he has asked Congress' support for a plan to keep America strong—economically and militarily.

Mr. Eisenhower's plan calls for—

A small regular military force—but one that could stand against attack and hit back hard.

A much stronger force of trained citizen reserves than we now have—almost 3 million part-time soldiers who could be ready in short order to help defend America.

So what has happened?

The House of Representatives went along with Mr. Eisenhower—part way. The Congressmen o. k.'ed a cut of 100,000 from the regular force.

Then, yesterday, they all but killed the Reserve program, by postponing further consideration of it—indefinitely.

What happens next?

We don't know.

But we hope Congress contains enough sensible leaders to get that Reserve program out of cold storage, and enough responsible Members to get it passed.

We hope people over the country, realizing the peril in which Congress has put us, tell their statesmen off.

We hope Mr. Eisenhower, a man even most Congressmen will concede knows military strategy, will make it clear to the country how vital it is to have his full defense program approved.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 21, 1955]

END THE RACE BIAS BLOCKADE OF READY RESERVE BILL

Philadelphia is appropriately closing Armed Forces Week today. During the week here and elsewhere in the Nation, Americans have been favorably impressed by demonstrations in many localities of greatly advanced types of weapons and other aspects of modern military strength.

With the tremendous complications of this perilous era these things are reassuring if we can look foward with reasonable confidence to further determined measures by our defense agencies to make still greater gains and improvements. That is something we must hope for and, in fact, the Nation must demand.

But armies, navies, air forces, are not just assortments of highly specialized weapons. They must also be made up of men and, in these latter days, women, trained, dedicated, and brave. And for our sure defense we must call upon all Americans to do battle for their country whenever the need arises.

Therefore, it was one jarring note in Armed Forces Week when, on Thursday, racial bias among Southern Congressmen caused President Eisenhower's Ready Reserve bill to be sidetracked and perhaps permanently endangered.

The Ready Reserve of 2,900,000 to be built up by 1960 is a truly vital defense need. The projected program, with 5 years for its development, is slow enough, in all conscience. But its adoption would mean an eventual end to the loose, meaningless present Reserve system.

Yet an issue of integration in National Guard and other Reserve organizations was raised by the Southern race fanatics. When the grim chips were down a man's race won't keep him out of the firing lines. In our wars it hasn't barred men from exalted acts of heroism.

Racial bias is an unworthy manifestation in any respect. To see it operate to block an immensely important development of America's defenses is disgraceful—another beautiful opening for Red propaganda. The House should not lose a minute in bringing back the Ready Reserve bill for enactment, for the greater strength and security of our country. And to vindicate the decent fairness of most Americans toward all its citizens.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of May 21, 1955]

A DAY OF REMINDER

As they watch the parades go by this Armed Forces Day, lawmakers in the House of Representatives had better search their consciences. This week they all but murdered the bill to give America a strong and adequate reserve of military manpower.

The bill is designed to build up our reserve strength to nearly 3 million men by 1960. The administration wants a smaller but highly skilled force of men under arms, backed by a big pool of reserves.

The administration's Reserve plan ran into trouble in the House on an issue of segregation. It also drew attack from some lawmakers who oppose anything that smacks of universal military training, which one very sensible feature of this bill does smack of.

What with crossfire from zealots on both sides of the segregation issue, and what with sniping from the UMT foes, the bill was felled on the House floor. It was not killed,

thanks to a timely rescue by Representative CARL VINSON; but it has been tabled, half-dead.

Today, Armed Forces Day, the lawmakers will be giving and hearing a lot of high-flown speeches about American defense and the need for constant vigilance. If they give half a thought to defense and vigilance, they will revive the Reserve bill and send it on its way into law.

Study of HEW Urged on Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article by Drew Pearson, which appeared in his column, Washington Merry-Go-Round in the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 3, 1955:

STUDY OF HEW URGED ON CONGRESS

(By Drew Pearson)

In order to make sure that President Eisenhower picks an outstanding successor to Mrs. Hobby it might be a good idea for the appropriate congressional committees to take a careful look at the entire Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This would give the public some idea both of how important that agency is and the importance of having it administered by an executive really in sympathy with health, education, and welfare.

One trouble with Mrs. Hobby is that she's been so gun-shy of being tabbed a welfare state executive that she's run away from some of her most important duties. Even Herbert Hoover points this out.

The Secretary of Labor is charged with working for the rights of labor and James Mitchell, the current Eisenhower appointee, has done a good job.

The Secretary of Commerce is charged with working for business, and Sinclair Weeks, whether you agree with him or not, has certainly gone all-out for business.

But Mrs. Hobby, who might have made an excellent Secretary of Commerce, has been scared to death about promoting health, education, and welfare.

MRS. HOBBY'S RECORD

Here, for instance, are some questions which go to the heart of Mrs. Hobby's record, and which a congressional committee should probe carefully:

1. Why did Mrs. Hobby alter grain inspection standards?

The Truman administration on October 15, 1952, began a campaign to inspect grain cars and grain elevators in order to clean weevil and rat manure out of the wheat consumed by the American public. But Mrs. Hobby, acting with Secretary of Agriculture Benson, wiped out the Truman order on May 1, 1953.

This was done over the protest of the Food and Drug Administration and the bakers of the United States. Both opposed her vigorously. However, Mrs. Hobby abandoned Government inspection of grain and took the word of the big grain elevator operators that they would impose voluntary inspection.

2. Who gave the order to abandon Government inspection for rat refuse and weevils?

Peavey Heffelfinger of Minneapolis, chairman of the Republican National Finance Committee, lunched with Ike and discussed the grain-inspection program just before Mrs. Hobby abandoned it.

3. Who tried to fire two Food and Drug officials because they insisted on grain inspection?

John L. Harvey and M. R. Stephens, of Food and Drug aroused the opposition of the big grain lobby, which demanded that Mrs. Hobby give them the ax. For a time Mrs. Hobby was on the verge of firing them. Then Secretary Weeks' firing of Dr. Allen Astin as Director of the Bureau of Standards caused such a furor that nothing happened.

4. Find out how much rat manure and weevil are now permitted in grain?

Mrs. Hobby finally discovered that voluntary grain inspection didn't work, and, with the bakers breathing down her neck, Government inspection was reinstated about 1 year later.

However, she now permits twice as much rat manure and weevil in grain for human consumption as was allowed under the Truman order—namely, 64 pounds of rat droppings per carload and 12 gallons of urine per car.

5. Why did Mrs. Hobby want to cut medical research by $10 million in 1953?

When the Senate, led by LISTER HILL, of Alabama, opposed a budget cut in medical research on cancer, polio, heart disease, epilepsy, muscular dystrophy, etc., Mrs. Hobby actually wrote to the Budget Director urging that her own budget for medical research be cut—even though the Hoover Commission has now urged more money for research.

Though Cabinet members sometimes are forced to accept a budget cut, it's almost unheard of for a Cabinet member to urge a budget cut. Yet Mrs. Hobby took a definite stand against medical research. Fortunately Senator HILL put through the appropriation over Mrs. Hobby's protest.

These medical research funds are allotted to universities and hospitals doing important work in research. They are not spent by the Government. But Mrs. Hobby seemed afraid she might be accused of promoting socialized medicine.

6. Why did Mrs. Hobby take a stand against hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act?

This is an important law by which the Federal Government puts up matching money to help localities build badly needed hospitals. Mrs. Hobby, though supposed to promote health, education, and welfare, seemed decidedly unenthusiastic about hospital construction.

7. Why did Mrs. Hobby try to cut the school-construction program in congested military and Federal areas by $100 million?

Also why did she for 2 years oppose any school bill; until this year it became evident that Congress would force her hand if she didn't act?

These are just a few questions that a congressional committee ought to develop in detail, not only to ascertain the mistakes of the past but to make sure Mrs. Hobby's successor doesn't carry on as if he were Secretary of Commerce rather than Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is the newest Department of government, but thrown into it are some of the oldest and most important Government functions, such as the Public Health Service, founded personally by Alexander Hamilton, who wasn't exactly a believer in a welfare state.

What it needs is a Cabinet chief who will operate it as if he or she were proud, not ashamed, to work for the welfare of the American people.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Role of the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the graduating class of 1955 at The Citadel, the military college of South Carolina, Charleston, S. C., the distinguished chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. A. W. Radford, delivered the address on Saturday, June 4. His subject was The Role of the Military.

In plain, simple, and everyday language, this outstanding officer, the holder of innumerable decorations and citations for leadership, courage, and valor, in the most deadly wars in which this country has ever been engaged, related to the graduates of that fine institution the tremendous necessity for participation in the mission assigned to the military during the years in which they, as graduates, will be called upon to give service to their country.

Admiral Radford's address demonstrates to these fine young men how the military man, during this global participation to which this Nation is committed, among other things is part and parcel of our economic and diplomatic life as well as the military.

I doubt that any man in the Nation is better qualified to speak on this subject than Admiral Radford. The Congress has confidence in his leadership. The Nation likewise knows that Admiral Radford regards its safety and security as one of his most sacred obligations.

The address of the distinguished chairman follows:

THE ROLE OF THE MILITARY

(Graduation address by Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, before The Citadel, Charleston, S. C., June 4, 1955)

Quite naturally, a ceremony like this carries me back around 40 years to when I was a member of the brigade of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy. I saw the graduation ceremonies then, including my own, and I have seen quite a few since.

As a result of my visit here, yesterday and today, I have become impressed by the high standards in your scholastics and training. It makes me very proud to take part this morning in your graduation.

Like other top military schools, The Citadel has more than a century of honorable tradition in contributing to the security of our country. Its graduates have gone out to serve the Nation both as soldiers and as civilians. As one of the oldest schools in the country, The Citadel has the reputation, the curriculum, and the tradition of good education combined with a sound military orientation.

In this day and age, most of you are going to be given the opportunity of service to your flag. Some of you probably expect to begin a tour of duty as a member of one of our active services. Others probably will enter our Reserves. It is my hope that many of you will go on, as so many of your distinguished alumni have done, to follow military careers.

But even if you do not choose to continue as professional soldiers—and I use the term soldiers to refer to all military men—the training and the sense of integrity instilled in you by The Citadel will prove invaluable to you and to the Nation in whatever profession you may pursue.

In my judgment, the greatest opportunity to which you can aspire is the opportunity of service—both military and civilian. You gentlemen have this opportunity for service directly on behalf of the United States of America. There is no greater honor than that.

It is on the subject of this role of the military that I want chiefly to speak, and it is to you graduates that I primarily address my remarks.

Perhaps some of you wonder why so many of your contemporaries are needed by the military services; and why so many, having completed their military service, must continue available for military duty in a national emergency.

The answer is simple: Today our Nation is confronted with the world's greatest and most dangerous menace to our freedoms and our way of life; namely, militant international communism.

Communism is backed by an immense military establishment, and is led by a handful of ruthless individuals who, at any time they see fit, could plunge us into war. Communist leaders have declared their intention to dominate the entire planet on which we live—and they have demonstrated extraordinary capacities for pursuing this intention. Needless to say, it is a struggle we must not lose.

This being the case, what would you say must be done by the Armed Forces in order to protect our peace and security? What is the role of the military?

The Armed Forces exist for one ultimate purpose: the security of the United States. They are organized, trained, and equipped for prompt and sustained combat operations—land, sea, and air—when and as directed by the President and the American people in accordance with our constitutional processes.

Our fighting role is probably our most obvious role. It is our hardest and most difficult role, but it is also our last-resort role, and one used only when our Government calls upon us to use force in defense of our vital interests.

READINESS ROLE

Our second role is our readiness role. "Readiness" is the word for the graduates of the Citadel on this day—a glad and happy day.

Readiness means preparedness. Readiness is your response to your country's call. Readiness is years of practice. It is training, and training means skill, and skill produces efficiency, and efficiency is economical of human life and resources.

Admiral Dewey demonstrated his keen understanding of the philosophy of readiness when he said: "You may fire when ready, Gridley." His words became an epigram destined to live as a part of American military tradition.

Reflect for a moment on the significance of those timeless words. Note how the thought construction of that quiet command describes so well the complete confidence and faith Admiral Dewey had in Gridley's judgment and courage on the eve of that great victory in Manila Bay.

Just as Admiral Dewey trusted Gridley's judgments that day, so Gridley was strengthened by his commander's confidence; and by the certain knowledge that the ships and the men of the American Fleet were ready to do their job.

There is a parallel for this readiness in our more modern times. As President Eisenhower has said: "We will never commit aggression, but we must always be ready to defeat it."

I wish I could assure each of you personally that the threat to our security has so diminished that the United States no longer requires strong military forces—and that there is no possibility of a war resulting from today's conflict between two opposing ideologies.

But I cannot. I must state flatly that a strong military posture is not only essential to our security, but it is clearly necessary for all the free world.

There has been, of course, a noticeable change in tactics on the part of the Communist high command. Symptoms of this change are the successful conclusion of the Austrian Treaty, and the apparent Soviet willingness to participate in four-power talks. But there has been no real indication so far that this represents a fundamental change, either in their character or in their basic long-term objectives.

Thus, while all America sincerely hopes and works for peace, there is still a definite requirement for us to maintain strong military forces in being. In this day, ready forces are strong forces. I stress this word "ready." Our active forces must be ready forces. So must our Reserve forces be ready forces. And all America must be ready to promote unity of action among free nations in establishing long-term security.

ADVISORY ROLE

A third important role or function of the Armed Forces, and these are not set forth in any order of priority, is to give military advice on national security matters. Let's examine for a moment just what this role means.

When I was a young man most of us in uniform were inclined to regard foreign policy as an interesting subject for an evening's academic discussion. We did not feel directly affected by foreign policy decisions unless the decision involved the use of military force.

This has changed—just as the world itself has changed. Fifty years ago our own security was relatively self-sufficient. Today our security is bound up with the security of the free world. Fifty years ago the military had but little concern with foreign policy. Today there is often no clear line of demarcation between foreign and military policy.

Instead, there is overlap. There are military implications in foreign policy, and, conversely, political implications in military policy.

In our democracy military men do not make foreign policies. Such policies are determined by the Chief Executive and the State Department. But their studies are not made without advice of other governmental agencies in pertinent fields; for example, legislative, economic, scientific, and military. Hence, there must be a breadth of comprehension and understanding by the specialists of each as to the roles of the others. After all, the United States is a partnership of all America.

INDIVIDUAL ROLE

Gentlemen, seldom has there been an opportunity for service to your country such as now. You must realize, as I am sure that you do, your country expects great things from you in the future.

In your early years you will not be dealing with the broader aspects of global strategy, new weapons developments, or big business. But you will be dealing with the men and the weapons themselves, and that in itself is no small task today. It is during these early years that you will have to prepare yourselves for the time when you will assume greater responsibilities.

Now, what should you do, personally and individually, to measure up to your increasing responsibilities in both military and civil life?

I feel confident that several thoughts occur to each of you. First is to learn your job and know it thoroughly. Second, keep yourself physically and mentally fit. Third, set a proper example for the people with whom you are associated. And fourth, strive to maintain that spiritual strength and vigor which you have acquired during your life here at The Citadel.

Inherent in all four of these guidelines is your American mission in life: To keep faith in your country and the freedom for which it stands; and to be ready to defend it against all those who would overthrow it.

For you who are being graduated today, I wish I might have the power to instill in each of you, a sense of the historic faith in this mission of America that has been handed down through the ages.

After you leave The Citadel, you will find that your education in the broad sense has only begun. The man who thinks he knows everything has ceased to learn. You should keep the insatiable urge to learn more and more about this great civilization of ours—history, geography, science, philosophy, administration, and so on.

How well you develop yourselves during your early years after graduation—how well you continue to learn all that you can—will determine how good you will be in handling greater problems as you advance into positions of greater responsibility.

Let me urge you in the strongest words possible to throw yourself into this military life—completely and enthusiastically while you are in it. Military service gets into your blood. It will be a constructive help to you in whatever career you follow afterward. This is something which is a little hard to express in words, but easy to feel in inspiration.

And now if I may take a minute more to address a special word to the families and friends of this graduating class. To you I say that your young man has proven his mental ability, his physical stamina, and his good character. He truly belongs with our country's finest. You can be proud of him.

And you can show your pride in ways he will appreciate. You can bear with him his absences on far-flung duties. You can share his sense of dedication to duty. In so doing, you contribute not only to his well-being—you contribute to the overall strength of our country.

Members of the graduating class, this is your graduation day. Your parents have looked forward to it almost from the day you were born. It may be that you will find it difficult to appreciate all they have accomplished for you, until you attempt to do the same thing for your children. I am sure that all present here today congratulate them, as well as you.

Then your professors and instructors are to be congratulated on the fine product here before us in the class of 1955. The improvement, discipline, and cultivation of the youthful mind, always is a goal worthy of man's finest efforts.

And finally, you gentlemen are to be congratulated. This ceremony is symbolic of the great responsibility that is placed in your hands today—not by me, or the President of this college—but by all the American people.

Regardless of the career you have chosen, what will count the most in your future will be the service you give to your flag and to your country. You have been judged and found worthy. Now it is up to you to prove your worth as dedicated American citizens.

For the greatest place of honor is really the place of service.

I am sure I speak for everyone when I say: You have made us very proud. Our heartfelt congratulations and best wishes go with each one of you, and with your families.

Your American Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, Adm. A. W. Radford, immediately upon delivering the address at The Citadel on Saturday, June 4, boarded his plane and journeyed to East Lansing, Mich., where, on Sunday, June 5, he delivered the commencement address to the graduating class of Michigan State College.

His subject was Your American Mission.

This was a great address and one fraught with advice every young man would do well to heed. We in the Congress could harken by his timely remarks. Few men have the capacity to speak in every day language of wisdom of which Admiral Radford is an enviable possessor. I want the Congress and the Nation to read this address:

YOUR AMERICAN MISSION

(Commencement address by Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, before Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich, June 5, 1955)

Today as you graduate, you are about to take your new places in the world, or perhaps continue your education in some other institution of learning. You have been fortunate so far, for your formal education here has given you an excellent start in life. I am sure you recognize in truth that it is only a start—a commencement to a whole future.

Many years ago, longer than I care to remember, the big event of my graduation finally occurred. It was a very hot day. I was sitting there like you, and a commencement speaker was standing here in my place.

In fact, we had two commencement speakers that day at Annapolis, early in June 1916. One was the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson; and the other was the Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels.

Probably most of the matters discussed by these two eminent commencement speakers have been long since forgotten. But one idea they expressed in common that day, I have never forgotten. It stood the test of time so well that I would like to take this opportunity to pass it along to you. I want you to know about it. I hope you will remember it, and set your sights on the target right now.

I do not recall the exact words, but the idea was simply this: We who were about to be graduated in that class of 1916 had a special mission in life. Our mission, individually and collectively, was to be ready to defend our country and our freedom.

The emphasis was on that word "ready." We were to be ready to respond to any call our country might place upon us. We were to be ready to sustain the best traditions of our forefathers. We were to be ready to assume some of the responsibility and the accountability for our fundamental beliefs.

For we, too, had a share in this freedom. We were responsible and accountable for it, under God, to the American people.

You, too, should be ready. You should be ready to perform useful functions in your chosen careers. You should be ready to accept individual responsibility in accordance with your abilities and skills. And you should be ready to help defend our American way of life.

This is a mission which is applicable today to every American. As you progress along the paths of your chosen careers, you will see for yourselves there is no way of escaping this mission without surrendering the things you value most. It requires just plain common sense to figure out that things worth having are things worth defending.

Now, I realize that most commencement speakers are expected to admonish you to beware of the pitfalls in the world outside the college campus; or to exhort you how best to achieve success in the world market places.

But I wish neither to admonish you nor to exhort you this afternoon. Instead, I hope to set forth briefly in clear-cut, unmistakable terms how important this mission in life is to you personally for your long-term future.

MEANING OF FREEDOM

In the early days of our United States, our Founding Fathers established the framework in which freedom could flourish. Those who conceived this Nation, and brought it to life, breathed into it a sense of mission—a sense of destiny—and of progress.

As representative government grew, these early Americans realized that our governmental processes would have to be free of dependence on the few, and rest on the informed cooperation and hard work of the majority. We rejected tyranny, and took up democracy. Thus our country and our history began to take on substance. We became in fact the living proof that freedom is the most worthwhile heritage of all.

What is freedom? What does it mean to you? Billions of words have been spoken about its concept. Entire books have been written about even a single phrase, such as: "Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Actually, it is set forth best in the basic documents of our Nation. We commonly refer to it as "the American way." President Lincoln made a blueprint for it when he said: "A new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

We also refer to freedom as "the rights of men." We hold certain truths to be self-evident: That to secure these rights of men, governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. You know about this, for you here at Michigan State College have been the recipients of the benefits of this heritage.

THREAT TO FREEDOM

But this is not a heritage which we are able to take for granted. Time after time, it has been challenged; and free men have had to join together like the minutemen of yesteryear, and fight to protect our liberty.

In the early part of this century, World War I came about as a challenge to this heritage of ours. I can recall very well the triumphant end of that war. There seemed no doubt then that, not only was freedom our ideal, it was the most powerful and worthwhile concept of human life in history. As a matter of fact, it was a concept which had just been fully vindicated by the outcome of the war.

November 1918 was a great month all right. No one in that hour of triumph could have believed that facism and nazism soon would threaten us. No one could have believed that communism would become the ruthless and relentless menace which later would spread across half the world to plot our destruction.

But we can believe it now. We can see it, hear it, feel it, and know it. Today, we are threatened by a formidable and sinister adversary whose Communist doctrine specifies a program for world domination. The military threat of communism is a very real one since the Communist bloc maintains forces far in excess of that required for its own defense.

There has been, of course, a noticeable change in tactics on the part of the Communist high command. Symptoms of this change are the successful conclusion of the Austrian Treaty, and the apparent Soviet willingness to participate in four-power talks. But there has been no real indication so far that this represents a fundamental change, either in their character or in their basic long-term objectives.

Indeed, communism continues to be the major challenge to our way of life—yours and mine. Its impact bears directly on man's destiny. At issue is the true nature of man himself. It is a struggle which goes to the roots of the human spirit—a struggle we must not lose.

Where does it lead? What can the intelligent college graduate of 1955 do about it?

DEFENSE OF FREEDOM

For one thing, you can keep faith in your country and the freedom for which it stands; and be ready to defend it against all those who would overthrow it.

For you who are being graduated today, I wish I might have the power to install in each of you, a sense of the historic faith in this mission of America that has been handed down through the ages.

After you depart from this campus, you may encounter some individuals who will try to tell you that we live in a world which could be destroyed without notice. They may speak with voices that say we are like Rome was in its declining years. They may even try to tell you that our national values have decayed; that we have no great cause to guide our future history; and that it is futile to try to maintain feelings of true patriotism and self-sacrifice.

This leads, of course, to a newer version of an old saying: "Eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow we die."

But what if you do not die? Suppose you should live and face the consequences of not defending your freedom and your way of life with all that is in you—even your life if need be.

I suggest that if any of you young people ever think of betting your future on the world being destroyed, you better take a long look at the odds. These end-of-the-world predictions are not new. Archeologists find them chiseled on stone tablets thousands of years old.

In a similar vein, in our own country, men have been wringing their hands over the end of freedom ever since the days of George Washington. Perhaps this occurs when there is a lack of "can do" spirit in fulfilling our mission. Perhaps it comes from Communists themselves who would like us to think that communism is irresistible.

Regardless of where it comes from, or what the cause of it is, I can tell you that communism is not the irresistable force or the only way of the future. I can tell you that we are fortunate—and that we have a good cause.

I can also tell you that the United States, its institutions, its people, and its great progress are refutations of the Communist dogma. We are living proof that the assumptions on which communism is based are false. Our free system is the complete antithesis of Communist dictatorship.

I can tell you all this but, in the final analysis, you must know it for yourself. You, individually and collectively, must be strong in your determination to preserve this Nation, and the freedom for which it stands. You must be stronger and more durable than the forces which would destroy us.

"We hold these truths * * *"—indeed we hold these noble truths right in our own hands. We hold them in trust. If we doubt our mission in the world, we probably will cease to progress. If America ever loses confidence in herself, we will retain the confidence of no one. We could even lose our chance to remain free.

Members of the graduating class: This is your commencement day. Your parents have looked forward to it almost from the day you were born, and they too are to be congratulated. It may be that you will find it difficult to appreciate fully what they have accomplished for you until you endeavor to do the same thing for your children. I am confident that all present here today congratulate them, and are proud of them as well as you.

Then your professors here are to be congratulated. It was no easy task for them to turn out a product such as we see before us in the class of 1955. The improvement, discipline, and cultivation of the youthful mind, always is a goal worthy of man's finest efforts.

And now I return to you and me. It is my hope you always will keep with you, your American mission in life, and realize how extremely practical and realistic it is.

Keep the defense of our freedom and our way of life first among your goals in life. Serve your country well. This may not be easy, but it will be a rewarding experience.

For the greatest place of honor is really the place of service.

Congratulations. Good luck. And God bless each of you and your families.

Soviet Union Is Graduating 300,000 More Scientists and Engineers Than the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 27, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this country faces a severe shortage of engineers and technically trained personnel. The critical nature of the shortage was emphasized by Allen W. Dulles, director of the Central Intelligence Agency in a speech before the Alumni Federation of Columbia University. Mr. Dulles said that in the decade from 1950 to 1960, the Soviet Union would graduate 1,200,000 scientists and engineers, compared to 900,000 in the United States. He warned that unless something was done at once, Soviet scientific manpower might well outnumber ours in many key areas.

I have introduced two bills, H. R. 2211 and H. R. 5152, which would go far toward meeting the problem facing our country today.

The Nation cannot afford to discourage young scientists. At a time when its requirements for trained men are rising sharply, bachelor degrees in science have been dropping, 20 percent in 1950–51, another 25 percent in the next year. In 4 years all bachelor degrees in science and engineering have dropped from 80,000 to 34,000.

During this same period, Russia has been extolling the scholar and scientists and encouraging its best brains to go into research. In a few years, Russia will be graduating 80,000 engineers a year. Last year the United States graduated 19,000. Experts say it would be fatal to underestimate the growing quality of Russian engineers.

It is figures like these which led Dr. John R. Dunning, dean of the Columbia University School of Engineering to say, "We have almost lost the battle for scientific manpower."

One of the major factors in this discouraging situation was discussed by Ben H. Bagdikian in one of a series of important articles which appeared recently in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C. The article was titled "Supersecrecy Slows Advance of Science." It is included here together with an article by Dr. Benjamin Fine, education editor of the New York Times.

I have introduced in the House a companion measure to the resolution offered in the Senate by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and Senator JOHN STENNIS. This resolution would establish a special commission on Government security. I am pleased to note that the creation of such a bipartisan commission was unanimously backed recently by a Senate subcommittee even though the administration so far has turned a cold shoulder to the plan.

The commission plan provided in this measure of mine has been urged by many of the country's leaders during the past 3 or 4 years. It is high time that the Congress moved to create such an impartial body and I am sure the country will heartily back the two-party inquiry when it is established.

It is a matter of the most serious natonal importance when, as a 1954 poll showed, half of all new Ph. D.'s say they would prefer a lower salary to going through the present uncertainties of security practices. The 1954 poll showed also that the 33 percent of Ph. D.'s who wanted to work for the Government had dropped to 8 percent and gave the chief reason as the present security program of the Federal Government. If the bipartisan commission, when it is established, will come to grips with this problem we may still win the "battle for scientific manpower."

[From the New York Times of June 5, 1955]

CRITICAL SHORTAGE OF TECHNICALLY TRAINED AMERICANS IS CAUSING MUCH CONCERN

(By Benjamin Fine)

This country faces a severe shortage of engineers and technically trained personnel. The critical nature of the shortage was emphasized last week by Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Speaking before the Alumni Federation of Columbia University, Mr. Dulles said that in the decade from 1950 to 1960, the Soviet Union would graduate 1,200,000 scientists and engineers, compared to 900,000 in the United States. And he warned that unless something was done at once, Soviet scientific manpower might well outnumber ours in many key areas.

This month, for example, just about 20,000 engineers will be graduated from American colleges and universities. At the same time, the Soviet Union will graduate more than 55,000. In addition, Russia will graduate far more men in the subprofessional fields of engineering, in the "technical" areas that are so vital in a technological age.

For a long time we boasted that our engineers had greater technical know-how, and were superior in every way to those coming from the Soviet Union. However, experts who have studied the problem say this is no longer true. The caliber of training received by the Russian engineers is rapidly approaching ours, and in some respects may even surpass it.

CHANGES SINCE THE WAR

What is the cause of the engineer shortage? There is no simple answer. Some educators say that the Government itself is to blame. Soon after World War II, when the veterans began to flood the college campuses, the engineering courses became extremely popular. Back in 1950 about 50,000 men were graduated from the engineering colleges. Government-sponsored reports at that time, said that this was too large a number, that our economy could not absorb them. Many engineers could not find jobs.

Then came Korea, and the frenzied attempt to build up our defense establishment in a hurry. We found that we did not have enough engineers or technically trained men to go around. The civilian economy, plus the military needs, absorbed them faster than schools could turn them out.

Other factors entered the picture. The draft took away many potential engineers. The colleges found that it was difficult for them to compete with industry for well-trained faculty members. Somehow, an interest in engineering dipped to a new low, despite the great interest in all things of a technical nature, such as jet planes, atomic weapons and scientific developments.

TO MEET THE PROBLEM

From the long-range point of view, educators are greatly disturbed at the sharp decline in interest in the sciences by high school students. Figures issued recently by the United States Office of Education show that proportionately fewer students now take courses in chemistry, physics, science and mathematics than ever before. More than half the high schools in the country do not even offer chemistry today.

Educators are seriously concerned at the apparent indifference to the engineering and scientific fields shown by college students and high school graduates. At recent conferences, some called for this very purpose, they have proposed certain steps that might bring the situation into better balance.

Among the most frequently mentioned proposals are these:

The creation of a Reserve Officers Training Corps in the fields of engineering and science. At present the campuses support these corps in the various branches of the Army, in the Navy and Air Force. It is known that the Pentagon has under consideration an extension of these programs, to include ROTC units devoted to engineering and scientific students. Under this plan, if approved, the military officials would provide financial support to qualified students in the technical fields. The suggested program appears to have considerable merit. Certainly it would aid those who are interested in the scientific fields but, for financial reasons, are unable to continue in this area.

ENGINEERING SCHOLARSHIPS

Scholarships for engineering and scientific students have been frequently suggested. In effect, the State or Federal Government would "subsidize" potential science or technical students. It is costly to attend engineering schools. MIT, for example, has just announced that its tuition will be increased still further, and will go over the $1,000 mark. Financial support, it has been argued, should go to liberal arts students as well as those in the fields of science. This question, at the moment, is receiving the thouhgtful attention of the educational authorities.

Higher salaries for teachers of science and engineering are essential if the faculties are not to be depleted. Although it is true that higher salaries should go to all teachers generally, it is doubly essential in the case of the professors in engineering schools. The competition from industry is so severe that the top-notch men are being drawn off by research groups, the Government and private industry.

More adequate physical facilities are essential. The country needs more engineering laboratories more scientific equipment, better working conditions for the scientific and engineering students.

AVOIDING THE DRAFT

It is also essential, the educators almost unanimously agree, that a more realistic attitude be taken toward the question of selective service. Many complaints have been registered in recent months that scientific and engineering students have been drafted before they have completed their studies. This is particularly true, the educators say, concerning graduate students. They point to men who get half way through their graduate work in engineering, only to be called into service.

Finally, a better public relations program appears to be badly needed. The educators want their story told to the American public so that greater support will be forthcoming. It is not commonly known that the United States is falling behind the Soviet Union in the training and preparation of able scientists, engineers and technical personnel. The story should be told.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 31, 1955]

WHAT PRICE SECURITY?—SUPERSECRECY SLOWS ADVANCE OF SCIENCE

(By Ben H. Bagdikian)

Today there is a physicist in a Government laboratory waiting to hear whether he is a "security risk" and therefore in danger of ending his professional career.

Six years ago he asked security officers whether his forthcoming marriage would affect his secret clearance. His fiance had no security problem, but her parents occasionally associated with persons thought to be pro-Communists. The physicist planned never to see his in-laws after the wedding. The security officers assured him the marriage would not jeopardize his status.

Five years later the physicist suddenly had his clearance revoked. The charge: His wife's parents are believed to associate with alleged pro-Communists. The information against him was precisely that volunteered by himself and accepted by the Government. He has appealed at a cost to himself of about $1,000 and approximately $10,000 to the Government. He is still waiting for a decision.

Last year an aeronautical engineer who had worked for the Government for 14 years was suspended from his top secret project in Seattle, putting him out of a job and all but stopping the urgent project. The charge involved information he had given the Government in 1940, which had been investigated and cleared at least twice since then. After 6 months he was restored. The personal cost of the appeal to him was $3,242.83, to the Government, 6 months' loss of time on an important defense project.

These are the kinds of cases that today are causing America's best young scientists to fear Government work. In 1953 a poll of science Ph. D.'s graduating from research universities showed them equally divided on where they would like to work, one-third each in Government, industry, and universities. In 1954—after the investigation of Fort Monmouth and the case of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer—a poll of Ph. D.'s showed that the 33 percent who wanted to work for the Government had dropped to 8 percent. The chief reason given: security.

In fact, about half of all the new Ph. D.'s said they would prefer a lower salary to going through the present uncertainties of security practices.

The Nation cannot afford to discourage young scientists. At a time when its requirements for trained men were rising sharply, bachelor degrees in science have been dropping, 20 percent in 1950–51, another 25 percent the next year.

In 4 years all bachelor degrees in science and engineering have dropped from 80,000 to 34,000.

During this same period, Russia has been extolling the scholar and scientist and encouraging its best brains to go into research. In a few years, Russia will be graduating 80,000 engineers a year. Last year the United States graduated 19,000. And experts say it would be fatal to underestimate the growing quality of Russian engineers.

It is figures like these which led Dr. John R. Dunning, dean of the Columbia University School of Engineering, to say, "We have almost lost the battle for scientific manpower."

Similarly, the Government as a whole cannot afford to encourage public contempt of highly trained, studious men, or "eggheads." The Federal establishment would collapse without them. Twenty percent of all Federal employees are of professional rank, most of them with graduate degrees. Another 37 percent are of top industrial skill. But while more than half are of top-grade talent, only 1 percent of Government workers get $9,000 or more. The legal limit for civil service is $14,500 a year. It is precisely in these badly needed skills that the Government cannot compete with private industry in attracting talent.

SECRECY HIT

Another factor in discouraging Government research is supersecrecy. It hampers not only the individual scientist, but at times the Government itself.

Recently, the Department of Defense completed a "secret" project. All that can be said of it is that it cost somewhere between $10,000 and $100,000 and took a number of senior scientists about a year to complete.

Unaware of the "secret" projects, some non-Government scientists in a university did exactly the same work and published their results. The published results were seen by scientists everywhere, who criticized and used them to improve their own projects and push to new horizons. This demonstrates a number of things:

(1) There is no such things as a permanent secret of nature; (2) any scientific discovery is a link to the future which, if kept secret, stalls the next step but does not prevent others from creating their own links;

and (3) safes, security officers, and generals do not create new weapons like atomic bombs or defenses against them; only the "egg-heads" can do that.

Few scientists want abolition of secrecy in military research, but almost all make a distinction between tactical secrets (such as actual weapons designs, military plans, storage points of bombs, etc.). And secrets of nature (such as the basic information on matter which any scientist anywhere can work on).

NO ONE HAS MONOPOLY

The fact that no nation has a monopoly on research was demonstrated last year when fallout ash covered a Japanese fishing vessel after a hydrogen bomb test at Bikini. The Atomic Energy Commission has not revealed scientific data on fallout materials for fear it would tell something of materials in the bomb. But 4 months after Japanese scientists began their analysis of materials on the fishing vessels, they had published an open paper giving the elements involved, their proportions, and the amount of radioactivity in each—more information than the AEC has published to date.

Another facet of secrecy keeps scientific facts bottled up in sealed compartments, giving each scientist only the information he needs in his own work. This is sound military doctrine on secrets, but it can be fatal to scientific progress. Some of the greatest advances have come from men who saw information they did not need in their own work, or at least thought so. The telegraph was born, for example, because a physicist, Allesandro Volta, in 1778 discovered a mistaken interpretation by Luigi Galvania of Galvani's own work. Under today Government secret research rules, Volta would never see Galvani's data and discovery of the error would have been delayed.

Today a secret-cleared AEC scientist in Los Alamos has a laboratory problem. A friend in an Eastern university, also a secret-cleared AEC man doing AEC research thinks he has the answer but cannot question his friend because in his own project he has no need to know details of his friend's work at Los Alamos.

Security measures, as typified in the Walter-McCarran Immigration Act, also impede scientific progress which in the past had been aided by friendly foreign scientists. Since enactment of the law about half of all foreign scientists applying have been forbidden to visit the United States. Some have contributed much to this country. Dr. Marcus Oliphant, of England, for example, gave information on radar during World War II which the United States said was "probably the most important single item of reverse lend-lease." Yet, under the McCarran Act, Oliphant was not permitted to attend a nonsecret conference here. Prof. E. B. Chain, of England, codiscoverer of penicillin, whose wartime collaboration saved hundreds of American soldiers, was not permitted to set foot on United States soil for a 3-day visit.

Of the 12 men who headed the Los Alamos atom bomb project, half were foreign born and thus of questionable clearance today. The leader, J. Robert Oppenheimer, was declared a security risk last year.

The combination of supersecrecy and distrust of scientists from friendly nations does not produce the strength which the United States depends on. This was only too clear in an incident during the building of the atomic submarine, the *Nautilus*.

At one time it was feared the sub would require extensive redesign because of sleeping-sickness paralysis of its atomic engine by accumulation of a chemical, xenon, whenever the engine stopped. The Government desperately needed basic information on the nature of xenon. A Canadian with top clearance in his native country's atomic project was brought to this country to do open research under an AEC grant.

COULDN'T GET CLEARANCE

Being a Canadian he could not get American clearance, a fact that did not bother anyone until it was discovered that he seemed to have discovered certain reactions and equations which might apply to the sleeping-sickness problem. But he could not be asked to apply his reactions to American data because he was not permitted to know the American data.

A fairly high-level conference was held in New York. An elaborate plan was devised to have the Canadian apply his reactions to some dummy figures, while concealing the true American figures. But at the last minute a nervous security officer dismissed the Canadian from the room, fearful that some secrets might be disclosed.

This left the American data secret and secure. But it also left them useless. Fortunately, the Canadian's data was recovered later and the sub did not have to be redesigned. No one knows in how many other instances we are not so lucky.

Respect the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD, the attached article entitled "Respect the Flag" by August W. Kopke, of Oklahoma City:

RESPECT THE FLAG

(By August W. Kopke, member, the United States Flag Association)

Tuesday, June 14, is Flag Day. It is the duty of every American not only to love his country, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws but also to honor and respect its flag.

Wherever you see the Stars and Stripes displayed, stand up and take off your hat. It is in the blood of some to deride all expression of noble sentiment. You may blaspheme in the street and bystanders will not pay much attention to you; but if you get down on your knees and pray to Almighty God, or if you should stand bareheaded while soldiers march by with flags to the breeze, some people will think you are only showing off. But don't you mind. When Old Glory comes along, salute and let them think what they please. When you hear the band play the Star-Splangled Banner, get up. Even if you stand alone. Stand there and don't be ashamed of it either.

For of all the signs and symbols since the world began, there is none other so full of meaning as the flag of our country. That piece of red, white, and blue bunting means 5,000 years of struggle upward. It is the full grown flower of ages fighting for liberty. It is the century plant of human hope in bloom.

Your flag stands for humanity, for an equal opportunity to all the sons of men. Of course we have not yet arrived at that goal, but the only hope of righting the wrong of men lies in the feeling produced in our bosoms by the very sight of that flag.

Other flags may mean a glorious past. This flag a glorious future. It is not so much the flag of our fathers as it is the flag of our children, and our children's children, yet unborn. It is the flag of tomorrow and of a brighter dawn with healing on its wings. It is not the flag of a reigning king over a royal house, but of a 165 million free people welded into a nation, one and inseparable. United not only by community of interest but by vital unity of sentiment and purpose, a nation distinguished for the clear individual conception of its citizens, alike of their duties and their privilges, their obligations and their rights. Its spirit is the spirit of the American nation.

Let me urge every owner of a vacant flag staff, here and every where, to display Old Glory not only on Flag Day but every day. And if you cannot display the physical emblem, then wear its image in your hearts and if you do, the great heart of America will one day interpret the heart of the world.

Address by Hon. Sam Rayburn on the Occasion of the 20th Anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration of Atlanta, Ga., May 11, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, on May 11 more than 1,200 enthusiastic members of REA cooperatives assembled in Atlanta, Ga., to mark the 20th anniversary of that great progressive organization that has done so much to take the farmer out of the bondage of backbreaking toil.

Officials of the Georgia electric membership corporation, in casting about for the most able American to address this great anniversary celebration inevitably decided to invite the father of the legislation that created the Rural Electrification Administration, our beloved Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN.

Fortunately for the good people of Georgia, SAM RAYBURN decided to accept the invitation to deliver the address celebrating the 20th anniversary of the REA. This was a statewide meeting, but the eyes of REA members the country over were focused on Atlanta for this mammoth celebration.

It was my privilege to accompany our speaker to Atlanta for this occasion. Together with hundreds of my fellow Georgians, I thrilled to the message of Speaker RAYBURN as he described his fight to overcome the opposition to the establishment of this great farm cooperative organization. I shared the inspiration of his words as he told of the tremendous success of the REA both economically and in banishing darkness from the homes of rural America.

I know many would want to read the stirring words of Speaker RAYBURN on this splendid anniversary occasion, and I know many Members want to keep for their records his message to Americans, urban and rural, who look to his unparalleled wisdom and experience for guidance and counsel.

The Speaker's address follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply honored to be here with you tonight. As author and sponsor of the Rural Electrification Act in the Congress of the United States, I would be less than frank if I did not tell you that I have a deep and abiding interest in your progress and welfare. On this 20th anniversary of the Rural Electrifi-

cation Administration, please believe me when I say to you that it is a source of profound satisfaction to me that I was permitted to take part in the creation of a movement and a program which has contributed so magnificently to the economic and cultural life of all Americans.

The miracles of Aladdin's lamp have virtually been transposed into the everyday life of the rural people of this Nation through the accomplishments of the REA program. A fair appraisal of these accomplishments during the past 20 years is convincing proof that your efforts and the work of your cooperatives is responsible for the greatest economic upsurge in the history of rural America.

And, let me say, here, now that the ultimate responsibility of the success of the program rested upon the shoulders of each of you who are the creators and organizers of the 1,000 rural electric cooperatives in this Nation. No segment of the population of any nation ever discharged its duties and responsibilities with more zeal and devotion than have you. Therefore, to you who have labored along the dusty roads, in the rich farmlands, and on the steep hillsides to sign up members by the light of a wood fire or a kerosene lamp goes the everlasting credit for the impetus given an agricultural movement which in two decades has contributed more to the agricultural industry than that industry has had contributed to it from all other sources since the founding of this Nation.

Although less than half of the farms of the Nation were served by electricity before World War II, today 95 percent, or more than 5 million, of our farms are electrified. In 1935, only 10.9 percent of those homes had electric service.

Fifty-five percent of the electrified farm homes of America are served by the 1,000 rural electric cooperatives which you represent.

During the debate on the floor of the House of Representatives while the Rural Electrification Act was being considered, many men wise in the financial world of this Nation argued eloquently that such a program was doomed to failure. Fears were expressed that even though the farmers and ranchers joined in such a movement, that they would certainly discontinue the service and refuse to pay their first monthly bill. Sincere though these men were, they could not have been more wrong. They reckoned without the spirit and determination of the people who form the backbone of this Nation—your actions have been even more convincing than were those of us who answered their arguments.

The repayment record of REA borrowers shows that only 14 of the 1,000 cooperatives are delinquent in their loan liquidation. This ratio of one-tenth of 1 percent is far below that shown by any bank loan record.

Approximately three-fourths of all rural electric cooperatives have made advance payments on their loans. In 1954, these advance payments totaled $78.5 million. In 1953 the advance payments were $62.5 million and in 1952, $52.5 million represented the amount prepaid. It is obvious that year by year the cooperative repayments record is steadily improving.

To date, the Rural Electrification Administration has loaned to all of the electric cooperatives approximately $2.5 billion. But that is not the interesting part of the story. Surveys made by the electrical industry show that for every dollars loaned to the cooperatives, the members of those cooperatives spend $4 for electrical wiring and appliances. Conservative estimates from all sources available are that the farmers and ranchers have purchased in the neighborhood of $15 billion worth of merchandise which they obviously could not have used without electricity.

Has this program spelled the doom of the privately owned electric industry? Certainly not. You have created and are daily creating new markets for these privately owned companies. In 1954 alone, you purchased from these companies $57 million worth of wholesale power, in order that you might serve your markets and customers through your network of 1,332,000 miles of electric wires.

At what price have the farmers and ranchers been able to receive this most valuable of all services? Today, electricity marketed by rural cooperatives and public-utility companies cost the average farmer approximately one-third less per kilowatt-hour than it did in 1940. By contrast, during this same period, feed prices advanced 225 percent, farm wages 400 percent, and farm machinery prices 100 percent. The rural market today is the largest user of electrical energy per average consumer by about 50 percent.

Surveys made this year reveal that more than 200 different services are performed on our farms and ranches by electricity. New equipment is constantly being designed and manufactured by the industries of this Nation to meet the ever-growing demand for rural homes and fields, for irrigation, milking, fertilization, incubating—for virtually every function which in the past has meant only back-bending and heart-breaking drudgery.

But these statistics are in a large sense only the cold entries in a dollar ledger, which reflect little of the contribution which your program has made in the life of our Nation.

We are today concerned with people throughout the world who are oppressed—oppressed economically, socially, and spiritually. In our own land we are confronted with these same problems to a lesser degree. Throughout all the ages, mankind has engaged in a never-ending struggle to emerge from the physical darkness of economic tyranny, and to pierce the dark shroud of cultural and spiritual blindness. Thomas Jefferson once said, "I have sworn on the altar of God everlasting hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man." It is self-evident that no man or race of men can achieve mental and spiritual freedom when chained too long in economic bondage.

It was in the spirit of Thomas Jefferson that your Government felt the least of its obligations was to provide a financial atmosphere whereby through your own efforts you might have hopes of emerging from the darkness which surrounded you and your children. You sought no charity, and you received none. You sought only opportunity for self-betterment. No responsive government could do less for its governed, and no government will long endure which does not provide hope for its people that one day they may achieve, with dignity, freedom of mind and soul and body.

On this 20th anniversary of the creation of your program, it is well to reflect upon your achievements, but it behooves us even more to pause and consider that relatively few people in all the lands of the world have little reason to hope that their lot will ever approach that which we now enjoy. In his wisdom, God gave man the power to forget—lest his struggles and unconquerable hardships would become unbearable. Likewise, we are prone to forget the hardships which we have overcome and the blessings which we enjoy. If I could leave you with but one thought today, it would be that you rededicate your mind and your energies to your program which has meant so much to so many people, and further, that you express your divine gratitude that you live in a land of hope and promise—a land where you might hope that your earthly span will be more bountiful through your own endeavors, and a land where you might fulfill the promise of eternal life as preached by the humble man who walked the shores of Galilea.

The Panama Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters and article:

ORDER OF RAILWAY CONDUCTORS,
PANAMA CANAL DIVISION, No. 690,
May 30, 1955.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Division 690 of the Order of Railway Conductors wishes to thank you for your efforts in our behalf in trying to prevent the abandonment of the Panama Railroad. It is indeed gratifying to know that there is someone in Washington who has our interests at heart and who has so thorough an insight into our problems and conditions in the Canal Zone. Enclosed are copies of some letters regarding the Panama Railroad that may be of interest to you.

Governor Seybold apparently was misinformed when he stated at the committee meeting that the railroad equipment was "worse than poor." We have the following equipment that the Governor failed to mention:

Number of cars	Type of car	Capacity of each car	Condition
[1] 60	Boxes (steel)	50 tons	Excellent.
[1] 55	Flats (steel)	do	Do.
[1] 15	Gondolas (steel)	do	Do.
6	Ballast	do	Do.
8	Boxes (wood) (steel underframe)	40 tons	Good mechanically.
58	Dumps (western)	18 yards	Do.

[1] These cars were purchased during World War II and are in as good mechanical condition as most railroad equipment in the United States.

The refrigerator cars are in poor condition, but the management has consistently refused to modernize this equipment. The ocst of modernization or of new refrigerator cars would be much less than the cost of the trucks and trailers they wish to buy; and the capacity of the railroad cars is 2 to 3 times greater per unit. Furthermore, the railroad cars will last many times longer than trucks will.

Our passenger equipment, while old and obsolete according to States standards, is in very good mechanical condition and would give many years of service.

We have three 1600 horsepower road-switcher diesel engines that are as good as anything in the States, and are taking care of our mainline service.

As you know, anyone can highlight those portions of a report that he wishes to emphasize and omit other portions that are not so favorable, thereby painting a picture that is seen in the light that he wants it to be seen in, which is apparently what is happening in this case. We feel that with the proper management and a desire to do so, the Panama Railroad could be made to pay dividends again. One way that this

might be accomplished is to have the Army, Navy, and Air Force use the railroad facilities instead of trucking. We have seen large military trucks crossing the isthmus with only 1 or 2 small boxes in them.

Another way in which the earnings of the railroad could be augmented would be for the other divisions of the Panama Canal Company to utilize the railroad services instead of buying trucks and buses to work in direct competition with the railroad, thereby undermining it, which has been going on for some time.

The Panama Railroad has been paying its own way, including maintenance of its right-of-way and equipment, depreciation, and interest on its investment; and in addition, has paid millions in dividends in the past.

One thing that must not be overlooked is the fact, so vividly demonstrated during World War II, that the Panama Railroad is an essential and vital artery of transportation in the Canal Zone and is the only stable and dependable means of transportation during an emergency. During the slightest unsettled condition in the Republic of Panama, which occur frequently, the railroad is relied upon almost wholly for transportation.

The railroadmen fail to see how the abandonment of the Panama Railroad, which has been in operation for over 100 years, and the investment of 9 to 35 million dollars in a new highway will solve the problem of economy for the Panama Canal Company and the taxpayers in the United States. The interest plus the maintenance of the new highway, which is estimated to be very great, will put the Company farther in the red without any chance whatsoever of recovering from the highway any of the interest, depreciation, or maintenance. The interest alone for 1 year on such an investment would keep the railroad running, under present conditions, for many years.

Thanks again for your time and efforts in our behalf. Any suggestions that you might be able to give us as to what we can do to maintain the Panama Railroad will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT C. DANIEL,
General Chairman.

[From the Panama American of May 23, 1955]

PANAMA CANAL SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON HEARS OBJECTIONS TO JUNKING PANAMA RAILROAD

WASHINGTON, May 23.—Rear Adm. John R. Perry, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks revealed last night that at the start of the 20th century the United States was about ready to build an Atlantic-to-Pacific Canal on the Nicaragua route. The disclosure was based on new research into official records.

The decision to construct at Panama followed negotiation culminating in January 1902 when the French company reduced its original price of $109,141,500 for rights and property at Panama to $40 million.

Perry spoke at the 20th annual meeting of the Panama Canal Society of Washington, which comprises 305 persons who were engaged in United States construction on the Panama route.

His speech dealt with the career of Rear Adm. John Grimes Walker, who was President of the United States Commission which explored the Nicaraguan route in the late years of the 19th century.

In 1899 Walker became head of the Isthmian Canal Commission which handled the Panama Canal preliminaries.

"One of the tasks of the Isthmian Commission was to ascertain from the French the amount for which they would sell their holdings," Perry said, in reviewing official documents pertaining to the crucial choice between Nicaragua and Panama.

"An examination of the correspondence conducted among Admiral Walker, the Colombian Minister, and the President of the Panama Canal Company reveals the many considerations that acted as a deterrent to the Commission's final report (on the Nicaraguan project).

"The French finally, in October 1901, named a price for their total property and rights as $109,141,500. This amount, added to the estimated cost of completing the Panama route, made a difference of $63,518,796 in favor of the Nicaraguan route.

"After consideration of this cost difference the Commission concluded and reported that the most practicable and feasible route was the Nicaraguan route.

"The Frech, fearing that they would lose everything, sent a new proposal in January 1902.

"By this they offered to accept for the totality, without exception, their property and rights on the isthmus for $40 million, the amount which Walker's Commission had previously estimated such to be worth.

"After considering the changed conditions, the Commission in a supplementary report informed President Roosevelt that in its opinion the most practicable and feasible route was the Panama route."

"As a result of the work of those two Commissions headed by Walker, Congress and the President (Theodore Roosevelt) were supplied the technical basis for the great decision of 1902 to build at Panama," Perry said.

At the meeting last night, Maurice H. Thatcher, former Governor of the Canal Zone, and Gen. James G. Steese (retired), former engineer of maintenance for the Panama Canal, made strong statements against the proposed abandonment of the Panama Railroad in favor of a new trans-isthmian highway within the Canal Zone.

Thatcher said that abandonment of the railroad would be shortsighted and unwise, and the cost of a new highway would be very great.

"The railroad," he said, "should be regarded as insurance against a possible disruption of Panama Canal traffic by landslide or other emergency. It would then be indispensable to maintenance of large-scale transportation across the isthmus."

Steese said that the Panama Railroad has paid dividends exceeding $30 million to the United States Treasury, and has incurred small deficits in only a few recent years.

"If slides should close the Panama Canal, no highway could meet the needs, and the roalroad would be absolutely necessary," he said. "In World War II we could not have fought the war without that railroad."

Steese said that conversion of the railroad right-of-way to a four-lane highway would offer great engineering difficulties, because of land subsidence in some of the soft areas.

The Panama Canal Society of Washington elected new officers last night. Col. George S. Brady was chosen president. He was engineer of the fortifications division at the Panama Canal from 1912 to 1914. Alexander E. McClure will be vice president, and Martin A. Seiler, secretary-treasurer.

MAY 25, 1955.

Mr. H. E. MUNRO,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HOWARD: Enclosed are copies of two letters to Governor Seybold that are self-explanatory. We are informed that this reduction in tariff has already been requested by the New York office of the Panama Line and also by the transportation and terminals director down here, but was denied by the Governor.

Some time ago Terminales, the trucking firm in Panama, expressed a desire to ship their truck trailers by "piggy back" on the railroad if the railroad would make them a price. The railroad management was approached through the yardmaster in Cristobal, but to date nothing has been done. So you can see how determined they are down here to get rid of the railroad.

Congressman FLOOD is doing a splendid job for us. I am going to write to thank him and give him a little more ammunition.

I am also enclosing a clipping from the Panama American, of May 23, 1955, concerning the Panama Railroad.

Thanks for everything. If there is anything that we can do, let us know.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. DANIEL,
General Chairman.

DIABLO HEIGHTS, C. Z., *May 25, 1955.*

Brig. Gen. J. S. SEYBOLD,
President, Panama Canal Company,
Balboa Heights, C. Z.

DEAR SIR: After making an exhaustive study of the reasons for our decline in freight business on the Panama Railroad, we find that one of the main reasons for our loss of revenue is the higher rate charged by the Panama Railroad over trucking concerns. The Panama Railroad receives at the present time 25 percent of the ocean freight rate on a through consignment. Trucking firms charge only 20 percent and as a consequence have been able to secure a large volume of this business.

The original freight rate of 33⅓ percent received by the Panama Railroad was reduced to 25 percent to be in line with the trucking concerns. We feel that if the rate were reduced to 20 percent to conform with the present rate charged by the trucking firms, we would be in a fair position to regain some of this business and to operate in the black again.

We find, after making inquiries from the merchants in Panama City, that due to lack of warehouses the railroad boxcar serves as a temporary warehouse. Also the Panama Railroad can at one time carry all of the freight consigned either to Panama or to Colon, usually in one train.

We also feel that due to the fact the shippers were told, by inference, that the Panama Railroad was to be abandoned, they naturally had to find other means of transshipping their cargo. Our inquiries with Panamanian merchants show that the greatest majority would still like to do business via the Panama Railroad.

Our main object is to keep the Panama Railroad running. We request your help in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

F. H. HODGES,
General Chairman, Division 49,
Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

MAY 25, 1955.

Brig. Gen. J. S. SEYBOLD,
President, Panama Canal Company,
Balboa Heights, C. Z.

DEAR SIR: With a view to establishing a basis on which the Panama Railroad can be maintained and operated to the best interests of all concerned, the Order of Railway Conductors respectfully requests that the tariff regulations for the Panama Railroad be changed to reduce the cost of the trans-isthmian haul from 25 percent to 20 percent of the amount of the through bill of lading.

The Panamanian trucking firms charge only 20 percent for this service. Consequently, the shipping companies have been routing their freight by trucks because in so doing they save 5 percent on the total freight bill. This is a major factor contributing to the decrease in the volume of freight business handled by the Panama Railroad.

If the new treaty between the United States and Panama is ratified, the Panama Railroad can still do a large volume of business with Panama by establishing more team tracks in the Canal Zone. At the present time, most of the cargo handled by the

Panama Railroad for Panama is spotted on team tracks in Panama City, which are to be given to Panama under the terms of this treaty. However, for the past year the Government of Panama has requested that their carloads of mail be spotted on the Balboa, Canal Zone team tracks instead of in Panama City.

Upon inquiry, we find that many of the merchants in Panama are very desirous of having their freight shipped by railroad instead of by trucks. The reasons given us are that the railroad service is faster, more dependable, and safer with much less damage to cargo; and, with the reduction to 20 percent, would be just as economical.

We know that the Panama Railroad has paid large dividends in the past and we are confident that with a few changes, it can be made to pay dividends again.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT C. DANIEL,
General Chairman, Division 690,
Order of Railway Conductors.

Newlands Project in Nevada Proves the Value of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, on April 27 I called the attention of my colleagues to some facts demonstrating the tremendous contribution of our Federal reclamation program to the growth, strength and stability of the West and the Nation, and pointed out that the reclamation program is, in my opinion, the Nation's wisest investment. I called attention to several specific projects and what these projects have meant to local, State, and National economies. I have asked the Commissioner of Reclamation for similar information on other specific projects because I believe that if the value of reclamation to a sound national economy is known and understood, the program will not be hurt by the various misrepresentations now being made with respect to it.

One of the reclamation projects which has returned its costs many times in added wealth and strength to our economy over the last 50 years is the Newlands project in Nevada, the very first reclamation project authorized by the Congress. In order that Members of Congress may have this additional information demonstrating the value of reclamation, I include an excellent article on the Newlands project by Mr. Hamilton L. Hintz, and printed in the May 21 issue of the Sacramento Bee, to be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD following these remarks:

NEWLANDS PROJECT BOON IN DRY YEAR IS ARGUMENT FOR RECLAMATION SPEEDUP

(By Hamilton L. Hintz)

FALLON, NEV.—The necessity for the continuance and expansion of Federal reclamation projects in the West is strikingly demonstrated by the Newlands project in Lahontan Valley, of which the thriving city of Fallon is the center.

Nevada has been going through a cycle of several dry years and the current situation is approaching drought proportions. Beef cattle and sheep are being marketed early off the drying rangelands and dairymen and growers of irrigated crops are looking anxiously at dropping stream and reservoir levels.

Hay production is expected to be considerably less than needed by livestock and dairy feeders. The picture is gloomy over the entire State, and water is so short in the Lovelock district, the State's largest alfalfa-producing area, that it is expected to get only 1 cutting instead of the usual 3.

ONE BRIGHT SPOT

The one bright spot in the State is in the Fallon area, where 800 farms aggregating 70,000 acres are served by the Newlands project, the Nation's first Federal reclamation undertaking.

The water-storage facilities of the project, the only one of its kind in Nevada, will make it possible to keep the farms of the Fallon area green all season and provide the irrigations to produce the usual three crops of alfalfa.

Residents of the area point to their favored position as the green spot of Nevada as a dedication to the foresight and pioneering of over half a century ago which embarked the Government on a reclamation program with the Newlands project.

REFUTES BACKWARD THEORIES

They also point to it as refutation of policies which have come to prevail in some Government quarters in recent years which have halted the progress of western reclamation in the face of the rapidly increasing population of the West and the crying need for full multipurpose development of all water resources.

The Newlands project was authorized by Congress in 1902 and construction was started the following year. The purposes were to serve the farmers of Lahontan Valley, make possible expansion of farming to make full use of the land, and to blaze the path of western reclamation.

The Lahontan Valley story had been the same as hundreds of other areas in the West, and still is in many places. In the winter the waters of the Carson River would run unused through the valley and often would overflow, causing considerable damage and loss. In the summer the stream would dry up, and the countryside with it.

LAHONTAN DAM

The first water for irrigation was brought in by a diversion canal from the Truckee River in 1907. By 1915 the key works, the Lahontan Dam, was completed on the Carson River at the head of the valley.

The dam holds back the winter runoff of the Carson River, stores additional water from the Truckee, and canals running from it serve the farms of the valley.

Thus it serves for both flood control and irrigation, but in addition a powerhouse at its base utilizes the water being released to generate power for the project, the farmers, and the city of Fallon.

POWER PAYS OFF

And what is important is the fact the power revenues are making it possible for the Government to be paid back its investment in the project without there being an unduly heavy cost for water service. The final payment is expected to be made within a few years, in line with reclamation law which allows 40 to 50 years for repayment.

In 1922 a drainage project was completed to better control the water after irrigation and to make reuse of some of it possible.

After the project was well underway the landowners formed the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District and in 1926 by contract took over from the Government the operation of the project.

OUTLOOK IS GOOD

In a dry year following a series of dry years, here is how Phil Hallbel, manager of the district, views the situation:

"Our water outlook is good. Even though water is reported extremely short elsewhere, we expect to get by with only a 25-percent curtailment.

"By efficient use this will give the same results as formerly and alfalfa growers will get water for the usual three cuttings. The outlook for the hay crop is good although domestic pastures may suffer some."

A SOUND PROJECT

"I consider this as sound a project as any in the West. The Government is nearly paid out now and will get all of its money back.

"The powerhouse at the dam supplies the major needs for domestic and agricultural use throughout the district. The proceeds are used to lower the water costs and pay out the construction costs.

"By construction of more storage facilities we have an opportunity to provide even better for the needs and continued growth of this district."

J. R. Shields' Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, dedicated to the role of public servant for many years, John Shields performed his duties with a keen sense of responsibility and a genuine interest in his fellowman. With great patience and understanding of the problems of the citizenry which he served his performance was ever beyond the call of duty. This type of service to the public can well serve as a fitting example to others. The tribute paid to him in the editorial which appeared in the Newark Evening News of June 2, 1955, is fitting recognition to a deserving individual. I am happy to add my best wishes on his retirement and congratulations for a job well done.

The editorial follows:

J. R. SHIELDS' RETIREMENT

On his formal retirement at age 70 as manager of the Social Security Administration's Newark office, John R. Shields merits recognition for 18 years of faithful and efficient public service.

Of all the members of SSA's executive field staff, the district manager has the closest contact with the public. His job requires infinite patience, an attitude of friendliness and helpfulness to the many aged seeking to establish their eligibility for old-age insurance.

Mr. Shields possessed these qualities in marked degree and there are hundreds, perhaps thousands in this area who will remember with gratitude his consideration and aid. He has reason to be proud of his record, which won him the acclaim of being one of the country's best social-security field administrators.

Federal Aid for Highway Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the House Public Works Committee has been considering legislation to modernize the Nation's highways. There seems to be universal agreement that modernization is needed if our transportation system is not to bog down.

The Senate has passed a bill which came before our committee just as we were concluding hearings on a bill before us.

I should like to point out some defects in the Senate bill.

The formula for distribution of funds to the States is based 50 percent on population and 50 percent upon the existing Federal-aid formula of one-third population, one-third mileage, and one-third area in each State.

This formula cannot result in the uniform development of an interstate system.

Under it, 31 States and the District of Columbia, as shown in the attached table, would not receive sufficient funds to meet their needs in a 10-year period. Eighteen others would receive more than is required to meet their needs. In the extreme case, New Jersey would not be able to complete its portion of the interstate system before the year 1998 even assuming that apportionments would be maintained after the 5-year life of the bill at the maximum rate authorized in the bill.

In contrast, the distribution formula proposed in H. R. 4260, the bill our committee has been considering, would provide for the distribution of the available funds in exact relation to the needs in all the States. The whole system would go ahead on a uniform basis with assurance that it would be completed within 10 years rather than 40 or more.

FINANCING

The Senate bill does not guarantee funds for the completion of the interstate system. Even if the present formula were corrected, the total funds made available by the Federal Government for this purpose would be $7½ billion in 5 years on a 90–10 matching basis. Total needs are $23 billion. While the bill says that it is the intent of Congress to complete the system at the earliest possible date, no further funds are provided.

Since the Senate bill provides for only 5 years' programing, the States cannot properly plan their development of the entire system because they do not know whether or when sufficient funds will be made available. The effect would be that they would use these funds to do the most urgently needed spot-type work rather than developing an entire system.

H. R. 4260 provides a complete assurance of financing of the entire interstate system in 10 years through the provision of bonds on roughly a 95–5 matching basis. Further it takes the project out of the deficit-financing class through a provision that existing gasoline and diesel oil taxes shall be used not only to amortize the bonding costs but also to continue other existing Federal-aid programs at least at current levels.

Under this bill, the improvement would be effective without large increases in taxes which the Senate bill requires unless the Government is to go further into debt.

Here is an authoritative table giving the comparison of interstate needs with approximate apportionment of interstate funds under 5-year program pursuant to the Senate bill.

Comparison of interstate needs with approximate apportionment of interstate funds under 5-year program pursuant to the Senate bill

State	Interstate needs (millions of dollars)	5-year total, Federal funds (millions of dollars)	Percent of needs	Interstate system mileage		
				Rural	Urban	Total
Alabama	$365	$159	44	790	114	904
Arizona	210	89	42	1,148	33	1,181
Arkansas	203	113	56	467	61	528
California	2,322	440	19	1,680	219	1,899
Colorado	156	104	67	628	33	661
Connecticut	555	74	13	158	109	267
Delaware	66	49	74	23	3	26
Florida	496	132	27	993	143	1,136
Georgia	700	182	26	996	108	1,104
Idaho	107	78	73	635	20	655
Illinois	1,065	365	34	1,283	265	1,548
Indiana	867	190	22	884	184	1,068
Iowa	276	160	58	632	65	697
Kansas	206	143	69	677	51	728
Kentucky	492	145	29	590	66	656
Louisiana	493	127	26	507	99	606
Maine	147	63	43	272	27	299
Maryland	434	92	21	204	66	270
Massachusetts	838	164	20	206	141	347
Michigan	1,296	278	21	849	136	985
Minnesota	483	176	36	750	106	856
Mississippi	246	124	50	608	76	684
Missouri	599	212	35	996	79	1,075
Montana	152	109	72	1,209	28	1,237
Nebraska	107	110	103	455	22	477
Nevada	73	81	111	529	11	540
New Hampshire	66	49	74	183	30	213
New Jersey	1,357	169	12	102	102	204
New Mexico	236	94	40	968	45	1,013
New York	1,336	548	41	740	305	1,045
North Carolina	247	198	80	627	87	714
North Dakota	107	87	81	496	21	517
Ohio	1,361	332	24	996	235	1,231
Oklahoma	377	140	37	747	62	809
Oregon	319	105	33	668	61	729
Pennsylvania	760	412	54	1,068	296	1,364
Rhode Island	123	49	40	21	26	47
South Carolina	183	105	57	694	55	749
South Dakota	95	91	96	503	17	520
Tennessee	380	166	44	958	80	1,038
Texas	872	446	51	2,487	283	2,770
Utah	238	75	32	659	57	716
Vermont	177	49	28	309	34	343
Virginia	569	156	27	796	112	908
Washington	468	124	26	507	86	593
West Virginia	259	92	36	179	42	221
Wisconsin	322	177	55	427	45	472
Wyoming	296	78	26	991	28	1,019
Hawaii						
District of Columbia	152	49	32		17	17
Puerto Rico						
Total	23,253	7,750	33	33,295	4,391	37,686

Actual Cost of Reclamation Projects Below Cost Estimates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions recently in hearings before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and before this body statements have been made which leave the impression that the Bureau of Reclamation consistently underestimates the cost of its projects. In order to have accurate information on this matter I requested the Commissioner of Reclamation to furnish by Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation a comparison of project final costs, or the presently estimated final costs in the case of projects not yet completed, with the original estimates of costs that were furnished the Congress at the time of authorization.

This information has been furnished for all Bureau of Reclamation projects which have been authorized and started since the end of World War II. The comparison demonstrates that the Bureau of Reclamation in recent years has been consistently conservative in its estimates of project costs. The study shows that the Bureau of Reclamation has built or is building all of the projects authorized and started since World War II at a cost of only about 4 percent above initial estimates as compared with an increase due to inflation alone of from 15 to 30 percent, depending upon the construction cost index used. Expressed in another way this means that the Bureau of Reclamation is building its over-

all program for 10 to 20 percent below the estimates made at the time of authorization if these estimates were adjusted to reflect the general rise in construction costs at the time of actual construction.

This study indicates, then, that in recent years the Bureau of Reclamation has an excellent record in estimating costs for reclamation projects.

In view of pending legislation on reclamation projects I am sure that my colleagues are interested in this information and I desire, therefore, to include the material and the letter of transmittal in the Appendix of the RECORD following these remarks:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., May 26, 1955.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ASPINALL: In compliance with your recent request, I am pleased to furnish you a comparison of the presently estimated costs of all Bureau of Reclamation projects which have been authorized and started since the end of World War II with the estimates of their cost that were furnished the Congress at the time of authorization. By including every one of the projects which has been authorized and started during this period, we avoid selecting only those projects which would present the best picture from the Bureau of Reclamation's point of view, and we also avoid doing what some of Reclamation's critics have done—selecting only certain projects which, without detailed explanation, would appear to show that Reclamation consistently underestimates costs. Actually, as the attached comparison demonstrates, Reclamation, in recent years, has been consistently conservative in the estimate of project costs.

The date selected as a cutoff point was the end of World War II, which gives us approximately a 10-year period which should be sufficient to demonstrate that the Reclamation administrators and engineers have been making good on the estimates which they furnish to the Congress and congressional committees when seeking the authorization of new projects.

With more research, the analysis could have been extended to cover a longer period and we are confident that such a larger study would result in equally favorable findings, if all pertinent factors were considered. However, to account adequately for pre-World War II cost estimates, we could be faced with endless argument, as in the past, not only on how to adjust for the general inflation, which would be relatively simple, but also on how to evaluate cost increases due to partial or complete shutdown because of the war and to justify changes in scope of the project which took place during the war period, when time was available for studying ways and means for improving and generally enlarging the project to meet increased needs at the later date of initial operation.

From time to time Congress has written into the appropriation acts provisions to the effect that current construction prices should be used. For example, the Interior Department Appropriation Act of 1950 provides "that no part of this appropriation shall be available for the preparation of any comprehensive plan or project report the construction estimates for which are not based upon current construction prices and costs. * * *" Similar language appeared in the appropriation acts of 1947, 1948, and 1949.

By such provisions it is clear that the Congress did not want the Bureau of Reclamation to make any guesses as to future trends in its project cost estimates.

Since the end of World War II the Bureau of Reclamation has had authorized and put under construction 27 projects, or new divisions of projects, the initial cost estimates for which at the time of authorization totaled $506,232,898. If this amount is adjusted to reflect construction cost increases existing at the times when Federal investments were made, as computed by the Bureau of Reclamation, the initial estimates would be increased to $581,124,900 on the basis of inflation alone. The Bureau of Reclamation cost index is based on periodic studies of current bids on the materials and labor that go into reclamation projects.

As a further check, our staff also adjusted the total initial estimates of $506,232,898 to reflect the independent index of construction cost as published by the Engineering News-Record in the October 7, 1954, issue. This index is a composite of the cost of selected construction materials and common labor and does not, therefore, reflect fully all the categories of cost that enter into reclamation projects; for example, skilled labor. Based on the Engineering News-Record construction cost index adjustment, the initial Reclamation estimate would be increased to $657,320,600. Of the 27 projects included in the analysis, 13 have been completed and the remaining 14 are well underway, ranging from 4 percent complete in the case of Glendo to 99 percent in the case of Cachuma. However, in the case of Glendo, although only a small amount of actual work has been done, the major construction contract on Glendo Dam has been awarded. The total cost to date of all of these 27 projects, plus the estimated cost of completion of those projects not yet completed, is $526,833,790.

This study shows that Reclamation has built, or is building, all of the projects authorized and started since World War II, at a cost of only about 4 percent above initial estimates, as compared with an increase due to inflation alone of 15 percent based on the Bureau of Reclamation index and 30 percent based on the Engineering News-Record construction cost index as applied to the times during which the work was done.

Expressed in another way, Reclamation is building its overall program for 10 percent (based on the Bureau of Reclamation index) to 20 percent (based on the Engineering News-Record index) below the estimates made at the time of authorization, if these estimates were adjusted to reflect the general rise in construction costs at the time of actual construction.

There is enclosed a table showing the analysis of each of these 27 Reclamation projects. While it is true that changes in project scope and the individual makeup of any one project might cause a somewhat different conclusion for that one project than was reached by applying the general construction indexes to the initial cost, the special circumstances tend to offset each other in the consolidation of the entire program. Consequently, it is believed that the analysis of the entire new program since 1945, as outlined above, is a fair one.

In your use of this material, you may wish to use only one of the indexes in order to simplify the presentation. If you used the Bureau of Reclamation cost index, there would be a better correlation with some of the other analyses that have been prepared by this office on cost increases. On the other hand, if you used the construction-cost index of the independent non-Federal organization, such as the Engineering News-Record, you could better refute criticism that Reclamation had developed a special yardstick to make its estimates look favorable. As a matter of fact, Reclamation's cost-estimating record looks even more conservative when the Engineering News-Record index is used than when its own index is used.

Sincerely yours,

E. G. NIELSEN,
Acting Commissioner.

COMPARISON OF BUREAU OF RECLAMATION COST ESTIMATES OF ALL PROJECTS AUTHORIZED AND STARTED SINCE THE END OF WORLD WAR II

Since the end of World War II 27 reclamation projects have been authorized for construction or rehabilitation. This program covers practically all types of construction performed by the Bureau of Reclamation including earthwork, canal construction, distribution system repair, concrete structures, major concrete dams, powerplants, and transmission lines. The total of the cost estimates of these projects at the time the work was authorized is $506,232,898.

During the period these projects were authorized and placed under construction the cost of labor, materials, and other construction services has experienced a continual rise so that construction costs at the end of fiscal year 1954 or the beginning of fiscal year 1955, the latest date that cost data are available, are considerably greater than at the close of World War II. The composite construction cost index of the Bureau of Reclamation, which is based on periodic studies of current bids on materials and labor that go into concrete dams, power generating plants, power transmission systems, earth dams, canals, laterals, and drains shows this overall increase to be 1.40. By comparison, the index of cornstruction costs published in the Engineering News-Record for October 7, 1954, which is based on costs of selected construction materials and common labor, shows this overall increase to be 1.98. The rise in costs during only a portion of this period for any particular project would be something less than 1.40 or 1.98, depending upon the date the project was authorized and the years when funds were spent on construction.

Therefore, if the estimated costs of reclamation projects and rehabilitation work which were authorized since World War II were adjusted in accord with the cost indexes and without taking into account any other factors which affect the estimates, such as unforeseen site conditions, change in project plan, or bids actually received, the cost of this work today would greatly exceed the estimates at the time the work was authorized. If, for instance, the unspent portion of the estimates of these projects had followed the construction cost index of the Engineering News-Record since the time the initial estimates were made, the total today of the estimates of construction in progress and actual cost of work completed would be $657,320,600. Similarly, if the estimates of this work were based on the composite cost index of the Bureau of Reclamation the total would be $581,124,900. Compared to these figures the total of the official fiscal year 1955 estimates for projects under construction and actual costs of completed work is $526,833,790.

To date construction has been completed on 13 of the 27 projects and progress on the remaining 14 ranges from 4 percent of completion on Glendo to 99 percent on Cachuma. However, despite the fact that only 4 percent of the cost of Glendo has been spent, the major contract has been awarded, and the present estimate appears satisfactory. From the figures cited it is evident that for all of the projects authorized and started since World War II, the Bureau of Reclamation is completing the work at an estimated cost of 80 percent of what the initial estimate would have been if it had been adjusted to the index of the Engineering News-Record, or 90 percent of what the cost would have been if it had been adjusted to the Bureau of Reclamation composite index.

The attached tabulation shows for each project the estimated cost at the time the project was authorized, what the estimated cost would have been at the beginning of fiscal year 1955 if the uncosted portion of the initial estimate had followed the Engineering News-Record cost index and the Bureau of Reclamation composite index, respectively, and the official estimated cost or completed cost of the projects at the beginning of fiscal year 1955.

While, in general, the estimated costs of individual projects based on the construction cost indexes as shown in the tabulation are higher today than the current official estimates, there are several instances where this does not occur. In the case of the Cachuma project, approximately $15 million was added to the construction cost in addition to general price increases as a result of unforeseen and extremely unfavorable conditions encountered in excavation of the tunnel. The current estimate for the Eklutna project has greatly overrun the initial estimate adjusted to 1955 prices by virtue of the fact that the initial estimate was Reclamation's first job in Alaska and did not account sufficiently for the higher construction costs prevalent in that area, nor include adequate provision for the type of construction contemplated. On the other hand, as a result of favorable bids and savings through modification in project plan, the current estimates for the Weber Basin, the Palisades project, and the Glendo unit are substantially less than the estimates at the time the projects were authorized and it is expected that these projects will be completed at a cost in accord with the current estimates with resultant savings to the Government.

Thus, considering the overall program which has been authorized and started since World War II, which includes the broad range of construction undertaken by this Bureau, and taking into account both the favorable and unfavorable circumstances where current or completed costs are compared to the initial estimates, it is seen that the Bureau of Reclamation is constructing these projects at a cost less than would be the case if all costs followed the general price trend during the same period.

Comparison of Bureau of Reclamation project cost estimates at time of authorization; adjusted to reflect subsequent changes in construction cost indexes; and current official estimate or completed cost

(This table covers all projects or separable divisions of projects which have been authorized for construction since World War II)

Project	Estimate at time of authorization			Initial estimate adjusted to date investment actually made [1]		Official estimated cost [2] fiscal year 1955	Percent of construction completed June 30, 1955
	Date of authorization, fiscal year	Date of estimate, fiscal year	Amount of estimate	E. N. R. construction cost indexes	BuRec composite cost index		
Lewiston Orchards, Idaho	1947	1946	$1,466,000	$1,971,000	$1,758,000	$2,484,000	100
Paonia, Colo	1947	1947	[3] 3,030,000	4,383,000	3,866,000	6,677,000	30
Arnold Irrigation District, Oregon	1948	1947	220,000	272,000	257,500	206,000	100
Cachuma, California	1948	1947	32,310,000	46,458,000	40,428,000	43,816,000	99
Hayden Lake Unit, Rathdrum Prairie, Idaho	1948	1947	90,650	111,000	103,400	118,000	100
Kennewick Division, Yakima, Wash	1948	1947	10,736,000	17,000,000	14,470,000	13,760,000	69
Preston Bench, Idaho	1948	1948	453,000	463,000	461,700	450,000	100
Wellton-Mohawk Division, Gila, Ariz	1948	1946	24,376,948	42,489,000	33,149,000	39,940,000	86
Ochoco Dam Division, Deschutes, Oreg	1948	1948	1,500,000	1,644,000	1,592,000	849,000	100
Solano, Calif	1949	1948	45,577,000	63,783,000	54,882,000	47,111,000	21
American River Division, Central Valley, Calif	1950	1949	59,200,000	73,695,000	64,245,000	45,924,000	95
Fort Sumner, N. Mex	1950	1948	1,798,000	1,940,000	1,867,000	2,432,000	100
Grants Pass—Northwest Pipeline, Deschutes, Oreg	1950	1949	100,000	100,100	99,900	100,000	100
Middle Rio Grande, N. Mex	1950	1947	30,179,000	48,234,000	40,784,000	29,606,000	23
Weber Basin, Utah	1950	1949	69,534,000	88,968,000	77,168,000	65,362,000	22
Sacramento canals, Central Valley, Calif	1951	1951	54,396,000	62,167,000	63,117,000	57,762,000	6
Eklutna, Alaska	1951	1949	20,365,400	24,771,000	20,836,000	29,500,000	100
Alcova powerplant, Kendrick, Wyo	1951	1951	6,377,000	6,888,000	7,143,000	6,428,100	100
North Side Pumping Division, Minidoka, Idaho	1951	1948	11,395,000	15,821,000	13,531,000	9,759,000	39
Palisades (present progress), Idaho	1951	1949	76,601,000	96,531,000	83,631,000	74,400,000	61
Vermejo, N. Mex	1951	1950	2,679,000	3,489,000	2,980,000	2,743,000	100
Savage Rapids Dam, Grants Pass, Oreg	1953	1952	678,000	722,000	705,000	713,490	100
Avondale, Idaho	1954	1953	221,100	230,000	224,100	277,000	100
Dalton Gardens, Idaho	1954	1953	267,800	277,500	271,300	270,200	100
Alamogordo Spillway, Carlsbad, N. Mex	1955	1954	1,526,000	1,526,000	1,526,000	1,526,000	20
Crescent Lake Dam, Oreg	1955	1953	297,000	310,000	302,000	320,000	80
Glendo unit, MRBP, Wyoming	1955	1953	50,859,000	53,077,000	51,727,000	44,300,000	4
Total			506,232,898	657,320,600	581,124,900	526,833,790	

[1] Amounts remaining to be invested adjusted to latest full year (fiscal year) for which indexes are available.

[2] For completed projects, estimates shown are actual total costs.

[3] Does not include cost of Minnesota unit which is now being considered for authorization as part of Paonia project.

Bananas on Pike's Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, if Congress approves the multibillion dollar upper Colorado River project, it would not quite grow bananas on Pike's Peak, but the taxpayers in each of 13 States would pay more for the project as now planned than all four of the States that benefit from it put together:

States that would benefit from project:	*What taxpayers would pay*
Colorado	$36,400,000
New Mexico	15,200,000
Utah	16,000,000
Wyoming	8,000,000
Total	$75,600,000

The taxpayers in these 13 States would pay:

Massachusetts	$127,600,000
Maryland	102,400,000
Pennsylvania	277,600,000
Texas	194,400,000
Illinois	276,000,000
Michigan	196,400,000
California	372,800,000
New Jersey	144,000,000
New York	493,600,000
Ohio	236,000,000
Missouri	100,000,000
Indiana	102,400,000
Wisconsin	88,000,000

Twenty-eight States each would pay more than the State of Colorado.

Thirty-seven States would pay more than the State of Utah.

Thirty-nine States would pay more than the State of New Mexico.

Forty-one States would pay more than the State of Wyoming.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pike's Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Aid to Pakistan Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, Members of this body have at times expressed disagreement with our country's policies in relation to economic aid to foreign nations.

However, a most illuminating fact has been brought to my attention concerning the work which Pan American World Airways is quietly doing to lend technical assistance to Pakistan International Airlines.

Here is a situation, Mr. Speaker, wherein the largest of our international air carriers has taken on the task of building a foreign airline which someday

may very well be competing with its teacher.

As we all know, Pakistan has taken a strong anti-Communist position. It is imperative that, if this position is to continue without jeopardy, Pakistan must have a strong civil air arm.

I congratulate Pan American Airways on this endeavor and, under unanimous consent, place in the RECORD an article by William H. Hessler which appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer of May 19 covering this most interesting and unique undertaking:

SOUND PATTERN SET IN AID TO PAKISTAN AIRLINES

(By William H. Hessler)

Overseas aid, especially to underdeveloped countries, ought never to be visualized as a task exclusively for Government. Much of the job can be done better by private enterprise. Ideally, almost all of it would be.

We have a good example of the right pattern in a new program of technical assistance to Pakistan International Airlines. It employs the financial resources of government but also the technical resources and personnel of private enterprise.

The American Government, through the Foreign Operations Administration, is putting up most of the money—$725,000 the first year, and probably $1,775,000 in the 2 remaining years. The Pakistan Government is putting up smaller sums, in rupees, to cover local currency expenditures.

Pan American World Airways, which likes to call itself (not without reason) "the world's most experienced airline," is putting up the experience, in the form of a 24-man team of technical experts. This team will train Pakistani personnel, over a 3-year period, in all phases of airline operations and management, from pilot training and plane maintenance to communications, traffic, passenger service, and accounting.

Pakistan has had two modest airlines. One, Pakistan International Airlines (PIA), was Government-owned and served routes as far as Cairo and London. Orient Airlines, privately owned, was a smaller, domestic operation. These now are merged, and the new line is 65 percent Government owned.

Air transport has a peculiar value for Pakistan—the fifth most populous country of the world—for it is a country divided as few ever have been. East Pakistan, with a little more than half the population, is separated from West Pakistan by 1,200 miles of India's territory. The two regions—very different in language, culture, and economy—are linked by sea only on the long route from Karachi around to Chittagong, 3,000 miles. Such a route is of value only for the bulkiest of cargo.

The railroads of northern India were laid out by the British long before they concocted the scheme for 2 separate countries—India and Pakistan, the latter split in 2 remote segments. Efficient, economical air transport, consequently, could be a tremendous spur to the economic development and the political unity of Pakistan.

Running an airline, however, calls for a world of technical know-how and experience. The Pakistanis had even less than their share, in the old British-governed India, because while they provided their full share of the old Indian Army they did not have many people in public administration or larger business enterprises. In general, the Moslems were not as aggressive and did not command as much wealth.

So we have a partnership of government and a privately owned airline, at this end, to build up the air transport of Pakistan. This probably would justify itself in economic terms alone, ultimately. But there is a more compelling reason. Pakistan is one of the Asian countries with a firmly anti-Soviet posture, is receiving military assistance from the United States, is allied with Turkey, and is for all practical purposes one of our allies against the Soviet Union.

A strong civil aviation will be a help in making Pakistan a position of anti-Communist strength. And as it helps to develop the economic life of Pakistan, and integrate its political life, air transport will help to combat the infiltration of communism by bolstering living standards.

In this fashion, one of America's international airlines is moving in to do a job, with the American Government's backing. It is a job that serves the common interest. And it is a safe assumption that the actual task of technical assistance involved here will be better done than if it were an outright Government undertaking.

Not all technical aid to underdeveloped countries can be put on this basis, with private enterprise taking the main responsibility. But where it is possible, it is extremely desirable. And although the Pan Am-FOA arrangement for Pakistan is the first of its kind, it is not really a new idea. For all through the 18th and 19th centuries, the economic development of backward countries (like the United States from 1700 to 1830) was in large part the work of private enterprise, most often providing its own capital.

Thus were our canals and early railroads built with predominantly British capital. Thus did the Hudson's Bay Co. launch the development of Canada. In the same way, British enterprise built the railroads of Argentina, and Dutch capital established the highly productive plantation industries of Indonesia.

Transport has changed, so there are some countries today that are skipping the railroad-building stage to some extent and moving directly into the air age. Pakistan is a particularly sharp case of the usefulness of this telescoping of history, because of its geography.

Address of Richard F. Doyle, President, Federal Probation Officers' Association, Before the 16th Annual Conference of the Federal Judges of the Sixth Judicial Circuit on April 29, 1955, at the Law School of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, to preserve for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I insert the address of Richard F. Doyle, president, Federal Probation Officers' Association, before the 16th annual conference of the Federal judges of the sixth judicial circuit, April 29, 1955, at the Law School of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

I consider the object and purpose of the speech most desirable and it is ably portrayed by a person familiar with the problem and able to make suggestions of reason for an effective solution.

The speech follows:

NEED FOR STRENGTHENING THE FEDERAL PROBATION SERVICE

Allow me to express my appreciation for being afforded the opportunity to present to you several matters which we of the Federal Probation Officers' Association have deemed to be of an urgent nature and of vital importance to the welfare of the United States Probation System.

Before doing so, however, may I pay respect to three distinguished friends of probation who are here today. Chief Justice Warren, while Goveronor of California, developed what is generally acknowledged as the leading probation and parole system of the United States. Chief Judge Simons is one of Federal probation's earliest advocates. Indeed, it would be difficult to find an earlier advocate, for as early as 1925 immediately after the passage of the Federal Probation Act while serving as a district judge, he extended the grant of probation to a sizable number of offenders, at first utilizing his clerk, and later, as the cases became more numerous, a deputy marshal to serve as probation officer. Consequently, when Congress provided funds in 1930 and a full-time officer was appointed, he found, upon assuming his duties, a ready made case load awaiting his attention. Chief Judge Simons, while no longer directly concerned with probation, has maintained a lively interest in our work. The third distinguished friend, Chief Judge Lederle, has long and ardently supported our service.

It may be that there are some here today who are not familiar with the Federal Probation Officers' Association, which has been national in scope only since the first of this year. This organization was conceived to provide a medium through which members might act in matters of common concern. Its objectives are threefold in character; namely, the fostering of professional standards, the stimulating of legislation for the betterment of our service, and the securing of economic benefits for its members. The executive board is comprised of three nationally elected officers, as well as representatives from each of our five regional associations. To date, one meeting of the board has been held. At that meeting a number of determinations were made. It is to some of these that I wish today to call your attention.

Unquestionably one of the most pressing needs is the necessity for additional personnel. Ours is a unique service. No other probation or parole system encompasses such a vast geographical area or performs such a multitude of functions. As a consequence we are beset with problems peculiar to us. Large distances must be covered within a limited time and frequently under adverse travel conditions. Officers strive to comply with investigative and supervisory demands by their court, other district courts, the parole board, youth authority, the numerous penal institutions, and military services. Their duties are concerned with both men and women, adults and juveniles. There are many who hold that such a multitudinous array of functions preclude the rendering of effective service. There is merit to this contention even when an adequate number of personnel are available, which is not the case at present.

The usual means employed in determining the need for personnel is by considering the number of probationers or parolees under the supervision of each officer. Leading experts in the field agree that an officer devoting full time to supervision should not be required to supervise in excess of 40 to 60 cases. Several of the State systems operate on this level and in at least two, Wisconsin and California, additional officers are added by law when case loads reach a specified number. With these numbers in mind, consider our situation.

The latest figures available indicate that 316 Federal officers supervise 29,472 persons

for an average case load of 94 per officer. This places us far above the limits recommended by experts. Our position is still less favorable considering that better than one-half of an officer's time is spent conducting investigations. There are indications that this phase of our work, which showed a 5 percent increase this past year, will continue to rise. As a consequence of the time factor, officers in many districts are unable to give at most but a few minutes per month to an individual under supervision. Such a situation does not permit the solving of frequently encountered complex rehabilitative problems. Nor does it assist in safeguarding the community from the serious offenders under supervision.

Recognizing the inherent dangers involved in inadequate supervision occasioned by high case loads, the Court of General Sessions in New York City recently doubled its staff. At that time the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York, commented as follows: "It is no accomplishment for the court to interfere in the lives of people and then because of lack of staff and facilities proceed to substitute court neglect for neglect of parents and community."

We maintain that our present number of officers and clerks is decidedly inadequate, and that measures should be instituted at once to provide for additional personnel. In this connection, your attention is called to an interim report of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, 83d Congress, second session, wherein it is recommended "that the Administrative Office for the United States Courts be requested by the Senate Appropriations Committee to submit data on a district basis regarding the number of additional personnel needed to lower case loads to accepted minimal standards, and that such sums as are required for their provision be included in its appropriation for such service."

Equally important as the need for additional personnel for the strengthening of our service is the adoption of a new salary schedule providing for both a higher entrance salary and an accelerated rate of advancement. Formerly, our service experienced no difficulty in recruiting well-trained and competent applicants, for the reasons that the starting salary was commensurate with that given elsewhere, and Government employment offered a certain amount of prestige and security. While the latter two inducements continue to exist, the controlling factor, that of salary, places our service in a very unfavorable light when compared to those engaged in like or similar fields of endeavor. Our current starting salary is $4,205 for officers, with an annual raise of $125. In his 8th year an officer will be drawing $5,185. In contrast, the State of Wisconsin provides an entrance salary $300 more than ours, and an officer in that State may advance to a salary of $5,232 within a period of 3 to 5 years. The State of Michigan offers an entrance salary of $4,781, an amount not achieved by a Federal probation officer until his 5th year. Also in the Michigan system, an officer may advance to $5,950 at the end of 5 years; whereas it will take a Federal officer 13 years to reach that figure. To cite another example, the Federal Bureau of Investigation agents, who are generally younger and less mature, are presently being hired at $5,500 per annum with an additional compensation of $759 being given for overtime. This total of $6,259 is nearly half again as large as our starting salary, and exceeds that presently paid to a probation officer in his 20th year of service. A further handicap in securing applicants is the limited opportunity for promotion to positions of administrative responsibility. Another disadvantage is the fact that officers entering our service are not given credit financially for experience gained elsewhere. This deters persons with actual experience in probation work for applying for positions.

Because of our inadequate salary schedule, several well-trained and competent probation officers have recently elected to accept employment with other agencies. Also many of our men have been forced to seek part-time work in order to augment their income and to provide properly for themselves and families. This is not a healthy situation. While it may relieve the financial stress of the officer, it altogether too frequently results in diminished effort on his part in relation to his duties and obligations to our service. Our work is a full-time proposition and must be so recognized. We do not believe that the present low salary can be excused on the untenable grounds that persons entering this field of work do so, knowing they will not be well paid; nor do we feel that those who are truly dedicated to the service should be unconcerned with compensation. We contend that those paid adequate salaries will be more dedicated to their work and will perform their duties in a more effective manner than those under continual emotional stress occasioned by financial worries. It is most inconsistent and incomprehensible that the wealthiest Government in the world is unwilling to pay well-educated and devoted employees a sum equal to that paid many unskilled laborers in private industry.

As mentioned earlier, one of the objectives of our association is to strive for higher personnel standards in conformity to the qualifications set by the Judicial Conference in 1942 and reaffirmed as recently as last year. These qualifications are as follows:

1. Exemplary character.
2. Good health and vigor.
3. An age at the time of appointment within the range of 24 to 45 years, inclusive.
4. A liberal education of not less than collegiate grade, evidenced by a bachelor's degree (B. A. or B. S.) from a college of recognized standing, or its equivalent.
5. Experience in personnel work for the welfare of others of not less than 2 years, or 2 years of specific training for welfare work (a) in a school of social service or recognized standing, or (b) in a professional course of a college or university of recognized standing.

We feel that the strict adherence to these requirements is a necessity if the service is to maintain the confidence which it has generally heretofore been accorded, to say nothing of its being essential to achievement of professional recognition. As an officer is in the critical position of being able to reflect credit or discredit to the court through his actions, it is our belief that the court should be represented by a mature, experienced, and well-educated individual. We have numerous men of this caliber, including many with masters degrees in social work and some who hold doctorate degrees. More and more of an officer's time is being given to complying with interdistrict investigative and supervisory requests; and, in all likelihood, this will continue because of the increasing mobility of our people. Thus, while appointments are made primarily to serve the needs of one district, all districts are directly affected by any appointment. It, therefore, is disturbing to see appointments which disregard the established qualifications, particularly in respect to educational requirements, since such appointsments lower the standard of our entire group. In all fairness, it must be acknowledged, however, that it has been extremely difficult within the past few years to secure qualified applicants because we have been unable to compete with other agencies in the matter of salaries. This may service to explain why only 50 percent of those appointed this last year met the established qualifications.

Before closing, may I reemphasize the vital role the probation system plays in the administration of Federal justice and the absolute necessity of obtaining and retaining competent personnel. By statute we are required to supply the courts with complete presentence reports on all convicted offenders unless the court otherwise directs. This is a tremendous assignment for a service comprised of only a handful of officers when compared to the large numbers employed by the apprehending and prosecuting agencies. Moreover, the responsibility entrusted to us in fulfilling this directive is indeed a grave one. Upon us rests the obligations of gathering all relevant material concerning the defendant as well as the offense committed and correlating it for the court in a concise and readable report. The defendant's future, the welfare of his family, and society's protection from him are dependent, to a large extent, on the information submitted. After disposition, there is a strong likelihood that our service will assume supervisory duties over the defendant either as a probationer or as a parolee. In this connection, it is to be noted we now have more offenders under supervision in the community than are confined in the numerous Federal penal institutions. In all humility, I ask whether any other service plays a more essential role in the administration of Federal justice. Yet, we are forced to operate under halfway measures, which is, to use a trite expression, "penny wise and pound foolish." For the sake of society, the courts, and defendants, we should be supplied with means to expand and strengthen our system by increasing our personnel and salaries. To this end, we earnestly seek your support.

Mrs. Holthausen Was Businesswoman Pioneer, Civic Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I want to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Hudson Dispatch of recent date containing a brief recital of the history of a famous businesswoman in my district. Mrs. Holthausen was a woman of remarkable talents and great charity. She stands as a symbol of the women of America. The editorial follows:

MRS. HOLTHAUSEN WAS BUSINESSWOMAN PIONEER, CIVIC LEADER

Death on Tuesday ended the career of a pioneer businesswoman and civic leader, who during many of her 90 years distinguishedly contributed to the development of North Hudson.

Mrs. Helen Holthausen, president of Holthausen Department Store since 1905 when its founder and her husband, Arend Holthausen, died, up to last year had taken an active part in the growth of the business, established in 1878.

Mrs. Holthausen, when a year old, came to this country with her widowed mother. It was in 1883 that they came to Hoboken and during that year she met Arend Holthausen, a young and progressive Union Hill merchant. In 1884 they were married, and with the help of Mrs. Holthausen the Holthausen store grew until larger quarters were necessary. The original little store on old Blum Street, Union Hill, now 36th Street, Union City, was a far cry from the modern department store now operated by Arend

Holthausen's sons, Carl and Ernest Holthausen, and grandsons, Carl Holthausen, Jr. and Duncan McClave Holthausen.

Mrs. Holthausen, while possessing a keen and analytical mind that made business a pleasure, found much satisfaction in working for civic and charitable causes.

She was one of the zealous North Hudson women who performed yeoman service for North Hudson Red Cross Chapter during World War II.

She was a founder of Helping Hand Society of North Hudson, which for a half century has done much to help unfortunates, and also a founder of North Hudson Hospital Guild, which has through the years done so much for North Hudson Hospital. Mrs. Adam Riesnberger and Mrs. Holthausen, in recent years, had been the only two surviving charter members of Helping Hand Society.

Mrs. Holthausen, annually, presided at the Founder's Day observance, which became a tradition at Holthausen's, and serves to keep alive the memory of her husband, Arend, whose genius made the department store as it is known today possible. For his widow and sons and grandsons had a firm foundation of business principles left by the founder on which to expand and develop the retail institution to its present peak.

North Hudson owes much to pioneer women like Mrs. Holthausen of old Union Hill and old West Hoboken for their great part in making Union City what it is today.

Our Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. SHELLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

OUR MERCHANT MARINE

(Address by Hon. JOHN F. SHELLEY at American University Transportation Institute banquet, Washington, D. C., May 25, 1955)

Our merchant marine is an industry vital to the development of our foreign trade in peacetime. In time of national emergency it is the means of joining our great productive capacity and our troops and allies overseas. Historically, in wartime, the word "our" when applied to our Armed Forces and merchant marine is proudly used by the general American public. During war the American public is made keenly aware of the heroic exploits of our Armed Forces and merchant marine assigned to the serious task of defending the freedom cherished by us and the free peoples of other democratic nations. Unfortunately, in peacetime many of our citizens as well as other nationals quickly forget the great accomplishments of our Army, Navy, Air Force, and merchant marine. In fact, up to pre-World War II it was common to hear such expressions as "only a bum joins the Army or Navy, and only a tramp or thief goes to sea as a merchant seaman." In times of peace the word "our" as applied to our Armed Forces and merchant marine sharply shrinks to a relatively small nucleus of Americans who refuse to forget the painful lessons we had been taught in the past.

MERCHANT MARINE IN PEACE

In peacetime the average American has little interest in the complex multibillion dollar American export and import trade. Many of us realize that our export-import trade is essential to the development of our economy which permits us to enjoy our high standard of living. Too many of us accept the theory of natural world markets which fall into specific relationships without the exertion of efforts aimed at developing such world markets.

Few Americans realize the importance of American shipping agents in foreign ports. These agents are busy drumming up business which normally means the exporting of American farm products and manufactured commodities. In return for the exports, our ships carry to our shores the raw materials and finished commodities which are required to bolster our economy and raise our standard of living.

A recent study shows that in 1952, the exports of our automobile industry totaled nearly $1 billion. One passenger car and truck out of every 20 manufactured in the United States was shipped to a foreign market.

The American merchant marine is extremely important to the agricultural segment of our economy. Annually we export approximately two-fifths of our wheat crop, more than a quarter of all the cotton and tobacco, and one-half of our rice crop. Other important agricultural exports are soybeans, barley, dried fruits, and such meat products as beef, pork, lard, and tallow. Over the last 10 years $1 out of every $8 of our farmers' income was realized by the export of his produce overseas.

A recent study revealed that annually there were 82,500,000 meals served to passengers and crew members aboard our merchant ships. The conclusion of that study is that these meals represent approximately $55 million worth of food. Since American ships purchase their supplies in the American market, this means a substantial contribution to our farm economy.

It has been estimated that our American merchant marine consumes approximately 3 million electric light bulbs a year. It also consumes over 9 million bars of soap a year. Taking into consideration American ships' purchases of such items as linen, glassware, dishes, washing machines, etc., it is evident that our merchant marine affects almost every segment of our domestic economy. Some critics state that even if our ships were swept off the high seas, foreign merchant ships would purchase the above-mentioned items in the American market. This is not true. We know that foreign merchant ships purchase their supplies in their home markets or in world markets other than the United States. The main exception has been during austerity periods in the world when foreign merchant ships were compelled to purchase their supplies in the American market.

Many American shippers utilize foreign merchant marines because they believe that it results in great savings. This is untrue for general cargoes which are carried aboard berth liners. Foreign and American berth liners are members of conferences which establish uniform shipping rates for all ships regardless of flag. In this field it is obvious that the shipping industry must conduct a public relations program designed to convince the American shipper to utilize American flag ships. This would result in the desirable equalization of the policies and practices of foreign shippers who utilize ships flying the flag other than their national flag only when their ships are definitely not available.

One of the greatest reasons for permitting the American merchant marine to wither in times of peace is the false belief that we can rely upon the merchant ships of our allies in time of war. This theory has been and is accepted by many despite the fact that it has been disproved during every major war.

MERCHANT MARINE IN WAR

World War I

Prior to World War I, the United States, leaning heavily on the false theory of reliance on foreign flag shipping, permitted our merchant marine to shrink to the point where we were carrying less than 10 percent of our export and import trade. At the outbreak of the war in 1914, the myth exploded and our foreign and domestic economy nearly collapsed. We were trapped in the untenable position of being a neutral productive giant without ships to transport our agricultural and manufactured commodities overseas and to import the raw materials required to keep our production machinery in gear. The piers and warehouses in our American ports looked like garbage dumps and junk yards heaped high with rotting farm produce and rusting manufactured commodities.

In August 1913, we exported 257,172 bales of cotton. One year later in August 1914, only 21,219 bales of cotton were exported. During the last 5 months of the first year of World War I, the price of cotton tumbled from $62.50 a bale to $36.25.

The foreign shipowners who sent a few ships to service our trade became wealthy overnight. After the war had flared into its full violence, the average rate on general cargo increased over 1,000 percent. Shipping profits from one voyage often paid the entire cost of the ship.

Our Government spent over $3 billion in acquiring an American flag merchant marine that was adequate to service the war needs of our Nation. We came out of World War I with 2,547 low-quality merchant ships which were purchased or built in a hurry.

President Woodrow Wilson, in his third annual message to Congress given in May 1915, warned Congress that we must maintain an adequate peacetime merchant marine in order to be prepared to meet world aggression. He stated:

"It is high time we repaired our mistake and resumed our commercial independence on the seas. For it is a question of independence. If other nations go to war or seek to hamper each other's commerce, our merchants it seems are at their mercy, to do with as they please. We must use their ships, and use them as they determine. We have not ships enough of our own. We cannot handle our own commerce on the seas. Our independence is provincial and is only on land and within our own borders."

Despite the knowledge that the lack of an adequate American-flag merchant marine prolonged a terrible war with the resultant cost of many thousands of lives, the end of the war saw the virtual end of our merchant marine. Our ships were stuck in the mud to become rust buckets.

World War II

At the outbreak of World War II on September 1, 1939, the United States merchant marine consisted of only 1,379 seagoing ships of 1,000 gross tons and over. At this time the total world tonnage was 80 million deadweight tons of which Britain and France controlled approximately 27 million tons. A great proportion of the remaining tonnage was under the control of neutral nations which were friendly to the Allies. German submarine warfare, especially at the beginning of the war, was extremely effective. During the entire war the losses of allied shipping totaled over 36 million deadweight tons. Of this tonnage 733 were American merchant ships aggregating almost 7 million deadweight tons.

In order to service our Nation and our allies, the United States embarked on the biggest shipbuilding program in history. We constructed over 5,000 merchant ships, aggregating more than 54 million deadweight tons. Approximately 10 percent of our new

ships were made available for the operation by our allies with the remainder flying the American flag. In turn, our allies made available to us only 715,000 gross tons. This exploded the theory of our pre-World War II experts who had claimed that in the event of war the United States would require only 1,200 merchant ships because our allies could adequately service the free world.

During the war, American merchant ships delivered almost 300 million long tons of dry and liquid cargoes. During the last year of the war, our merchant ships delivered an average of 8,500 tons of cargo every hour of every day and night. The successful American shipbuilding and ship-operating programs enabled the Allied armed forces to meet and defeat the Fascist aggressors.

The total American cost of the shipbuilding and ship-operating program during World War II totaled over $22.5 billion. Of this staggering amount, $12.5 billion was for shipbuilding and the remainder for ship operating. Unfortunately, in our haste to build an adequate wartime merchant marine, we were compelled to construct the relatively simple design and slow-speed Liberty-type dry-cargo and tanker ships. Approximately three-fifths of all of our wartime ship construction were Liberty ships, which were obsolete on the drawing board. Had the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 been properly administered, we would have had a more adequate merchant marine to meet the initial war needs. This would have given us the time needed to design and construct more modern ships which would have been of greater commercial value in the postwar period. Also, it would have saved billions of the $12.5 billion taxpayer dollars which were spent for a hasty but necessary emergency shipbuilding program. This is a good example of saving pennies in peacetime and, as a result, spending dollars in time of war.

Korean war

Immediately prior to the outbreak of the Korean war our active American merchant marine had shrunk to the approximate size it had been immediately pre-World War II. Again we were taught that we could fully rely only upon our own merchant ships in a national emergency. Fortunately, our Nation had placed a great number of our World War II ships in mothballs. We activated from 25 to 75 of these ships a month, up to the total of over 700 additional ships which were needed to service our troops overseas. During the Korean war, American merchant ships carried over 80 percent of the cargoes to the war theater. It is my opinion that if it had not been for our merchant marine we would have been driven out of Korea or compelled to engage in an allout third world war.

Atomic age

Today, at the beginning of a possible third world war, our merchant marine has again shrunk to its pre-World War II and pre-Korean war size. There is some loose talk that a merchant marine will have little, if any, place in this atomic age. I sharply disagree with this dangerous kind of thinking. To begin with, we know that the Communist aggressors have been and are following a war strategy of nibbling away at the periphery of the spheres of influence of the free world. Examples of this strategy are Korea, Indochina, and at the present time the dangers over Formosa. In order to adequately meet this type of aggression, we need a large modern merchant marine flying the American flag. This strong belief of mine was recently confirmed by Secretary of the Navy Charles Thomas. In a Maritime Day speech given 2 weeks ago before the Propeller Club of Washington, D. C., Secretary Thomas emphatically stated that it was absolutely essential to achieve and maintain an adequate American-flag merchant marine today. He strongly emphasized the fact that the atomic age does not make our merchant fleet obsolete.

50–50 fight

Last year we passed a law which provides that American bottoms shall carry at least 50 percent of our foreign-aid cargoes, cargoes financed by the United States Government or for the United States account, and cargoes financed by foreign currencies of which convertibility is guaranteed by the United States Government. Since Col. Arthur Syran, of the Foreign Operations Administration, has given you a 1-hour lecture on the transportation of our foreign-aid programs, I shall not go into the history or details of the so-called 50–50 concept. However, the most recent intensive attack by foreign shipping lobbyists and some foreign nations on the requirement that American bottoms carry 50 percent of our farm surplus products under Public Law 480 warrants special attention and comment.

Recently, several foreign nations have stated that unless the 50–50 provision is waived they would not accept American farm surplus commodities to be shipped under Public Law 480. They argue that these are commercial transactions which are paid for in foreign currencies guaranteed for convertibility by the United States Government. I challenge their definition of commercial transactions. To me, a commercial transaction is one in which one party receives a given commodity which is paid for with money or, in the case of barter, with other commodities. There the commercial transaction between the two parties ends. This is not the type of transaction which takes place under Public Law 480. Under this law, foreign nations who are able to pay for our farm surplus commodities receive those commodities and, in turn, are supposed to pay for them in their soft currencies. However, recently the Secretary of Agriculture reported that during the first year of Public Law 480 operation, 50.7 percent of the soft currencies received by the United States were directly contributory to overseas economies and were not reimbursable to the United States.

Recently, one foreign nation refused to accept $7.7 million worth of our farm surplus commodities because of the 50–50 provision. In this particular case their currency was merely a bookkeeping entry. In return for the grain they were offered, they were to ship a given amount of their manufactured products to underdeveloped areas of the world. To me, it is amazing that a foreign government would classify such a transaction as a purely commercial one. In this particular case we send them grain and boost their industrial production which is sent as aid cargoes to the world's more unfortunate peoples. All we demand is that our depressed merchant marine carry 50 percent of the grain to the recipient nation.

Another foreign maritime nation refused to accept surplus American tobacco unless the 50–50 provision was waived. Our Nation compromised, compromised spelled g-a-v-e, to the point where we agreed to ship them $15 million worth of surplus tobacco for which the foreign government would spend their currency to build housing which they would lease to the American Air Forces stationed in their country. The negotiators for that particular foreign nation quickly agreed that this was not a purely commercial transaction and, therefore, they were willing ot permit American ships to carry 50 percent of the tobacco. Then an astounding thing happened. The foreign shipping lobbyists of that country immediately protested their government's "bowing down to the American merchant marine." To my knowledge the agreement has not yet been signed by the representatives of that foreign nation.

The maneuverings of the foreign shipping lobbyists and their foreign governments are clear. They want our farm surplus commodities and they are satisfied with the terms of payment. However, they are hopeful that their temporary refusals to accept the farm commodities will cause the powerful American farm bloc to take action against their own American merchant marine.

Recently a spokesman for one of the farm organizations stated that by applying the 50–50 provision to the $700 million available in Public Law 480, $70 million would be paid to American shipowners. He stated that this would result in a correspondingly lower shipment of farm surplus commodities. This is absolutely not true.

Of the $700 million worth of commodities to be shipped under Public Law 480, approximately 80 percent will be carried in berth liners. Since American and foreign berth liners operate under conference rates, the cost of shipment will be the same whether the cargoes are carried by American or foreign ships. Therefore, the only possible additional cost would be for the American tramp carriage of the 20 percent of the total exports under this program. It is estimated that the total freight money which would be paid to American and foreign tramp ships would be $15.3 million. With the estimation that the freight rates of American tramps will be 25 percent higher than foreign tramps, it means that American tramps would receive $8.5 million and the foreign tramps would receive $6.8 million. The estimated difference for the entire program is $1.7 million, or one quarter of 1 percent of the cost of the commodities in the basic disposal program itself.

It is important to note that the so-called additional cost for using American tramps to carry 50 percent of the tramp cargoes is based on the assumption that foreign tramp rates would remain the same should we withdraw the American tramps from the market. However, being realistic, we know that as soon as we withdraw our tramp fleet the foreign tramp rates would rise and the so-called $1.7 million saving would evaporate.

It has been estimated that the revenues to the American Merchant Marine resulting from the carriage of the surplus farm commodities under Public Law 480 would result in estimated disbursements of $30 million within our domestic economy. These disbursements would create some 8,000 man-years of employment. Approximately 3,000 man-years of this employment would be direct employment of American merchant seamen who are now suffering from great unemployment. This contribution to our economy is an important one.

It has been estimated that the revenue received by American shipowners by the carriage of farm surplus commodities under Public Law 480 will result in a direct return of some $9 million of taxes to the United States Treasury in the form of personal income taxes on wages and salaries and corporation taxes.

Another important potential saving may be realized by our Government via the recapture provision contained in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. This provision enables the Government to recapture one-half of the profits of a subsidized shipowner which are over 10 percent of capital necessarily employed during the period of the operating subsidy contract up to the amount of the entire subsidy accrual. During the years 1948 through 1952, the estimated gross subsidy accrual is $279,046,000 and the gross estimated recapture is $80,141,000. This estimated recapture savings of over $80 million is to a great extent due to the revenues the subsidized ship operators received under 50–50 legislation. I state that our Government makes a good investment when it ships cargoes aboard the subsidized ships.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion I wish to emphasize that the problems confronting our merchant marine are serious ones. During the few short days

that you have been attending these informative lectures at this great university, you have been briefed on some of the major problems. I am hopeful that some of you now fall within the definition of the word "our" when we say "our merchant marine."

Address by United States Attorney J. Julius Levy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of United States Attorney J. Julius Levy on the occasion of retirement of Judge Albert Watson as chief judge of the middle district of Pennsylvania, and elevation of Judge John W. Murphy to chief judge of said district court, Tuesday, May 31, 1955:

Chief Judge Murphy, Judge Watson, Judge Follmer, President Judge Hoban, judges of the State courts, honored guests of the several bar associations of this district, ladies, and gentlemen, I have been requested as president of the Lackawanna Bar Association, the host bar association, and as the United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania, to speak on behalf of the bar of this court on this occasion.

On such an event as this, the words of the great Bard of Avon comes to one's mind:

"What hath this day deserved? What hath it done, that it in golden letters should be set among the high tides in the calendar?"

In setting apart this day to honor these judges of this court, we are in truth dedicating and setting apart the day to honor the courts of the United States and their true administration of justice. If it takes merely the form of pageantry then rather this day, as the bard has said, would be best "turned out of the week." But if we here resolve to dedicate the day to true American justice, "Equal justice under the law," then the day deserves to be set in golden letters.

This day then will have done honor to the retiring chief judge of this court, Judge Albert L. Watson, who served and adorned this judicial tribunal for more than a quarter of a century.

This day then will have done honor to Judge John W. Murphy, who will assume the duties and responsibilities of the chief judgeship of this court.

This day then also will have done honor to Judge Frederick Follmer, who now becomes a permanent district judge for this middle district of Pennsylvania.

To you, Judge Watson, the day can best be described in the simple lines of Oliver Goldsmith:

"O blest retirement!
* * * * *
How blest is he who crowns, in warmth like these,
A youth of labor, with an age of ease!"

You were appointed to this court on December 17, 1929, and for more than 25 years you have served it tirelessly and faithfully, with single-minded devotion to the true administration of justice. Your decision to retire from the regular active service has brought to the entire bar of this court a mingled feeling of regret upon your retirement and of gratification that you will continue to be called for court work. On this day, we wish to express our feeling of obligation to you for your distinguished services to the court, and to assure you of the high regard and esteem in which your professional brethren hold you.

Of our new chief judge, it has been said often that he is a self-made man, that he was born poor and that in spite of this obstacle he became great. What an obstacle to overcome for one who as a breaker boy and laborer around the mines, wanted to go through college and law school can only be told by one who did these things, as Judge Murphy did. A graduate of the College and Law School of the University of Pennsylvania, an assistant district attarney of this county, a Congressman of this district, honored by his Congress by appointment to the Joint Committee of Congress for Pearl Harbor Investigation before whom appeared as winesses a Justice of the United States Supreme Court and the highest officers of the Army and Navy, appointed United States district judge, remembered and honored by his law school by appointment to its board of managers, elected to the American Law Institute, and now the Chief Judge of this Court.

How did be become great? He had the qualities which essentially fitted him for the public offices he occupied—a sound constitution and good health, a very keen intelligence, an almost unerring memory which to the lawyers who have had matters before him, is nothing short of amazing, a wide knowledge of the law, and the power of analysis that enables him to separate the wheat from chaff in the many complicated matters presented to him, and a thorough understanding of the art of government derived from his experience as a Congressman. During your incumbency on this bench, Chief Judge Murphy, you gained the high esteem of your professional brethren and the judges throughout the third circuit.

To you, we bespeak the best of wishes of the bar of this court in this new and great responsibility which rests on a Chief Judge—and the full enjoyment of your new office.

And to you, Judge Follmer, who is now a permanent judge of this court, the bar brings you a special warm welcome. I am happy to be able to personally convey it to you. From the first day we of the middle district bar came to know you, we have found you faithful to every private and public trust. You have served this district as the United States attorney with great success, and for almost a decade now you have presided over a Federal court the jurisdiction of which extended in the three districts of Pennsylvania, and during these years you have brought honor and dignity to the court, and you have earned the high esteem of the judges throughout this Commonwealth.

Thus another page of the history of this district court is this day written, and in golden letters it is set at the end thereof, for the purpose of the day, and in rededication of this bench and bar:

"The true administration of justice is the firmest pillar of good government."

Mayor Poulson Right in Gas Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Times of Thursday, May 26, entitled "Mayor Poulson Right in Gas Stand":

MAYOR POULSON RIGHT IN GAS STAND

The position taken by Mayor Norris Poulson in favor of exempting natural gas producers from Federal regulation is with little question correct and in the best interests of Los Angeles—a city which, as the Mayor pointed out, must obtain half its gas supply from outside the State.

PRICE-FIXING DUTIES

The mayor spoke before the Senate Commerce Committee in favor of the bill by Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, Arkansas, to excuse the Federal Power Commission from the duty of fixing prices on gas at the well. The FPC does not want the job, but the Supreme Court held the existing law requires that it take it on.

The mayor is almost alone, among city officials who have appeared before the committee, in favoring the bill. But he says that at the conference of mayors in New York, he found few advocates for Federal regulation.

The reasons for the Fulbright bill are few and simple. Gas production is a competitive business, and competition is a sufficient regulator; it is essential that an adequate supply of gas be available for domestic consumers and for industry, and this is best assured by noninterference on the part of the Federal Government. If there is any need for regulation it should be applied at the State level; and regulation of gas would entail at least partial regulation of oil production, which is best left in private hands.

The Fulbright bill is essentially the same as the Kerr bill which Congress passed several years ago and President Truman vetoed, taking the demagogic stand that he was "protecting consumers."

If Los Angeles continues to grow, it must look for still larger supplies of gas and the amount available locally is strictly limited. There is even talk of importing gas to this area from the Canadian fields.

New gas fields will for the most part be developed by wildcatting, and Federal regulation would discourage venture capital from embarking in an investment that has such great hazards. Most wildcat wells, as the records show, discover nothing; and if the wildcatter is to have his profits regulated on the few wells that do succeed, he will chance his money elsewhere.

PRODUCTION VENTURE

The interstate pipelines, being common carriers, are regulated, and the companies that distribute gas to consumers also are regulated. In both cases there is an element of natural monopoly which justifies regulation. But neither gas nor oil production is a monopoly; on the contrary, competition is very actively at work.

As Mayor Poulson said, in time of peace there is no justification of Federal regulation of the price of any commodity.

Roadbuilding in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I want to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Newark Star-Ledger of May 26, 1955, one

of New Jersey's outstanding newspapers, dealing with the important question of road building in the State of New Jersey. The editorial follows:

THE MOST FOR OUR MONEY

The Democratic United States Senate has shelved the administration's highway program for one of its own, but the day may yet be saved by the House of Representatives. We hope so, for the administration plan is much, much better for New Jersey than the Democratic substitute.

A last-ditch fight will be needed in the House to win support for the administration program, developed by Gen. Lucius Clay. We trust that every one of New Jersey's congressional bloc, Democrat and Republican alike, will be lined up on the side that offers our State the most for its money.

The Democrats should not find the Eisenhower side too uncomfortable. Governor Meyner, a Democrat, has already endorsed the administration plan, because he recognizes how much better it is for the State than the Democratic program.

Here are the facts:

Administration plan: New Jersey would get $141,900,000 per year for 10 years. We will contribute $11,200,000 a year in addition, making a grand total of $153,100,000 a year for 10 years.

Democratic plan: New Jersey would get only $54 million a year, and for only 5 years. Our share would be $8,100,000 a year.

The Clay plan is obviously a much better deal for New Jersey. We would pay 3 times as much, but get more than 5 times as much in Federal aid.

These figures are stratospheric, of course, and it's a little hard to visualize just what all this means to us. You may get a better perspective on the terrible need for road construction and modernization in New Jersey when you realize that we are the first in traffic density in the entire Nation. It's no honor. It's a nuisance.

Our State is the carpet between that big city across the river and the rest of the United States of America.

Our traffic problem, as a result, is in reality the Nation's traffic problem. It is unfair and unrealistic to think that we should, or could, solve the Nation's problem by ourselves.

The Clay plan recognizes this reality. It offers New Jersey a substantial share of the Federal road-building program. It offers us enough money to make a significant and worthwhile contribution to solving our immense traffic headache.

The Democratic plan will not solve the problem. It will only ameliorate it. And that is not enough. Niggardliness in road-building usually ends up costing more money in the long run.

The future well-being of northern New Jersey rests largely on the success we have in eliminating the traffic problem. The New Jersey contingent in Congress should take the lead in persuading the House of Representatives to pass the administration's highway bill, and then in persuading the Senate to change its mind.

The Panama Canal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

UNITED STATES CITIZENS ASSOCIATION,
CANAL ZONE, *May 28, 1955.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: The members of this association feel they must express to you their sincere appreciation for the avid and active interest you took in the recent hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations who are concerned with the budget of the Panama Canal. It is very gratifying to the United States citizens in the zone to be able to read the text of the proceedings in the local newspaper, the Star and Herald, which is published in the Republic of Panama.

Our chief concern, as United States citizen employees of the Canal, is to keep the Panama Canal; to remind other citizens that this vital asset of our Nation must remain under the sovereignty of the United States of America; that the Canal is operated in an efficient manner, consistent with economy now and in the future; and to strive for the maintenance of the chief objective of the Canal, "maritime service to all nations." All of these, we are certain, can be achieved under the guidance of proper laws, rules, regulations, and directives.

Under no circumstances do we feel that any of the foregoing objectives should be sacrificed and we are sure that you do not want them to be. For this reason we shall continue to urge that careful consideration always be given to any questions that may arise, or any legislation that may be proposed in the future which relates to necessary changes in order to insure the accomplishment of such objectives to the betterment of our Nation.

Again, this organization wishes to thank you for the time you gave to its representatives, Mr. Collins and Mr. French while you were visiting here at Eastertime. We trust that you will return to the Isthmus again, and allow us to express the hope that we will be afforded the opportunity in the future of seeing more of your colleagues take the interest that you do in the Canal's affairs.

Sincerely yours,
(MRS.) THELMA H. BULL,
Corresponding Secretary.

A Bill To Provide Assistance to Communities, Industries, Business Enterprises, and Individuals To Facilitate Adjustments Made Necessary by the Trade Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States.

This proposal is identical to H. R. 229, which was introduced by our esteemed colleague, Mr. HARRISON WILLIAMS, of New Jersey.

I am introducing this bill today for the purpose of cosponsorship with Congressman WILLIAMS, of New Jersey.

I believe that this legislation if passed will do much to help develop world trade.

It will certainly help the people of the United States of America to make adjustments that will be necessary if we are to operate an effective reciprocal trade policy.

This trade adjustment bill would establish a Government-wide adjustment assistance board which would be empowered to step in when low tariffs under the reciprocal trade policy would endanger the American market. It would provide that if the President in the overall national interest disregards the escape clause or peril point findings of the Tariff Commission, he could at the same time authorize the Board to extend the following benefits to United States communities and industries which are hurt by the foreign competition.

First. The Government would finance technical assistance to companies and communities needing it, to encourage diversification. Engineers, market researchers, and other technicians would be financed for expert surveys out of Federal funds. Easier tax provisions for building new plants would be allowed and import firms would be encouraged to enter such communities to stimulate new markets.

Second. Unemployment compensation assistance would be doubled. Under present law, jobless payments last for 26 weeks. Under the trade adjustment bill, this would be extended to 52 weeks.

Third. Older workers would be allowed to retire at the age of 60 instead of 65. In addition, counseling and placement and special training allowances would be allowed, coupled with special moving allowances for workers seeking employment in other areas and fields.

This legislation would, in my opinion, make the individual enterprise system even stronger than it now is, relative to totalitarian systems. It would go a long way toward dissipating unreasoning fear and, at the same time, would strengthen our own economy by bringing the economies of the other countries of the free world closer to ours. Unity here means economic strength. Economic strength makes spiritual courage and determination easier, and together with the military preparedness that is already under way, such strength can go a long way toward the creation of a truly strong free world.

The text of the bill is as follows:

A bill to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Trade Adjustment Act of 1955."

PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) It is recognized that the maintenance of a sound domestic economy and healthy international relations requires that the United States engage in trade among the free nations of the world. Further, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 reflects the congressional desire that the President be authorized to negotiate with the other countries of the world with a view to lowering trade barriers. The Congress has also recognized, in enacting the peril point and escape clause provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, that there are situations in which the reduction of trade barriers, although redounding to the benefit of the Nation as a whole, may have serious adverse effects on particular domestic industries. These provisions provide mechanisms for determining at what point reduc-

tions in trade barriers, either in prospect or already accomplished, will have such adverse effects. They provide no method by which greater prosperity and security for the Nation as a whole can be secured by the reduction of trade barriers, while avoiding or ameliorating the economic losses which particular communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals may suffer in the adjustment of their productive activities which may be made necessary by such reduction. It is the purpose of this act to resolve this problem by providing assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in the adjustment of their productive activity to the economic conditions created by the national trade policy. It is not the purpose of this act to provide a permanent subsidy, but rather to provide the means by which those affected by lowered trade barriers may be assisted in the period of their adjustment.

(b) It is the intention of Congress that, in determining eligibility for the assistance provided for under this act, the act shall be construed liberally and that any doubt regarding eligibility shall be resolved in favor of the applicant.

ESTABLISHMENT AND FUNCTIONS OF ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE BOARD

SEC. 3. The President shall appoint a 5-member board to be known as the Trade Adjustment Board (hereinafter called the Board), 1 member of which he shall designate as Chairman. The members of the Board shall be appointed from among the officers and employees of the executive branch of the Government and shall serve without compensation in addition to that otherwise received as officers or employees in the executive branch of the Government, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Board.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of performing its duties, the Board is authorized to—

(a) hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, and to take such testimony, as the Board may deem advisable;

(b) secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics needed to carry out the purposes of this section; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Board upon request made by the Chairman;

(c) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths, to take testimony, to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Any member of the Board may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Board. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the Chairman and shall be served by any person designated by him. The Board is authorized to exercise any of the powers conferred upon the Securities and Exchange Commission by subsection (c) of section 21 of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, and subsection (d) of such section shall be applicable to witnesses before the Board; and

(d) establish such rules, regulations, and procedures as may be appropriate to permit the Board to perform the functions prescribed in this act.

SEC. 5. (a) Whenever the President, in accordance with the provisions of sections 4 and 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended by sections 12 and 13 of this act, shall determine to invoke the provisions of this act with reference to any article as to which a modification in the rate of duty or other import restriction, or any other concession, has been found either to threaten or to have caused serious injury to a domestic industry, he shall notify the Board of his decision.

(b) After the notification by the President provided for above, the Board shall, upon application by any community, industrial development corporation, business enterprise, employee, or organization representing employees, determine whether the applicant is eligible, or represents persons eligible, to receive the benefits provided for in this act. If the Board shall determine that any community, industrial development corporation, business enterprise, employee, or organization representing employees is eligible for the benefits provided for in this act, or represents persons so eligible, it shall issue a certificate describing the community, industrial development corporation, business enterprise, or employees found eligible which shall conclusively establish for a period of 18 months or such shorter period as the Board may determine that the described persons are eligible for the benefits provided for in this act. Such certificates shall state the period for which they are valid and shall automatically expire at the end of such period. Upon application, the Board shall have authority to renew any certificates of eligibility for successive periods of 18 months, or less, upon a showing that such renewal is necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act. The Board shall also have authority on its own motion or upon the motion of any interested person, to cancel any such certificate of eligibility if it finds the continued existence of such certificate is not necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act.

(c) The following may be determined by the Board to be eligible for the benefits provided for in this act:

(1) Any business enterprise engaged in the production of an article identical to or directly competitive with an article with reference to which this act shall have been invoked.

(2) Any unemployed individual whose last regular employment shall have been in a business enterprise which is eligible or may be determined to be eligible for the benefits provided for by this act.

(3) Any community a substantial number of the residents of which are individuals who are eligible or may be determined to be eligible for the benefits provided for by this act.

(4) Any industrial development corporation organized for the purpose of aiding the development of a more balanced and diversified economy or diversification of production in a community which is eligible or may be determined to be eligible for the benefits provided for by this act.

In determining whether a particular business enterprise is eligible for the benefits provided for in this act, the Board shall consider what portion of the total production of such enterprise consists of the production of an article identical to or directly competitive with the article with reference to which this act shall have been invoked. In determining whether any such enterprise or any community or industrial development corporation is eligible for such benefits the Board shall also consider whether such enterprise, community, or industrial development corporation has developed satisfactory proposals for programs of economic adjustment consonant with the purposes of this act.

(d) As used in this act—

(1) The term "industrial development corporation" includes any body organized and operated by private citizens for the purpose of aiding the development of a more balanced and diversified economy or diversification of production in a community through industrial development, the training or retraining of employees, or through any other means.

(2) The term "employee" includes an unemployed individual whose last regular employment shall have been in a business enterprise which is eligible or may be determined to be eligible for the benefits provided for in this act.

ADJUSTMENT BENEFITS

SEC. 6. Information and advice: Any business enterprise found to be eligible by the Board for assistance under this act may apply to appropriate departments and agencies of the Government for technical information, market research, or any other form of information and advice which might be of assistance in the development of more efficient methods of production and in the development of new lines of production. Similarly, any community or industrial development corporation found eligible for assistance under this act may apply to appropriate departments and agencies of the Government for such information and advice as will enable it to develop a more balanced and diversified economy.

SEC. 7. Loans: Section 207 of the Small Business Act of 1953 is amended—

(a) by striking out the word "and" at the end of subsection (d);

(b) by striking out the period at the end of subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the word "and"; and

(c) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(f) to make such loans as the Administration may determine to be necessary or appropriate to business enterprises and communities, either in their corporate capacity or as represented through industrial development corporations or similar agencies, for the adjustment by such business enterprises and communities to economic conditions resulting from the trade policy of the United States: *Provided, however,* That no such loans shall be made by the Administration to any business enterprise, or community unless the Trade Adjustment Board, as established under the provisions of the Trade Adjustment Act of 1954, shall have certified to the Administration that such business enterprise, or community is eligible for benefits under the Trade Adjustment Act of 1954: *And provided further,* That the requirements of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall be applicable to the loans authorized to be made under this subsection."

SEC. 8. Unemployment compensation: (a) (1) The Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall on behalf of the United States enter into an agreement with any State in which an enterprise, or community, with respect to which a certificate of eligibility has been issued under this act, is located, under which the State, as agent of the United States, will make payments of supplementary compensation to unemployed individuals in the State as provided for in this section, and will otherwise cooperate with the Secretary and with other State agencies in making payments of supplementary compensation under this section.

(2) Payments of supplementary unemployment compensation under this section shall be made only to individuals within the class of individuals determined by the Board under section 5 of this act to be eligible to receive the benefits provided for in this act.

(3) In any case where an unemployed individual is no longer entitled to payment of compensation under the unemployment compensation laws of the State solely by reason of the expiration of the period for which such compensation is payable under such laws, there shall be paid to such individual, out of amounts paid to such State by the United States for such purpose and without cost to such State, supplementing compensation in an amount equal to the rate of State unemployment compensation which he was receiving immediately prior to the time he was no longer entitled to receive such rate. In order to remain eligible for supplementary compensation under this para-

graph, an individual must comply with the provisions of State law with respect to ability and availability for work, and with respect to the acceptance of offers of suitable work, and failure to so comply shall result in immediate cessation of payment under this paragraph. The total period during which an unemployed individual may receive benefits under this section shall not exceed 26 weeks.

(4) The amount of the Federal supplementary compensation to an individual for a week of partial unemployment shall be the amount necessary to provide such individual with a weekly benefit equal to the amount he would have received under paragraph (3) of this subsection for a week of total unemployment, less his earnings for such week in excess of the partial earnings allowance, if any, permitted by the unemployment compensation law of the State.

(5) Any agreement under this section shall provide that compensation otherwise payable to any individual under the State's unemployment compensation law will not be denied or reduced for any week by reason of any payment made pursuant to such agreement. No agreement under this section for payment of compensation by a State agency shall be valid if compensation payable to any individual under the law of such State is less than it would have been under such law as it existed on January 1, 1955.

(b) Whenever the Board, either upon application of an interested party or upon its own motion, determines that unemployment among individuals found by the Board to be eligible to receive the benefits provided for in this act is no longer attributable to the trade policy of the United States, no further payments shall be made under this section to such individuals with respect to weeks of unemployment occurring after the date of such determination by the Board, or occurring during any period for which there is not in effect a certification under section 5 describing such individuals.

(c) Each State shall be entitled to be paid by the United States an amount equal to the additional cost to the State of payments of compensation made under and in accordance with an agreement under this section which would not have been incurred by the State but for the agreement.

(d) In making payments pursuant to this section, there shall be paid to the State, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, such sum as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this section for each calendar month, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary finds that his estimates for any prior calendar month were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. Such estimates may be made upon the basis of such statistical sampling, or other method, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency.

(e) The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payments to each State sums payable to such State under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment to the State in accordance with such certification, from the funds available for carrying out the purposes of this act.

(f) All money paid to a State under this section shall be used solely for the purposes for which it is paid; and any money so paid which is not used for such purposes shall be returned, at the time specified in the agreement under this section, to the Treasury and credited to current applicable appropriations, funds, or accounts from which payments to States under this section may be made.

(g) An agreement under this section may require any officer or employee of the State certifying payments or disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement, or otherwise participating in its performance, to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Secretary may deem necessary, and may provide for the payment of the cost of such bond from funds available for carrying out the purposes of this section.

(h) No person designated by the Secretary, or designated pursuant to an agreement under this section, as a certifying officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any compensation certified by him under this section.

(i) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this section if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated as provided by this section.

(j) For the purpose of payments made to a State under title III of the Social Security Act, administration by the State agency of such State pursuant to an agreement under this act shall be deemed to be a part of the administration of the State unemployment compensation law.

(k) The agency administering the unemployment compensation law of any State shall furnish to the Secretary such information as the Secretary may find necessary or appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this act, and such information shall be deemed reports required by the Secretary for the purposes of paragraph (6) of subsection (a) of section 303 of the Social Security Act.

(l) Whoever makes a false statement or representation of a material fact knowing it to be false, or knowingly fails to disclose a material fact, to obtain or increase for himself or for any other individual any payment authorized to be paid under this section or under an agreement thereunder shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

(m) The Secretary is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. The Secretary shall insofar as practicable consult with representatives of the State unemployment compensation agencies before prescribing any rules or regulations which may affect the performance by such agencies of functions pursuant to agreement under this section.

SEC. 9. Training and transportation: (a) The Secretary shall—

(1) prescribe and provide suitable training for unemployed individuals eligible for the benefits of this act who are in need of retraining, reemployment, vocational education, or vocational rehabilitation;

(2) utilize and extend all existing Federal governmental facilities, and utilize the facilities of any other governmental agency maintained by joint Federal and State contributions, to carry out the purposes of this section; and

(3) by agreement or contract with public or private institutions or establishments, provide for such additional training facilities as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this section.

(b) The Secretary shall have the power and the duty to cooperate with existing Federal, State, and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation for the purpose of coordinating his activities with those of such Federal, State, and local agencies.

(c) Whenever the Secretary shall determine that (1) no job opportunity for an unemployed individual found eligible for the benefits of this act exists within his own current labor market area, (2) a job opportunity for such individual equivalent to his former employment is available at a place in the United States outside of his current labor market area, (3) such individual agrees to take the job opportunity outside of his labor market area, and (4) the acceptance of such employment would be in the best interest of the United States, then the Secretary is authorized to make available to such individual at Government expense, facilities for the movement of such individual, his dependents, and his household effects to a location designated by such individual and approved by the Secretary, by using Government or commercial means of transportation.

SEC. 10. Retirements: (a) Whenever the Secretary shall determine that any individual, 60 years or older, included within a certificate of eligibility issued by the Board is unemployed as a result of the national trade policy of the United States and is unable to find employment because of his advanced age, the Secretary shall issue a certificate containing such a finding.

(b) Section 216 (a) of the Social Security Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

RETIREMENT AGE

"(a) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the term 'retirement age' means age 65.

"(2) In the case of an individual who is certified by the Secretary of Labor as unemployed by reason of the trade policy of the United States and unable to find employment because of advanced age, the term 'retirement age' means age 60."

(c) The amendment made by this section shall take effect with respect to payments made for months beginning more than 1 month after the date this act is enacted.

SEC. 11. Accelerated amortization: (a) Section 168 (e) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by adding after the words, "necessary in the interest of national defense during the emergency period," the words "or necessary for the development of new or different lines of production by an eligible business enterprise or of a more balanced economy in an eligible community"; and by adding after the words "attributable to defense purposes" the words "or the national trade policy of the United States, as the case may be."

(b) Section 168 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by adding the following:

"(3) Eligible business enterprise, community: As used in this section the terms 'eligible business enterprise' and 'eligible community' refer to business enterprises or communities holding certificates of eligibility under the Trade Adjustment Act of 1954."

SEC. 12. Section 4 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 is amended by adding the following:

"(c) In any case in which the President is required, under the provisions of subsection (a) above, to transmit a message to Congress identifying an article with respect to which a trade agreement has caused or threatens to cause serious injury to a domestic industry, he may determine to invoke the provisions of the Trade Adjustment Act of 1954 by notifying the Trade Adjustment Board, created under the provisions of such act, to that effect. The President shall include in his message to Congress, provided for in subsection (a) above, a statement indicating whether he has so notified the Trade Adjustment Board."

SEC. 13. Section 7 (c) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Upon receipt of the Tariff Commission's report of its investigation and hearings, the President may (1) make such adjustments in the rates of duty, impose such quotas, or make such other modifications as

are found and reported by the Commission to be necessary to prevent or remedy serious injury to the respective domestic industry, or (2) notify the Trade Adjustment Board, created under the provisions of the Trade Adjustment Act of 1954, that he has invoked the provisions of the Trade Adjustment Act of 1954 with respect to such industry. If the President does not take either of such actions within 60 days, he shall immediately submit a report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and to the Committee on Finance of the Senate stating why he has not made such adjustments or modifications, imposed such quotas, or invoked the provisions of the Trade Adjustment Act of 1954."

Citizen Jim Tountas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow evening the graduating class of the LeRoy, N. Y., High School will assemble at Olmsted Memorial Hall in that village for a dinner which has become one of the cherished traditions of the commencement season.

Their host will be a man who, himself, never knew the advantages of formal education, though he has given more time than most of us, perhaps, to a study of the book of life. James P. Tountas came to this country from Greece as a young boy, endowed with energy and idealism and dreaming of freedom and success. In the village of LeRoy he found both and he has spent these latter years of his life "making token payments," as he puts it, "on my great obligation for the privileges accorded me in citizenship."

Jim Tountas has found many ways to make these token payments. Last November he divided among the churches of LeRoy a fund of $4,000 which he had accumulated on account. There were no conditions attached to his gifts. They were made out of a full heart and without favoritism. All shared, according to their membership.

His annual dinner to the seniors has become an institution in the village.

Its objective is to send the students forth with a new appreciation of citizenship. This year, he will see to it that each of the boys and girls gets a copy of the poem, "Workshop of Freedom," written by Miss Elizabeth Ellen Evans, of Virginia, a poem that has been an inspiration alike to native-born and foreign-born, the tutored and the self-taught, the young and old.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Citizen Jim Tountas" from the LeRoy Gazette News of June 2, 1955, which well expresses the love and esteem in which this man is held by his neighbors and friends in LeRoy and in western New York:

CITIZEN JIM TOUNTAS

Next Wednesday evening the members of the senior class of LeRoy High School, the board of education, Supt. Matthew W. Gaffney, and a few of the faculty members will be guests of James P. Tountas at a dinner in Olmsted Memorial Hall.

This will be the 15th year that Mr. Tountas has thus entertained the senior class as a continuing expression of his appreciation of American citizenship. The writer has known Jim Tountas as a main-street businessman and as a fellow citizen for the past 34 years, and has every confidence this act on his part is no promotional gesture or window dressing but rather a very sincere outpouring of a heart that truly appreciates being a part of the land of the Star Spangled Banner.

Jim Tountas was born in Greece and his boyhood days were largely spent aiding his father in agricultural pursuits. He had little opportunity for school education. From time to time he learned of America through acquaintances who had migrated here and returned to Greece for visits. The reports of opportunities here fired him with a determination to come to the United States. His parents encouraged him and aided in creating a fund that enabled him to reach New York when he was 17 years old.

He immediately secured a job in a fruit stand. Diligent work and thrift enabled him to save enough money to move on to Rochester, where he learned candy making and dreamed of the day when he would have his own confectionary store. In 1921, with his accumulated savings and a loan from his employers, who were impressed by his faithful work and honesty, he purchased the business which he has so successfully operated to the present time in the property he has long owned.

When asked why this expression of his appreciation of American citizenship was first centered upon school graduating classes Mr. Tountas said: "It is twofold. If through these dinners and inspiring speakers I can have a little part in causing youth to gain a better understanding of the wonderful opportunities so freely afforded them in this Nation, it seems to tell me I have made a token payment on my great obligation for the privileges accorded me in citizenship."

"Then, too," he continued, "there is the joy I have in this mass acquaintance with boys and girls. The cheery 'Good morning, Mr. Tountas' I frequently receive while walking on the street brightens my day immensely and expresses a warmth of friendship denied those having no children of their own."

A few years back Lt. Gov. Joe R. Hanley was the speaker at the Tountas dinner. He characterized the event as being one of the finest incidents he had experienced in his long political career. Another speaker, Mark Ellingson, president of the Rochester Institute of Technology, said he could only hope his talk had given the youth of Le Roy one-half the inspiration that he gained from the signal gathering. Congressman HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, a recent speaker, highly commended Mr. Tountas for his well-chosen manifestation of appreciation of citizenship. "The Nation needs a lot more of his type," he said.

Last November Mr. Tountas gave further expression of citizenship and his interest in the worthwhile things of America when he voluntarily and generously presented $4,000 to the churches of Le Roy, distributed among all of them on the basis of membership. No conditions or stipulations were attached to the gifts.

We salute Jim Tountas as a man who does much credit to the citizenship he has earned and of which he is so justly proud. We admire him for his quiet, unassuming personality and are honored in having him as a fellow Le Royan.

The Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, today there is much discussion of the farm program, and in many quarters there seems to be proposals arising to change or radically curtail the various policies of the Nation in regard to agricultural productions and marketing quotas.

While all such discussion is good and should be considered, it is not proper—nor would it be profitable for the Nation or for agriculture—for any new program to be taken quickly and without full and lengthy consideration.

In this connection, I am pleased to place in the RECORD for the study of the Members, a letter I have received from Mr. Lloyd Godley, of Osceola, Ark. Mr. Godley is one of the outstanding farmers in the Mid-South and is a student of farm programs and agricultural policy. His letter, while dealing specifically with the cotton farmers, indicates some of the problems that must be faced in the changing of any of our farm programs.

Mr. Godley's letter reads as follows:

OSCEOLA, ARK., *April 28, 1955.*

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR "TOOK": There seems to be a great campaign in progress to soften up the cotton farmers for low support prices and unrestricted acreage or greatly increased acreages. The power behind the campaign comes from the cotton trade and from others who have long opposed our price-support program and control program.

There are a number of factors which indicate that such a change in our program would not work to the cotton farmer's advantage.

1. A system of a so-called free market with no controls and no price supports was in operation up until 1933, and the result was poverty for the South and complete price collapse every few years, with burdensome surpluses.

2. It is doubtful if our speculative cotton marketing system should be considered a competitive marketing system when an offering of futures on any day in excess of the futures demand on that day, can decisively lower the price of cotton.

3. Much has been said to the effect that our control program plus 90 percent supports has caused a great increase in foreign production. This same line has been used by the cotton trade and others since 1933, but we are still in the cotton business strong.

4. The theme seems to be that we have priced ourselves out of the world market. American cotton sets the world price. If we lower our prices with the objective of running other nations out of the cotton business, we will most likely find that they will accept our challenge and continue to lower their prices to undersell us. The end results will be poverty for those who grow cotton.

5. Industry has at all times a control program and a pricing program that works. International Harvester, John Deere, et al., do not compete on the price of tractors. They fix their annual quotas and their prices.

When farm prices go down and demands drop off, they do not lower tractor prices. They cut production.

The cotton farmer cannot of his own will cut cotton production nor control prices.

To be assured of a fair return, he must have a program of at least 90 percent of parity.

To protect from overproduction, he must have a system of acreage controls.

6. We should not be in and out of a control program, but should have quotas each year. We will then avoid surpluses and will do a better job of diversification, which means maintaining soil productivity.

7. Relaxing or abandoning controls will give the new cotton areas of the West an opportunity to overwhelm us in cotton acreages and production.

8. Cotton farmers like the present program as shown by their response in voting controls by such a great margin.

9. Before we had a farm program, most of those who did the field work in producing cotton were in rags because they could not earn enough to buy cotton clothing to hide their nakedness. Now, there is not one patch on the seat of a thousand britches. The women folks have lost the art of patching because it is easier now to buy a new pair of britches than it was to buy the thread for the patch in 1933.

10. Before the farm program, a large percent of the children of those who worked the cotton did not attend school because it was necessary for all to work, and they had no clothes fit for school. Now, all such children—black and white—attend good schools and wear good clothes.

11. A few days ago I attended the funeral of the father of a laborer on my farm. The church was filled with tenant farmers, sharecroppers, and farm laborers, all well fed and well dressed. There were flowers on the casket from a commercial florist. The remains were brought to the church in a Buick hearse by a professional undertaking company. Every person there came in a good automobile.

On observing all this, my mind went back to 1933 and the conditions under which this person would have been buried then. I remarked to a friend, "My what wonders, under God, man has wrought in such a few short years."

I wish the Secretary of Agriculture and all those who are opposing our program could visualize as you and I do, conditions in the South today as contrasted with conditions as they existed in 1933.

It seems that the most reactionary would not want to turn the clock from a time of unprecedented plenty back to a time of poverty, ignorance, and suffering.

Pardon me for taking up your time, I must let go. The support of men like you in Congress is all that will prevent our program from being destroyed and agriculture again being made desperate.

Sincerely,

LLOYD.

Monsignor Monteleone Indefatigable Missionary and Builder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I want to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Hudson Dispatch. The people of Hudson County, of New Jersey, and the Nation were saddened when a famous American priest was called to his eternal reward. Inasmuch as his work and reputation as a priest of God, as a helper of the poor, and as a remarkable administrator and great patriot were known throughout the country, I would appreciate having printed the following editorial:

MONSIGNOR MONTELEONE—INDEFATIGABLE MISSIONARY AND BUILDER

Few wearers of the cloth have served longer, certainly none more assiduously and devotedly, and few have accomplished as much as did Rt. Rev. Msgr. Ernest Monteleone, pastor our Our Lady of Sorrows Roman Catholic Church, Jersey City, who died on May 19 at the age of 78, after having been a priest more than 55 years.

Monsignor Monteleone, who succumbed to complications after a long illness, has left an indelible imprint upon Jersey City, where he first arrived a half century ago. His works will live long after him, for he established two thriving parishes and was responsible for the creation of the splendid CYO Center which is serving such vital purposes in that community. The late prelate also founded Mount Carmel Church in Netcong.

An indefatigable worker and one blessed with the faculty of always getting things done, Monsignor Monteleone gave everything that he possessed in any undertaking he ever tackled. He well deserved the blessing of his Maker: "Well done, good and faithful servant; enter thou into the Kingdom of Heaven."

Actually, this remarkable servant of God began his training for the priesthood 72 years ago, when at the age of 6, he started his studies in the seminary at Sarno, Italy, where he was born. In 10 years, he completed the elementary grades, junior and senior high school, and junior college. He then studied philosophy and theology, and in 1893, at the age of 17, he received his first minor orders. A year later, he received the remaining two.

Not being able, because of his age, to receive his first major orders until he reached 21, he enlisted in 1895 and served a year in an infantry regiment. After his discharge, he returned to his studies at the seminary, following completion of which he was ordained September 23, 1899. Then he became rector of St. Alphonsus Church in Sarno. In a competitive test for the pastorate of the senior church in that town, he received such high honors he was appointed vice canon of Sarno Cathedral, the first time in the history of that diocese that a priest ordained only 1 year had been elevated to such a position.

In 1902, after gaining more honors in his home community, Monsignor Monteleone sailed for the United States as a missionary. His first assignment in this country was as curate of Holy Rosary Church, Jersey City, where he remained 3 years. Immediately, his penchant for getting things accomplished manifested itself. He led the parish effort toward financing and constructing a new edifice. A tireless worker, he assumed responsibilities far beyond the call of duty, even performing hard manual labor in order to keep costs down.

In 1905, the young priest, not yet 30 years old, noting the absence of a Catholic church in the Marion section of Jersey City, and realizing the need for such a parish for the many residents of Italian extraction in the area, embarked on the task of establishing such a church. Through his efforts, an abandoned Baptist Church was purchased, and, out of his own funds, Monsignor Monteleone provided for virtual reconstruction of the building, in which he established Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church, where he served as pastor for 11 years. He was to have officiated on July 17 at the golden jubilee celebration of that parish. In 1911, founded the Netcong parish.

In 1913, still pursuing his missionary bent and continuing to display his positive genius for creating and building, he purchased an unused Presbyterian Church in Claremont Avenue, Jersey City, and established Our Lady of Sorrows Church, which undertaking proved an arduous task since he discharged his duties as pastor of 2 churches at the same time.

His creative work was interrupted by World War I, during which conflict he spent the better part of a year serving as chaplain in the Italian army. When he resumed his dual pastorates, his outstanding contributions were recognized by Pope Benedict XV, who elevated him to the monsignori, which rank he held for 39 years. Early in 1917, he resigned as pastor of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church to devote himself entirely to Our Lady of Sorrows parish. There he built a new church, new rectory, new school, and a new convent. He established a clubhouse for youth of the parish and erected a shrine in a small park dedicated to Our Lady of Sorrows.

Landmark for Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Landmark for Norway," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 7, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LANDMARK FOR NORWAY

At a time when fractionalization and bitterness too often reign, it is pleasant to record the completion of 50 years of friendly cooperation between a fully independent Norway and its partner in the former united kingdom, Sweden. As an aftermath of the Napoleonic wars in which Sweden and Norway had been on opposite sides, the long-standing Norwegian tie with Denmark was broken and Norway was ceded without its consent to the King of Sweden. The Norwegian yen for independence remained strong, and after many years of discussion the issue came to a head in 1905 over a demand for a separate Norwegian foreign service—a demand vetoed by the king in Stockholm. Half a century ago today the Norwegian Storting, or parliament, dissolved the union.

King Haakon VII, who as Prince Carl of Denmark was elected to the throne in Oslo, has ruled for half a century as a constitutional monarch with great presence and dignity. He refused to yield to the Nazi tool, Quisling, in 1940; and during the remainder of World War II, in which Norway suffered cruelly, King Haakon was the symbol of resistance from his exile in England. Today he is unquestionably the most beloved man in Norway. Meanwhile Norway has become known for the stability of its democratic government, which has been under the dominion of the nondoctrinaire Labor Party since 1945, and for its acceptance of the responsibilities of world citizenship.

It is a mark of the maturity of the relationship with Sweden that despite differences in attitudes (especially during World War II when Sweden remained neutral) friendship and cultural and economic bonds have flourished on a voluntary basis. Today the two countries cooperate, along with Denmark and Iceland, in the Nordic Council, a sort of minuscule Council of Europe which considers tariff, trade, and cultural questions. Significantly the Swedish Social Democrats, who along with liberal groups worked for a peaceful solution in 1905, have taken the lead in marking the present anniversary. The Prime Ministers of both countries have participated in ceremonies at the border—a border over which Norwegians and Swedes cross freely, much in the manner of Canadians and Americans.

Norway and Sweden had a solid base for their cooperation in their common heritage. This is an advantage, however, that often has been discarded in other settlements, and their relationship today is an impressive model for the world.

Public Opinion Sample of Fifth Congressional District of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce the results of a sample I have taken of public opinion in the Fifth Congressional District of Wisconsin. I prepared this questionnaire with the help of public-opinion experts at Wisconsin State College, University of Wisconsin Extension, in Milwaukee, and Marquette University. The questionnaire reached 5,000 people in all walks of life in every ward and precinct of the Fifth District, a true cross section of the people I represent.

I am pleased to announce that 21 percent, or 1,058, of those receiving the questionnaire mailed me their replies before the deadline of May 25, and from these returns the results have been tabulated.

As the final question, I asked what worried people the most. The answer given showed that 30 percent were worried most about the possibility of another world war. Next, with 9 percent, were those worried about their own financial security and the cost of living. The third highest group was 7.8 percent, those worried about Government spending. Then came 2.6 percent worried about national defense and 2 percent worried about communism.

The questionnaire reflects the viewpoints of many occupational groups. The tabulated returns are from the following:

Factory workers	320
White-collar workers	278
Professional	155
Housewives	76
Businessmen	51
Students	48
Retired	45
Servicemen	32
Miscellaneous	53

Of the 21 percent answering the questionnaire, the following are the results:

1. Do you favor Federal appropriations to deepen the Lake Erie Channel so as to complete the St. Lawrence seaway, permitting oceangoing vessels to enter Lake Michigan ports? Yes; 95 percent; no, 2 percent; don't know, 3 percent.

2. Do you favor tax reduction for families in low- and middle-income groups:

(a) Even though it will increase the Federal deficit? Yes, 53 percent; no, 42 percent; don't know, 5 percent.

(b) If the Government can make up for the loss in revenue by plugging tax loopholes? Yes, 89 percent; no, 6 percent; don't know, 5 percent.

3. At present the prices of natural gas you use in Milwaukee are regulated by Federal law at the source in Texas and Oklahoma. Are you in favor of a change in the law which would exempt natural-gas producers from Federal regulation? Yes, 14 percent; no, 75 percent; don't know, 11 percent.

4. Do you think that widows should be eligible to receive social-security benefits at age 60 without waiting until 65? Yes, 88 percent; no, 9 percent; don't know, 3 percent.

5. Recently 17 first-term Congressmen made recommendations to President Eisenhower in regard to our foreign policy:

(a) The President should take steps to end the cold war deadlock by proposing a U. N. trusteeship and defense of Formosa. Approve, 60 percent; disapprove, 18 percent; no opinion, 22 percent.

(b) The President should ask Russia to withdraw to her original frontiers, which would free Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other enslaved countries and permit unification of Germany. In return for this withdrawal, Central Europe would be demilitarized so that it could not make aggressive war. Approve, 61 percent; disapprove, 23 percent; no opinion, 16 percent.

6. Do you favor the continuation of the reciprocal-trade program of lowering tariffs so as to increase exports and imports? Yes, 63 percent; no, 23 percent; don't know, 14 percent.

7. Do you favor Government assistance to companies and workers injured by foreign competition due to lowered tariffs? Yes, 35 percent; no, 47 percent; don't know, 18 percent.

8. Do you favor statehood for: Hawaii? Yes, 82 percent; no, 11 percent; don't know, 7 percent: Alaska? Yes, 83 percent; no, 11 percent; don't know, 6 percent.

9. Do you favor Federal financial aid to States for school construction? Yes, 76 percent; no, 20 percent; don't know, 4 percent.

Taken by occupational groups, the following chart shows how these groups voted on particular issues in the questionnaire:

	1. Deepen seaway channels			2a. Tax cuts—Even if deficit raised			2b. Tax cuts—If tax loopholes plugged			3. Exempt natural-gas producers from regulation			4. Social security for widows at 60			5a. U. N. trusteeship for Formosa		
	Yes	No	Don't know	Yes	No	Don't know	Yes	No	Don't know	Yes	No	Don't know	Yes	No	Don't know	Approve	Disapprove	Don't know
Factory workers	305	6	9	184	73	15	268	14	21	38	242	33	296	18	1	194	33	72
White collar	266	6	6	106	128	8	238	21	8	42	201	36	236	30	9	161	52	53
Professional	146	4	5	47	79	9	126	13	7	23	118	15	125	16	11	77	38	29
Housewives	68	3	5	32	26	5	62	4	5	10	51	14	68	3	4	35	13	19
Businessmen	50	0	1	30	12	2	41	0	2	11	38	2	47	3	1	22	7	14
Students	48	0	0	14	29	2	45	0	3	8	34	5	45	2	1	32	12	5
Retired	44	0	1	31	6	0	40	1	2	4	38	3	40	3	1	26	2	11
Servicemen	31	0	1	7	19	0	25	3	0	1	24	6	27	2	3	19	9	4
Miscellaneous	47	0	3	28	13	4	40	5	2	13	34	5	38	13	1	24	10	11

	5b. Russian withdrawal to historic borders, unified Germany, neutralized Central European Community			6. Continue reciprocal-trade program			7. Federal aid to companies injured by foreign competition			8a. Statehood for Hawaii			8b. Statehood for Alaska			9. Federal aid for school construction		
	Approve	Disapprove	Don't know	Yes	No	Don't know	Yes	No	Don't know	Yes	No	Don't know	Yes	No	Don't know	Yes	No	Don't know
Factory workers	211	40	54	174	83	55	146	95	66	276	26	25	271	18	20	259	39	15
White collar	156	70	36	181	59	30	72	157	42	232	30	15	231	30	17	201	69	5
Professional	73	55	22	112	29	9	33	85	25	125	19	11	132	15	8	105	47	3
Housewives	38	18	17	37	20	17	19	33	21	63	6	7	64	5	6	62	10	3
Businessmen	31	7	7	29	13	7	22	22	6	42	3	5	42	2	5	41	6	3
Students	21	21	4	37	5	5	11	27	8	35	10	3	33	11	3	36	8	4
Retired	37	1	4	26	9	7	24	15	5	39	0	5	37	1	5	33	8	2
Servicemen	18	7	5	23	6	3	6	21	4	22	9	1	20	12	0	24	7	1
Miscellaneous	28	14	10	29	15	7	22	25	3	35	13	3	29	15	2	31	17	4

Cardinal Spellman Inspires Graduates at Merrimack College, North Andover, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the following address of His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, D. D., at Merrimack College's fifth commencement exercises.

Merrimack College is opened to all qualified high school graduates, regardless of race, creed, color or social standing. It is conducted by members of the Order of St. Augustine. The Augustinian Fathers now conduct Villanova College and many other schools in the United States and Cuba. Demand for their services is very great for teachers with their long years of training and experience are not easily found today.

And we must remember that in addition to the finest training, these men have no other interest in life but the service of God through the teaching of the young. When the end of World War II and the release of Augustinian Fathers from service as chaplains made possible an expansion of their teaching work, they were able to accept the request of the New England area and establish a new college in North Andover, Mass.

Merrimack College is teaching our young people the things we would want them taught; responsibility, respect for legitimate authority, belief in the democratic principles of Government, and a morality based on love of God and love of neighbor.

The inspiring address of Cardinal Spellman follows:

MERRIMACK COLLEGE GRADUATES HEAR CARDINAL SPELLMAN CITE POWER OF FAITH IN TODAY'S WORLD—PRELATE RECEIVES HONORARY DEGREE—GRADUATES PRESENTED AWARDS IN PROGRAM

(By Bill Collins, Jr.)

In a stirring, long-to-be-remembered address at Merrimack College's fifth commencement exercises Saturday afternoon, His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, D. D., called upon the graduates for allegiance to faith in God, declaring that faith in God is America's strongest weapon against our atheistic foes.

"Only when men and women stand united in the strong bond of service for the good of mankind, spirited by reverence and love of God, working together to do God's will on earth as it is done in heaven," said His Eminence, "only then do they glean their legacy of * * * pray you friends and fellow alumni, cherish and live your precious heritage of faith * * *."

"Allegiance to faith in God should be the self-imposed command of every American citizen and patriot," said Cardinal Spellman.

"Faith," he said, "is God's most treasured gift—and on this memorable commencement day resolve to work and pray that your lives will be lamps of faith to help guide others to know, love, and faithfully serve Almighty God."

HONORARY DEGREE

Earlier in the commencement exercises Cardinal Spellman, who is archbishop of New York and a leading public figure on the national and world level, received the honorary degree of doctor of laws. The honorary degree was presented by Rev. Joseph J. Gildea, O. S. A.

Degrees were conferred by Rev. Vincent A. McQuade, O. S. A., hear of the college, as the candidates were presented by Rev. Joseph J. Gildea, O. S. A.; Rev. Joseph P. Murray, O. S. A.; Rev. John H. Crawford, O. S. A., and Rev Joseph A. Flaherty, O. S. A.

His Excellency the Most Reverend Richard James Cushing, D. D., archbishop of Boston, presided over the commencement exercises and delivered remarks to the graduates.

The valedictory was given by James A. Mulligan, 220 Tyler Street, Methuen. The graduates pledge of loyalty was administered by Reverend McQuade.

The invocation was given by the Very Reverend Henry E. Greenlee, O. S. A., and the benediction was given hy His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, D. D.

ACADEMIC PROCESSION

The academic procession was as follows: The chief marshal, Rev. William J. Wynne, O. S. A., bachelor of science in library science; the graduates, division of liberal arts and sciences, Marshal Margaret M. Sullivan, John J. Fragala; division of business administration, marshals, Adele M. Byron, John R. Martin; division of engineering, marshals, Paul T. Cody, Joseph P. Mulligan, Jr.; the alumni and honorary alumni, alumni, marshals Augustine J. Twomey (class of 1952), Edward L. Regan (class of 1951); honorary alumni, marshals, Dr. Leo F. King, John Ventura; the faculty, marshals, Virginia G. O'Neil, master of education, Frederick J. Guerin, Ph. D.; the administration and distinguished guests, marshals, James F. Liebke, M. B. A.; Rev. James E. Hannan, O. S. A., A. M.; the college administration, distinguished guests the board of trustees, the Very Reverend Henry E. Greenlee, O. S. A., Ph. D., Prior Provincial; His Excellency, the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., archbishop of Boston; His Eminence, the Most Reverend Francis Cardinal Spellman, D. D., archbishop of New York.

AWARDS PRESENTED

The following awarded were presented: Archbishop Cushing Medal, for general excellence, founded by the Association of Merrimack College in honor of the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D.; gold medal and cash award of $50, Joan M. Nery, 152 Green Street, North Andover; next in merit, Florence K. McDuffie, 45 Sunset Avenue, Marianne J. McKay, 827 Riverside Drive, Methuen.

Very Rev. Mortimer A. Sullivan, O. S. A., medal, for excellence in the division of liberal arts and sciences, founded in memory of the late Very Reverend Sullivan, provincial founder of Merrimack College, silver medal and cash award of $25—Marianne J. McKay; next in merit, Ann M. Hickey, Mary Ann Maynard, 55 Maple Avenue, North Andover. M. Madeline Sullivan, 16 Annis Street, Methuen.

Edward J. Burns medal, for excellence in the division of business administration, presented in memory of the late Edward J. Burns, of Torrington, Conn., silver medal and cash award of $25—Leo J. Greaney; next in merit, Adele M. Byron, 63 Plymouth Street, Methuen, James J. Cunningham.

Very Rev. Henry E. Greenlee, O. S. A., medal, for excellence in the division of engineering, presented by the Holy Family Sodality of St. Augustine parish, silver medal and cash award of $25—John S. McNaughton, 6 Florence Avenue.

Markham medals, established by the late Most Reverend Thomas F. Markham, D. D., in memory of his parents, Mr. and Mrs. James E. Markham; speculative philosophy, gold medal and cash award of $50—Ann M. Hickey, 274 Turnpike Road, North Andover; next in merit, Mary Ann Maynard; practical philosophy, silver medal and cash award of $50—John R. Martin, 223 Walnut Street; next in merit, Marianne J. McKay.

Holy Name medal, for excellence in the study of religion; gold medal—Natalie T. Morin, 172 Summer Street, Andover; next in merit, Joan M. Nery, Helen M. O'Brien, 24 Summit Avenue.

Austin medal, for excellence, class of 1956, presented by the men of Merrimack, gold medal—Joseph J. Previte, 20 Greenwood Street; next in merit, Jo-Ann M. Baum, June F. Broderick.

The alumni medal, presented by the Alumni Association of Merrimack College to the member of the association who best exemplifies the ideals of the college—Daniel B. Breen, class of 1951, North Andover.

Very Rev. Joseph M. Dougherty, O. S. A. medal, for excellence class of 1957 established in memory of the late Very Reverend Dougherty—silver medal—Barbara J. Reilly, 114 Warwick Street, Lowell; next in merit, Louise A. Pothier, John E. Valeni.

Joseph E. Sullivan medal, for excellence class of 1958, donated by Joseph E. Sullivan of Lowell, silver medal and cash award of $25—Judith Sullivan, 275 Newton Road, Haverhill; next in merit, Paul J. Collins, Stephen Scully.

Loyalty award, sponsored by the Fraternity of the Holy Name of Merrimack College, awarded to the graduate who manifested the greatest devotion and loyalty to the ideals of the college, silver medal and cash award of $20—William F. McKeon, class of 1955, 16 Atlantic Avenue, Beverly; next in merit, Eugene P. Barrett, Lowell.

Student council award, sponsored by the student council and awarded to the student who has manifested the greatest interest and cooperation with the student council, silver medal—Richard J. Hillner, class of 1955, 193 Middlesex Street, North Andover; next in merit, John E. Valeni, class of 1957, Robert M. Wesson, class of 1956.

Patrick F. McDonald yearly award, donated by Patrick F. McDonald, K. M., D. C. S., honorary, class of 1953, of Boston, $200 to the most deserving graduate who will pursue higher studies—Joan M. Nery, 152 Green Street, North Andover.

CARDINAL'S ADDRESS

The commencement address by His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, D. D., was as follows:

"Gratefully do I acknowledge the distinction that is mine today as I become an alumnus of Merrimack College. As alumni we share, not only pride in our living faith, but also pride in living our loyalty to the law of this great and blessed land, as diligently we labor for America's preservation and peace. The sanctified wisdom of Catholic education teaches men to be peacemakers, men whose God-loving hearts and Christly virtues should help to stay the torrent of antichristian vices in a world in which atheism, intolerance, and disunion are rife. And I pray to God to grant that all of you, graduates of Merrimack, may become apostles of truth and charity, virtues which must predominate in the souls of men if they would aspire to become builders for peace.

"On this today begins your world of tomorrow, and, in these days of testing man's faith, trying his hopes, tempting his trust, I beg you to learn and strive to live the prayer of St. Francis: 'Lord make me an instrument of Thy peace. Where there is hatred, let me sow love; where there is doubt, faith; where there is darkness, light.'

"As graduates of a Catholic college, Merrimack's sons and daughters have an especial

vocation and obligation to serve and help save not only our own free and beloved America, but civilization itself, by living the laws of God and striving to preserve for men the peace which their brothers, fathers, and forefathers suffered and died to gain.

"America is a religious Nation, her strongest armor against her atheistic foes is godliness; her strongest weapon faith. And only by love of God and the courageous practice of faith can men and nations be saved from deterioration and destruction by atheism and apathy. Only when men and women stand united in the strong bond of service for the good of mankind, spirited by reverence and love of God, working together to do God's will on earth as it is done in Heaven, only then do they glean their legacy of God's glory. Therefore do I pray you friends and fellow alumni, cherish and live your precious heritage of faith, seeking devoutly to spend yourselves for God, your country, and your neighbor. Only thus will you prepare within your own souls a fertile field in which the seeds of faith and liberty can take firm root and grow. Liberty is America's beacon flaming from every hill and spire. Liberty is America's pledge to peoples yet unborn near and far, to pass on God's torch of freedom, its light undimmed by the mock light of atheist minds. Liberty is America's glory, for, in this land liberty was born; in this land freedom to exercise God-given rights was won; in this land enterprise and labor have prospered; in this land hunted minorities found haven and homes.

"From out the loins of every country of God's earth came forth men and women of all races and peoples made one by the common will of all their sons, freely to work and worship as they built their common home—America. Their strong backs bent beneath the log chain and the tow rope. They toiled beneath the blazing benediction of the sun, and their arms and faces bronzed in the wheat fields and the logging camps. They teemed into this promised land of America from across the far plains of Europe, from the Mediterranean Basin to the storm-beaten shores of Baltic countries. They came, our ancestors, yours and mine, they labored and suffered as all men are fated to and sought and found their daily bread as they had done of old in their fatherlands. There was however, this difference, they earned their bread here sweetened with the hope of security and personal liberty, a people conscious of the Fatherhood of God, willing to contribute humbly yet generously to the brotherhood of man and became the inspiration of our generation and of generations of Americans yet unborn.

"Allegiance to faith in God should be the self-imposed command of every American citizen and patriot. And when people of different religious beliefs ask me what my faith means to me I tell them that this question goes more deeply even than the question—What does life mean to me? To one born in the faith and dominated by its all-pervading gentle presence, life and faith cannot be separated but are fused as body and soul are fused in integral oneness. But in this oneness of life and faith, faith is more important and by God's grace, the dominant factor. There are circumstances in which I would be willing to give up my life, but there is no conceivable circumstance in which I would be willing even to consider, surrendering my faith.

"Faith was mine long before I studied its theological definition or even mastered the penny catechism during my Sunday school days. Faith to me has been, from longest remembrance as real and tangible as my mother's smile, my father's reverent responsibility to his church, his country, and his family, as real as the rosary in my grandmother's fingers and the blinking sanctuary light in our little country church. As a child of faith, I have ever been in its warm, all-embracing atmosphere. Like the sky it drew my thoughts upward; like the earth beneath, it steadied my feet. Like the air above me, it served to satisfy the hidden needs of my soul. Like the goodness of my mother, it sent me away satisfied, contented, at peace with God, myself, and my fellow man.

"This gratification that faith has brought me is not, however, a satisfaction that leaves the soul in a spirit of inertia. On the contrary, like a mother who momentarily holds her child at her heart, so faith enfolded me. Faith has endowed my soul with rich tranquillity and also challenged me at every step of my life, driven me onward, made me aware of my own limitations, and spurred me to conquer self even while engaged in bringing God to man and men to God.

"What does my faith mean to me? I have seen the answer beneath the streaming glory of our Nation's flag, against the crimsoned glow of the tropical sunset, above the tranquil quietude of the white-crossed graves of our beloved dead. This is what faith means—the ultimate and only satisfying answer to life's most disturbing frustrations, the solution of problems, the solvent of all pains, victory even in all defeats. Faith, my friends, is to me the wine of life, the pearl in the dregs of sorrow, the daily chalice of graces God offers me for my strengthening, the source of my love and my hopes, golden door by which, in God's good time, I devoutly pray, I shall pass into that fullness of possession where love rewards me for having held faith's strong and guiding hand amid the darkness, the terrors, and the toil of this mortal world.

"Faith has meant to me—and please God and His Blessed Mother will always mean to me—everything, for everything has come to me through faith. The sunset dies away, the flag sleeps at its staffhead, our valiant dead in their white-crossed graves slumber in the moonlight, all the world for a moment is at peace. Faith and faith alone sleeps not, and sentinel-like watches over us in death even as in life, holding the promise of our resurrection as individuals and as a nation that has not repudiated its redemption.

"It is because of this precious faith which we share that I implore you, brothers and sisters of Merrimack, whatever vocation you follow, daily raise your hearts to heaven and pray God to give to you the graces fearlessly, steadfastly to live your love of God and thus save your own and help save your country's soul. Pray within the quiet of your own hearts, in simple church, lofty cathedral, or open field, in your homes or at your work. What alone matters is that in humility you acknowledge and revere God, and by your works and prayers prove your love of Him, not by lip alone, but by spending yourselves in daily deeds of holy living. Within your souls you hold the gift of faith—God's most treasured gift—and on this memorable commencement day resolve to work and pray that your lives will be lamps of faith to help guide others to know, love, and faithfully serve Almighty God. For,

"This is our faith:
One God in heaven,
A Father, font of life and truth,
A Son begotten, and to us bequeathed,
A Spirit, bond and breath of Love.
And in this land, our heritage of faith
Has proven pattern to the open mind.
For truth, no shackles fastens on the soul,
But rather sets men free and pours her light,
Which is the light of God from our Christ's wounds,
Upon the world of men.
This is our faith:
Seen in the glory of His face who came
To set all peoples free, and now, when everywhere
There rises clamor in the market place
And swords are forged and peace in vain is sought,
While statesmen seek despairingly a way,
Within this hour pregnant with destiny,
Our faith alone stands firm before a world
Shaken by universal strife, and bowed
By woes too vast for utterance.
Here lies
Alone our hope and here alone the gift
Which by our living we must give the world:
This is our faith!"

DISTINGUISHED GUESTS

Distinguished guests attending were: Monsignori: Robert Senott, chancellor of the Boston archdiocese; Timothy O'Leary, supervisor of schools in Boston archdiocese; Thomas Riley, rector of St. John's Seminary, Brighton; Charles Flannagan, rector of St. Sebastian' day school; Francis Juras, pastor of St. Francis Church; Francis Shea, pastor, St. Michael's Church, North Andover; Augustine Dalton, pastor, St. Kevin's Church, Dorchester; Thomas Madden, pastor, Sacred Heart Church, Bradford; Francis Lally, editor of the Pilot; John Sikora, pastor, St. Peter's Church, Salem; William Reilly, pastor, St. Agnes' Church, Reading; Very Rev. Henry E. Greenlee, O. S. A., provincial; Very Rev. John B. Martin, pastor, St. Augustine's Church; Very Rev. James M. Hurley, O. S. A., pastor, St. Mary's Church; Very Rev. Patrick J. Campbell, O. S. A., pastor, St. Augustine's Church, Andover; Very Rev. John Twiss, pastor, St. Peter's Church, Lowell; Francis Low, assistant supervisor of schools, Boston archdiocese; Patrick F. McDonald, K. M., Boston; Merrimack College honorary degree, 1953; Hon. John E. Fenton, K. H. S.; Merrimack College honorary degree 1954; Leo Cronin, Haverhill, Merrimack College honorary degree, 1953; Homer Bourgeois, Lowell; Merrimack College honorary degree, 1954.

Chester G. Hanson, of the Times, Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for many years anyone remotely connected with politics in southern California, on the local, State, or national levels, has known, respected, and loved "Chick" Hanson, political columnist and correspondent for the Los Angeles Times. In addition, his pithy style, accurate reporting, and the philosophical musing which sometimes crept into his writing endeared him to millions of readers.

"Chick," whose formal byline identifies him as Chester G. Hanson, is retiring from service with the Times after having served with that newspaper since 1932. The passing of time has brought him up to the retirement age as inevitably as it brought this milestone to the lives of millions of others.

His thousands of friends have refused to let the event go uncelebrated. In fact, the lower house of the California Legislature not only passed unanimously a congratulatory resolution wishing Hanson good luck in the future, but topped off this legislative kudo by singing "For he's a jolly good fellow" at the conclusion of their vote. Every member of the legislature, Democrat and Repub-

lican, joined in coauthorship of the resolution, which received similar speedy treatment in the California State Senate.

The resolution declared that while Hanson, as a reporter, often differed with legislators and politicians, he had "held the respect and affection of thousands of men and women in public life in California." It praised Hanson as a "student of government" as one who "during all his years had done an outstanding job of consistent, forthright, and objective reporting." The resolution closed with a "wish for many more years of happiness together for Chick and his wife Helen."

Certainly, all of us who serve from California in Washington echo this appreciation to a true and able friend and join in the good wishes for future happiness for him and his family.

Inequitable Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues once again the subject of the discriminatory transportation tax on travel to Mexico, Canada, and the Central American and Caribbean Sea areas. It is significant to me that this matter is receiving increasingly more editorial treatment throughout the country, and I am hopeful that the nationwide interest in this tax, as evidenced by the editorials noted below, will result in its being favorably considered for removal during this Congress:

[From the Milwaukee Journal]

INEQUITABLE TAX

If you want to travel to Europe by air, all you need is the price of a plane ticket. No tax. If you want to fly to Asia, the same is true. No tax. This applies to nearly any other spot in the world with the notable exceptions of the Caribbean area, Mexico, and Central America. For plane travel to these areas there is added to your plane fare a 10 percent Federal tax.

This penalty on air travel to neighboring areas exists for no obvious reason—and certainly for none that can be justified. It is a hangover from the wartime days when a tax was imposed on all air travel. The intent then was to discourage such travel. For flights from the United States to most of the world the tax since has been lifted.

Why is it not lifted from plane fares to the region immediately to the south? These are friendly areas, with which we would like to cultivate closer ties. Many Americans do business in these Latin countries. Their economies are heavily dependent upon United States tourist trade. Encouraging travel to and from these countries would be to the patent advantage of all concerned.

Congress has before it at least three bills to repeal the tax. The Departments of State and Commerce and the President's Advisory Commission on Economic Policy have indorsed removal of the tax. The House Ways and Means Committee has indicated willingness to hold hearings on the legislation if the question seems of sufficient public interest.

This it should do promptly, so as to get a repeal measure moving toward passage at this session of Congress. The public interest involved is self-evident. It is a matter not only of simple fairness and removal of discrimination but of economic advantage and good neighborliness.

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram]

EVADING A TRAVEL TAX

When an American buys a ticket for a trip to Mexico, Central America, the Caribbean or Canada, he must pay the 10 percent United States tax on the whole thing. If he buys a ticket for travel to Europe, Asia, or South America, he pays no United States tax on the travel outside the country.

There are several bills in Congress to take the tax off tickets to our near neighbor countries, too. The purpose is to treat all travel abroad the same way, free of United States tax. Many steamship and airlines are for that, of course.

The exemption might boost their business, though foreign travel is at a new peak. Mostly it would relieve the traveler and give him a bit more to spend in countries he visits. That would help those countries, hungry for American dollars.

It would also deprive the United States Treasury of some $10 million a year. That could be a reason for opposing it.

Closing travel tax loopholes could make up the loss at least in part. Loose definition and interpretation of "continuing travel" allows sale abroad, for example, of a ticket from London to New York, plus tickets between dozens of points all over our country, all without paying United States tax.

Exchange orders purchased abroad are devices for another travel tax dodge. They can be used to buy untaxed tickets for trips within this country. American tourists and businessmen who travel much are taking advantage of both loopholes. This is described in an article today on the travel pages of this section.

Nobody likes to talk for quotation about it. Nobody claims to know how extensive the evasion is. There's no excuse for letting tax cheaters get away with it any longer, though.

That would be only fair to the 99 percent of travelers who pay the required tax on their tickets, and the honest travel agencies abroad that collect it. It would be only fair, too, to exempt all travel outside the country from the United States tax so long as most of it is.

Power Struggle at Hells Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GRACIE PFOST
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, the following article entitled "The Power Struggle at Hells Canyon" was written by Father Mark J. Fitzgerald, an associate professor of economics at the University of Notre Dame, and was published in the May 21, 1955, issue of America, the national Catholic weekly review. Father Fitzgerald is a recognized authority on the power question:

The article is as follows:

POWER STRUGGLE AT HELLS CANYON

(By Mark J. Fitzgerald)

Congress now has before it legislation (S. 1333) to authorize Federal construction of a high dam on the Snake River in famed Hells Canyon, Idaho, the deepest gorge in North America. Yet for many months the Federal Power Commission has been weighing arguments, presented in a year-long hearing, for and against the request of a license by a private power company to build three small dams in place of this large Federal dam.

THE QUEST FOR KILOWATTS

The Pacific Northwest's hope for freedom from the status of an economic colony controlled by the East lies in its largely untapped resource, falling water. Apart from a declining, seasonal timber industry, and some minerals, there is not much else on which to build an industrial economy. Though the Columbia River Basin in the Northwest, which includes Hells Canyon, has 42 percent of the Nation's hydroelectric power, it is only about one-seventh developed. Thirty million kilowatts of low-priced power could actually be drawn from the rivers of this area, and low-cost kilowatts are the key to increased industrial growth.

If the water resources in the Columbia Basin remain only fractionally developed, over one-tenth of the country's land area will be retarded economically. Already expansion of the electroprocess industry, which was hardly known in the Northwest before Grand Coulee Dam was built, has come to a halt because new starts for power dams have not been forthcoming. Industry fears a serious kilowatt shortage within the next decade. The electroprocess industry now accounts for over one-third of the total regular consumption of electric power in the Columbia region and is the means by which the area hopes to attain leadership in the production of phosphates, aluminum and its lighter and stronger rival, titanium.

Present power requirements in the Northwest are expanding every 10 years at over twice the national average. In 1953 it was estimated that energy supplied the Northwestern States by the Bonneville Power Administration was 438 percent above the amount supplied in 1940. The power needs for the entire Nation during that time increased only 212 percent. Since World War II, population has increased almost one-third in the Northwest as against half that percentage for the country. Despite lagging industrial expansion, heavy requirements for electric service by farm and residential users have steadily increased the power consumption in this area since 1945.

To meet the future demand for electric power in the Northwest, almost 11 million kilowatt-hours will have to be available by 1963. Without new construction starts, however, capacity in 1963 will be short of requirements by more than 1 million killowatt-hours. Moreover, nonindustrial needs will consume all the scheduled power increases during that time. On this basis, the prospect for industrial expansion in the Columbia Basin is a bleak one.

TWO PROPOSALS

Consistent with his farsighted belief that every river should serve the public in as many different ways as possible, President Theodore Roosevelt in 1908 ordered that the Hells Canyon power site, as part of the forest reserves, be placed under the protection of the Federal Government. It was Theodore Roosevelt's firm conviction that a river system from its headwaters to the sea is a single unit and should be treated as such. The entire Columbia River Basin, of which the Snake River is an important tributary, well illustrates the many purposes which can be served by treating a river as a single system. Hydropower, flood control, irrigation, and navigation, all can be developed on a vast scale if the water resources of the area are properly balanced and coordinated.

After years of study by the Corps of Army Engineers it became evident to this agency that a high dam at Hells Canyon would be an essential part of a comprehensive plan of water storage for the Columbia River Basin.

This dam would provide maximum storage to impound the high river flow each spring, both to prevent flood damage and to harvest an ample supply of water for the heavy power demands each winter.

Army engineers consider Hells Canyon the strategic site to help avert a recurrence of the disastrous flood of 1894, which, if repeated in our time, would cause damage estimated at $350 million. Without a coordinated system of storage dams in the Columbia River Basin, the area will remain subject to such divergent calamities as the 1948 flood, which took 50 lives and caused $100 million in damage, or the fall and winter drought of 1952, which ruined crops and caused industrial unemployment because of the low supply of hydropower.

In the Columbia Basin it is becoming evident that water must be harvested as carefully as any lifegiving crop so that it can be used for a variety of purposes before finally reaching the Pacific. Water is wealth, and fortunately can be stored in the mountains by building dams. Otherwise the Northwest could not be sanguine about facing its mounting dependence on this precious commodity.

As an alternative project to the high Federal dam at Hells Canyon, the Idaho Power Co., largely owned in the East, seeks authorization to build three private low dams on the Snake River. If all 3 of these dams were actually built, they would provide only one-fourth the water storage of 4.4 million acre-feet projected for the Federal dam. Moreover, the 3 low dams would generate no more than 885,000 kilowatts of power as compared with 1.46 million kilowatts possible with the high dam at Hells Canyon.

These points of difference on storage and power serve to challenge the entire policy of river development laid down by Theodore Roosevelt when he first set down the Nation's conservation program. Multipurpose use of the Snake River for power, irrigation, and flood control would be forever restricted under the three-dam plan. Each year there would be 575,000 kilowatts less power than with the high dam.

To gage the significance of this loss, it may be noted that the economic impact of electric power from Grand Coulee Dam has enabled its operator, the Bonneville Power Administration, to estimate accurately the number of new jobs and households, the value of new investment and tax revenue which can be expected from each additional million of kilowatts added to the Northwest power pool. Using this guide 575,000 less kilowatts each year would mean 26,000 fewer jobs in industry and about the same number lost in the service trades. Payrolls would fail to expand by $180 million and future production would lag by more than one-half billion dollars each year.

The reduction in stored water from the use of the 3 dams would lower by 570,000 kilowatts the power potential of other dams in the Columbia Basin below Hells Canyon, since water for power production can be used repeatedly as it flows downstream. The yearly value of this amount of power loss has been estimated at over $11 million. This permanent block to power expansion in the Hells Canyon area would intensify the already predicted power shortage and serve to make power a high-cost commodity, thereby further hampering industrial development.

MULTIPURPOSE DEVELOPMENT

The somewhat more than a million acre-feet of water storage possible with the three-dam project would be insufficient as an aid to flood control. In contrast, the Hells Canyon Dam, since it could store over 4 times this amount of water, is listed as 1 of the 5 major reservoirs projected under the main flood control plan for the Columbia Basin.

Opponents of the Hells Canyon project have argued that its vastly greater storage capacity would take more water from the Snake River than can be spared in view of the irrgiation necessary in southern Idaho. On this point the records of the United States Geological Survey show that there is enough water in the Snake River, in the driest years and after all irrigation diversion, to fill two reservoirs of the size proposed for Hells Canyon.

Studies by independent experts confirm the position that there will be enough water in the Snake River to provide for all demands of irrigation and for the economical operation of Hells Canyon Dam as well. Further, Senate bill 1333 declares that all present and future irrigation rights on the Snake River are safeguarded in the Hells Canyon project, since storage will begin only after irrigation needs are met. Besides irrigation, it is estimated that the reservoir at Hells Canyon, coordinated with other storage dams on the Columbia and the Snake Rivers, will make available in the Columbia Basin 500 miles of low-cost water transportation, a boon to manufacturers and farmers.

LONG RANGE ECONOMY

Estimates by consulting engineer, John S. Cotton, place the outlay for the Federal Hells Canyon Dam at about $534 million, compared with approximately $340 million for the three-dam project. Mr. Cotton emphasizes, however, that the lower cost of the three-dam scheme is more than offset by the permanent loss to the Northwest each year of 575,000 kilowatts of regular power with an annual value of $5.9 million. Judging the two projects for economic feasibility, he approves the high dam because it assures full development of power resources.

At the Hells Canyon Dam, the cost per kilowatt-year would be under $21 compared to almost $40 with the three-dam construction. This big difference of $19 in rates would be a lasting barrier to extensive industrial and irrigation development under the Idaho Power Co. plan. Factors helping to explain the lower rate for Hells Canyon power are the superior engineering design, more economical power loads, better pooling of power and long-range planning of transmission service. The oft-cited tax return of almost $10 million per year predicted from the three-dam project appears small compared to the loss of tax revenue of 4½ times that amount on income and investment from private enterprise which would be excluded from the area because of the high power rates.

The low power rates under the Federal project, by promoting private investment and employment, assure payment within 50 years of the cost of Hells Canyon Dam plus interest. For similar reasons, other Federal dams in the Northwest such as Bonneville and Grand Coulee are years ahead on their payment schedules, with an interest charge of 5 percent and ample reserves in addition.

Mindful of the long-range benefits at stake, the issue of Hells Canyon should be judged on the basis of whether public authority or a private power concern can better serve the country's interest here. Included in that broad consideration are the many private utility companies themselves, whose low-head dams stand to gain from falling water which would be sent them from the reservoir at Hells Canyon. For private enterprise in general, it should not be forgotten that Grand Coulee, a public project comparable to the Hells Canyon Dam, has done more to encourage expansion of private industry than numbers of small, single-purpose dams privately owned.

Key questions posed about the whole issue of Hells Canyon are whether there shall be maximum or merely fractional development of our water resources; whether the recommendations in the exhaustive No. 308 report on the Columbia Basin brought out by the Corps of Army Engineers after years of research shall be followed or scrapped; whether the Pacific Northwest is to expand economically with low-cost power or be hamstrung industrially because of the high price of kilowatts.

Much more is in question than just Hells Canyon itself. If this power source fails of realization, a number of other dams projected in the Columbia Basin may face congressional rejection because their economic feasibility depends on coordination with Hells Canyon. In a larger sense the national conservation policy first set forth over 50 pears ago is facing serious danger. Invaluable power sites throughout the Nation, which have long been under public protection as part of the Federal conservation program, may become easy prizes for private exploitation at public expense.

Should the Federal Power Commission rule in favor of the three-dam project it would be tantamount to discarding the historic principle laid down by Theodore Roosevelt, and later made part of the Federal Power Act. This states that for successful development of our waterways we should follow a general plan prepared by the best experts in the field and providing for every potential use of a river. Congress could still set aside an FPC ruling for the three-dam project by directly authorizing construction of Hells Canyon Dam. In the same legislation it could, for future guidance of the Commission, reaffirm in even more emphatic language what is meant by a full and comprehensive development of water resources.

France Puts Empire First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The present French Government is pursuing a course of colonialism in north Africa. Its first concern is France's national interest in that area.

The Chicago Tribune, in an editorial on June 10, puts the proposition quite clearly and under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the editorial:

FRANCE PUTS EMPIRE FIRST

The Council of the Atlantic Treaty Organization has decided to acquiesce by silence in French withdrawal of one of its few remaining active divisions from the NATO jurisdiction in Europe. This division, the 2d Infantry, plus reinforcing motorized elements of the 3d Division, is being sent to Algeria to hold down the restive colonial population.

Although the French contribution to NATO in Europe was supposed to be 14½ divisions, the number already was down to 5, 2 others having been sent to north Africa within the year. With the withdrawal of the latest division, France leaves NATO with only 4 of her pledged divisions—two-thirds of the strength of America's contribution of 6 divisions.

Inasmuch as the United States is not a European power, has no tangible interests on that Continent, and is herself not exposed to any enemy continental advance, the indifference of the French to the supposed Soviet menace suggests 1 of 2 things: Either the United States scriously overrates this alleged menace, or it is taking upon itself

a disproportionate burden in protecting its European allies.

France is adjudged the first continental power among the NATO allies. Can anyone rationally defend an arrangement whereby that country can ditch its responsibilities and put the task upon us? Yet the French have never ceased to exact promises that the United States would maintain its present troop strength in Europe, as if it were wholly our responsibility to stand against attack, while our principal ally on the scene feels free to cut down her commitments.

The French reduction of European troop strength is in accord with Premier Faure's assertion that France's obligations to the Atlantic alliance cannot be permitted to interfere with the reestablishment of order in Algeria. This statement was a repetition of the French principle that none of France's forces is permanently committed to European defense and that her overseas territories have first call on her soldiers.

The French maintain this position although a provision of allied agreements states that forces under the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe shall not be redeployed or used operationally "within that area" without his consent, subject to the political guidance of the NATO council. The French choose to interpret the phrase "within that area" to mean Europe alone, although the Atlantic pact covers North Africa as well.

France is thus pursuing a course which seems to her to serve her national interest best. If the United States were to govern itself by this same motive, would we maintain six divisions in Europe? Would we not, instead, say that America's vital interests are within the limits of the North American Continent, and that our troops would serve us best if they were here? Every working internationalist would, of course, condemn this as a narrow parochial view, but it is singular that the same people have never a word to say when another country makes mock of its firm commitments to us and its other allies.

The Tax on the American Tourist Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD an editorial appearing in El Mundo, Habana, Cuba, May 27, 1955, discussing the discriminatory excise tax the United States still imposes upon travel to the Caribbean and Central American countries. Although the editorial refers to a bill I introduced on the matter, a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, both in the House and in the Senate, have noted this discrimination and have introduced similar bills. I am quite hopeful that this discriminatory feature in our relations with the Caribbean and Central American countries will be promptly removed. It should have been removed a long time ago.

The editorial follows:

[Translation of editorial from El Mundo, Habana, Cuba, May 27, 1955]

THE TAX ON THE AMERICAN TOURIST TRADE

In the month of October 1941 the United States created a tax on fares which had as its purpose to remove the congestion of the transportation services by increasing the costs of trips of a tourist nature. That tax was removed for the countries of Europe and South America in the year 1947, through a revision of the law enacted for the purpose of channeling American tourist trade to them, favoring them with the flow of money which implicitly accompanies a flow of tourists. As for Cuba, Mexico, Canada, Central America, and the other countries of the Caribbean area, the tax continues in effect.

It involves, naturally, an economic discrimination which, in respect to Cuba, does not correspond to the treatment and facilities given to Cubans who desire to spend vacations in the United States. Although the flow of American tourists to Cuba is traditional, that flow, until recently in one direction, is now compensated by the increasing arrivals of Cubans who desire to come in the ports of Florida. Without the necessity of referring to statistics, we may affirm that none of the European or South American countries which benefit from the exemption of the tax on fares sends to the American coasts so many tourists as those which annually go from Cuba to Miami.

Because of the injustice involved in the maintenance of said tax, United States Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS has presented a bill to the Congress to modify the law on transportation tax which would exempt passengers going to Cuba, Mexico, Central America, and the other countries of the Caribbean area of the obligation of paying the 10 percent extra charge on their fares. This project counts on the support of various departments of the American Government and of private organizations, national and international, as well as the carriers which sustain regular service to the countries affected.

It does not concern us to expound arguments related to the fiscal nature of the tax. Aside from the inequality which, by its discriminatory nature, constitutes an injustice in the treatment which is given to a neighbor country, we ought to point out that it inflicts on us serious economic detriment, since there can be no doubt that the increased tax on fares to Cuba discourages a large part of the tourists who plan to visit us. To a large extent the American airlines which maintain regular air routes between the United States and Cuba also share in these losses.

For these reasons, we believe that diplomatic channels should be utilized to bring to the attention of the Washington Government the desirability of repealing this discriminatory tax. First and last, it is the policy of the United States, declared repeatedly by the present President, and other officers of the Government, to promote inter-American tourist ties, not only as a means of strengthening the monetary reserves of the countries lacking in dollars, but also to consolidate the chains of friendship through mutual acquaintance and frequent contact among the peoples of the Americas.

Touristism is, without a doubt, an excellent means of dissipating misunderstandings and cementing friendship. In place of creating difficulties to trips, the opposite should be done, and such trips should be within reach of the most modest budgets.

Diminishing Returns To Diminishing Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, as the son of a farmer who spent some 35 years on the farm to wind up with net assets of less than $1,500 for all of those years of toil and sweat, I naturally have some understanding of an concern for the plight in which the producer of our food and fiber now finds himself. And certainly with that background I have a minimum of patience with that segment of the consuming public who feel that the producers of dairy products are getting more than their share of the consumer's dollar. To talk of "milk at 12 cents a quart" is to ignore the basic economics of the situation and certainly overlooks the fact that the 10-cent drop in overall farm prices has almost all gone to meet additional labor demands in the processing of foodstuffs.

The present unholy alliance between certain congressional and labor leaders is born of political expediency and is predicated on a program of subsidies to be paid out by taxpayers so that farm income can be kept up, labor's "take" increased, and consumer prices lowered. The over-weaning ambitions of certain labor demagogues can lead us to situation comparable to that in which Russia presently finds herself; namely, in building labor's political machine at the expense of the farmer or by placing him in a bureaucratic straitjacket we may well find that we have destroyed the last segment of our free-enterprise system and in that process have likewise destroyed the source of the food we eat and the clothes we wear.

Included with these remarks is an editorial by Beatty H. Dimit, the editor in chief of the Pennsylvania Grange News, who, in my opinion, speaks for Pennsylvania's farmers and who sounds a warning to those who fail to realize that the domination of agriculture by labor can only end to the disadvantage of both. Mr. Dimit's article follows and is worthy of your attention:

IS THIS HANDWRITING ON THE WALL

A misleading but significant article under the caption "Milk 12 Cents a Quart—Why Not in Your Town?" appeared in Collier's magazine of April 29. Misleading, because, while it recites some wholesome truths as to unwarranted official interferences, indefensible sanitary regulations, uneconomical labor practices, etc., yet it leaves the unwarranted inference that the producers are getting too much for milk and the dairy industry is getting more than the product is worth. Any such indictment is far from the truth. The average dairyman on a family-sized farm must invest from $25,000 to $40,000; have the equivalent of several years technical training; and must be on the job every day of the year since his cows must be fed and milked regardless of Sundays, holidays, rain or shine, winter or summer. In return, if he makes as good a net wage as the average milk-truck driver with no capital invested, he is fortunate. The inference that milk can be produced, processed, transported, and delivered to big city markets for 12 cents per quart could only be possible if the farmer received a much lower price; less than the cost of production. Unnoted by most urban readers is the part played in the final price to the consumer of the industrial wages, fees, fringe benefits, and labor-union restrictions supported by minimum-wage hours, the Wagner Act, and other governmental-imposed regulations.

But while the article with its truths, half-truths, and inferences is misleading, yet it is significant. It reveals the typical urban consumer reaction working for and demanding lower food prices. The urban population

in our large cities is always for a lower cost of living. In part, at least, and perhaps in large measure, this accounts for the interest of labor-union leaders in agricultural subsidies and their backing of Government price fixing of farm products. This article then voices a demand on the part of the consuming nonfarming population which now outnumbers our farmers 8 to 1. It may well be a handwriting on the wall for agriculture. It should reveal the disaster in the long run which will overtake the farmer if he relies on governmental rulings and subsidies in a society where urban consumers far outnumber him and in which his political influence is steadily waning.

Hoover Commission Reports Draw Strong Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a letter from Mr. J. W. Koski, general manager of the Central Cooperative Wholesale. Mr. Koski's letter expresses the opposition of his association to certain recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

I have found that many of the Hoover Commission recommendations do not find favor with people in the Ninth District of Wisconsin. I am also opposed to many of the recommendations.

Following is the full text of Mr. Koski's letter, which I recommend to my colleagues for their study:

CENTRAL COOPERATIVE WHOLESALE,
Superior, Wis., June 3, 1955.

Hon. LESTER JOHNSON,
Representative from Wisconsin,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: You are familiar with the Hoover Commission report relative to reducing the costs of Government. Many of the sections of this report no doubt have a great deal of merit and should be seriously studied.

There is one section of the report, however, which we feel takes a shortsighted view and we also feel is not in the best interests of the economy of our country. We wish to bring this section to your attention as we feel very strongly that adoption of some of these provisions would be very detrimental, and we hope that you will concur with this view.

The section we have reference to is in regard to lending agencies. The report advocates abolition or crippling of the lending agencies set up over the years to aid agriculture, cooperatives, small business and veterans.

Certain groups are conducting intense propaganda to create public pressure toward the possible adoption of this crippling legislation. For instance, we refer you to the United States Chamber of Commerce's publication, Taxpayer's Dollar, special issue No. 1, May 1955.

We protest vigorously the Hoover Commission blows at the Rural Electrification Administration, the banks for cooperatives, Farmers Home Administration, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Veterans' Administration, the Small Business Administration, the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, the Agricultural Marketing Revolving Fund, and the Public Housing Administration, as unwarranted and extremely shortsighted.

Government aid to business and industry through special tax writeoffs, tariff protection, and numerous other aids and subsidies has long been accepted and workable principle with regard to the role of Government in these fields.

It can hardly be argued even by the most vociferous enemies of democratically owned and controlled people's enterprises, such as the REA's, which truly are private enterprise in its highest form, that these organizations have not been highly beneficial to the development and growth of our country, and the perpetuation of the American principle of mutual self-help.

We believe that you will agree that the organizations mentioned above have become an established and necessary part of our American system, and to destroy them would be an extremely shortsighted and harmful act. As an organization of 75,000 consumer and farm families, operating in the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, North and South Dakota, we urge you to leave no stone unturned to help defeat the above-mentioned proposals of the Hoover Commission.

Respectfully yours,
CENTRAL COOPERATIVE WHOLESALE,
J. W. KOSKI, *General Manager.*

Self-Interest on the Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, representatives from southern California have taken occasion this week to accuse me of injecting emotionalism into the fight by the four States of Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Wyoming for a project which will permit them to use their share of the Colorado River water.

Evidence presented to the House Interior Committee clearly shows that this water is now running to waste at the rate of 4 million acre-feet per year in the Pacific Ocean. The only use to which it is now being put is to furnish firm power at dump power rates to industries in the Los Angeles area. In effect, some 3 million residents of the Nation's richest undeveloped area are being attacked for daring to question why their most precious resource—water—is to be given away to subsidize the power bills of a few fortunate Los Angeles industries.

We in the upper basin States are not jealous of the fact that southern California now supports 6 million residents. We supported the multipulpose projects, such as Hoover Dam, Davis Dam, and the All-American Canal. These projects have made the phenomenal growth of southern California possible. We are not jealous of this growth. But I, for one, resent the fact that their propagandists are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to flood this country with false and misleading statements as to the cost and feasibility of the upper Colorado storage project. We need this project to permit our States to share in this growth.

I am submitting for the RECORD an editorial that appeared May 31, 1955, in the Salt Lake Deseret News-Telegram. I hope Members will give it their close study:

SELF-INTEREST ON THE COLORADO

A short press dispatch from Los Angeles recently brought word that 6 million residents of southern California had expressed—through their "civic representatives"—strong opposition both to the Colorado River storage project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

Now 6 million is a sizable group of humanity and at first glance anyone is apt to give their expressed opinion a lot of weight. More thoughtful analysis, however, puts aside mere weight of numbers until the reasons for any expression of opinion have been examined. Six million Russians expressing their belief in communism, for example, would not carry much weight with any believer in democracy. And a close examination of the reasons these 6 million southern Californians oppose the two big reclamation projects fails to turn up a much better foundation in logic than the Russians' belief in communism.

The "reason" stated in the press dispatch is that the Colorado and Fryingpan projects would "threaten to curtail their area's supply of Colorado River water." To anyone who has studied the situation, this is no reason at all. It is merely an attempt to make the American public swallow a big falsehood by stating it as a fact, without any attempt to give proof.

If every unit of the Colorado project proposed for initial-phase construction were built, the upper basin States would still be 3½ million acre-feet a year short of their share of Colorado River water under terms of the 1922 compact. Californians, when backed into a corner, will admit—they cannot do otherwise—that the upper basin's annual use of 4 million of their alloted 7½ million acre-feet of water is no threat to the lower basin's share of the river water. But, they now argue, if the upper basin filled its storage reservoirs (using its own share of Colorado water to do so), it would "hold back for 20 or 30 years" water which would otherwise flow down through the lower basin. This, by some unexplainable quirk of California logic, is supposed to be unfair.

The real reasons for California's position are obvious. First of all, filling the upper-basin reservoirs would keep a lot of now-surplus water from running down through the lower basin and on to waste into the ocean. This water is now generating power at Hoover Dam, power which is sold to southern California industry at extremely low "junk" (surplus) power rates. If the upper-basin dams were filling, sufficient water would continue to flow to the lower basin to fill Hoover Dam's firm power commitments, but the Los Angeles area would lose some of the surplus power—which under present conditions is actually firm power sold at junk rates.

Secondly, some Californians think that if they can postpone upper basin development long enough, they can get the 1922 Colorado River compact set aside and get most or all of the upper basin's share of water, along with their own.

The same technique of self-interest disguised by specious logic was attempted by Representative CHESTER HOLIFIELD in a speech in the House of Representatives last week. He entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an impressive list of organizations who were on

record as opposed to the Colorado project. The list's impressiveness shrank considerably when it was seen that about 95 percent of the listed organizations were located in southern California.

Representative WILLIAM A. DAWSON did a thorough job of replying to Mr. HOLIFIELD. We can only hope that the rest of the Members of the House took the time to study both Mr. HOLIFIELD's and Mr. DAWSON's presentations and to draw the obvious logical conclusions.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the National Prospector's Gazette, Bellflower, Calif., October 1954, entitled "God's Country and Bad Kids," by Karl von Mueller.

I believe I can say, with assurance, that every Member of this House is interested in and would like to assist in every way possible in combating the ever-growing problem of how to cope with and control juvenile delinquency in our country. Our future citizens of tomorrow need help today. It is with this in mind that I call to your attention an interesting and constructive article sent to me by a constituent, Mr. T. Vanides, of Culver City, Calif., which advocates certain solutions—some original and others tried. I hope my colleagues will find it of value.

The article follows:

GOD'S COUNTRY AND BAD KIDS

(By Karl von Mueller)

As you read this, at various places in this old world of ours, at least 1,000 parents are going to, attending, or returning from juvenile courts. They are doing this because one or more of their children have become involved in the toils of law.

These kids have become involved probably because their parents could not take the time to provide the love, care, and attention that every growing child needs. It is true that a very few children appear to be incorrigible from birth. The balance can attribute their troubles directly to parental ignorance, disregard, or passive disinterest.

This article is not intended to be a sermon, so read on as it contains some very interesting facts and food for thought.

While I know there are those who will dispute this statement, I still go on record as believing that there is not a more interesting, intriguing, and a more wholesome hobby than the study of geology and active participation in its various phases.

Show me a boy who does not revel and thrill in anticipation of an overnight rockhunting or prospecting trip to the mountains or desert, and I will show you a boy who is sick in mind or body. Show me a boy who does not get a great deal of satisfaction and gratification from grinding and polishing cabochon and I will show you a boy who has missed one of life's most interesting hobbies. Show me a boy who has not dreamed of the mountains, the desert, the plains, or the sea, and I will show you a boy who is lost.

Every normal boy loves the out-of-doors, and his happiest, healthiest hours are those spent in the fields beyond the noise and smell of the city. You readers who live in the smaller towns and rural areas see a daily parade of happy, healthy, active children. On the other hand, the city dwellers' most convincing evidence of the effect of good, clean air and exercise is the changes which have taken place in the neighborhood kids who have had the opportunity of attending summer camps, scout encampments, or vacations in the rural areas.

Since juvenile delinquency is most usually a problem of the city dweller and police, this is a good time for parents of children approaching or in their 'teens to take inventory and determine if they are giving their children the attention and guidance that commonsense and morality dictates. A few of the facts to which our reformatories and honor farms attest are: (1) plenty of spending money does not guarantee good behavior in children, (2) a home with absent parents does absolutely nothing to assure proper conduct of children, (3) a family with busy parents certainly does not have the parental respect of the children, (4) parents who ignore or fail to participate in the interests and activities of their childen overlook and miss some of the most pleasurable joys of parenthood, (5) parents who associate with their children only at mealtime quite often are forced to part with them in court.

All of this means just one thing: enjoy your children, get acquainted with them, and share your hobbies and interests with them.

Fortunately, it is no secret that all of the finest hobbies and interests are directly associated with nature. Camping, hunting, fishing, skiing, skating, boating, rock hunting, and prospecting (to name a few) all require the closest association with nature. Some years ago there was a popular saying that went like this: A boy who goes fishing never gets in trouble. So true was this statement that many of our most eminent jurists saw fit to mention this fact in their books.

Today this same adage may be applied to the rockhound and pebble pup. While I realize there may be instances of which I have no knowledge, I have never heard of a single instance where a boy who became interested in the lapidary or prospecting field has ever run afoul of the law.

Civic-minded people, police authorities, and conscientious parents will do well to consider the organization of a rock and mineral club in their community as a faultless means of keeping young minds and bodies busy. Usually a local science teacher, or some citizen well versed in geology, can lead the discussions at the first few meetings or until the members have elected their officers and are making headway on their own. Regular club meetings at 2-week or monthly intervals are desirable and it will be found that the members will devote a greater portion of their spare time in collecting and preparing mineral specimens and also in studying further the rocks and minerals to be found in the vicinity.

Local libraries can be urged to make suitable books available to members. When this interest is shown, many libraries have been known to petition the Representative or Senator for a complete set of Federal publications on mining, geology, and the lapidary field for the library shelves.

Meeting places are usually quite easy to arrange. Different junior clubs are using different types of meeting places. Rooms in city, county, or State buildings; meeting rooms in churches; rooms in schools; and even hangars at airports are being used. In other instances, some businessmen are allowing clubs to use back rooms or basements in store or office buildings, and even radio stations are permitting the use of their auditoriums for meeting places.

There are many junior clubs located in the Western United States which restrict their membership to children under 18 or 16 years of age. When clubs are being organized in communities where there has not been much interest in this field, it is often advisable to organize the clubs so that both children and adults can belong and participate in club activities. When enough kids are regularly attending meetings, they can be permitted to form their own group.

One thing about the junior clubs: let them elect their own officers and govern their own clubs. Adult guidance in the form of 2 or 3 counselors who attend each meeting is necessary, but let the youngsters govern themselves and conduct themselves in a businesslike fashion. Too much adult supervision has wrecked several junior clubs, so let them handle their own business. Of course, mischief and vandalism should not be allowed. The best punishment is suspension of an offending member for so many meetings or for a field trip or two.

Field trips are a tonic to every club and are easily arranged. A letter addressed to the chief of your State bureau of mines or department of natural resources will usually bring abundant information on nearby rock or mineral sites and what may be found there. If you do not know the agency to be addressed, a letter addressed to the Governor of the State will usually be directed to the proper bureau or official for action and information.

Field trips not only often result in valuable additions to mineral collections but they also contribute greatly to the knowledge of the mineral resources of the State or area. Not only this, but everyone always has a great time on every field trip. Overnight trips where everyone roughs it by cooking over an open fire and sleeping under the stars are always a thrill to everyone.

Tenderfeet on their first trip out generally are plagued by fears of snakes, lizards, coyotes, and a number of other things, but the first night is the worst for them, and after that they usually really enjoy the activity, the food, and even the washing with cold water on the cool, crisp mornings.

These fears are perfectly normal in both "kids" and adults on their first few trips out, but as these fears subside a genuine interest in nature arises.

Looking at this juvenile problem from a purely economic point of view, it does not take a mental giant to reason that it is much cheaper to invest a few dollars in lapidary or camping equipment than in attorney fees and court costs. Going a little further than this, there is absolutely no embarrassment involved in being active in the lapidary hobby.

It was my honor and pleasure this summer to visit the California Sheriffs Convention while it was in session in Los Angeles. I met and talked with a number of police officers and not a single one could recall a case of a rockhound getting in serious trouble. One sheriff could recall several cases of adult rock hounds causing trouble on private property, but other than this the slate was clean for the rock hounds. Nearly all officers expressed a wish and desire that more juveniles, as well as adults, could become interested in this fascinating hobby.

All of this adds up to one thing: the rockhound, the amateur geologist, and the prospector has too many interests and activities to permit him to take time to get into trouble. So, if you have boys in your family, in your community, or in your town who are inclined to mischief or who may possibly be problems, get them to join your local gem and mineral club and if you do not have such an organization you can help them get one organized. You will find that many of your elected officials, civic clubs, and citizens will be most helpful in this enterprise. The Gazette will offer all possible

assistance to those interested in forming local societies and inquiries should be directed to the magazine.

With juvenile delinquency now at a shocking all-time high, the lapidary field offers a very interesting and attractive outlet for young minds and provides tangible results in the form of rings, pendants, bookends, lamp bases, and hundreds of other items which can be worn as jewelry or display to beautify the home or office. In addition to this, the annual shows offer a means of publicly displaying the hobbyists' products.

It is a wonderful hobby and you are urged to enlist your children, as well as those of your neighbors and friends, in its interesting activities.

European Wheat Requirements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a paper entitled "European Wheat Requirements," which was presented by Dr. John A. Shellenberger at the Hutchinson meeting of the Kansas Wheat Improvement Association on May 27. Dr. Shellenberger is head of the flour and feed milling industries department of Kansas State College. He is also a consultant to the Grain Division of the Foreign Agricultural Service in connection with the world wheat quality survey.

I believe that Dr. Shellenberger, in the presentation of his paper, discusses some matters which are very important to the wheat-producing sections of the country, not only in my State, but in other States. He has sought to point out ways to deliver better wheat than we have been supplying for some of the export shipments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire who this gentleman is?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. He is the head of the flour and feed milling industries department of Kansas State Agricultural College. He has made a considerable study of wheat. He is also a consultant to the grain division of the Foreign Agricultural Service, in connection with the world wheat quality survey.

Mr. LANGER. Is he an expert on soft wheat, or hard wheat?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. He is an expert on all kinds of wheat.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that if he will check up on the article which I am presenting for the RECORD, he will find it informative and productive of the development of a better quality of wheat for general use over the country. I heartily commend the article to the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUROPEAN WHEAT REQUIREMENTS

(By Dr. J. A. Shellenberger)

The feeling seems to prevail among wheat growers that surplus wheat, regardless of quality, can be sold in foreign countries, particularly in Europe, if only a sufficient effort is made to create the market. That this is not true sometimes comes as a shock to the American farmer. It is often not realized that two wars in Europe within the span of a lifetime have brought about many profound changes in the thinking of people and in the policies of the governments of European nations. Having suffered through food privations as a result of war, the peoples and their governments have developed strong nationalistic tendencies to be as self-sufficient in food as the agricultural economy of the country will permit. This policy has been implemented by high-price supports for agricultural products, especially wheat. Several European countries encourage the growing of wheat with support prices higher than these in the United States. In fact more than 96 percent of the world's wheat crop today is produced and marketed under price supports or other forms of official incentive to grow more wheat.

A fact we must learn to accept is that governments encouraging the growing of wheat, plus favorable weather, has changed profoundly the older concepts regarding potentialities in Europe for the marketing of wheat. The situation can be illustrated effectively by comparing the 5-year average wheat production in several countries during the period 1935–39 with the 5-year period from 1945–49. France, Germany, and Sweden all produced much less wheat during the period 1945–49 than during the period 1935–39 but Switzerland increased production slightly. The specific increases are shown in this table:

Wheat production

	Average, 1935–39	Average, 1945–49	1954	Increase
	Bushels	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Percent*
France	286,505,000	238,200,000	386,500,000	62
Germany (Western)	92,400,000	67,420,000	105,600,000	57
Sweden	25,351,000	23,222,000	37,870,000	63
Switzerland	6,050,000	7,800,000	9,370,000	20

However, the 1954 wheat harvest in France was 62 percent above the average production for the 5-year period 1945–49; for Germany the same comparison shows an increase of 57 percent; Sweden 63 percent, and Switzerland 20 percent. It becomes obvious that Europe is not dependent to the same extent as previously upon the importation of wheat. Thus market potentialities have been reduced. But most of the wheat produced in Europe is soft wheat; therefore, there continues to be a market for strong type wheats.

There are two important aspects in the European market for wheat that need to be reemphasized, first, the large increase in the production of wheat and, second, the need for the importation of strong wheats to blend with the locally grown wheats to produce satisfactory flour for bread production. Thus there is a market for United States wheat, if the price is right and the quality satisfactory. It is in regard to the quality of our wheat exports that your special attention is directed.

The United States Department of Agriculture through its Foreign Agricultural Service has worked hard to develop markets for wheat in foreign countries. To be competitive in a market it is essential, among other things, to know the caliber of your competition with respect to price and the quality of the merchandise. To obtain factual information on the quality of wheat imported into northern European countries the Foreign Agricultural Service has arranged to obtain samples from cargoes of wheat as the ships arrive at the ports and for the determination in the United States of the complete grading, chemical analysis, baking, and physical dough determinations of the samples. I have had the pleasure of being associated with this project and I thought you might like to have some advance information on the tests being performed and the results obtained. It is expected that approximately 136 samples will be received from various importing countries during the sampling period extending through the months of February, March, and April of this year. The evaluation work on the samples will be completed by June 30 and full details will be available later from the Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA.

It is common knowledge that dissatisfaction has been expressed in Europe with the quality of some of the wheat shipments originating from the United States. Usually the grain trade rates Canadian and Argentine wheats as being stronger and more satisfactory than shipments from the United States. The opinion prevails, in some quarters of Europe, that only the poorer quality wheats are delivered to port terminals for export. It is therefore important to learn what quality of wheat is reaching Europe from the United States and how these shipments compare in quality with cargoes from other countries.

Foreign buyers of United States wheats often complain that our system of grain grades and standards is inadequate or misleading insofar as describing the milling and baking quality to be expected from wheat of a particular grade and market class. FAS has prepared material for our agricultural attachés which explains the significance of our grain standards. Unfortunately for us, the only other important wheat exporter using numerical grades is Canada. The coincidence of wheat of comparatively uniform baking value, and somewhat more rigorous grade specifications for damage and foreign material, makes a Canadian No. 1 or No. 2 an appreciably more valuable wheat than our No. 1 or No. 2. The Canadians enjoy another advantage in that the average protein of their exportable surplus will range between 12 and 13 percent, whereas a special contract specification is required to insure the delivery of such protein wheat from the United States.

Our system of official grades, on the other hand, is much more informative to a buyer than is the system of f. a. s. deliveries under which much of the European imports are purchased. In countries that do not have a grading system, admixtures of Durum with White and Hard and Soft Winter wheats are often encountered as well as high amounts of shrunken or broken kernels, foreign seeds, and also stones.

The application of our grading system to some of the wheat shipments arriving in Europe from other countries would be an improvement because the grading and classification of the wheat would provide much helpful information regarding the characteristics of the shipment prior to its arrival. Thus the situation prevails whereby the application of our grading system helps our

Nation to deliver better wheat than that which originates from some other exporting countries. But our system is not functioning as effectively as would be desirable for the delivery of wheat of a quality competitive with that which is being delivered by other exporters, particularly Canada.

The majority of the wheat shipments from the United States arriving in the Northern European countries during the period February-April 1955 graded Soft Red Winter. Comparing the hard wheat shipments from the United States which graded Dark hard or Hard Winter or Dark Northern or Northern Spring with the wheat shipments from some of the other exporters, it is understandable why our hard wheats are not in greater demand. We are supplying, on the average, hard wheats of slightly lower test weight and protein content than are obtainable from some of the other exporting countries. The flours from the United States wheats have a lower absorption and produce smaller loaf volumes than do the flours milled from important competing hard wheats. In other words, even the hard wheat shipments from the United States are surpassed in strength and in desirability by the wheats delivered by some of the other exporters.

A partial solution can be effected as a result of the efforts of our foreign representatives to explain the quality characteristics of our market classes. There is no doubt, however, about the need for improving the quality of our bread wheat exports to Europe. We can take pride in the fact that we are supplying better wheat to Europe than that grown locally or delivered from some other countries, but generally the fact seems to be that wheat exported from the United States is less satisfactory for bread-making purposes than that obtainable elsewhere.

A way must be found to deliver better wheat than we have been supplying for export shipments, if we desire to meet the competition in Europe. Wheat production throughout Europe is on the increase. The wheat produced is predominantly soft and hence hard wheat is required to blend with it for the production of bread flour.

Mechanization of the baking industry is on the increase in Europe. This trend will increase the requirements for stronger wheat. It is an inescapable fact that a means must be found whereby wheat of better quality is made available for export. This means that farmers must give more serious consideration than ever before to the strength characteristics of the wheat grown. It also means that every effort should be made by all segments of the wheat industry, including Federal and State agencies, to work collectively to develop and grow better wheat, to prevent the debasement of good wheat by admixtures of poor quality wheat or foreign material, and to segregate wheat on the basis of protein, variety, and baking quality considerations.

There is no hungry Europe ready and willing to take whatever quality wheat we may wish to dispose of and all indications are that the demands for strong, good quality wheat will increase rather than decrease in the years ahead.

Kremlin Changes the Signals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Constantine Brown for the May 24 issue of the Washington Evening Star, entitled "Kremlin Changes the Signals." My reason in asking for insertion of this article is that I consider it to be a very fine interpretation of current movements by the Soviet Government in advance of the forthcoming meeting between representatives of the major powers. Mr. Brown has been a student of government for many years, and I always find his articles informative and helpful.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KREMLIN CHANGES THE SIGNALS—SOVIET PRESS BLASTS RULERS OF UNITED STATES FOR OPPOSING GERMAN NEUTRAL BELT

(By Constantine Brown)

Government experts on Soviet affairs are studying the new anti-American outbursts in the Soviet press, now that a meeting "at the summit" has been agreed on in principle, and are trying to guess what they mean.

The Soviet press, it must be remembered, is not only government-controlled but is either party or government owned. And the party and the government are one and indivisible. The Red newspapers and magazines reflect only the views of the Kremlin. They give advance notice of coming official moves.

In Russia there are no such things as leaks to "friendly reporters" or "pipelines" as we have in the West. Soviet editors and "name" commentators are medium-echelon government officials. Reporters belong to the lower strata of the Soviet bureaucracy. Consequently editorials and articles in the Red publications are carefully read by Western Foreign Office employees because they indicate the political thinking of the men in the Kremlin.

The Moscow newspapers blew up beyond all realities the good will displayed by the USSR in giving Austria a state treaty. And they hailed in friendly editorials the Western powers' bid for a meeting between the Big Four heads of state.

Now the Soviet papers, which are giving the signals on international affairs, have changed their tune. They are blasting the United States "rulers" and particularly their whipping boy, Secretary of State Dulles.

The real reason behind the recent venomous attacks, according to official students of the Soviet moves, is our reported opposition to the neutralization of West Germany.

Contrary to what was generally believed, the Soviet gesture toward Austria was not spontaneous despite appearances. It had been discussed with the British and French representatives in Moscow since late last summer. While the Kremlin may not have spelled out that its objective is to create one or two neutral belts including an eventually unified Germany, there are good reasons to believe that at least French Ambassador Joxe, a strong left-winger, knew a good deal about the Soviet intentions.

There were reports here as far back as last January that Austria would be given her sovereignty on condition she accept complete neutrality. This was to serve as a pattern for the German people. Austria could never be anything but insignificant as a military power. She could contribute no more than, say, Denmark in the Western coalition. But the Kremlin decided to make the Danubian republic a symbol for Central Europe and particularly for Germany. The Austrian neutrality pledge, so eargerly given, was to be a pacemaker for Western Germany whose potential military might the U. S. S. R. reportedly fears more than our nuclear weapons.

It is difficult to say what the State Department and Mr. Dulles knew about the Kremlin's game. In any event they decided to take no official notice of the Red antics. The administration accepted the Soviet decision at its face value and decided to use the Austrian treaty as an indication that the Kremlin had undergone a change of heart in connection with the 8-year cold war.

President Eisenhower regarded the Soviet decision diplomatically as one of the "deeds" he had demanded before agreeing to meet with the other three heads of state of the big powers. And when Britain and France, forced by domestic problems, pressed him to agree to this long-sought parley, he assented. A note was sent to Moscow inviting the Russian rulers to a gathering and they in turn accepted tentatively. But immediately they made known their views on the possibility of relaxing tension through creation of neutral belts. Also they told Germany that she could purchase her unity by following the example of Austria which incidentally has not been restricted by treaty as to the size of its military establishment.

The Russians have informed the Bonn government that in exchange for neutrality—that is giving up its adherence to NATO—the reunited German republic would not be forced to confine its military strength to 500,000 men as limited by the recent treaties with the West. The sky could be the limit, insofar as the U. S. S. R. was concerned, provided Germany broke away from its "Western entanglements."

Washington's reaction was firm. It let the Foreign Offices of our allies and the U. S. S. R. know that such a bargain was basically unacceptable. We are willing to talk over "neutral belts" on condition that the Soviets agree to evacuate their forces from all the satellite countries where they have large garrisons under one excuse or another.

Is Russia Ahead?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Is Russia Ahead?" written by Mr. Richard England, and published in the Quincy Patriot Ledger, which has to do with the development of airpower. Mr. England has made a special study in this field.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS RUSSIA AHEAD?

It is deeply disturbing to learn that the Soviet Air Force is rapidly reaching or has reached equality with the United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Woodbury M. Burgess, Deputy Chief of Staff for intelligence of the Continental Air Defense Command said in a speech May 18, "The Russian Air Force is currently at least as good as ours, possibly better."

This is just one statement to that effect.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, former Secretary of the Air Force under President Truman, has suggested right along that not only is the United States falling behind in the race for big bombers but is also losing ground to the Russians in the development of an intercontinental guided missile.

General Burgess, too, is afraid "the Russians are ahead of us in the effort to perfect the guided missile."

Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff, has also expressed grave concern over disclosures of new Soviet air strength. He has strongly hinted that the United States may need a bigger air force to maintain its lead over Russia.

This newspaper, of course, has no tried and tested method of evaluating statements like these. But until there is an official denial we must recognize their significance as disquieting dissents.

Senator SYMINGTON takes as confirmation of his first view the Defense Department announcement of May 13 disclosing that the Soviets apparently have matched the best American intercontinental bomber in production today.

This is the B–52 jet stratofortress, which can fly to Russia and return. Its Soviet counterpart, of course, could fly to the United States and return.

Reliable reports from Washington indicate that the United States Air Force will admit to having only 25 or 30 of these big bombers. Russia is believed to have 10, possibly 18 and perhaps more of the same type plane.

Nor is this all. The Russian bomber (it's called the type 37) requires only 4 jets while the American B–52 requires 8 jets to bring it up to peak performance. This indicates that the Soviets now have developed a jet engine which is twice as powerful as any operational American jet engine.

To those of us living in metropolitan areas likely to be atomic and hydrogen bomb target in any future war this is hardly comforting news. It is the giant intercontinental bomber that gives the Soviets an ever present capability to attack our cities, the same way it gives us the capability of retaliating against Russian cities.

While we are undoubtedly in a better retaliatory position than the Russians, because of our overseas air bases, it begins to look as if we are falling behind in the technological race, as Senator SYMINGTON has maintained.

President Eisenhower in his Wednesday press conference tried to throw cold water on any tendency to assume that we have presently lost this technological race.

"I don't know the exact number (of B–52's)" he said, "but to say that we have lost in a twinkling all of this great technical development and technical excellence as well as numbers in our total aircraft is just not true."

The President is the man who should know about these things, so we accept his word that we are presently ahead of the Soviets. But as he admitted, we have grossly underestimated the Soviets in the past. There is no reason to believe they will not continue to forge ahead until they gain air superiority in the immediate future.

Other disclosures support this assumption.

Recently, the Boeing Co. announced that it had recently constructed its 1,000th B–47 medium jet bomber, our second best bomber. This is the fast but smaller plane able to fly to Russia and return, if it refuels en route.

Thirty of the Russian counterpart of the B–47 bomber have been sighted. If we have seen 30 then there are undoubtedly many more.

The Defense Department announcement also admitted the Soviets have developed a turbo-prop bomber (perhaps for use in refueling other bombers) and an all weather jet fighter, incorporating radar and other electronic equipment.

If the Soviets can put radar into a small fighter then it may easily have a radar network around its principal target areas—one just as good or better than ours.

What are the implications here?

We know that the Soviet Union is bending every effort to overtake and surpass the United States in the production of weapons of war, both in quantity and quality. It appears they are succeeding at least in the critical field of aircraft development.

We know the Soviets are turning out many more new scientists and engineers every year than the United States, though we believe we still have a slight edge.

We know they have many more ground troops than we have.

They have on the other hand embarked on an inexplicable peace propaganda campaign that looks like it may be the real thing. Their troops are to leave Austria under the new peace treaty. The supposition is that the Soviets might do the same in East Germany if the West offers a profitable enough deal.

Is it at all possible that Soviet technology is becoming so far advanced that they are beginning to feel relatively more secure behind a wall of top-notch weapons and therefore feel they can afford to surrnder some bits of territory that were unpleasant to hold anyway?

There is credible evidence that the President has permitted his Defense Department to be less than honest with the American people. The May 13 announcement, it seems fairly well established, was released hurriedly to head off Senator SYMINGTON who was going to kick up a fuss on the Senate floor over this aircraft situation.

One Senate subcommittee appears ready to start an investigation into the relative air strength between the United States and the U. S. S. R. We would rather not have this happen. The Congress and the American people should be able to have full confidence in the administration, at least on such crucial matters as defense.

But if the Eisenhower administration persists in begrudging the information that will enable the public to support a stronger defense program, then we are in favor of a Congressional investigation.

Defense is something we can't afford to monkey with.

Moscow Seeks Another Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by David Lawrence which he wrote for the May 24 issue of the Washington Evening Star. This article entitled "Moscow Seeks Another Yalta," is the work of a man who is an alert and highly qualified observer of international affairs, and I believe his comments are worth bringing before all the American people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOSCOW SEEKS ANOTHER YALTA—INDIGNANT PRAVDA ACCUSES UNITED STATES OF INSINCERITY ON SUMMIT TALKS

(By David Lawrence)

LONDON, May 24.—Somebody got the Soviet Government's goat last week, and maybe it was Eisenhower or maybe it was Dulles. But the net result is an indignant editorial in Pravda, which is widely reprinted here this week, complaining that the American Government isn't really sincere about the four-power conference at the summit because presumably irrelevant questions are being raised by the United States for discussion.

Thus, for instance, the Moscow editorial says it is absured to introduce the matter of restoring the old regimes in the satellite countries or prohibiting the progressive movement in capitalist countries. All this, the Soviets say, has no connection with the tasks of the conference and are merely technical obstacles.

The Soviets, of course, would like another Yalta conference in which the world would be carved up by the major powers and there would be binding agreements made that amounted to the abandonment of the hopes and aspirations of the oppressed peoples.

The Moscow strategists had better watch out, because, while they accuse America of interfering in the British election campaign by saying a four-power conference is favored by the United States when really not caring for it, there is a chance the partisans here will come to the conclusion that the Russians are doing a bit of interfering, too. For if they blast the hopes of the British stump speakers about the eventual value of the four-power conference, they will be hurting the campaign arguments of both sides here. The Socialist Labor Party folks, for example, applaud the decision to hold a four-power conference as being the result of their efforts. The Conservatives, while cautious about their predictions, are nevertheless playing the issue for all it is worth as an index of their own constructive purposes. Harold MacMillan, Foreign Secretary, and Conservative leader, puts it this way:

"All this process of negotiation will take time. There will be disappointments as well as successes. But so long as this process is going on, it means peace and not war. The very fact of this system being effectively at work will serve to reduce tension and perhaps prevent dangerous outbreaks at this or at that tender spot in international relations. To that extent, even if it does not achieve anything or everything, it will still be more than justified."

Mr. MacMillan talks in this broad and vague way to impress the electorate with the belief that something vital toward the making of peace is going on. He declares that the four powers "should not arrogate to themselves the authority to settle all the difficulties which beset all nations," but he thinks their survey should cover the globe and "should not be confined necessarily to Europe but could comprise the problems of the Far East."

The passion for peace is tremendous, but it is a serious question whether it is wise to let the people believe the chances are better than they really are. What the conservatives are campaigning against is a program of the left-wing Socialist Labor Party speakers who are saying many of the things Soviet Russia would like to see accomplished. Aneurin Bevan, one of the Socialist Labor Party leaders, argues for his party platform, which includes a ban on all nuclear bomb tests. He says:

"The H-bombs now being exploded may have appalling effects on the human species. Children may be born with all kinds of hideous formations."

This is the line the Communists have been trying to put over for a long time, even in America. The British press prints charges about the fallout from nuclear tests which aren't true and have no official confirmation at all. Alfred Robens, former minister of labor and now a candidate for Parliament on the Socialist Labor ticket, says a vote for him means "an effort to get nations to agree to stop H-bomb tests." He adds: "Certainly, Eden is not as likely to stand up to the United States State Department as was Attlee."

Despite the claim that this election campaign is being fought on domestic issues, a lot is being said about foreign policy and it seems certain that if the Socialist Labor Party wins Moscow will be happy—at least for a while. For the truth is that the Social-

ist Labor Party leaders know that friction with America would mean a short tenure for them.

It is remarkable how little intelligence the electorate is supposed to have. That's the biggest mistake the politicians make, both here and back home.

Where Inflation's Magic Ends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent editorial from the Daily Oklahoman entitled "Where Inflation's Magic Ends." My constituent, in forwarding me this editorial, made the statement that Senator BYRD is doing more than anyone else toward keeping our Government solvent.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Oklahoman of May 12, 1955]

WHERE INFLATION'S MAGIC ENDS

In fiscal matters Senator BYRD, of Virginia, has been a tireless Jeremiah, warning patiently and repeatedly of the fatal consequences of chronic deficits.

His austere and uncompromising attitude toward debt has made him appear old fashioned to economists of the new compensatory spending school who fear deflation more than they fear inflation.

In refusing to swallow the fashionable present-day arguments aimed at rationalizing or beautifying debt Senator BYRD concedes he may be a bit old fashioned. At a recent meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce he described himself as an old-fashioned person "who believes that a debt is a debt just as much in the atomic age as it was in the horse and buggy days."

He said he was disturbed "these days to hear some economist argue the budget should not be balanced and that we should not begin to pay on the debt because, they allege, it will adversely affect business conditions."

At the time BYRD was talking this same question of debt reduction was being discussed also by Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. In an interview for the U. S. News & World Report, Burns was asked how he reconciled the Treasury's repeated deficits with the fact we've been taught ever since we knew anything about debt that you've got to pay it off sometime.

Burns conceded that it would be desirable to reduce the national debt, but only whenever this is consistent with the maintenance of reasonably full employment. He said he'd begin worrying very much if we embarked on a policy of paying off national debt without regard to economic conditions.

But Senator BYRD observes that the Government hasn't shown much inclination to reduce the debt regardless of full employment and abnormally swollen tax revenues. He inquires when the budget ever will be balanced if it isn't done in this day of our greatest dollar income.

A further question occurs as the business boom continues apparently unabated in the face of evidence that a balanced budget is a receding prospect. How long can inflation continue without bringing on the catastrophe that Senator BYRD has been warning against? Or have the planners actually discovered the way into a new era? If inflation eventually is going to lose its magic, on the other hand, at what point will that occur?

The answer is suggested by what's happening already to the still expanding steel industry. Tax depreciation allowances are inadequate to pay for the new steel plants because the tax laws as they relate to replacement costs refuse to acknowledge any of the inflation that has occurred. Meanwhile plant construction costs in the steel industry have tripled since prewar, and so-called profits are being vastly overstated.

In the forthcoming round of expansion the steel industry would be required to build several completely new plants like the vast Fairless works at Morrisville, Pa. But at current costs and current prices there is little profit incentive in steel expansion.

When this point is reached in enough lines of risk and endeavor inflation loses its economic magic which is based on deception. Production will fall off if incentives fade in a profitless prosperity. And of course rising production in the present rat race against rising costs in all that has kept inflation in check up to now.

Cotton Crop Aids Central America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Cotton Crop Aids Central America," published in the New York Times of June 5, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COTTON CROP AIDS CENTRAL AMERICA—RIVALS COFFEE AS A SOURCE OF REVENUE—UNITED STATES PRICE SUPPORT A BIG FACTOR

MEXICO CITY, May 27.—Cotton, through a series of circumstances largely attributable to the United States, is taking a dominant position in the economies of Mexico and most of Central America.

The 1954–55 crop for Mexico and the four Central American cotton-producing countries amounted to 2,118,326 bales as compared with 1,400,872 bales for the 1953–54 crop.

It is conservatively estimated that the 1955–56 crop will be considerably higher than the present one. Some estimates run from one-third to one-half again as high.

The radical increases in this region that began in the late 1940's are a matter of utmost interest not only to the producing countries themselves but to the United States as well. The increases in Mexican and Central American planting and production figured largely in a report this past April by a Senate agricultural subcommittee.

BECOMES RIVAL OF COFFEE

For the producing countries in this region cotton is of vast interest because of the vagaries of the coffee market, which traditionally has been the chief source of revenue from abroad. In some of these countries cotton already has passed coffee as the chief export, and soon this may be true of all of them.

The Central American cotton producers are El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, and Nicaragua. Of these four Nicaragua has made the most spectacular strides in production. In 1953 she had 100,000 acres of cotton under cultivation and produced about 100,000 bales.

In 1954 Nicaragua had increased her cotton acreage to 190,000 acres and produced 200,000 bales. It is estimated that the cotton acreage this year will be about 360,000.

Honduras, the smallest producer, had 4,718 acres under cultivation in 1953 and produced 18,872 bales. In 1954 she increased the acreage to 5,779 acres and stepped up production to 23,126 bales.

El Salvador had 54,000 acres under cultivation in 1953 and her 1953–54 production was 54,000 bales. In 1954 her planting had been stepped up to 73,000 acres with a production this year of 75,000 bales. Estimates for the 1955–56 production on approximately the same acreage is for 90,000 bales.

PRODUCTION IN GUATEMALA

Guatemala had 27,000 acres under cultivation in 1953 with a production of 27,000 bales. The acreage increased to 40,000 in 1954; production has been put by some authorities at 35,000 bales and by others at 40,000.

Mexico, for many years a heavy cotton producer, has stepped up her production enormously over the last 20 years. Between 1935–39 she cultivated an average of 725,000 acres and produced an average of 334,000 bales. In 1953 she had increased the acreage to 1,890,000 acres and produced 1,210,000 bales. Her 1954 acreage was 1,830,000 with production increased to 1,780,000 bales. It is estimated that the 1955–56 crop will exceed 2 million bales.

The primary reason for the accelerated production is that cotton support prices in the United States has given foreign sources of cotton a distinct competitive advantage in the world market. Another important factor is that advanced planting, cultivating, and insecticidal techniques have overcome difficulties that had made cotton production uneconomic.

Oil Imports Into the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement copied from Platt's Oilgram News Service of June 3, 1955, showing that imports of oil increased from 1,047,800 to 1,334,900 barrels between the week ending May 20 and the week ending May 27, 1955.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPORTS TURN UPWARD

NEW YORK, June 2.—Total United States imports of crude and products in 4 weeks ended May 27 averaged 41,900 b/d more than during 4 weeks ended April 29, API reports.

East of California imports were up 51,000 b/d, while California imports were down 9,100 b/d.

Current figures include 56,700 b/d to cover nonreporting companies, all east of California. They do not include Rate Provision No. 16 (military and other government

agencies) receipts, which averaged 37,000 b/d during January, February, and March.

[Barrels per day]

	Week ended May 27	Week ended May 20	4 weeks ended May 27
East of California:			
Crude oil	866,500	654,100	665,000
Residual fuel oil	375,300	320,200	343,300
Distillate fuel oil	6,400	4,700	4,100
Asphalt	24,300	6,800	12,900
Others	20,800		14,700
Total	1,293,300	985,800	1,040,000
California:			
Crude oil	91,600	62,000	85,300
Products			
Total	91,600	62,000	85,300
United States:			
Crude oil	958,100	716,100	750,300
Products	426,800	331,700	375,000
Total	1,384,900	1,047,800	1,125,300

Inside East Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Inside East Germany—Time Is on Side of the Communists," written by George Grim and published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of May 28, 1955. The article is of great interest to me, and I am sure it will be to all who read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSIDE EAST GERMANY—TIME IS ON SIDE OF THE COMMUNISTS

(By George Grim)

EAST BERLIN.—Just beneath what seems to be the iron control the Communists have clamped down on East Berlin—and East Germany—there is secret opposition. Once, 2 years ago, it broke out in resistance to Communist decrees. Then it vanished again.

To assess the depth of this opposition, I had to make furtive trips, some by night, to residential areas of the Communist side of the city. I could give you names and places—but to print them would mean banishment, perhaps death, for these people. What they said, however, is a challenge to American policy.

"You can't wait much longer to do something," said one official of the Red regime. "Of course the overwhelming majority of East Berliners and East Germans would vote for one Germany. Not 3 percent would vote Communist if the election were free. But, with each passing 6 months, that percentage will rise. It may go up sharply.

RED POLICY IS COLD-BLOODED

"This Communist policy is cold-blooded, calculated. It has no emotion, like yours in America. It has consistency. And it can wait and wait and wait until just the right moment for the most effect. Look at Austria—for 10 years and hundreds of meetings, you kept asking the Communists to help draft a peace treaty. Then, suddenly, they agree and get all the credit. They're heroes instead of villains.

"They could do this here. They know that all Germans want to be together.

"Old man Adenauer is 79 and is a sort of Mr. Germany. But the Communist line here is that the West is putting up bait and he rises to it. That he's a new Hitler. That the half-a-million-man army he agreed to raise may be used against fellow Germans here in the East. That West Germany is an American suburb."

I suggested that, at 79, Adenauer didn't have mucht time to become a Hitler.

EAST GERMANS ARE PROPAGANDA VICTIMS

"That's the point," said this official of the Red government—an intense, secret anti-Communist himself. "These East Germans are the victims of complete, all-out propaganda. You've seen the papers, the slogans, the billboards, heard the street loudspeakers, and watched the groups march with Red flags on Sunday.

"Keep this up, year after year, and you'll plant many doubts in adult minds. You Americans say, Where there's smoke there must be fire. Even anti-Communist Germans are beginning to see some Red flames now.

"But the youth indoctrination is complete. Marching songs of the Reds, rewritten school books, discipline that turns them against their parents—all this takes effect quickly. And, as they grow up, where's the resistance to be?"

This official and his wife aren't revolutionaries. They criticize much of what the West has done—and what it is not doing. He runs the risk of discovery. Millions of Germans know his name, his face, and his reputation.

"I believe they know I have not gone over to the Reds by taking this government post," he said. "Would it have been better to have run away to West Germany and worked for you? Which course would you call traitorous?"

Then he let our State Department have both barrels.

"Do you Americans really want a unified Germany?" he asked. "Do you figure that an armed half will somehow bring you safety? On paper, and to a military mind, that may make some foolish sense. But you must remember that the overwhelming desire for Germans is to unite.

"You must never consider the problem at all settled until there is that unity.

"Remember, Russia is unsure of its control over the East Germans. And it has every right to be. But if it can keep this division for another few years, then that control will be established securely. Just how this would stabilize this part of Europe I fail to see. Your policy is not winning the cold war, but losing it."

I asked this man precisely what America should do. But he would never give a direct answer.

"You need a policy first," he said. "You are like a boxer who ducks and weaves and dances about, while the other boxer waits his time to administer that direct blow. Stop dancing."

UNITED STATES POLICY OVERSEAS APPEARS BANKRUPT

From this man, and others in the East who would talk, after my pledge not to reveal their identity, I could see the bankrupt appearance of America's policy—as viewed from the other side of the Berlin Iron Curtain.

Despite all the neon signs and skyscrapers and whipped cream and happy freedom of life in West Berlin, we have not succeeded in approaching a solution to the problem. No amount of whipped cream on the apple cake or pineapple in the sauerkraut can answer the question of a family with half its relatives in the Communist side.

Our Congressmen, even our State Department people, who confidently speak of "tying West Germany to our side against the Russians," are flying a huge paper kite. The prevailing winds are slowly shifting. That kite won't stay up there.

The Communists, as time passes, are saturating the East Germans with antiwestern propaganda. Even scientific laboratories have their "culture rooms" filled with slogans, antiwestern books, pro-Russian technical papers. Man in the street, or intellectual, are both being brainwashed.

DIVIDED GERMANY DOESN'T MEAN SAFETY

We can't assume that a divided Germany will bring us safety. Both east and west of the dividing line, there is the intense desire to be united.

Our State Department must do more than pay lip service to this. While yet the East Germans are against the Reds, we must let them know we're for one Germany.

That's the theme of conversations I had in East and West Berlin. When I pointed out the danger of a united Germany siding with Russia in some future year, I was told:

"First, let us be one nation. Then you'll see that we are not Communists. We don't like their system, their creed. We will never be willing Moscow satellites."

You can argue that one if you like. It could hamstring a real policy on Germany. But you can be sure of one thing:

When we back a political party which doesn't really want Germany unified, you can kiss that race goodby.

Tribute To Mrs. Glenn G. Hays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article regarding Mrs. Glenn G. Hays of Ransom, Kans., national president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. The article appeared in the June 2 issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union has, through 82 years of its existence, been active in its support of programs which have called the attention of the people to the evils of intemperance and strong drink. These programs have been carried on through the schools and churches of our Nation.

In this campaign of education, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is pointing out the effects of liquor advertising on the youth of our Nation. One effect of the educational program, Mrs. Hays states, is that—

The child who learns early how and why to leave alcohol absolutely alone for all time will never have his future clouded by the possibility of becoming an addictive drinker.

Mr. President, I commend to the Senate a reading of the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAN GRAPPLES WITH WCTU MYTH

(By Godfrey Sperling, Jr.)

EVANSTON, ILL.—The gracious, friendly woman from western Kansas who now directs the Woman's Christian Temperance Union possesses a keen competence and

glowing attractiveness that remind one of Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican, of Maine.

To be able to describe a WCTU leader with such superlatives is not without point. In the minds of a sizable segment of the public, a WCTU worker is a prissy, militant woman with an ax upraised to destroy the demon drink.

Mrs. Glenn G. Hays, who views this warped viewpoint with a tolerant smile, says that the latest national-magazine coverage of the temperance movement is also in print. The writer of that article interviewed her, and quoted her, but did not ask for her picture. Instead he used a picture of Carrie Nation to illustrate the WCTU.

"Carrie Nation was from my home State," Mrs. Hays says, "but we do not consider her a representative of the WCTU. In my historical work, I have been unable to find that she was even affiliated with our organization for more than a single year."

LIQUOR INTERESTS BLAMED

This does not mean that Mrs. Hays takes a critical attitude toward Carrie Nation. She is aware, of course, of the busybody portrait of the woman that now prevails in the public mind. And this, like the negative picture of the WCTU which is being presented from some quarters, she deplores. She attributes both distortions to propaganda from the liquor interests.

Mrs. Hays, her associates will tell you, personifies not only the enlightened WCTU approach to the liquor problem but also a significant shift in organizational policy.

Prohibition, for instance, is a word not often used in Mrs. Hays' utterances. This does not mean that she does not believe in legal restraints wherever possible. It is just that she feels it is more realistic to stress alcohol education at this time.

Her principal legislative project now is to put an end to liquor advertising. She observes that "any legislation—National, State, or local—which makes alcoholic beverages less readily available in public places has always resulted in reducing the consumption of alcoholic beverages and is a protection to young people."

It is only through alcohol education, she says, that people can come to accept either self-imposed or State-imposed restraints.

The WCTU program, as it has always been throughout its 82 years of existence, is based on religion and church activity. Of this year's program, Mrs. Hays says:

"WCTU women propose a program which will impress upon every church member the cardinal truth that spiritual values have their roots in the influence of Christ's teaching in everyday living as well as in worship, an emphasis which demands of every citizen that his Christianity show in his business and social life as well as in his charities.

FOCUS ON SCHOOLS

"Stated concretely in relation to the liquor traffic, this proposition recognizes the authenticity of that old truism, 'The church could destroy the liquor traffic if it would; the liquor traffic would destroy the church if it could.'"

The schools and colleges, however, remain the principal focal point of the WCTU program. State constitutions generally provide that education about liquor and its effects should be taught. And the WCTU intends that alcohol education from the standpoint of abstinence, not moderation, shall reach the children.

At the same time that the Yale Center of Alcohol Studies is making headway in indoctrinating many teachers with what the WCTU terms "acceptance of moderation," it can be reported that the WCTU is, nonetheless, greatly enlarging its sphere of alcohol-education influence.

PROGRAM APPROVAL WON

These WCTU gains have come about, in part, through the setting up of a narcotic-education consultant who works directly with State boards of education throughout the United States.

This consultant has been able to win approval for the WCTU program in man States. This means that now WCTU representatives and other workers for abstinence are supported by State-level backing when they go to local school boards or teachers and ask that the abstinence approach to alcohol education be stressed.

There is also a shift away from temperance essay and poster contests, which the WCTU now believes hold none of the long-range value of a serious, factual program in the schools. Teachers are shown how these facts can be made most attractive to the pupils—by correlating the information in English, history, safety, civics, and other courses.

Of the effect of such teaching, Mrs. Hays says:

"The child who learns early how and why to leave alcohol absolutely alone for all time will never have this future clouded by the possibility of becoming an addictive drinker."

Christ's Teaching for the Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it was my privilege to listen to one of the most interesting and significant sermons of my life at St. Helena's Cathedral in Helena, Mont., on Sunday, May 22, 1955.

His Excellency the Most Reverend Joseph P. Dougherty, Bishop of Yakima, Wash., delivered the sermon at the baccalaureate mass on the occasion of the graduation of the class of 1955 of Carroll College, one of the outstanding Catholic colleges of the United States. His theme was that Christ's teaching offers special armament in the atomic age, and I commend his remarks to the Senate of the United States for careful study. They are well worth our most serious consideration.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRADS OF CARROLL TOLD TRUTH GIVES KEYS TO FUTURE—CHRIST'S TEACHING IS SPECIAL ARMAMENT OF ATOMIC AGE, YAKIMA BISHOP SAYS

"As graduates of Carroll College you need not fear the future if you listen to the lessons of truth taught you by our college," the Most Reverend Joseph P. Dougherty, bishop of Yakima, told the Carroll graduates of 1955 in his sermon given at the Baccalaureate Mass at St. Helena's Cathedral Sunday, May 22. Speaking on The Catholic College Graduate in the Atomic Age, Bishop Dougherty declared that even though the world may fear the future of the atomic age, the graduates need not do so, "Because your knowledge of the truth and your desire to seek it always will make you free to face the realities of life on earth as you go forward to the eternal destiny for which you were created and redeemed."

The special armament of the class of 1955 in the atomic age is the truth of Christ, said Bishop Dougherty. The Church, ever faithful to its divine commission to teach the truth, has founded colleges and universities, such as Carroll, to testify to the truth in every age and place.

TESTIMONY TO TRUTH

Bishop Dougherty charged the graduates to give testimony to the truth in their own lives. "During these next 45 years you will have your own spheres of influence where you will give testimony to the truth, and its testimony will have an ever widening effect upon the people whom you will meet in your social life and in your business and professional life. You will not be alone; you will be united with other men and women whose training in truth has been similar to yours. The force of truth, if properly guided, should bring sufficient men to demand the things that will bring peace to the world."

The complete text of Bishop Dougherty's sermon is as follows:

"This is why I was born, and why I come into the world, to bear witness to the truth." John xviii, 37.

We have entered the second decade of the atomic age. We are unaware, though, that a definite transition has been accomplished and that we have been a part of it because we have not yet adjusted ourselves to the more rapid pace of our lives in this new era. Nevertheless, we are definitely in a vastly different life from the kind we knew 10 years ago when the first atomic bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Even though our bodies have not been affected by the radioactivity of those explosions and the later experimental blasts on land and sea, still our minds have been impressed by the power that was displayed.

SCIENTISTS FEAR ATOM

People stand in awe at what has happened. Scientists are fearful of an uncontrolled nuclear explosion. Prior to the atomic age some scientists were the first to scoff at fear; now all scientists are prompt in admitting their fears of what may come to pass. As for the rest of us, we know that if there is an all-out war with the full array of nuclear weapons, the end will have come; and so in our day we have seen science advance to a point where its high priests have become reverential before the unseen division of the atom, which they had conquered but which, in turn, has conquered them.

With the development of the atomic age, whether we consider the material and even spiritual advances that it will bring us in industrial development, or the destruction it will shower upon us in war, we know that most people cannot keep pace with its speed because they are not geared to it, inasmuch as their way of thinking has been damaged by the abrasion of secularism, which destroys the fine equipment of their faculties of intellect and will for thinking and acting as God's creatures—equipment which includes the compass of their conscience that would lead them along a course well defined by God's law to the correct solution of problems that arise out of the speed of living in the atomic age.

Now, all we find are the newspaper notices of the disruption of the lives of individuals and families; the increase in the numbers of people who cannot adjust themselves to their sociological problems, so that they seek the easy way out of murder and suicide. Many moderns find death easier than facing the problems which the speed of the atomic age crowds upon them, and even for those who do not seek a release from their problems in death literally millions wander restlessly upon the earth in an unreal world created by their minds that are disturbed

by a very real world over which they have no control.

BLUEPRINT FOR FUTURE

This is the kind of world into which you are going as college graduates. It bears a more frightening prospect than that which the graduates faced at the height of the depression during the early thirties and during the war years. But the more I think about it the more convinced I am that the blueprint for the future should not be changed. It is the same blueprint that was prepared by our Master for His own disciples and it has been the plan for your training here at Carroll College.

When the Blessed Saviour was on trial before the civil governor of Palestine, Pilate asked him the question filled with irony, "Art thou then a king?" To which our Lord replied, "Thou sayest it: I am a king." And then He added most significantly, "This is why I was born, and why I have come into the world, to bear witness to the truth. Everyone that is of the truth, hears my voice."

Thus did our Blessed Saviour state the purpose of the Redemption. In His coming into the world, the angel had said to Joseph, "Thou shalt call His name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins." And now the Redeemer Himself tells us that He will save His people by giving testimony to the truth. Men would be freed from the shackles of sin and error by the truth: The truth would make them free, so that they would have life and have it more abundantly; so, indeed, that they would have eternal life with God.

The truth whereby men would be saved would be taught by those who would be commissioned by Christ Himself through His church to give testimony to it. The Apostles and their successors, the popes and bishops, would bear the primary responsibility for teaching the truth, and in every age and place, they would identify with their teaching office qualified persons to testify to every facet of truth in the whole range of learning, through the arts and sciences to theology, the queen of the sciences. For this reason, schools and colleges developed in the Middle Ages from the residential schools of bishops and abbots, and although in some instances they became vast universities, they retained their identity in one way or other with the bishops of their localities. Ever and always the Catholic colleges were distinguished for their fidelity to their mission of teaching the truth. Catholic college men were called upon in their day to suffer the red martyrdom of blood for the same truth, but the vast majority of them suffered the white martyrdom of disdain and ridicule for having given testimony to the truth.

To bring this history to our own time and place, we know that 46 years ago the bishop of Helena, John Patrick Carroll, mindful of his commission to give testimony to the truth in every phase of human learning, established the school which developed into the college of which you are privileged to have been students. The glorious traditions established by Bishop Carroll were continued by his successors in office, and especially by the present bishop of Helena, his excellency, Bishop Gilmore, who had served as a professor on the staff of the college when he was a young priest and who helped guide the destiny of the college while he was chancellor of the diocese of Helena.

Carroll College took root at a time when the flame of materialism was burning at its fiercest heat in other colleges and universities, and except for its native strength, the college would have been destroyed at the outset. It continued to grow, despite this handicap, and weathered other attacks made upon it and other comparable colleges. The day came when men asking Pilate's question, "What is truth?" attempted to bring to bear the full force of pragmatism to eliminate the small colleges by educational attrition, because in their estimation they could serve no useful purpose in competition with larger schools which stressed the utilitarian approach in the fields of learning. Truth prevailed, although it took the purging fire of war to enable our youth to appreciate the values of truth wherein they would find their freedom: and so in this atomic age which has taken its origin in the closing years of the first half of the century, we find young men and women eagerly seeking truth in a college which is equipped to teach it, not only in classes of religion or metaphysics but in the whole diapason of the college curricula.

Although Carroll College is listed as one of the smaller colleges in comparison with richly endowed schools, yet it has sent men and women into the world well equipped with the armament of truth, who in their own spheres of influence, have given testimony to the truth in such manner as to have made a worthwhile contribution to the well-being of the communities in which they have lived, offsetting specifically the evils of secularism which would tend to exclude God and religion in every phase of life.

But what of you of today's graduation class and of your future in the atomic age?

What is said on this commencement day you will not long remember: It will be the lessons of truth which you will remember—lessons taught in philosophy and literature, in the science laboratories, in the mathematics classes, in the courses of nursing education, in the professional study of truth in its highest form in religion and theology, and above all in the informal lessons acquired from your association with the priests of the diocese of Helena and with the lay faculty, all of whom have dedicated their lives to truth. You will remember especially that you must ever and always thirst for the truth.

As graduates of Carroll College, you stand at the threshold of the second decade of the atomic age, looking into a future of uncertainty and fear for what the coming years may hold. As you look ahead, you are thinking of the destruction that has been wrought on the earth in your own lifetime by man's attempt to live by the confusing and ruinous philosophies, which he has inherited from the intellectual imperialists of another day.

You look for that which you desire most for yourselves—namely, peace: It will mean so much for your social and economic life, and, indeed, for your eternal life; but you can foresee nothing that will guarantee it. Peace should be the result—the work—of justice, which in turn should rest on the pillars of truth. The persons who have already spent more than 10 years in the anteroom of the peace table cannot agree on the basic terminology for the application of justice which should flow from the natural law. Fundamentally, they cannot agree on what constitutes truth. Most appropriately could the question which Pilate addressed to Christ be used as a motto over the doorway of the peace chambers with all the sarcasm of Pilate himself, "What Is Truth?"

Yes, what of the future for you if men cannot agree on truth itself? The answer is startling when we visualize what is happening—the atom bomb and hydrogen bomb and even more terrible weapons of war are being carried over terrain of the future which is pocked with the pitfalls of secularism by men whose lack of knowledge of the criteria of truth causes them to walk insecurely with their murderous burdens, thereby endangering the whole of civilization.

As graduates of Carroll College you need not fear the future if you listen to the lessons of truth taught you by your college. Come what may, you will be ready for any eventuality. The life expectancy of your age group should bring the majority of you to the end of this century. During these next 45 years you will have your own spheres of influence where you will give testimony to the truth, and its testimony will have an ever-widening effect upon the people whom you will meet in your social life and in your business and professional life. You will not be alone; you will be united with other men and women whose training in truth has been similar to yours. The force of truth, if properly guided, should bring sufficient men to demand the things that will bring peace to the world.

And this peace on earth is only a prelude to the peace of the eternal life guaranteed to those who are of the truth. The truth to which Christ gave testimony culminates in the possession of eternal life, the end for which man was created. Anything short of this makes truth a mockery, stunts its growth, does not allow it to mature to its fullness.

And so, my dear graduates, your college bids you farewell, and this it does with a feeling that even though the world may fear the future of the atomic age, you need not do so, because your knowledge of the truth and your desire to seek it always will make you free to face the realities of life on earth as you go forward to the eternal destiny for which you were created and redeemed. This farewell of your alma mater is extended to you in no empty ceremony but in connection with the holy sacrifice of the Mass, which is the renewal of the sacrifice of the cross on Calvary, which itself was Christ's greatest testimony to the truth. Go thy separate ways in peace. Wear proudly the badge of truth with the distinctive colors of Carroll College, so that all whom you meet in life may read it even as some of them may run from reality. Go forth with the prayers of the college faculty accompanying you down the years to the day, please God, when we shall be united in the full possession of the truth for which Christ was born and for which He came into the world.

Available Aluminum Supplies for Industrial Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. KERR SCOTT

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I ask unanimous consent that an exchange of correspondence between his office and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization; Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., and Representative SIDNEY R. YATES, of Illinois, relating to available aluminum supplies for industrial use, be printed in the RECORD of today.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., May 24, 1955.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: This will ackowledge your letter of May 3, 1955. You ask by what directive to General Services Administration, the agency charged by Executive Order with administering the guaranteed marketing contracts, or to any other Gov-

ernment agency, has the Office of Defense Mobilization protected the rights and interests of the nonintegrated aluminum users by guaranteeing that the additional aluminum available for industrial use as a result of the cancellation of proposed stockpile purchases will be made available for sale to them by the primary producers.

The reply to your question is that no directive was issued by the Office of Defense Mobilization for the reason that in the opinion of my General Counsel the rights of the nonintegrated users are set forth very clearly in existing contracts between the producers and the Government.

As you pointed out in your letter, the guaranteed market contracts between the Government and the primary aluminum producers provide that two-thirds of the production of primary aluminum covered by the contracts, less the quantities purchased by the Government, must be made available by the primary producers for sale to the nonintegrated users.

Accordingly, when the Office of Defense Mobilization directed the General Services Administration to reduce its acquisition of aluminum for the stockpile by 150 million pounds in the first 6 months of 1955, the primary producers were obligated by contract to make additional aluminum available to the nonintegrated users unless deliveries already arranged were sufficiently in excess of contract obligations as to cover the increment.

In carrying out its responsibilities for administering procurement contracts, the General Services Administration receives periodic reports as to the distribution of all aluminum produced in facilities covered by the guaranteed marketing contracts to assure that nonintegrated users receive the amount of aluminum which the primary producers are contractually obligated to deliver to them. Thus far it appears that the primary producers have provided nonintegrated users with primary aluminum in amounts in excess of those called for by the contracts.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
June 6, 1955.

Mr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense
Mobilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: Senator MURRAY is in Geneva, Switzerland, attending an international conference as United States delegate, and I have communicated with him about your letter of May 24 in answer to his of May 3. We have now exchanged five letters on the current primary aluminum shortage for independent users and your recent order deferring aluminum shipments to the stockpile. The Senator recognizes that you have only recently received his latest letter. However, he considers that your answers to date have been unseemly brief and almost totally nonresponsive.

In his initial letter to you dated April 1 he pointed out that a deception was perpetrated in the writing of the Government guaranteed marketing contracts. This resulted in a travesty on the original intent of these contracts which sought in part to assure additional supplies of primary aluminum for nonintegrated users. Your failure to comment on this statement leads him to believe that you share this view.

You provide no answer to question No. 1 of Senator MURRAY's April 1 letter which asked whether the Government knows if the provisions of the guaranteed marketing contracts are being carried out by the primary producers. He assumes, therefore, that you do not know whether these provisions are being enforced.

You indicated, in answer to question No. 2, that the General Services Administration is responsible for administering the guaranteed marketing contracts. Senator MURRAY wants to know who in GSA determines policy matters concerning equitable distribution of aluminum under these contracts.

In answer to the Senator's question No. 3 of April 1 regarding steps taken by GSA to assure equitable distribution of aluminum under the contracts and in answer to his question of May 3 asking specifically what directive action ODM took to protect the rights and interests of the nonintegrated aluminum users, you indicate that no directive was issued because, in the opinion of your general counsel, "the rights of the nonintegrated users are set forth very clearly in existing contracts between the producers and the Government."

The testimony of the three primary producers on Tuesday and Wednesday of this week, May 24 and 25, before House Small Business Subcommittee No. 3 belies the clarity which you contend exists in these contracts. Each of these primary producers appears to have a separate and different view of the rights of the nonintegrated users under these contracts.

Mr. Richard S. Reynolds, Jr., president of the Reynolds Metals Co., told the subcommittee: "Our primary reason for producing pig was to provide our own fabricating plants with raw material." He also told the subcommittee: "We are fabricators and merchants; we went into the business for that purpose, not to supply other people aluminum."

Reynolds does not consider itself a supplier of aluminum pig, notwithstanding requirements of the guaranteed marketing contracts that they sell primary aluminum to independent users. Has it been Reynolds' intention not to live up to their contracts with the Government?

In 1951 the same Mr. Reynolds, testifying before a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee studying monopoly in the aluminum industry, testified: "But let me point out we went into the aluminum production not to supply ingots; we went in as having a source of raw material for our own fabricating plants. We have fabricating plants that can fabricate twice as much aluminum as we can produce."

Either Reynolds' representation that it would supply aluminum to independent users under a guaranteed marketing contract was not true or the contract was given to Reynolds by the Government irrespective of Reynolds' disavowal of intention to live up to the contract.

The benefit of the Nation's credit was extended to Reynolds to support its own credit to enable the company to build facilities to produce additional primary aluminum. Either they obtained the benefits of Government aid by trick and device, or it was forced upon them by a Government agency that knew in advance that the company would not live up to the guaranteed marketing contract.

The general counsel of GSA, testifying before the House Small Business Subcommittee Number 3 on May 23, told the subcommittee the primary producers have a moral obligation to sell primary aluminum produced from facilities covered by these contracts to the non-integrated users. Does this moral right flow from the contract?

In light of these varying versions of the obligations of the primary producers under these contracts, Senator MURRAY insists on having your counsel's views on the rights and obligations of all parties to the contracts. This should not be too difficult to detail if the contracts are as clear as your counsel tells you they are.

Irrespective of any revival of the third round of primary aluminum expansion which seems pressaged by recent announcement in the press that two companies have made proposals to enter the primary production field, Senator MURRAY wants a prompt and detailed answer to all the foregoing.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. MURRAY,
Administrative Assistant.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
June 6, 1955.

Hon. HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.
United States Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Senator MURRAY is in Geneva, Switzerland, attending an international conference as United States delegate, and so he has asked me to transmit to you a copy of a letter from Director Arthur S. Flemming of the Office of Defense Mobilization regarding the aluminum shortage for independent users and the reply which the Senator directed to be sent to Mr. Flemming.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. MURRAY,
Administrative Assistant.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
June 6, 1955.

Hon. SIDNEY R. YATES,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 3,
Select Committee on Small Business,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YATES: Senator MURRAY is in Geneva Switzerland, attending an international conference as United States delegate, and in his absence I am acknowledging your letter of May 31.

I am sure the Senator will be pleased at your reaction to his letter of May 24 and that it will be inserted in the record of your proceedings.

Senator MURRAY has asked me to transmit to you a copy of Mr. Flemming's answer to his letter of May 3, together with our answer thereto.

With best regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. MURRAY,
Administrative Assistant.

Pressure of Liquor Advertisers on Press and Radio-TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, as author of H. R. 4627, which is a bill to ban liquor advertising and beercasting in publications and on radio and television in interstate commerce, I wish to call the attention of this body to a front page article in Advertising Age bearing yesterday's dateline in which is set forth not only the advertising policy of the distillers, but also their apparent attempt to influence the editorial policy as well as the newscolumns of the daily press.

I would also like to point out how subservient radio and television networks are to the brewing industry as shown in

an editorial which appeared in the Christian Century, May 25, 1955, and which is entitled "Does Beer Belong to Radio-TV or Radio-TV Belong to Beer?":

[From Advertising Age of June 6, 1955]

OR ELSE—SEAGRAM ASKS EDITORIAL SUPPORT OF MODERATION AD

NEW YORK, June 2.—A stern warning to newspapers to come up with more and better merchandising services or face loss of advertising has been voiced by George Mosley, vice president in charge of advertising and sales promotion for Seagram Distillers Co.

Mr. Mosley made his comments at a luncheon at which representatives of about 160 newspapers received insertion orders for this year's moderation ad, slated to run during the week of June 13.

He said that the liquor industry was looking for more merchandising ideas and more cooperation on advertising positioning from newspapers, rather than statistical studies.

"We're looking for constructive merchandising suggestions from all the media in which we spend our money," he said.

Mr. Mosley noted that national consumption of liquor has gone down in the last 3 years, even though general prosperity is at a high level. "Liquor advertising is facing a challenge," he said, pointing out that one of the questions was whether or not newspaper advertising is productive.

"The day may come when we will have to cut the costs to fit the pattern," he cautioned the newspaper representatives.

Mr. Mosley was preceded at the luncheon by Sam Youngheart, vice president of Warwick and Legler, agency for Seagram's 7 Crown and institutional copy. Mr. Youngheart had praised newspaper advertising for the role it played in maintaining the sales lead of Seagram's 7 Crown and criticized editorial departments for the bad press they gave the liquor business by playing up such things as drunken driving.

He introduced his moderation ad, 37th in a series which began in 1934. Written with graduations and father's day in mind, the ad is headlined, "Your son can write his own future." It stresses the father's role in giving his son good living habits and opportunities.

Along with the insertion order, newspaper representatives received a request for special positioning as well as "editorial support."

Positioning preferences were, in order: back page of paper, back page of section, page facing editorial page, and "live news page far forward with carryover of front page news."

The positioning request, signed by Warwick and Legler media buyer Peter Marron, continued:

"We are aware that some of the newspapers you represent are editorially combating juvenile delinquency. We feel, therefore, that the theme of this advertisement, which points out the opportunities offered young men through better education, infers that, delinquency could be minimized through education. We know that this subject at the moment is strongly in the public's interest, especially in the light of the many current problems concerning juvenile delinquency.

"We hope that your publishers, through you, will see fit to give it a maximum of editorial support."

The newspaper representatives were asked to fill in a report on the position to be expected and state whether or not there would be editorial support.

[From the Christian Century of May 25, 1955]

DOES BEER BELONG TO RADIO-TV, OR RADIO-TV BELONG TO BEER?

Some Americans who deplore the increasing sale of alcoholic beverages, especially beer, think that the temperance advocates who are trying to restrict liquor advertising over the air have been tilting at windmills. Have they? Well, here's a speech that has a bearing on the answer. It was made by Robert C. Kintner, president of the American Broadcasting Co., to the United States Brewers Foundation at its Los Angeles convention. The Chrstian Science Monitor printed it on May 7. Mr. Kintner started by telling the brewers how nervous it made him to speak on the same program with Mr. (Anheuser) Busch and before such "a large number of people who spend a great deal of money on ABC." Then he swung into this:

"Let me say first of all I would not have accepted your invitation if ABC was not a willing servant of the beer industry. I say that advisedly because I have heard people criticize the broadcasting business, as a public franchise, for taking beer advertising. As far as ABC is concerned, we not only actively solicit it, we definitely want it; we believe it is a basic part of the American scene just like our radio and television business is. So let me say that we approach your industry with a great desire, both on our local stations and on our network, to cut the pattern to fit your cloth. And may I compliment, very sincerly, the United States Brewers Foundation and its advertising agensy, the J. Walter Thompson Co., for the building up by advertising and public relaitons of the concept that 'beer belongs' as a family drink of a freedom-loving people. The part radio and television has played in helping you in bringing beer into the home has been a part of which we are proud. The more the story appears and is told generally, the greater is consumption."

We regret that space considerations keep us from reprinting this gem of huckster eloquence in full. But the temperance people owe Mr. Kintner a vote of thanks for this testimony from the radio-TV industry itself that the purpose of liquor advertising over the air is to get liquor into the home.

City of Minot Fights To Keep Veterans Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable agitation in my State at the present time against the closing of the veterans hospital at Minot, which was recommended by the Hoover Commission task force. One of the criticisms of the Minot Hospital has been that local doctors are fighting the hospital. In order that all the current facts in this case may be brought to light, I request permission to include the following material in my remarks:

NOTICE

To the Veterans' Administration:

At the proposed hearing relative to the closing of the John Moses Memorial Hospital, you are requested to have available the following men:

Dr. Donald McCarthy, area Chief of Professional Services, Veterans' Administration, St. Paul, Minn.

Dr. Einar C. Andreassen, Area Medical Director, St. Paul, Minn.

Dr. John McHugh, manager and Chief of Professional Services, Veterans' Administration Hospital, Kansas City, Mo.

Dr. Roland Hipsley, manager and Chief of Professional Services, John Moses Memorial Veterans' Hospital.

You are further requested to make available to the mayor of the city of Minot, the Minot Chamber of Commerce, and to all interested persons, the original reports and evidentiary material upon which the decision to close the John Moses Memorial Veterans' Hospital is based, and a copy of the decision to close.

You are further requested to make this information available by May 30, 1955, in order that these instruments may be examined prior to the time of hearing.

McGEE & VAN SICKLE,
Attorneys for the Minot Chamber of Commerce, Minot, N. Dak.
BRUCE M. VAN SICKLE,
Member of the firm of McKee & Van Sickle.

STATEMENT OF DR. CAMERON, CONFERENCE WITH DR. CAMERON, MAY 20, 1955

On Tuesday, May 17, 1955, Dr. Andreasson, area medical director, St. Paul, Minn., and Dr. McCarthy, area chief of professional services, Veterans' Administration, St. Paul, Minn., had a conference with Dr. Cameron in his office at the Northwest Clinic, Minot, N. Dak. At that time they stated that they were here to examine the hospital to determine whether the hospital should be closed.

In the course of that conference, Dr. Cameran offered to go all out in order to keep a medical staff available to the John Moses Memorial Veterans' Hospital in Minot. Dr. Andreasson said that the hospital's need was full-time men. Dr. Andreasson also stated that for some reason, when Minot is mentioned to these men, they are afraid to come come up here, and at that time said that mentioning Minot was like mentioning the North Pole.

In the conversation, salaries were contrasted, and Dr. Andreasson said that one of the difficulties was the disparity between Veterans' Administration salaries and salaries offered doctors here and elsewhere in private practice.

Dr. Cameron pointed out:

A. That his preferred minimum was $12,000 per year for beginners. He occasionally starts them at less.

B. This is the entire benefit received by the incoming doctor.

However, a Veterans' Administration doctor receives all of his fringe benefits; receives a minimum of $10,000 a year, plus living quarters; and a man interested in his professional development finds available here the broadest possible scope of medical problems and the finest possible equipment.

Dr. Cameron suggested that he never has any insurmountable difficulty recruiting men and that if the staff hospital manager were authorized to go out after professional personnel, the problem would be solved.

A. L. C.

Dated May 20, 1955.

BRUCE M. VAN SICKLE.

STATEMENT OF DR. BRESLICH

Dr. Breslich spends considerable time at the John Moses Memorial Hospital. During the conversation with Dr. Wall at the John Moses Memorial Hospital, Dr. Breslich was informed by Dr. Wall of the hospital staff, that Minot has a bad name because of the practice of forcing medical men to stay in Minot until they are relieved. This practice is contrary to the general rule. Dr. Wall added in the same conversation, that the same thing was done at a West Virginia hospital and when the hospital changed its policy, and allowed the medical personnel to move freely after 2 years, there was no longer any difficulty in keeping it staffed.

Dated May 21, 1955.

BRUCE M. VAN SICKLE.

STATEMENT OF DR. HART, NORTHWEST CLINIC, MINOT, N. D.

Dr. Hart, on May 20, 1955, had occasion to go into a downtown Minot store and was accosted with this question: "What's the matter with you doctors that you're fighting the hospital?"

This is an example of the positive harm done by the false declarations that Minot doctors are fighting the hospital.

Dated May 21, 1955.

BRUCE M. VAN SICKLE.

The meeting is scheduled for June 6 at Minot, and while it cannot be predicted what the final outcome will be, there can be no doubt that the people there are determined to try to work out some way to maintain this magnificent new hospital.

Industry-Financed Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in yesterday's New York Times there was published an editorial entitled "Industry-Financed Security." I am sure we are all gratified to know that the strike which had just started yesterday in the Ford industry has been peacefully settled, and that some kind of an agreement looking toward industry-financed security has been entered into. I think the editorial is very thought-provoking, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRY-FINANCED SECURITY

Whether or not a Ford strike is averted, it is clear that the contract negotiations between the company and the United Automobile Workers have added a new dimension to collective bargaining. Agreement has been reached on the principle that an employer has an obligation to provide financial protection for jobless workers beyond the limits of State unemployment insurance systems.

This does not mean the "guaranteed annual wage" the union first demanded. But there is little reason to doubt that the principle accepted by Ford will spread through most mass-production industries. Union pressure will be strong for its adoption in the rest of the automotive field, in electrical manufacturing, in steel, in rubber, in railroads, in shipping, and in many other sections of the economy. With pension and welfare programs already broadly established as responsibilities of industry, employers will now add another layer of security to that provided by Government.

The economic implications of this trend cannot be assessed in absolute terms. Certainly it is desirable to give industry a greater stimulus toward stabilizing employment by leveling out the ups and downs of production that mean overtime work one month and layoffs the next. Certainly it is constructive to provide increased purchasing power for workers idle through no fault of their own, especially when our State legislatures have been so slow to bring unemployment insurance checks up to reasonably adequate levels in most States.

It is a demonstration of the vitality of the democratic process that so fundamental a change in old concepts of labor-management relations was made by voluntary agreement without Government intervention. Union and company representatives worked out their own accord on principle and on the amount of money that should be used to implement the principle. Yesterday's hectic down-to-the-wire talks were concerned primarily with how much security the proposed expenditure could buy.

But the whole move for industry-financed unemployment support systems will prove destructive if employers and unions forget that the price must be paid out of increased productivity. There are some industries in which any rise in production costs is bound to aggravate deep-rooted economic woes. Coal mining and textiles are two areas in which automatic extension of the notion that what Ford does all industry must do, would jeopardize the solvency of the employers and the marketability of their product. Even within prosperous industries there will be many companies that cannot assume new costs without inviting bankruptcy.

How well the Nation can sustain this new item of fixed payroll cost if a slump carries us well below our present high level of output no one can tell. Nor is it possible to predict what the long-run impact will be on curtailing job opportunities. Inevitably employers will hesitate to hire new workers if they must guarantee them anything like full pay for as much as a year after they stop working. Instead the tendency will be to rely on a minimal work force, with overtime in periods of peak production.

But our economy has proved itself fantastically resilient. It has provided the highest level of wages, security benefits, and living standards for our people. We are confident it will be able to undertake this newest impost without strain if industry and labor concentrate on full realization of the yield recent advances in the field of automation make possible.

The Glory of Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial printed in the East Side News, a local newspaper published in my district. The editorial is entitled "The Glory of Youth":

THE GLORY OF YOUTH

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

"Each is given a bag of tools,
A shapeless mass,
A book of rules;
And each must make
Ere life is flown,
A stumbling block
Or a stepping stone."

—*R. L. Sharpe.*

This is a salute to young America. We call on all to act for the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency, so that our children and our youth may fulfill their promise and become effective citizens of the Nation. For the youth of today is the maturity of tomorrow.

The national character can never be higher than the composite of the individual characteristics of the citizens who make up the Nation. We must help our youth into good citizenship, founded on respect for love of God and man. Each individual has within himself a small scale battlefield where truth triumphs over falsehood, where right conquers wrong, where goodness defeats evil, where eternal verity rises over viciousness.

Each individual must erect his own spiritual barriers. Each individual must be on guard against snipers and bombers who would, with their hellish weapons of insinuations, who would, with their lying propaganda, weaken his moral and religious rampart before the surrender of his immortal soul. Every parent owes his child a knowledge of God whose light shines for those who seek it.

The youth who heeds the teachings of his parents, of his spiritual leaders, and of his schoolteacher is not likely to become a delinquent. The home, church, and school are the greatest influence in building the lives of our children.

Every time a boy goes wrong, a good man dies. Every time a bad boy is reclaimed, a good man is born.

Youth of America: Your future is not padlocked. You have a place in the sun. This is the march of youth instead of the march of time.

This is an age of great challenge. This is an age of great opportunity. During the long period of our history, no generation has been free from challenge. History abounds with illustrations of youth who have risen to fame and fortune.

We can only recite a few—

Alexander Hamilton was Secretary of the Treasury at 32.

Alexander Graham Bell invented the telephone at 28.

George Eastman produced the dry plates for photography at 26.

Henry Ford produced his first motor car at 29.

George Westinghouse invented the air brake at 22.

Thomas Edison invented the incandescent lamp at 32.

F. W. Woolworth established his first store at 26.

John D. Rockefeller organized the Standard Oil Co. at 31.

John Wanamaker opened his first store at 31.

Luther Burbank produced the "Burbank Potato" at 22.

Dr. Robert Hutchins became president of the University of Chicago at 30.

Dr. Carter Davidson became president of Knox College at 31.

Dr. Charles William Eliot became president of Harvard at 35.

These men were products of American opportunity. These men were products of American enterprise.

Young people of America: Glory in your freedom, and use your freedom gloriously. Dedicate yourself with all the splendid vigor of your youth to this high purpose: That the American standard may fly high over a free and happy people.

We must protect our democracy. We must have an immutable determination to give our all, if need be, for the preservation of American way of life.

With faith in your country, with spirit and understanding, with courage and sacrifice, we may be assured that: The age of challenge will usher in the age of great achievement. May God grant youth guidance to use their talents well. May God help youth to solve the greatest objective of mankind—peace—not by force—but with freedom.

Give your best to America. America will give its best to you.

United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Saturday, June 4, it was my privilege to journey to Columbus, Ohio, to address the Buckeye state department of a great veterans organization of which we are truly proud—American Veterans of World War II.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

(Address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY at State convention, AMVETS, Department of Ohio, June 4, 1955)

Last summer I was in Europe on an assignment from the Secretary of State and in my capacity as then chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It was during that critical period when the French Chamber of Deputies rejected the European Defense Community. During the days immediately following rejection of the EDC, there was widespread dejection. If the French wouldn't accept the EDC, there was no alternative. My voice seemed a lone one in the wilderness. But I kept repeating that the idea of the European Defense Community would not die.

Several days later I met with then Premier Mendes-France. As I spoke with him across his desk, he remarked that many people in France were disturbed at press reports of my comments to the effect that the idea of the EDC would not die. Mendes-France said that he wanted me clearly to understand that the EDC was dead. But he added that he knew what I meant. What I was saying, said the Premier, was that the spirit of a united free Europe was not dead.

MUST NOT DEAL IN ABSOLUTES

I tell this story because in foreign policy we must not deal in absolutes.

In Western Europe last summer, it was not the EDC or nothing, as many of our friends thought. There were alternatives. They have been explored and today—some 9 months after the EDC was rejected—we see a new hope in Europe. Western Germany has regained her sovereignty; Western European Union is a going concern; plans are well under way to help the Germans build defense forces; and we have in prospect large possibilities of settlement in Europe.

It was erroneous to think that it was EDC or nothing.

Diplomacy has been described as the art of letting the other man have your own way. Diplomacy cannot operate effectively if people think constantly in terms of absolutes—of everything being either black or white.

AMERICANS DEMAND RESULTS

There is perhaps a tendency on the part of Americans to think in these absolute terms. We want to move fast and get things done. "Put up or shut up" is an American phrase that indicates our impatience with halfway measures. We are not satisfied with little results; we want big results, and we want them now.

Having so recently emerged from a frontier period, we feel that all things are possible. Within the confines of the United States, we have been able to control our destiny. As a result of our experience in the last 100 years, it is perhaps but natural that we have a feeling of omnipotence—a capacity to see things that need doing, and then do them.

Now that we move into a position of great importance in the international community, there is a tendency for us to feel that we can manage things in international affairs much as we have managed them in domestic affairs. We tend to think of other nations as box cars that we can move from place to place at will.

LIMITATION ON CONTROL OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

But there are some great differences between domestic and international affairs. For one thing, most of the world is outside the boundaries of the United States. Fifteen-sixteenths of the land area of the world is not under our jurisdiction. Sixteen-seventeenths of the people of the world are foreigners to us, again not subject to our jurisdiction. This means that many events take place over which we can have but little influence and no control.

We may not like what goes on behind the Iron Curtain, but there is not much we can do to prevent it. We may not like to see the Communists take control of China, but we have not been able to stop it. We may not like what Mr. Nehru does in India, but our legislative mandate does not run to India.

Although many of the things which occur outside of the United States may have a terrific impact upon this country, they may in fact be largely beyond our control. Sometimes foreign relations is a little like the weather. We do a lot of talking about it, but not much can be done to control it.

MUST NOT BE DEFEATIST

I do not emphasize this fact with the idea of being defeatist. I underline it because we must understand the world in which we live if we are to be able to exert our maximum influence in it.

Unless we realize that we are but 1 of some 80 nations, albeit the most powerful, we will be a frustrated people when events occur in the international community which we do not like. A frustrated people is not a good foundation on which to build a strong foreign policy—and I must emphasize that public attitudes are extremely important in the formulation and the conduct of our foreign policy. The Senate and the President cannot carry on a foreign policy which is not supported by a substantial majority of the American people. Every single person constitutes one element in that majority, or minority, as the case may be.

INFLUENCING FOREIGN POLICY

I referred earlier to the fact that the United States cannot bring order to the international community by government fiat. There are, of course, ways in which the United States can and does influence international events. Let me mention a few.

INFLUENCE OF MILITARY POWER

In the first place, the military power of this Nation is one of the most important ways of influencing foreign relations. I am not one who believes that our power should be used to compel nations to take courses of action which we might find desirable. Power so used would surely corrupt. But it is necessary that the United States maintain sufficient military power to deter potential aggressors from seeking by force to impose their will on less powerful nations. It has been American military power in the past few years which, in my opinion, has served to prevent Communist encroachment in Europe, South Asia, and to some extent in the Far East.

I have long advocated the establishment of American Air Force bases overseas within striking distance of the centers of production in the Soviet Union. I am convinced that these bases have exercised a tremendous deterrent effect on the Soviet Union. We and our friends know these bases do not exist for purposes of aggression. But they are available in the event the Kremlin should embark on a military adventure against the free.

We need the cooperation of friendly nations throughout the world to maintain these bases. We must not let current dovelike noises from Moscow persuade us to abandon these bases.

INFLUENCE OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

There is another way in which this Nation may influence foreign policy. We can seek to influence policy with economic assistance. Some of our enemies have accused the United States of using its foreign-aid programs to influence the policies of foreign countries. There may have been isolated instances when this has been the case. As a general rule, however, our foreign money programs have not been used to coerce nations to follow a course of action that would be acceptable to this Nation. By way of illustration, I would point to the hundreds of millions of dollars which the United States has made available to India in recent years. I see no evidence that American assistance has corrupted Mr. Nehru or made him change his policy with respect to the United States one bit.

INFLUENCE BY PERSUASION

Another way to influence nations is by persuasion. Our delegates to the United Nations are constantly engaged by word of mouth in expressing American attitudes in the field of foreign policy. They seek to persuade other nations by the honesty of American convictions and the logic of our argument. They try to show that the courses of action we desire are in the best interests not only of the United States, but of the world at large. We also endeavor to influence events abroad by our information programs, which include the Voice of America, libraries, the exchange of students, and motion pictures.

INFLUENCE OF FREEDOM

The most important way in which the United States can influence foreign policy is not by military power, not by money, and not by persuasion. The best way to influence foreign nations to accept American principles of foreign policy is to convey to them the democratic ideas which underlie our system.

For 2,000 years, since the time of Christ, the idea of individual freedom has constantly grown. Man has won liberties for himself in centuries of struggle. There have been times when the individual's deep aspiration to control his own destiny has been thwarted by tyrants, dictators, and authoritarian movements. But over the span of history, the area of man's individual freedom has constantly grown.

THE ROLE OF THE INDIVIDUAL

This is the idea upon which our Nation is founded—the idea that government is the servant of the people and that no nation can expect to develop to its fullest unless it appreciates and honors the role of the individual living in freedom. It is as a result of individual freedom that we get motive power for invention, for economic development, and eventually for a world in which individual free men may live at peace with each other.

This idea of individual freedom is, I believe, the greatest power we have. It is the weapon of free men able to influence other nations to conduct themselves in a way which will be beneficial not only to themselves, but to the United States.

Unfortunately, while the idea of individual freedom is perhaps our greatest strength, we have been weak in using it.

The democratic idealism that fired the imagination and the creative powers of the founders of this Nation has been corrupted

by materialism. We have been so busy developing this Nation that we think in terms of production, salesmanship, and investment. We seem to have a capacity to sell and export every product of America except the bedrock ideals upon which our system rests.

EXPORTING AN IDEA

In concentrating on building a nation we have come close to losing the ability to export an idea. I do not believe we have lost the individual freedom ideals of our forefathers, but those ideas have gotten so mixed up with material things that their underlying importance is lost upon many of us.

That is why I have said that while ideas are our strongest weapon in the worldwide ideological struggle characteristic of this century, we do not use ideas effectively.

AMERICANS AS FREEMEN

Our job throughout the world is to get foreigners to think of Americans not as rich men, but as free men. When the nations of this earth think of the United States not as a rich nation, but as a free nation, and realize that the democratic way offers them also the chance to be free, we will need have no fear but that the Communist conspiracy that walks like a state will be destroyed from within.

One of the best ways by which our democratic ideals can influence foreign nations is to exhibit those ideals in our daily life in the United States. It has been said that the United States is a showcase of democracy. There is truth in this observation. It is certain that the better democracy works in this country, the greater the influence this Nation will have abroad.

ATTAINMENT OF FOREIGN POLICY GOALS

It is easy to state the aim of our foreign policy. It is our policy to bring about and to maintain conditions in the world in which the United States may live at peace and be secure in its freedoms. The difficulty in the conduct of foreign policy is not a difficulty in stating aims, but it is the difficulty of making the day-to-day decisions that will promote our aims. The goals are important, but the means by which we try to attain those goals are equally important.

MILITARY DEFENSE

In recent years United States foreign policy has proceeded along two main lines with bipartisan support.

In the first place, we have sought to maintain our military defenses, and those of allies, at a level sufficiently high to prevent the Communist conspiracy from seeking to impose on free nations its philosophy of collectivism by force. I wish we did not need to maintain a military posture of this kind. As long as the threat continues, we need to be prepared. But the constant maintenance of such a military posture is not the way to settle forever the conflict between communism and democracy.

In a local community, if there is a problem of juvenile delinquency, one way to handle it may be to increase the size of the police force. This may protect the community. It will not, however, eliminate juvenile delinquency. Steps must be taken instead to get at the fundamental causes of juvenile delinquency.

It is somewhat the same in the international community. Free states must maintain their military defenses, but only until it is possible to establish conditions in the world which will prevent situations from arising where force may be needed.

I believe our military defensive strength is now beginning to pay off. The Communists understand forces in being.

ECONOMIC DEFENSE

The second aspect of our present policy is to try to create conditions in the world that will promote stability and eliminate the dangers of military conflict.

The technical assistance program, for example, provides assistance to backward countries which, without such aid, might find themselves in such chaotic conditions that they would tend to throw away their aspirations for individual freedom in exchange for promises of plenty under a collectivist system. I have supported economic and technical assistance over the years. I propose to continue to support those programs because they provide permanent cures for conditions which might otherwise encourage violence.

RELATIONSHIP OF MILITARY AND ECONOMIC DEFENSES

It seems important to me that the American people realize the close relationship which exists between the military aspects of our foreign policy and the economic aspects. Last year the United States spent 75 cents out of every dollar of national expenditures for military purposes. Only some 3 cents was available for economic and foreign policy programs of a nonmilitary type. This balance is not right. We must gradually put more of our national expenditures in the economic column and less in the military column. But movements in this direction cannot take place overnight. They require first the creating of world conditions in which tensions are lessened and the threat of force abated.

GERMANY

In the weeks ahead one of the spots that will merit our special attention is Western Germany. That nation, now reendowed with the attributes of sovereignty that were wrested from her during the war, has cast her lot with the West. Western Germany is now a full-fledged member of NATO. She will soon start creation of forces to serve with other NATO forces in defense of the free nations of Western Europe. Under the able leadership of Chancellor Adenauer, Germany has moved rapidly toward the creation of a genuine democracy.

Yet Germany is in very real danger. She naturally desires to be reunited and it is for that reason that the recent suggestion that Germany be neutralized must be viewed with suspicion. That was a seductive, dangerous, and unrealistic doctrine. Seductive because it may have a wide appeal to those who do not want Germany to become a strong military power again; dangerous because it would take the heart out of our Western defense system; and unrealistic because no nation, with Germany's location, population, and industrial might, could long remain neutral.

But it is just this kind of thing that we must guard against in the weeks ahead.

THE FAR EAST

We must also keep a wary eye on the Far East. The Chinese Communists have recently had a demonstration of the strength of the idea of freedom in Asia. At the Bandung Conference, many of the newly free nations gave positive evidence that they know the dangers of communism. That statesman of the Philippine Republic, Gen. Carlos Romulo, recently told me that he came back from the Bandung Conference "exalted." He told of hearing representatives of newly free Asian nations quote the language of the American Declaration of Independence, the language of Magna Carta, and the language of the Gettysburg Address.

But the fact that there are many in Asia who know of the dangers of communism and who have attached themselves to the ideas of democracy, does not lessen the possibility of Communist China seeking to precipitate situations in which her agents might take over by subversion, supported by force.

Formosa, though a quiet area now, might again become a focal center for potential conflict.

The situation in Vietnam is fraught with danger for freedom. Unless her gallant Premier Diem is able to consolidate his strength, there is danger that communism will infiltrate and conquer that new country.

I mention these matters because they are likely to give us trouble in the weeks ahead.

I wish it were possible for me to predict a future in which all our foreign policy problems would be small ones. I cannot do that. There is one thing we can be sure of in the future and that is that we have lots of trouble ahead of us. There will be occasions when we will feel that the only recourse open is for us to use force. There will be occasions when we will be frustrated almost beyond endurance. There will undoubtedly be instances in which we will be offered panaceas which, though attractive on the surface, may hold within them dangers to our individual liberties.

NEED FOR RESTRAINT AND UNDERSTANDING

As we face the future, I would emphasize the constant need for restraint in our relations with foreign nations and the need for understanding on the part of our people. This is especially important in the weeks immediately ahead.

Our President will be meeting with the leaders of the United Kingdom, France, and Russia. This will be the first face-to-face encounter by the heads of these states since the Potsdam Conference at the end of World War II—nearly 10 years ago. There have been several such meetings among the Big Three, but none with the head of the Soviet State.

I have the greatest confidence that President Eisenhower will represent us faithfully and well. We must back him up 100 percent because this is one of the times when unity in time of peace is nearly as important as unity in time of war.

The kind of unity of which I speak was demonstrated earlier this week when the Senate passed the Mutual Security Act of 1955. It has been our unity in support of these programs over the past years that is now paying off.

I recently asked Mr. Dulles how he felt about this. He replied: "The policy of the Soviet Union with reference to Western Europe has failed. Today marks the death knell of the great Soviet policy for Western Europe which they have pursued with every means at their command for the past 3 years. They now have to throw up their hands and admit they have failed. Therefore * * * they have to find new policies."

No one would deny that there has been a clash of Soviet and United States policy throughout most of the globe for the past 10 years. The longer the peoples of the world have to examine communism on the one hand with its outward evidences of unity imposed by the domestic threat of force, and democracy on the other hand with its unity achieved as the result of the give and take of freemen, the more likely they are to choose the unity of the free.

In conclusion, I should like to revert for a moment to the point made at the beginning of my remarks, that we must not think in terms of absolutes.

I do not expect the meeting at the summit will ring in the millenium of peace. Neither do I expect that a failure at that meeting would leave us with no alternative but preparation for eventual war. The results of the conference are not likely to be all white or all black.

It is essential that great organizations such as the AMVETS take the lead in helping the people of this Nation to realize that we must not expect too much of this meeting; we must not succumb to a feeling of frustration if the conference does not go too well.

We have a long pull ahead. The American people must have patience and fortitude. Ultimately we know that the way of freemen will prevail and that man can live at peace.

Oversecretive Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Oversecretive Washington," which appeared on the editorial page of yesterday's New York Herald Tribune, written by Marguerite Higgins, an outstanding newspaperwoman. I think the article would be of interest to Senators and all other persons at this time, when we are disturbed so much about an apparent misunderstanding, or a lack of understanding, as to just what the situation is in our defense posture.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OVERSECRETIVE WASHINGTON
(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.—In the last 2 months the Russians have substantially built up defenses in the entire Moscow area. Although just completed, preparations for the new defenses, including guided missiles and new tactical airfields, were underway late last fall when this correspondent was in Moscow. The buildup is known to innumerable Muscovites and many Western diplomats. But the American public hasn't been told about it.

Yet the new defenses are important. In the event of trouble, they would mean that considerably greater United States air strength than originally estimated would be required to penetrate to the target.

Moscow defenses are no secret to the Russians. And the Russians know that we know. So what is being hidden from whom?

This development is but one more reason why complaints have been voiced on Capitol Hill charging that the Government sometimes follows policies that in effect help Russia to keep Russia's secrets.

Important Senators and Congressmen feel that misplaced secrecy is part of the explanation as to why the American public is constantly being taken by surprise by Soviet progress.

There are members of the House and Senate Armed Services Committee who qualify as old pros in the matters of defense and national security. They have had more experience than some of the lawyers and businessmen who, as administrations change, are given positions of great authority in Washington. In the eyes of these Congressmen, the newcomers are mateurs in the art of government—and, according to the record, amateurs in the art of deciding what should be kept secret from the American people. Businessmen and lawyers in Government, it is suspected, tend to err on the side of supersecrecy, feeling that this way they are less likely to make a mistake.

This is alarming to those on Capitol Hill who remember how such attitudes have in the past been turned to Russia's advantage.

They remember, for instance, that for nearly a year the United States suppressed information that Russian pilots were flying in combat attacking United Nations forces in Korea. The secrecy began not as a matter of high policy but through simple technicality. All reports of American pilots debriefed after a mission were automatically classified secret. That was the standard operating procedure in intelligence, a field in which this country is a comparative newcomer. The Americans did not understand the importance of coordinating material gathered about the enemy with psychological warfare. And no one at higher levels of government was smart enough, or personally brave enough, to point out that the secret classification was silly.

The resulting secrecy was, of course, a boon to the Russians. The Soviet press and radio could denounce the so-called American imperialists for intervening in Korea and still be secure in the knowledge that the Americans themselves were hiding the fact that Russian pilots were just as directly involved.

The Americans also helped the Russians camouflage the fact that in Korea Russian citizens were also fighting on the ground. The first tanks captured in Korea were manned by Soviet citizens. Racially the men were of Korean ancestry. But more than 60 years before they had migrated to Uzbekistan, Soviet central Asia, where they lived as Russians and later Soviet citizens. In fact, the first captured tank driver, an oriental, could speak only Russian. He said he had gained his battle experience at Stalingrad. He was among many thousand Soviet citibens shipped to Manchuria, then put in North Korean uniform and ordered to attack. But under the prevailing system all POW interrogations were secret. The Russians could pretend innocence, and we didn't contradict.

The latest furore in Washington over suppression of information began in the middle of May after a Defense Department announcement that Russians had staged formation flights of their own version of the intercontinental jet bomber. Congressmen charged that the Defense Department had delayed the announcement for no good reason since every one in Moscow had seen the air parade. And the Department was taken to task because the original announcement omitted significant details. These were eventually confirmed by the Defense Department after having first been printed in Aviation Week.

The subsequent senatorial demand for public accounting as to comparative Russian-American technological strength has been given full publicity.

But additional issues are being raised that are far broader than this single incident. It is felt increasingly that the whole haphazard relation between the field of intelligence and psychological warfare should be improved so that the United States can make maximum use of what it knows about Soviet policy—instead of helping Russia to keep her secrets. And it is being asked if the succession of amateurs in executive posts should not be accountable to, or at least advised by professionals in intelligence, phychological warfare, and national defense. It has been suggested that such an advisory board should have the ability to exercise considerable independence of judgment and should have no ax to grind except to see that this country and its people are not surprised by the enemy in an age when such surprise could mean this country's downfall.

Highway Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. KEITH THOMSON
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I include a resolution recently adopted by a regional conference of governors representing my section of the country.

The governors of the West and Midwest region express themselves in this resolution with regard to the highway construction problem.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that these men, governors of their respective States or their representatives, are in a pretty good position to know the sentiment of their people concerning highway matters. Their thinking is bipartisan. They live at home, so to speak, right around the calendar. They are not laboring under the same disadvantage that we do, in being away from our home territories during a good portion of the year.

That these governors have the confidence and respect of their people is self-evident; else they would not occupy their high office. I beileve they can justifiably be considered as speaking for the people of their States when they pass along a resolution such as the following, which I commend to your attention and study:

Regional conference of governors this day adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the President of the United States, the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, earned the gratitude of the people of the United States when on July 12, 1954, he advanced the plan for providing the highways so necessary to the security and commerce of America; and

"Whereas the Senate of the United States, after holding long and comprehensive hearings on the problem of roadbuilding, enacted legislation thereon; and

"Whereas the matter of getting the program underway at the earliest possible moment is of prime importance; and

"Whereas the people of our State desire that an accelerated road program be enacted by this 84th Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Governors of Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, South Dakota, North Dakota, Colorado, and Wyoming, and the Governors' representatives from the States of Montana and Missouri, do here and now urge the Congress to proceed expeditiously with enactment of the pending road program; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we urge the House of Representatives to bring the Senate bill more in harmony with the Governors' highway proposal which was worked out by the Clay committee."

A State of Insecurity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following very interesting article which was written by Hans J. Morgenthau, director of the Institute for the study of American Foreign Policy, University of Chicago, and former consultant to the Department of State. It appeared in the April 18, 1955, issue of the New Republic magazine:

A STATE OF INSECURITY
(By Hans J. Morgenthau)

The propositions which are being set forth in this article are completely and emphatic-

ally at odds with the assumptions which underlie the security system, as applied to the Department of State. The author does not only take exception to the way in which the security regulations have been applied to certain prominent men—an attitude shared by many; he also questions the very conception of security and the methods to assure it which the President's Executive Order No. 10450, of April 27, 1953, propounds.

Finding himself in such an opposition of one against almost everybody, the scholar must be particularly careful in checking his position and that of the majority against the empirical evidence available to him. Could it be that he is more complacent and gullible and less sensitive to the requirements of security than the rest? Yet he has gone on record, in the face of vociferous opposition, in pointing to the error or virtually the whole academic community when in the 30's it dismissed the revelations of Communist infiltration in the Government as nothing more than a partisan smear of the New Deal. And he remembers vividly how shocked he was by the laxity of security practices when he encountered them in person.

It is possible to explain the security system—which incidentally the present administration has inherited and perfected but not created—as a psychological reaction to the laxity preceding it; it is impossible to defend it on rational and empirical grounds.

A critical analysis of the security regulations, as applied to the Department of State, must answer four basic questions: (1) What is to be secured? (2) Against whom is it to be secured? (3) By what means is it being secured? (4) What is the cost of security in terms of other objectives to which the Nation is equally committed?

I

A security system must protect the integrity and secrecy of foreign policy. It has, first of all, to assure that the foreign policy of the United States is not determined by persons who owe primary loyalty to a foreign power and, hence, put its interests above those of the United States. If there had ever existed, as is widely but falsely believed, in the Department of State a pro-Communist clique who deliberately worked for the triumph of communism in China, a security system would have to prevent such a situation from repeating itself.

It must, however, be said that the very mechanics by which the foreign policy of the United States is conducted make it extremely unlikely that such a situation could ever arise. The formation of American foreign policy is characterized by a diffusion so extreme as to border on chaos. A multitude of people on all levels of the governmental hierarchy are continuously called upon to analyze a certain political situation and to propose a policy dealing with it. Out of that welter of divergent opinions, certain basic propositions are slowly distilled which are submitted to the President for final approval. It is only when the President has spoken with the ultimate authority of his office, not infrequently choosing among alternative policies, that the foreign policy of the United States has been determined.

For a foreign power to subvert the foreign policy of the United States, a network of agents is needed strategically located not only in the Department of State but also in the other governmental establishments, such as the White House and the National Security Council, which are directly concerned with the determination of American foreign policy. No foreign power was able to establish such a network when American public opinion was hardly aware of the problem of security and when security regulations were extremely lax.

It stands to reason, of course, that genuine military secrets must be protected. The quality and quantity of weapons, the disposition of the Armed Forces, war plans, codes, fall into that category. Insofar as the operations of the Department of State deal with such military secrets, they require protection on military grounds. Secret service operations with which the Department of State concerns itself must be protected on similar grounds. The considerations of the problem of secrecy in the Department of State that follow, then, apply exclusively to foreign policy proper.

I was once told by an official of the Department of State that from his long experience he could remember few documents the transmission of which would have been advantageous to a foreign power. From my own much more limited experience, I do not remember a single top secret document, let alone any document of a lower security classification, the knowledge of which would have been advantageous to a foreign power. I would go so far as to say that if a foreign power would gain knowledge of all the classified documents I have seen or written, such knowledge might benefit the United States rather than help that power, provided it would be advantageous to the United States to confound a foreign power as to the nature of our foreign policy and its future course. As concerns espionage with regard to foreign policy in general, it is hardly more than a racket, engaged in by shady characters frequently working both sides of the street. The typical information thus obtained is either phony, irrelevant, or public property.

That this cannot be otherwise, a consideration of foreign policy, especially as it must be practiced under present world conditions, will make obvious. The great lines of action which the foreign policies of the great powers are likely to take are predetermined by their respective national interests as they are rationally defined by the small group which ultimately decides upon the course of action. This has always been so and is so today. The cold war has, however, imposed a peculiar rigidity upon the foreign policies of the great powers, which leaves very little room for maneuver in the implementation of their respective national interests. Given this situation, there can be hardly any secrets which rational analysis could not detect, but which espionage would be able to uncover. In order to know what Chinese policy with regard to Korea or Formosa is likely to be, it is not necessary, and probably not even expedient, to pilfer the secret files of the foreign office in Peiping; it is only necessary to ask oneself what the national interest of China has been with regard to these two regions and what it is likely to be as interpreted by the present rulers of China.

The attempt to discern the foreign policy of the United States through espionage is bound to be even more fruitless, due to the diffusion of the processes of government. No rational analysis could have anticipated with any degree of certainty what our policy with regard to Indochina was likely to be in the summer of 1954, but it could have assessed the nature and strength of the divergent pressures which were brought to bear upon the President's mind, and the latter's likely reaction to them. As concerns foreign policy proper, again in contrast to military dispositions and planning, even a spy participating in the deliberations of the National Security Council and transmitting its minutes to a fofeign government could not have revealed more than rational analysis was able to ascertain. In one word, what is needed for the performance of the vital task of assessing correctly the next move of the other side is not intelligence in terms of espionage, but intelligence in terms of rational analysis.

In truth, what needs protection from foreign subversion is not the whole process of foreign policy in all its ramifications but only those elements of it which, in the nature of things, are capable of being subverted, that is, that small area where decisions are actually made and which has access to military secrets and secret service operations. Secrecy in foreign policy serves not so much the security of the United States in terms of concealment of its plans and operations as it protects its officials who must be free to express their opinions without concern for the favorable or unfavorable reaction of outsiders. If the officials who are engaged in the conduct of foreign policy could not rely upon their official actions and expressions of opinion being made in confidence, they would at the very least be tempted to surrender their own professional judgment of the merit of the case to outside pressures, domestic and foreign. In the absence of secrecy, an official could not be expected to express his opinions about the personnel and policies of a foreign government without anticipating the reactions of that government. Nor could he be expected to express his opinions about the policies of his own Government without regard for the political reactions on the domestic scene.

The main purpose of secrecy, then, is the protection of the professional integrity of the Foreign Service and affiliated agencies. Security regulations which seek to protect that professional integrity must obviously be different from those which seek to protect the United States against the betrayal of official secrets.

II

How can we determine beforehand who is likely to be disloyal if participation in the conduct of American foreign policy should be entrusted to him? Section 8 of Executive Order 10450 undertakes to answer that question. It enumerates close to 100 characteristics, any one of which excludes a man from Government employment as a security risk, his employment being not clearly consistent with he national security. Yet that list of characteristics, according to the preamble of section 8, is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather to establish general categories to which the security officials may add other related ones.

What the security regulations are trying to do here is to localize treason as an outstanding but surreptitious evil by making it a function of other outstanding but patent evils. In this philosophy a man who has deviated drastically in other respects from the moral standards of society is more likely to deviate from those moral standards by committing treason than one who has not so deviated. This assumption is illogical to begin with, and there is not a shred of empirical evidence to support it. Its illogical character stems from the very nature of treason which is an act of disloyalty committed by a person who, in view of his revealed qualities, appears to be deserving of trust. If it were possible to identify the prospective traitor by some outward quality, the commission of treason would by definition become impossible. That the assumption of a necessary relationship between general immorality and the particular immorality of treason also is untenable on empirical grounds can be shown by putting the following two questions to the empirical test: Are people who deviate in a particular respect from the moral standards of society more likely to commit treason than others, and are traitors as a type likely to be immoral in other aspects as well?

In order to answer the first of these two questions, let us take the type of immorality which not only constitutes a particularly radical and repulsive violation of normal moral standards but which by general consensus is also most obviously conducive to treason: sexual perversion. That the homosexual is peculiarly prone to commit crimes under the threat of blackmail is hardly doubted by anyone who faces the problem for the first time. Yet neither the histories of diplomacy and of treason nor the recollections of practitioners of diplo-

macy, insofar as I could ascertain, contain an instance of a homosexual having committed an act of treason under the threat of blackmail. On the other hand, at least two notorious homosexuals have in recent history given outstanding diplomatic service: Prince Eulenburg, German Ambassador in Vienna from 1894–1902, and Baron von Hoesch, German Ambassador in Paris and London from 1924–36. While Eulenburg was finally ruined by the public revelations of his private life, he was never accused of disloyalty; and of Hoesch, Professor Holborn says that he was "the greatest of the German professional diplomatists of the interwar period * * * the sensitive and devoted man proved himself a master of his craft." Whatever one deems the proper treatment of the homosexual by government and society at large to be, there is no empirical evidence for a correlation of any kind between this particular type of deviation and the deviation of treason.

Nor is there any such evidence with regard to a very mild "deviation," completely devoid in itself of any negative moral connotation: that of having relatives behind the Iron Curtain. That an official who has relatives living behind the Iron Curtain is particularly susceptible to committing treason under blackmail sounds on the face of it so plausible that it is virtually accepted as self-evident. But who knows of an official who has violated security regulations under such circumstances? Here again, what on the face of it looks like commonsense reveals itself on closer examination as superstition which unchallenged repetition has vested with the plausibility of truth.

Approaching the same problem from the side of treason, one cannot but arrive at the same conclusion. Throughout history all manner of men have committed treason: intelligent and stupid men, respected men and outcasts, sane men and mad men, idealists and mercenaries, believers and atheists, sober men and drunkards, faithful husbands and philanderers, scions of old families and sons of foreigners, even—to disprove Shakespeare's Julius Caesar—fat men as well as those with "a lean and hungry look." Yet, if all kinds of men are capable of committing treason, only a few actually do commit it. Do they not wear the mark of Cain on their foreheads, which sets them visibly apart from the rest of humanity before they have committed their crime?

Alas, Cain and his tribe are not born with some outward sign which makes visible to all the deed they are to commit. It is their deed which marks them, not their nature. Nobody is born a traitor, but everybody can become one. Treason as betrayal of that to which one ought to be loyal is as an accomplished fact indeed peculiar but to a few; as a potentiality it is a curse common to all men. In whom that potentiality will become actual no man can foresee, not even the prospective traitor.

Executive Order 10450 assumes that there exist two easily discernible types of men, one likely to commit treason, the other not. The composite picture of the latter, which emerges from Executive Order 10450 and its application to the personnel of the Department of State, is the ideal type of a Babbitt with strong pseudopuritanical connotations. He is a person who is "normal" in every respect; that is, who conforms to certain requirements which a "good" American is supposed to possess. In their application to the Department of State, these requirements run the whole gamut of actions, associations, attitudes and opinions with which a person might identify himself. Emphasis has been put upon conformity with a conservative ideal in the field of political opinion and attitudes, and with a pseudopuritanical idea in the sphere of sexual behavior. In the course of security investigations, officials of the State Department have been asked about their attitude toward Franklin D. Roosevelt, the New Deal, and the recognition of the Communist government of China. Investigators have also shown an almost obsessive curiosity about the pre- and extra-marital sexual activities of officials.

It stands to reason that this ideal of the "good" American is at odds in one or the other respect with the actual behavior of most men who have ever lived and are now living. Hardly an American statesman from Franklin and Washington onwards has, and could have, lived up to it, and most of them would fail the test on multiple grounds. And it is not by accident that men of undoubted loyalty and merit have been dismissed from the Foreign Service as security risks under Executive Order 10450. For that executive order makes virtually everybody a security risk and for two reasons. First of all, as already pointed out, few men will correspond in every respect to the ideal picture of the "good" American which is implicit in Executive Order 10450 and its application. More importantly, few men will be so transparently good, approaching saintliness, that it can be said of them that their employment is "clearly consistent with the interests of the national security," which is the general standard repeated again and again by the executive order.

"I am myself indifferent honest: but yet I could accuse me of such things, that it were better my mother had not borne me: I am very proud and revengeful, ambitious; with more offenses at my beck than I have thoughts to put them in, imagination to give them shape, or time to act them in. What should such fellows as I do crawling between earth and heaven? We are arrant knaves all; believe none of us."

These words of Hamlet all men can say of themselves and of each other. Even the best man's goodness is darkened at least by the shadow of a doubt, and thus he is a security risk within the meaning of Order 10450.

It may be pointed out in passing that in the philosophy of Executive Order 10450 and the spirit of its application there reveals itself a deeply engrained tendency of our culture to externalize evil, localize it, reduce it thereby to seemingly intelligible and manageable proportions, and finally exorcise it by means of some social arrangement. Executive Order 10450 is the latest of such endeavors, all of necessity futile, of which the Volstead Act, trying to legislate virtue through prohibition, and the neutrality legislation trying to legislate peace through isolation, are the most recent prominent examples.

III

The security regulations, as applied to the Department of State, operate essentially through three instrumentalities: security investigations, police supervision, and political pressure.

That a person be subjected to a security check before he is employed in a sensitive position by the Department of State is an obvious necessity. Yet in the eyes of the Department of State a man's loyalty is never settled once and for all (as actually it cannot be, in view of what we have said above). Since no man can ever be fully trusted, all men are forever suspect on grounds of security and, hence, are at all times subject to renewed security investigations. The case of Mr. John Paton Davies, Jr., who underwent nine security investigations, has gained nationwide attention; yet his case is but an extreme example of a fairly typical situation.

This multiplication of security investigations is institutionalized by the requirement that the personnel file of every official of the Department of State in whose personnel status a change, such as a new assignment or promotion, is contemplated be checked for security. In the course of such a check any old incident which has been satisfactorily explained in preceding security investigations can jeopardize the official's career and destroy his reputation. An official who has been suggested for a promotion by virtue of his professional competence (of which compliance with security regulations is obviously a part) may be suspended for months as a security risk because 10 years ago, on the instigation of the Government, he joined an organization infiltrated by Communists in order to combat their influence. Never mind that this incident was a matter of record from the very beginning, that it has been explained to the satisfaction of all concerned time and again; now it must be explained again and with it the whole life of the official, private and public, and it is he who must prove that the continuation of his employment is "clearly consistent with the interests of the national security," by collecting affidavits from public and private acquaintances testifying that they found nothing wrong with him.

The assumption that all men are really security risks and that this defect, shared by all men, can somehow be neutralized, if not eliminated, through the proper social arrangements cannot but give rise to a psychology which is indistinguishable from that of the police state. For given these two assumptions, eternal vigilance becomes the price of security. Treat everybody as though he were a traitor, and you will be safe from treason.

The Department of State has acted upon these assumptions and has established a system of supervision which in good part is supposed to operate covertly, but of which everybody within the Department is jokingly or indignantly aware. The Bureau of Security of the Department of State employs, of course, a staff whose personnel and functions are officially known. Aside from this official staff, it employs a network of agents (both categories estimated to total more than a thousand) whose identity and functions are not supposed to be known. Individuals have been placed in the different functional and geographic units of the Department of State for the ostensible purpose of performing the substantive functions of these units, yet for the actual purpose of supervising and reporting on their colleagues. Delegations to international conferences are accompanied by individuals who perform similar functions, traditionally associated with a GPU or Gestapo. The Secretary of State himself has invested this system with the authority of his office by imposing upon all officials of his Department through Department Circular 95 of April 15, 1954, the duty to be informers:

"I am aware that no agency of the Govment can improve, or even maintain, its level of effectiveness unless it is receiving a stream of new ideas and constructive criticisms. I hope that the inspection operation will be the focal reception point of that stream. I have told Mr. McLeod that in his capacity as administrator of the inspection operation he should be available at any time to receive personally from any of our people the benefit of their thinking on improving operations and procedures or on other problems, official and personal.

"In brief, I regard the internal inspection operation of the Department as one of its most important concerns. Its success will depend upon the cooperation and aid received generally from employees of the Department."

This emphasis upon the vital importance of investigation and supervision for purposes of security, institutionalized in a special bureau within the Department of State, has inevitably led to a shift of effective control over the operations of the Department from the Secretary and Under Secretary of State and the heads of the functional and geographic units to the Bureau of Security. This shift has occurred in all modern totali-

tarian states and has given rise to a phenomenon which has been aptly called the dual state. It is characteristic of the dual state that in it, as a matter of law, the power of making decisions remains with the authorities charged by law with making them, while, as a matter of fact, by virtue of their power over life and death, the agents of the secret police—coordinated to, but independent from, the official makers of decision—at the very least exert an effective veto over the decisions. Once the secret police has established itself firmly in an agency of the Government, it will less and less need for intervening drastically in day-by-day operations; for its omnipresence and reputed omnipotence will generally be sufficient for the constituted authorities to avoid any action which might displease the secret police.

The Bureau of Security in the Department of State, as originally constituted, was combined with and, hence, had direct control over four areas of operation: Security, consular affairs, personnel, and inspection of United States missions abroad. While the Administrator of the Bureau of Security has been deprived of direct responsibility for the two latter functions, it is generally believed that he still retains effective control over personnel because the office of personnel continues to be administered in the spirit of, and in close cooperation with, the Bureau of Security. Whether the formal separation of inspection from the Bureau of Security will have different results remains to be seen. However, it would be surprising if it should. For the powers of the Bureau of Security by themselves are all-pervading insofar as the hiring, assignment, promotion, and firing of personnel are concerned. Nor do its powers end there.

The powers which the Bureau of Security has assumed over the operations of the Department of State flow only in part from its policy functions as such. The power of the Bureau of Security over the Department of State reflect in good measure the political power of those whose political philosophy its leading officials represent, to whom they owe their present positions and their primary loyalties as well. Those are not the President of the United States or the Secretary of State but certain Members of Congress and, more particularly, of the Senate. The police system which has been established in the Department of State is their secret police in a more profound sense than it is the secret police of the executive branch. It is through it that these Members of Congress are kept informed about the—presumably secret—operations of the Department of State, and it is through it that they exert a direct or indirect influence upon its operations.

This unofficial Department of State, operating within the framework of the official one, has been incapable of functioning as an instrument of a positive foreign policy. It has been able to hamstring, delay and prevent, but not initiate, foreign policy. Its attempts to sabotage the official foreign policy of the United States, as in the case of the Korean armistice, have been, as far as one can see, sporadic and inconsequential. This could have hardly been otherwise. For not only have those in charge of the operations of this unofficial Department of State been generally ignorant and ineffective, but they have also been—and this sheds an illuminating light upon the philosophy of the security system of the Department of State—essentially hostile to the very purposes and nature of foreign policy.

For them, all men are suspect as traitors, but diplomats in particular are so. For they deviate in certain obvious respects from the ideal type of the normal good American: they know foreign languages, spend much of their lives abroad, have many contacts with foreigners, concern themselves professionally with foreign countries—and they tend to be intellectuals, committing their brains rather than their passions to the conduct of foreign policy. Thus it is not by accident that an enterprise which starts out to protect the integrity and secrecy of American foreign policy transforms itself, as we have seen, into an undertaking to assure conformity and ends in an attempt to make the United States safe from foreign policy as such. What began as a technical operation to improve the protection of the United States against subversion and espionage has matured into an onslaught—know-nothing in its philosophy and isolationist in its implicit purpose—against the very existence of an active American foreign policy.

IV

Obviously, to preserve the integrity and secrecy of foreign policy is only one among many objectives to which the United States is committed. A policy, however sound and successful in its own terms, must be evaluated in terms of the impact it has upon other national objectives, as important or even more important than its own. Such scrutiny is particularly required for a policy which is so unsound and unsuccessful as we believe the security policy of the Department of State to be. What, then, has been the price we have had to pay in terms of equally or more important objectives, for the security policy of the Department of State? That price is being paid primary in three areas: the effectiveness of American foreign policy, the prestige of the United States abroad, and the security of the United States.

For an impartial professional observer, the conclusion is inevitable that today, more than a year after the letter by the 5 diplomats, quoted on page 9, was written, the Department of State, as presently constituted, is hardly competent to serve any government, totalitarian or otherwise. Not only the morale but also the professional competence and capacity for teamwork of its members have drastically declined. The Department of State which the present administration inherited was, to say the least, a useful instrument of foreign policy. Its obvious administrative weaknesses were compensated for by the intellectual ability, technical competence, and devotion of most of its top and middle-layer officials. Many of these officials have either been dismissed or have voluntarily resigned. Of the officials of this type with whom our High Commission in Germany was staffed two years ago, not a single one is said to be left today. They could not have been replaced even under the best possible circumstances with a new team of equal competence and experience. For no nation is rich enough in diplomatic talent, demanding a rare combination of extraordinary qualities of mind and character, to be able to afford taking one team out of the game and replacing it with another one equally good. What is possible in football cannot be done in diplomacy.

The United States could not have afforded the loss of its ablest diplomatists even under the best of circumstances. Yet the circumstances under which the United States had to make good this loss were far from being the best. A system which makes security the overriding consideration gives a golden opportunity for advancement to the incompetent, the time server, and the informer, who has never uttered a wrong thought and who has never associated with the wrong person. A system which not only does not require professional competence but actually suspects it cannot help but use standards of selection congenial to it.

Not only has there been deterioration at the top and in the middle layers of the departmental hierarchy but there has also been starvation at the bottom. A system characterized by repeated security investigations, police supervision, and political pressure has depleted the lower ranks of the Foreign Service. Many younger officials have been dismissed as security risks, and many more have resigned of their own volition. What is worse is that such a system must act as a deterrent upon both application for employment and employment itself. The number of graduates of our institutions of higher learning who today choose to make the Foreign Service their career is small as compared with that of 3 or 4 years ago. The few who apply today may be the bravest and the most desperate, but they can hardly be the best; and those who are able to pass the security test and are actually hired will not be necessarily the best of them, and even many of them resign soon in disgust.

In consequence the personnel of the Department of State has drastically declined in quantity and quality. Hundreds of positions remain continuously unfilled, sometimes for many months, because the Bureau of Security has failed to clear the appointees. This depletion has gone so far that positions in important countries, requiring constant contacts with representatives of foreign public opinion, must be filled with persons who have spent all their official life outside not only this particular country but this particular continent and who are ignorant of the native language. This same depletion accounts, at least in part, for the marked tendency to fill top diplomatic posts with individuals whose professional qualifications are obscure but whose political claims are only too obvious.

This decline in the quality and quantity of the personnel of the State Department is matched by the decline in the quality of its operations. Objective analytical reporting, the prime function of diplomacy, has fallen to a low ebb in our Foreign Service. The reports of our diplomats are no longer as regularly read by the officials at the respective geographic desks in Washington as they were in time past, for they contain frequently nothing more than digests of the newspapers of the countries concerned, which the official in Washington can and does read himself. Heads of missions have refused to allow the transmission to Washington of reports painting a picture of the local situation at variance either with reports of other agencies or with the estimate of the situation prevailing in Washington.

This abdication of independent judgment is, of course, the result of the fear that deviation from the "official line" might jeopardize one's very livelihood and reputation. Yet this fear is more than the subjective anticipation of an evil which is largely imaginary, as is much of the fear of being controversial, so prevalent in academic life. That fear is, indeed, the fruit of bitter experience. Officials have been dismissed for having reported facts which they were not supposed to report, and for having advocated policies which they were not supposed to advocate.

Under the impact of all these influences, the Department of State is probably not more immune to subversion and treason than it was before. A case could even be made for the proposition that an official whom the dual state constantly subjects to the moral stress of having to reconcile his own professional judgments and moral principles with those of the organization in which he works may become particularly prone to laxity and failure of judgment in matters of security. In any event, the Department of State has ceased to be the eyes, ears, and brains of the foreign policy of the United States.

This disintegration of the Foreign Service of the United States is better known abroad than it is at home. The governments and public opinion of foreign countries have seen with amazement officials of whose competence and loyalty they have had tangible evidence investigated, dismissed, or forced to resign as security risks. Continuous contacts with our representatives abroad provide them with unmistakable evidence of the

diminution of their professional competence. This writer who has recently had occasion to ask officials, political leaders, and journalists of European countries what they think of the Foreign Service of the United States has been shocked and dismayed by the instances of individual incompetence reported to him, by the invidious comparisons with times past, and by the condescension and contempt to be found at every turn.

It must, however, be said that this dark picture is brightened by a few light spots. Due to luck, personal connections, or the inefficiency of the security system, there have remained in the Department of State a few, and ever-diminishing number, of officials who have not yielded to the pressures which incessantly bear upon them. Forsaken from above, spied upon from below, surrounded by all manner of opportunists and worse, they risk their careers, their positions, and their honor in maintaining for themselves and in defending in their subordinates the traditional standards of intellectual integrity, professional competence, and devotion to duty. If and when out of the ruins of today a new foreign service will be built, worthy of the traditions and the mission of America, the Nation will owe a great debt to these brave, able, and devoted men who defend in obscurity and against great odds the pitiful remnants of a fine tradition.

A THREAT TO NATIONAL SECURITY

(From a communication to the New York Times, of January 17, 1954, signed by Norman Armour, member of U. S. Foreign Service 1915–51, Ambassador to Chile, Argentina, Spain, and Assistant Secretary of State 1947–48; Robert Woods Bliss, U. S. Foreign Service 1903–45, Ambassador to Argentina, special assistant to Secretary of State 1942–44; Joseph C. Grew, U. S. Foreign Service 1904–45, Ambassador to Japan and Under Secretary of State 1944–45; William Phillips, former Ambassador to Italy, special envoy to India, and Under Secretary of State; G. Howland Shaw, U. S. Foreign Service 1917–44, Chief of Foreign Service Personnel and Assistant Secretary of State 1941–44)

"The conclusion has become inescapable * * * that a Foreign Service officer who reports on persons and events to the very best of his ability and who makes recommendations which at the time he conscientiously believes to be in the interest of the United States may subsequently find his loyalty and integrity challenged and may even be forced out of the Service and discredited forever as a private citizen after many years of distinguished service.

"When any such tendency begins its insidious work it is not long before accuracy and initiative have been sacrificed to acceptability and conformity. The ultimate result is a threat to national security.

"The forces which are working for conformity from the outside are being reinforced by the present administrative setup within the Department of State which subordinates normal personnel administration to considerations of security.

"It is obvious, of course, that candidates for the Foreign Service should be carefully investigated before appointment and that their work should at all times be under the exacting scrutiny of their professional superiors. But when initial investigation attaches undue importance to such factors as even a temporary departure from conservative political and economic views, casual association with persons holding views not currently in fashion, or subscription to a periodical labeled as 'liberal'; when subsequent investigation is carried to the point of delaying a promotion list for a year and routine transfers from one post to another; when investigations of individual officers must be kept up to date to within 90 days; when an easy path has been opened to even the anonymous informer; and when the results of these investigations are evaluated not by persons experienced in the Foreign Service or even acquainted at firsthand with conditions abroad, but by persons of quite different experience, it is relevant to inquire whether we are not laying the foundations of a Foreign Service competent to serve a totalitarian government rather than the Government of the United States as we have heretofore known it."

American Foreign Policy in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on May 22 last it was my privilege to deliver a commencement address at Carroll College, Helena, Mont., on the subject American Foreign Policy in the Far East.

I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

It is good to be with you young men and women of Carroll College, with your distinguished faculty and your families and friends. It is also good to be home again in Montana.

In the years ahead many of you will use those same words, "It is good to be home again," and some of you will use them often. I say that because the world of today and tomorrow, for better or worse, is the kind of world that propels people and especially young people to distant places. It is a world of change, a world of movement.

You will find, however, that no matter where you may go, the roots are here. The reason for that will become clearer as time goes by. You will find that from these roots, from these years that have already been, years of training and experience at home, in church, in schools and college—from these roots you draw the strength to grow in understanding. From these roots comes the background to put the vast and complex panorama of modern life into meaningful perspective. These are roots which hold fast to the enduring in what is otherwise a world of incessant and rapid change.

It is to this world, this world of the enduring and the changing that American foreign policy must be adjusted. There was a time when we could largely ignore peoples and developments beyond the Atlantic and Pacific shores of the Nation. That time is past. American foreign policy is now crucial to the preservation of freedom in this country and the world over. And the content of American foreign policy is of transcendant importance to each of us if for no other reason than that it can move us toward peace or toward war.

While foreign policy is by no means a simple thing to understand, neither is it beyond the understanding of American citizens who try to fulfill the obligations of their citizenship. Foreign policy is the course by which we attempt to provide for the safety of the Nation and its institutions and to advance its total interests in the world. If it is to serve the Nation in that fashion and, if it is to develop in accord with the religious and moral principles of the Nation, it must be fixed in the understanding of the American people.

Now I know that you graduates have heard many lectures over the past few years. You are probably not, on this day, in a mood to tolerate another, at least not a long one. I shall not, therefore, tax your patience too heavily by attempting to review in detail American policy throughout the world.

Let me say in passing only that the prospects for peace and for liberty in Europe are brighter today than they have been for a long time. The patience of this country and other western nations has finally produced a satisfactory peace treaty with Austria after 379 previous attempts had failed because of the negativism of the Soviet Union.

Sovereignty has, at long last, been restored to Western Germany and that nation has become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization on the basis of full equality with the other western countries. All that remains in order to bring the whole of Western Europe under the protective cover of this defensive organization is to secure the inclusion of Spain, a step which I have urged on numerous occasions in the past.

In the Middle East, the continued strife between the State of Israel and the Arab countries and the economic and political difficulties of the latter create a dangerous situation. Your Government, however, is aware of the situation and is attempting to prevent a deterioration in it which might open the region to Communist penetration.

Africa is beginning to press itself on the consciousness of the rest of the world. A conference of Afro-Asian nations was recently held at Bandung, Indonesia. For the first time the voice of this least known but vitally important continent was raised forcefully in the councils of the nations. It is a voice that is bound to grow in strength and significance as the years go by. We in this country, particularly our younger citizens, will do well to educate themselves in an understanding of Africa so that we may establish sound relations with the nations that will inevitably emerge and grow powerful on that continent.

Latin America remains an area of primary concern to us. We are linked with the other American republics in defensive arrangements and by cultural and economic ties. Nevertheless we cannot take these relations for granted. Our failure to pay sufficient attention to them in the past has constituted a serious gap in our foreign policy which we may be able to remedy in time. As in the case of Africa much will depend on the consideration which is given to Latin America by our younger citizens.

I have taken you on a 2-minute tour of two-thirds of the world in order that I might have 20 minutes for the remaining third, the Far East. That region, I know, is uppermost in the minds of Americans these days when they think of foreign policy because it is in that region that peace has been most consistently threatened in recent years. Developments in the far Pacific and our policies with respect to them are not the sole concern of Washington.

Every State, every community, and every home in the land has a stake in them because they involve the issue of war or peace. I can think of no question of greater concern to you men and women at the beginning of maturity. Your interest is this situation in Asia thousands of miles away is direct and vital. Your right to the facts in connection with it is fundamental.

Let me, then, try in the balance of my remarks to give you some background on recent developments in the Far East. When the Chinese Communists came to power on

the mainland of Asia in 1949, the Government of the Republic of China, under Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, moved to the island of Formosa. The United States continued to recognize his Government as it has done for decades. For the past 5 years military and other aid, hundreds of millions of dollars of it, has been provided to support and to sustain that Government. That policy of aid has been based on the belief that if the Communists were permitted to take Formosa by aggressive force the safety and the freedom of this country and other free nations would be seriously jeopardized. It is a policy which was instituted by President Truman and reaffirmed by President Eisenhower. It has had the continuing support of Congress. It has also had the support of both great political parties.

A few months ago President Eisenhower asked Congress to pass a resolution supporting the defense of Formosa. He believed the resolution would strengthen his hand in dealing with thet crisis created by the threat of the Chinese Communists to invade the island. Congress passed the resolution by overwhelming votes in both Houses. It did so, however, only after three points had been clarified. Many of us in the Senate sought to make clear in debate that the President by the resolution would not dilute his constitutional power and responsibility to command the Armed Forces and execute foreign policy. We also tried to make clear that Congress was not transferring to the President its sole power and responsibility to declare war. Finally, we sought to establish beyond doubt that the only purpose of the resolution was to strengthen the defense of Formosa against the Chinese Communists and to prevent further bloodshed in the Formosan Straits, if that were possible.

The responsibility for keeping Formosa out of the hands of the Chinese Communists now rests squarely with the President. He is responsible to God and to the American people for what action he may or may not take in carrying out this responsibility.

I do not know whether we shall avert war or be plunged into war in the Formosan Straits. No one can make a meaningful prediction of that kind. I believe, however, I speak for all of the people in this room when I say that it is our common and our deepest hope that families shall not be separated once again by the demands of war. I believe further that it is the obligation of all and particularly those of us who are elected servants of the people to work to safeguard this country in peace and not by war so long as peace is humanly and honorably possible.

That is why I want to go, today, a little deeper into the difficulties in which we now find ourselves in the Far East. In some ways the crisis in Formosa is a symptom rather than a cause of the difficulties. And if there is to be peace in Asia—if there are to be long-term solutions in Asia, it is to causes rather than symptoms that our attention must be directed.

The crisis in the Formosan Straits is not an isolated incident. Our difficulties in the Far East include obvious threats of Chinese Communist expansion in Korea, Indochina, and Formosa. They also include others that are not so obvious.

The most important of these difficulties center on Japan. That nation, as I have pointed out on many occasions, is the ultimate objective of Communist expansion in Asia. Its position is precarious in the extreme. There are some 90 million Japanese living in an area smaller than Montana—only 16 percent of which is arable. Japan has three alernatives for survival.

1. To expand trade with other free nations on a mutually beneficial basis;

2. To live on a more or less permament subsidy from the United States;

3. To turn toward the Communist bloc in Asia not because of ideology but out of sheer economic necessity.

The attitudes of this country as well as economic circumstances in the Far East and elsewhere will determine in the near future which path Japan shall tread.

Unity among the nations of Western Europe and ourselves can be strained by differences in policy over Formosa and that is another difficulty with which we have to contend. The attitude of certain neutral states in the Far East—countries like India, Burma, and Indonesia—toward Communist China differs from our own and creates additional problems of foreign policy. Furthermore an outbreak of hostilities in the Formosa area could signalize the resumption of hostilities in Korea and Indochina. Finally, behind all these and other factors in the Asian situation we must reckon with the tie-in of the actions of Communist China and the policy of the Soviet Union.

The difficulties in the Far East, in short, are interrelated difficulties and action to deal with any one of them is not likely to be effective unless due regard is paid to the others. Yet in recent years, it seems to me, we have been thinking of these crises and dealing with them in a piecemeal fashion. Today the question is, What are we going to do about Formosa? Yesterday it was, What are we going to do about Indochina? And the day before, What are we going to do about Korea?

The answer almost invariably has been more millions in economic or military aid dispensed in what appears aften to be a disconnected and haphazard fashion. In the last 2 or 3 years we have, I repeat, contributed hundreds of millions of dollars of economic aid to Formosa and the other free countries of Asia. And we have provided billions of dollars of arms and military equipment in an attempt to strengthen their defenses. These efforts, however, have so far failed to put a stop to the recurrent crises in the Far East. Unlike the Marshall plan aid which saved Europe from famine and kept alive the light of freedom, our aid appears to have been far less effective on the other side of the globe.

As a result we have exercised in the Far East in recent years a kind of chain-reaction diplomacy, a kind of crisis-foreign policy. We have jumped from the effects of one crisis to its successor. From the Korean crisis we rushed too late to Indochina to quench a fire which had spread beyond control. We have now rushed to the fire in Formosa. We may be blinded by the glare in Formosa to the fire which is being kindled in Japan or Indonesia. We have, in short, never been ahead of the game.

That the crises continue to occur seems to me to be evidence that either our positive measures have been insufficient or the situation has been beyond our control. I think it is probably a little of both. There are limits to what we can do to control the flow of events in Asia short of war, and even with war.

That does not mean the answer is to pick up our marbles and go home. Asia is too important to us, to our security and to our other national interests to permit that kind of response. That would simply amount to postponing the day of reckoning. Furthermore, as Pope Pius XII said in his Christmas message in 1948:

"A people threatened with unjust aggression or already its victim may not remain passively indifferent, if it would think and act as befits a Christian. All the more does the solidarity of the family of nations forbid others to behave as mere spectators, in an attitude of apathetic neutrality."

In a world as integrated as is ours today the chances are slight that we alone can continue to move forward in freedom while the rest of it, whether in Europe or Asia, slips backward into communist totalitarianism. From a practical standpoint, we would have little hope for continued advance as a free people if we cut ourselves off from the spiritual, the economic, the defensive, the cultural and the scientific relationships which we now have with other nations.

A few still cherish the notion that the United States is a self-sufficient, invulnerable fortress. They would like for the United States to turn inward in space and backward in time. We can do neither. We can only face the problems of national life in this modern world with such intelligence and courage as God has seen fit to bestow upon us.

I, for one, am convinced that we have exhausted neither our intelligence nor our courage in dealing with the situation in the Far East. The effort in the last 2 or 3 years has been confined to pouring dollars into the situation there. It has required neither great intelligence nor outstanding courage, unless it be the courage to face irate taxpayers at income-tax time.

Economic and military aid has a place in our policies in the Far East, but it is not a cure-all. It has not worked very successfully to date, yet it is the only formula that has been tried to date. It has not worked, it seems to me, because those who have operated it have overlooked one ingredient, an ingredient which does not carry a price tag and yet can be far reaching and profound in its effect.

The missing ingredient is the human factor and it is to be found in the realm of attitudes and ideas. I think that most of us would agree that "man does not live by bread alone" and we might also add that "freedom is not preserved by weapons alone." What I am trying to suggest is that the struggle in Asia is fundamentally a struggle of ideas and attitudes, a struggle for the deeper loyalties of millions of people. And if that is the case, then it is in the spiritual as well as the military and economic arenas where the long-term solutions to our difficulties in that part of the world may possibly be found.

What I am suggesting is that we examine the Asian attitudes which give rise to many of the basic problems with which we must deal. I am suggesting, too, that we examine Asian reactions to our state of mind and our actions. Perhaps, then, we will find some of the answers to the peace we seek. Such answers will not lead to a purchased peace, or a power peace. They could, however, lead to a peace based on mutual understanding.

We have grown too accustomed to wrapping all the ills of Asia into the single package marked "militant communism." Of course this threat exists; we have seen a half billion Chinese brought under the influence of that ideology. Countless millions more are threatened with it elsewhere. We have spent blood to prevent the conquest of Korea by Communist aggression. Too late, we saw Vietnam north of the 17th parallel brought within the orbit of communism. We have seen militant Communist expansionism advanced not only by armies but by political penetration, by organized propaganda, by the activities of disciplined cadres of intimidators and by calculated economic policy. The Communists have alternated military threats and the allurements of trade, industrialization, and cultural exchanges to capture converts to communism. In Indochina we see the Communists and their agents using blackmail, bribery, and intimidation in attempting to undermine the honest government of Prime Minister Ngo Dinh Diem. We see the new maps of Communist China brazenly include the territory of its southern neighbors. North Korea has been placed within a stranglehold of Communist control. And now, the Communist sword is pointed at Formosa.

It is all too evident that militant communism is a force in Asia. But why, we may well ask ourselves, has it not met with more resistance? Why haven't Asian patriots who in great measure were stimulated by our own history interposed a more formidable bulwark to the Communist advance?

Some have assumed in recent years, in a cynical fashion, that merely by pouring billions of dollars into Asia, we could guide that continent toward our own precepts of democracy; some have also assumed that by arming Asian nations heavily we could prevent Communist penetration. These efforts may have been necessary, but as I have already said, I do not think they have been conspicuously successful. Why is that the case?

Perhaps we may find part of the answer to that question in the experience of Indochina. As you may know, I have had occasion to visit that area in the course of official duties on several occasions in recent years.

We poured hundreds of millions of dollars in military and other aid into Indochina, into the State of Vietnam, in an effort to help repulse the Communists. This aid failed to prevent the disastrous defeat of the French colonial forces at the battle of Dien Bien Phu last year. It failed to prevent the loss of northern Vietnam to the Communists at the Geneva Conference.

Months before the defeat at Dien Bien Phu I had reported to the Senate that Vietnam was not going to be saved by economic and military aid alone. The fundamental problem then as now was one of mobilizing the people of Vietnam behind an independent honest, responsible government able to lead them and to serve their interests.

At the 11th hour, when the Indochinese situation was lost almost beyond retrieving, a government of that caliber was installed in the Vietnamese capital of Saigon. It was headed by Ngo Dinh Diem, a Vietnamese patriot of deep religious conviction, who had spent a good deal of time in the United States and France.

Diem faced monumental problems. The State of Vietnam was split across the middle by the Geneva agreement. The Communists had fastened a tight grip on the northern half of the country. In the south near anarchy reigned outside the capital. Diem had to establish the authority of his government while at the same time providing food, shelter, and a livelihood for some 700,000 refugees from the Communist-held parts of the country.

When I was in Saigon last fall refugee ships were arriving in a steady stream from the north. Most of them were American vessels; our Navy was doing a magnificent job in transporting these uprooted human beings. I went aboard one of these American ships in Saigon Harbor. It was carrying several thousand Vietnamese, mostly Catholics, led by their priests. They had chosen to come to the south with nothing but the rags on their backs rather than to live under the Communists.

In his attempts to salvage the situation in Vietnam, Ngo Dinh Diem has had the support and encouragement of the United States. At the same time, he has been opposed, not only by the Communists, but by a fantastic assortment of gangsters, racketeers, ex-river pirates, witch doctors of strange religious sects, and French colonial adventurers, all of whom had terrorized and exploited the Vietnamese people for years.

These underworld forces, as I pointed out in a report to the Senate some 8 months ago, were engaged in a constant conspiracy designed to sabotage the Diem government almost from the moment he took office. The conspiracy finally came into the open and staged the revolt in Saigon which you have been reading about in the papers during the last few weeks.

The conspiracy has been defeated. It has been defeated largely because there was in Ngo Dinh Diem a native non-Communist leader who had the spirit and the courage to champion the independence and the interests of his people against their oppressors. Now, for the first time, there is at least a glimmer of hope that Communist totalitarianism in Vietnam may be stopped and turned backfl. Now, for the first time, freedom has a fighting chance.

What does this experience in Indochina suggest for our policy respecting the rest of the Far East? It suggests to me that part of our difficulty has been due to an unwarranted emphasis on the material and our ignoring of the spiritual factors which move people in that part of the world.

Although the era of colonialism is almost over in Asia, its after effects remain. There is extreme sensitivity among Asians and especially among Asian leaders about being recognized and dealt with on a basis of absolute equality. There exists most of all an ever-present sensitivity, an often unreasonable sensitivity, to any action which resembles a return of the colonial relationships of an earlier era. And force, the military force of foreign powers, is associated very closely in their minds with colonialism.

These deep-seated attitudes of Asia toward the West form a base which is readily exploited by Communist propaganda. As Asians look at the West from these attitudes, and particularly as they view the United States there is a tendency for many of them to interpret present United States policy as a policy which emphasizes force. When irresponsible spokesmen for the Government boast of our power, it undermines our dignity and our prestige. For the mightiest power on the face of the earth to flaunt its strength in this manner is readily interpreted in Asia in the light of a man who threatens to shoot his neighbor if the latter's cow comes into his pasture. The Asian, like the average American, would prefer that he keep his pistol out of sight and discuss the problem of mending the fence.

To be sure, the reactions vary in different parts of Asia, but I think it is correct to say that Asians in general, including the Chinese people—in spite of recent actions stimulated by their Communist rulers—are a peaceful people and they tend to admire the strong who are also peaceful. Much of the great respect which this country enjoyed in Asia in the past derived from that fact. President Theodore Roosevelt's admonition to "speak softly but carry a big stick" won us a backlog of goodwill in Asia. This sensible advice seems to have been forgotten by too many of our present leaders.

Those who know the peoples of Asia, and I know there are several here today who hav given years of selfless service in that region, can attest to the great emphasis which they place on negotiations. A spirit of negotiation permeates their everyday life; it involves adjustments and give-and-take and prolonged discussion. Those who know Asia will also attest to the lack of the visible use of force in the everyday relations among Asians.

The constant mention of force by our leaders threfore is easily misinterpreted in the Far East. Instead of enhancing the strength of our position it has the effect of suggesting that we are incapable of coping with the situation on a plane of reason. The irony in this situation is that communism, where it is not known firsthand in Asia, is portrayed and widely accepted as a movement for peace despite the fact that its deity is force. This country, which has grown to greatness on the premise of reason rather than coercion in relations among men and nations, is branded in the minds of many Asians as a worshipper of force.

Communist propaganda of that kind aided by the irresponsible and boastful statements of some of our own officials negates much of the good that is done by our constructive efforts in Asia. What then should be the role of force in our policy in Asia? We know that in all realism no great power, least of all the United States, can afford at present to abandon or weaken its military power on a unilateral basis. We must continue to maintain our military defenses in the Far East. Is it not, however, in the interest of peace in Asia, and in our own national interest, that we relegate force to the background? Is it not in our interest to explore any measure which offers some hope of leading to peace?

As a first step it seems to me essential that we keep clearly in mind that our national interest in the Formosan area is the defense of the islands of Formosa and the Pescadores; President Eisenhower, in submitting the Formosan resolution to Congress, stressed that point. He also made clear that he was trying to prevent further warfare in the Formosan Straits rather than to enlarge the conflict. In that objective, the President should have the full support of the people of the Nation regardless of political parties.

I believe it is also essential to recognize that it is not enough to build a military wall to contain communism in the Far East. We must maintain adequate defenses there, but in the foreground our energy, our intellect, and our courage should be directed toward building bridges of understanding across the chasms which separate the free nations.

It will take more than what we call military and give-away economic aid to do that. The challenge is to move into spheres of cooperation in which the common progress of all free nations becomes possible. If we are equal to that challenge, if we have the patience and understanding to stay with it, we need have no fear of the outcome of this contest between totalitarian communism and freedom—in Asia, in Europe, or anywhere else.

I believe the President is trying to move in that direction now and in so doing he has had the encouragement and support of a preponderance of the Senate. He has many times in recent months emphasized the need of a policy of partnership. Such a policy calls for close collaboration with other free nations based on national equality, mutual respect, tolerance of differences, and free association for the pursuit of essentially common goals.

Partnership in international affairs, if it is to be successful, requires forebearance, compassion, understanding and accommodation. It is not an easy approach to foreign policy. It means give and take. If it succeeds, however, it can produce a united strength which will make each free nation impervious both to the blustering threats and the glittering allures of Communist totalitarianism. Most of all it will provide an international environment in which individuals in this country and elsewhere will have an opportunity to develop and to prosper in peace.

Adm. John Grimes Walker and Inter-Oceanic Canals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, one of the great chapters of American history concerns interoceanic canals. Though isthmian literature is voluminous, the subject is not adequately understood, either as to key episodes or principal leaders. Some who made important contributions, on severing their connection with the enterprise, passed from public view and seemed to be forgotten.

These included such eminent figures as the distinguished engineer, Adolphe Godin de Lepinay, and the great engineer and construction organizer, John F. Stevens.

In recent years, however, events have transpired to rescue de Lepinay from oblivion, and John F. Stevens from the shadow of neglect, and to give them their proper stature in canal history.

The latest rescue from obscurity is that of Rear Adm. John Grimes Walker, 1835–1907, a son of New Hampshire and adopted child of Iowa, who was a principal architect of Isthmian Canal policy.

It, is indeed, gratifying that the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D. C., at its annual reunion on May 21, 1955, honored the memory of this distinguished naval officer. Among the special guests of the occasion was John Grahame Walker, a grandson of Admiral Walker. The occasion was historically noteworthy in that the toastmaster was Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, former Representative in Congress from Kentucky, and the sole surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, which had supervision of the actual construction of the Panama Canal, and a life-long student of Isthmian history and problems.

The principal address was delivered by Rear Adm. John R. Perry, C. E. C., Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy Department.

A considerable number of "old timers," who had been engaged in the work, on the isthmus, of building the canal, were in attendance—among them Lt. Gen. James G. Steese, who, as a young graduate from West Point, started his Army-engineering career in the Canal Zone, during the construction period, and held various positions in the Canal organization, including that of engineer of maintenance.

Mr. President, because of the growing interest in the subject of interoceanic canals, and to call better attention to the significant program under discussion, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address of Admiral Perry.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, survivors of the Isthmian Canal Commission, ladies and gentlemen, I am indeed happy to have the opportunity of saying a few words to you on the subject of Adm. John Grimes Walker and interoceanic canals. I am fearful, however, that much of what I may recount on this subject may be old news inasmuch as you, not I, are the survivors of the Isthmian Canal Commission. So you see, I have to run the risk of speaking about events of which many of you may have first-hand knowledge. And I am sure that you will agree with me when I say that historical accounts, regardless of how unbiased they may be, seldom disclose all the important facts.

Hoping that I may come as close to all facts, including those about which you may have first-hand knowledge, as is possible, I would like to recount the major events leading up to the construction of the Panama Canal, and include in such remarks the contributions to that final reality as were made by Admiral Walker.

It is frequently the case—that in order to review events leading up to a specific accomplishment—we have to go back a few years; however in the case of the Panama Canal, going back only a few years would be wholly inadequate to trace the accomplishment back to the original conception of the idea.

Although the conception of the idea of the Panama Canal did not originate with Christopher Columbus, it was through his confident relief that in sailing westward he would find a shorter route to the Old World that began the series of discoveries which lead to the locating of the narrow strip of land separating the waters of the Atlantic from those of the Pacific.

When Balboa, a follower of Columbus, was told by the Indians that a great sea lay beyond the mountains of the Province of Dairen which Spain had claimed by right of discovery, he immediately began organizing an expedition which culminated in his reaching the water which he named the South Sea on September 29, 1513. Two years later he had successfully transported enough timber from the Atlantic to the Pacific side to construct four brigatines for navigating the new sea to the land of precious metals spoken of by the Indians.

The career of this brave man who first marked out a line of transit across the isthmus and demonstrated its practicability was closed in 1517 when he was charged with treasonable conduct and was beheaded.

In the decade following ,the circumnavigation of the world by members of Magellan's crew proved that the far-eastern countries could be reached by either direction from Europe; but this western passage around the southern tip of South America did not reduce the distance nor satisfy those who sought direct route by a hoped-for strait along the coastline of the new continent.

Though all previous attempts had been baffled, the belief in the existence of such a strait was not entirely abandoned; and efforts to discover it were confined mainly to the isthmian section, where it had been developed that the two oceans were least widely separated.

When Charles V came to the throne of Spain in 1516 he took great interest in the exploration of the South Sea and the discovery of a connecting strait. He charged the governors of his American Provinces to have the entire coastline thoroughly examined, and every bay and river mouth that offered a solution to the problem was entered and explored. While these explorations to find a maritime channel or a suitable route for a canal were fruitless, the importance of a permanent communication across the isthmus by land was not overlooked; and in 1520 a road was built across the isthmus over the rout which Balboa had taken.

The value of this interoceanic communication increased every year, with tolls bringing benefits to Panama and enriching Spain. However, with the succession of Charles V by his son Philip II in 1555, the search for the strait and the idea of a canal was abandoned. One of the reasons for this discontinuance was the belief that the opening of a canal through the isthmus would be in opposition to the will of the Almighty Who had placed this barrier in the way of navigation between the two oceans.

This policy, adopted by Philip II, continued for two centuries after his death. Hence no scientific data valuable for canal purposes were available when the subject wos revived in the 19th century and the question of the feasibility of the different projects began to receive serious consideration. It is recorded, however, that Charles III authorized an investigation in Nicaragua, which was undertaken in 1779. Manuel Galisteo, who did the investigating, reported Lake Nicaragua to be 134 feet higher than the Pacific with intervening mountains that made connecting the lake with the Pacific impracticable.

In 1814 interest was again revived with the Spanish Cortes passing a formal decree for the construction of a canal through the isthmus for vessels of the largest size and providing for the formation of a company to undertake the enterprise. This decree lead to no results, and Spain's opportunity to obtain the glory of opening this great highway for the commerce of the world terminated in 1823 when the last of her Central and South American provinces succeeded in establishing their independence.

Governmental changes wrought by successful revolutions and the formation of new federations within Central America were followed by a revival of interest in the interoceanic dream. As a result the envoy extraordinary representing the Republic of Central America presented in 1825 to Henry Clay—then Secretary of State—a letter assuring him that nothing would be more grateful to the young Republic than the cooperation of the American people in the construction of a canal of communication through Nicaragua. Mr. Clay made a favorable response and assured the Minister that the importance of uniting the two seas by canal navigation was fully realized and that President Adams had determined to instruct the Charge d'Affaires of the United States to investigate with greatest care the facilities which Nicaragua offered. The President made such wishes known in 1826 but the desired information was never furnished.

Meanwhile, the Republic of Central America, not waiting for any action on the part of the United States Government, decreed that proposals should be received for the right to construct an interoceanic canal. They then accepted the terms offered by Aaron H. Palmer and associates of New York and entered into a contract with them. Efforts to secure the needed capital were unsuccessful and the contract was never executed.

The Republic of Central America again turned to the United States and offered to grant to the Government the right to construct a canal. Our Government gave this favorable consideration and in 1835 President Jackson sent a Mr. Charles Biddle to visit Nicaragua and Panama with instructions to obtain accurate information as to practicability, estimates, surveys, etc. This mission led to no satisfactory result and the idea was temporarily dropped.

It was revived again under President Van Buren and another agent was sent to the Isthmus to make studies. This agent recommended the Nicaraguan route, estimated the cost at $25 million but recommended that the time was not favorable for such an undertaking.

In 1838, the Republic of New Granada (which then controlled the Panama route) granted to a French company a concession to construct roads, railroads, or canals across the Isthmus with the Pacific terminus at Panama. The company spent several years in making explorations only to wind up by forfeiting their concession.

The increased importance of a maritime connection brought on by the ceding of California to the United States in 1848 again brought into focus the canal question. A joint resolution introduced in the House authorizing the survey of certain routes for a canal or railroad was referred to a committee which recognized the superior importance of a ship canal, but suggested that a railroad would be valuable for earlier use and would also serve as an auxiliary to any canal constructed in the future.

Such a railroad was completed in 1855 by Aspinwall, Stephens, and Chauncey who with their associates had organized the Panama Railroad Company. But this railroad, valuable and useful as it promised to be, was only a forward movement. In fact, its presence increased rather than abated the desire for a maritime canal.

The history of the examinations and surveys of the different routes and of the un-

completed contracts with individuals and companies for the construction and operation of canals would fill volumes. The United States, France, and Great Britain were each involved. I regret that time will not permit me to go into each of these events since they serve to point up the magnitude of the task which was ultimately accomplished and the significance of the reports rendered by the commissions headed by Admiral Walker.

Perhaps the event that hastened the actual construction more than any other was the meeting of the Congress of Geographical Science in Paris in 1875. There De Lesseps, still riding the pinnacle from his success at Suez, made the sweeping announcement that the authors of all plans up to that time had committed the serious error of examining only canal routes with locks, and that the interoceanic canal had to be constructed at sea level like the Suez in order to meet the requirements of navigation. At the conclusion of De Lesseps' remarks, De Lepinay rose in strong protest. He had adequately studied the geography of the Isthmus and recognized the elevated lake idea as offering the solution to the canal problem. He laid out his plan, which was essentially the one eventually adopted in 1906, but De Lesseps' influence was so strong that De Lepinays' plan was ignored.

The French did, in 1878, secure a concession from the Government of Colombia for a ship canal and soon thereafter began construction on a sea-level canal connecting the Bay of Limon to the Bay of Panama. After many different contracts had been let, pursued and abandoned and after De Lesseps had finally capitulated to the lock-canal idea, public confidence and financial support waned. In 1889 their effort completely collapsed.

Meanwhile the United States had continued to study the Nicaraguan route and had been granted a concession authorizing the construction of a canal through that country. A company was organized and was incorporated by Congress in 1889. Construction was actually begun but halted in 1892 because of lack of money.

This repetitive pattern of trial and failure still did not end the United States efforts. In 1895 President Cleveland appointed the Nicaragua Canal Board to obtain final answers on the construction and completion of the canal through Nicaragua. This board found that the time and money allotted to it was insufficient for obtaining all essential data required and thus recommended in its report that further explorations and observations be made.

As a follow-up to these recommendations President McKinley in 1897 appointed the Nicaragua Canal Commission and named Rear Adm. John G. Walker as president. This choice came as no surprise since Admiral Walker as Chief of the Bureau of Navigation had previously directed the compiling of all historical and technical information on interoceanic communication by way of the American isthmus. Further, he had established a reputation as a strong administrator and as the most influential officer in the Navy. He had also gained valuable experience as general superintendent of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad while on a 2-year leave of absence from the Navy. The commission which he was to head had conferred upon it all the powers and duties of the former board, and was to report upon the proper route, feasibility and cost for a canal in Nicaragua.

An examination of the report rendered by the Nicaragua Canal Commission and submitted to the President in 1899 shows the thoroughness of its organization and work. Nicaraguan routes previously recommended were evaluated and compared from engineering cost standpoints. A final canal route was adopted by the Commission and all field work necessary to its preliminary location and cost determination was accomplished. In its conclusion the Commission stated its belief that a high-level lake-lock-type canal could be successfully built across Nicaragua.

Events of the Spanish-American War, particularly the war-emergency run of the *Oregon* around the Horn in 1898, dramatically emphasized the need of a canal for national-defense purposes. To the pressure of commercial demands was added the new demand for adequate defense of the new empire which included the Philippines.

In answer to these demands President McKinley appointed the Isthmian Canal Commission on March 3, 1899. He charged the Commission with the investigation of all routes including the Panama routes and directed that it recommend the most practicable one. Rear Adm. John G. Walker was again appointed as president of the newly created Commission.

Following the failure of the French in 1889 a New Panama Canal Co. had been organized in 1894 to continue the French effort. Work had continued on a limited scale and their Colombian option was still held. Hence one of the tasks of the Isthmian Commission was to ascertain from the French the amount for which they would sell their holdings. An examination of the correspondence conducted among Admiral Walker, the Colombian Minister, and the President of the Panama Canal Co. reveals the many considerations that acted as a deterrent to the Commission's final report. The French, finally, in October 1901, named a price of their total property and rights as $109,141,500. This amount added to the estimated cost of completing the Panama route made a difference of $63,510,796 in favor of the Nicaraguan route. After consideration of this cost difference the Commission concluded and reported that the most practicable and feasible route was the Nicaraguan route.

The French, fearing that they would lose everything sent a new proposal in January 1902. By this they offered to accept for the totality, without exception, their property and rights on the isthmus for $40 million, the amount which Admiral Walker's Commission had previously estimated such to be worth. After considering the changed conditions, the Commission in a supplementary report informed President Roosevelt that in its opinion the most practicable and feasible route was the Panama route.

As a result of the work of these two Commissions, Congress and the President were supplied the technical basis for the great decision of 1902.

The story of Colombian refusal to grant the United States the necessary leasehold, and of Panama's later revolt and independence is well known.

Following the ratification of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty, and as required by the Spooner Act of 1902, President Theodore Roosevelt in March 1904, appointed the first Isthmian Canal Commission for construction of the Panama Canal—naming Admiral Walker as its chairman. This Commission visited the isthmus in 1904 and completed the formalties of taking over the Canal Zone strip and formulating plans for the new Canal Zone Government. Admiral Walker continued as chairman of the Commission until a new Commission was appointed on April 1, 1905. This was his last official service.

I am sure that you present know in full the story of actual construction of the Panama lock-type canal which was opened to traffic in 1914 culminating the dreams and efforts of 400 years.

The importance that the canal has been and will continue to be is measureless. The contributions of Rear Admiral Walker and his Commissions to that final realization are also measureless.

It seems only proper that this line officer of the Navy, who distinguished himself as an outstanding leader and organizer from the day of being graduated as honor student at the Naval Academy until his retirement from active service in 1897, should climax his service as one of the principal architects of the Isthmian Canal policy of the United States.

Polio: Canada's Way—Government Held the Reins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to an article, written by Mark Gayn, which appeared in the June 4, 1955, issue of the Nation magaznie. Mr. Gayn is now living in Montreal, Canada.

The article follows:

POLIO: CANADA'S WAY—GOVERNMENT HELD THE REINS

(By Mark Gayn)

MONTREAL.—Back in the very dark year of 1953 there were 8,900 cases of infantile paralysis and 481 fatalities in Canda. Last year the graph dipped sharply—to 2,400 cases and 105 deaths—but it was still bad enough to induce the Government to sponsor field tests of the Salk vaccine in the Provinces of Alberta, Manitoba, and Nova Scotia. Even at that time tentative plans were being shaped for mass inoculation should the vaccine prove successful.

By last fall these plans had reached the point where the department of health and public welfare was ready with specific proposals. When the medical officers from the 10 Provinces gathered here for the 66th regular meeting of the Dominion Council of Health, the federal government laid the plan before them. What it said in effect was this: If a uniform program of inoculation could be agreed upon, the department would finance half the cost of the new vaccine, with the provincial governments paying the other half. It was estimated that $750,000 would be needed to inoculate the most vulnerable group of half a million children.

Both vision and courage were needed by Paul Martin, Minister of Health, to make the offer. Biologicals in this country have traditionally been a provincial responsibility, and some of Canada's Provinces are just as jealous of their prerogatives as the most ornery American States. Mr. Martin, however, felt that the threat of polio could be regarded as a national emergency in which Federal action was justified. If the field tests of the Salk vaccine in Canada and the United States proved successful, there could be no delay in the launching of a mass inoculation.

It is to the credit of the Dominion Council of Health that it wasted no time. A five-man subcommittee that it appointed promptly drafted a national program which assured uniformity in the Provinces, free inoculation, and restriction of the vaccine to the age groups which needed it most. One of the subcommittee members was Dr. R. D. Defries, whose Connaught Medical Research Laboratories at the University of Toronto, had already done some important pioneer work in the general field. In fact, it was at the Connaught Laboratories that the young Canadian scientist, Dr. J. F. Morgan, and his associates devised medium 199, a synthetic medium in which polio virus could be grown in tissue culture.

In October 1954 the Department of Health and the Provincial governments signed the contracts, and the Connaught Laboratories were told to go ahead with the industrial production of the vaccine. On April 12, when Dr. Thomas Francis, Jr., gave the green light at Ann Arbor, Mich., the vaccine was ready for distribution to the Provinces on the basis of population.

Thus far, more than half a million children have been inoculated and are scheduled to get their second shot before the end of June. Nearly all the vaccine was administered through schools or clinics to the prescribed age groups. One batch of Parke, Davis vaccine imported from the United States was distributed to doctors through drugstores and used to inoculate some 13,000 children. No more American vaccine has been imported as a result of the series of bans imposed by the United States Public Health Service.

By and large, the program has been carried out with only one minor hitch. In Quebec Province the original decision was to inoculate children born in 1953. But on the appointed Monday only 1 child of each expected 10 was brought in for inoculation. No one in Montreal is quite sure why. The reasons given to me have ranged from the fact that Monday is washday in French Canadian Quebec to the suspicion that the first ban in the United States might have alarmed many parents in Montreal. In any case, the provincial health authorities then ordered the vaccine to be made available to all children between the ages of 3 months and 10 years. This brought on a stampede, especially in Montreal, where a turnout of 80 to 90 percent quickly exhausted the vaccine at many clinics, and the "first come, first serve" rule had to be employed. If the Quebec health authorities misread the domestic calendar and the parental moods, they have redeemed themselves with an early $600,000 grant to the Institute of Microbiology at the University of Montreal for the construction of a new laboratory to produce the Salk vaccine. The building will be ready in July and industrial production will begin in September.

With half a million children already given their first shot, Canada has had—at the time I write—only 2 suspicious cases—1 was found to be something else than polio; in the other instance polio had struck the child only 4 days or so after the inoculation and must have been incurred before.

Canada's health authorities, however, are keeping their fingers crossed. It is felt here that "what looks simple in a test tube might prove to be very tricky in a vat." Contrary to the untrammeled early enthusiasm south of the border, the feeling here all along has been that the problems of testing the Salk vaccine have not all been solved. If any of the inoculated Canadian children develop polio as they did in the United States, medical experts here will be distressed but not surprised.

Yet one must also note that medical officials here are proud of the thoroughness of their testing procedures. The original testing, done at the Connaught Laboratories, is very similar to that carried out by the American commercial producers. In the United States additional spot testing is then done by the Public Health Service. Here the Department of Health has been content with nothing less than a complete retesting of each batch of the vaccine by the National Laboratory of Hygiene.

Thoroughness has paid off. In the earlier days of the program the National Laboratory, on retesting, detected suspicious evidence in several batches of 100,000 doses each. They were promptly rejected. Had there been no such comprehensive recheck, this vaccine would have been used, with possible unfortunate results.

Two American firms have been licensed to import and distribute their vaccine here, and the first—and the only—batch of Parke, Davis vaccine brought here was not subjected to a retest. The Washington ban has of course stopped the flow of the American vaccine here; if it is resumed, the Department of Health will require the same thorough recheck that is given to the Connaught vaccine. The Department sees nothing wrong with the testing procedures used by the American commercial producers; it simply is convinced that a second thorough check has justified itself. The Government is now also insisting that the American firms, instead of shipping here a portion of their domestic output, send vaccine produced in its entirety for Canada. Two firms have tentatively agreed to this, but nothing further has been done.

Public-health experts here think that, apart from the unexplored characteristics of the industrially produced vaccine itself, the big problem for the United States Public Health Service lies in rechecking the vaccine. The spot testing obviously has not worked out well.

But the main contrast bewteen the successful operation here and the confusion to the south lies clearly not in technical procedures but in the underlying philosophy. The Liberal Government in Ottawa is just as devoted to the concept of private enterprise as most GOP stalwarts. But at the same time it is aware that there are important areas where the Government must take over. Public health is one of them. As much as a year ago the Government decided that polio was one area where Federal initiative, guidance, financing, and supervision would be essential. In the United States no comparable decision was made. Much of the financing was done by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, the production by six commercial firms. The difference in the approach was reflected in the results:

First, when the Department of Health and the 10 provincial governments concluded their agreement last October, Ottawa was able to insure that the vaccine would be free and would go to the age groups most vulnerable to polio. In the United States roughly half the vaccine had gone to private doctors who could, if they wished, inoculate all those able to pay for it, whatever their age.

Second. State control here was matched by a most exhaustive doublechecking of the vaccine. This has been in contrast to the catch-as-catch-can procedure adopted by Washington.

Third. Early Federal initiative here insured uniformity in administering the program that was tragically lacking in the 48 States to the south.

Fourth. The "polio season" here begins in July and reaches its peak in September and October. Without waiting to see what effect the mass inoculation will have on the incidence of disease, Mr. Martin has already made it known that Ottawa stands ready to finance half the cost of the vaccine needed in 1955–56.

Fifth. And this is perhaps the most striking contrast between the 2 programs—the Connaught Laboratories are selling the vaccine at cost, which is $1.50 for 3 doses. At a drugstore in Ottawa or Toronto the same three doses of the American commercial vaccine might be available at $6.60. This, of course, is the retail price, and if the Canadian Government bought the vaccine in bulk from the American producers, it would expect to pay roughly $4.50 for 3 doses, or 3 times what it costs to produce it here. Canadian public-health experts are willing to concede that the six American drug companies had spent some of their own money to develop the techniques of industrial production. But this fails to explain the tremendous disparity in the cost, for the Connaught Laboratories have also had to develop these techniques. The American prices caused raised eyebrows here.

"If I were running a drug company," says one highly qualified expert, "I'd probably do what they are doing. I'd call the directors in and say, 'Look, boys, we've got this bonanza that'll last us 4 or 5 years. So let us exploit it for all it's worth.' "

In general, the Canadian health officials are loath to criticize the Americans in their hour of trouble. All along there has been close United States-Canadian collaboration on all levels, scientific as well as governmental. More than that, when Washington banned the sales of the vaccine abroad, it allowed some sales to Canada. Yet the confusion to the south has hurt Canada too, and the Canadians would have been inhuman if they had remained indifferent. Ottawa, for instance, had been thinking of inoculating a total of 1,500,000 children this year with the help of vaccine bought in the United States. This hope has now been abandoned.

One indication of Canadian feeling is the circulation in at least one institution here of Walter Lippmann's recent article, Polio Vaccine and Public Policy, neatly pasted on white paper for easy examination. I have also met public-health experts in both Ottawa and Montreal who shared Mr. Lippmann's misgivings about the dramatic buildup, the theatrical suspense, and the spectacular publicity" which attended the Ann Arbor announcement. There is widespread agreement with this view that the blazing publicity was bound to convey, as it did convey, the misleading impression that a full solution had been found; and one finds an almost identical belief expressed by Mr. Martin: the vaccine is "a very encouraging beginning * * * not a total and complete preventive of paralysis from polio."

Some of the experts I have met felt Washington should have been ready with national legislation even while the field tests of the vaccine were in progress last summer; or, at the least, should have initiated detailed consultations with the scientists and manufacturers last year, instead of waiting until May. There is, finally, a belief here that the American press, by and large, contributed to the confusion and shock by reducing a major item of medical research to the level of a glorious barroom brawl. "Here in Canada," I was told, "the press has cooperated with us in toning the story down and in keeping a sane approach to this difficult problem."

But in the end it is relatively unimportant whether the United States Public Health Service did or did not begin holding comprehensive consultations until this spring, whether the Ann Arbor ceremony was conducted with the desired decorum, and whether the bulk of the American press has thrown its blackest headlines into the exploitation of the polio tragedy. The only thing that really matters is that Canada has demonstrated that the program could be carried out with a minimum of hitches and a maximum of safety, with the greatest benefit to those who need the vaccine most, and at the lowest possible cost.

This is the great lesson that Canada offers Washington. The failure of the United States Government to take over control of this crucial program from the outset was a costly and even tragic blunder. The human costs are bound to soar if the present haphazard course is pursued. From this vantage point there still seems to be time and opportunity to put the Canadian experiment to good use in the United States.

Budget Message of Gov. George M. Leader, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD Gov. George M. Leader's budget message to the General Assembly of Pennsylvania, on April 19, 1955:

BUDGET MESSAGE OF GOV. GEORGE M. LEADER BEFORE A JOINT SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN THE HALL OF THE HOUSE, HARRISBURG, PA., APRIL 19, 1955

Mr. Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Speaker, members of the general assembly, this day, ladies and gentlemen of the general assembly, is a day of reckoning because we are going to the people with a balanced budget program.

It is a day of reckoning because it is the day we cast accounts; the day we face the needs of the State for the next 2 years and contrast those needs with the revenues available to pay for them.

It is a day of reckoning because it is of necessity a time of realism, a time when all wishful thinking, executive, legislative, or public, must give way to cold hard facts.

A day of reckoning is the moment in time when truth becomes absolute; when it finally becomes clear that you cannot remain solvent if you spend more than you take in, if you make commitments against the future without the funds to make them good, if you borrow without creating a reserve fund to pay your debts when they come due.

The budget which I must submit to you today is a tally sheet for such a reckoning.

There was a custom in ancient days for disappointed princes to kill the bearers of bad news.

Perhaps it was in point, but this day, at least, I am glad that it is no longer in general usage.

For, to my deep regret, I have only somber fiscal information and proposals for the legislature, and for the people of Pennsylvania today.

We must first make a reckoning of our experience in this current biennium which is about to end. That reckoning shows a period of disastrous financial management, in which our State will incur a deficit estimated at $74,732,533. If we had not promptly exercised strict budget controls and operational economies, this deficit would have been greater still.

It should be remembered that this huge deficit occurred even with the general sales tax that was enacted at the last session of the legislature.

Now, as we budget for the coming biennium of 1955–57, we must make appropriations and levy taxes to cover the $75 million shortage which is our inheritance from the previous administration.

We must also recognize the simple arithmetic which dictates that if the revenues in the last biennium were insufficient by 75 millions to meet the 1953–55 budget; then, the revenues for the 1955–57 budget must be increased by 75 millions of dollars to bring into balance a budget no larger than the last one.

The hard fact is that the failure of the 1953–55 budget to match its appropriations with its actual revenue yield will force us to find $150 million in new revenues now, at this session, for the next 2 years.

It is idle to exchange recriminations as to why this happened.

The fact is that it did happen, and it is before us.

In addition, at the beginning of the 1953–55 biennium, the State had a cash surplus of $22,786,519. That balance was wiped out and replaced by a deficit.

We now must replace it in the State's fiscal reckonings with new income obtained from additional revenue.

To summarize a rather complex set of circumstances into one sentence:

If we were to adopt to the letter and the dollar the budget which was adopted by the last session of the legislature, and make that budget serve for 1955–57, we would be forced to find new revenues totaling more than $172 million.

But we cannot adopt the budget totals of the 1953–55 biennium, and still keep faith with the commitments written into law prior to this administration. We presume that these commitments represent the pledged word of the representatives of the people of Pennsylvania; some of them are absolute and binding legal commitments as well.

Let me list these mandated payments, which are now included in the budget in fulfillment of policies and pledges already made and written into law.

For support of public schools through reimbursement for instruction—which means principally teachers' salaries: $426,840,000.

This is an increase of $78,840,000 above the last State budget. The increase represents the added costs of increments in teachers' salaries coming due in this biennium on the basis of the schedule voted by the legislature in 1951.

For support of public schools through a subsidy for pupil transportation: $29,761,000.

This is an increase of $5,359,000 above the last State budget, and is again in accordance with the requirements of existing law.

For support of public schools through rental reimbursement of public-school buildings, $25,599,000.

This is an increase of $6,638,000. The appropriation represents the State's contribution to schools built and proposed under the State school authority and the municipal authority laws.

For State reimbursements of county health units, $5,432,000.

This is a long-standing commitment by the State, expressed in Act 315 of 1951, and and now at long last proposed for payment as a matter of good faith and good public-health practice.

For State aid to stream-purification projects, $3,200,000.

This is an increase of $1,200,000—due and payable under legislation enacted in the 1953 session.

For public assistance, $138 million.

The increase above the 1953–55 appropriation is $15,821,000. This recommended appropriation is in fulfillment of the State's legal obligations under legislation first enacted in 1937.

For rentals to the general State authority, $23 million.

This represents an increase of $5,165,873 above the last State budget. It is a contractual obligation of the State which cannot be reduced or avoided.

For payments on debt service for the World War II bonus, $63,490,000.

This is an increase of $6,880,000, to which the full faith and credit of the Commonwealth are pledged.

The increases in these payments mandated by legislation total $125,335,873.

This $125 million must be provided in new revenues or the legislature must be prepared to amend the laws which make these increased expenditures necessary. I doubt that a majority can be found in either house, or upon either side of the political aisle, which will be willing to make such amendments.

In the present event we are forced to add them to the budget.

In the same event the legislature will of necessity be compelled to enact taxes to pay for them.

In examining the revenue prospects from existing taxes and other income sources, we find that we cannot always expect to get the same return in 1955–57 as we gained in the last biennium. An illustration is the transfer of profits from the liquor sales in State stores, which has been done on an unsystematic take-as-you-need basis. The actual working capital of the liquor stores has been depleted and payments from liquor-store receipts to the general fund will not be available in a similar amount in the biennium for which we now budget. The revenue loss will be $12,500,000.

Estimated reductions in other revenue receipts will total approximately $9 million.

I did not seek election as Governor of this State to live in the past or to assess the blame for our difficulties upon my predecessors in office.

Our common task today, and in the hard days ahead, is to solve our problems, and not to whine about them.

Accordingly, I am quite prepared to divide this budget and its grave requirements between those critical troubles which make up our inheritance, and those challenges and problems which we freely admit are of our own seeking out and recognition.

On the basis of the existing tax structure, and of the budget of the last State administration plus the mandatory increases, our need for new revenue totals nearly $320 million.

All of this is on our doorstep; all of this is the result of a continuous willingness to advocate and accept appropriations and commitments without the levying of taxes sufficient to support them.

I have within me a deep conviction that we are now ready to do better; that we are no longer so thoughtless as to pass to each new session and to each new Governor the failures and the evasions of the years gone by.

Certainly, I am ready to do my part, ready to assume my full share as Governor of the responsibility for a fiscal policy that will be honest, however hard.

If, as I have said, this is a day of reckoning, I trust that it will also be a day memorable because the reckoning was marked "paid, paid in full."

The last session of the general assembly passed a general sales tax.

I oppose this kind of tax because it is a wrong tax. It is a regressive tax—unfairly placing burdens of payment upon those least able to pay.

As a Senator, I voted against that tax. As a candidate for Governor, I campaigned for its elimination. As Governor, I cannot, with any self-respect, with any regard for my pledged word, with any regard for the plain instruction of the people, come to you today and urge its retention, or, as many voices now advocate, urge its extension to food and clothing and its increase in rate to 3 or 4 percent.

I expect this legislature to let the sales tax expire.

But equally, I expect this legislature to pass, as part of an equitable-tax program, a revenue substitute for the sales tax.

The net revenue loss from the expiration of the sales tax will be $80 million. Its yield has been disappointing to its sponsors, and the return from it will be $35 million less than the original budget estimates adopted in 1953.

In the interest of complete accuracy, it should be noted that the 1955–57 budget will benefit by $20 million from the continuation

of the sales tax to its legal expiration date of August 31 of this year.

Again in the interest of accuracy, it should become clear to the people of this State that the existing sales tax is no answer to the State's fiscal problems. Anyone who poses the question "Do you favor the retention of the sales tax or the adoption of some other tax?" leaving the impression that is all there is to it, is either wholly ignorant of the State's financial requirements or is practicing a planned deceit.

Our decision—for which we take full responsibility—to let the sales tax die does indeed make it necessary for us to find new revenues totaling $80 million for the next 2 years. This amount—and it is a sizable amount—is nevertheless only one-fourth as much as those new revenues we are compelled to ask as a result of actions taken before this administration came into being. It is only 15 percent of our total new revenue needs.

The total general fund budget which I am today submitting calls for appropriation of $1,237,464,930.

We do not regard these estimates as inviolate.

The Legislature may choose to reduce some of them, or to add to them.

But they do represent our best judgment as to the needs and obligations of the Commonwealth.

There are substantial increases provided in the amount of State assistance to State Teachers Colleges, Pennsylvania State University, and to the State-aided universities and medical schools. The total increase in this category is $14,637,000.

There are substantial increases provided for our State-aided local hospitals, so that they may continue to care for patients who are unable themselves to pay their way.

The total increase in aid to such hospitals is $7,228,000.

Our State and our society have failed miserably in the past to meet the problems of mental health and mental disease. Under Pennsylvania law, the care of mental patients is a complete responsibility of the Commonwealth. Since we have the responsibility, we should manfully have the courage to accept its weight, and summon up the imagination and determination to carry out an effective program.

We all know of the thousands of retarded children in this State who cannot gain admission to the institutions we are obligated to maintain for their care and treatment.

The mental health program is of such importance that I intend to submit a supplementary message to the Legislature outlining in detail exactly what is proposed; what it may cost, now and in the future; and what good things may be achieved.

To start a good program will cost $29,959,000 in additional appropriations.

The total increase now requested for the Department of Welfare comes to $44,895,890.

The printed budget estimates are based upon existing programs and existing State responsibilities. They do not include the cost of the economic development program which I outlined to the legislature on March 28.

This will cost, as you will remember, $35,700,000 in appropriations. No better money, no more necessary money, could be spent by the State than this "seed money" for our economy. We quite willingly accept responsibility for its addition to the projected appropriations, and I am gratified by the measure of bipartisan support which has already been evidenced on behalf of the economic development program.

Our total needs for new revenue for the general fund of the Commonwealth will come to the enormous amount of $510,604,474.

This figure does not include any allowance for additional appropriations made by the legislature or for the administration of the tax program which the legislature finally adopts.

I doubt that any State in our Union was ever confronted with the need to raise so much in new revenue at a single session of its assembly.

We do not have an enviable assignment, you and I. It is always popular to appropriate; it is never popular to tax.

I think that for a few minutes, before I come to my recommendations as to the tax program which we should adopt, we should discuss the basic trends which have brought us to this pass.

Primarily, they are the assumption by the Commonwealth of responsibilities which once were local responsibilities. Under the compulsion of our times, and with the consent and urging of both parties, we have found it necessary to assume on a statewide basis the major degree of support for public education, the whole degree of support for public assistance, the entire responsibility for mental disease, an ever-increasing percentage of the highway and road system.

The State government has entirely changed in its character.

It is for you to determine whether this trend is irreversible.

You could, the legislature could, turn the whole responsibility for public education back to the school districts and their local taxpayers; you could turn relief back to the counties; you could exact from local tax rates the amounts now spent for the care of mental patients who after all come from a locality.

It could be truthfully said, for instance, that it is not the State that has a financial crisis.

It is public education in Pennsylvania which has a financial crisis.

The total recommended appropriations to the Department of Public Instruction come to $623,462,352. If these costs for education were not borne by the State, we would have the pleasant duty of coming before you today and recommending tax reductions of more than $100 million.

It can be said with equal truth that it is not the State government which has a financial crisis, so much as we have a social and welfare crisis in Pennsylvania.

The departments of health, public assistance, and welfare call for a combined appropriation in State funds of $380,514,552.

Here again, if the State should decide that these social services were none of its concern, that local communities could care for their welfare needs as they did under the Elizabethan poor law, the State government would be easily financed.

But I think we are all realistic enough to know that these rollbacks to the past are not going to happen.

We have been elected to administer the present.

Having sought election, we cannot now shrink from our duties.

Consequently, I have not looked for an easy refuge in any pretense that taxes are a legislative responsibility and that the Governor may present his estimate of needs and duck a recommendation of taxes to finance those needs.

Instead I do now recommend a tax program to the legislature which will finance the expenditure budget I have submitted—and finance it equitably, fairly, and in full accordance with the platform upon which I ran, in accord with the established principles of my party, in accord with every word I have spoken in public or in private. Obviously, it is a tax program which I believe will be in the best interests of the people of the State.

The principle of this program is the sound principle of ability to pay.

It has been shaped within the limitations of the constitution of Pennsylvania.

Its core is an income tax, an income tax that will fall upon every classification of income, earned or unearned.

We have long classified income in this State as a subject of taxation. We did that when we first taxed corporate income and did not tax personal income.

I now propose a tax program that will carry forward this principle of classification of income as follows:

Net income derived from long-term capital gains. To be taxed at a rate of 6 percent a year. Estimated biennial yield, $34,250,000.

Net income derived from dividend payments. To be taxed at a rate of 5 percent per year. Estimated yield, $56,750,000.

Net income derived from interest, rents, and royalties. To be taxed at a rate of 4 percent per year. Estimated yield, $42 million.

Net income derived from the operation of a business or the practice of a profession. To be taxed at the rate of 2 percent. Estimated yield, $83,200,000.

Net increase derived from all other sources, including employment. To be taxed at a rate of 1 percent. Estimated yield, $194,800,000.

The total yield from this system of classified income tax is estimated at $411 million. This estimate is based upon a collection system which gives the taxpayer the normal business and professional expense deductions as granted under the Federal income tax law, and gives the employed person the right to a cost-of-earning deduction, plus a deduction of all local taxes, which may be an actual itemized statement or a flat claim of $1,000, whichever is the higher.

I submit this proposed tax schedule to the legislature as a tax which can be readily collected, which is simple for the taxpayer whose return will follow the Federal classifications, and which is based upon ability to pay.

It is not a graduated income tax because the Constitution forbids us to levy a graduated income tax.

It does differentiate between classes of income on those good grounds of public policy which are to be found in comparative ability to pay.

It is in proper counterbalance with the recent changes in the Federal tax system which have conspicuously favored income from investments as against income from employment.

Our people have already been exposed to extensive misrepresentations that this tax would fall most heavily upon our wage earners. I submit that this is a deliberate attempt to mislead them. The impact of this tax program falls most heavily on those best able to pay; more than half of the anticipated revenues come from investment income and business and professions. I have kept faith with the great mass of our people who subscribe, with me, to a tax philosophy that our higher income groups should pay a proportionately higher share of the cost of Government. I shall hold fast to that philosophy.

To raise the additional revenues which are required above the yield of the classified income tax, I recommend:

1. That the corporate net income tax rate be increased by 1 percent. Estimated yield of the increase, $52,800,000.

2. That the gross receipts tax on public utilities be increased from 14 mills to 24 mills. Estimated yield of the increase, $18,500,000.

3. That companies furnishing natural gas be made subject to the gross receipts tax on public utilities, at the new rate of 24 mills. Estimated yield, $11,880,000.

4. That the tax on bank shares be repealed and banking corporations be made subject to the corporate net income tax at the new rate of 6 percent. Estimated net increase in yield, $3,500,000.

5. That Federal savings and loan associations, mutual savings institutions, building and loan associations, and cooperative banks be made subject to the corporate net income tax. Estimated yield, $5,100,000.

6. That the corporate net income-tax statute be amended to make dividends received by corporations taxable to the same extent that they are taxable under the Federal income-tax law. Estimated yield, $3 million.

7. That the net 8-mill tax on the gross premiums paid to domestic stock insurance companies and to mutual life-insurance companies be reinstated. Estimated yield, $7½ million.

8. That a license fee for the privilege of storing natural gas in Pennsylvania be enacted, to be collected at the rate of 1 cent for every 1,000 cubic feet of gas withdrawn. Estimated yield, $3 million.

9. That the rate of the inheritance tax for nondependent lineal heirs be raised from 2 to 5 percent. Estimated yield, $12,800,000.

I also suggest to the legislature that it now begin the job of clearing away some of the brush that has grown up around our tax system in Pennsylvania.

Specifically, I recommend the elimination of the following hodgepodge of taxes:

1. The tax on corporate loans.

2. The tax on gross receipts of motor carriers.

3. The gross receipts tax on private bankers.

4. The stock transfer tax.

5. The tax on income of agricultural cooperative associations.

6. The tax on membership of rural electrification associations.

With the exception of the tax on corporate loans, these yield relatively little revenue. They are burdensome in the paperwork they force on both the taxpayer and the State, and generally are part of a hodgepodge unrevised system of taxation into which we are now attempting to bring order.

The total loss of revenue to be expected from the repeal of the taxes I have just listed is $3,513,000.

As I have already said, I urge the repeal of the tax on bank shares because banking corporations should become subject to the corporate net income tax. The same reasoning leads to a recommendation that the existing tax on the net earnings of mutual savings institutions and similar agencies should also be repealed, and these organizations also brought under the corporate net income tax.

Further, I recommend the repeal of the excise taxes on both domestic and foreign corporations. These taxes present a financial and a psychological handicap to the development of new businesses in Pennsylvania, and to the expansion of existing enterprises. The revenue loss will be $4½ million.

In all, we are able to recommend repeal of nine nuisance taxes, chiefly affecting business, and thus contribute substantially to the simplification of our tax structure, while increasing substantially our revenues from remaining business-tax sources.

On the basis of the tax schedule I now submit, the revenue yield to the Commonwealth in the next biennium will be $1,358,288,000. This will finance the general fund budget and the proposed economic program which together total $1,273,000,000. It will pay off the $75 million deficit of the preceding administration. It will leave a balance of $10 million for additional appropriations that may originate in the legislature to finance the collection of taxes and other legislatively mandated appropriations.

The budget will be thoroughly in balance.

We will take the turn of the road that leads to solvency, and abandon the skid-row alley that has been leading our State to the equivalent of bankruptcy in its public finances.

Like any human instrument, this program is, of course, not perfect. No one in this administration will be so obstinate, I hope, or so full of the pride of authorship, as to refuse to accept modifications and improvements.

But in its basic principles, this program is sound and fair.

It is not a soak-the-rich tax program.

It is not a soak-the-poor tax program.

It is not a soak-business program.

It has no prejudice, or special target.

It recognizes the fact that our new revenue needs come to $25 a year for every man, woman, and child in Pennsylvania. It attempts to distribute the burden broadly, but to distribute it in relationship to ability to pay.

I fully expect the great debate to be between those who accept this program in its general outlines, and those who will argue for an increase in the sales tax rate to 3¾ percent with a removal of all exemptions except food bought for home consumption.

Such a 3¾ percent sales tax schedule would cost practically every employed person more than he will pay under the income tax proposed. Every fact we can find, every statistic as to the average Pennsylvania family, shows this beyond a doubt.

Under the income tax schedule that is proposed, a typical family with an annual income of $4,000 would pay $30 to the State.

Under the increased sales tax, figured at 3¾ percent, that same family would pay $56 to the State.

This same disparity runs up and down the income scale. Of course, the lower the family income, the more oppressive the sales tax becomes.

I think our people can count, and even if they pay the sales tax in driblets, they will know from their household books what it is costing them.

Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes said that "taxes are the price we pay for a civilized society."

He was right, but that doesn't prevent a tax debate in a free country from verging into savagery.

I accept the fact that this will be a hard, a savage fight, but the Governor, at least, will not lose his sense of proportion. I expect to pound the facts home at every opportunity, and I expect those who campaigned with me to keep their word as I propose to keep mine. And I expect the facts to prevail, as they always do when they are sufficiently understood.

In addition to the portions of the State budget financed by the general fund, there are, as the legislators know, special services of the State financed under either constitutional or statutory provisions by special taxes and licenses.

The largest of these special services is the motor license fund, which is financed by the taxes on liquid fuels, by the motor license charges, by the charges for operators' licenses, and by grants-in-aid from the Federal Government.

I will submit a supplementary message explaining in detail our proposals for an improved and accelerated highway maintenance and construction program, and for increased distribution of highways funds to the localities for the improved maintenance of rural roads and urban streets.

The highway department budget as submitted calls for appropriations of $589,241,648.

To finance this budget I recommend an increase in the liquid-fuels tax of 1 cent per gallon. The estimated yield from this increase in the gasoline tax is $52 million for the biennium. I recommend further that the motor-vehicle license payment for passenger cars be increased from $10 to $15. The estimated yield in revenue will be $29 million. I recommend, finally, that the motor-vehicle license fees for trucks be increased along their whole range, to a new series of charges rising from $20 to $300. The estimated yield in new revenue is $18 million.

We all know, and I am sure we all agree, that the need for improved highways is great and always growing; that we need new and better highways now. To get them we must be prepared to pay their cost. No one has a more direct return in service from the taxes he pays than the motorist and trucker.

The other special fund budgets are:

The fish fund	$4,546,224
The game fund	9,056,439
The banking department fund	1,950,022
The milk control fund	933,500
The State farm products show fund	390,903

Now, you have the budgetary facts as we see them and the solutions we propose.

In looking toward the future, I would suggest these things:

First. That we make a firm decision as to what are local and what are State responsibilities in the public affairs of Pennsylvania, and that all of us—State government and local agencies of government—organize ourselves to meet our responsibilities supremely well.

Second. That we abandon the pretense of temporary taxes in the State's tax structure, and have the hardihood to enact a tax program with the honest admission that it has come to stay unless changing circumstances and constitutional amendments provide the opportunity for constructive alteration.

Third. That the process of State budgeting be made more intelligent and intelligible by the passage and adoption of the constitutional amendment providing for annual sessions of the legislature.

Fourth. That this session of the legislature begin the long process of submitting to the people an amendment to the Constitution which will permit us to adopt the fairest of all tax systems—the graduated income tax.

As to the grave matters before us, it seems to me that the one thing which the people will not forgive is a prolonged deadlock—an impasse which will cripple the State financially, drive us further into deficits by delaying revenues, exhibit the weakness in Pennsylvania which we are so quick to condemn in other free countries where party strife and divisions paralyze the democratic process.

I recognize the natural ambition, the natural function of opposition, which now lies in the other party.

If we had a majority in both houses, I would urge my fellow Democrats to accept their responsibility, to take their lumps, and let the opposition enjoy its freedom from the cares of office and the State.

We Democrats have been in the minority so often that we are ready—always ready—to let the other party revel in what to them are the unaccustomed pleasures of free-wheeling.

But the voters of Pennsylvania did not so decree.

They divided the responsibility between a Democratic house, a Democratic Governor, and a Republican senate.

Accordingly, the financial plan we fashion must sometime, somehow, someplace in this session be a work of common consent and mutual responsibility.

I must therefore ask my Republican colleagues to remember their share in the affairs of the Commonwealth. After they have had their fun and made their speeches, they too must soberly participate in these decisions of State and accept with us a common devotion, above partisanship, to the affairs which the people have entrusted to us.

This is not a time, it cannot be a time, for any one of us to worry about his political future. I am quite ready to lay mine on the block.

It is a time for us to worry about the future of Pennsylvania.

And I have made this pledge to myself—that I will, under no circumstances, be party to passing on to my successor in this office a structure of State finance that is built of straw.

That, I believe, is a resolve that as honorable men and women you all share equally with me.

Let us then get to the hard task before us.

Is It Principle or Profits?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the problem of how far the people, acting through their Federal Government, shall go in conducting public business will be decided again in this generation.

On one side we have such groups as the Hoover Commission which says the Government should get out of business as soon as possible and stay out of any business which private enterprise is willing to undertake, regardless of the cost to the taxpayer.

On the other side are those who say that much of the business in which the Federal Government is engaged is public business—and that Government went into it only because private enterprise was either unable or unwilling to do the job.

In the June 3, 1955, issue of the Government Standard, Mr. James A. Campbell, national president of the American Federation of Government Employees, carries one side of this argument to its logical conclusion. He imagines a situation in which the Government has practically gone out of existence, yet taxes were many times greater than they are today.

I believe my colleagues will be interested in Mr. Campbell's editorial which follows:

IS IT PRINCIPLE OR PROFITS?

(By James A. Campbell, national president, AFGE)

With just a dash of imagination, we can picture a situation in which the Government has practically gone out of existence, yet taxes were many times greater than they are today.

All we have to do is to apply the "get the Government out of business at whatever the cost" philosophy to its logical conclusion.

The advocates of this philosophy seem to be doing quite well by themselves, but in a spirit of helpfulness perhaps we can suggest certain additional fields of Government operation which private business might be willing to take over—at a guaranteed profit, of course.

For example, why use Government employees to take the census and correlate the statistics? Surely some enterprising research or poll-taking business would be able to do the job if it paid well enough.

Likewise, it seems silly to have our post office deliver packages and thus compete with Railway Express and other private shipping firms that would be glad to do the job. It may cost a bit more, but cost doesn't appear to be a factor in turning over Government operations to private business.

As a matter of fact, if you really got down to it, there probably isn't a job being done at any Navy yard, airbase, Army, or Marine depot that some private firm wouldn't be willing to take over, if the price was right.

And who knows, you might even interest some concern in recruiting and training a private air force which would be available to fly in defense of the United States—on a cost-plus-profit arrangement, of course.

With the exception, perhaps, of the last item, there is nothing in the previous suggestions—ridiculous as they may sound—which would be drastically different from actions which have already been taken on a smaller scale.

The House wisely kept in the Defense Department appropriations bill a provision which would ensure a congressional check before any additional Government operations are sacrificed to the phony "no competition with private business" principle. Such a check is urgently needed because the administration has specifically ruled out increased cost as an argument against contracting out.

Big business interests are concentrating their pressure on the Senate. It is imperative that, without delay, lodges and individual members of AFGE wire and write their Senators on this issue.

It is going to be a close decision. At stake is not only the jobs of thousands of Federal employees, but economy and efficiency of Government.

This is not a partisan issue, as the vote in the House of Representatives demonstrated. Both parties should be equally interested in efficient Government at the lowest cost. That can be accomplished only through the retention of the language of the defense appropriations bill passed by the House.

Peking Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Hindu Weekly Review of April 18, 1955, called Peking Propaganda. It espouses the American cause in Asia and takes to task those who state that American aid to Asia is intended for military aggression, economic exploitation and colonialist expansion. It properly states that such a characterization is a gross travesty of fact. The editorial puts American aid to Asia in proper perspective. We have so often heard criticism in this country against India and her leaders. I am pleased to point to this good example of India's newspapers taking up the cudgels for the United States.

The editorial follows:

PEKING PROPAGANDA

American suspicions of Communist China are only equalled by Peking China's suspicions of the Americans. A typical example of tendentious writing is the leading article in the Peking People's Daily attacking United States aid to Asian countries. The Peking paper is entitled to hold that American attitude to the forthcoming Bandung Conference is lukewarm, but when it describes American aid to Asia as being intended for military aggression, economic exploitation, and colonialist expansion it is a gross travesty of fact. It may be unfortunate that the emphasis in the American aid program is more on military than economic assistance, but even so the provision for economic aid alone during the current year is over $500 million. The picture of United States capital penetrating Asian and African nations under cover of "aid," drawn by the Peking daily, is wholly fanciful, because American investment in these countries during the past few years has been negligible and there is nothing to suggest that Americans are anxious at all to increase their investments in any of these countries. The problem, on the contrary, has been to induce them to bring in capital and know-how to develop industries in these countries and India, for instance, has had to offer special terms to the American oil companies to start their refineries here. The paper's suggestion that the United States has been dumping rotten surplus wheat and cotton on gullible Asian countries is unfair. The assumption seems to be that India, Japan, or some other Asian country does not know what is to its interest.

When the Peking paper goes on to suggest that Asian peoples should rely on their own efforts to develop their economies and should dispense with American or other foreign aid, one cannot help asking whether Red China has been able to achieve her development entirely by herself and whether she has not had to rely on considerable Soviet technical and economic aid to develop her resources. Self-reliance is all right, but it would be a strange form of perversion to urge that poorly developed Asian countries should not seek the aid of more developed countries, even if such help can be had without political strings. The recent survey published by the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East estimated the annual requirements of external capital of the Asian and far-eastern countries at $3 billion for carrying out the development programs of these countries. It is obvious that the United States is the only country that is in a position to meet the bulk of these requirements. India, Burma, Indonesia, Pakistan, and other countries of this region would greatly welcome American assistance on terms which respect their sovereignty and integrity and are economically reasonable. The main concern of the countries who will be assembling at Bandung next week should be with measures to promote peace in the region so that the newly freed countries may go forward with their development plans uninhibited by fears of the possibility of a major conflict.

Distribution of Salk Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, since the announcement of the discovery of the Salk polio vaccine almost 2 months ago, thousands upon thousands of parents throughout these United States have been awaiting positive action by the Federal Government in insuring prompt inoculations for their children.

They are still waiting, and the entire inoculation program is presently bogged down with no assurances that there will be a definite plan set up which would make this vaccine available to our

youngsters without further delay. Already valuable time has been lost.

The people in my home district, in New York, are naturally concerned, and rightly so, about the lack of Federal action on this important problem. We can only hope that the Government will realize the seriousness of the situation confronting us, and will put into effect an equitable program for the distribution of the vaccine.

I would like to include in my remarks a copy of the letter I wrote to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, on April 21, 1955, shortly after the announcement of the vaccine discovery. And I will also include a copy of Mrs. Hobby's reply of May 6, 1955, which indicated that several committees were studying the problems involved.

To date nothing has been accomplished. Confusion still reigns, and the polio season is upon us. The Government must accept its responsibility and put into effect an equitable distribution system immediately. I hope and pray that this will be done.

The letters follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1955

Hon. OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. HOBBY: Since the recent announcement of the discovery of the Salk vaccine, one of our greatest problems is its equitable distribution.

The conference to be held at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare tomorrow should strive to set up a workable plan whereby the vaccine will be administered to every child in the United States, regardless of cost. This is an investment in our future well-being, and the Federal Government must take the lead in putting into operation a national plan which will abolish the confusion and vague proposals which have been heard since the announcement.

This is a tremendous medical achievement, and with the results indicating that the vaccine is 80 to 90 percent effective in preventing paralytic polio, we can feel that the dread disease is now facing defeat. Thousands and thousands of children, whom it strikes most frequently, will be able to live out their lives without any crippling effects, and the many serious and oftentimes uncontrollable outbreaks of poliomyelitis will be terminated.

The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, which has been conducting research against polio for a number of years, has initiated the rule of "children first," and I believe that this rule should apply in the nationwide inoculations which have already started. No child should be deprived of this vaccine because of an inability to pay for it. I believe that no time should be lost in determining whether or not each child can afford the inoculation. If the cost of the shots cannot be undertaken by the child's family, then ways and means of appropriating sufficient funds to care for this expense should be developed. This is a step forward in the field of medicine, the benefits of which should be extended to everyone.

The distribution of the vaccine calls for calm and orderly deliberation and planning, and the problems of making it available—first to our children, and then to adults when the supply is more equal to the demand—can be resolved without delay if the Government will act quickly and decisively to set up controls on allocations and prices, which will ensure against any exploitation of the discovery by special interests, or those seeking personal gain.

I realize that there are many problems to be overcome in setting up such a system of controls, but I am confident that the urgency of the situation will be recognized by those at the conference, and I earnestly hope that a satisfactory policy will be developed.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER HOLTZMAN,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
May 6, 1955.

Hon. LESTER HOLTZMAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOLTZMAN: This will acknowledge your letter of April 21, 1955, concerning Salk poliomyelitis vaccine.

This Department has established a National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine to advise on the problems of distribution and an Expert Technical Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine. The responsibilities of these committees relate to equitable distribution, as well as to a safe and effective vaccine. The questions raised in your communication are currently being studied by these committees and will be discussed in our report to the President which will be completed in a few days.

Sincerely yours,

OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Secretary.

The Dairy Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, because, with improved methods of production, it is impossible in peacetime for the taxpayers, through the Government, to purchase and find a market for all farm products, the farm program adopted during the war has been modified. The new overall program has not as of this date gone into effect. Nevertheless, prices of farm products have fallen drastically.

Dairy farmers who have been affected by a change in policy have found one partial remedy.

In an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of June 5, an outline of what the dairy industry has attempted to do has been described as follows:

DAIRY FARMERS LEARN HOW TO SWIM

A member of this department had a schoolmate who dreaded water—not as a beverage, or with soap, particularly, but in wholesale quantities. He was afraid to learn to swim. His old man tossed him off the government pier one day and eventually he became the best swimmer at the Waukegan YMCA.

A year ago, April 1, Agriculture Secretary Benson tossed the dairy industry off the pier. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that he bored a sizable hole in the bottom of its boat. The Government had been supporting dairy prices at 90 percent of parity. The people of the country wouldn't buy all of the milk products produced at that price level, and the Government had spent hundreds of millions of dollars buying butter, cheese, dried milk, and other dairy products to keep them off the market and keep retail prices up. So Mr. Benson cut the dairy support level to 75 percent of parity.

The expected happened. When dairy manufacturers were unable to sell their products to the Government at a fancy price, they started selling them to consumers at a more reasonable price. Dairy sales began to increase immediately.

The American Dairy Association and individual manufacturers decided to intensify their advertising. A recent survey indicated that a third of the increase in butter sales can be explained by lower prices and two-thirds by new customers attracted through advertising.

The consequence was that 165 million people in the United States are now eating butter at the rate of 9 pounds a year, and their per capita consumption this year may reach 9½ pounds. In 1953, with high price supports holding butter off the market, it was 8.6 pounds for each person. Margarine, the butter rival, has increased sales, but not per capita consumption. On the other hand, 1954 was the first year since 1925 in which per capita consumption of butter, fluid milk, and cheese—the three most important dairy products—increased in each instance over the previous year's consumption.

Lester J. Will, general manager of the American Dairy Association, predicted the other day that the dairy surplus will vanish this year, or certainly in 1956. That will mean that taxpayers will no longer have to pay to take unsalable dairy products off the market. Already speculators are preparing to buy surplus production in the expectation of rising prices when production drops during the winter months.

There is some possibility that the dairy farmers, forced to learn to swim, will so conduct their affairs that production temporarily will fail to meet demand. A cow doesn't yield milk unless she becomes a mother at least once a year. That means that there is a possible gross increase of 50 percent annually in the size of milking herds, though of course old cows do die.

While it is possible for dairy farmers to increase their herds fairly fast, they would go broke if they kept all their cows as long as they yielded milk. Right now dairymen all over the country are culling their herds, sending the boarders with low production off to the stockyards to make steaks and pot roasts.

We do not say that dairy farmers and manufacturers can expect to rest henceforth on a bed of thornless roses, for they won't. But their enforced swimming lesson has produced some rather handsome muscles. By advertising, they have expanded their market to absorb their production. Lower prices have resulted in more efficient herds. The industry has ceased, or will soon cease, to be a burden on the taxpayers, and thus is free of bureaucratic controls. It is the star example of the benefits of flexible price supports.

Most of the farm products which the Government does not subsidize by loans and hoarding are selling at better prices today than they were a year ago. This is true of vegetables, eggs, and poultry. Hog prices are an exception, well below those of last year, and beef prices have declined but are recovering.

But, in contrast, growers of the basic crops like corn, wheat, and cotton that have high Government price supports face reduced income this year. The Government is sitting on more than $6 billion worth of basic products, which overhang the market and keep prices at the support level, or below. Until those surpluses are worked off and the Government quits paying farmers to grow products that can't be sold, those farmers will get into worse trouble every year.

"One Law and One Ordinance Shall Be Both for You, and the Stranger That Sojourneth With You"—Numbers 15: 16

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker—

One law and one ordinance shall be both for you, and the stranger that sojourneth with you (Numbers 15:16).

The foregoing quotation from the Old Testament is a most appropriate introduction to the following statement:

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES, REGARDING AMERICAN IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION POLICIES, INCLUDING SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR BASIC REVISION OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT OF 1952, TO BRING IT INTO CONFORMITY WITH THOSE PRINCIPLES

(Statement of the joint views of the American Jewish Congress, Jewish Labor Committee, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, United Synagogue of America, and 33 Jewish community councils and Jewish community relations councils in all parts of the country, all of which together comprise the National Community Relations Advisory Council)

This statement represents the combined and joint views of the constituent organizations of the National Community Relations Advisory Council, coordinating and joint policy-forming agency of national congregational bodies representing the Conservative, Orthodox, and Reform movements of American Judaism and Jewish community relations organizations, national and local. All these constituent organizations are engaged in programs to foster interreligious and interracial amity, in furtherance of the principle that all men are to be dealt with justly and equally in total disregard of race, creed, religion, and ancestry.

The organizations affiliated in the National Community Relations Advisory Council are:

American Jewish Congress
Jewish Labor Committee
Jewish War Veterans of the United States
Union of American Hebrew Congregations
Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America
United Synagogue of America
Jewish Welfare Fund of Akron
Jewish Community Relations Council for Alamada and Contra Costa Counties, Calif.
Baltimore Jewish Council
Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Boston
Jewish Community Council, Bridgeport, Conn.
Brooklyn Jewish Community Council
Community Relations Committee of the Jewish Federation of Camden County, N. J.
Cincinnati Jewish Community Council
Jewish Community Federation, Cleveland, Ohio
Connecticut Jewish Community Relations Council
Jewish Federation of Delaware
Detroit Jewish Community Council
Elizabeth, N. J., Jewish Community Council
Jewish Community Council of Essex County, N. J.
Community Relations Committee of the Hartford (Conn.) Jewish Federation
Indiana Jewish Community Relations Council
Indianapolis Jewish Community Relations Council
Community Relations Bureau of the Jewish Federation and Council of Greater Kansas City
Community Relations Committee of the Los Angeles Jewish Community Council
Milwaukee Jewish Council
Minnesota Jewish Council
New Haven Jewish Community Council
Norfolk Jewish Community Council
Philadelphia Jewish Community Relations Council
Jewish Community Relations Council, Pittsburgh
Jewish Community Council, Rochester
Jewish Community Relations Council of St. Louis
Community Relations Council of San Diego
San Francisco Jewish Community Relations Council
Southwestern Jewish Community Relations Council
Jewish Community Council of Toledo
Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington, D. C.
Jewish Community Relations Council of the Jewish Federation of Youngstown, Ohio

AMERICAN IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION POLICIES

This statement is addressed to an appraisal of the general assumptions upon which our immigration system is built and from which its major inadequacies derive, rather than to a detailed résumé of each of its specific faults. The hearings and congressional debates on the McCarran-Walter immigration bill permitted private agencies, at least partially, to express their views regarding individual sections of measures which became the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. Because the 82nd and the 83d Congresses failed to take any action to correct the inequitable and discriminatory provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act, those criticisms remain tragically in point. At the same time, much of the discussion in this field since the present law was enacted has tended to obscure consideration of basic immigration principles. It is obvious by now that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 cannot achieve its worthy purposes. Other proposals which are not aimed at amending the basic law will suffer the same fate because they would be in the nature of cosmetic legislation which, like cosmetic surgery, can at best patch and pretty, but not remedy an essentially unsound condition. We must not lose sight of the concepts which are at the heart of our immigration system and which are incredibly out of harmony with the knowledge and needs of our time and with the beliefs and aspirations of the vast majority of the American people.

These concepts may be grouped, as is done in this statement, under the following headings: national origins quota system, deportation inequality between native-born and naturalized Americans and opportunity for appellate review.

The organizations joining in the present statement have no special private cause to plead, they have no special self interest in the improvement of our immigration laws save that of Americans concerned with the reformulation of basic laws to accord with democratic principle. It is a tragic fact that such betterment neither primarily nor directly will redound to the benefit of prospective Jewish immigrations or to the special advantage of the Jewish community in this country. More than 6 million Jews in Europe were exterminated in Nazi gas chambers and concentration camps; another 3 million remain irretrievably locked behind the Iron Curtain with no foreseeable prospect of flight. The remnants of world Jewry are largely scattered islands steadily shrinking in size, mostly destined for migration to Israel. Our concern with immigration laws is of a different character.

Immigration laws crystallize and express a society's basic human values. They deal with our relationship with people other than our immediate neighbors. Such laws affirm the degree of our acceptance or rejection of the essential equality of all human beings. They codify our prejudice or our freedom from prejudice. They reveal the measure of correspondence between our professed ideals and our practices. In our endeavor to increase this measure of correspondence, it would be unintelligent and profligate deliberately to blind ourselves to the body of social and scientific knowledge and experience we have acquired since 1924. The many urgent problems of migration and resettlement now demanding immediate solution prohibit continued indulgence in artificial respiration of the phobias and fears of some 25 or 50 years ago. Concepts like the national origins quota system or deportation have hardened over the years until they have come to be regarded as somehow sacrosanct and immutable.

Since 1924, we have maintained by default a method for the selection of immigrants and for the treatment of aliens and naturalized Americans which flies arrogantly in the face of everything we know and have learned and which stands as a gratuitous affront to the peoples of many regions of the world. The welfare of this country and its people requires that we put aside our palliatives and halfway measures and that we come to grips with those fundamental central provisions of our immigration laws which have been a source of national embarrassment in the conduct of our foreign policy and which have produced immeasurable heartbreak, injustice and waste.

One last word is in order before turning to specific recommendations. No legislative amendment, no matter how cogent, can be implemented or made meaningful unless they are accompanied by recognition of the immigrant as a self-respecting, sincere, and worthwhile human being. Some apparently regard liberalized immigration as being in the nature of a bad bargain, with all the benefits flowing to the alien and all the liabilities accruing to ourselves, and have set about to make our terms in this bargain as stringent as possible, just to prove to ourselves that we are not being taken in. Without discounting the significant contributions this country has made under its general immigration laws, we must at the same time recognize that what has been done in the last quarter century has been done grudgingly. Our immigration laws have popularly come to be regarded and administered as a kind of obstacle course designed to trip up those who seek admission. Implicit throughout our immigration law is poorly disguised hostility to immigration and to immigrants. Indeed, it is primarily this spirit which is codified and given added force in the immigration measures adopted by the 82d Congress.

We have an obligation to protect ourselves against those who seek to enter the United States for purposes of subverting our democratic system of government. In addition, we are compelled to set up some principles of selection to choose the comparative few out of the many who wish to enter. But these principles of selection must not be motivated by fear or dislike. Xenophobia has no place in a vigorous and confident democracy. More important than any other changes which might be recommended, is a change in official attitude from one of suspicion to one of welcome. Immigration is not only a humanitarian gesture. It expresses our national need for manpower to maintain the strength and vigor of our economy. We must recast our thinking and begin looking upon the immigrant as a

dignified human being who should be made to feel at home and permitted to take his place among us without subjection to unending ordeals, tests, and challenges. If we are to meet our responsibilities justly, we must stop daring the immigrant to get here and start inviting him to come.

A. National origins quota system

In brief, the national origins formula adopted in 1924 and employed ever since, admits a total of approximately 150,000 people a year and, except for nations of the western hemisphere, fixes maximum quotas for each country. Quotas range from 100 to 65,000, each country's quota being equal to the percentage that persons of that national origin resident in the United States in the year 1920 were of the total white population of the United States at that time. The point merits emphasis that Negroes were not counted for purposes of establishing the population base.

Under present quota allocations over 70 percent of the number of visas available annually are allocated to natives of northern and western European countries. In the years 1910–1914 immigration from southern and eastern Europe was more than 4 times as large as that from northern and western Europe. Yet under the permanent quotas of the 1924 act, 5 times as many immigration quotas are assigned to northern and western Europe as are allotted to eastern and southern Europe.

The national origins formula was no legislative accident. The end of World War I brought with it an intensified demand for sharp limitations upon immigration. The quest for "normalcy" which dominated the time was associated with the rise of isolationism and of antipathy toward the peoples of Europe and the rest of the world. Rumors were widespread that the United States would soon be inundated by a flood of new immigrants from a devastated Europe. Restrictionists pointed to the arrival in the fiscal year of 1921 of 802,228 immigrants, 65.3 percent of them from southern and eastern Europe, as proof that literacy tests and other comparable tests of personal physical, mental and moral qualification failed to achieve a lessening of the flow of new immigration. These arguments were strengthened and made persuasive in the atmosphere of a severe post-war recession and the emergence of the bigoted Ku Klux Klan as a political force.

Congress thereupon quickly passed the first quota act of 1921, limiting immigration to an annual total of approximately 350,000 and setting a ceiling upon the number of any nationality admitted at 3 percent of the foreign born persons of that nationality who resided here in 1910. The 1921 act, however, was drawn only as an emergency, makeshift measure. Not until 1924 was the national origins formula enacted and our quota system placed on a new and permanent basis.

Even cursory review of legislative debate in 1924 discloses that the authors of the quota plan deliberately, carefully and consciously contrived to encourage immigration of the English, French, Irish, Germans and western Europeans and to discourage all other immigrants. Resting upon a theory compounded of bigotry and ignorance, they argued that persons of other national origins represented inferior biological stocks and possessed ethnic qualities making them unassimilable. The pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of those days reflect an intense preoccupation with race and blood, a preoccupation which today seems monstrous. A report was submitted by Dr. Harry Laughlin, appointed in 1922 by the House Committee on Immigration to study the biological aspects of immigration, and repeatedly cited during debate by those who favored the national origins formula. The Laughlin report asserted:

"Our outstanding conclusion is that making all logical allowances for environmental conditions which may be favorable to the immigrant, the recent immigrants (southern and eastern Europe) as a whole present a higher percentage of inborn socially inadequate qualities than do the older stocks."

Were it not for the continued support accorded the national origins plan and were it not for the shocking statements made by supposedly knowledgeable men on the floor of Congress during debate on the McCarran-Walter bill, one would assuredly think it unnecessary in this day and age to elaborate the point that from a scientific view, doctrines of Nordic or Anglo-Saxon ancestry are sheer undiluted hokum. Because of these statements, however, and at the risk of needlessly reiterating truisms, it should again be recorded that the unanimous testimony of physical anthropologists is that the concept of a pure race is nothing more than an abstraction, bearing no concrete relation to the real world. No pure race can be found in any civilized country. Racial purity is restricted at best to remnants of savage groups in isolated wildernesses. The present races of man have intermingled and interbred for so many thousands of years that their genealogical lines have become inextricably confused. The concept of race is at the most a zoological device whereby indefinitely large groups of individuals of more or less similar physical appearance and approximately similar hereditary background are classified together for the sake of convenience. In the words of Prof. Ashley Montagu, "not one of the great divisions of men is unmixed, nor is any one of its ethnic groups pure, all are a mixture."

Moreover, even conceding for purposes of classification the existence of separate and distinct races, there is no proof whatever that mental capacity, moral sensibility, or cultural achievement are a function of race. It is evident to the scientist, if not to the legislator, that each racial type runs the gamut from idiots and criminals to geniuses and statesmen. And no racial type produces a majority of individuals at either end of the scale. So far as is known there are no racial monopolies either of human virtues or of vices.

Scientific study and social experience have surely withered these racist fictions with the finality of an atomic blast. It is paradoxical that America, which prides itself on its loyalty to the dictates of scientific knowledge and discovery, should continue to base so significant a portion of its legal and legislative structure on foundations thoroughly and irrevocably exploded by scientific findings.

Recognizing the stupidity of alleging a biological ranking among racial groups, some restrictionist spokesmen have attempted instead to stress the value of the national origins formula as expressing the ease with which the various peoples submit to cultural assimilation. Setting aside for a moment the question of cultural homogeneity as a desirable national objective, it is worth pausing to examine a few of the old wives' tales that have evolved in this connection.

The allegation that the new immigrants from southern and eastern Europe depress wage levels and resist unionization is answered by the rise of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, and other trade-union organizations which have brought about a stabilization of employment conditions and industries into which newer immigrants flow. The frequent allegation that southern and eastern Europeans have tended to congregate in cities is an obvious distortion of the fact that urbanization is a characteristic of modern industrial life, by no means confined to immigrants. Mechanization of farms has led to a shift of population to urban centers. Moreover, insufficient emphasis has been given to foreign colonies as stepping stones to assimilation. In time, immigrants from such colonies tend to distribute themselves generally throughout America. Analysis of available statistics indicate that since 1910 immigrants from southern and eastern Europe have not concentrated in urban areas to a greater extent than other groups.

The national origins quota system incorporates into law a network of unfounded estimates of cultural assimilability. It wholly disregards the phenomenon of cultural change. It assumes, for example, that our national institutions bear the stamp of a particular nationality in the same proportion that persons of that national descent bear to the whole population. But cultures are not amenable to such analysis any more than plants, animals, or humans can be viewed as a result of a simple addition of the chemical compounds they absorb. The vast developments which have taken place in American life throughout our history are not the mechanical result of simple additions from elements of immigrant cultures but rather the evolution of a new and distinctive culture in response to the demands of a new environment.

To use but one illustration, the German quota that came into effect under the McCarran law is 25,814. It is the second largest in size, ranking after that of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (65,361). The quota for Italy is 5,645, for Greece 308, and for Turkey 225. These discrepancies can find no warrant in the theory that it results in the selection of immigrants from countries whose traditions, languages, and political systems are akin to ours. It would be absurd to claim that the Germany which twice precipitated the world into war, which was warped by Nazi propaganda for more than a decade prior to 1933 and molded by 12 years of Nazi power, is culturally closer to America than Italy, Greece, or Turkey. And if Germany is closer, is the degree of propinquity 80 times greater than in the case of Greece, 4 times greater than in tahe case of Italy, and 115 times greater than in the case of Turkey?

That northern and western Europeans adjust to American life better than eastern and southern Europeans is a baseless assertion. Those who insist upon assimilation by the obliteration of all foreign traits with the utmost speed and thoroughness have ignored the development and enrichment of our cultural life which has accrued from the adoption of ideas and customs of European or other origin. As Prof. Franz Boas has said: "The social resistance to Americanizing influence is so weak that it may rather be regretted that we profit so little from the cultural heritage of the immigrants than that we should fear their modifying influence upon American thought and sentiment."

America's richness has not been merely our material resources, amply endowed though we are. It has been, even more, our diversity of peoples and cultures and our unique ability to fashion a creative national unity out of that diversity. That has proved to be our strength as well as our richness. Totalitarianism carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction through the mechanical uniformity it seeks to impose, for imposed uniformity must ultimately result in social and human degeneration. Uniformity can emerge not only from legal or physical coercion, but as a result of rigidly limiting the human resources on which we should be free to draw. The "American type" has not been nourished at a single fount; it has drawn from many springs, and it must continue to draw from many springs if it is to be enriched—indeed, if it is to remain healthy.

The failure of successive legislatures to expunge the national origins system from our statutes has resulted in the retention of a series of preferences, priorities, bars, and prohibitions which stamp a seal of inferiority upon persons of other than Anglo-Saxon

origin. For all its highly advertised purging of racism from our immigration laws, closer inspection of the McCarran Law, Public Law 414, reveals that it contains such provisions as the section establishing the "Asia-Pacific Triangle" (section 202 (b)) limiting annual immigration from countries in that area to a maximum of 100 a year, with no reference to any formulas or figures and with no rationale save that of antipathy to persons coming from that part of the world.

Indeed, the new law is so thoroughly immersed in racist feeling that for persons deriving from the Asia-Pacific triangle usual procedures are exactly reversed. Country of birth for this group is made irrelevant and the fact of racial ancestry becomes the single important criterion upon which admissibility depends. A native Englishman, even one of whose parents derived his ancestry from China, Japan, Korea, or other countries within the so-called Asia-Pacific triangle is not permitted to enter this country under the ample British quota; he is compelled to seek admission under the limited quota of 100 for the Asia-Pacific country. Public Law 414 thus imposes an inescapable onus upon some racial groups, never to be avoided no matter to what ends of the earth their members may travel. Negro immigration, in like fashion, is carefully restricted by denying certain dependent areas in the West Indies, for the first time, the right to use quotas belonging to the mother country.

Moreover, quotas under Public Law 414 continue to be premised upon the 1920 census, a device clearly intended to freeze if not paralyze the composition of our population. Because those areas of the world whose peoples are most urgently in need of resettlement and most deserving of assistance have among the lowest of the quotas, and because these quotas are in almost every case oversubscribed for years to come, our present immigration laws are more ironic than helpful. All of these inequities, along with a host of others, would be removed at one stroke with the elimination of the quota system.

In support of the national origins system it is frequently urged that given the need for some quantitative restriction of immigration, there exists no other feasible method of apportionment. Surely, human ingenuity is not so feeble. To claim that the existing discriminatory and arbitrary scheme is just because no alternative can be devised is to confess to an extraordinary lack of imagination. Without by any means exhausting the alternatives, we respectfully suggest the following as a means of furnishing an equitable and workable substitute for the national origins formula:

1. Retention of the standard of one-sixth of 1 percent of the census to determine the maximum number of immigrants to be admitted annually, substituting however the 1950 census as the basis for calculation. This would provide an annual ceiling number of approximately 251,000, a number which we believe to be within the absorptive capacity of the United States and in keeping with its needs.

2. Special provision, within the ceiling number, for the reunification of families, the persecuted, displaced persons or refugees, such skills as our country may need at the particular time, as well as for new seed or self-initiated immigration.

3. Establishment of a new and independent Government agency which would be responsible for administering the immigration and naturalization laws of the Nation. This would include responsibility to engage in a continuing study of our domestic need for immigrants and world conditions which impinge upon American immigration policy. On the basis of such a continuing study, the agency would determine the number of visas, within the ceiling, which should be apportioned to each of the preference categories and for general immigration.

The formula as above outlined would abolish the discriminatory features of the national origins quota system and provide increased opportunity for securing immigrants with needed skills. Moreover, emergency situations could be taken care of by periodic readjustment of the various categories within the ceiling number.

We continue to be cognizant of the problem of refugees and surplus populations. The plight of these dislocated peoples will be a continuing emergency which will be with the free world for many years and possibly generations to come. To the extent that immigration can be helpful in coping with this global problem, it our conviction that piecemeal emergency legislation, such as the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, is not the proper approach. We suggest instead that it is possible within the bounds of our permanent immigration laws to give such attention to distressed areas by allotting an adequate number within the ceiling as a preference for persecutees or refugees.

The world situation urgently requires that the national origins system should be eliminated. Once this is accomplished, we are then equipped to meet emergency needs within the framework of a just, humane, and flexible immigration system.

B. Deportation

The concept of deportation as employed in our basic immigration laws is no less in need of drastic revision. The present law stands in flat opposition to the principle that once a person is admitted into the United States for permanent residence, he should have the privilege of remaining in this country unless his immigration was based on fraud or illegal entry. No one denies that among the rights of sovereignty is that of deportation. However, deportation used as a penalty is inhumane and medieval. It frequently punishes persons entirely innocent, such as members of the immediate family of the deportee. An alien who does wrong should be punished for his wrong the same as a citizen but the punishment should not carry with it the additional penalty of banishment.

Immigrants who come to this country are not here on consignment. Those persons who pull up their roots and rearrange their lives to come to the United States under our laws and under a system of qualifications which we draw and which we administer are entitled to believe that once here they will be allowed to remain and that they will be dealt with justly and equally. This of course does not imply that they are not to be penalized or held fully accountable for their crimes or their mistakes. It does mean that they are not to be assessed with penalties higher in degree or in character from those imposed on native Americans for like acts.

We must admit to a measure of responsibility for persons entering this country from the moment they disembark. Immigration is a profound experience. It entails the breaking up of preexisting ties and the reconstruction of a whole life. Immigrants who fail are as much our problem as native Americans who fail. The immigration system must not be made to bear a burden properly residing in our economic institutions, or communities and neighbors, or in our schools. It is much too easy a solution to slough off responsibility simply by sending the alien back where he came from, rather than recognize our own implication in his failure.

The United States Supreme Court has asserted that loss of the right to remain in the United States, technically not a criminal penalty, nevertheless partakes of the nature of such penalties and in most cases imposes an even more serious injury. Deportation usually entails the breaking up and separation of the family unit. Innocent dependents who remain behind are the prime sufferers when the head of the family and the sole source of income and livelihood is expelled.

Compounding of penalties for immigrants has no basis in American life. Theoretically all persons who reside within our borders are entitled to identical treatment. And indeed it is a radical and dangerous practice to initiate a system of caste among our residents. No one denies that those who initially obtain entry into this country illegally or by virtue of deceit or fraud should not be entitled to capitalize on their duplicity and should be made deportable. With the sole exception of fraudulent entry, we must concede tenure to immigrants once they have been admitted permanently, otherwise liberty is a meaningless term. Elimination of the motion of deportation as a penalty would initiate a single system for the punishment of wrong doers and would compel our courts and our administrative bodies to bring practice into line with theory and grant to all persons within our borders equal standing under our laws. Public Law 414 completely departs from this principle. Under that law immigrant culpability for a variety of acts, many of them minor, inexorably results in deportation.

Thus, under Public Law 414, aliens are now deportable for acts that were not a ground for deportation at the time when they were committed (sec. 241 (d)). The law also repealed certain statutes of limitations, thus reviving "punishment" for acts or conditions expressly forgiven by our law. Such provisions are contrary to the spirit of the constitutional provision against ex post facto laws.

An alien may be deported at any time for having committed a proscribed act; no matter how trivial and no matter how long the alien has lived in this country. Virtually all Federal crimes must be prosecuted within a specific period, but a deportation proceeding, which by legal fiction is not deemed criminal punishment in the constitutional sense, may be commenced after a lapse of so many years that witnesses have died or disappeared and documentary evidence is no longer available. It seems cruel and inhuman to keep the threat of deportation hanging over the head of an alien during his entire lifetime.

Under the law an alien admitted for permanent residence is deportable for proscribed subversive activity even where such activity has ceased and there has been a bona fide repudiation of past conduct or affiliations (sec. 241 (a) (6)). The law does not concede the possibility of redemption or repentence, as it does in the admission of aliens, where ex-Communists are eligible if they have broken with that party. These ex-Communists are often the best informed and the most alert opponents of the Communist Party. The present law therefore discourages Communist aliens from breaking with their party.

Under the "reentry doctrine" an alien who voluntarily leaves the United States no matter how brief the absence or for what reason and regardless of the length of his residence here is treated on his return as a new immigrant and is subject to the same exclusionary provisions as an alien coming to the United States for the first time (sec. 101 (a) (13)). This is true even where the alien has obtained an official reentry permit before leaving. Thus a legal fiction makes a new immigrant out of a legally resident alien and provides what amounts to deportation under the guise of a refusal to readmit as a penalty for temporary absence from this country. Although section 212 (c) gives the Attorney General discretion to admit reentering aliens in spite of excludability features, this discretion is not broad enough to meet all situations nor should such rights be subject to the Attorney General's discretion. The reentry doctrine has an additional consequence. Events that occur subsequent to an original entry may become a basis for later deportation proceedings. For example an alien in the United States who becomes tubercular is not deportable for that reason but

if he leaves the country for a few hours he becomes inadmissible. Should he be readmitted in spite of this he may later be subjected to deportation proceedings on the basis of excludability at the time of reentry.

We hold no brief for the criminal, the wrongdoer, the narcotics user, the subversive, or the alien who seeks through immoral means to obtain personal advantage. At the same time we recognize that this country is necessarily implicated in his actions. The criminal alien represents a menace, but it differs in no descernible character, quality, or degree from the menace represented by the criminal native-born. The reconstruction and rehabilitation of defective, sick individuals is a job for our entire community. It is not one which lies within the province of the immigration system. It is not one which can be avoided by the simple means of ejecting those whom we find unpleasant. The marriage of the immigrant and of the United States is presumably one premised on sincerity on the part of both and it is marriage for better or for worse. The use of deportation as a means of coercing conformity or of inflicting extrajudicial punishment is a repudiation of the principle of equality.

C. Inequality between native-born and naturalized citizens

Distinctions between native-born and naturalized citizens in our immigration laws must be eliminated as contrary to the spirit of the Constitution. The naturalization process should be so devised as to insure that before a person is naturalized, he is genuinely attached to the governing principles of this country. Thereafter, certificates of naturalization should not be canceled, save upon a showing of fraud.

The stamp of a free and secure society is its abjuration of all forms of limited citizenship. Our courts have declared that under our Constitution, a naturalized citizen stands on an equal footing with a native-born citizen, in all respects save eligibility for the Presidency. They have explicitly rejected the notion that "the framers of the Constitution intended to create 2 classes of citizens, 1 free and independent, 1 haltered with a lifetime string attached to its status." The naturalized citizen, being invested with all the rights of citizenship, has been held no more responsible for anything he may say or do, or omit to say or do, after assuming his new character, than if he were born in the United States.

This guarantee of equal rights to naturalized Americans is not a doctrine recently come by or lightly held. It is of the very fabric of our history. Chief Justice Marshall long ago definitively declared that a naturalized citizen becomes "a member of the society, possessing all the rights of a native citizen and standing, in the view of the Constitution, on the footing of a native. The Constitution does not authorize Congress to enlarge or abridge those rights. The simple power of the National Legislature is to prescribe a uniform rule of naturalization, and the exercise of this power exhausts it, so far as respects the individual." (*Osborne* v. *U. S. Bank* (22, U. S. 738, 827.)) The grant of American citizenship is not a partial grant and it is not a grant upon a condition subsequent.

Public Law 414 flaunts this principle. For identical acts it metes out harsher penalties to naturalized Americans than to native Americans. Section 340 (a) provides that refusal to testify on the part of a naturalized citizen, within 10 years following his naturalization, before a congressional committee concerning alleged subversive activities, which results in a conviction of contempt, shall be grounds for revocation of naturalization. Similarly, section 340 (c) repeats provisions placed in our law by the Internal Security Act to the effect that a person who was naturalized and who within 5 years becomes a member of, or affiliated with a subversive group, is presumed to have obtained naturalization through fraud. Thus actions which when performed by native-born citizens are either non-penal or are, at the most, minor crimes, become the basis for the imposition of the most grave and severe punishment of all, the loss of American citizenship.

Finally, Public Law 414 reenacts those sections of the Nationality Act of 1940 which expatriated naturalized Americans merely because of residence abroad for a period of 5 years or more, while permitting native Americans to remain away indefinitely, without loss or penalty. The State Department repeatedly has testified that, in its opinion, these provisions bear no reasonable or perceptible relation to our national interest. The expatriation statutes symbolize the suspicion felt toward the alien, and the unjustifiably rigorous standards of conduct demanded of him. If our professions of equality are to be seriously regarded, our law must give equal treatment to the native-born and the naturalized citizens.

D. Opportunity for appeal and review

The core of the American system of justice is that each person shall be accorded a fair hearing. Public Law 414 fails to accord to immigrants or aliens the necessary judicial protection which accompanies the concept of fair hearing by omitting any provision for a Board of Immigration Appeals and a Visa Review Board. Even more, it explicitly denies opportunity for further inquiry to any alien if the Attorney General in his discretion believes the alien to be excludable under paragraphs 27, 28, and 29 of section 212 (a), and concludes that the disclosure of the information upon which his belief is based would be prejudicial to the public interest, safety, or security (sec. 235 (c)). The grant of such discretionary power is contrary to normal democratic procedures. Where the exclusion is for security reasons, and it is deemed vital to protect the Government's sources of information, it is imperative that the alien, at least, be accorded a chance, in accordance with normal standards of American justice, to plead his side of the story and bring any witnesses he may desire. Further, it is necessary that the existing non-statutory Board of Immigration Appeals be retained and made statutory, and that the existing procedure be retained, whereby appeal may be made to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization from a decision of a lower official to exclude an alien, and from the latter's decision, if adverse, to the Board of Immigration Appeals. The Board of Immigration Appeals should be written into the law and not remain at the mercy of administrative decision.

Under present law, consular officials have an absolute right to deny issuance of a visa, and there is virtually no means whereby an interested American citizen or organization may obtain a hearing to put in question the correctness of the action of the consul. While the Department of State may require a report of the consul, final discretion lies with the latter, the Department's participation being limited to an advisory opinion. To prevent prejudice, arbitrariness, or caprice in the award of visas, and in the grant of the all-important opportunity for immigration, we urge legislative provision for the establishment of a Visa Review Board empowered to review and reverse consular decisions to issue or deny visas. Such Board should provide an opportunity for an American citizen or organization interested in bringing an alien to this country to appeal on his behalf. Measures addressed to these objectives will surround the immigration process with the protection and safeguards it merits.

CONCLUSION

The eloquent affirmation of the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal" expresses the cardinal democratic belief that all persons are to be regarded as equally capable of intelligence, freedom, and social usefulness, that every individual can claim the right to be judged on his own merits. The immigration policy enacted in 1924 was a repudiation of that doctrine, for it asserted that persons in quest of the opportunity to live in this land were to be judged according to breed, like cattle at a country fair, and not on the basis of their character, fitness, or capacity.

Our immigration and naturalization laws must be so reshaped that they will conform to American ideals and experience, which require equal treatment of all persons and the fullest guaranties of basic civil liberties. In the light of our knowledge and aspirations and, indeed, the needs of the Nation, the national origins quota system and the concept of penal deportation must be abolished and the internal administration of our immigration processes must be improved. Our immigration and naturalization laws must be purged of every taint of racial, religious, and ethnic discrimination. Nothing less than this is worthy of a freedom-loving people.

Dictator Loosens Grip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, that the demands of the teamsters unions, as voiced by Beck, Hoffa, Ring, and others who seek to bring all those engaging in transportation activities under the control of the union, force them to comply with and pay tribute to the teamsters, can be successfully opposed, is indicated by an article written by Fred W. Perkins, Scripps-Howard staff writer, and which appeared in some Hearst publications on June 3, 1955. That article reads as follows:

TEXAS TRUCKER SHOOTS THE WORKS IN "HOT CARGO" SCRAP WITH UNION

(By Fred W. Perkins)

Desmond A. Barry, the determined Texan who came here and set a record for the speed with which he got two Federal agencies to help in his fight against the AFL Teamsters Union, has won the battle so far.

But he isn't through yet.

The union has called off its pickets. And connecting truck lines are handling his freight. They hadn't been because the union had called it "hot cargo."

But the Houston businessman is after a whole-hog victory. His lawyer is talking about suits against the union and the other truck lines for damages.

"I'm not going to stop half way," Mr. Barry told reporters. "I'm going to haul freight come hell, hallelujah, or high water."

This also was the word received today by officials of the National Labor Relations Board.

When Mr. Barry hove into view last week, the board quickly agreed to seek a court injunction under the Taft-Hartley law against the teamsters on the charge they had a secondary boycott in effect against the Galveston Truck Lines, the Barry concern.

NONUNION FIRM

This nonunion firm has headquarters in Houston and normally operates to Oklahoma City. There truck freight is transferred to other lines serving more distant points.

Mr. Barry ran into trouble when five connecting truck lines refused to handle his freight at Oklahoma City on the ground the union wouldn't let them because of a "hot cargo" clause in their labor contracts.

So Mr. Barry not only got NLRB help but he also induced the Interstate Commerce Commission to let him run his trucks temporarily beyond Oklahoma City. That was to let him go ahead with his business while he battled the union.

UNION BACKS DOWN

Word received here is that the twin actions have been followed by withdrawal of union pickets at both Houston and Oklahoma City. The union is also said to have notified the other truck lines that the Barry concern is no longer considered unfair to organized labor.

I. J. Saccomanno, of Houston, Mr. Barry's attorney, said his client now is going to fire the other barrel.

Mr. Barry will complain to the ICC about the trucking companies that refused to handle his freight because of the "hot cargo" clause, which he claims is illegal.

ICC officials revealed there are precedents for such complaints and that it would be possible for the Commission to revoke the certificates of carriers that refused to accept freight under such conditions.

PLANS DAMAGE SUITS

Mr. Barry, said his lawyer, also plans damage suits for losses he took while his freight was embargoed.

And although the union has backed off, the action for the Taft-Hartley injunction is still alive. It could be pressed if Mr. Barry is not satisfied.

Publicity given Mr. Barry's trip here has brought in, he said, approving messages from over the country.

"Hot cargo" cases are bobbing up in many States. The Teamsters Union, headed by Dave Beck, is trying to retain his powerful weapon for enforcement of union organization.

In a recent case the ICC granted 30-day authority to the nonunion Decatur Truck Lines, Inc., Birmingham, Ala., to haul between Florence, Ala., and Memphis, Tenn. Officials said this resulted from application of the "hot cargo" clause to carriers, under contract, who had been furnishing service to a strikebound manufacturing plant.

Legal status of the disputed clause is cloudy under NLRB rulings.

Mr. Speaker, few individuals or organizations have either the funds or the will and courage to, in the courts, defy the Teamsters' czars. There is a legal remedy for the illegal exactions which the racketeers seek to impose, but the Congress should write and enforce legislation which will protect the citizen in his constitutional rights.

National Characteristics of Modern Greeks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have been very much pleased to see that recognition of a splendid race of people has been given by the Atlantic of June 1955, which has devoted a large part of its publication to modern Greece.

Greece has always played important parts in world affairs. The people of that country are energetic, and those Greeks who have come to the United States and have made America their home have made significant contributions to our own national life and culture. It is well for us to reflect on the progress and position of the Greeks in a modern world.

While this issue of the Atlantic contains many fine articles, I would especially like to call attention to one entitled "The Modern Greeks," by George Theotokas. I ask permission to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the matter will make approximately 2½ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $200.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION BY LINCOLN MACVEAGH, FORMER AMBASSADOR TO GREECE

The inclusion of Greece in this Atlantic series of "Perspectives" on the countries of the free world is highly appropriate. Being perhaps the most intensively as well as the longest studied of all those countries, she might have been left out as needing no new appraisal at this time. But the very fact of our having learned so much about Greece makes it difficult to see her as she is. Facts and opinions about her, emanating from many sources over the whole course of history, come to mind immediately her name is mentioned, and this is confusing. Perhaps of no country could it more truly be said that she requires to be better known because she is already known so well. Certainly none is in greater need of being seen in perspective.

Take the foreground position we tend to give to Ancient Greece, consciously or unconsciously, whenever Greece is spoken of. Someone has truly said that reading about this or that foreign country must be, to many Americans, "like going home." If that is so, then reading about Greece must be, to nearly all of us, like going home to mother. She is indeed the mother of our civilization and for many centuries our scholars have been gathering information about her ancient way of life for the light this throws on the development of the whole Western World. But this way of approaching her, which still conditions the average American's view of Greece, can be of only very limited assistance in any attempt to understand her as she is.

Or take our thinking about what is still too often called Modern Greece, though the age of Otto is today as dead as that of Pericles. We have not studied the Greece of the nineteenth century to anything like the same extent that we have studied Ancient Greece. But there was a time in the first half of that century when she was of intense interest to the whole Western World. Much of what was written about her then is even now unforgotten, and the almost wholly incredible character dreamed up for her by Byron and other romantic sympathizers in her War of Independence against the Turks still clings to her. Had the West continued its interest in what went on in Greece after her independence was achieved, we might now be more aware than we are of the fact that she was never so much romantic in herself as the source of romance in others, and we might appreciate better the truly heroic toughness and resiliency which enabled her to achieve a new culture for herself in less than a century. We tend to see Modern Greece very much in the light of Europe's 19th century Romantic Movement, and as this is to see even that Greece only partially and contemporary Greece not at all, the need for an improved focus is again apparent.

With the longest history of any country in Europe, Greece has had as many lives as the proverbial cat, and has died as many deaths. She has been invaded and conquered, in whole or in part, by foreigners of almost every description, among others by Persians, Macedonians, Romans, Gauls, Goths, Slavs, Franks, Normans, Sicilians, Genoese, Florentines, Navarrese, Venetians, Catalans, Turks, and Germans, and from each of these in her long and repeatedly successful struggle to "lead captivity captive," she has derived certain cultural elements which she has made her own.

The following articles, stories, poems, and reproductions of works of art by modern Greeks will not, I think, surprise us if we keep these things in mind. They reveal a culture which is by no means a mere survival of the classical and romantic traditions so well known to us, but which is a fusion of many elements. They also do much more than this, since they make us feel its quality. On the surface, there could hardly be a closer association than now exists between America and Greece. Since our declaration of the Truman Doctrine in 1947, we have shown an understanding not only of the importance to us of the independence and territorial integrity of Greece, but also of the great step forward she has taken on the international stage in composing her agelong differences with Turkey and allying herself with that country on the present frontiers of freedom.

Despite our acceptance of the new importance of their country, we tend to think of the Greek people too much in the patronizing manner of a generation ago, when archeology and philanthropy accounted for most of our interest in Greece. It is true that in recent years we have supplemented these feelings with a large measure of admiration for the basic qualities of heart and mind among the Greeks which alone could explain their devotion to the very ideals of heaven and home which we cherish. We have thought of this development as the Greek miracle, and have not even glimpsed the lesson it so clearly teaches of essential fellowship between us and them. To bring that lesson fully home, the following selective sampling of their literary and artistic achievements cannot, of course, be sufficient. But it does give us an opportunity, through direct acquaintance with their manner of thinking and feeling, to reinforce our present relationship with a greater measure of comprehension. In so doing it may facilitate an adjustment of focus which is so urgently needed for a proper perspective on Greece today.

THE MODERN GREEKS—AN INTERPRETATION OF NATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

(By George Theotokas [1])

I

Who are the modern Greeks? What is their origin? How did their national character come to be formed? Greeks today speak a language which, though not the ancient Attic tongue, is nevertheless, in a modernized form, a genuine Greek language. As a nation we have undoubtedly maintained some very ancient traditions. I know of villages, on my native island, where one may find records dating back to the 15th century. Common peasant families may

[1] Born in 1906, George Theotokas studied law at the University of Athens, continuing his general studies in Paris and London. His writings include a series of novels, Argo (published in English), The Demon, Leonis, The Sacred Way, a number of plays, and his recently published volume, An Essay on America. He was general director of the National Theater of Greece when it visited New York in 1952.

there trace their ancestry as far back as the period of the Byzantine Empire. But again, who were the ancient Greeks and who the Byzantines?

At no time in history does there appear to have existed a pure Greek race. The ancient Hellenes were an ethnic mixture of prehistoric Mediterranean peoples and of northern invaders who, in successive waves, overran the country in the millennium before Christ. After the campaigns of Alexander the Great (336–323 B. C.) the Greeks spread across Asia Minor and other east Mediterranean regions, where they assimilated many foreign elements. From these blendings, there developed that Hellenism which was to gain ascendancy over the Byzantine Empire (330–1453) and, even after its fall, to continue to influence the culture of the Western World. A Greek tradition, constantly renewed and transmuted, was kept alive in Greece itself through the Middle Ages. Then the Turks came in the 15th century and conquered all but a few islands of Greece. Principally because the Turks were Moslems and the Greeks Christians there was little cultural interpenetration between them. Thus the Greeks who after bitter struggles regained their independence early in the 19th century were essentially the same as their ancestors of Byzantine times.

Many and various have been the factors which have molded the modern Greek character. There is no certain way of proving the influence exercised by natural environment upon the mind and soul of a people. Yet the natural beauty of Greece has always been of such paramount importance in the life of the people that it seems to have left its indelible mark on our mentality.

The intensity of the light in Greece—that unique transparency of atmosphere—the brilliant reflection of the sun on the sea, the clear, delicate, yet firm lines of the mountains against the sky, the endless variety of an everchanging scenery, have deeply impressed every sensitive traveler. He becomes aware of beauty in a complete, finalized form, of an expression of the universe—simple, tangible, intimate, yet incomparable in its purity. The traveler becomes alive to the intellectual and moral significance of a natural environment seemingly fashioned to man's stature, to its teaching of a sense of proportion. In Greece the sea, the forest, the mountains, the climate, the elements, do not dwarf, do not debase man but give him stature. Nature is in harmony with man and yields to him the privilege of being the center and the measure of the universe.

Because he has been shaped in this environment, the Greek, when expressing his personality, will tend toward clarity, delicacy, and fine balance—which is nature herself—limpid, harmonious, and comprehensible. There is no room in the Greek mind for the colossal, the gigantic, nor for frenzy and confusion. We see this spirit in Greek art, irrespective of the various styles affected at one period or another. Yet Greek art has never been exclusive. From the earliest times it has always been ready and willing to adopt methods, teachings, and elements from East and West alike. But Greece has almost always assimilated such acquisitions, adapted them to her character, comehow humanized them and brought them all into harmony with the Greek measure.

Two other physical features deserve mention: Greece is nearly as mountainous as Switzerland and almost as insular as Great Britain. Mountains cover over three-quarters of the land area, with small plains between the rocky ranges. Islands make up a considerable part of the country (the Peloponnesos itself is, strictly speaking, an island). But even the greater part of the Greek mainland, with its countless capes and promontories, its bays and harbors, is so much washed by the sea that it, too, takes on an almost insular character, particularly as the mountains isolate so many regions. This geography has produced a strong sense of independence and an inflexible attitude toward external enemies.

On the other hand, the sea—ever present—tends to broaden the imagination, to awaken a strange curiosity and longing for faraway shores. The sea sharpens and cultivates the mind, instilling in the restless spirit a lust for adventure, for the unknown. Throughout history it has prompted the Greek to become either a sailor or an emigrant, to get to know, like Ulysses, the towns and spirit of many peoples, to set up colonies of Greeks all over the world. Yet the mysterious call of the sea is not the sole reason for the traditional tendency of Greeks to emigrate. There is also the pressure of poverty.

Greece has always been poor. One of the oldest Greek myths is the epic of Jason setting out with his companions in the good ship *Argo* in quest of the Golden Fleece, the substance of wealth which was missing from the radiant but barren rocks of their own country. Even today, though much technical progress has been achieved during the last 30 years, Greece is unable to offer her people an adequate living standard. The great landed properties were expropriated by the state a generation ago and parceled out among the indigent peasantry. But the average plot assigned to each peasant family is insufficient and keeps shrinking further with the increase of population. Modern farming methods have been adopted, numerous factories founded, and large reclamation projects completed. Yet official statistics tell us that 2 million Greeks, or fully one-fourth of the total population, are still destitute.

The poverty of the soil, combined with the other factors mentioned, has made the Greek resourceful—again I think of Ulysses—has given him mental adaptability and adroitness and has taught him how to get juice out of a stone. At the same time there has remained in Greece, much as in the days of Thucydides, a kind of permanent restlessness, an underlying discontent of Greek with Greek, as well as an inherent fickleness in political affairs. And sometimes the recollection of poverty and of the lack of opportunity produces in successful Greeks who have amassed a fortune a rather embarrassing display of wealth.

II

In Greece the memory of her ancient past has lingered on to this day. Byzantine Hellenism kept the flame of classical learning alive until it could be passed on to Western Europe in the Renaissance. During the long years of Turkish domination (1453–1821) the memory of the glories of ancient Hellas grew into a legend, kindling the national pride and stirring hope for a reawakening in Greece. The learned used classical literature and history to stimulate national consciousness and morale in the people, to inspire them by holding up the example of their ancestors. The names of Marathon, Thermopylae, and Salamis became hallowed symbols of that fighting spirit which was to free Greece from new conquerors who, like the Persians, had come from Asia. Homer, the ancient tragedians, Thucydides, Plato, and Aristotle became heralds of the Greek war of independence.

Yet this reverence for the great thinkers and writers of the past was not merely the result of a reborn nationalism. However one may apply their words, in the end they will point to a certain attitude toward life, to a certain conception of man's lot upon earth. The classical Greek spirit acknowledges man's ignorance and his limitations. It rejects every kind of fanaticism and despotism, whether political or intellectual. It seeks truth and beauty, aims at perfection in art and thought, but, prompted by the nature of the country, pursues these objectives with a sense of measure. Because man's personality is the only true source of intellectual creativeness and social development it consitutes life's greatest good. Yet only in a climate of freedom is it possible for man to create and to achieve a sense of happiness. Freedom requires courage which is action and struggle. Some phrases contained in the ancient texts, to this day commonly used by Greeks, are eloquent of this spirit: "The one thing I know is that I know nothing"; "Measure in all things is best"; "Happiness demands freedom and freedom demands courage." An immortal way of life and thought is reflected in these simple words, and in many others like them, a way which for centuries has molded the spirit of the Greek people.

Christianity in Greece did not clash with the ancient culture nor did it aim at suppressing or abolishing it. On the contrary, the early Christians made use of the ancient lore to help them in their own spiritual development and in the propagation of their faith and thus greatly enriched Christianity. Out of these influences the Greek Orthodox Church was born, at once as a religion, a form of worship, and a theology. Greek classical culture introduced a sense of measure into dogmatic conceptions, clear and harmonious forms into art, logical reasoning into the search for truth and the formulation of thought. Christianity was wedded to Hellenism and absorbed precise and balanced forms in accordance with the traditional Greek genius.

Adapting itself ever more closely to the atmosphere of the land, the Orthodox faith has influenced Greek life to its very roots and has become an inseparable part of it. We have here an enlightened, warm, and liberal religion, made to man's stature. The church is democratic. Its teachings are clear and intelligble, suited to the Greek mentality. The moral attitude of the church is humanitarian and lenient. Its symbols are familiar to everyone. Its worship rests on a succession of cheerful symbolic feast days rhythmically following the seasons of the year. The greatest and most splendid religious festival in Greece is Easter, the Feast of Spring, which in the consciousness of the people expresses not only the dogma of Resurrection but also nature's eternal rebirth. "Easter so pleasant, in joy one another we embrace * * *" goes the church choral in dance rhythm. The blessing of St. John Chrysostom, the golden-mouthed, adds, "Hades, it is said, was subdued when finding You below. It was subdued and verily abolished. It was subdued and verily derided. It was subdued and verily put to death. It was subdued and verily exterminated * * *." A death-defying triumph of life, joy, and love of all people in the sun and the green of April—that is the message contained in this culminating feast in the religious life of the Greeks.

Another great spiritual force which has left deep imprints on the psychology of the Greek people is the memory of the Byzantine Empire. For centuries after its fall Byzantium lived on in their imagination as some kind of Paradise Lost—a great, glorious, mythical country of their own which had been submerged in the darkness of time. The more painful and humiliating the stark reality of enslavement became, the more the national memory would embellish that period of splendor when Hellenism had constituted the greatest power in Europe and the Byzantine capital, Constantinople, had held a position similar to that later occupied by Paris. This nostalgia gradually bred an ideal which became known as the great idea. This was the dream of reestablishing the old empire, which would include most of the Balkans and Asia Minor. It was to be a motive power in Greek society

during the whole of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries.

After the military disaster in 1922 in Asia Minor and the exchange of populations between Greece and Turkey, there occurred a radical change in the political orientation and objectives of the Greek people. Forgotten were the dreamy ambitions of an empire. Greece made friends with her neighbors and has pursued a policy of peaceful progress. But in the soul of the Greeks there remains a note of complaint that history has treated them unfairly; that they had no share in the flowering of European civilization in the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries. When at the beginning of the 19th century they reentered the family of European nations they felt that they no longer held pride of place but were relegated to the position of poor relations. Modern Greek literature clearly reflects the inner conflicts of the Greek soul, torn as it is between the absorbing spell of the past and the impelling necessity for a new original life of its own.

III

Thanks to her geographical position and historical circumstances, Greece has always been at the crossroads of the most varied influences. Her whole culture has never ceased to adopt and to adapt alien elements. Down through history west and east have always met on Greek soil—sometimes clashing with and at others times complementing each other.

Basically Greece has always belonged to the Western World. Greece gave the West some of its most fundamental principles, such as free philosophical and scientific thought and its bearer, man's emancipated personality. European civilization was born from the combined influences of the classical Greek spirit, of the Roman conceptions of state and law, and of the Christian doctrines. In Greece, Rome was something more than a mere foreign conqueror. Rome borrowed much Greek culture but in return she gave Greece her state organization and legal science. Roman law was completely integrated into the lives of the Greek people and became the cornerstone of society, which it remained even during the years of Turkish occupation. Under the Turks the Greeks managed to maintain their religious life and their communal self-government, as well as their own ecclesiastical courts which interpreted Roman law as it had been modified and completed by the Byzantine emperors.

Nevertheless, Turkish oppression proved a terrible ordeal. For 4 centuries Greece was cut off from the rest of Europe. The people were forcibly subjected to Asiatic influences. Such tyranny left ugly wounds in the nation's soul. Many daring young men refused to go on living under the Turkish rule. They took up arms, banded together in partisan groups, and lived a free life in the mountains. Soon this resistance gave rise to heroic and romantic legends among the population. Popular ballads celebrated the struggle in a tone reminiscent of Homeric epics. From these independent fighters, the Klephts, was born the military tradition of the modern Greeks, their collective pride, and the spirit of their national struggles which have always been conducted under the banner of freedom. In the towns and plains the subject people eked out their existence, filled with uneasiness and melancholy at the presence of the foreign conquerors. Something of this psychological attitude has remained typical of the modern Greek, as has his mistrust of government and of any organized authority. There also were those among the population who curried favor with the Turks, sought to serve and flatter them, and then to deceive them. These people developed a roguish cunning and lost some of their self-respect.

Greek psychology today still reflects our history. We meet men worthy of the highest praise for their independence of character, their generosity, and their superior morality. Then we meet those who, psychologically, appear to be still in fetters, still retain some of the sadness of the once enslaved Greeks, some of their fear of life, of their indolence, or their cunning. We shall also find the type of person who, unconsciously suffering under the memory of foreign tyranny, seeks release through a desire to enslave others, to tyrannize a family, an office staff, or, if he holds some position of authority, the common citizen, or even, at times, a whole nation.

In modern times the efforts the Greeks have made to rejoin Europe and catch up with lost progress have been hard and often painful. But there was no time to lose. The industrial revolution had begun in the West and conditions of life were changing. Moreover, in Eastern Europe new national groups were taking up arms prepared to stake out fresh territorial claims. Struggling against heavy material obstacles, often further hampered by bitter internal controversy, the Greeks did whatever they could to bring their nation up to a modern standard. From England and France they copied political ideas such as the parliamentary system. From France, too, they borrowed the organization of law courts as well as administrative procedure. The university system and most scientific methods were copied from Germany. In the field of art and letters Greece was very much influenced by Italy and then later by France. Intellectual and social ideas were absorbed from all over Europe.

There is no doubt that many mistakes were made in this wholesale assimilation, but how could they have been avoided? Often the Greeks were carried away by a tendency toward indiscriminate imitation, rashly adopting habits and ways of thinking which were ill-suited to the character of the people and so bound to fail. But in many spheres this fusion of the Greek and the modern European spirit was effected naturally and harmoniously.

IV

Despite its long and troubled history, Greece today is a young nation; its emotional pattern has the freshness of youth, its imagination is that of an adolescent, its spontaneity is sometimes almost primitive. This is the same nation which cherishes so many old memories and preserved traits formed in different eras, long ago. Its personality is complex, worked and fashioned by many a century. Yet Greece is far from tired. It is actually renewing itself constantly, ready to start out afresh every so often in quest of a better and brighter existence.

The Greek is a good soldier and sailor. Within the limited period of his newly found independence he has produced noteworthy military leaders. He is easily capable of heroism and self-sacrifice when he fights for freedom. But he wants to know for what he is fighting and to convince himself that the cause is just.

As a people the Greeks are fond of dispute, at all times ready to argue over anything, to question and to criticize endlessly, stating their views. They have a passion for truth but are no fanatics. They do not seeme to be deeply attached to any particular ideology.

The Greek loves life. He believes that the world is beautiful and that it is worth enjoying with one's body and one's soul. He holds that man is the center of the universe and that he is good. He has confidence in man and respects him. The Greek is generous. He has a very well-developed sense of hospitality and is always ready to help others. He is a confirmed individualist by nature, inclined to make his own world, free from outside interference, where he may achieve his own happiness and, if possible, through his life's work leave something of himself to posterity. He abhors tyranny and often misinterprets the meaning of the state, seeing it as an encroachment upon his liberties, which leads him to oppose law and order.

In politics modern Greece has produced two prominent personalities of international significance: Count John Capodistria, at the beginning of the 19th century, and Eleftherios Venizelos, a century later. The country has had many able politicians but it can hardly be claimed that Greek public life has attained anything near an ideal level. Generally, I should say, the modern Greeks have not yet developed that sense of organization and team spirit which is so essential in the world of today. Conversely, their talents and capabilities often bring exceptional results wherever individual initiative is in itself sufficient.

Greeks have a distinct aptitude for intellectual work. During the last 150 years they have made valuable contributions in theoretical science archeology, history, and law. There have likewise been a number of eminent physicians. In the field of the arts, literature is doubtless in the forefront. The really important milestones in the intellectual life of the nation have been left by the poets—Dionysios, Solomos, Andreas Kalvos, Kostis Palamas, Constantine Kavafis, Angelos Sikelianos, and two famous men of letters, true guiding spirits of the nation, Adamantios Koraïs and John Psycharis. We also find interesting developments in plastic art, in music, and the theater.

Heretofore her statesmen, writers, and heroes have given substance to the life of the nation. But in the immediate future modern society and technocracy will demand of Greece a fresh and enormous effort of psychological and intellectual reorientation. If the Greeks wish to hold their own and advance within the civilized world to which they belong they will need a more up-to-date social consciousness, better organization, more scientific methods, deeper thinking, and correspondingly capable leaders. Let us hope that those virtues with which the Greeks have shown themselves endowed—humanity, courage, intelligence, and a sense of measure—will see them through.

Doctor Draft Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the current issue of the Dental Survey. It seems both unfortunate and unnecessary to take these doctors who are past 40 years of age, especially if, as this article indicates, there is no need for them in the armed services at the present time. Besides, there are many of these doctors who attempted to enlist during the emergency but they were rejected at that time. The extension of the doctor draft law should give serious consideration to this situation.

The article is as follows:

DOCTOR DRAFT DISPUTE

The dental profession still is entangled with Defense Department over the physician-dentist draft act. ADA maintains that there will be enough young dentists finishing school this June to take care of the mili-

tary's needs, and that no special law is required to bring older men into service.

So far the Department has resisted all such arguments. It maintains that it needs some older men, with specialty training and administrative experience, to balance off the young dentists. This is the same argument used by the department in the case of physicians, where obviously the specialty factor is of greater consideration. In recognition of this, the American Medical Association's position is not as unequivocal as the ADA's. AMA says there may be a need for the extension, but that, if there is, the Department of Defense hasn't made the evidence public.

Unless an extension is granted, the law will expire next June 30. Defense Department is asking a 2-year extension, but Congress may cut this back to 1 year if it decides the law should be kept on the books.

In its dealings with Defense, the ADA unearthed some evidence that not all is as it should be in the military dental departments. It learned that the Air Force and Navy have informed 150 members of the 1955 classes, who had been signed up to Reserve commissions, that they would not be called to active duty until at least a year from now. But at the same time Selective Service was calling on 330 dentists over 40 years of age and telling them to report immediately for active duty.

When Defense Department didn't straighten out the situation fast enough, ADA took its case to the Health Resources Advisory Committee, the department's civilian review authority. The committee made strong protests to the department, with indications that the orders would be changed.

Address by Robert B. Anderson, Deputy Secretary of Defense, Before the Graduating Class, University of Texas, Austin, Tex., Saturday, June 4, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM RAYBURN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by placing therein an address by Robert B. Anderson, Deputy Secretary of Defense, to the graduating class of the University of Texas on Saturday, June 4, 1955.

I commend this address to you for thoughtful reading. It is a very able address delivered by a very able man.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY ROBERT B. ANDERSON, DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, BEFORE THE GRADUATING CLASS, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN, TEX., SATURDAY, JUNE 4, 1955

Into the crucible of his experience, man has poured the elements of time, endless effort, experimentation, hope, drudgery, and slavery, and a multitude of other concomitants, all aimed at producing things and services suited to his requirements. The products of this crucible have been continuous—some of them good and some evil; some of them tangible and other describable only in terms of a general sensing and appreciation. Through the course of history man's lot has been shaped by the adding of ingredients, the achievement or failure of production, the masters of the brew and the uses of the end results.

Ever so often the pot boils furiously and man's hopes are raised or new fears are generated. Some of the time the restless tides of human activity are perceptibly slow and progress seems to retrograde, although measured in centuries this appearance is essentially unreal. Thus the panorama moves on. At any given point of time and place in history there always seeps into man's consciousness the realization that this moment, and only this moment, is his. Hence he represents the conjunction of the past with the future in the transiency of the present. What of today? What of tomorrow? What of the measurement of opportunity? How great is the challenge to effort? How rich is the rewards of achievement? What to be hoped for? What do we dream of? Where is the door to the undiscovered, the key to the locks of comprehension and creativeness?

In recent months many of the headlines in America and around the world have told of the development of power and the strength of nations; the capabilities of violence, the destructive uses to which energy can be put.

There has been a parade of dreary items of uncertainty, crisis, and danger.

We cannot turn our backs upon these grim realities of our time, and this we will not do. We have, and we will maintain, both the military capability and the resolution to fulfill our role as one of the primary custodians of freedom and hope for the whole world.

But tonight I come to join with you in lifting the veil to see what may lie beyond us that can give new reality to hope and new purpose to life.

A recent example of the spening of the door to the future is the unfolding story of man's first conquest of polio, offering freedom and escape from a crippling disease. For this our hearts are filled with thanksgiving.

Thus the progress of medicine moves along its way, healing the sick, relieving pain and wretchedness, and enabling people to live longer, healthier, and more enjoyable lives. And we are assured that, while medicine is thus contributing significantly to man's health and comfort, the discoveries and innovations we are making everywhere else in the realm of natural science are likewise adding to the prospects of a more abundant life for people. In almost every way the years ahead will be marked by breathtaking scientific progress, which may or may not be employed in ways which add to the prospects of human happiness. But the opportunities for good certainly will be there, and to a large extent the choice as to how we dispose of them will be ours.

With the coming of the fission and fusion of the atom, mass became directly convertible to energy, and the greatest source of power of all time became in a measure subject to man's control. This triumph of science has been regarded with a marked ambivalence by our people. Inadequately controlled, it could presage a new age of destruction and fear—fear of the unknown and of those who would use this power destructively, and fear that man's capacity for moral and political responsibility cannot measure up to its demands.

Yet at the same time, it represents the hope of a vast new source of productive energy which may in time free millions of human beings from the necessity of physical drudgery, and in so doing create the material conditions in which life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness may have meaningful reality to those who now are able to regard them only as vague and distant abstractions.

This does not mean—it should not mean—the lessening of a demand for useful work. Labor is indispensable to useful life, and usefulness is indispensable to happiness. It means rather that man—freed from the drudgery of toil, may address his talents to a higher order of intelligent achievement, to the discovery of the new, to the order of society by examination of cause and effect, and to the other endless pursuits which may stem from the efforts of beings created in the image of God.

Last year saw the beginning of the first atomic powerplant for commercial use, at Shippingport, Pa. This plant, and the many which will someday follow it, will supplement the power installations utilizing conventional fuels as we prepare to meet a demand for mechanical energy which is almost certain to double by 1980. Our experience with the sea trials of the submarine *Nautilus* daily increases our knowledge of the possibilities of the atomic engine for the whole field of marine propulsion. This knowledge we shall put to excellent use in the next few years as we proceed with the construction of the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship.

But the production of usable energy is only one of the many possibilities of the peaceful atom. From the progress of our experiments in producing beneficial mutations in plants, we can hope to reduce some of our staggering agricultural production loss to diseases such as rust and wilt. Meat exposed to mild gamma-ray pasteurization can be kept safely for much longer periods than formerly. Radioactive isotopes are used as tools of measurement and observation in factories, laboratories, and hospitals all over the country. Radiocobalt, radioiodine and radiophosphorus are regularly used in the diagnosis and treatment of diseases such as cancer and leukemia.

A look at what is transpiring in our laboratories today gives some clue as to what we may someday expect to see in common practice. It is of course true that many successful laboratory experiments never get out of the laboratory stage, but our State of material abundance attests to the fact that a great many of them do. About 2 years ago scientists at MIT succeeded in decomposing water into its component elements of hydrogen and oxygen using only solar energy aided by catalysts, and last year at the University of California, sunlight was actually harnessed to create starch and sugar from carbon dioxide and water for the first time outside the living cells of green plants. We have developed a battery which yields electric energy directly from the sun's rays. We have discovered chemicals which kill cancer cells without harming the normal cells about them. We have heated houses entirely through the radiant energy of the sun. We have done some astonishing things with chlorella, a sea plant which holds promise of becoming an important source of food. We have found ways to make sea water drinkable without resorting to the process of distillation. We have discovered and developed new techniques in the production and utilization of petroleum and coal.

Meanwhile we are witnessing a continuing increase in the productivity of an economy that is already maintaining the world's highest standard of living on a 42-hour average workweek. The continued development of our industrial technology holds out the prospect that the American family in 1980 may have an income after taxes of almost half again what it was last year on the basis of a workweek which may not exceed 36 hours.

If any proof were needed of man's ultimate capacity to master his physical environment, it would seem that the example of America in mid-20th century would be sufficient. There is no question about that. It can be said that man is substantially the master of the physical world about him. Yet all these scientific triumphs have a common characteristic; they belong to the external world of things. They are the product—not the essence—of man's creativeness, his hu-

manness, his divine relationship with his Heavenly Father. We must not forget that. We must not forget that these things have meaning only to the extent that they serve to enhance the dignity, the uniqueness, and the separateness of men as individuals. We are resolved not to produce a society of human automatons, conditions like Pavlov's dogs to a dreary set of uniform signal responses to outside stimulation. We shall instead produce a material environment which tends to differentiate people, not drive them together into some drab and formless egalitarianism, which promotes individuality rather than conformity, which demands from each member the very best of his own distinctly personal contribution to the group. We shall direct our energies to realizing a world in which material advances mean increased possibilities for the further expression of human talents, ideas, abilities, and creativeness.

These objectives require that the improvements to our social structure, such as our political organism and our systems of production and distribution, keep equal pace with our advances in the physical sciences. I know of no more auspicious climate for such a demonstration than that provided by America. Here is the birthplace of government by all the people. Here religious feredom is not only written into organic law, but, more importantly, it is practiced in the customs and mores of the people. Freedom of person, of speech, and of the press are specifically provided for in our Bill of Rights. Our legal system is based upon an immutable higher law above the passion and prejudice of man in the fallibility of his interpretation. We work constantly to improve its integrity.

The philosophy of our competitive economy announces the thesis that if man works to produce the goods and services required by others for the betterment of life, his own lot may be benefited by additions of goods and services as well. Other theories of economy—that of the Communist and Fascist dictatorships—improve the lot of the favored few by the appropriation of the labors of the rest. Only in a free world with the privilege of competition does the whole level of living standards rise at one time, and only in a free world are there rewards in proportion to the energy, the resourcefulness, and the pride of workmanship which a man invests in his contribution to society.

It is one of the high offices of education to keep our material opulence and success in its proper perspective; to make it meaningful in terms of human living; to differentiate between culture and the things it uses. It is a continuous task, one which must be undertaken anew each year and each generation. For no people can "inherit" a civilization merely by falling heir to its material relics. Civilization is a matter of spirit; of conviction and belief; of folkway and tradition. It is a shared attitude toward life and living that is felt and practiced by a whole people, into which each succeeding generation is born, and upon which it is nurtured throughout childhood to maturity. Within this great and endless process the university finds its place not merely as the repository of accumulated wisdom, but as a source of new truth and new understanding which dedicated men and women may present to the world of their own time and to all those who follow them. I dare say that there are few, indeed, among you for whom tonight marks the effective end of your contact with this university. More than likely its influence will touch your life again and again over the years of the future, in ways so intimate as to be surprising. For the future is inextricably bound up with the present and the past. Society is, as Burke remainds us, "a contract. It is a partnership in all science; a partnership in all art; a partnership in every virtue, and in all perfection. And as the ends of such a partnership cannot be obtained in many generations, it becomes a partnership not only between those now living, but between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are not yet born."

We are thus within and of the great stream of humanity, receiving of its bounty and morally bound to return to it all that our efforts can bring forth in a lifetime of useful endeavor.

Unused knowledge, for example, serves little better than ignorance. In fact, it may well be worse, because it represents a waste, not only of the talent and capacity of him who possesses it, but to that extent, it means also a waste of the efforts and conributions of all those who made it possible for such knowledge to be owned without being used. Learning is a privilege which all too few enjoy, and because it is thus a privilege, it carries with it the responsibility that it be intensively and productively employed in ways which contribute to the prospects of human happiness in our world.

In pursuit of this objective, we are concerned with the past because we must use the tools and the knowledge it has given us; we are concerned with the present because we must live in it, largely within the scheme of things as they exist. It is only the future which we are free to influence, and to which we have any chance of making a real contribution.

So the future becomes the justification for the existence of those who live in the present. It will be largely the kind of future that we have the wit, the wisdom, and the moral goodness to make. At all events it is certain to be a very lively one. But if it is to be productive in the sense that there is a spreading and diffusion of those values upon which our civilization is founded and from which it draws its strength, it will only be because we who are the present custodians embrace them with genuine conviction, live by them, and include them in our legacy to the world of our children. It is not simply a matter of copybook answers or of any ritualistic laying-on of hands. It is a matter of loving and hating the proper things; a matter of rejecting that which is known to be false in favor of that which is known to be true; of putting principle before expediency, of cherishing universal values rather than those of limited worth and application. It is a problem of stark realism and honesty in the evaluation of fact; it is one of meshing humanity and science; of balancing frailties and determinations; of recognizing responsibility and acknowledging both the restraint and demand of unimpeded conscience. The future will depend upon the instruments which we are able to bring to its solution: our moral conviction, our vision, our wisdom, and our will.

The Cost of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM COON

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I have here an editorial from the Union-Bulletin, published at Walla Walla, Wash., of May 5, entitled, "The Cost of Power." The writer of this article brings out so clearly the urgent need for hydroelectric power projects in the rapidly expanding Pacific Northwest and the ideal plan which H. R. 5789 sets forth in regard to raising the necessary money, that I think it would be advisable for every Member of Congress to read this article. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

THE COST OF POWER

An interesting analysis made a few days ago by officials of the Bonneville Power Administration points up the severity of the financial problem involved in supplying the rapidly growing Pacific Northwest with electric power.

BPA economists estimate that to meet power requirements in the next 10 years will involve an investment of at least $3.5 billion for new dams and transmission facilities and for completion of projects now under way.

This means a requirement of about $1 million per day for the 10-year period.

This $3.5 billion compares with a total Federal expenditure of about $2 billion in the past 20 years, including the large Columbia Basin irrigation project.

Interestingly enough, even considering the huge cost of projects now under construction, such as McNary, Chief Joseph, The Dalles, and other dams in the region, expenditures have been averaging less than $500,000 per day. In other words, the rate of investment must be at least doubled to keep pace with demands.

In this connection, it is worth noting that the large Federal expenditures in the past two decades were made mostly in response to a major depression and two wars, and in a period which saw the national debt rise from $30 billion to $275 billion. The question that inevitably must arise is: Can we expect Congress to appropriate $1.5 billion more in the next 10 years than it appropriated during the last 20 years for river development in the Pacific Northwest?

The answer, it seems to us, is unmistakable. The full amount of money needed will not and cannot be forthcoming. Complete reliance on the Federal Government to supply this region's power needs in the years ahead would be tragically shortsighted.

That is the basic reasoning which has prompted the exploration of partnership or non-Federal participation and sharing in power development. Non-Federal funds, largely from the private investment market, must be drawn into the picture if the power requirements are to be met. The cooperative efforts of every agency involved in the generation and distribution of electric energy must be obtained if the Pacific Northwest is to avoid critical difficulties a decade hence.

Such a partnership has, in effect, been in operation for at least 10 years. Since the end of World War II non-Federal utilities, both public and private, have added over a million kilowatts of capacity in the region. During the same period of time, the Federal system added 1.8 million kilowatts. In other words, over one-third of the new power installed came from non-Federal sources. Clearly our loads and resources would not now be in balance if we had depended solely upon the Federal Government for our power supply.

The issue is clearly defined in the case of John Day Dam and other major projects which are being proposed now for partnership development, with the local utilities of the region supplying most of the construction funds needed. The only wise course is to take advantage of every such opportunity to draw in non-Federal funds, leaving to the Federal Government those projects which are, for various reasons, not easily susceptible to partnership development. The latter category would probably include such projects as are primarily for storage, as for example Libby Dam.

These facts are, or should be, well known to Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER, of Oregon, who are currently opposing the proposal to build John Day Dam as a partnership project. Their insistence on a completely federalized system, if successful, could only result in disaster for the region they claim to serve, for the Federal Government is not able to do the job alone.

Russia's Worldwide Sports Offensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in August of last year the U. S. News & World Report magazine prophesied that "Soviet Russia is pushing a worldwide sports offensive with a calculated goal: Victory over everybody—but most of all over the United States—in the 1956 Olympic games at Melbourne."

Further weight is given to this prediction by a very comprehensive and illuminating article appearing in the June 6, 1955, issue of Life magazine, entitled "Red Amateurs Are Pros," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED AMATEURS ARE PROS—FOR 1956 OLYMPICS, SOVIETS REGIMENT SPORTS AS WEAPON OF STATE

(By Yuri A. Rastvorov, former Soviet secret agent)

In the 17 months since my flight from the Russian intelligence service I have studied international sports with particular interest from the viewpoint of a fan and a former athlete in the Soviet Union. I was at once amazed by the gulf between the United States and Soviet attitudes toward sports. I believe that if Americans do not learn just how complete this difference is before next year's Olympic games, they may be in for some rude shocks. Americans have to realize that such terms as "amateur and voluntary" are totally irrelevant in the U. S. S. R. Soviet teams are not organized; they are assembled as parts of a great state machine. Soviet teams do not play at their sports; they work at them.

In the past two years the world has watched Soviet athletes make a stunning impact on international sports. Soviet teams and competitors have traveled to more than 15 countries, while from Moscow has come a lavish stream of invitations to foreign groups ranging from a British soccer club to a Japanese wrestling team. Most of those who have accepted these Russian challenges have met crushing defeats: in 1954, for instance, the Russians beat the Canadians at hockey, the British at soccer, the Norwegians at skating. Last July a crew of Soviet oarsmen carried away Britain's Grand Challenge Cup at the Henley regatta.

Soviet participation in such international competition has little to do with coexistence, certainly even less to do with recreation or sportsmanship for its own sake. The objective in this field was laid down in a 1948 decree, and it is exactly the same as in all others: world supremacy.

As a member of the Russian generation that grew up after the revolution and later as a member of the Soviet intelligence service, I had very full opportunities to observe the total regimentation of Soviet sports. As a youth I was trained in the military skills that were compulsory sports requirements for young Soviet citizens. As a young man I learned of the flagrant special privileges that are given Soviet sports stars, and later in a Siberian prison colony I saw what happened to athletes who were suspected of abusing those privileges. I learned that no Soviet team is sent into foreign competition unless it is practically certain of winning, although this may involve bribing judges and referees. Finally as an espionage agent in Japan (Life, November 29, December 6, December 13, 1954) I saw how the machinery of Soviet intelligence is constantly at work evaluating foreign athletic capabilities just as it evaluates foreign military capabilities.

All Soviet sports activities are under the direct control of the Central Committee of the Communist Party through the Committee of Sport of the Council of Ministers. Pressure from the top is constant. In 1948, the Politburo instantly removed Nicolai Romanov as chairman of the Committee of Sport after an abrupt party-line switch decreeing new emphasis on Western-style athletics. He was replaced by one Colonel General Apollonov, an MVD officer whose background for the job had been the command of the Border Guard Directorate. Presumably the Central Committee felt that this tough MVD soldier could be counted on to inculcate proper discipline in all lower echelons.

Below the committee level are the great Soviet sports clubs or unions that actually operate the peculiar system of recruiting athletes and putting them on the equivalents of their payrolls. Soviet propaganda persistently shouts that there are no professional athletes in the U. S. S. R. In the sense that no one can fill out an entry on a questionnaire with the words "Occupation: Athlete," this is true. Each of the great clubs hires and retains promising players through its own unique system of coercions and rewards. The stars end up as full-time athletes, although each of them nominally carries on some other more mundane activity.

TOUGH TALENT SCOUTS

These ostensible jobs as well as the recruiting methods and emoluments depend upon what branch of the Soviet state runs the athletic club. The most famous and powerful club, the Dynamo, with approximately 500,000 members in units that cover cities throughout the U. S. S. R., is the organization of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Committee of State Security—the secret police. These groups have had first priority in recruiting men for their services throughout the U. S. S. R., and the Dynamo has made full use of this in picking out athletes, who may be given officers' commissions although they almost never appear in uniform.

Because it has been almost impossible for an athlete to turn down a bid to play for the secret police, the army-navy clubs, known as TsDSA (for Central House of the Soviet Army) usually have had to be content with second place as far as talent is concerned. Like the secret services, though, they can offer comfortable officers' commissions. Two star TsDSA soccer players named Bobrov and Grinin held the rank of captain or major in the Soviet army when I last saw them play in 1950.

The remaining big clubs are forced to offer more material inducements. The Spartak, which represents the state-owned commercial enterprises, trade unions, and other government bureaus, is in an excellent position to dispense goods as well as money. The Torpedo team of the Zis auto works makes it possible for players to own luxurious cars, thus conferring inestimable social prestige. The captain of the Torpedo soccer team is a Spaniard named Gomez who came to the U. S. S. R. during the Spanish civil war and is carried on the payroll as an "automotive engineer." Soccer became such a preoccupation around the Zis plant a few years ago that the manager had to be fired, one of the reasons reportedly being because he was giving so much time to his soccer team and so little to his assembly lines.

In the manager's case this was a mistake, but the individual player is just as much of a full-time athlete as any member of an American big-league baseball team. His rewards are comparably handsome. A member of the winning team in the Soviet equivalent of the World Series—the All-Union Soccer Championship—receives a bonus of 5,000 rubles ($1,250) and a share of the gate receipts. The player who has received the coveted title of Master of Sport and the handsome medal that goes with it receives a special monthly check. Should he be picked as the outstanding player of the year in his sport, he will get about 2,000 rubles more a month. Should he be rated among the top 10 players in his field, he will get perhaps 800 or 1,000 rubles. All of this, plus his pay from the job he nominally holds, enables him to live as well as a top bureaucrat.

SECRET CARROTS, PUBLIC STICKS

Although these facts are well known to most Soviet citizens, for purposes of outside consumption the government still attempts to keep the payments secret. A top-ranking woman tennis player once told me that when she stopped by to pick up her monthly check she and her fellow athletes were required to sign a paper that threatened prosecution and punishment should they reveal this income.

Should a player's performance fall off in a crucial game, should he fail to absorb the indoctrination that is given him constantly by the team's party organizer, should he even fall open to charges of conceit, disgrace and punishment are swift and spectacular. He is considered guilty of antistate activity.

Yuri Tukalov, the young single-sculls champion who blemished the Soviet rowing triumph at Henley by letting himself be beaten by a Yugoslav, was assailed in the press for his spoiled attitude, weak will and lack of perseverance. After a TsDSA soccer team made a dismal showing against some almost unknown Czech teams in 1948, its managers and captain were hauled before a central committee commission and told that any repetition of the performance would mean a sad end for the team's coach and party organizer. Another TsDSA soccer team that was beaten by the Yugoslavs in the 1952 Olympics was immediately recalled to Moscow, the team dissolved and its managers accused of a political crime.

During a 1948 assignment to the Khabarovsk penal area in Siberia, I caught a glimpse of the famous Starostin brothers who built up the great Spartak soccer team of the 1930s and are still known as the fathers of Soviet soccer. Shipped out to Khabarovsk in the purges of the late 1930s, the Starostins were, when I saw them, employed as trainers for the MVD's local Dynamo soccer team. The Khabarovsk commandant told me, "You don't have to go to Moscow to see the best actors, musicians, or soccer players. We have them all right here, and it doesn't cost a ruble to see them perform."

Although recent Soviet victories in such sports as rowing and skating and feverish Soviet training for such others as basketball and volleyball indicate just how completely Moscow hopes to dominate every event everywhere, soccer is still the top Soviet sport.

In addition to being the most popular sport in the Soviet Union, where almost every village, factory, and military unit has a team, soccer has vast propaganda value because it is the favorite spectator sport of the Western European workingman. In England, France, and Italy crowds of as many as 100,000 often gather to watch important soccer matches.

As far back as the 1930's the Soviets began to realize how much prestige they could build with winning soccer teams and they began to compete with a few foreign teams. These early encounters convinced them that their skill did not match that of the Westerners, and in any case Stalin's isolationist policy did not encourage such contacts. During World War II most sports were completely curtailed, and it was not until well afterward that the Soviets began to try in earnest to manage their soccer campaign like a well-run military operation to provide propaganda material at home and abroad.

CAMOUFLAGED ALL-STARS

Nowadays no Soviet team meets a foreign one until the latter has been carefully evaluated by Soviet intelligence. The Soviet group, which usually plays under the name of one of the big clubs, is usually an all-star aggregation assembled from the best players of all the best teams. Sometimes even this careful planning has failed to pay off, especially in matches with satellite teams. Such fiascos have caused a good deal of grief for those who run Soviet sports and a good deal of amusement among spectators such as myself.

In 1949 the top-ranking Hungarian Vashash soccer team was invited to Moscow to meet what was billed as "a typical amateur team of factory workers"—the Torpedos of the ZIS plant. Actually, this team had been most carefully made up of top Soviet soccer stars, headed by the TsDSA's captain, Grinin.

I watched the first game of the series. Our players as well as the spectators were considerably puzzled by the courteous Hungarians, one of whom, after accidentally shoving a Soviet player, apologized and extended his hand—which was ignored. The Hungarians' soccer tactics baffled our men even more, and our "typical amateurs" lost the game.

Afterward I met the wife of a sports official who knew General Apollonov, then serving as chairman of the Committee of Sport. According to her, he turned progressively more pale as the game went on; and when it became clear that his Torpedos couldn't win, he walked out of the stadium. For the next couple of days he took to his bed.

Steps were immediately taken to make up up for the defeat. Another team, made up of a whole new set of stars, was hastily assembled to meet the Hungarians under the Dynamo banner. At the second game, which I also watched, the Hungarians inexplicably failed to put in their own top star and generally played terrible soccer. The resulting Soviet victory was not only hailed wildly in the Moscow press but was made the subject of a full-length motion picture, which contained no mention of the Torpedos' earlier defeat.

Occasionally the spectators as well as the opposing teams get out of hand—incidents that are also unreported. In 1947 there was a championship playoff between the armed forces' TsDSA team and the Dynamos. As usual, public sentiment was against the Dynamos because of their secret-police connection and as usual the lowest 2 or 3 rows in the stands were completely filled with MVD internal troops and policemen to keep the 80,000 spectators from getting out of hand. As the close game went on, the crowd became increasingly tense. After the TsDSA had scored its final winning point the spectators swarmed onto he field shoving aside the cordon of guards. Several plicemen who tried to stop the stampede were mauled, to the general satisfaction of the crowd. At the next game in the series many more seats were occupied by internal troops.

THE VICISSITUDES OF VASILY

Such fracases seldom become so violent, but they are not uncommon at Soviet sporting events, which provide one of the few outlets for popular emotions. Another one that I recall took place at a hockey game during the brief sports promotion career of Vasily Stalin, son of the then dictator. About 1948 Vasily decided that his position as an air-force general did not of itself give him enough prestige, so he decided to dip a finger into Soviet sports. He went about this in a completely straightforward way, browbeating sports officials by invoking his father's name and bribing all good players he could lay his hands on. Among the sports his new air-force club became interested in was hockey, which has become increasingly popular in the U. S. S. R. since the war. For his hockey team he stole two Spartak stars named Novikov and Zigmund. The air-force group did so well that at the end of the season it met Spartak for the national championship. The moment Novikov, Zigmund, and their teammates appeared on the rink there were wild yells of "Traitors! Swine!" from the Spartak fans, who were greatly in the majority and who presently unleashed a hail of potatoes on young Stalin's men. When the Spartak players came out they were feeling equally bloodthirsty, and soon there was a wild melee on the ice in which Novikov was badly beaten up.

Vasily Stalin's teams, like himself, have now dropped from sight. Presumably they have been reabsorbed into those of the other armed services.

Far below the level of the hugh and well-publicized sports clubs, the armed services play a constant role in the sports training of every Soviet youth. As a youngster I went through all of the prescribed steps in a sports program that has as its objective the training of every young Soviet citizen in those basic muscular arts that will make him useful as a soldier. In my school years I had to qualify in such sports as cross-country skiing, rifle markesmanship, and hand-grandate throwing in order to be eligible for the GTO (Ready for Labor and Defense) certificate that all youthful athletes supposedly hope for.

Through my father, an officer in the army recruiting service, I became a member of the army's TsDSA sports club. Because I was on several of its teams, my army orders for the Finnish front in 1940 were canceled. Even in this period those who showed athletic promise often were given direct commissions as lieutenants, allowed to skip their basic training, and permitted to live at home instead of in army barracks.

With the Nazi invasion almost all sports activities came to an abrupt halt, but in 1943 those useful in military training were revived and stressed harder than ever. One young man I knew, who had to spend almost all of his time at the sedantary occupation of studying foreign languages, was forced to take part in a cross-country skiing competition. At the finish line he dropped dead of exhaustion. A few such incidents brought a little moderation into the program.

After the war the emphasis on sports, especially those having military usefulness, was stepped up among the young by means of a whole new series of awards for every conceivable specialty. My only advanced award was the GTO second-degree certificate, which I won as a tennis player but which can also be purchased for 30 or 40 rubles from clerical employees in the offices of the committee of sport in almost any part of the Soviet Union.

As a member of the MVD, I played tennis on the Dynamo's splendid indoor courts in Moscow. Had I been a star player the Dynamo Club would no doubt have seen to it that I got some sort of sinecure so that I could devote my full time to the game.

Soviet tennis has advanced hardly at all since the days in the late 1930's when the great Frenchman, Henri Cochet, was brought over to teach and publicize the game. As the purges of the period gained in ferocity, Cochet was presently accused of being a French intelligence agent, and deported. Several of the Russians closest to him were convicted of espionage and liquidated. Today Cochet's surviving pupils, most of them in their forties, still form the elite of Soviet tennis, which is played mostly among the upper level of the Red hierarchy in the few large cities that have decent courts Soviet tennis equipment is scarce and far from first rate, and that from abroad, especially from Czechoslovakia, is in great demand.

After I fled the Soviet world, the sports bureaucrats in Moscow announced that they had found a way of getting around all this by means of what they call malyy tennis (little tennis). Malyy tennis is played on a court smaller than a regular one with wooden rackets somewhat like ping-pong paddles and old wornout tennis balls. The bulletin describing this supposed means of mass producing Davis Cup material asserted:

"It is true that tennis is a complicated sport form, but can we Soviet athletes use this as a justification for our lagging behind? It is not in the nature of the Soviet people to fear difficulties or to shrink before them. It is on this foundation that in our country we decide to surmount difficulties and to attain more new successes."

Ludicrous as all this may seem, it typifies the present Soviet attitude toward sports, in which any means, however farfetched, devious or plain dishonest, is used toward the end of world supremacy. Victory in next year's Olympics will mark the realization of that aim for the present.

As one who watched the Soviet preparations for the 1952 Olympics, I can assure you that not only the full resources of the great Soviet athletic training and recruiting system but also the full resources of the U. S. S. R.'s foreign intelligence system are now at work, and have been at work since 1952, to assure Soviet victory.

In the spring of 1952 our intelligence office in Tokyo received instructions from Moscow to collect all possible information on the strengths and weaknesses of local teams and athletes, and to "report on the honesty and quality of the managers, ceaches, and trainers of nationally known sports teams."

The implications of this last instruction were obvious. In 1948 I had a conversation with the coach of the Dynamo basketball team in which he admitted that the buying of foreign officials and judges was a routine part of Soviet sport strategy.

Spotting potentially corruptible officials is one of the jobs of the Committee of Sport's foreign section, which receives and evaluates all conceivably useful information on all athletic activities in every part of the world. If it discovers that a noted foreign team is having a rather weak season, it will suggest a challenge to that team by a Soviet group with an almost sure chance of winning. If it discovers that a particular foreign country is getting ahead of the Soviet Union in a particular branch of sport, it recommends an intensive Soviet buildup in that branch. Finally it maintains complete control over the activities of Soviet athletes abroad, watching them for possible defections and giving them instructions for intelligence activities of their own among foreign athletes.

Between now and the 1956 Olympics we may expect to see more and more Soviet teams abroad winning more and more victories in such sports as skiing, gymnastics, marksmanship and track. We may expect to

see Soviet athletes set new records as they have already set them in many sports. These same teams of rigidly controlled and highly paid "amateurs" will then appear at the Olympics.

At the 1952 Olympics the United States eked out a victory over the Soviet Union by 80½ points. So unwilling to admit defeat was the Committee of Sport that a few days after the games closed, it issued an amazing pronouncement that "according to checked data," United States teams gained the same number of points as the Soviet Union. The Soviet press immediately took up this line, explaining the discrepancy by charging that the officials at the games had been "Wall Street capitalists' hirelings" and "filthy businessmen" who had deprived Soviet teams of honestly won victories.

Next year the Soviets are determined not to have to employ such sophistry.

Is Moscow's "Sweet Reasonableness" a Mirage?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, undear leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address I delivered at the Memorial Day exercises of the Veterans of Foreign Wars at Seaford, Del., May 30, 1955:

IS MOSCOW'S "SWEET REASONABLENESS" A MIRAGE?

Memorial Day this year occurs at one of the most strategic moments in a very critical era of world history.

It is for this reason that I propose to give you—if I may—a briefing, that's what they call it in Washington, a briefing, from my own angle of vision, on the situation that confronts the free world.

I hope this briefing is even more pertinent because I am addressing myself particularly to the American veterans.

American veterans, I know, have a prior right to avail themselves of my impressions, a prior right also to my services as their Representative in Washington and in the Congress. As your Representative at large, I suppose I am correct in regarding myself your eyes and your ears, in fact, your voice and your will at the heart of the Government of the United States where the decisions are made that affect the lives of us all and that will determine the survival of the free world.

Let me disabuse you to begin with of any notions that you may have from what I have just said that I am going to let you in on some top secrets. On the contrary, I hope very much today that the Kremlin has an agent in this audience to report back to Moscow precisely and accurately and fully what I am going to say.

The first point I have to make and that I wish the Kremlin to recognize is that Soviet Russia has no credit—no credit whatever—for integrity with the free world and that this credit for integrity is even less than zero with the Government of the United States.

If we start from that position, we can then proceed to evaluate realistically what has been happening in recent weeks: The strategic moments I spoke of in this critical era of world history.

Little Austria has her independence back again. To be sure, it is a bit shriveled. Her substance has been drawn out of her by the greedy paw of the Soviet Union. But nevertheless, she has her independence. And the Soviet Union did make concessions—precisely those concessions she had failed to make all along, which would have permitted sovereignty returned to Austria 6 years ago. One of the concessions, just incidentally, to achieve this end, was the relinquishment by the Soviet Union of its cruel claim to the lives of refugees from communism in Austria. It had hoped to bring them back for punishment—and we can imagine the kind of punishment—behind the Iron Curtain.

Thus the Soviet Union on this point and others reversed itself in signing the Austrian Treaty.

The Soviet Union has been making gracious overtures to Dictator Tito of Yugoslavia, its estranged fellow Communist and semienemy. Tito replied by all but slapping the Soviet Union in the face with his declaration of his continuingly favorable attitude toward the West, irrespective of what the Kremlin delegates to Belgrade may propose.

Tito, who should know the Kremlin even better than we know it, has no faith in Soviet diplomacy either. But the Yugoslav dictator remains loyal to the Communist techniques. He has been talking to the West more recently in the same tone he has applied to the East. It looks at the moment as if he were playing both ends from the middle.

We know also that the wily Soviet commissars are engaged right now in what they hope is a monumental realinement of the international power situation in Europe and that the major key in this alinement is Germany and its possible unification under some questionable stipulations of guaranteed neutrality as between the East and the West, thus alienating the rebuilt free Germany from its Western alliance. The Soviet Union would undoubtedly like to weaken NATO—if possible even nullify it—and strike some kind of a bargain whereby the painfully constructed, democratically negotiated defenses we have built up in Europe against possible Soviet aggression, would be turned into so much scrap. And by defenses I mean both military bases as well as diplomatic safeguards, and economic and political fortifications.

This could then be expected to have repercussions in the Far East with like results.

The Soviets have accepted the invitation of the Western governments for a meeting "at the summit." They have even been making pleasant little personal overtures to the White House in the form of letters of admiration from Marshal Zhukov, the Soviet Defense Minister, to the President. This was followed up by a message of "friendly greetings" from Marshal Sokolovsky through Americans visiting Moscow on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the meeting of American and Russian Armies on the Elbe. The Communist oligarchy seems at the moment to be in a state of lull from the business of murdering one another. And this has afforded them the opportunity to make themselves seem as if they have indeed rendered themselves harmless to world peace.

Now we live in a thermonuclear age, and we know there is no such thing as winning a war even if you win it. That's the paradox of world war III. And there are those who find that even if you should win the third world war, you are very likely to lose much more than you win: civilization itself. This fact plus the horror of the two World Wars this generation has been through—and the cost—have deeply intensified the instinctual desire of the average American for peace and decency. It is a feeling we share with the British and the French—with all of Europe and the East. In fact, it is a feeling we share, I am sure, with the oppressed and harassed Russian people themselves, mass victims of a form of government known as the police state.

The free world is thus caught between the Soviet threat and the risk of world destruction, partial or total. And overall hangs the danger of the psychology of a dynamic oligarchy of diplomatic and political gamblers—without moral principle—who may play with the peace and safety of the world, as some of their compatriots are known to play Russian roulette. The world—slave and free—is thus at the mercy of ruthlessness and caprice.

There are Yalta and Potsdam, Moscow and Berlin, the United Nations and Korea, Geneva and Bandung—a hundred and one conferences—to testify to a voluminous record, with full documentation, of Communist trickery and betrayal.

What policies we shall pursue with such an antagonist will depend upon many factors, and I do not propose today to invade the province of the President, his Secretary of State, and the leaders of Congress who are engaged in this very sensitive and crucial area of direct decision. I ask only for a reemphasis on what we already know: The Soviet Union has no credit for integrity with us and with the free world. That is the conviction, I believe, of the American people. In this, I am sure, all American veterans will go along with me and my fellow citizens here in Delaware. Nor will we seek to obstruct—those of us who have these suspicions of the Soviet Union—any negotiations that may develop and are in process now. If there is good to come of what is now going on, let it come.

If Zukhov and Sokolovsky mean their friendly greetings to the President and they have the power to act, let it happen. If there is an iota of sincerity from the Soviet side in the Austrian treaty, let us on the show of proof act accordingly. If the death of Stalin means in fact a change in the aggressive expansionism of the Soviet Union let us, by all means, take the fullest advantage of this change of heart, for the good of all the world. A meeting at the summit or a meeting at the base, or a meeting at any of the intermediary points, if it will advance the cause of peace another inch, another minute, another dollar's worth, is in order.

All I can say from the conduct of the past of Soviet negotiations and from the known facts about Soviet philosophy, and the teachings of Stalin and Lenin is that I—for one—cannot be made to believe it. For me, it is not enough that the parties to any negotiations in the future are in oral agreement, however clearly and plainly, in any form of words. For me it is not enough that the parties to such negotiations put it all down in writing, spelling out the details, item for item, and word for word, in a commonly understood mutual translation of each other's language.

All I can say is that nothing is enough—except performance.

Performance is enough. We cannot accept anything less.

That means that every move we make should depend upon our strength and not upon the supposition of honest dealing and anticipated performance from the other side of the conference table. Nothing can be accepted by the West less than the deed itself. And this must be so implemented that the continuing guarantees will insure the physical impossibility of a betrayal of a Soviet promise, or a reversal after the promise is half or all fulfilled.

I make no recommendations of policy, and I have the highest respect for those vested with that responsibility, on both sides of the aisle in Congress and in the administration.

All I say is that for me the Soviet Union is now playing a complicated game of chess and we shall be on the alert at every move. It is right and good that they shall know they are not trusted. That is why I hope my

words today, however humble and however slight, may be heard in the Kremlin as a symptom of what all the American people think. A nation without credit for integrity cannot through a splurge for world attention and by making minor concessions—still minor as of this hour, I insist—come to the bargaining table and expect us to fool ourselves into believing that her unclean hands are clean. They drip with blood and the lost liberties of vast masses of the earth's population.

We must not forget that Communist tyranny rules one-fourth of the world's surface and one-third of the earth's population.

How much of it will they give up to prove their good will?

How much of the tyranny they have exercised and the powers they have usurped will they surrender in the captive countries of Poland, Hungary, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, East Germany, Russia, and the non-Russian nations of the U. S. S. R.?

That is the answer all the world is wating for.

After that there are counterpart problems in the Far East.

Until these questions are answered according to the established laws of justice and sovereignty, how can the West take with anything like a respectful mein the Soviet protestations of peace and its recommendations—ridiculous on the face of it—for disarmament?

Disarm who? For what?

The Soviet disarmament plan was answered by the British through Anthony Nutting, the British Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, and by James J. Wadsworth, the United States delegate to disarmament talks in London. I have studied the Soviet proposals and the replies to them. And what this all comes down to, as I appraise the Soviet offer is, just so much hogwash for which the modern term is "propaganda." There is the subtle presumption that the Soviet has somehow come around to the view on disarmament we advocated as long ago as 1947 and that the Kremlin has reversed its line. They are now putting up a polite posture to what we told them was right and they formerly rejected.

The Soviet position regarding an effective international control system, Britain's Anthony Nutting points out, is "still obscure."

And "obscure" is the key word to describe all Soviet negotiations.

If there is anything in this series of faked up "sweet reasonableness" attitude of the Soviet Union it is this: They are in the midst of a domestic economic convulsion. They are issuing to their own people exhortations that reveal low production in industry, and confusion and disorder in agriculture. They have deposed the ostensible successor to Stalin—Malenkov—in humiliation and self-abasement. They have murdered the formerly powerful Beria.

They may be bidding for time to consolidate their power at home.

This may very well be an opportune time for the West to seize on the situation for the enduring enforcement of peace on the basis of guaranteed, concretely implemented, terms, protected by the West's strength in being.

This is Memorial Day, and we cannot forget the sacrifices of those who made possible the freedom under which we live. We shall not betray the heritage they left us.

What remains of the free world is living on the profit of their heroism.

This is the hour for heroism on our part, for firm resolution and a demand for performance in the face of Soviet blandishments. It is the hour for assurance, in the form of unmistakable and irrevocable guarantees, from the Soviet Union, that the world will have peace and that this peace will endure for ourselves and for our children.

On this principle we can and will stand fast. To negotiate through strength—to accept only the deed, not the word of the discredited Commissars of Red Russia.

Betray me once—shame on you. Betray me twice—shame on me.

The Civil Air Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, for some time many of us have been concerned by reports that the United States will be graduating 27,000 engineers in 1956 as compared to 45,000 engineers that will be turned out during that same year by the Soviet Union.

This disparity poses a very real challenge.

On Saturday, May 28, speaking before the Civil Air Patrol Wing Commanders banquet at Colorado Springs, Mr. B. G. David, president, Ziff-Davis Publishing, took cognizance of this challenge and offered, on behalf of himself and his company, a 4-year scholarship at Massachusetts Institute of Technology for the most deserving Civil Air Patrol cadet.

Mr. President, because of the great work being done by the Civil Air Patrol with its 80,000 members, I ask unanimous consent that the talk by Mr. Davis be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, in the hope that many others will join in offering similar scholarships.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MR. B. G. DAVIS, PRESIDENT, ZIFF-DAVIS PUBLISHING CO., AT CIVIL AIR PATROL WING COMMANDERS BANQUET, BROADMOOR HOTEL, COLORADO SPRINGS, SATURDAY, MAY 28, 1955

Colonel Byrd, our vice chairman, national executive board; General Beau, our national commander, ladies and gentlemen of the Civil Air Patrol, it is a privilege for me to be here at your annual national board conference, and I welcome this opportunity to give you what I think is an important message. The best way I can tell you how important the message is would be to quote a recent statement of Assistant Secretary of Defense Donald A. Quarles, who warns: "The critical shortage of engineers and scientists in America is potentially a greater threat to national security than are any weapons known to be in the arsenals of aggressor nations."

According to latest available figures, the United States will be graduating about 27,000 engineers in 1956. Compared to that 27,000 figure, the Soviet Union will turn out 45,000 engineers in 1956. I don't think any more statistics are necessary. We have begun to lose the technological race with the Communist world.

Now, if I understand the aims and missions of this aviation-youth program you have for Civil Air Patrol cadets and in many secondary schools throughout the country, you are the only organization in the entire Nation who has accepted the challenge of filling this critical need and are actively doing something about it. I think your efforts, as civilian volunteer members of the United States Air Force's auxiliary, are most commendable and worthy of wider public recognition.

However, I have had the opportunity of closely studying your program, particularly as it relates to the incentive you offer both the CAP cadets who take part in your program and the adult members of your organization whose primary concern is the youth program. I would be doing you a great injustice if I did not offer some constructive criticism as a most interested outsider. This criticism is directed by no means against civil air patrol alone. It is equally directed to the attention of the United States Air Force, the aviation industry, the airlines, the hundreds of subcontractors, publishers like myself, the news media, educational foundations, the American public, and, in the final analysis, our duly appointed representatives in the Congress of the United States. How in the world can we, the strongest and most technically advanced nation in the world, champion of world peace, permit a situation where our ablest young men and women are not aggressively encouraged to seek their future in the most exciting and productive careers ever open to young people—in the aviation and electronics industries, and in the United States Air Force and air arms of the sister services? How can we afford to let Communist Russia build a superior striking air force which can, when and if their leaders desire, wreak destruction on this Nation which is the last hope of peace on earth? Are we so busy making money and spending it that we are not concerned with what happens 5 years from now—10 years from now—20 years from now?

Some of you may shake your heads and say to yourselves, "We in civil air patrol are doing something about this. We're giving freely of our time and money to channel young people's interest in these careers in our cadet program." I do not deny that you are, but let's take a sharp look at what you are doing. You give teen-age boys and girls in the 48 States and Territories an excellent preflight course, depending on the ability of volunteer instructors. You give them basic background in military courtesy and customs. You take them on orientation flights periodically, but not very often. You give a few flight scholarships. You send thousands to summer encampments at more than 50 Air Force bases. You have an exchange program for your girl cadets with Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. You exchange about 150 of your best male cadets to visit 1 of 21 foreign nations for 3 weeks in the summer, and bring an equal number of foreign boys to this country as guests of civil air patrol. If the CAP cadets successfully completes his course and passes the final examination, he is awarded your certificate of proficiency, which is the ultimate you can give him, signed by General Twining and General Beau.

But what is that certificate of proficiency actually and tangibly worth to the cadet and to the Nation? It permits the boy to enter the United States Air Force regardless of enlistment quotas and gives him the automatic rank of airman third class (Pfc) upon enlistment. These two matters are his only tangible rewards for staying with the program and giving up a lot of his free time for 18 months or more. Is that enough? Have you reached the goal of 100,000 cadets which your charter from Congress calls for? Are you making any appreciable advances toward that goal? The answer to these questions is "No." Now, mind you, the failure cannot be charged to CAP alone. We are all to blame. This program must be a national effort. It must have the support of the entire Nation if we are to have undeniable air supremacy, both military and in civil aviation. And, above all, if we are to secure this supremacy 10 years from now.

In a small but precise way, I am here to make a definite contribution toward our security of tomorrow. It is my pleasure to announce a contribution from the firm I have the honor to head, to an organization which deserves the fullest support. Realizing that more incentive may be the answer to help you attract the cream of our Nation's youth, as well as the adults to work with you and them, the Ziff-Davis Publishing Co., which has long been very much interested in aviation and electronics, will donate a full 4-year tuition aeronautical engineering scholarship to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for the most deserving Civil Air Patrol cadet. This scholarship is given in the name of William B. Ziff, my associate, who passed away in December 1953, who was himself an air cadet in World War I. He was one of the earliest and most vociferous supporters of Billy Mitchell. He fought for a separate Air Force and the Air Force Academy, which will soon be dedicated in this beautiful State. He and I worked together on the first issue of Flying magazine for the first time when Charles Lindbergh had just completed his flight to Paris. He was perhaps best known for his widely recognized book, The Coming Battle of Germany. Bill Ziff loved aviation and loved to see young people interested in it. I know of no greater monument to his memory than the establishment of the William B. Ziff aeronautical engineering memorial scholarship.

I hope the CAP cadet who wins it and enters MIT this fall will not too many years from now become the Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, or the President of Boeing, or the scientist who develops the first interplanetary passenger rocket, or whatever it might be.

This is the first scholarship of this kind Civil Air Patrol has ever received. I ask the aviation industry, the electronics industry, the airlines, educational foundations, and the Congress—to stop and consider. Is this not a wise investment? Is this not an answer to the urgent problem of scientist shortages? Are not these young CAP cadets, who have already evidenced their interest in these fields, deserving of our Nation's full support? How much longer must CAP pilots continue to tell their eager cadets, "Sorry, we can take you on orientation flights, but we can't teach you to fly." Would not 10,000 flight scholarships a year provide just the needed incentive for CAP to attract and hold 100,000 cadets, which at the same time would assist local airport operators in keeping private flying in small aircraft alive?

The answer to these questions lies within the means of the very people to whom I pose them.

Colonel Byrd, here is our check for a 4-year aeronautical engineering scholarship to Massachusetts Institute of Technology. It does not represent a fortune, but it does stand for the will on our part to set off what we hope will become a chain reaction, in which ultimately every aviation corporation and allied industry in the United States will participate.

Thank you.

Now It's the South's Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, after the decision of the United States Supreme Court of Tuesday, May 31, supplementing the Court's opinion of May 17, 1954, ordering mixing of the races in the public schools, there appeared in the Richmond News Leader of June 1 and June 2 editorials entitled "Now It's the South's Move" and "The Children of Prince Edward." I concur wholeheartedly with the editor's expressions and, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of the editorials:

NOW IT'S THE SOUTH'S MOVE

Now that the United States Supreme Court has laid down its program for ending segregation in the public schools, we in the South can begin making more definite plans to preserve it. The Court made its move yesterday. Now it is our move.

So far as Virginia is concerned, this is what the Court said: The school officials of Prince Edward County now are "required" to make "a prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance" with the Court's opinion of May 17, 1954. The "parties to these cases," meaning the Negro plaintiffs in Prince Edward, must be admitted to public schools on a racially nondiscriminatory basis "with all deliberate speed."

What is meant by "all deliberate speed"? It must be "as soon as practicable." How soon is "practicable"? The Court attempeted to fix no date.

Instead, the Court acknowledged that "varied local school problems" may require solution before its 1954 opinion can be fully implemented. The Court advised lower judges to be guided by equitable principles—to shape their remedies according to a "practical flexibility" in order to reconcile "public and private needs." Further, the lower courts may take into account the "public interest" as they undertake to eliminate obstacles to integrated schools. Once Prince Edward has made a start toward compliance, county officials may ask for more time to carry out the original decree. In seeking more time, the county must provide evidence that additional time "is necessary in the public interest and is consistent with good faith compliance at the earliest practicable date."

Again, when is the earliest practicable date? In Prince Edward, we should place it somewhere around the turn of the next century.

For we have not the slightest idea that Prince Edward County intends to make a prompt and reasonable start toward mixing the races in its public schools—next fall or any other time. Indeed, the county's board of supervisors met last night and calmly refused to approve any school operating budget for the coming fiscal year. If one wished to oversimplify this action, it could be said that the Court ruled at noon that Negroes must be admitted to Prince Edward's public schools, to which the county replied at 8 o'clock, "There will be no public schools." Actually, last night's action by the Prince Edward supervisors was a precautionary action. Their hands are left free. In all probability, Prince Edward's schools will be operated in 1955–56 on a segregated basis, just as they have been operated in the past.

We have dwelled upon Prince Edward County's position for this reason: At the moment, the Supreme Court's decree is directed to the School Board and Board of Supervisors of Prince Edward County, and to them alone. From a wholly litigious point of view, the Court's ruling applies nowhere else. To be sure, the Court declared that all provisions of State or local law requiring segregation in public schools must yield to its rewriting of the Constitution, but the enforcement of any particular decree can lie against the named defendants only.

The named defendants here—the Prince Edward authorities—have made it clear that they intend to do nothing that might set a pattern applicable to Virginia as a whole. For this cooperative and resolute attitude, Prince Edward merits the thanks and admiration of the rest of this Commonwealth.

But the converse of this proposition must hold true also: The rest of this Commonwealth must take no action that would compel Prince Edward County, or any county, to act against the wishes of its local citizens. When the county turns to the State for guidance, the State must exercise the greatest care in providing guidance acceptable to the parents and school patrons most intimately concerned.

What can the State do?

The Governor's Commission on Public Education can get down to work now in drafting specific legislation to be submitted to the general assembly.

One aim should be to eliminate from the State constitution and from the Code of Virginia all laws that now require segregation in the public schools; these provisions are dead letters now and are only hindrances.

A second aim should be to repeal the compulsory school-attendance law; we should not leave in the code any provision that might compel Virginia parents, white or Negro, to send their children to any given school against their will.

For a third aim, the assembly should make it possible for any locality that wishes to integrate its schools to do so. There may be quite a few counties in southwest and valley Virginia, where Negro population is small, that will wish to pursue this course.

Fourth, the Governor's commission should draft a law permitting the assignment of individual pupils to particular schools.

Fifth, the commission should consider legislation that would achieve the maximum possible decentralization of authority over school operations. In a statement last night, Thurgood Marshall, chief counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, had this to say: "As to the States that insist we go county by county, we are prepared to go county by county." To this, Virginia might well reply, we, too, are prepared to go county by county. But it may be possible to place school administration not merely at a level of county governments, but at a level of magisterial districts or even at a level of school districts within magisterial districts.

Sixth, the commission may be able to formulate legislation that would give fresh stimulus to the formation and operation of private schools. Here we have no specific suggestions to venture, but it is a field worth exploring.

Seventh, the commission may wish to recommend legislation that would establish within the Attorney General's office a special division, generously financed and liberally staffed, to assist local authorities in the long and expensive litigation that can be foreseen.

Many other recommendations doubtless will occur to the Governor's commission. The chief significance of the Court's action yesterday is that we now can formulate some orderly, systematic countermoves; we are not to be thrown into the drastic series of moves that would have been required if the Court had ordered an immediate end to segregation in the schools.

In all of this to advocate that Virginia attempt, by lawful means, to get around the law?

That is exactly what we advocate.

For let this be said once more, in unmistakable language: In May of 1954, that inept fraternity of politicians and professors known as the United States Supreme Court chose to throw away the established law. These 9 men repudiated the Constitution, split open the 10th amendment, and rewrote the fundamental law of this land to suit their own gauzy concepts of sociology. If it be said now that the South is flouting the

law, let it be said to the high Court, You taught us how.

From the moment that abominable decision was handed down, two broad courses only were available to the South. One was to defy the Court openly and notoriously; the other was to accept the Court's decision and to combat it by legal means. To defy the Court openly would be to enter upon anarchy; the logical end would be a second attempt at secession from the Union. And though the idea is not without merit, it is impossible of execution. We tried that once before.

To acknowledge the Court's authority does not mean that the South is helpless. It is not to abandon hope. Rather, it is to enter upon a long course of lawful resistance; it is to take lawful advantage of every moment of the law's delays; it is to seek at the polls and in the halls of legislative bodies every possible lawful means to overcome or circumvent the court's requirements. Litigate? Let us pledge ourselves to litigate this thing for 50 years. If one remedial law is ruled invalid, then let us try another; and if the second is ruled invalid, then let us enact a third.

But while we resist, let us do everything we can—not because of the Supreme Court, but in spite of the Supreme Court—to raise the cultural and educational levels of all of our people. We should continue to do our utmost to assure education for every child, white and colored alike—and we should do this despite the antagonisms created by Negro leadership. But we should work toward this end within the framework of a dual society.

Yesterday's opinion of the Supreme Court ended nothing. It changed nothing. And if it be said that the court's opinion was conciliatory, we would reply that the South is no more of a mind to conciliate on Wednesday than it was on Tuesday. When the Court proposes that its social revolution be imposed upon the South "as soon as practicable," there are those of us who would respond that "as soon as practicable" means never at all.

THE CHILDREN OF PRINCE EDWARD

Tuesday night's action by the Board of Supervisors of Prince Edward County provides a challenge and a responsibility for Virginians who believe in maintaining segregated schools. The first order of business now is to see to it that the children of Prince Edward are not deprived of an education next Fall.

While the rest of us have been sitting back in the grandstand, lambasting the Supreme Court and exhorting our public officials to greater effort, Prince Edward County has been out in the sun bearing the brunt of the battle. As the "test case county," Prince Edward stands in the direct line of court decrees. The rest of us, for the time being, are off to one side.

When the Supreme Court's decree came down at noon on Tuesday, county officials read the opinion with quiet, deliberate care. Unlike so many southerners, who burst into cries of gratification and pleasure, the Prince Edward people were not fooled by the sweet-talk. They saw that this opinion, for all its soft phrases, meant business; they observed that the High Court's decree, like a Chickahominy shad, looked fine on the platter—but there were bones underneath.

The board met Tuesday night, and by unanimous vote refused to appropriate operating funds for its schools next year. Instead, the board earmarked only $150,000 for debt service and building maintenance. Jack Bruce, of Farmville, a member of the board, gave the simplest possible explanation: "The people of Prince Edward County," he said, "have been pushed as far as they can go."

Unless alternative arrangements are made within the next 3 months, there will be no educational facilities for the children of Prince Edward County next fall. Faced at last with the bitter choice of mixed schools or no schools, Prince Edward has chosen to have no schools. It must be a great satisfaction to Chief Justice Warren and the NAACP.

As a practical matter, alternative arrangements must be made in much less than 3 months. Last year Prince Edward employed 41 elementary teachers and 21 secondary teachers in its white schools. The county's 1,100 white elementary pupils and 425 white high-school students presumably will require about the same teaching staff next fall if their education is to continue without interruption. If the faculty is not to be lost for lack of contracts, prompt assurance must be given the teachers that their salaries will be forthcoming from some source.

From what source?

Make no mistake, we are out of the realm of abstract law in this fight for segregation now. We are down to practical facts. It will cost approximately $325,000 to continue the same level of education for Prince Edward's white children next fall. This includes roughly $140,000 for salaries of elementary teachers, $85,000 for salaries of secondary teachers, $35,000 for operation of buses, and perhaps $65,000 for miscellaneous expenses of administration, maintenance and operation of buildings, and the like.

If schools are not to be operated by public authority, arrangements must be made for private structures to house the pupils. Whether the county would have authority to sell its present school buildings, lock, stock, and barrel, is a legal question now unresolved. Whether the county would want to sell the buildings is a question the county must ponder carefully. But it is time now to think upon these things.

Raising the money should not prove overwhelmingly difficult. At present, the county collects some $335,000 annually in local taxes. Of this amount, 85 percent (or approximately $285,000) is paid by white persons, 15 percent (or roughly $50,000) by Negroes. For the record, it may be noted that Prince Edward's population of 15,400 is 55 percent white, 45 percent Negro; its school enrollment this year is precisely the reverse of this—45 percent white, 55 percent Negro.

Presumably, the bulk of the money needed to continue education of Prince Edward's children could be expected to come from Prince Edward people themselves, provided they were relieved in some fashion of the greater part of local taxes now demanded of them. The balance, we are confident, would be subscribed overnight by friends of Prince Edward who admire the county's resolute stand.

At the moment, no such fund is required. It may well be that events will move along so that Prince Edward, and all other localities in Virginia, can continue operation of public schools on a segregated basis next fall. This is not the time for hasty action that might be regretted later.

But it assuredly is time for those of us who are determined to preserve segregation in education to begin making specific plans, and committing those plans to paper. And the highest priority in such planning must be given the immediate problem of Prince Edward County. The children of Prince Edward—white and Negro alike, but especially the white children—are the victims of a tragedy not of their making. We have said all along that the education of our children must be preserved at any cost. The moment has come to compute that cost, and to gird ourselves for the sacrifices that must be made to meet it.

Arctic Air Service To Europe Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Northwest has never had direct air service to Europe. Last year Scandinavian Airlines System inaugurated service to Europe from Los Angeles over the great circle route. Until recently no American flag international carrier indicated an interest in connecting the Pacific Northwest with the trade and travel centers of the European continent.

However, I am pleased to learn that Pan American World Airways has petitioned the Civil Aeronautics Board for permission to operate regular service between Portland and London and beyond. This is a most encouraging development for the people of Oregon.

It is quite fitting that Pan American which has been a pioneer in developing international air travel under the American flag, should be the carrier seeking this route. Competition breeds good service in air travel and certainly the fact that the Scandinavian line is already operating from the west coast to Europe via the polar route will mean that Pan American will have to provide as good or better service to compete successfully with this excellent European carrier.

It is my hope that the Civil Aeronautics Board will take prompt and affirmative action on the Pan American application. This is an opinion shared by many of my colleagues from cities and areas which will be served by Pan American on this new route.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of my colleagues, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Oregon Journal of May 26, which outlines graphically the details of Pan American's application to fly from the west coast to Europe:

ARCTIC AIR SERVICE TO EUROPE NEEDED

Portland has more than passing interest in the recent application of Pan American World Airways for permission to fly from West Coast cities over the polar route to western and northern Europe.

Pan-Am is asking certification of such a service from Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, and Seattle to London and other cities by a route approximating the great circle course. It already has permanent certification for conventional trans-Atlantic service to Britain and is the only United States line serving Brussels, Amsterdam, Berlin, Hamburg, Copenhagen, Helsinki, Stockholm, Oslo, and Keflavik, Iceland.

Aside from the fact that such service would be a marked improvement over existing air transport services from the Pacific coast to Europe (via New York, via Chicago or Detroit, via Los Angeles or via Vancouver, B. C., and over the pole), there also is another factor: Provision of United States service over the pole in competition with foreign operations.

Pan American seeks to provide competitive United States service from the Pacific coast to Europe over a polar route now exclusively

in the hands of foreign flag carriers. Scandinavian Airlines presently operates such an Arctic service between Los Angeles and Scandinavia. A bilateral agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom permits a British airline to operate between London and San Francisco and beyond. And a Canadian airline shortly will start service from Vancouver, B. C., to Amsterdam over the polar route.

Where does that leave United States airlines—except out of the running?

It is to be hoped, therefore, that the CAB will give prompt and sympathetic attention to Pan-Am's polar flight request. West coast cities, including Portland, are entitled to this better domestic airline service to Europe by the shortest route. And the Nation has a stake in maintaining its prestige in a highly competitive air transport race around the world.

Genuineness of Peiping's Gestures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting editorial from the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., Saturday, June 4, 1955:

GRATITUDE WITH CAUTION

It is characteristic of Communists that they often seek credit for undoing something that they never should have done in the first place. The release by the Red Chinese of four illegally held American fliers is such a case.

We are all grateful that these men are now free and reunited with their families. But we as a nation cannot make a deep bow of gratitude to Red China. For the Communists owed us these men, as they owe us 11 other fliers and a sizable number of civilian prisoners as well.

The return of the four, indeed the return of all, will not wipe out the crime. In the matter of the four released men the Chinese did not in fact acknowledge that they had been guilty of the slightest injustice.

They tried the four—not previously charged with any specific crime—and ordered them deported for having violated Chinese territory. All had been downed, of course, during the Korean war, and as prisoners should have been released in 1953 under terms of the Korean armistice.

Eleven other fliers are held as convicted spies, and it may not be so easy for the Reds to find a face-saving formula for their release.

But if they do release them, then the United States might well consider whether these moves reflect a new desire on Peiping's part to follow a path toward an easing of tensions in the Far East. If we should decide they do, then we might conclude that favorable conditions exist for negotiations with the Chinese.

Nevertheless, we would have to make it plain that we were not agreeing to talk in payment for the release of wrongfully imprisoned Americans. We cannot strike bargains which credit the Communists for undoing unjust acts.

So long as that is thoroughly clear, the American Government cannot lose by sitting down at the council table to test the genuineness of Peiping's gestures toward a more relaxed Far Eastern situation.

As for the immediate achievement of the four fliers' release, America must extent first thanks to the long-patient efforts of U. N. Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold. Ever since the U. N. resolved to act in the fliers' behalf, Hammarskjold has worked tirelessly toward this goal.

Krishna Menon, India's U. N. delegate, has publicly assumed full credit for the release. He has only recently returned from a Peiping mission whose aims included freedom for the fliers, and he may indeed have played a significant role in the Red move. But this country will not forget the long-range negotiations of Hammarskjold. In all fairness we must credit him, as the fliers themselves do, with laying the real foundation for this heartening event.

Federal Aid for School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following debate on the question of Federal aid for school construction, the affirmative side taken by Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, and the negative by Dr. Burges Johnson, teacher and author.

The articles follow:

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION?—YES. NATIONAL GOVERNMENT MUST SHARE—SAYS EDGAR FULLER

(The executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, Dr. Fuller is the former commissioner of education for State of New Hampshire.)

Since President Eisenhower's state of the Union message for 1955, the policy of both major political parties has been that the Federal Government should assist in paying for new public elementary and secondary schools. This national policy recognizes that preservation and improvement of our system of society makes it necessary to utilize all our human resources, and that education has a great role in preparing the people of the United States of America to solve the complex problems of our time.

We shall deal briefly with four aspects of the problem: (1) the need for school construction; (2) how this need can be met under modern conditions of public finance in local, State, and Federal Governments; (3) how proposed legislation preserves State and local control of education; (4) types of legislation now before Congress.

1. Need: The United States birthrate now exceeds 4 million a year. Cumulative annual increases in school enrollment are now approaching 1½ million. The public elementary and secondary schools enrolled 25,111,427 in the school year 1949–50; 29,133,000 in 1953–54; this year the United States Office of Education estimates 30,663,000. The increase each year of children already born will bring the total to an estimated 37,363,000 by 1959–60. This astounding change can be related to the content of this article by realizing that there was an actual decline of public-school pupils from 25,976,728 in 1930–31 to 25,111,427 in 1949–50. Now there will be an accelerating increase of 49 percent from 1949 to 1959.

For the foreseeable future, increases in enrollment will require 50,000 new instructional rooms each year. Then add the accumulated deficit of 312,000 classrooms reported by the National Survey of School Facilities as of September 1952, a deficit due to economic depressions and wars reaching back to 1930. Add another conservative estimate of 10,000 schoolrooms annually made necessary by shifting of population, by consolidation of attendance units and school districts, and by extension of educational programs to meet the current needs. The conclusion is inescapable that, if we of the United States intend to provide suitable school facilities for the children already born, we must increase the present record-breaking building rate of 60,000 instructional rooms to at least 100,000 each year.

The National Survey has recently reported the second phase of school-plant studies made by the departments of education of 34 States and 3 Territories. This phase of the survey forecasts what the department of education in these States and Territories regard as the need for school construction up to September 1959. Extending these estimates to all States, the requirement for the 1954–59 period is 476,000 instructional rooms.

About 60,000 of these rooms were constructed during the past year, leaving 416,000 for the remaining 4 years prior to September 1959. This indicates needed construction at the rate of 104,000 rooms a year to catch up with the need by 1959. Assuming continuance of the present peak construction rate, there will be a remaining deficit of 176,000 classrooms in September 1959. We need about $6 billion to supplement the anticipated $8 billion State and local construction program during the next 4 years. I believe that $3 billion of Federal funds would attract on a matching basis an additional $3 billion of State and local funds that would not otherwise be available for school construction.

2. Local-State-Federal sharing of costs: It is safe to assume that the American people do not desire to deny a defensible minimum education to millions of children. Neither do they want to starve thousands of units of their great system of public education into mediocrity. The local-State-Federal sharing of costs necessary to prevent such neglect of the national welfare and security must be achieved.

The Federal Government must join the State-local team for obvious reasons. A few years ago the States and localities collected 75 percent of all taxes; now the Federal Government has reduced the State-local share below 25 percent. As the national income has increased 300 percent since 1939, local property taxes have increased comparatively little. The local property tax is inadequate for raising the funds necessary for the schools because it no longer closely reflects the national income.

During the 1930–50 period, the dilemma of public-school support was met by increasing the States' share approximately 1 percent each year; now the averages for the country are about 55 percent local, 42 percent State, and 3 percent Federal. The increases in State aid during the 1930–50 period supplemented local property taxes enough to keep schools running only because the number of pupils decreased during those years. Now State aid is more difficult to get, and property taxes cannot educate 49 percent more children in a decade, not to mention the huge capital expenses necessary to build the required new schools.

One little understood aspect of the current situation is the way even those State and local funds which the schools might otherwise have are skimmed off by matching funds offered in huge amounts by the Federal Government for public assistance, health, and rehabilitation services, hospital and highway construction, and other services. These Federal matching funds tap the national income through the Federal in-

come tax and drain off State and local funds to match them. The schools lose both ways—first, because they receive no Federal funds; secondly, because State and local funds the schools would otherwise receive must be used to match Federal funds for other services.

Let us illustrate how this Federal discrimination against education works. Let us think of a local government unit of low economic capacity in which public services of all kinds are needed. Suppose this governmental unit were able to float $500,000 worth of bonds for capital improvements of one kind or another and that hospitals, roads, and schools are competing for the funds. Under the present Federal laws, the choices are a 1½-million-dollar hospital, 1 million dollars' worth of roads, or a $500,000 school. This is because the Federal Government will match the hospital funds 2 to 1, the highway funds on a 50–50 basis, and the school funds not at all. Needing all these facilities, the Federal incentives against the use of limited State or local funds for construction of schools are strong indeed.

But even this is not the worst feature of the Federal discrimination against education in favor of highways and other services. In case of economic depression, Federal funds would preserve matched funds and the schools would be the first to be cut. They must be placed in a position of equality with other public services so that they can compete equally for State and local funds without both direct and indirect discrimination against them by Federal matching funds favoring their competitors.

3. Federal control of education: Along with the issue of public funds for private schools, the fear of Federal control of education has accounted for the defeat of so-called "Federal aid" for many years. These objections to the Federal-aid bills were widely regarded as plausible because the proposed Federal funds would be available for current and recurring expenses of education, such as teacher salaries, school supplies, and pupil transportation. School-construction bills now before the Congress would not suffer these handicaps; the Federal funds would necessarily be for public schools only, and no Federal influence could touch the educational programs later to be conducted in the school plants constructed.

Let us be doubly certain on the Federal-control issue. Under the current proposals, Federal school-construction funds would go to the States for administration by the States. Standards and procedures for construction would be as at present in State and local hands. Local communities in the States would cooperate with the States on school construction as they do now, the change being merely that Federal funds would supplement State and local funds to make more school construction possible. No Federal official would go below the State level under the legislation favored by the leading educators, educational associations, and citizens' organizations. All fiscal reporting to the Federal Government would be done by the States.

Once a building were completed, the local district would be free to conduct its educational program under exactly the same conditions as at present. Whatever may have been believed about proposals of the past for general Federal aid, there is no possibility of Federal controls over the local programs of instruction under the widely supported construction-aid bills now before the Congress.

4. Concrete proposals. There are two basic types of Federal school-construction legislation pending in Congress. The type approved by experts in educational finance, education associations, and most citizens' groups is represented by the bipartisan Kearns-Bailey-Humphrey-Ives proposal. These and similar bills would authorize Federal funds for the States according to the number of children 5 to 17 years of age. The State educational agencies would allocate the funds to local school districts according to their relative needs, fiscal abilities, and past and present efforts to construct schools for themselves. The priorities among school districts defined by each State would make certain that the Federal funds are allocated for school construction that would not otherwise occur. School districts fully competent to construct their own schools would not be eligible for Federal funds.

Under this type of legislation the States would account to the Federal Government for the Federal funds. School-building standards would be left to the States and localities. There could be no Federal control over the buildings, much less any Federal control of educational programs conducted in the buildings after they have been completed. This bipartisan legislation has been considered repeatedly in congressional hearings for 4 or 5 years. The bill sponsored by Senator LISTER HILL and several other Sentors differs only in minor details.

The second type of proposal was introduced by Senator SMITH and Representative FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey, purportedly to implement the President's special message on education. It was hastily contrived and introduced substantially without consultation with educators knowledgeable in Federal-State administration of educational finance. Most informed educators and citizens are of the opinion that these bills would not achieve the plain intention of the President's message to Congress on February 8, 1955.

Educators are bipartisan in their political viewpoints. They believe that the bipartisan Kearns-Bailey-Humphrey-Ives bill is best. At the same time, however, they sincerely wish to extend their bipartisanship in reference to the supporters of the administration's bill. It may be possible for the Congress to salvage something from 2 of the bill's 4 sections. Its major provisions, however, have gained almost no educational support at all. It is believed that they would impose or lead to higher financing costs, excessive Federal and State red tape, delays caused by necessary special sessions of State legislatures in all States and court tests on constitutionality, almost no Federal financial aid, and too much Federal discretion reaching down to the local school district.

There is also a general feeling that the administration is not on solid moral ground in requiring the States to enact special laws which are obviously devices to evade State constitutional and legal debt limits. No chief State school officer or experienced administrator in educational finance has been found who is willing to support those features of the administration's bill which would prescribe, as a condition for participation in the Federal program, a special State agency in every State of a type that can be defended for a few States as emergency measures, but which would be objectionable in a majority of the States.

The administration's proposal fundamentally agrees with the adamant opponents of Federal funds for school construction in their desire to keep educational costs fixed on local real estate, with some aid from the States. Federal funds provided would be picayune and the increased financial burdens of education in the next decade would be placed where they cannot be borne. The schools do not need such devious and questionable credit devices. They need funds from the same tax sources that supply billions each year to construct highways and hospitals and to pay for social security and public assistance. We need to recognize what Walter Lippmann has pointed out—that the Nation is spending only one-third as much now for education in comparison with other public services as it did in 1900.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION?—NO; SCHOOLS ARE LOCAL BUSINESS—SAYS BURGESS JOHNSON

(Long a respected teacher on university and college faculties, Dr. Johnson is also famed as an author and one-time editor of Judge. He lives in Vermont.)

There is a way of presenting this public-school problem in the simples terms. When our first colonist ancestors were building their homes in a wilderness and dragging stumps out of the ground to make space for corn and beans, schools were almost their first community concern. Believe it or not, schools in many settlements ranked ahead of churches in the hearts and hopes of the people. In early Vermont, for instance, the settlers built schools instead of churches until some godly citizens in Connecticut were disturbed and sent missionaries up there to save the Vermonters from perdition.

All communities built their own schools and hired their own teachers for their own children. They knew locally just what they wanted and they would not have allowed their colonial governments to interfere in such intimate business. Such action would be flaunting democracy.

That attitude has persisted for 300 years. All across the United States the local school district has exercised an authority as great as that of the town in which it lies. Its boundaries do not necessarily coincide with those of the township, but may include parts of adjacent towns. In the past few years a sensible idea has spread widely to combine several adjacent school districts in order to get rid of lonely one-room schoolhouses and build larger central schools, with buses to carry children to and from distant points. By such means citizens are getting more successfully the sort of schools they want for their own children and retaining control over them and finding tax money to pay for them.

What they have conceded to their several State governments is the task of preparing an available supply of well-trained teachers, and the setting up of minimum standards not only for teachers but for school buildings, and in some States the selection or suggesting of textbooks. Often these suggestions of higher authority are enforced only by a sort of bribery: districts which live up to them may be entitled to a share in funds allotted by the State for public education. With or without such State aid, in communities all over the United States, education has been the largest item in the town budget, and citizens have paid it cheerfully.

All that is an outline of conditions in simpler, happier days gone by. Nowadays what do we find? Everywhere taxes have increased far beyond the most extravagant expectations. Town streets must be lighted by electricity; town water must be kept pure, and waste and sewage disposed of; town roads must be constantly repaired or rebuilt to withstand the weight of tractors and trucks and a steady stream of motorcars coming from anywhere, and driving through to somewhere else. Winter snows must be removed and there must be some policing.

All individual citizens must have their own motorcars, their furnaces, electric refrigerators, washing machines, telephone service, radios and television sets, and attend occasional lectures, concerts, and movie theaters. Taxes plus all these private expenses have leaped so high that citizens cannot afford to pay their teachers a decent wage, or pay the interest on bonds for new school construction, though they are producing more and more children and keeping them alive.

So now a cry arises from every corner of the land, "Let Uncle Sam do it." Forget 3 centuries of insistence that schools should be the business of the communities which built them and which chose their teachers

and bred their pupils; and instead put all public schooling under the direction of Washington, D. C. What if our National Government does go just so much further into the red? We citizens would not feel individually the weight of a bigger national debt, as much as we would feel a bigger local school tax.

But there is no sense in denying that Government subsidizing of our public schools would mean eventual Government control over them. Government cannot pay for our schools without classifying them and standardizing them and then requiring them to stay within their classifications. The men and women higher-ups who would direct all this must be politically appointed. Congressional committees must inquire whether school superintendents should be permitted to express private opinions and why Boston schools got more Government money per pupil last year than the Tallahassee schools. If the answer is that Boston needed more per pupil because of a lower average I. Q. which had to be corrected, think of the havoc that would raise.

There are, of course, a variety of Federal-aid proposals now under study. Two of these plans provide that Federal funds should be used only for the building of more schoolrooms. Some educators want this money given to State governments whether the State needs such additional funds or not. It would be apportioned according to the number of school children, so much a head. The State would then hand out the cash only to the needy communities within its borders. And what is a "needy" community? The moment the Federal Government officially definies the term, controls have started. Has it been a spendthrift district, or has it suffered from "acts of God"? Has it public funds to spare? Can you imagine any town admitting that fact?

Even if the Federal Government should lend funds directly to the States, letting the States administer them without any national control, we would still have bought a peck of trouble. Then local educators, looking around their crowded classrooms, would not ask themselves, "How much do we really need?" Instead, they would wonder, "How much can we hope to get?" The questions are as different as independence and dependence.

Of course, we have a precedent. In 1862 President Lincoln signed the Morrill act; each State received a large sum of money acquired by the sale of public lands, to be used for education—higher education. The history of our resulting land-grant colleges gives some idea of how quickly politics can be mixed with education. College presidencies became political plums, and there is at least one instance of the removal of an entire Republican faculty to be replaced by a Democratic one, or vice versa.

Undeniably the land-grant colleges have distinguished themselves in many ways, but no research has ever determined the reverse of that picture. Political pressure went into action as soon as the first one was founded, to determine where they should be located. Too many were planted not where the need for a new college was greatest, but where political pull was strongest, many of them within a few miles of some worthy but struggling small college which was at once blighted by Government-supported competition. Centralized authority over public schools at the State level has revealed many weaknesses; at the national level it would be worse. When politics is introduced into the management of education at any level, we have at once a rot spot in a sound apple.

I have mentioned the fact that one of the powers now granted to the State by local school boards is the choosing of textbooks for use in all the State's public schools. Any benefit to village schools resulting from this has been counterbalanced by automatic instruction by teachers who have lost the tools of their own choice, and even by bribery and corruption in State "adoptions."

I recall a conversation with the distinguished woman superintendent of schools in a large Western United States city. "Soon after I accepted this position," she said, "I realized that I must either yield to many political pressures or resign. After a good deal of battling with my conscience I decided to compromise. I found that the political higher-ups were greatly interested in adult education. It appealed to voters and it called for large appropriations. But from what I had seen, it didn't amount to much. So I managed to make it clear that I would throw adult education to the wolves if I could have undisputed authority over the schooling of the city's children. I must admit they have played fair with me: not even any pressure to appoint some teacher. I think our schools here are as good as any in the land; but as for our adult education, it's a racket." Politics watches for a chance to creep in at any level; but the higher the level, the greater are its rewards.

President Eisenhower is eager to have the Government do something at once for public education; and everyone who recognizes his warmheartedness and his eagerness to bring about social betterment is not at all surprised. This is closely akin to his other appeal that the voting age should be lowered to 18. His affection and admiration for the millions of boys in his armies convinced him that since they were ready to give their lives for their country, they are therefore fitted to share in making the Nation's greatest decisions. But there are at least as strong arguments in favor of setting the age at 24, and requiring an intelligence test for all voters of any age.

Advocates of Government subsidy point out that school problems are no longer local but national. Metropolitan schools are being overcrowded by migrant children from rural poverty-stricken areas. They bid us remember that of all the children in their teens living on farms in 1920, 40 percent had moved to cities within 10 years. But if our large cities are not eager to grow still larger, then let them say so; instead they are inclined to vie with one another as to size, and brag about their astonishing growth in the past few decades. If, as seems to be the case, they are gainers financially by reason of increased population, let them pay for that gain by building adequate schools. The problem continues to be a local one.

A basic question is whether States and even local districts have exhausted all opportunities to raise sufficient money to educate their own children. The reliable New York Times on February 25, 1955, published an interesting commentary on this point. According to the Times, a commission including such highly regarded educators as Dr. Adam S. Bennion, of Salt Lake City, and the Federal Commissioner of Education, Samuel H. Brownell, had made a confidential study of the problem. They were unable to find a State which cannot afford to make more money available for schools.

Neglected and badly administered schools aren't necessarily the best ones to reward with cash. Neither are the school systems with bad credit. One of the current aid proposals would have the Federal Government buy the bonds of local school authorities—or at least those bonds that would be hard to sell in the regular bond market. No one can tell how that program would work in practice. But is it sensible to make easy loans to any organization with a doubtful credit rating? Aren't we tempting people to borrow more than they can repay? If they default, aren't we inviting a Federal receivership—with all the controls all receivers must impose?

The farther away we get from the sound of the school bell, and the individual family checkbook, the less personal our education system will become. And education is an individual and highly personal experience. It is a child and a teacher, and a wisely supervised school playground. Fundamentally it is nothing more than that.

One answer to all this argument sounds fantastic, but it is at least sound in theory. If schools all over the country are too few and too badly equipped because their districts cannot afford to put any more money into the education of the children within their boundaries, then by all means let Uncle Sam come to their aid—but not by purchasing any right to school supervision or control. Let him instead assume the cost of other town utilities which are less personal and more nearly his business, such as roads and town lighting and town policing. All roads and lights and police are of benefit to thousands of citizens of other communities who drive through the district. But note this limitation: All such Federal or State aid for roads and lights and highway policing would be withheld from any community of whatever size which did not immediately add an equal amount to its school budget, to raise teaching salaries or improve classrooms, or both.

The law would define the school budget as the average annual amount spent by each district during the past 5 years, including repairs.

By such a roundabout device our towns would be assured of decent roads, adequate lighting and policing, and an increased expenditure for their schools, without any surrender of local authority over the children's schooling. Uncle Sam, on the other hand, would find himself facing less trouble and expense than if he undertook responsibility for the Nation's schools, as would surely happen if he subsidized them. He would benefit by improved commercial traffic over rural roads, by reduction in highway accidents, and by keeping several hundred thousand schoolteachers out of his hair.

There is of course another sane alternative. Extend the practice of centralized schools wherever some district is seriously below par, as widely as possible by lending these enlarged school districts money at the lowest possible rates. At the same time empower such enlarged school districts to seize, impound, and offer at public sale any television set or any motorcar not essential for the transaction of business, or any other nonessential luxury from any citizen delinquent in the payment of his school tax.

Dirty Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the passage today of H. R. 3333 should be an important step forward in the continuing war against the dirty business of selling obscene books and literature. There has been a serious loophole in the law which has permitted this filth to be distributed by private automobiles and by trucks. That could no longer be done under this legislation. It is my hope that this bill will promptly become law.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Lockport (N. Y.) Union Sun and Journal:

DIRTY BUSINESS

The Post Office Department reports more cases charging obscene mailings, which may be a sign of good enforcement but also shows how this dirty business of selling pornography continues.

Representative KEATING, Republican, New York, told a House Judiciary Subcommittee that even though the United States Criminal Code bars this disgusting material from the mails and railroads and common carriers, it evades the law. The business is so big it uses motorcars, planes, and helicopters, KEATING asserted.

The Rochester Congressman wants a national law to say any person possessing two or more copies of obscene or crime-inciting matter should be "presumed" to have them for sale, and hence be open to prosecution.

Censorship is not a remedy. There is law now against these objectionable pictures, movies, records, and "comics." Present State and Federal laws may be strengthened; the Keating proposal looks good. But to stop the growing problem of commercial exploitation of obscenity there must be general public insistence upon prosecutions.

People must realize, as the Congressman pointed out, that this stuff is "linked with such related problems as juvenile delinquency, the rise in the crime rate, teen-age discontent and rebellion and even certain trends in the field of mental illness." The dirty business must be stopped.

The Foreign-Aid Program—1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a very timely editorial, appearing in the June 7, 1955 issue of the Wall Street Journal, containing very pertinent comments upon the Hoover Commission recommendations relative to pending legislation for our continuing foreign-aid program. The article follows:

BY NO OTHER MEANS

The Hoover Commission has added up the dimes and the dollars that went into foreign aid in the past 10 years and finds the total to be in the neighborhood of $50 billion.

The Commission found also that $360 million a year can be saved by a reorganization of the foreign-aid programs. It took some time and much trouble for the Commission to dig out all the facts about spending overseas; the task force that worked on the problem learned that 34 different Government agencies were in the business of handing out money to foreign countries.

That much of this aid has been wasted and much of it has been unnecessary is not a startling discovery; what is startling is the enormity of the waste and the agility of the spenders to find unique projects. One example the Commission mentioned was aid to the Netherlands for "social psychology and human relations practice." Not food nor clothing, nor dollars to repair the dikes, but money to study behaviorism.

The Hoover Commission doesn't believe that all foreign aid should be ended forthwith; but it does believe that it should be expended with the primary purpose of strengthening the security of the United States. It is a fair question to ask whether this purpose is pursued in the granting of point 4 aid to 55 countries and overseas territories.

Is aid to that many nations really necessary to the security of the United States? Of course not; for if our security is dependent upon that many countries we have no security at all. And if it were not so serious a matter it might be amusing to have some of the aid experts name off these 55 countries without reference to their geographies.

Elimination of duplicate staffs and services and the granting of aid only where it is actually a need or obviously in the interests of the United States would save large sums of money annually even if foreign grants are continued, the Commission finds.

The task force also found that there will be an unexpended balance of almost $8 billion in foreign aid appropriations left in the spending till when the Foreign Operations Administration goes out of business on June 30. The budget for fiscal 1956 includes an additional $3.4 billion. The Commission suggested that Congress—before it passes the foreign aid bill now before it—should see how much of the unexpended funds are not yet committed by contract and reduce the requested appropriation by that much.

It need hardly be necessary to say that of course that should be done; but the Congress ought to go much further than just to try to recapture for the Treasury and the taxpayers the uncommitted balance. The Congress should look to an end to foreign economic aid altogether.

Eight of the twelve members of the Hoover Commision said as much in a statement that accompanied the report on foreign aid. "Surely, after 10 years, the time has come to apply some brakes to this overseas spending program. We believe the Commission should recommend substantial reductions for this purpose. By no other means will the growing trend toward permanent foreign spending be halted."

The full Hoover Commission shows how millions can be saved by proper reorganization of all the aid programs. But that will not halt the philosophy that funnels taxpayers' money overseas. A majority of the Commission shows how billions can be saved. And they show also the only way the philosophy can be halted. Indeed, it cannot be stopped by other means than stopping it.

Under Treaty Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Idaho Daily Statesman at Boise, Idaho, June 1, 1955:

UNDER TREATY LAW

Debate on the still pending bill to strengthen the Nation's military Reserve forces brought to the attention of Congress for a moment a provision of treaty law under which American citizens in service overseas are deprived of their constitutional rights.

Congressman FRANK T. BOW, Republican, of Ohio, cited instances of this operation of treaty law. He referred to the case of Private Keefe, who was sentenced to 5 years of solitary confinement by a French court for joyriding, and of another young American soldier who commandeered a taxicab in a Japanese town one night and was sentenced by a Japanese judge to 3 years at hard labor although he had paid the cab driver 1,400 yen which the oriental jehu claimed had been stolen from him.

Under terms of this treaty law, the Congressman said, 40 foreign countries have gained the power of life and death over tens of thousands of American men and boys. He was informed, he said, by the Defense Department, that as of last February 10, there were 58 Americans serving sentences ranging up to 15 years for various alleged infractions of the laws of the nations in which they were stationed.

This state of affairs has come about, he said, as a result of United States departure from established precedent when it entered into the status of forces agreement with the NATO nations, in amendments to the Japanese security treaty and in other treaties and executive agreements entered into since World War II.

Under these agreements, members of American Armed Forces charged with violation of the law of the country in which they are stationed are turned over to the police authorities and the courts of that country for trial. They are not guaranteed the right to have a public trial. There is no guaranty against cruel or unusual punishment before or after trial. There is no prohibition against demand for excessive bail. In many countries there is no presumption of innocence. There is no guaranty of right to trial by jury and of course no possibility of trial by a jury of one's fellow citizens. The President of the United States cannot exercise his right to pardon.

The Ohio Congressman urged his amendment to prohibit the assignment of drafted men to duty "at any installation located in a foreign country with which (at such time) the United States has in effect a treaty or international agreement containing provisions permitting such country to exercise in any way jurisdiction over American personnel stationed within its boundaries." It would restrict the assignment of American draftees to one country—Spain.

The House approved the amendment by recorded vote of 174 to 56, although Congressman OVERTON BROOKS, Democrat of Louisiana, committee chairman, who spoke in its favor, commented that "it would be an idle gesture on our part to adopt the amendment" because "the House of Representatives does not have control of the treaty-making power."

The House vote nevertheless has served impressive notice that it is not in favor of treaties of this kind.

Pilot Is Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a well-deserved editorial which appeared in the Revere Journal, Revere, Mass., under date of June 2, 1955:

PILOT IS HONORED

Top press honors for the Pilot, official organ of the Boston archdiocese, and the oldest Catholic publication in the United States, were won last week at the annual convention of the Catholic Press Association. As a result, the Pilot now shares the title of "Catholic Newspaper of Distinction" for 1954 with publications in California and Ohio.

Winning a sheaf of new honors by the Pilot is of interest to all Catholics in the archdiocese and is of special interest in Revere because Msgr. Francis J. Lally, editor

of the publication, resides at the Immaculate Conception parish rectory in this city and is well known to parishioners and residents outside the parish.

The Pilot was also cited in all other award divisions judged at the 45th annual convention, held at Buffalo, N. Y. Joseph A. Ryan of Brookline, former member of the staff, was awarded top honors for a feature story on the Boston eye bank.

The newspaper was cited for the "Best Example of Teaching Doctrine," for its weekly feature, "Theology for Everyman," and for its editorial entitled, "Is Wiretapping Morally Sound?"

Philip Stack, photographer of the Pilot, won a prize for his picture showing Archbishop Cushing distributing communion to his favorite youngsters—the exceptional children at St. Colletta's School in Hanover.

Newspapers and individuals were chosen for awards from among 98 newspapers. Competing with the best in the Catholic association, the Pilot again demonstrated its excellence. Congratulations to Monsignor Lally, whose editorial leadership has again brought the highest honors to the Pilot. His success is well deserved.

Labor and Management Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation was cheered this week by a display of management and labor statesmanship at its best—well described by the dean of American labor reporters, Abe Raskin, writing in the June 7 issue of the New York Times:

THE FORD SETTLEMENT: AN ANALYSIS OF THE FACTORS INVOLVED AND PROBABLE EFFECTS ON INDUSTRY

(By A. H. Raskin)

European unionists, reared in the Socialist tradition, always wonder why United States labor is so enthusiastic about a competitive economic system. Yesterday's settlement at Ford should help supply the answer.

The principal factor in Ford's decision to grant supplementary unemployment benefits without a strike or Government intervention was its desire to stay out in front of Chevrolet in the race for mastery of the low-price automobile field.

In the first quarter of this year, license registrations were filed on 332,401 Ford sales, just 593 above the Chevrolet total. If the car market were sluggish or if the United Automobile Workers, CIO, had threatened a simultaneous walkout at General Motors, Ford would have found it easy to withstand the union's pressure. But the thought of being shut while General Motors was producing was more than Ford could take, and the union won.

SOME PROBLEMS EMERGE

Its victory established a pattern that is likely to spread through most of the Nation's mass-production industries as rapidly as present contracts expire.

It is probable that some form of wage guaranty will become general this year in the major automobile and electrical companies. By the end of next year steel, rubber, aircraft, aluminum, farm equipment, and other basic industries should be in line.

With victory, however, go some problems. Minor companies in many industries may find it difficult to stay solvent if they are obliged to yield all the benefits the auto workers won from Ford. American Motors and Packard-Studebaker, battling to hold 5 percent of the market, are in this class. Even without the added payroll costs, American Motors is laying of 3,400 Nash and Hudson workers as part of a "downward adjustment in production."

But the necessity for tempering his demands in some areas does not detract from the personal triumph scored by Walter P. Reuther in establishing the principle that employers have an obligation to provide protection for jobless workers beyond the limits of State unemployment insurance systems.

Four months ago Mr. Reuther voluntarily agreed to relinquish first place in a combined labor movement to George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor. Many observers felt that the tireless redhead would go into eclipse with the passing of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Now Mr. Reuther has blazed a challenging new trail for all labor. The introduction of the guaranteed-wage principle rounds out the structure of industry-financed social security that began with pensions and welfare programs.

It is a substantial contribution toward removal of the financial uncertainty that has always oppressed hourly rated workers. It puts them closer to the assured-income status of whitecollar employees and other salaried workers.

In achieving this goal, Mr. Reuther avoided the slogans of class warfare that were so much a part of the union's formative two decades ago. He did his negotiating at the bargaining table, not at press conferences or mass rallies.

NO WORDS TO SWALLOW

The company was equally careful not to maneuver itself into "do-or-die" positions from which it could not extricate itself with honor.

While the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce were denouncing the guaranteed wage as the death knell of free enterprise, Ford and General Motors kept silent on the subject. When it came time to settle, Ford had no incautious words to swallow.

The performance on both sides was a heartening exhibition of industrial maturity. It promised to add 3 years of labor-management peace to the half decade of harmony established in the auto industry by the 1950 agreement between the Reuther union and General Motors.

The turbulence that expressed itself in the early sitdown strikes and in hundreds of "quickie" shutdowns has yielded to a more cooperative relationship based on mutual respect.

The auto manufacturers are aware that the union can get a solid response whenever it feels the need to show its muscle. The union knows that the major producers will shut their plants rather than surrender the basic rights of management to run the business efficiently.

That kind of bilateral respect is the foundation for industrial stability. This year it was helped by a recognition that the Government intended to keep its hands off, whether or not a strike ensued.

In 1946 John L. Lewis won a pension and welfare fund for coal miners only after the Government had seized the mines. The contract was signed by the Secretary of the Interior, J. A. Krug, over the violent objections of the coal operators.

In 1949 a Presidential factfinding panel wrote the opinion that paved the way for employer-paid pensions in the automobile and steel industries. And, even with that backing, the steelworkers had to strike for a month before the companies caved in.

No such pressure was exerted on either side in the guaranteed annual wage talks. The union and the company knew that the issue would have to be decided through collective bargaining or a strike. Collective bargaining won.

The Electronics of the Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, the House has appropriated $80,500,000 for the United States Information Agency which, in my opinion, is a very worthy expenditure when one considers the complexities of our international problems.

I want to call your attention to an organization known as Moral Rearmament which is presently not costing the taxpayers of this country any appropriation as such and yet is doing a fine job throughout many places in Europe where they have presented their shows and also in the continental United States.

An ideological task force of Moral Rearament of 163 people from 26 countries will fly on June 9 to Japan to be welcomed by the Prime Minister Ichiro Hatoyama, at the beginning of a 3-month tour of the capitals of Asia and the Near East. Invitations have also come from President Abdel Nasser of Egypt, President Ramon Magsaysay of the Philippines, the Shah and Foreign Minister of Iran and Foreign Minister of Iraq, Prime Minister Sir John Kotelawala of Ceylon, as well as Prime Minister Yui and Foreign Minister Yeh of Nationalist China.

The leaders of this force will include such statesmen as Dr. Theodor Oberlaender, Minister of Refugees in the Federal German Cabinet and personal representative of Chancellor Adenauer; John McGovern, British Labor Member of Parliament for 26 years; Dr. Oskar Leimgruber, Chancellor of the Swiss Federation from 1943 to 1951; Ole Bjord Kraft, former Danish Foreign Minister and Chairman of NATO in 1952 and 1953; Diomede Catroux, former Minister of Air for France; Fausto Pecorari, Vice President of the Constituent Assembly of Italy; B. C. Okwu, Nigerian Member of Parliament; The Tolon Na, Member of Parliament, Chairman of the Northern Territories Council comprising 1,500,000 Moslems of the Gold Coast; Chester Carter, Canadian Member of Parliament; Mahmoud Masmoudi, Minister of State for Tunisia; Claudius Petit, former Minister of Reconstruction in six French French cabinets; and Dr. Fadhil Jamali, former Prime Minister of Iraq, now heading the Iraq delegation to the United Nations, and a recent delegate to Bandung; and James Haworth, member of the national executive of the British Labor Party. The daughter and son-in-law of the Prime Minister of Japan, Mr. and Mrs. Junichi Furusawa, are traveling with the task force.

On the eve of their departure, this distinguished group will visit Washing-

ton for 2 days. On June 7 and 8 there will be presented at the National Theater the new musical drama The Vanishing Island which will spearpoint the advance of this task force on the world tour. Hailed by the leading theatrical and musical people of Hollywood, many of whom helped to produce it, as: "an unforgettable show" and as the "solution to our burning problems," it is a tried and tempered weapon in the war of ideas. I would like to call the attention of the Members of the Congress to the full page announcements of these performances which have appeared in recent editions of the Washington Post, the Washington Star, the News, and the Afro-American, which I include herewith:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 4, 1955]

On the eve of a world mission, Moral Rearmament presents the Washington premiere of the new musical The Vanishing Island, by Peter Howard and Cecil Broadhurst; music by George Fraser and Dr. Will Reed.

"The Vanishing Island is a wonderful and original play. The idea, the music and lyrics will be a revelation to every person, capturing the hearts of man and nation" (Lauritz Melchior).

"An unforgettable show * * * truly a miracle. * * * Here is something a man can understand and live. The music is terrific." (Ole Olsen, of Olsen and Johnson.)

"Deeply moved by a brilliant performance. I heartily subscribe to every word that came over the footlights." Jesse Lasky, pioneer Hollywood producer.)

"These people on the stage are living the spirit of St. Francis. That is what America needs today." (Joseph Scott, Los Angeles attorney and prominent Catholic layman.)

Hollywood has given of its genius to help stage and produce this new musical for the ideological age.

Lewis Allen, Hollywood director, supervised the staging.

Herbert Weiskopf, director of opera, Los Angeles Conservatory of Music, trained the chorus.

Thomas Peluso, a former musical director of NBC supervised the orchestration of the music and conducted the world premiere performances.

Nico Charisse, noted Hollywood choreographer; created the choreography.

George Gibson, head of scenic department of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, planned the stage effects.

The cast includes: Ivan Menzies and Elsie Griffin, well-known singing stars of the D'Olyly Carte Gilbert & Sullivan Opera; Megan Foster, British soprano; Jane Wax, Hollywood radio singer; Leland Holland, the singing lead of Jothan Valley which played on Broadway and throughout Europe and Asia; Reginald Owen, of London, Broadway, and Hollywood, who has taken leading roles in more than 150 films.

Tuesday, June 7 and Wednesday, June 8, 8:30 p. m., the National Theatre.

"I saw the international task force under the leadership of Dr. Frank Buchman in operation. What I saw there was the proved effectiveness of an ideological initiative that can answer the dilemma between armed conflict and a default to communism, and develop the ideological strategy to unite the West and change the Communists. It is possible that the work of MRA and those that help it may permit us all within the span of our lifetime to live in peace." (Representative HARRY SHEPPARD, Democrat, of California, speaking in the House of Representatives, May 1955.)

"The Vanishing Island is not only delightful and captivating. It is, in the language of Hollywod where I come from, stupendous and colossal." (Representative E. W. HESTAND, Republican, of California, speaking May 30, at the World Assembly for Moral Re-Armament, Machinac Island, Mich.)

ASIAN MISSION

At the invitation of State and Government leaders, The Vanishing Island will go from Washington to Tokyo and then to 12 nations of Asia and the Middle East. Statesmen from Asia, Africa, and Europe will fly with the cast of the play as part of an internatonal force of 163 from 20 nations.

Prime Minister Ichiro Hatoyama of Japan, welcoming this mission, wrote to Dr. Frank Buchman, initiator of Moral Rearmament: "A supreme effort is called for at this time to create better understanding on a world scale. A way must be paved to enable all to live peacefully together, where common moral laws are accepted by peoples, leaders and nations. This is the only guarantee against the destructive forces science has developed. I extend my earnest desire for the continued success of Moral Re-Armament."

Last December at the World Assembly for Moral Rearmament at the Shoreham Hotel I had the privilege of meeting Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, the founder of Moral Rearmament. Since that time I have had the opportunity to observe the functions of MRA. I believe that the existence of this force at this time is a miracle of history and that their work truly represents the pinnacle of human achievement—bringing peoples and nations together. On Dr. Buchman's 77th birthday, June 4, he made an address entitled "The Electronics of the Spirit" wherein he said:

Statesmanship without the electronics of the spirit, without guidance, and without change is like flying an aircraft in stormy weather over uncharted territory without choosing to use radio, maps, or compass. It is both unnecessary and criminal. It is recklessly selfish. It leads inevitably to disaster.

With the electronics of the spirit renaissance becomes inevitable—and it can happen fast. The electronics of the spirit holds the answer to the second half of the 20th century.

It is an answer that works.

At this point I include his address:

THE ELECTRONICS OF THE SPIRIT

I found something new in Los Angeles.

I found it at a dinner.

And I found it in a man. His name is Lee de Forrest. He is a pioneer of the new science of electronics, which is leading us into an age beyond the atom age. He says the time will soon come when the world will work a 4-day week and a 6-hour day.

My old friend Thomas Edison came to mind as I listened to this pioneer. Edison gave the world illumination, electric light. I saw it happen. It opened up something new for the whole world. Mrs. Edison, also, flew out with me to California to fulfill her conviction when she said, "Moral rearmament, like my husband's light, must go into every home."

Now electronics is a new science. Spirit has been known for a long time. It's an old science. But linked with electronics, it hitches the world to a new dimension of life and thought. Millions can speedily, automatically yield to this new practice, the electronics of the spirit.

We can scarcely grasp what the electronics of the spirit means. We just faintly glimpse it. Think of the veritable instantaneous reaction whereby a thought can travel across America in less than one-fiftieth of a second. And now, with electronics, in a flash you not only hear the voice but the time you speak is registered and you get the bill at the end of the month, all without any human aid. No words of mine can explain it.

Then take the electronics of the spirit. It works with an Infinite Mind. It circles the globe instantly. It taps resources hitherto unexplored and forces hitherto unknown. Take the whole question of guidance—God's mind and my mind. The thought that slips in any time, day or night, can be the thought of the Author of mind. We are dealing here with facts that no one can measure.

A thought comes—maybe just an arresting tick. One responds to it. And millions can be the richer if it is effectively carried out. It may apply to someone who crosses our path—some friend, perhaps, who may be the link which can reach Cabinets, which can prevent nations from taking the wrong turning.

It was the results of the electronics of the spirit to which Congressman HARRY SHEPPARD, dean of the California delegation to the United States Congress, referred when he said a few weeks ago, "What MRA is doing is the pinnacle of human achievement—bringing people together."

Take Nigeria, a nation of 33 million people, pivotal for the whole of Africa. A full-page article in the Colonial Review of the London Times describes how Dr. Azikiwe, Prime Minister of the eastern region, met Moral Rearmament in 1949 and decided to apply it to Nigeria.

The Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition, who had fought a long libel suit against each other, came together on the opening night of an MRA play in Nigeria. The theater was crowded. Hundreds had to stand. Dozens more peered in through the windows and listened outside.

The leader of the opposition came to the play four times. During the presentation of the budget, when Parliament and all the galleries were crowded, he crossed the floor of the House to great the Prime Minister, and paid a generous tribute to him. He said, "Our greatest problem, greater even than grinding poverty, is spiritual confusion."

The Prime Minister and leader of the opposition together gave a reception for the House of Parliament to meet the whole MRA task force. They sent out an invitation on gold-engraved cards. The two men chaired the reception like old friends. The Prime Minister had all the guests repeat after him the four standards—absolute honesty, absolute purity, absolute unselfishness, and absolute love. The issue of unity in Nigeria is crucial because the bitterness is intense. One member of Parliament made an experiment in the electronics of the spirit between God's mind and his own. He said, "I have divided the nation, and spoken bitterly in public. I must change and work to unite the nation."

In South Africa, too, a force is at work powerful enough to unite even the bitterest enemies. The Eastern Provine Herald quotes a well-known Afrikaner, "Moral Rearmament has brought together those who were poles apart in the task of building a new South Africa. It has brought the answer to hatred in the country's heart."

In India, the Hindusthan Standard in a special 10-page supplement tells how this electronically heart-spanning force spreads from continent to continent. This is the 11th of the great Indian newspapers which have published special supplements on the work of moral rearmament.

Its front-page headline is "Asia and Africa—New Era of Constructive Cooperation." Manilal Gandhi, editor of South Africa's Indian Opinion and son of my old friend Mahatma Gandhi, whom I met on my first visit to India in 1915, is one of the contributors to this special supplement.

The speaker of the Indian House of the People, Mr. Mavalankar, says, "Moral rearmament is the old, ancient way of the East.

It has given our old philosophy a new orientation and given it wings."

A leader of the opposition in the United Provinces Legislature, member of the state executive of the Praja Socialist Party, says, "I have learned more from MRA in 2½ days than in 25 years of political life. One day's living of the four standards is worth more than a 1,000 hours of lectures."

The electronics of the spirit certainly save time—and it comes out with the right answers. Some people spend 20 years and more in politics, but still do not seem to have all the answers fully right.

For 20 years of politics does not always produce a new type of man. But the electronics of the spirit produces new men who are effective at the heart of nations.

Two Australians, who had spent a lifetime in political opposition, and who had greatly suffered when their country was at war with Japan, went together to Tokyo. They brought an electronic answer which had freed them from bitterness and hate. One of them told the Japanese Prime Minister, "We came here to work with you to make Dr. Buchman's vision 'Japan the lighthouse of Asia' a reality." They were received by the Japanese Cabinet Ministers. They were welcomed at a reception in the Diet. They spoke to the left and right wings of the Socialist Party. Within recent days the Prime Minister had a special showing of one of the moral rearmament plays in his official residence for cabinet and government leaders which press, radio, and television covered nationally.

And Dr. Ichimada, the Japanese Finance Minister, said, "The spirit of MRA is permeating the life of our country. We pledge ourselves to fight that a fresh illumination shall come to Japanese political life, by making MRA the basis of our policy." This represents the fulfillment of the vision I had when I made the first of many unforgettable visits to Japan 40 years ago.

The electronics of the spirit is available for everyone. It is not only necessary but normal for all men everywhere. The Afro-American, most respected national Negro newspaper in America, caught the joy of this basic answer given at the Afro-Asian conference with its bold headline, "Moral Rearmament urged in Bangdung." The story reads, "Dr. Jamili, chairman of the Iraq delegation, speaking at the opening of the conference called for 'moral rearmament as the need of the world today.' He received a vigorous, sustained ovation." The speech concluded, "We must work on the basis of moral rearmament. The world would then turn into one integral camp with no Eastern or Western camps."

These truths are readily perceived and speedily acceptable to the far-flung Moslem world which can be a girder of unity for all civilization. My ancestor, the scholar Bibliander, was the first man to make the riches of the Koran available for Europe when he translated it into German 413 years ago. Today the Secretary-General of the Arab League says, "The Arab world hails the advent of Moral Rearmament as one of the most significant factors on the world scene."

Colonel Nasser, the Prime Minister of Egypt, in a message to the Washington Assembly for Moral Rearmament early this year said, "The problems of government which confront the statesmen will not be solved without this secret of a change of heart which you are giving back to the world. It will lift men everywhere above the hates and jealousies fostered by selfish interests and recall them to the creative inspiration which comes from obedience to the Will of God."

A book called "Where Do We Go From Here?" which with pictures and colorful phrases that all can understand gives the secret of the change of heart of which the Prime Minister speaks, was translated into Arabic by the Director of Information in the Egyptian Ministry of National Guidance.

Plays as well as books can bring this electronic answer to millions. Twenty-seven casts are giving the moral rearmament plays in eight languages on every continent. In Hollywood, leading directors of screen and music, as well as actors, technicians, and designers, have given of their genius to help create a new musical, The Vanishing Island, which has a captivating answer that reaches the heart of every man.

Ole Olsen of Olsen and Johnson says of this musical, "This has something a man can understand and live by. The music of this show is terrific. It is an ideological atom bomb that will have repercussions around the world."

We have reached a point where man must either solve his problems or be destroyed by them. Politicians in every country are beginning to discover that the human mind, however able and sincere, cannot solve the problems created by the human passions of hate and greed and fear. It needs an electronic intervention, an experience of the spirit. It needs the new dimension that can usher in a new age. This experience must go into every department of life in every land.

How to catch this new dimension? St. Francis of Sales says the secret is to listen to the inner voice. He says that a half an hour a day is a basic minimum, except when you are exceptionally busy. Then a full hour is necessary.

An Italian priest declares that writing down the thoughts which come from the mind of God to the mind of man is advisable. He says, "What you do not write down, you will forget. So you might as well never have thought it." He adds that we reach the presence of God when and only when our wills are touched and crossed.

The electronics of the spirit, so simple, so natural, and so fundamental. Herein lies the key to a new age.

Statesmanship without the electronics of the spirit, without guidance, and without change, is like flying an aircraft in stormy weather over uncharted territory without choosing to use radio, maps, or compass. It is both unnecessary and criminal. It is recklessly selfish. It leads inevitably to disaster.

With the electronics of the spirit, renaissance becomes inevitable—and it can happen fast. The statesman, the businessman, the labor leader, the workers, the housewife, the family—all have their part to play. Guided by God, all men build unity and answer the frustrations and divisions of our times. The electronics of the spirit holds the answer to the second half of the 20th century.

It is an answer that works.

Citizenship Day 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has issued a proclamation calling upon all citizens to recognize September 17, the anniversary of the signing of the Constitution, as Citizenship Day.

Under joint resolution adopted in 1952, the Congress has set aside this day as one of recognition of all citizens who have come of age and all who have been naturalized within the year preceding.

I join the President in urging suitable recognition of our new citizens and of the anniversary of the Constitution.

I feel, however, that the anniversary of our American Constitution, one of the greatest written documents of all times, deserves greater recognition than is provided under the resolution and the proclamation of the President. I feel that it should be a legal holiday devoted to the Constitution. For this purpose, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 95, which is now waiting consideration of the Committee on the Judiciary, and which I hope may soon have the approval of that committee.

Under leave to extend, I include the President's proclamation and the text of House Joint Resolution 95:

PROCLAMATION 3098

CITIZENSHIP DAY, 1955

By the President of the United States of America, a proclamation

Whereas by joint resolution approved February 29, 1952 (66 Stat. 9), the Congress of the United States has designated the 17th day of September of each year as Citizenship Day in commemoration of the signing of the Constitution of the United States on September 17, 1787, and in recognition of all our citizens who have come of age and all who have been naturalized during the year; and

Whereas in this time of world uncertainty and unrest it is most appropriate that every one of our citizens, whether native-born or foreign-born, give special thought to the priceless blessings secured to us by our Constitution; and

Whereas the aforesaid resolution authorizes the President to issue annually a proclamation calling for the observance of Citizenship Day with appropriate ceremonies:

Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, call upon the appropriate officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on Saturday, September 17, 1955, and urge the people of the Nation to display the flag on that day at their homes and other suitable places.

I also urge Federal, State, and local officials, as well as religious, civic, patriotic, educational, and other organizations, to arrange for appropriate ceremonies on Citizenship Day, in schools and churches and other appropriate places, to the end that all of us may gain a deeper apreciation of our rights and responsibilities as citizens of the United States.

And I also call upon all our citizens to renew and reaffirm their allegiance on that day to the principles and ideals embodied in the Constitution—the foundation of our strength and the symbol of freedom and justice for all.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 1st day of June in the year of our Lord 1955, and of the independence of the United States of America the 179th.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

By the President:

[SEAL] JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State.

[F. R. Doc. 55-4560; Filed, June 3, 1955; 1:38 p. m.]

House Joint Resolution 95

Joint resolution to make Constitution Day a legal holiday

Resolved, etc., That the 17th day of September in each year, being the day celebrated and known as Constitution Day, is

hereby made a legal holiday to all intents and purposes and in the same manner as the 1st day of January, the 22d day of February, the 30th day of May, the 4th day of July, the first Monday of September, the 11th day of November, the fourth Thursday of November, and Christmas Day.

The Elks Contribute to Community and National Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to include the address I delivered at the dedication exercises of the new Elks Building, June 5, 1955, sponsored by the Framingham (Mass.) Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Lodge No. 1264.

The address follows:

It is a high privilege and pleasure to take part in these dedication exercises, not so much, indeed, as your Representative in Congress, but more as a fellow member of the great Order of Elks.

The subscribers who have contributed so generously to this beautiful structure and those who have labored so tirelessly and earnestly toward the completion of this project now see the result of their efforts. It is eminently fitting that such a result should crown the devoted and self-sacrificing work of the many who have given freely of their time, energy, and means in its behalf.

The dedication of a building such as this represents an offering on the altar of the noblest aims of civilized mankind. It is more than foundation stones, walls, beams, steps, and a roof. It embodies the principles of fraternalism, good fellowship, and cooperation which exists within the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks.

The primary object of fraternal organizations is to bring together men with kindred interests, thoughts, and ideals so that they may enjoy each other's society and gain mutual benefit. In this order we have banded ourselves together so that each individual may lend to the entire group the strength and talents which he possesses and, in turn, receive the help, inspiration, and protection of the whole organization.

Fellowship is to be valued for what is in it—not for what may be gotten out of it. When a group of people unite for purely material benefit, that union is not a fraternity. It is impossible not to have differences of opinion. That is democracy. But without unity and cooperation there can be no progress. It was this spirit which caused the founders of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Virginia each to lay aside his individual interests and prejudices and unite in forming the Continental Congress which laid the foundation for the world's great Republic.

The building we dedicate today will provide our organization with greater facilities for becoming more useful and give us more capacity for enjoyment. Elkdom has expanded and grown because within it men find social fellowship which they can combine with the opportunity to give expression to their instinctive desire to be of genuine service to their fellow men. An Elks Lodge in any community gives that community new civic strength and enthusiasm.

The passage of years is marked by changes all about us. Sometimes the changes are so sudden that they are immediately noticeable, and we reflect upon the inevitability of change and the instability of men and ideas and institutions. More often, however, change comes so subtly that we are unaware of the process and only later is it realized that modification has occurred.

The 87 years through which the Order of Elks has grown and prospered have brought changes in the Order. These changes have been for the better. They have made no fundamental alteration in the character of the order; on the contrary, we have held firmly to those principles laid down by our founders, adding to them, yes, and strengthening them. Succeeding generations of Elks have clung to the earliest traditions, and have added to them wisely to give us a rich and valuable heritage.

Of fundamental importance to the order is our Elks ritual. It states with beautiful clarity the noble ideals that inspire us. It is the golden cord that binds us together in fraternity with our brothers of today, of the past, and with those yet to come. From the very first lodge, stress has always been laid on the faithful, dignified, and impressive rendition of the ritual. Through good times and bad, the high standards set by the founding Elks were adhered to, and without question, this example has had a profound influence throughout the order.

So it is with the tradition of Elk hospitality. The visitor from far places always has found a hearty and generous welcome awaiting him at the door. Times, men and places have changed, but the spirit of hospitality has never waned.

The willingness of Elks to assist our Government and our Armed Forces was made evident at the outbreak of World War I, when adequate care of sick and wounded servicemen overseas was of urgent necessity. Our grand lodge appropriated $1 million for this purpose, and it was through this fund that the first 2 base hospitals set up in the battle area in France were made possible. The first reconstruction hospital for war casualties to be established in the United States was a 700-bed facility constructed and equipped by the order in Boston, Mass., and turned over to the Government in November 1918.

It was at that time that our order created its revolving fund through which it was able to assist over 40,000 disabled veterans during their vocational training period. The detailed system of disbursement of these moneys originated by our grand lodge was found so practicable that it was adopted by a Government agency in distributing its own funds.

When World War II presented its problems to our Government, the order's reputation for ready cooperation and know-how was well established and its assistance in recruiting flying cadets was requested. Over 400 lodges organized and conducted refresher-course schools to qualify men for the Air Corps with such excellent results that the Army called upon the Elks for aid in recruiting 45,000 Air Corps ground crewmen; within a few months 97,000 had been secured. The Elks came through in such record time when the Navy asked for help in recruiting fliers that we were the only organization solicited when both the Army and Navy were in vital need of engineers and Seabees. This faith in our efforts was rewarded when we were able to fill their quota 3 months ahead of schedule.

With this record of accomplishment for reference, it is not surprising that our Government continues to call upon the Elks for assistance in its projects benefiting our servicemen.

When the Veterans' Administration set up a Public Information Committee in its national advisory group in order to bring to the public a better understanding of the work being done by volunteers of all organizations in its hospitals, the Elks National Service Commission's representative was named chairman. In that capacity, not long ago, he enjoyed the privilege of delivering his committee's first, and well-received, report before national representatives of leading veteran, fraternal, and service organizations in Washington, D. C.

Another outstanding contribution the Elks have made to society is our interest in American youth. Our order has noticeably increased its sponsorship of youth programs in recent years. Every major town in America has its youth problems. We must redouble our efforts and increase our program of scholarships, leadership contests, Boy Scouts' programs, athletic contests, playgrounds, parks, swimming pools, and summer camps. Such activities are of great help and influence if properly planned. We desire to reach all sorts of children, to do more for the underprivileged child.

By proclamation of our Grand Exalted Ruler, May 1 is designated as Elks national youth day. Every lodge is expected to sponsor some particlar event paying tribute to the youth of our country "to demonstrate to the world that we have a real interest in, and concern for, the welfare of our youth, and that we are proud of them."

For many years our organization has been concerned with improving our national health. We have played an important part in the care for crippled children. Convalescent homes, diagnostic and rehabilitation services for thousands have been provided.

About 10 years ago the Elks began to realize that the victims of cerebral palsy were not necessarily deficient in mentality and that they could be helped to live normal and useful lives through proper, intelligent treatment. Little by little, subordinate lodges, groups of lodges and States began to take up this work. The trustees of the Elks National Foundation became interested in this movement and played a part of strong leadership in the movement. Our national foundation is constantly broadening its activities in the cerebral palsy treatment field. Up to July 1954, it has expended over $100,000 to train doctors, teachers, nurses, and other qualified persons in the treatment of cerebral palsy.

Occasionally we meet someone who tries to tell us that the Elks are nothing but a lot of "good time Charlies" without serious thoughts in their heads. I would say they are dead wrong. I doubt whether many social or fraternal organizations in our American communities could surpass our record over the last 50 years. We have established solid public relations in our communities which have demonstrated to our fellow man that our order typifies Americanism. We have demonstrated not only to our own membership, but to the country as a whole, that our aim is to translate into realities the cardinal principles of Elkdom.

Our program is one of expansion. Those who work the hardest in our order develop an even more profound love for it as they work. From our service to each and every community in the Nation we symbolize the ideal relationship between the citizen and his Government. Government in the hands of active, honest, faithful citizens is safe. The fundamental articles of faith of all liberty-loving American citizens contain an unswerving belief in basic human rights. The fundamental articles of faith of all loyal Elks contain an unswerving belief in basic human rights. We believe in the dignity of man, the freedom of the individual, and the Christian principles upon which these United States were founded.

If our American institutions are to survive, our manhood must be characterized by a great regard for the day set apart by God Himself. William H. Seward said: "The ordinances which require the observance of 1 day in 7 and the Christian faith which hallows it are our chief security for all civil and religious liberty."

Perhaps the 20th century has been prone to direct too much attention toward materialism. Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote: "The true test of civilization is not the census, nor the size of cities, nor the crops—no; but the kind of man the country turns out." Accordingly, to counteract any landslide of our civilization into materialism, we must give our attention not only to political, diplomatic, military, and economic endeavors, but we must also look with a large and steady eye at ourselves and attempt to add spiritual stature to our own society. The role that spiritual ideals have played in our national life has filled volumes. Thirty-five years ago Woodrow Wilson, in one of his last messages to the American people, said: "Our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually."

These dedication ceremonies should include a rededication of ourselves to the Christian ideals of human brotherhood for all in which our order so thoroughly believes.

Elks can continue to demonstrate to the world the true principles of Christian brotherhood through our four great principles of charity, justice, brotherly love, and fidelity. We want our free America to continue as a free Nation, but we should not forget that America will be no stronger, no more free than the people who are America.

When an Elks lodge assumes the leadership of any activity, bringing into play its organizational ability, anthusiasm, and steadfastness of purposes, there is action; things happen, and another successful project results. That has been the case whenever Elkdom has demonstrated its unwavering vigilance in preserving Americanism against the encroachments of communism.

The record of Soviet aggression has in it much of the quality of Aesop's fable of the wolf and the lamb who were standing in a shallow stream. The wolf complained that the lamb was muddying the water the wolf wished to drink. The lamb pointed out that this could not be, for the wolf was upstream and the water flowed from him down to the lamb. "Anyway," said the wolf savagely, "I heard that you told lies about me last year." "How could that be," pleaded the lamb, "since I wasn't born until this year?" "Well, then," snarled the wolf, "it was someone in your family, anyway. But no matter who it was, I do not intend to be talked out of my breakfast." And without further ado, he leaped upon the lamb and devoured him. The moral Aesop points out, is that the tyrant can always find an excuse for his tyranny.

The principles of our order are exactly the opposite of those embodied in communistic practices. We believe in and have a concern for the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of citizenship under our constitutional government. We believe in community betterment for the good of all. We believe that the blessings of liberty which we enjoy should be passed on to posterity. We are here today as Elks, but in a much larger sense, we are here as Americans.

When the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks had its origin approximately 87 years ago, the Golden Rule became its foundation. The eternal truths of this foundation have been proven by the growth and virility of our order. Our accomplishments are proof positive that Elkdom is composed of those who want to share their lives with their fellow man.

It is a man's privilege to assume the responsibilities of citizenship. And it is his responsibility to insure the privileges of his fellow citizens. Two things are vital to democracy: that every man grant every other the rights he claims for himself, and that every man accept the obligations he expects others to exercise. The good citizen concerns himself with the privileges of others and the responsibilities of himself.

The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks in this community has assumed the responsibilities of citizenship in its finest interpretations for the good of mankind.

It is tremendously important that a building be erected on a firm foundation, lest it sag and cause cracks to appear in the walls, or even topple. It is impossible for a building to be constructed properly without a plan. Regardless of the size of a structure, good building material is needed.

The foundation upon which this beautiful structure rests, the planning and material which has gone into it, represent these ideals of firmness, proper planning, and good material that are contained in our order.

We are happy and proud to have arrived at the completion of this structure. Founded on charity, justice, brotherly love, and fidelity, we can have complete hope in the fact it will fulfill its mission and assist in spreading the ideals of Elkdom, that we may remain free to continue the tasks which lie before us. May our ambitions for all the great and good things which our order represents be fulfilled within these walls. As we dedicate this home, may we hope to be rededicated to the principles of our order—to the principles of America.

Widening Horizons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial entitled "Widening Horizons" which appeared in the New York World-Telegram on May 13, 1955.

Due to the fact that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member, has a very close association with the airlines, I have long known of the fine work that Pan American World Airways as well as the other large international airlines are doing in promoting good feeling throughout the world.

The editorial follows:

WIDENING HORIZONS

The role private enterprise can play in aiding underdeveloped countries—and thereby also winning friends for Uncle Sam—is pointed up in the plan worked out by the Foreign Operations Administration and Pan American World Airways.

The idea is to stimulate the economic growth of Pakistan with technical assistance for Pakistan International Airlines. Pan Am experts will work with Pakistan personnel for 3 years, training them in modern techniques. Expansion of its aviation industry will, in turn, facilitate Pakistan's industrial development.

In a shrinking world which measures distance by hours instead of miles, the aviation industry has an unparalleled opportunity to make the most of this proximity. That's what Pan Am is doing in this instance. And it's what Trans-World Airlines did recently in flying 45 American newsmen on a tour of Ireland, Egypt, and Spain.

Cultivation of economic, political, and social ties can't be left entirely to governments. There's much that private enterprise can do to help far-flung countries help themselves, with improved good will and better understanding as happy byproducts.

Watch Your Dollars at Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

WATCH YOUR DOLLARS AT PANAMA—PROPOSED SEA-LEVEL CANAL AND ANOTHER GIVEAWAY TREATY DEMAND ATTENTION OF CITIZENS AND CONGRESS

(By Earl Harding, vice president, National Economic Council)

A tangled web of confusion—a mix of engineering boondoggle and diplomatic squandermania—continues to enmesh the Panama Canal.

Congress, through two sessions, has delayed action on pending bills to create a competent, impartial, independent commission to reassess the complex engineering, governmental, and economic problems at the isthmus.

Their solution, right or wrong, and further delay in facing up to these problems, will affect not only world commerce but the future welfare of America and the pocketbook of every American taxpayer.

Congressional delay has given time for those who temporarily make policy at Panama to revive and further promote, even in congressional hearings, their scheme to rebuild the canal at sealevel. In 1947 they estimated the cost at $2,500,000,000. Gen. John S. Seybold, president Governor of the Canal Zone, and President of the Panama Canal Company, testified March 29 to 31, 1955, that sea-level reconstruction would now cost $4,500,000,000. Other competent engineers say an accurate estimate is as impossible as predicting the cost of a war. Ten billions is nearer.

And engineers still living who played important parts in building the Panama Canal say from their experience that rebuilding at sea level would involve landslide and other engineering hazards more than offsetting the so-called security advantages claimed by sea-level partisans if ever an atom bomb got through its defenses.

Besides this bottomless pit for American dollars, rebuilding at sea-level would bring still more demands from an unpredictable government of Panama, whose instability the past year's Presidential assassination has further demonstrated. The sea-level rerouting would require still another new treaty to permit changes in Canal Zone boundaries and to cover property damages for which Uncle Handout would have to pay aplenty—or be hauled before the U. N.

BIRTHPLACE OF SQUANDERMANIA

In Economic Council Paper of September 1, 1953, we traced the beginning of the worldwide American giveaway series. It did not start with the Marshall plan of 1947, nor at Yalta in 1945, nor at Teheran in 1943. Squandermania was born with the "good neighbor" giveaway treaty with Panama signed March 2, 1936, and approved by the United States Senate July 25, 1939.

The 1936 giveaway treaty abrogated priceless rights granted to the United States in return for its part in setting up Panama as a nation in 1903. These rights, abandoned by the United States, included the right to build outside the 10-mile Canal Zone bases to protect the Panama Canal—and incidentally the Republic of Panama itself. Then Uncle Sam was bled through the nose for the privilege of building 134 such bases

during World War II. He was kicked off of them in 1947-1948.

Continuous negotiations for still another new treaty, insistently demanded by Panamanian politicians, have been conducted by our State Department since September 1953. We reported in Economic Council Letter No. 341, August 15, 1954, on the rumblings from the top-secret negotiations. This newest treaty was finally signed January 25, 1955, ratified by Panama March 15 and sent on May 9 to the United States Senate. There it awaits action, first by the Foreign Relations Committee, of which Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, is chairman.

WHAT THIS GRAB BAG HOLDS

The concessions agreed to by the State Department in this latest giveaway treaty are too numerous for this limited space. Conspicuous are the following:

1. Increasing the United States annuity to Panama from $430,000 (originally $250,000 before gold dollar devaluation) to $1,930,000. This means either increased tolls, burdening all shipping, or increased drain on American taxpayers. American ship owners are currently protesting that tolls are too high.

2. Giving to Panama, without compensation, waterfront and other properties, including the Panama Railroad's yards and terminals in the cities of Colon and Panama. Their value has been stated in various press dispatches from Panama as high as $30 million.

3. Agreeing to ask Congress to appropriate and authorize building a bridge across the Panama Canal to replace the existing ferry. Panamanian estimates, preposterously high, put the cost of this bridge at $27 million.

4. Other concessions to Panama, if the pending treaty is ratified, are for the most part designed to restrict American and to extend Panamanian rights in respect to commissary privileges, trade advantages, wage differentials, taxation, etc.

The proposed giving away of Panama Railroad properties fits into plans of the present managers of the Panama Canal. They have already voted to abandon the century-old railroad and replace it with a motor highway. But, on May 19, 1955, the House Appropriations Committee in its report No. 603 advised a legislative investigation be made of the proposed abandonment.

WHAT UNCLE SAM WOULD GET BACK

Panama's principal token return for all the concessions agreed to by the State Department is the right to use, for a period of 15 years without cost, as a military training and maneuver base the old Rio Hato base west of the Canal Zone. Extension after 15 years is to be subject to agreement between the two governments.

But Panamanian law and sovereignty over the area is not to be affected by American occupation. American soldiers ordered to drill there will lose the protection of their own country's Constitution—just as United States forces in other parts of the world lose their rights under the much-condemned Status of Forces Treaty.

So much, in brief, about the pending treaty. Its giveaways, subject to ratification, express the vain old notion that friendship can be bought. What real friends has such squandering ever made, or held?

And how wise is it, with the physical needs of the Panama Canal still undetermined and the sea-level proposal a deep-rooted controversy, to tie the future of the canal in the straitjacket of this treaty?

THE SEA-LEVEL DREAM ANALYZED

The Panama Canal Society of New York, which includes many distinguished engineers who helped build the canal, devoted its annual meeting on May 7, 1955, to a discussion of the sea-level proposal. Not one voice was raised in its defense.

The canal-diggers' guest was former Canal Zone Gov. Maurice H. Thatcher, sole survivor of the Isthmian Canal Commission, who was a Kentucky Congressman for 10 years following his pioneering service at Panama.

"In search for theoretical security," said Governor Thatcher, "many have lost sight of the prime function of an interoceanic canal."

He outlined the three main proposals that have been debated in Congress since 1947. One is to correct engineering errors and at minimum expense expand the present canal to meet future needs. Another is the so-called sea-level plan, which will require tidal locks at the Pacific end; and the third is to build another canal elsewhere, perhaps at Nicaragua.

"The problems," said Governor Thatcher, "are not merely engineering and marine in character. They include grave questions of international relations, interoceanic commerce, and economics. For their objective evaluation a broader body than an exclusive engineering group is required. Such a body is contemplated in the Martin-Thompson bills (S. 766 and H. R. 3335, 84th Cong.) for the creation of an independent and broadly based International Canals Commission composed of the best qualified men the Nation can obtain.

"As one who has followed this question closely for many years, I am clearly of the opinion that only by such a body can this problem be adequately resolved. * * * There are many factors, including navigational needs and ease of operation; cost of construction and maintenance; the just resolution of diplomatic problems, and the simplest and most practical type of design."

SEA LEVEL, TOO, IS VULNERABLE

Governor Thatcher likened the problems of security from atomic attack to the universal problem of humans and animals—the protection of their eyesight. "If we are so weak, or lacking in source of defense in wartime to keep away the agencies of destruction, the canal will be utterly destroyed," he said, however it is built.

"This being the fact," he added, "it seems to be most unwise and unavailing, unless the necessity be absolute, to build at Panama a new canal at vast cost which must be reflected in substantial manner in increased tolls."

The cost of the sea level rebuilding, he said, would include indemnity and increased annuity to Panama and would "probably run to a staggering total between $5 and $10 billion."

Any material increase in tolls, Governor Thatcher said, "will inevitably harm our own merchant marine more than that of any other nation, because of higher wage and benefit conditions in our shipping system. The net outcome, in my judgment, would be well calculated to drive our ships from the seas.

"I cannot believe that congressional sanction will ever be given to the abandonment of the present Panama Canal and construction of an entirely new waterway of unknown design and astronomical cost, unless convinced in the most satisfactory way that such action is the absolute and indispensable solution."

Congress, he thought, would rather turn to Nicaragua or to some other Isthmian location to meet growing needs and let the Panama Canal remain as it is.

Recalling his own observations during construction days, the former Governor spoke of the long-neglected crack on the face of Culebra Cut and said it "emphasizes the perils which will surely be repeated and accentuated * * * for the deeper the excavation goes, the greater will be the danger of slides * * * and the cost will be tremendous, without any understandable advantage over the present lake-lock system."

THE ALTERNATIVE TO SEA LEVEL

The alternative to building a new canal at sea level is known in the engineering world as the Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan, which involves only modification and enlargement of the capacity of the present canal. This plan has been presented in detail to engineering societies and in engineering magazines. Governor Thatcher told the veteran canal diggers' assembly that while some distinguished engineers favor the sea-level idea, other distinguished engineers, just as honest in their judgments, are for the Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan.

"I have never met any construction-era engineer," said Governor Thatcher, "who expressed his judgment in favor of the sea-level design. I cannot believe that Wallace, Stevens, Goethals, Sibert, and Gaillard and all the host of distinguished engineers who participated in the construction—if they were alive today—would favor abandoning the present design for one requiring a deepened excavation of 100 or more feet in Gaillard (Culebra) cut, with all the slides that would inevitably result."

Strangely enough, the Panama Canal builders, faced with navigational problems, never had a Navy line officer on their commissions or boards. Lacking such advice, John F. Stevens, chief engineer who built the great organization which General Goethals carried on, favored the general plan now embodied in the Terminal Lake-Third Locks design. It is now known that Stevens accepted only under protest the arrangement of locks at the Pacific end that has proved for 40 years to have been a navigational bottleneck.

A comprehensive evaluation of the Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan, illustrated with maps, charts, and photographs, appeared in language understandable to laymen in the March 1955 issue of the professional magazine of the Navy, the U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings, published in Annapolis.

This plan would undo the engineering error which was forced upon John F. Stevens. It would consolidate the 1 lock at Pedro Miguel and the 2 locks at Miraflores into 1 triple-stage lock at a point near Miraflores. This would raise the level of Miraflores Lake to the level of Gatun Lake and eliminate the navigational bottleneck at Pedro Miguel. There would then be uninterrupted summit-level navigation between enlarged locks at both ends of an extended Gatun Lake.

Engineers favoring the Terminal Lake-Third Locks design estimate that the cost of all this reconstruction would be well under $750 million. And, they contend, the canal would be navigationally more efficient than would be the restricted channel dug to sea level, at a cost of several billions, and would require no new treaty negotiation with Panama.

THE MESS HASN'T BEEN CLEANED UP

Council letter No. 341 described the tangle of conflicting authority in the Panama Canal organization disclosed by the audit for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953. The Comptroller General's 1954 audit, released on May 13, 1955, shows that duplication of Government activities and waste in the Canal Zone still continue, and that accomplishments have been minor.

The earlier report recommended a complete reorganization, and creation of a single independent agency to manage canal construction and operation and government of the Canal Zone. The recommended changes, now says the Comptroller General, are still needed.

The Comptroller General mentions "factors affecting future operating results," including the proposed $1,500,000 increase of annuity to Panama and costly wage adjustments. These factors, obvious to Government auditors, as well as the proposed expenditure of untold billions on a sea-level project of questionable need, should not escape public and congressional attention.

Ordinary American prudence demands that ratification of the pending giveaway treaty be at least deferred until the impartial commission provided for in the Martin-Thompson bills can make its investigation and report its conclusions to Congress.

The Test of Real Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, 1955, it was my honor to address the commissioning ceremonies of the Reserve Officers Training Corps at John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio. I chose as my subject for that address The Test of Real Leadership. In that address, I have suggested four basic objectives which should guide our preparation for, and any participation in, a conference with the Russians looking forward to an easing of world tensions. I hope the President and his advisers will give some thought to my recommendations, because I sincerely believe they have a vital bearing on the future welfare and security of the people of the United States. Under leave granted, I insert my address in the RECORD:

THE TEST OF REAL LEADERSHIP

(Address by Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Member of Congress, 20th Ohio District, at the commissioning ceremonies, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, John Carroll University, June 5, 1955, Cleveland, Ohio)

I offer my hearty congratulations to each and every one of you who today has been signally honored by being commissioned a Reserve officer in the Army of the United States.

This is a moment of great pride for all those who have played a part in helping you achieve this high honor.

The officers on the faculty of the John Carroll University see in you well-trained leaders eminently qualified to carry out such tasks as may be necessary to defend the security and welfare of the people of the United States. The good fathers and the entire faculty of John Carroll University look upon you as men well grounded, not only in the science of military tactics, but equally as well prepared with a philosophy of life which immediately gives you complete dedication to God and to country. For your parents this occasion is the climax to their hopes and prayers and sacrifices. They can take real comfort and satisfaction in knowing that you have had the best preparation available to anyone to meet the challenge of life as you must face it in the days and years that lie ahead.

The Reserve officers movement in the United States has had a long and glorious history. The first congressional stimulus to the Reserve officers program occurred during the Civil War. During World War I and between the wars, it became, of necessity, a fixed part of our national life. It is no surprise, therefore, that during World War II more than 100,000 graduates of the Reserve Officers Training Corps program served in the Armed Forces in all ranks from second lieutenant to general. Without such advance preparation it would have been impossible for us to have put together so rapidly the mighty fighting machine required for us to meet the challenge of aggressive tyranny which brought about World War II.

The basic foundation and indeed justification for the Reserve Officers Training Corps rests on the fact that we, as a Nation, want to avoid a huge standing army with all the implications it has with respect to our family life, our educational system, the training of our professional men and women, and the development of careers in a free-enterprise system. Paired with this basic requirement is the realization that human freedom has been won by and will be preserved only by men who are prepared to fight to defend it.

We Americans understand full well the great sacrifices made in freedom's cause on our very land as well as the sacrifices we have made in all parts of the world to maintain it. We are aware that the tyrants down through history have fought to destroy all those things of the spirit which symbolize freedom's cause and which we hold to be as dear as life itself. The Reserve Officers Corps has been a happy and safe answer to those basic requirements. Through that program we are assured of trained, alerted, dedicated officers in all branches of the service who are real leaders of men. As leaders of men, we know that in time of national emergency they quickly form the nucleus around which emerges a powerful fighting force competent to meet and destroy any form of tyranny which challenges our national existence.

Being leaders of men, the Reserve Officers Corps must at all times be well informed on all issues having to do with the basic question of war or peace. This is necessarily so because informed leaders are the strongest leaders as well as the most inspired type of leaders. I would like, therefore, to discuss with you briefly what I consider to be some of the basic issues of our day having to do with the question of peace or war. Following World War II all of us had hoped that mankind would find the road to universal peace and freedom. That was the goal toward which we fought during World War II and it was only reasonable, with the magnificent victory that was ours, that we could expect a rich reward for our great sacrifices. Consequently we rapidly turned our attention to peacetime pursuits and problems of a purely domestic character but still finding time to perform multiple errands of mercy in a world torn half apart by war. We envisioned on the immediate horizon a golden era of peace, with freedom, as the heritage for all men for all time. This state of mind, in a large measure, took us into a deep slumber out of which we have not as yet fully awakened.

We, as a nation, were disturbed by the drums of war that were being thumped in every quarter of the world by the masters of the Kremlin. Slowly we became aware of the fact that a new and well organized tyrant was on the march. A new type of warfare was being waged against us and all other free people. This new type of warfare was completely unlike the classical or orthodox type which history records altogether too frequently, but nevertheless we soon found it to be total warfare, directed against the complete destruction of the civilization of which we are a part.

There can be no doubt that the world of our day is in a deep political crisis. Every hamlet in every nation of the world—every man, woman, and child is involved. This is not merely an economic crisis—that is only a part of the upheavel. This is not merely a social crisis in the sense that we understand social values. That too, is only a part of the crisis. This is not a military crisis, because the use of military forces and weapons in the orthodox sense have been used to a minimum extent. I have called it a political crisis because it affects every element of society as we know it.

Some people have called the crisis of our times a cold war. Almost all of us have come to realize that we were engaged in a new kind of war and cold war seemed like a good description because it indicated the absence of a shooting war. But, we have made a grave mistake in calling it a cold war because the warfare being waged against civilization as we know it is hotter than any war ever known to mankind. In this new type of warfare, more people have already been tortured, maimed, imprisoned, and killed, than in any other war in history. As an example of my point, I would only cite these elementary facts to you. During the period of 1932 to 1933 the Russian Communists starved to death by means of a man-made famine, over 5 million patriotic God fearing Ukrainians. In the Soviet Union alone there are over 15 million human beings held in slave labor camps under the term political prisoners. In most of these prison camps, the life span rarely exceeds a period of 2 years. Millions of people have been forcibly deported from their Communist occupied homelands to the interior reaches of the Russian Federated Soviet Republic, bringing about the separation of husband from wife and parents from children—few of whom will ever be united, and still fewer will be returned united to their beloved homelands. Entire nations have been destroyed by this new type of warfare—nations such as the Crimean Tatars, the Chechen-Inguish, and the Kalmucks. Yes, some of these ancient non-Russian nations were destroyed by the process of mass deportations carried out in a period of less than 48 hours. These are some of the crimes against humanity which have been carried on under the name of cold war. The long list of similar crimes committed by the international Communist conspiracy is almost endless and ever-increasing in its violence.

Against this background of criminal warfare being directed against all forms of civilization, the Kremlin recently called for peaceful coexistence between the still free world and the world enslaved by the Russian Communists. The propaganda organs of the Kremlin then began to blast out statements attributed to the leaders of the world Communist conspiracy to the effect that the time had come for a concentrated effort to ease world tensions. The pleas for peaceful coexistence by the Russians was quickly followed up by a propaganda and diplomatic offensive on a worldwide basis. The clear objective of that propaganda and diplomatic offensive is to split the political and military alliances of the free world, to neutralize Germany and Austria, thereby providing a neutral belt between the Communist empire and the free world and finally to isolate the United States and the Western Hemisphere.

In the face of this propaganda and diplomatic offensive engaged in by the Kremlin, the Congress of the United States, through the reports of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, has attempted to alert the people of the United States to the true nature of communism and the meaning of its current propaganda drive for peaceful coexistence with the free world. That committee, on which I had the honor to serve, recommended in January of this year, that to meet this new propaganda challenge by communism and to avert world war III, the Government of the United States engage in a bold, positive political offensive. That basic recommendation was supported by 12 definitive recommendations which were in the nature of concrete steps that should be taken to initiate such a political offensive. These recommendations were arrived at after hearing the direct testimony of over 300 eye witnesses who themselves had been the victims of communism, and after the study of thousands of sworn statements and all available documentary evidence. Moreover, this was the work of a truly bipartisan committee attested to by the fact that all 27

of its reports were unanimous. Since that time, many prominent Americans have come forward to urge the Government to take up a political offensive against the conspiracy of communism. It is encouraging to see that there is an awakening to the fact that if we are to avert world war III and at the same time extend the cause of freedom and peace, bold and resolute action is required. The record is clear that if we continue to engage in weak, half-hearted, fearful measures based upon a desire to placate the Russians, we are taking the course which inevitably leads to war and possibly slavery for our people.

We are told of the likelihood of what one statesman of the free world has called a Conference at the Summit. This, of course, implies a meeting of the leaders of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union. We are also told the primary objective of that conference is to find ways and means for easing world tensions and opening the door to peace and freedom. You and I, because of our basic spiritual beliefs and our faith in the free institutions as we know them here in America, must always seek with fervor and determination the goal of peace, justice, and freedom. But facing the facts as we know them to be, we realize that any agreement entered into with the Russian Communists, whether it be on a bilateral basis or developed at an international conference, it is not worth the paper it is written on. That is the irrefutable record which the Russian Communists have made for themselves and it is a record which must, of necessity, guide us in any discusisons we may have with them now or in the future.

Since we must arrive at all times for the great goal of peace and avoid missing any opportunity for winning it, it may be necessary for our leaders in Washington to attend a conference with the Russians before this year is out. If such a meeting does take place, I believe that the guideposts to our participation in such a conference must be those unalterable principles upon which our Nation is founded. As a step in that direction, I would commend the following to your attention as minimum goals we would seek in such a conference:

First, we must regard such a conference as nothing more than an opportunity for us to spell out for the entire world what we stand for and what we stand against. In this connection, we should make it clear that we stand for the rights of all nations, large and small, to national self-determination, and the natural rights of all people to the basic freedoms. We should make it equally clear that we stand unqualifiedly against any form of colonialism or imperialism and in particular, we will never acquiesce to the new Russian colonialism which is being carried out under the camouflage of Communist imperialism.

Second, as a logical followup to this first condition, we must demand that the Communist-enslaved non-Russian nations be permitted to determine their own destiny by the use of free elections, including multiple political parties, the secret ballot, together with international supervision to guard these basic requirements. If we fail to do otherwise, the good people of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Ukraine Byelorussia, Georgia, Turkestan, Idel-Ural, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cossackia, and Russia will look upon any United States participation in a conference at the so-called summit as the failure of the last great hope of mankind and a sellout of all those moral and political principals which the United States has stood for during the 179 years of our national existence.

Third, the Russians must agree to dismantling and completely removing the Iron Curtain which they have constructed from the Baltic Sea to the Pacific Ocean. They must remove the minefields, the barbed wire, the vicious dogs, the special squads of machine-gunners, and all other unnatural barriers which the Russians have concocted in order to divide the world into separate parts. The Russians must agree without reservation that the Iron Curtain is the basic obstacle to true peace and freedom.

Fourth, we must abide by the proven principle of open covenants openly arrived at. There can be no secret understandings reached at such a conference. To insure against this possibility, the administration should avoid being party to any joint communique being issued from such a conference because the constant Russian demand for unanimity would mean that any joint communique would serve primarily the Kremlin interests. President Eisenhower would be wise to issue his own communique, on a day-to-day basis, covering developments and any successes or failures that might come out of such a conference.

The proposed conference at the summit, if it takes place, will have much to do with the fundamental question of peace or war. All mankind will watch with keen interest the developments that come out of such a conference. Those who are enslaved behind the Iron Curtain will be watching anxiously to see whether we, as a nation, by act or omission, confirm their enslavement. They regard our beloved America as man's last great hope. All the people in the still-free world will watch this event with equal concern. Our responsibilities are heavy. Consequently we must stand resolutely by our principles whatever the transitory cost may be.

The role of a leader in the affairs of nations must not be guided by a desire to win the popularity contest. Real leaders are seldom popular, but real leaders are respected. That inspiring lesson of history applies both to nations cast in the role of leaders as well as those men cast in the role as spokesmen for those nations.

I have tried in these few minutes to present to you some of the facts as I know them, so that you would be a better-informed officer in the Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States. I know that you have had the best possible training in military science. I am also keenly aware that in preparing you to meet all the trials of life, the good fathers at John Carroll University have left no stones unturned. It is now your responsibility to go forth in the world as a trained and responsible leader. I know that you will respond without hesitation to all those demands that a leader in life must expect. Remaining a well-informed leader will make you not only a better man, but a better citizen of our beloved country.

My wishes for every success go to each and every one of you.

Al Day's Valedictory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks I have been endeavoring to familiarize the Members of the House with the shortcomings in the present situation whereby the United States Fish and Wildlife Service is being forced to use the special duck stamp funds for routine operating expenses. As the Members know, these funds are derived from the yearly sale of duck stamps to sportsmen so that the accumulated receipts can be used to advance the national waterfowl program through the acquisition of suitable wetlands for living space for ducks and geese. This program is extremely popular with the sportsmen. The original act had their wholehearted support and, in 1949, the Congress responded to the sportsmen's urgings and raised the duck stamp fee to $2 so that the program might be accelerated.

The program has not advanced proportionately, however. Of late, land acquisition has accounted for only a minimum amount of the funds expended whereas routine operations of the Service are taking increasing amounts. To correct this deplorable situation and to hold faith with the sportsmen of this Nation, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 2142, that would require the Fish and Wildlife Service to spend a greater portion of the duck stamp receipts for this vital activity.

In respect to the justifiable concern that this practice has caused sportsmen throughout the country, I wish to call the Members' attention to a feature story that appeared in the June 5 Washington Post and Times Herald by Hugh Brannen concerning the retirement of Albert M. Day from the Fish and Wildlife Service. Mr. Day was the Director of the Service from 1946 to 1953, and is now the assistant to his successor. It was under Mr. Day's tenure in office that waterfowl made steady improvement from the drought and duck depressions of the 1930's.

But as the editorial points out:

His reward, as you know, was demotion.

His experience was an object lesson for young men who are considering a career in Government. They should know what they're getting into. Political expediency, political vengeance still rule the roost, not only in waterfowl jobs, but throughout the establishment.

Mr. Speaker, sportsmen and conservationists will take comfort in knowing now that Mr. Day has been obliged to forsake Federal service, but he will continue his lifelong interest in waterfowl. Upon his retirement following 36 years of service in the Federal conservation agency that has the primary responsibility for the management of the Nation's waterfowl resources, he will join a private organization, the Arctic Institute of North America, to direct a basic study of the continental waterfowl situation.

The article, Al Day's Valedictory, follows:

AL DAY'S VALEDICTORY—WATERFOWL DEFENDER GIVEN NEW MISSION

(By Hugh Brannen)

At 4:15 o'clock of an afternoon next week Albert Merrill Day will say goodby to his office associates, put on his hat and, with that lack of fanfare that has always characterized him, walk out of Interior and out of Government.

That act will be his valedictory to the far-flung Fish and Wildlife Service which, including its predecessor agency the old Biological Survey, he served 30 years and directed 7 years.

It will be a farewell to Government, but not in any sense a farewell to conservation. He's joining the Arctic Institute of North America, for which he'll undertake at once a comprehensive survey.

Fish and Wildlife's loss will be the Institute's gain, but the biggest beneficiary will be the waterfowl resource.

The institute is a private organization of scientists and leading laymen who recognize in general, the validity of Paul M. Dunn's observation that "The rise and fall of certain nations was closely correlated with the treatment accorded their natural resources."

Specifically the institute is concerned over the mountaing dangers facing the birds of the Arctic and subarctic regions of Canada and Alaska, whose mysterious flights to the southward every winter are of such recreational and esthetic value to the people. A more immediate worry is the threat of starvation hanging over Eskimos and Indians who depend on ducks and geese and their eggs for food and on the down for clothing.

Day's investigation will start June 16 at the institute's Washington office, 1530 P Street NW. It will be his task to discover, to evaluate, to catalog and possibly to dramatize, hostile forces.

Some of these already are notorious. Consider the prairie pothole area, covering 217,000 square miles of fertile land dotted with marshes and ponds, in Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, the Dakotas, and western Minnesota. There is the breeding ground for a third of the duck population.

It's vanishing. In 2 years 44,000 potholes have been drained.

The Federal Government and States like Minnesota and California are spending millions to develop refuges. Sportsmen are at last realizing that hunting bags must be kept within reason. Thoughtful people everywhere are coming to understand that the number of ducks and geese is not limitless.

In spite of all this, waterfowl habitat south of the subarctic is perceptibly declining. Al Day's assignment couldn't have been timelier.

And it could hardly have been given to a better man. His tenure was marked by a steady improvement in wildlife from that sorrowful day of the market gunner in the thirties when the winged resource reached its lowest ebb.

His reward, as you know, was demotion.

His experience was an object lesson for young men who are considering a career in Government. They should know what they're getting into. Political expediency, political vengeance still rule the roost, not only in waterfowl jobs but throughout the establishment.

Day was no politician. In his time he'd worked for both parties, but most of all he'd worked for the birds. Still, he made the mistake of defying a coterie of politicians who wanted the right to hunt ducks as they pleased.

It's beside the point that he was succeeded by a good man, a sincere and conscientious man. His removal was sorry thanks for a job well done, it was cynical, it was almost sordid. It stank up the Erie marshes.

Contrary to the popular impression, neither Ohio nor Maryland interests did for Day, primarily. That sorry footnote in the history of conservation was written by Alaska salmon packers and wealthy duckhunters of California.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

Appendix

Retention of All Enemy Property Seized During World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in view of the continuing interest of the various veterans' organizations in having the United States retain all enemy property seized during World War II, and from which our veterans who were captives of the enemy receive certain specified compensation for each day spent in a prison camp, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix part of a report of a special American Bar Association committee.

This committee, which is from the section of international and comparative law of the association, has concluded that the property in question should not be returned to the former enemy owners.

This conclusion has been approved by the council of the section.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE DIRKSEN BILL

PART II

This committee was appointed by the council to study proposals in Congress to return enemy property held by our Government, and specifically the Dirksen bill (S. 3423, 83d Congress; introduced in the 84th Congress as S. 995 by Mr. KILGORE for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN). Part I of your committee's report dealt with a review of previous action with respect to this matter taken by the American Bar Association or the Section of International and Comparative Law. This part will deal with the rules of law involved and the merits of the bill.

The Dirksen bill and corresponding House measures would amend the Trading with the Enemy Act so as to return to their former owners enemy assets vested by our Government during the war. It would also return any dividend, distribution, or increment which may have been paid or allowed on the property subsequent to its vesting. It has been estimated that approximately one-half billion dollars worth of property is involved.

Under the existing law and international agreements with other countries, both allied and enemy, these assets are being held to meet war claims of American citizens. For example, the allied nations waived reparations from Germany on the condition that they would hold seized German assets in lieu thereof. This was made a part of our agreement with the West German Government which agreed to compensate its own citizens for losses of property held by the United States and by other allied nations, in consideration of the waiver of reparations.

The question of the return of enemy property has been exhaustively considered and debated. There have been literally hundreds of thousands of words written about it and about the related subject of war claims. The view that the sanctity of enemy property rights should be recognized even in times of total war has been urged on the American people and their allies, on Congress, and on the courts of the United States. This view was repeatedly rejected by our courts and by the United States and its allies as evidenced by the Paris Reparation Agreement of 1946 and by the War Claims Act of 1948. The Paris agreements of 1955, recently ratified by the Congress of the United States, is the latest recognition of our agreement with Germany to retain external assets seized during the war in lieu of reparation or restitution.

After thorough study of the matter your committee concludes that at the present time there exists no rule of international law requiring the return of enemy property, or prohibiting international agreements to hold such property in lieu of reparations. Since there is no international legislature, the only rules of international law are those which nations incorporate in treaties and agreements among themselves; or which they permit some freely selected tribunal to formulate for them. Hence, inasmuch as the International Court of Justice has not yet spoken to the contrary, and since the nations concerned have made treaties on the point, those treaties are the only binding international law on the subject of retention or return of former enemy property. Your Committee believes, therefore, that this question is strictly one to be decided as a matter of grace without reference to any purported rule of law.

The cornerstone of the majority report of the committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate is the unfounded assumption that the holding of enemy property to meet war claims amounts to confiscation. This is based upon the equally unfounded assumption that there is a binding rule of international law which would require the return of enemy property regardless of international agreements to the contrary. The statement of the problem as "to confiscate or not to confiscate" means that the answer has been assumed in the statement.

Your committee is in complete accord with the view that confiscation is contrary to principles of law. It concludes, however, that the question of confiscation is not involved in the agreement of the Allied Governments and Western Germany whereby the former waive their claims to reparations in return for the commitment of Germany to compensate its own citizens for any property which the Allied Nations retain and apply to war claims.

Your committee is of the opinion that if any general rule that an enemy's private investments should be returned to him following a war ever existed (and the exceptions to it are so numerous as to cast serious doubt on its existence), the distinction between old-time war and the totality of modern warfare would require its change. Ancient warfare divided populaces into combatants and noncombatants and the property of warring nations into war materiel and peaceful private property. Such distinctions did not exist during World War II and this was particularly true in Germany.

The majority report of the Senate committee stresses the fact that the goodwill of the German people may be gained by returning the property. If such policy should be followed, there is at best a doubtful chance of thereby buying our former enemy's gratitude, a very rare and highly perishable international commodity, which may or may not produce tangible benefits to our citizens. If this property should be returned, Germany's responsibility for the damage arising out of its aggression against the United States will be completely shifted to American taxpayers. In one of the most generous acts in history the American people have already given Germany $3 billion to rehabilitate itself. Your committee believes that the moral position of the United States has been thereby sufficiently established.

The passage of the Dirksen proposal would constitute a unilateral repudiation of our obligations to our allies. They waived their rights against Germany on the understanding that the United States acted in good faith when it agreed to retain enemy property in lieu of reparations. Even assuming that we could buy German goodwill by canceling this agreement, the committee believes that the price of incurring the enmity of our allies would be exorbitant. In the agreement between the Allies and Germany the latter agreed to compensate its own citizens for all property vested and retained by the Allies. Thus, the proposal made in the Dirksen bill would also be a request to the German Government to repudiate the obligations which it has assumed to its own citizens.

The bill under consideration proposes to return enemy property at its increased value. The increase arose out of the fact that many of the properties were used in our war effort against Germany and Japan. The increased value is very substantial and in some cases runs as high as 2,000 percent. Under the proposal this unearned increment would not even be subject to normal United States taxation. Your committee does not see how this proposition can be defended on any ground. If we are to follow the policy of building up an enemy's property, and of returning it to him tax free at the end of a war, a premium is placed on aggression.

The war constituted a tremendous drain upon the assets of all the Allied governments. It is a well-known fact that our allies were forced to liquidate many of their foreign holdings to finance their war effort. They were unable to place their overseas assets in a sanctuary. We do not believe that the United States should take unilateral action which would preserve the assets of the aggressors, when those of our allies were consumed in our common cause. If the proposal is to be considered at all, our allies should be consulted.

The majority report of the Senate committee points out that Congress has the power to change the agreements with Germany and our allies. There can be no question that Congress has such power to reverse our policy, and, as a matter of grace, return former enemy assets seized in lieu of reparations. If this is done, and the consideration moving from Germany is to be destroyed, should not the whole agreement fall? Apparently it was not suggested to the Senate committee that such a waiver of Germany's obligation might resurrect its legal obligation to make reparations and to meet the claims of all of those it damaged. Our allies fear

that unilateral repudiation on our part would be followed by a demand from Germany for general release from all of its obligations. Your committee feels that if Congress should decide to return the property it should make an explicit declaration that the overall policy of the United States requires that existing agreements with our allies be abrogated. Your committee believes that the United States should adhere to the agreements which it made, both with its Allies and with Germany, with respect to enemy property.

Your committee concludes that any possible goodwill which could be secured by giving Germany and Japan an additoinal half-billion dollars in this manner would be insignificant when weighed against the injury which would be done to the reputation and standing of the United States with the other signatories of the Paris Agreement on Reparation from Germany. The mere fact that the Dirksen bill was considered by Congress caused other nations to question the good faith of the United States. Therefore, the committee is opposed to the amendment of the Trading With the Enemy Act in the manner proposed by the Dirksen bill.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT B. ELY, III.
VICTOR C. FOLSOM.
WILDER LUCAS.

MAY 13, 1955.

Introduction of Legislation for Limited Return of Enemy Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, has addressed, under date of June 6, 1955, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives a letter enclosing a draft bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended. The letter together with the draft bill and an explanatory memorandum on the draft bill, were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on June 7, 1955.

As chairman of the committee, I have introduced the bill as drafted by the Department of State and, in order to afford all interested parties an opportunity to study the recommendations made by the Department of State in its letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the explanatory memorandum, I am making these two documents public simultaneously with the introduction of the bill.

JUNE 6, 1955.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I enclose a draft bill "To amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended." The first part deals with the assets in the United States, title to which was vested in the Government under the Trading With the Enemy Act as a consequence of World War II. By far the greatest portion of these assets was owned by nationals of Germany and Japan. In general, this part of the draft bill provides for a limited return as a matter of grace of the vested assets, or of the proceeds of their liquidation, to such of the former owners or their successors in interest as are natural persons not in territory behind the Iron Curtain. The maximum value of property or proceeds returnable to any one individual is fixed at $10,000. In the few instances where property of charitable, religious, and educational organizations was vested, such property would be returned without regard to its value. Interests in trademarks would be returned to business enterprises as well as natural persons. All interests in copyrights would be divested in favor of the former owners or their successors in interest. Patent interests would not be returned.

The second part of the draft legislation deals with certain claims of United States nationals against Germany arising out of World War II. This part establishes a fund of $100 million to finance payments to such claimants. The compensation payable to any single claimant probably would not exceed $10,000.

I enclose also with the proposed bill a memorandum describing its provisions in detail and, where necessary, explaining the reasons for particular provisions. However, in order to afford a clear understanding of the general purposes of the draft legislation, it will be helpful to add here a brief statement of the events which have led to its recommendation.

By the first War Powers Act of December 18, 1941, Congress amended the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917 to grant the President extensive powers to vest assets in the United States owned by foreign countries or their nationals. The 1917 act already contained provisions for the return of such of the property to be vested as might ultimately prove to be owned by nonenemies. However, neither the 1917 act nor the 1941 act provided for the disposition of World War II vested assets finally determined to be owned by enemy governments or their nationals. That matter was left open.

Early in 1942 the President created the Office of Alien Property Custodian as an independent agency and delegated to the Alien Property Custodian the power to vest property other than securities, cash and credits. In June 1945, the Custodian's vesting power was expanded to include German and Japanese-owned securities, cash and credits. As a result, substantially all the German and Japanese assets known to be in the United States as of December 7, 1941, were vested by the Custodian or by his successor, the Attorney General.

In January 1946 the United States and 17 allied nations other than the Soviet Union and Poland executed the Paris Reparation Agreement whereby they agreed upon the division of the limited German assets in kind available to them as reparation from Germany, including German external assets located within the respective signatory countries. The 18 Allies agreed to hold or dispose of these external assets in such a way as to preclude their return to German ownership or control. This program was formulated in light of the Allied experience after World War I when the attempt in effect to exact reparation from Germany's current production failed and led to Germany's default on its obligations. Moreover, it was clear after the end of World War II that the United States would have to provide major assistance to Germany to prevent disease and unrest. This country, therefore, favored measures which would limit Germany's World War II reparation to its external assets and other assets in kind, thus relieving Germany of reparation payments from current production and avoiding the indirect financing of reparation by the United States. The Paris Reparation Agreement met this objective.

In 1946 Congress enacted section 32 of the Trading with the Enemy Act authorizing returns of vested property to persons having merely technical enemy status and to enemy nationals who were persecuted by their own governments. In the same year, Congress added section 34 to the Act, providing for the payment of pre-vesting debt claims of Americans against enemy nationals whose property was vested.

By the War Claims Act of 1948 Congress added section 39 to the Trading with the Enemy Act, providing that German and Japanese assets not returnable under section 32 should, after the payment of debt claims therefrom, be retained by the United States without compensation to the former owners. In addition, the War Claims Act of 1948 gave priority to the use of the net proceeds of liquidation of this retained property for the payment of compensation to American civilian internees of the Japanese, to American servicemen captured by the forces of Germany, Japan and other governments which failed to provide adequate subsistence as required by the Geneva Convention and to certain Philippine religious organizations which had rendered aid to American personnel. This Act did not provide for the payment of war claims of Americans arising out of war-caused property damage but authorized a study of the problem. The Attorney General has advanced a total of $225 million from the proceeds of vested assets for purposes of the War Claims Act of 1948. Thus that act constituted a Congressional disposition of the German and Japanese assets vested under the Trading with the Enemy Act during World War II. Furthermore, that act, in effect, gave confirmation to the reparation program set forth in the Paris Reparation Agreement by devoting German external assets to the satisfaction of certain American war claims.

The Japanese Peace Treaty of 1952 also followed the policy incorporated in the Paris Reparation Agreement with respect to enemy external assets. It provided that the Allied powers should have the right to retain and liquidate Japanese property within their jurisdictions. In addition, the peace treaty provided that Japan should compensate nationals of the allied powers in Japanese currency for war damage to property located in Japan. In consequence of these and other provisions the United States and the other Allied powers waived any additional war claims against Japan.

The Bonn Convention of 1952 for the settlement of matters arising out of the war and the occupation, between the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States, Britain, and France, also affirmed the policy of the Paris Reparation Agreement. In that convention the Federal Republic of Germany agreed to compensate its own nationals for their loss of external assets by the vesting and other action of the Allied powers. For their part these countries gave the Federal Republic a commitment that they would not assert any claims for reparation against its current production. These provisions of the Bonn Convention were carried forward and approved in the Paris Protocol of 1954 which was approved by the Senate April 1, 1955, and came into force on May 5, 1955.

On July 17, 1954, Chancellor Adenauer wrote to the President to enlist his support for legislation which had been introduced in Congress for the general return of vested German assets. The Chancellor referred to the hardships suffered by many of the German individuals whose property had been vested. He mentioned old people, pensioners, and beneficiaries of insurance policies and inheritances in particular, and urged that alleviation of these hardship cases would make a considerable contribution to furthering the friendship between the peoples of the United States and Germany. The President's reply of August 7, 1954, referred to the fact that the Allied Governments decided to look to German assets in their territories as a principal source for the payment of their claims against Germany. The Presi-

dent expressed sympathy with individuals in straitened circumstances in Germany for whom the operation of the vesting program in the United States had created particular hardship. He pointed out that American nationals who had suffered losses arising out of the war had received no compensation, also with resultant hardship in many cases. Finally, the President stated that although none of the bills then pending in Congress with regard to the return of vested assets had the approval of his administration, the problem was receiving earnest consideration and he hoped that a fair, equitable, and satisfactory solution could be achieved. The matter was also raised by Chancellor Adenauer with the President during the former's visit to Washington in October 1954 and conversations between representatives of the two governments were agreed upon.

The Japanese Government also expressed a hope that the return of vested Japanese assets would be considered. The subject was discussed by Prime Minister Yoshida with the President on November 9, 1954.

As a result, the executive branch formulated the plan represented by the enclosed draft bill. Thereafter representatives of the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany discussed the matter of vested German assets and the related problem of American war claims against Germany. Subsequently, similar discussions were held between representatives of the United States and Japan. During these discussions representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan were informed that the executive branch would recommend a limited return of vested assets to natural persons up to a maximum of $10,000 as a matter of grace for the purpose of alleviating the cases of hardship caused by vesting. The United States representatives pointed out that this action would result in a full return to approximately 90 percent of the former owners whose property had been vested and would achieve the equitable solution sought by the President. The United States representatives expressed the hope that, in addition to relieving hardships of an appreciable number of German and Japanese people, this action would serve to make even more secure the ties between the United States and those countries. The representatives of the German Federal and Japanese Governments expressed the hope that the proposed return would subsequently be followed by a wider program. They were informed, however, that the administration did not envisage a broader return than was contained in the present recommendation.

It appears that the contemplated return program can be financed out of vested assets, or their proceeds, presently held by the Attorney General. After taking into account the payment of $225 million under the War Claims Act of 1948, returns and debt claims paid and payable under existing provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, and the payment of other authorized sums, it is estimated that there will remain a balance of $60 million for use in the proposed program. Its cost would be approximately $50 million for West German assets and $7.5 million for Japanese assets. If the funds in the possession of the Attorney General should prove to be inadequate or not readily available for the program, alternative supplemental means of financing are provided for in the bill.

The proposed bill would amend section 9 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, to permit the sale of important vested properties despite the pendency of a suit for the return thereof and to permit the substitution of the proceeds of sale or just compensation, at the election of the claimant, as the subject of the suit. This provision is included in order to facilitate the expeditious termination of the alien-property program and in order to remove the Government from the operation of certain American business enterprises.

It will be noted that returns of vested assets would not be made to persons behind the Iron Curtain. It would be desirable for the program to be extended to such persons by supplemental legislation when conditions warrant.

The second part of the proposed bill provides for the compensation of American claimants against Germany for war damage to property. This part of the bill would set aside for this purpose a fund of $100 million out of sums payable by the Federal Republic in settlement of its indebtedness to the United States for postwar economic assistance. The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission estimates that there are 24,000 claims of American nationals outstanding against Germany for property damage during World War II, amounting to approximately $232,500,000. The Commission also estimates that a fund of $100 million would permit the satisfaction in full of all claims not over $10,000.

The proposed earmarking of $100 million of the repayments the Federal Republic of Germany is to make for postwar economic assistance rendered by the United States would be, in effect, a restoration of the $100 million of reparation from Germany used for other purposes under the War Claims Act of 1948. The total value of vested Japanese assets is approximately $60 million. Consequently, it is clear that of the $225 million deposited by the Attorney General in the Treasury under the War Claims Act of 1948, at least $165 million was derived from German assets. According to estimates of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, total payments under that act to satisfy American prisoners of war and other claims which arose in Europe will amount to approximately $60 million. As a result, about $100 million of the proceeds of German vested assets will have been used to satisfy claims attributable to countries other than Germany—i. e., in the main, Japan. If this sum had not been so used, it would have been available at the discretion of the Congress to pay American property damage claimants against Germany. The creation of the $100 million fund would, therefore, not establish a precedent for the payment of American property damage claims against foreign governments out of public moneys.

The draft legislation was prepared by the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Treasury Department, and the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. It is based upon a full and careful consideration of the problems involved, and represents the considered position of the administration. The proposals should be considered as a whole. Prompt and favorable action would resolve a troublesome problem in the field of our foreign relations and would strengthen the ties of friendship with the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan.

I respectfully request that early consideration be given to the proposed legislation which is transmitted herewith. A similar communication is being sent to the Vice President.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that the enactment of the proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM ON DRAFT BILL "TO AMEND THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT, AS AMENDED, AND THE WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948, AS AMENDED"

The first part of the proposed bill is designed to effect: (1) The return in general as a matter of grace of vested assets other than patent interests to natural persons not behind the Iron Curtain up to a limit of $10,000; and (2) the return of trademark and copyright interests to business enterprises as well as to natural persons without regard to the $10,000 limitation on value and, insofar as copyright interests are concerned, without regard to the limitation on return to persons behind the Iron Curtain. Property owned by charitable, educational, and religious organizations would also be returned without regard to the $10,000 limitation. It would treat several types of vested assets in a manner different from the treatment accorded the great bulk of such assets. The differences are deemed advisable by virtue of past policy, facility of administration of the contemplated return program and the desirability of terminating the World War II alien property program as quickly as possible. There is set forth below a résumé of the manner in which the proposed bill would affect various categories of assets.

CATEGORY I. ASSETS OTHER THAN TRADEMARK, COPYRIGHT AND PATENT PROPERTIES, AND PRINTS OF MOTION PICTURES

The great bulk of the vested assets falls within this category. The proposed bill would effect return of these assets in an amount not exceeding $10,000 to natural persons. Natural persons would not be deemed to have had any ownership interest in assets vested from a business enterprise in which they have stock or some other beneficial interest. Consequently, no part of such assets would be returned to them. Persons who have made settlements or compromises of claims or suits with respect to vested property would be barred from obtaining any property in addition to that which they obtained in the settlement or compromise. Persons convicted of war crimes would be excluded from return.

The following property would be excluded from the return program by reason of United States commitments to foreign governments:

1. Vested property located in the Philippine Islands and subject to transfer to the Republic of the Philippines under the Philippine Property Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1381–86).

2. Certain securities of American issue looted in the Netherlands by Germany during its occupation of that country. Under an agreement with the Netherlands executed January 9, 1951, the United States undertook to return such securities to the Government of the Netherlands or its nationals.

3. Property which this Government is obligated to release or to receive or retain pursuant to existing agreements between the United States and certain World War II Allies relating to the resolution of conflicts between the alien-property custodians of the signatories. These agreements, entered into by the United States pursuant to Public Law 857, 81st Congress, provide for transfers of various categories of vested property by and to the United States.

Returns of property in category I would be effected under a claims program. Claims would have to be filed with the Attorney General within 1 year of the enactment of the proposed legislation. In order to facilitate the administration of the contemplated program new claims would be required of persons who have previously filed claims under section 9 or section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act. This requirement would obviate the necessity of reopening thousands of closed claims and examining additional thousands of claims now pending under those sections to obtain the new data required by the proposed legislation.

The proposed bill provides that in general a return of vested property in this category will be subject to a deduction of the amount of conservatory expenses incurred with respect to such property, a deduction to cover general administrative expenses, a reserve for any unpaid taxes with respect to the property, and a reserve for any pending debt claims against the property under section 34 of the Trading With the Enemy Act. If the Attorney General should hold property vested from the prevesting owner in addi-

tion to the property returnable under the proposed bill, the amounts of expenses and reserves would be deducted, to the extent possible, from such additional property.

A person who has a pending claim under section 9 (a) or section 32 could claim return under the proposed bill only upon the filing of a written waiver renouncing his claim under section 9 (a) or section 32 to the amounts retained for expenses and reserves. As a practical matter this provision would reduce the amount of vested property returned under this bill to a section 9 (a) or section 32 claimant by the amount of the deduction for administrative expenses plus the amount of any debt claims. On the other hand, it would permit the claimant to receive a return under this bill without the necessity of establishing himself as a nonemeny under section 9 (a) or as a persecuted person or other eligible claimant under section 32. The provision for waiver has been included in the proposed legislation in an attempt to close out as expeditiously as possible the great majority of the pending title claims—that is, those which are filed against vested property worth less than $10,000. Elimination of these claims would be a major step toward the termination of the administration of World War II vested property.

CATEGORY II. TRADEMARK PROPERTIES

Since the use of a vested trademark would be deceptive except in connection with goods made by the prevesting owner of the mark, or the successor in interest of such owner, it is deemed advisable to make a general return of trademarks and unexpired interests in prewar contracts relating to trademarks. The proposed bill would authorize returns of trademarks or contract interests therein without regard to the $10,000 ceiling and thus would enable a natural person to receive such marks and contract interests in addition to $10,000 of other vested property. However, royalties or other income received from the marks on contract interests during the period of vesting would be charged against the $10,000.

The proposed bill would authorize the return of trademarks and contract interests therein to business enterprises as well as natural persons. However, any royalties or other income derived from such marks or contract interests during the period of vesting would not be returned to business enterprises. Also excluded from return by reference to specific vesting orders are certain possible reversionary or other similar rights relating to trademarks and good will which, since prior to World War II, have been assigned to and held by vested corporations which are still controlled by the Attorney General and which conduct manufacturing businesses. In general, the vesting orders excluded from the return provisions are "catchall" vesting orders issued as a precautionary measure for the purpose of cutting off any unknown or undiscovered rights which may have been retained by enemy nationals with respect to the good will, trademarks, and trade names of these vested corporations. Some of the excluded vesting orders vested contract rights which related to such trademarks and trade names. In many cases these nebulous reversionary rights may be nonexistent or without any real value, although the catchall vesting orders still serve a precautionary purpose. To return the rights vested by these vesting orders might invite unnecessary harassment of vested corporations and their involvement in litigation with respect to those portions of their businesses in which the trademarks are used, notwithstanding the fact that the vested corporations for many years have operated these businesses independently of the former owners of any purported reversionary rights.

Inasmuch as the Attorney General has only about 325 vested trademarks and trademark contract interests, the return of such property would not involve the administrative problems described below with regard to copyrights. Consequently the return would be effected by the claims program described under category I and would be subject to the restrictions mentioned there. The proposed bill provides that where a trademark or trademark interest was owned prior to vesting by a person in East Germany, it would be returned to a person in the Federal Republic of Germany if a competent agency of the Federal Republic certifies that an equivalent trademark has been registered by it for such person.

CATEGORY III. COPYRIGHT PROPERTIES

Vested copyright interests number more than 300,000. These cover vested copyrights and copyrights which are the subject of prewar contracts. A program for the return of copyrights and unexpired contracts interests in copyrights of the nature described under category I might well become unmanageable because of the number of claims which might be filed and the complexity of claims of authors and composers in connection with vested pre-war contract interests. Furthermore, since a substantial number of copyrights and contract interests would not be returned under the program proposed for category I by reason of the exclusion of East Germans, the Attorney General's Office would be forced to continue the administration of such copyrights and interests without any apparent practical means of terminating such administration within a reasonable time.

As a result of these considerations it has been deemed advisable in the proposed bill to effect the return of copyrights and unexpired contract interests therein by means of a statutory divestment which would require no action on the part of the Attorney General. Such divestment would be effective without regard to the value of the copyrights and contract interests and would serve to effect returns to business enterprises as well as to natural persons. The divestment would not extend to royalties or other income received during the period prior to divestment. Such funds would be returnable only to natural persons within the limits and pursuant to the claims program described under category I.

It should be noted that the divestment proposed in the draft bill would serve to return copyrights and unexpired contract interests therein to persons and firms in the east zone of Germany. Thus, although such persons and firms would not receive the return of any money in the hands of the Attorney General they would become entitled to any income from their copyrights and contract interests which might accrue after divestment. It is not possible to estimate the future annual amount of such income since the number and identity of former owners in the east zone of Germany are not known at this time. However, the annual income realized from all vested copyrights and copyright contract interests during the past 5 years has averaged approximately $200,000. Even assuming that a substantial part of this figure would be paid annually to persons behind the Iron Curtain during the next several years, divestment seems preferable to the administrative problems and substantial expense inherent in an extended claims program or other procedure for separating East Germans from other persons entitled to copyrights and contract interest therein. In addition, the divesting technique would enable the Attorney General to be rid of the administration of copyright properties and thus hasten the termination of the alien property program.

The proposed bill specifically excludes from return the moneys collected in connection with the publication in the United States of Hitler's Mein Kampf, the diaries of Paul Joseph Goebbels, the memoirs of Alfred Rosenberg, and a work by a leading Nazi, Otto Skorzeny. The copyrights and contract interests connected with these works are also excluded from divestment. A photographic history of the Nazi Party, formerly owned by Heinrich Hoffman, its official photographer, has been excluded from return. In addition, the copyright to a scientific motion picture entitled "Meiosis" has been excepted from divestment because of its wide use by American educational institutions. Since this copyright was owned by an East German firm prior to vesting divestment, this might impede its future use in this country.

CATEGORY IV. PATENT PROPERTIES

Patents and interests in prevesting patent contracts are excluded from return by the proposed bill. It has been the policy of the United States since 1942 to make the patents and technology vested from World War II enemy nationals readily available to American industry by means of revocable nonexclusive royalty-free licenses for the life of the patents. This policy has been widely publicized and has been relied upon by licensees in making investments to develop and exploit the patents. The exclusion of patent interests from the return program is thus in keeping with the Government's longtime policy and will serve to safeguard the interests of American licensees.

With two exceptions, the income received by the Alien Property Custodian and the Attorney General from vested patents and contract interests in patents would be returned by the proposed bill to natural persons up to a limit of $10,000 in the same manner as other property in category I. One exception is the money collected from American licensees under prewar contracts with enemy nationals deemed violative of the antitrust laws. This money was collected because the Government did not suffer the disability of the enemy party. (See *Standard Oil Co.* v. *Markham*, 57 F. Supp. 332, affirmed sub. nom. *Standard Oil Co.* v. *Clark*, 163 F. (2d) 917 (C. C. A. N. Y. 1947), certiorari denied, 333 U. S. 873). It would of course, be inequitable to enrich a returnee with a gift of funds which he himself could not collect. The second exception arises from the fact that much of the income received from vested patents and patent contract interests was derived from their use in war production. In returning vested patents and patent contract interests to nationals of Allied countries the Attorney General deducts royalties received from war production and turns them over to the Treasury. The returnee is compensated by his own government pursuant to reverse lend-lease arrangements. In the negotiation of the understanding between the United States and Italy which led to the return of vested Italian property it was agreed that patent royalties derived from war production should not be returned. In view of the fact that the segregation of such royalties would have been difficult, it was agreed that all royalties earned by vested Italian patent and patent contract interests prior to the end of 1945 would be deemed attributable to war production. The policy and date agreed upon in the Italian understanding have been used in the proposed bill.

CATEGORY V. PRINTS OF MOTION PICTURES

The Attorney General administers a considerable number of prints of motion pictures. Few, if any, of the individual prints are of more than nominal value. The aggregate value is not commensurate with the expense which would be involved in processing claims for their return. Furthermore, these prints can be duplicated elsewhere in almost every instance. Accordingly, the proposed bill excludes the prints from return except in cases where claims thereto have already been filed under existing law. The bill further provides that the Attorney Gen-

eral deliver the prints to the Library of Congress, which may retain or dispose of them in any manner it deems proper.

A section analysis of the first part of the proposed bill is set forth below:

The proposed section 1 would make technical amendments to section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act necessitated by other provisions of the proposed bill.

Section 2 of the proposed bill would add new sections 40 to 43 to the Trading With the Enemy Act to effect the proposed returns of vested property. Such returns will not affect or be affected by transfers of the proceeds of liquidation of vested property to the War Claims Fund under the War Claims Act of 1948.

The proposed section 40 (a) would effect the returns in general of vested property to natural persons up to a limit of $10,000. It specifically excludes from return the securities subject to the looted securities agreement with the Netherlands, copyrights and copyright contract interests, motion-picture prints, patent and patent contract interests, property transferable to the Philippine Government and property subject to intercustodial agreements with foreign countries. It further provides that if the property of a prevesting owner exceeds $10,000 in value and cannot be divided into a portion having a value of $10,000, then return would consist of a lesser portion, if practicable, augmented by a supplemental return. Finally, section 40 (a) would make returns thereunder subject to deductions for expenses and reserves as set forth in section 40 (m).

The proposed section 40 (b) relates to trademarks and trademark contract interests. It would provide that they should be deemed to have no value in connection with the $10,000 limit on returns and in connection with valuation for the purpose of deducting general administrative expenses under section 40 (m). Section 40 (b) would make business enterprises eligible for the return of trademarks and contract interests therein. The reference to specific vesting orders would exclude from return certain possible reversionary or other similar rights relating to trademarks and goodwill connected with vested corporations still administered by the Attorney General. Trademark registration by the German Federal Government authorities would govern the return of trademarks in certain instances. All returns of trademarks would be subject to outstanding licenses issued with respect thereto.

The proposed section 40 (c) would authorize return of vested property to charitable, religious and educational institutions without regard to its value.

The proposed section 40 (d) would limit to $10,000 the amount of property to be returned to the estate or the heirs of a prevesting owner who has died since the date of vesting. In addition, it would specifically prohibit any one person from receiving more than $10,000.

The proposed section 40 (e) would bar returns to persons claiming vested property who have previously settled or compromised suits or claims with respect to such property, to persons or firms behind the Iron Curtain as of January 1, 1955, or subsequently, and to persons convicted of war crimes. Section 40 (e) (2) uses the phrase "maintained his principal dwelling place" in connection with the disqualification of persons behind the Iron Curtain. This phrase is used in preference to language appearing in section 2 of the Trading With the Enemy Act which defines an enemy as including a person resident within enemy territory. The definition in section 2 has caused difficulty, in part because of uncertainty as to the weight to be given to a person's intent as to the future place of his abode. The phrase "principal dwelling place" would eliminate such intent from consideration.

The proposed section 40 (f) would exclude from return by reference to specific vesting orders any income received by this office from Mein Kampf and other works mentioned above and would exclude the Hoffman photographic collection both as to income and actual physical property.

The proposed section 40 (g) would exclude the return of moneys received from patent licensing contracts deemed to be violative of antitrust statutes and moneys received from the use of patents prior to the end of 1945.

The proposed section 40 (h) would bar return of property to a person claiming such property through his stock ownership or other beneficial interest in a business enterprise which owned the property prior to vesting.

The proposed section 40 (i) is practically identical with section 32 (d) of the Trading With the Enemy Act. It would restore persons to whom return is made to all rights, privileges and obligations in respect of the returned property which would have existed if the property had not been vested. This section would specifically exculpate the Government from any liability in connection with its administration or use of the property during vesting. It would also bind the returnee by any notice received by the Attorney General prior to return and impose on him any obligations which accrued with respect to the property during the time of its vesting. The period of vesting would not be included for the purpose of determining the application of any statute of limitations to the assertion of any rights by such person.

The proposed section 40 (j) is practically identical with section 32 (e) of the Trading With the Enemy Act. It would permit persons eligible for return under the proposed section 40 to sue subsequent to the return to establish as against the returnee any right, title or interest they may have in the returned property. The period of vesting would not be included in determining the application of any statute of limitations to any such suit.

The proposed section 40 (k) would require that claims for return under section 40 be filed within 1 year from enactment in such form as the Attorney General shall prescribe. New claims would be required from persons who have filed previously under other sections of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

The proposed section 40 (l) would prevent anything in section 40 from affecting the rights of claimants to pursue remedies under sections 9 (a), 32 or 34 of the act. It would prohibit a person claiming property under section 9 (a) or section 32 from receiving a return under section 40 unless he waives his claim under section 9 (a) or section 32 to the amounts of expenses and reserves retained under section 40 (m). A return of property to any person under section 40 would be prohibited while a claim to the same property filed by some other person is pending under section 9 (a) or section 32.

The proposed section 40 (m) would provide for the retention by the Attorney General of the amount of conservatory expenses incurred with respect to the returnable property, a charge for administrative expenses and reserves for the payment of taxes and debt claims. It would provide that such expenses and reserves be retained from any additional property of the owner prior to vesting. Any unused portion of a reserve for the payment of taxes or debt claims would become returnable as though it had not been a part of a reserve. Returnees would be permitted to pay the amounts of expenses or reserves in lieu of the liquidation of returnable property to provide funds therefor.

The proposed section 40 (n) relates to the controls exercised by the Treasury Department pursuant to section 5 (b) of the Trading With the Enemy Act over assets owned by Communist Chinese and certain other blocked nationals. Returned property would be subject to these controls if owned by such persons.

The proposed section 40 (o) would make the determinations of the Attorney General in the administration of section 40 final.

The proposed section 40 (p) contains definitions.

The proposed section 41 (a) would permit the use of currency of the Federal Republic of Germany payable to the United States to finance returns to persons in the Federal Republic or the western sectors of Berlin when the Attorney General deems that such action should be taken.

The proposed section 41 (b) would provide for the same possibility with respect to Japan if circumstances permit.

The proposed section 42 (a) defines "copyrights."

The proposed section 42 (b) would provide for the divestment of vested copyrights effective 90 days from the enactment of the section. This 90-day period is proposed in order to afford time for adequate notice and instructions to American licensees and American parties to vested prewar copyright contracts regarding the effect of divestment on their future payments of royalties and taxes thereon. Divestment would be made subject to outstanding licenses previously issued and assignments of interests in such licenses. The rights remaining in the Attorney General under licenses would be transferred effective the day of divestment to the owner of the divested copyrights. All royalties accrued up to that day would have to be paid to the Attorney General.

The proposed section 42 (c) would divest the vested interests in prewar contracts relating to copyrights effective 90 days from the enactment of the section. All sums payable under such contracts prior to the day of divestment would have to be paid to the Attorney General.

The proposed section 42 (d) would exclude from return the right to sue for infringement during the period of vesting.

The proposed section 43 would authorize the transfer of motion-picture prints to the Library of Congress with the exception of prints subject to claims under present law. The Library would have full discretion to retain or dispose of the prints in any manner it deems appropriate.

Section 3 of the proposed bill would amend section 32 (h) of the Trading With the Enemy Act to exclude from returns to designated successor organizations thereunder any property returnable under the proposed section 40.

Section 4 of the proposed bill would amend section 9 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act to permit the sale of vested property held subject to suit under that section upon a determination by the President that the interest and the welfare of the United States so requires. Any claimant in the suit would be permitted to elect, after the sale, whether to take his share of the proceeds of sale, if successful in the suit, or to request a determination of just compensation.

The final part of the proposed bill is to provide for the settlement of five categories of American war claims against Germany. Payments on allowed claims are to be made from the proposed German claims fund which is to consist of $100 million to be set aside from repayments by the Federal Republic of Germany under the agreement settling the United States claim for postwar economic assistance to Germany. The general types of claims authorized in the proposed measure are as follows:

(1) Physical damage to or physical loss or destruction of property located in Albania, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Greece, Poland, or Yugoslavia in the period beginning

September 1, 1939, and ending May 8, 1945. Such losses must have occurred, under the proposed bill, as a direct consequence of military operations of war or of special measures directed against such property because of the enemy or alleged enemy character of the owner. The property must have been owned directly or indirectly by the claimant at the time of the loss, damage, or destruction. Certain items of personal property and intangibles are expressly excluded from the types of property, loss of which would otherwise be compensable under the bill.

(2) Damage to or the loss or destruction of ships or ship cargoes owned by the claimant at the time of such damage, loss or destruction, which must have occurred as a direct consequence of military action by Germany in the period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending May 8, 1945.

(3) Net losses by insurance companies incurred in the settlement of claims for insured losses, including reinsured losses, of American owned ships or ship cargoes as a direct consequence of military action by Germany in the period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending May 8, 1945.

(4) Loss or damage on account of the death or injury of any civilian national of the United States who was a passenger on any vessel engaged in commerce on the high seas if such death or injury was a result of military action by Germany during the period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending December 11, 1941 (the date upon which the United States declared war against Germany). In this general category the proposed bill would also include claims for the loss or damage to the property of any such passenger.

(5) Losses resulting from the removal of industrial or other capital equipment in Germany which was owned by the claimant on May 8, 1945, and removed for the purpose of reparation including losses from any destruction of property in connection with such removal.

Within the limits of the categories of claims provided for in the proposed bill, except with respect to death or personal injury claims, provision is made for the recognition of claims based upon assignments to the claimant of the rights or interests in lost or damaged property or property that was subject to reparation removal.

Recognition of claims of stockholders or the direct or indirect owners of any other proprietary interest in a corporation or other entity, under the proposed bill would be conditioned upon 25 percent ownership, direct or indirect, of such interest at all times between the date of loss and the date of filing claim, by United States citizens or nationals. Each award under this type of claim would be in an amount equal to the respective percentage interest of each claimant in the total corporate ownership. In other words if one-half of the stock of a corporation were owned by five persons, each having a one-tenth ownership of the total stock and the total loss was $1 million, such individuals collectively would be entitled to one-half the loss and each claimant to one-fifth of such one-half or $100,000.

Payment of awards certified to the Secretary of the Treasury by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission would be made in the following order of priority:

(1) Death and disability claims would be paid in the full amount of each award certified.

(2) Payments of up to $1,000 would then be made on awards certified for all other claims. Thus, if the award is for $1,000 or less the full amount certified would be paid.

(3) Thereafter, payments would be made on the unpaid principal of awards in equal amounts on each award or in the total amount of the remaining unpaid principal amount, whichever is less. The total payments under priorities (2) and (3) on any single award would not exceed $10,000 under the bill.

(4) Within the limits of any remaining funds available for payment of awards and after satisfying the requirements of priorities 1, 2, and 3 in that order, any remaining unpaid principal of an award would be paid on a prorated basis. If the funds remaining available for payment of awards, for example, amounted to 10 percent of the aggregate of such unpaid awards, each such unpaid award could be paid to the extent of 10 percent of the unpaid balance of such award.

Eligible claimants in the case of natural persons are required to be nationals of the United States on the date of the loss for which a claim is filed and continuously thereafter until the date of filing such claim. In the case of a person who may have lost United States citizenship through marriage to a citizen or subject of a foreign country, such person would be an eligible claimant if citizenship is reacquired prior to the date of enactment of the proposed bill, and if such person would have been a national of the United States at all times on or after the date of such loss if such marriage had not taken place. A national of the United States is defined as any person who is a citizen of the United States or who owes permanent allegiance to the United States. Aliens are expressly excluded from such definition.

Eligible claimants in the case of corporations or other business entities, under the proposed bill, are required to have been incorporated or otherwise organized under the laws of the United States or of any State or Territory thereof or the District of Columbia on the date of the loss, damage, destruction, or removal of its property, and not reincorporated or otherwise reorganized under any other laws in the period beginning with the date of the loss and ending with the date of filing claim. In addition the proposed bill requires as a condition of eligibility for such corporations or business entities that at least 50 percent of the outstanding capital stock or other proprietary interest in such entity was owned directly or indirectly by natural persons who could qualify as eligible claimants as described in the preceding paragraph.

These provisions of eligibility follow the traditional and generally accepted principle of international law relating to the nationality of claimants asserting claims against governments other than their own. It is believed a strict compliance with the eligibility requirements established by international law is essential since, in theory, the claims are to be paid from the proceeds of vested German assets that have been vested as reparation.

In addition to the foregoing major provisions of the proposed bill certain necessary collateral provisions are included relating to the claims-filing period, limitation of attorneys' fees, deduction for administrative expenses, and similar administrative matters.

These are more particularly described in the following section-by-section analysis of this part of the proposed bill.

Section 5 amends the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, by designating such act as title I.

Section 6 amends new title I by changing the word "act" to "title" wherever the word "act" appears.

Section 7 further amends the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, by adding at the end thereof the following proposed title II containing sections No. 201 through 220. These sections provide as follows:

Section 201 contains definition which would require that the loss, damage, destruction, or removal for which compensation is claimed shall have occurred within the territorial limits of Albania, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Greece, Poland, and Yugoslavia as those limits existed in continental Europe on December 1, 1937. These countries are included since no provision has been made or is likely to be made for the payment of American war claims arising in these areas. In addition this section defines the term "Commission" to mean the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States.

Section 202 creates in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the German Claims Fund and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to cover into this fund $100 million from the moneys to be paid to the United States by the Federal Republic of Germany under the agreement dated February 27, 1953, settling the United States claim against Germany for postwar economic assistance. In addition this section requires the deduction from such fund of an amount equal to 5 percent thereof as reimbursement to the United States for expenses incurred by the Commission and the Treasury Department in the administration of the claims program subsequently authorized.

Section 203 contains the basic authorization to the Commission for the receipt and settlement of five categories of claims which have been previously described in the summary of the major provisions of the bill.

Section 204 specifically excludes certain items of personal property, including tangible property, from the types of property the loss, damage, destruction or removal of which forms the subject matter of any claims authorized under section 203. Section 204 further provides that in determining the amount of any award credit shall be given for the amount which any claimant has received or is entitled to receive from any source on account of the same loss, damage, destruction or removal, thus preventing double benefits.

Section 205 relates to the eligibility of natural persons and corporations or business entities as claimants under proposed title II. The provisions of these sections have heretofore been described in more detail.

Section 206 relates to claims based upon proprietary or other interests in corporations or business entities. These provisions have been heretofore summarized and need not be repeated.

Section 207 requires the Commission to give public notice in the Federal Register within 60 days after enactment of the proposed bill or within 60 days after enactment of legislation making appropriation for administrative expenses, of the time limit for filing claims, and permits a maximum of 18 months after such publication within which claims may be filed.

Section 208 restricts recoveries under any claim which accrued to a national of the United States and purchased by another national of the United States to the amount of the actual consideration last paid for such claim prior to January 1, 1953. In other words, this section is designed to prevent unconscionable gains as a result of purchases motivated by this legislation.

Section 209 requires the certification of claims to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment.

Section 210 requires all awards to be paid from the German claims fund and permanently appropriates the money in such fund for the making of payments on all certified awards.

Section 211, subsection (a), sets forth the order in which awards shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury. The provisions of this section have been heretofore described in the summary of the proposed bill and need not be repeated here.

Subsection (b) requires payments and applications for such payments on certified awards to be made in accordance with regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Subsection (c) provides that the term "award" shall mean the aggregate of all awards certified in favor of the same claimant

except awards made with respect to death or disability claims where the basis of the claim would not consist of a series of losses by the same claimant.

Subsection (d) authorizes the issuance of a consolidated award in favor of several claimants having an interest in the subject matter of the claim and provides that such awards shall indicate the respective interests of such claimants therein. In other words, for example, where the original owner of destroyed property, who would have been an eligible claimant, dies either before or after filing a claim, the heirs of such deceased original owner would be entitled to a consolidated award based upon such loss to the extent of their respective fractional interests therein.

Subsection (e) expressly authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to create a reserve for the payment of certified awards and to defer payment thereof if such deferment is necessary or desirable and thereupon to make payments on account of all other awards. In other words, this provision is designed to prevent payments under later priorities from being delayed because of legal problems or other difficulties arising in connection with payments under awards having an earlier priority. For example, payment of an award may become impossible to make at a particular time because of litigation among survivors of an award holder or possibly because of corporate dissolution. Under these circumstances the payment of such award might be delayed for several years. Under this provision, meanwhile, a reserve could be set up in an amount sufficient to cover such an award and the Secretary could thereupon proceed with payment of awards having a later priority.

Section 212 provides that the payment of any award unless in the full amount of the claim shall not divest the claimant, or the United States in his behalf, of the right to assert a claim against any foreign government for the unpaid balance of his claim filed with the Commission.

Section 213 provides that the decisions of the Commission in the settlement of claims shall be final and conclusive without recourse to review in any court. It contains, further, the usual provision authorizing the Comptroller General to allow credit in the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer for payments in accordance with the decisions of the Commission.

Section 214 authorizes appropriations by the Congress for necessary funds with which to administer the program.

Section 215 limits the fees of attorneys or others acting in behalf of any claimant in connection with any claim filed with the Commission to a maximum of 10 percent of the total amount paid pursuant to a certified award and sets forth certain criminal penalties for violation of this provision. This provision represents the accepted policy of limiting such fees in connection with claims and other services in matters involving agencies of the Government of the United States.

Section 216 authorizes payments under certified awards to the legal representative of any deceased person or persons under legal disability except where such payments will not exceed $1,000 and there is no qualified executor or administrator. In such cases the Comptroller General would be authorized to determine who is entitled to such payment. In other words, where the payment does not exceed $1,000 the expense of obtaining the appointment of administrators or guardians or of probating a will will not be required.

Section 217 prevents payments to any persons who collaborated with the enemy in World War II.

Section 218 incorporates certain definition and administrative provisions contained in the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, making such provisions applicable to the administration of the German claims program. These provisions relate to rule-making authority, notice of the claims filing period, hearings, subpena powers and related administrative matters.

Section 219 requires the completion of the German claims program within 5 years after the enactment of legislation making appropriations to the Commission for administrative expenses and provides that nothing in the provisions with respect to such program shall be construed to limit the life of the Commission or its authority to act with respect to other claims programs.

Section 220 directs the Secretary of State to make available to the Commission records and documents required by the Commission in the settlement of the claims authorized under proposed title II.

Section 8 of the proposed bill is a severability provision.

Our Scandinavian Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech entitled "Our Scandinavian Heritage," delivered by our colleague, the distinguisher senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], on the occasion of the 300th anniversary of the founding of the Lutheran Mission in Pennsylvania. It was also the 175th anniversary of the arrival in Pennsylvania of the Swedish officer who came to give his technical advice to the colonists, during the American Revolution. This was an able and informative address on "Our Scandinavian Heritage," and it is a privilege to have the honor of presenting it for printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SWEDEN AND AMERICA

America, it has been said, is a nation of nations. From the ends of the earth men have come to these shores seeking freedom and a chance to build a new life for themselves and their families. As they have become part and parcel of the American community, they have nevertheless remembered, as indeed they should, the lands from whence they sprung. It has become something of an American tradition to honor the contributions to our common life of the sons and daughters of those great nations across the seas from whom we are descended. We are gathered here today representing an important and vital part of that tradition.

The first immigrants from Sweden, save for a few scattered adventurers, arrived on the American Continent in the spring of 1638. The colony of New Sweden represented a dream of the great Gustavus Adolphus put into action by his daughter Queen Christina. For a time it seemed that New Sweden—established in an area embracing parts of Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, and New Jersey—where no other power was firmly established would be a success. But Sweden, preoccupied with the gigantic European struggle of the Thirty Years' War could not support expansion into the New World. Thus in 1655 New Sweden fell to the Dutch and 9 years later the Dutch—in their turn were displaced by the English.

But if New Sweden was not fated to be a strong bastion from which Swedish political influence could spread over this continent—it nevertheless laid the foundations for the deep and lasting Swedish contribution to American life. Thus, in 1640, with the arrival of the Reverend Reorus Torkillus in New Sweden, the Lutheran confession entered into the mainstream of American religous life. The Reverend Mr. Tarkillus was not only the first Lutheran minister to serve in the New World, he was also the first Protestant clergyman to serve in the Delaware River Valley. He and his successors, notably the Reverend Johan Campanius, were the first Luthern missionaries to the American Indians and laid the foundations for the religious tradition in the valley which continued long after the Swedish authority had been extinguished.

The members of the Swedish colony were excellent farmers, men unafraid of hard work whose diligence was admired by William Penn. To their eternal credit, the Swedes of the Delaware Valley had a record of fair dealing with the Indians similar to that of Penn and the Quakers. As a matter of fact, Swedes served as Penn's interpreters, and because the Indians knew and trusted them, they accepted their assurances that the Quakers, too, were humane and trustworthy. The Colony of New Sweden was a haven for the persecuted—dedicated to liberty of person and security of property in a world where to espouse these ideas required a true pioneering spirit. Unlike some other colonies, neither slavery nor the slave trade was ever permitted in New Sweden.

This Swedish tradition of libery found a cause to admire in our Revolution. Many Swedish officers served in the American, French, and Dutch naval and military forces and participated in the fighting against the British. There were Swedish sailors with John Paul Jones. In June 1780 Count Axel Von Fersen, the best known of the Swedish officers, served the cause of American independence with skill and distinction. In this country thousands of men who had descended from the earliest Swedes served in the Continental Army and two men of Swedish lineage, John Hanson and John Morton, were outstanding figures of the Revolution. The former was elected "President of the United States in Congress Assembled" in 1781—the chief officer of government under the Articles of Confederation—while the latter is credited with casting the decisive vote in the Pennsylvania delegation, which became in fact the decisive vote in the whole Continental Congress, in favor of independence. His signature is appended to that historic declaration. When the Revolution was over and the independence had been won Sweden was the first European nation to sign a treaty of friendship and commerce with the infant Republic, United States.

The story of that latter migration is well known to all of you, how the America letters were read and reread by entire Swedish villages, how America became known as the "Framtislandet"—the land of the future. Our Middle West became a new home to hundreds of thousands of Swedish folk. As a northern people they were quite naturally partial to the northern areas of this country and spread throughout Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, and the Dakotas. But man soon looked for new horizons and moving across the country in straight lines they pioneered again in the building of the Pacific Northwest.

The men and women of Swedish origin who came to this country brought with them the sterling qualities of the race—the vigor, the appetite for work, the desire to lead useful lives—that soon enabled them to fit right into the American picture and become among the most valuable and valued members of

the national community. Swedish farmers helped make our land among the most productive in the world. Swedish-American loggers played an indispensable part in the development of our lumbering industry. Swedish laborers by the thousands were employed in building the railroads of the great Northwest.

But if Swedish contributions were essential to our peaceful development, they were no less vital to our national defense.

In the fields of American art and culture, Swedish contributions have likewise been highly significant. Wherever they settled in considerable numbers, people of Swedish origin founded academies or colleges. No immigrant group was more concerned about education than the Swedes, and it is no wonder, in consequence, that people of Swedish background are always found among our intellectual leaders. From the vast array it is extremely difficult to single out any individuals for special mention, but none would begrudge, I am sure.

People of Swedish descent have been active in civic and political enterprise. They have demanded the best in their public servants and have furnished political leaders of the highest type at all levels of our Government.

In 1687 William Penn wrote: "I must needs comment the Swedes' respect to authority and kind behavior to the English. They do not degenerate from the old friendship between both Kingdoms. As they are people proper and strong of body, so they have fine children and almost every house full. Rare to find one of them without 3 or 4 boys and as many girls. Some 6, 7, and 8 sons. And I must do them that right; I see few young men more sober and laborious."

Like all Americans, they felt the urge to move West—to develop. The colony in Pennsylvania furnished only the beachhead. From that point their story was the story of all Americans. The West offered a challenge. They met that challenge head on.

And they are meeting the challenge in the same fashion today.

There is another characteristic virtue of the Swedish people. A most important virtue because it is the basis and cornerstone of international peace. It is their respect for the rights and integrity of others. They have not established colonies by the force of arms or lived off the fruits of the toil of the vanquished. Instead they have assisted others in realizing their legitimate economic and social ambitions. That the only secretaries of the United Nations have been Swedish emphasizes this.

In our own country today peace is the most important of all issues. It is dearest to our hearts, the greatest goal we can achieve.

At the present moment in the press and in the Congress, there is much debate as to who is ahead in the race for mastery of the air, ourselves or the Russians. The fact is that we are today, but the accelerated productions of Soviet factories will put them ahead tomorrow. This will result in fresh effort on our part. The arms race is never ending.

The cold reality is that in arms, planes, battleships and devilish destruction there is no guaranty or even mild assurance of peace. We cannot rattle an atomic or hydrogen bomb at the world and say "massive retaliation to those who do not agree with us." That same retaliation will be the fate of those who first employ it. A very few if any of us here today, will survive such a conflict.

There is no safety in atomic arms. The answer to peace is not to be found in war. It is only to be found in the patient practice of this virtue of consideration of the economic and political rights of others, characteristic of Scandinavia.

As a Nation, I feel we tend to talk about this more than putting it into active practice as do the Swedes.

But we must realize that so long as any people in this world are denied a right to a place in the sun. So long as one people is permitted to exploit another people, there is no peace on earth.

This is a terrific responsibility for us. There is so much profit to be made by exploitation, but we must restrain in our own citizens from indulging it. It is so easy for us to tolerate a friendly government that oppresses its citizens on the basis that it is no business of ours. In my opinion it is and must be if we are ever to achieve peace. For I am quite sure that a just God is as jealous for the rights and happiness of a Malayan as of any American.

One of the greatest goals we have sought to reach as long as I can remember is peace in our time. We have had it off and on; between World War I and World War II. We thought we had it permanently after World War II, only to have the Korean war come along.

We have attempted to achieve it with everything from top level to low level conferences in this country and abroad. We have had many high sounding words and phrases thrown about on the subject. We have had experts thoroughly conversant with the foreign situation as it existed at that particular moment, but I wonder if we have achieved through all these discussions, conferences, any semblance of the meaning that you and I attribute to the word "peace." A few moments ago, I mentioned the arms race that has been underway certainly through my generation and yours, the weapons that the arms race produced. As I view the situation, we have achieved a sort of an armistice, an uneasy one at that with the world tottering on the brink of peace or war. Actually, it depends upon whether you are an optimist or a pessimist, which one, peace or war?

It is one of the most unusual situations to hear words about peace on every hand. As far as I can tell, everyone you talk to wants peace. Certainly the wishes for peace aren't reserved to the White House or the State Department. We in the Senate want it just as badly as anyone else, regardless of party. In my talks to the Members of the House of Representatives, they feel the same way. Carry the discussions into the street and you won't find a single person who openly says he wants a war. We are led to believe that everyone in Russia except the high command wants peace. I think that story would be generally true throughout Europe, if we were to take a poll of sentiment among the people.

By this time you are probably reaching the same conclusion I am. The whole world clamors for peace, yet prepares for war. The individual in Russia whose inner spirit cries out most for world peace is the busiest right now in an airplane factory turning out planes that can fly faster, farther, and carry a heavier load than our B–52's. Or, he is feverishly working to improve their version of the atomic or hydrogen bomb. Or, probably, some of them may be studying maps of the free world trying to see what people to put under the totalitarian thumb next.

The sad part about all of this are the other needs that go wanting through this confusing picture. For example, medical research. Mental health. Research into agriculture. Use of our forest industries. Attempting to get the earning level of the average man throughout the world to the point where he can enjoy more than the bare essentials of existence.

Probably as a nation, we have done more to get the world thinking along those lines than any other. But we should, because of all the world, ours has been the most productive nation, mentally and physically. But even with our efforts they have not been enough. Nor will they be enough until a few of the goals we talk about are achieved and achieved they must be if we are ever to convince the rest of the world that we honestly are bent on betterment—not exploitation—if we can convince peoples elsewhere that we merely intend to help them develop their own resources and then use them even more wisely than we have been able to use own. If we can convince them that this talk they get about our capitalistic system being out strictly for dollars instead of bettered lives is nothing but propaganda—then I think that world peace will be ours during our generation because we will have shown them the way through deeds, not talk. Through action, not conferences. Through humanitarian efforts—not through gestures. Through a helping hand from the heart, not through a closer look at the almighty dollar.

Independence in the Judiciary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Los Angeles Bar Bulletin. This article comprises the address given by the learned jurist, Leon R. Yankwich, chief United States district judge, southern district of California, upon the occasion of the admission of a group of young lawyers to the Federal bar. May I recommend its reading to the Members of Congress and students of government.

The article follows:

WHAT KIND OF INDEPENDENCE DO WE ASK IN THE JUDICIARY?

(By Leon R. Yankwich, J. D., LL. D., chief judge, U. S. District Court, Southern District of California)

The code of ethics for lawyers which is embodied in one of California's codes—Business and Professions Code, section 6068—makes it one of the duties of the attorney "to maintain the respect due to the courts of justice and judicial officers."

In a prior talk to a group of admittees I treated one phase of the question (Los Angeles Bar Bulletin, vol. 28, No. 11, p. 393 et seq.) stressing particularly the delicacy of the relationship between counsel and court, and the necessity—in the words of Mr. Justice Jackson in a famous case—not to "equate contempt with courage or insults with independence." (*Sacher* v. *United States* (1951, 343 U. S. 1, 14).)

Now I speak of the duty of the lawyer to help maintain the independence of the judiciary by encouraging courageous action by judges.

I. AN INDEPENDENT JUDICIARY

An independent judiciary is a part of the democratic tradition. It was one of the complaints of the colonists against the English King that he stood in the way of an independent judiciary. In the Declaration of Independence they charged that—

"He has obstructed the administration of justice, by refusing his assent to laws for establishing judiciary powers.

"He has made judges dependent on his will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries."

And the Constitution sought to assure the independence of the Federal judiciary by providing for service during good behavior and against diminution of compensation during their continuance in office, for both

constitutional judges and for such judgeships as may be created by the Congress. (Constitution, art. III, sec. 1.)

All agree on the need for such independence. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, when he was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, stated the meaning of this independence in this manner:

"An independent judiciary is a strong judiciary, a fearless judiciary, having respect for its coequal branches of Government, but respecting even more its paramount obligation to the American people in interpreting the supreme law of the land." (WILEY, The Meaning of an Independent Judiciary, 1948, 7 F. R. D. 553, 556)

By contrast, in totalitarian countries such as Soviet Russia, the judiciary is considered an organ of state power. (Julian Towster, Political Power in the U. S. S. R., 1917–1947, (1948) p. 304.)

The division of powers embodied in the Constitution also expresses the ideal of the independence of the judiciary without the power of the executive and legislative branches to encroach on its prerogatives. These are truisms which no one disputes. Yet, at times, in the conduct of lawyers toward the judiciary, the desire to achieve an immediate result becomes more important than the maintenance of respect of courts and of judicial officers, and their courageous independence. More specifically, many lawyers in their zeal to serve their client's cause, do not hesitate to take action which not only reflects on the person of the judge, but which is not consistent with protests as to a desire to have a fearless, independent judiciary. And often, as I read in the books and see in the press, things said concerning judges not only by laymen but by lawyers, I ask myself this question: Do we want really independent judges or do we just mean judges who are only independent as the momentary whim of a litigant may command?

II. DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGES

What gave me the thought of emphasizing this point again was the suggestion of a rather independent young university man, not a lawyer, who had lived in Minnesota and had great admiration for Judge Luther W. Youngdahl, that he should have stepped aside in the Lattimore case when requested to do so by the Government. The attitude is very common and is one shared by many lawyers who feel that the moment it is indicated that a litigant or his lawyer does not desire a particular judge to try the case, the judge should take himself out of the case. Speaking as a judge of over a quarter of century experience, I would say that in ordinary cases, the judge's attitude should conform to the thought expressed by the Supreme Court of the United States in a famous case:

"For what concern is it to a judge to preside in a particular case; of what concern to other parties to have him so preside?" (*Berger* v. *United States* (1921, 255 U. S. 22, 35).)

The answer is that, ordinarily, it is of no concern. But a Federal judge of great courage who presided at some famous trials in Missouri involving general election frauds, has condemned the attitude that would call for immediate disqualification at the request of a litigant in this language:

"* * * Such things have been said, but not by those who think. The father of such a conception of the duty of the judge is the fundamental error that the judge is but a referee at a game, chosen by the players, subject to removal at the will of either. He is not a referee at a game. He is not the representative of the parties. He is the representative of the sovereign and he will abandon the trust reposed in him only at the sovereign's command or when he falls at his post." (*United States* v. *Buck* (D. C. Mo., 1937, 18 F. Supp. 827, 828–829).)

In the particular case, the attempt was made to disqualify Judge Merrill E. Otis, who, in ruling on some legal questions relating to the various indictments before the trial, had used rather strong language in characterizing the acts with which the defendants were charged. He was not commenting on their truth. He was merely commenting on the enormity of the offenses. The court of appeals sustained his attitude, saying:

"His statements were made in the course of judicial proceedings prior to an appeal to this court. The common knowledge of a widespread condition in Kansas City would not necessarily include any particular precinct. As said in *Craven* v. *United States*, (1 Cir., 22 F. 2d 605, 608), 'The statute never contemplated crippling our courts by disqualifying a judge, solely on the basis of bias, or state of mind (*Berger* v. *United States* (255 U. S. (22) 42, 41 S. Ct. (23) 236, 65 L. Ed. 481)) against wrongdoers, civil or criminal, acquired from evidence presented in the course of judicial proceedings before him.' An opinion based upon evidence cannot be considered a personal prejudice. There was nothing in these judicial utterances indicating that the judge entertained or expressed any opinion that this appellant was guilty." (*Ryan* v. *United States* (1938, 8 Cir., 99 F. 2d 864, 871).)

Unlike the statute of California which requires a charge of disqualification to be determined by another judge (California Code of Civil Procedure, sec. 170), the Federal law of disqualification provides for automatic disqualification. The judge is required to disqualify himself if the affidavit is factually sufficient. (28 U. S. C., sec. 144.) But the courts have held that the affidavit must charge bias or prejudice that is personal and that a mere attitude towards legal problems or adverse rulings are insufficient. (*Ex parte American Steel Barrel Co.* (1913, 230 U. S. 35, 43–44); *Wilkes* v. *United States* (1935, 9. Cir., 80 F. 2d 285, 289); *Price* v. *Johnson* (1942, 9 Cir., 125 F. 2d 806, 811); *Beecher* v. *Federal Land Bank of Spokane* (1945, 9 Cir. 153 F. 2d, 987, 988); *Littletown* v. *DeLashmitt* (1951, 4 Cir., 186 F. 2d 973, 975); and see the writer's opinion in *Cole* v. *Loew's, Inc.* (D. C. Cal., 1948, 76 F. Supp. 872), affirmed, in this respect, in *Loew's Inc.* v. *Cole* (9 Cir., 1950, 185 F. 2d 641, 646).)

And so, when years ago, I declined to step out of a case at the behest of a motion picture company because they claimed I had, before the case was before the Federal courts, expressed a view as to the law involved in the litigation—a position which the Court of Appeals upheld—I was acting in the same spirit as many other Federal judges past and present. It would have been easier to deny disqualification and transfer the case to another judge. But the easiest way is not always honorable. So I wrote:

"Judge Otis has echoed the sentiment which I have expressed repeatedly, that a lawsuit is a means to achieve justice through law—not a game in which the prize is to go to the more skillful. * * * Like him, I must reject an attempt to disqualify which has no legal foundation to support it and which, if successful, is, for the reasons already indicated, fraught with serious dangers for the efficiency and independence of the Federal Judiciary. So doing, I incur the risk of having the defendant feel that, consciously or unconsciously, my action might result in resentment against them or their opponent think that—as lawyers say—I might lean backwards. But I must hazard such speculation. And so I have taken my stand. With God as my witness, I cannot, in good conscience, take another." (*Cole* v. *Loew's, Inc.* (1948, D. C. Cal., 76 F. Supp. 872, 881).)

In so acting, we deny to litigants the right to pick judges, as we deny them also the right to designate what cases we are or are not to try. If bias or prejudice exists against the litigant, it is unitary. It cannot be split up by counsel claiming that in a particular case, they will not question the judge's qualifications to act, but they will do so in others.

This attitude applies to litigants in civil cases and to litigants in criminal cases. In the Missouri case it was the defendants who sought to disqualify the judge. But in the recent Lattimore case, it was the Government of the United States which attempted to do the same thing. The facts are well known and can be treated with brevity to point the moral of this talk.

Owen Lattimore was indicted for perjury. On a previous indictment, Judge Luther W. Youngdahl had thrown out some of the perjury counts. On appeal, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, sitting en banc, sustained the ruling of Judge Youngdahl in the most important assignments of perjury. (*United States* v. *Lattimore*, 1954, U. S. App. D. C., 215 F. 2f 847.) There had been no trial of the cause. The action of the judge related merely to motions to dismiss the indictment upon which he ruled. Nevertheless, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia filed an affidavit of bias or prejudice against Judge Youngdahl in which it was claimed that the language he had used in granting the motions indicated a prejudice in favor of the defendant or a conviction that he was not guilty. Judge Youngdahl used these burning words to answer this charge:

"The factual allegations are simply that in taking judicial action in this case I used certain words. These words cannot reasonably be thought to 'give fair support' to an inference of bias and prejudice. Moreover, the Supreme Court determined long ago '* * * that the bias or prejudice which can be urged against a judge must be based upon something other than rulings in the case' *Berger* v. *United States* (255 U. S. 22, 31, 41 S. Ct. 230, 232, 65 L. ed. 481). Obviously therefore it must be based upon something other than the words the judge used in setting forth his rulings.

"At bottom the affidavit is based upon the virulent notion that a United States judge who honors and adheres to the sacred constitutional presumption that a man is innocent until his guilt is established by due process of law has 'a bent of mind' that disables him from conducting the fair and impartial trial to which both the accused and the Government are entitled. The affidavit is therefore so patently and grossly insufficient that I cannot escape from the conclusion that the purpose of the affidavit is to discredit in the public mind the final action of our courts or else to intimidate the courts themselves. It follows that those who made or authorized the certificate that the affidavit was made in good faith acted irresponsibly and recklessly as lawyers and officers of the Government.

"Under my oath to preserve sacred constitutional principles, I can properly do no less than to strike the affidavit as scandalous." (*United States* v. *Lattimore* (1954, D. C. D. C., 125 F. Supp. 295, 296).)

III. A DANGEROUS PROPOSAL

In this connection there is a proposal fraught with great danger to which I desire to call attention.

I begin with a story. When Bishop John Fell was at Oxford, Tom Brown came before him for punishment for an infraction of some of the rules. The noted clergyman told the young man that he would overlook the matter if he made an on-the-spot satisfactory translation of the following epigram of Martial:

Non amo te, Sabidi, nec possum dicere quare:

Noc tantum possum dicere non amo te.

Tom Brown translated:

I do not love thee, Dr. Fell,
The reason why I cannot tell:
But this alone I know full well
I do not love thee, Dr. Fell.

In the same spirit, the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate, at its last session, recommended for adoption a bill—S. 3517 of the 83d Congress—which would amend the section on disqualification so as to allow a litigant to disqualify a Federal district judge by filing an affidavit stating "that he verily believes the judge before whom the matter is pending has a personal bias or prejudice either against him or in favor of any adverse party."

Contrary to the present statute which requires "the facts and reasons for the belief" to be stated and which calls for a judicial determination whether the affidavit is legally sufficient, the proposed amendment specifically provides that the affidavit "need not state the facts and the reasons for the belief," that bias or prejudice exists. When the affidavit is filed, it automatically disqualifies the judge. The amendment provides that he shall have no further jurisdiction "with respect thereto, but shall notify the senior (the chief) circuit judge of the circuit and another judge from a different district shall be assigned to hear such proceeding."

This means that in a multiple court like ours consisting of 11 judges, such an affidavit could disqualify every judge in the district. In States which have only one district, judges would have to be imported from other States and, in the District of Columbia, from another circuit. The judicial function would stop in its tracks, as the chief judge of the circuit is asked to assign a judge to hear the matter.

The Committee on Revision of the Laws of the Judicial Conference of the United States, in a report dated November 8, 1954, and signed by its three members, Albert B. Maris, circuit judge, third circuit, chairman; Clarence G. Galston, district judge, eastern district of New York, and William F. Smith, district judge, New Jersey, has condemned the bill in these words:

"The effect of the proposed bill is thus to give to every party in a proceeding in a district court the right to one peremptory challenge of the district judge who is to try this case and thereby to secure the assignment of a judge from another district to try it. The Committee on Revision of the Laws believes that it would be unwise and not in the public interest to accord parties to a litigation such a right which they could exercise arbitrarily and without specifying any basis for their allegations of bias and prejudice. To permit it would open the way to gross abuse and might well disorganize the operations of a busy district court as well as drain off the personnel of adjoining district courts who would have to be assigned to hear cases in which affidavits of bias and prejudice had been filed."

The judges of this court unanimously instructed me at their meeting of December 13, 1954, to express their opposition to this bill. In a letter addressed to Judge Maris, under date of December 14, 1954, I wrote:

"It is our view that a bill that would allow disqualification at the whim of a litigant, including the Government—which, in our district, is one of the most important litigants in civil matters—is very dangerous. Particularly objectionable is the provision that requires that a judge from a different district be assigned by the chief circuit judge to hear the matter. This, in effect, would mean that in this district, which has 11 judges, the filing of an affidavit of disqualification would disqualify not only the judge before whom the matter is heard but every member of the court."

It is regrettable that a committee of the Senate of the United States, consisting of lawyers, should have given its approval to a piece of legislation which would enable a litigant, including the United States Government, to disqualify by an affidavit not based on facts all the judges of a district. To paraphrase the words of Mr. Justice Jackson, the supreme object of the lawyer's calling "is to protect the process of orderly trial." (*Sacher* v. *United States*, 1952, 343 U. S. 1, 14.)

A law which would allow disqualification upon such basis is perhaps indicative of the tragic era in which we live—in which values seem to be forgotten and we seem to be all intent on doing the unusual—without regard as to whether a gain in a particular case is worth the sacrifice of that orderly process which is of the essence of the administration of justice in a democratic society.

This is not to deny that judges, being human, are above bias or prejudice. But the present law which requires that the facts which constitute such bias of prejudice should be stated protects adequately any litigant. A litigant, be he the Government or a private person, is entitled to equal justice. Ours is the great promise of Magna Carta:

"To none will we sell, to none will we deny or delay right or justice."

A principle which would enable a litigant to gain an advantage by the mere filing of an affidavit stating beliefs not supported by facts would destroy one of our most precious of our heritages—justice through law.

So once more I call upon you, as younger members of the bar, to "stand at Armageddon" and battle for the protection of the integrity of the courts by helping defeat all attempts to undermine the judicial process by cowing judges. Only if you help judges stand unafraid will they be able to live up to the Biblical injunction:

"Ye shall not be afraid of the face of man." (Deuteronomy 1:17.)

Three Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Discovery of Boston Harbor by Samuel de Champlain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. KENNEDY] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article furnished by the La Societe Historique Franco-Americaine of Massachusetts, in commemoration of the 350th anniversary of De Champlain's discovery of Boston Harbor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAMUEL DE CHAMPLAIN

Numerous historical publications relate where and how Samuel de Champlain, the great navigator, explorer, and cartographer, penetrated the forests of America and paddled the waters of the interior, how he mapped and charted harbors from Belle Isle in Labrador to Chatham on Cape Cod, how he went about from 1603 to 1635 to establish settlers in Canada, and how he prevailed as his brother's keeper.

The people of Vermont, Maine, New York, Quebec, and Ontario have erected many monuments to the Champlain memory. In each instance the people there proudly identify and mark their soil with monuments and tablets, each relating one or more Champlain accomplishment. Each monument, each marker transmits an association of sturdy body, sturdy morals, great adventure, great discovery, great accomplishment, and great love of fellow man.

In Massachusetts, on Cape Ann, and far across on Cape Cod, bronze markers preserve the Champlain memory. Champlain as cartographer published excellent charts of Gloucester, Chatham, Nauset, and Plymouth Harbors. In 1605 he discovered, explored, and mapped our shoreline and wrote a diary account of his discoveries. In his own modest manner he recites that he cast anchor July 16, 1605, in Boston Harbor at about what is now the East Boston Airport. He then named Massachusetts Bay, La Baie des Isles, and the Charles River, La Rivière du Guast, in honor of his Huguenot commander, Pierre du Guast, Sieur des Monts.

The following quotations about Boston Harbor are taken from volume III, page 380, et seq., of the Champlain Society edition of the Works of Samuel de Champlain: "July 1605: After I had drawn for them (the Indians at Cape Ann) with charcoal, the bay and island about where we were * * * they pictured for me with the same charcoal another bay (Massachusetts Bay) which they represented as very large. * * * Doubling the cape we entered a bay where there were many vines, Brazil peas, pumpkins, squashes, and roots that are good, having something of the taste of artichokes, which the Indians cultivate. * * * Continuing our course to the southwest, we saw several islands upon either hand. Having gone 7 or 8 leagues, we anchored near an island (Noddle's Island now East Boston) where we saw many columns of smoke all along the coast and many Indians who came running to see us. * * * We sent 2 or 3 men toward them in a canoe, giving these men knives and rosaries to present to the Indians, who were much pleased therewith and danced several times in acknowledgment. * * * All along the coast there is much cleared land sown with Indian corn. * * * The country is very pleasant and agreeable. * * * On the following day on the 17th of the same month (July 17, 1605), we weighed anchor to go toward the cape which we had seen the day before which appeared to be to the south-southwest of us (Scituate)."

Special events commemorating the discovery and mapping of Massachusetts Bay and Boston Harbor by Champlain, will be held in Boston the week of July 10, 1955, at about the place where Champlain cast anchor July 16, 1605. This is done because Champlain was a man of excellent character and high accomplishment. Historians consider him great as man, explorer, and navigator and they attribute to him the qualities and attainments he depicts as requisite in his writing entitled "Treatise on Seamanship and the Duty of a Good Seaman." The Société Historique Franco-Américaine and Edward Rowe Snow, the historian of Boston Harbor, do well in marking for the people of America, this commemoration of Champlain and the 350th anniversary of his discovery of Boston Harbor.

Masaryk Memorial Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me in Chicago, Ill., on May 29, 1955. The occasion was the dedication of the Thomas G. Masaryk Memorial, which is located on the Mid-

way near the University of Chicago campus.

The dedication was under the joint auspices of numerous patriotic, religious, fraternal, and civic organizations, whose membership is composed chiefly of Americans of Czechoslovak birth or descent.

It was a splendid demonstration of unity and harmony.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA, OF NEBRASKA, AT MASARYK MEMORIAL DEDICATION, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 29, 1955

This day is destined to remain for many years as an important milestone in the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans of Czechoslovakian descent. Many are with us here in body, all are here in spirit to honor the memory of one of the truly great men of our century. This day has similar import for all Americans for we are here to honor not a nationalist nor the patriot of a single country, but a world renowned figure of deep meaning to all humanity. We are here to dedicate formally this splendid tribute in granite and bronze, erected in the memory of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, whose greatness far outreaches the boundaries of his own beloved Czechoslovakia.

Masaryk has a permanent place in the hearts of men everywhere to whom the ideals of democracy are more than just mere political catch phrases. One effective way to evaluate fully his meaning and his devotion to the cause of the common man is to see in his personality and life something of the qualities of great Americans who worked, lived and fought for human liberties through the past 9 score years of our own Nation's history.

The names of Masaryk and George Washington are often linked. Each is justly called father of his country. Anyone familiar with Masaryk's devotion to the concept of the utter need for dignity and integrity of the individual man, is struck immediately with the similarity between Thomas Masaryk and Thomas Jefferson, the ideological father of the American Republic. It was Abraham Lincoln who carried further the ideals of pure brotherhood and who fought against dissension and cleavages of the American Union. It was Masaryk who carried on similar battles in his own Czechoslovakia—4 scores of years after Lincoln's untimely death. And finally there are Masaryk and Wilson, both dreamers of a better, peaceful world; both advocates and supporters of international cooperation designed to bring about peace and good will among men the world over.

Viewed in this way, it is no wonder that we see in Masaryk more than just the founder of the Czechoslovak Republic and its first president during the hesitant years following World War I. We see him as a true world figure, as one of the rare occurrences of a century when a really outstanding man rises on the crest of world history and plays his role nobly, honorably and to a successful conclusion. This is no doubt why a famous world author, when once asked who should be chosen as the head of the United States of Europe, answered without a moment's hesitancy, that only Thomas G. Masaryk of all the men of Europe could fill such a lofty position.

Masaryk had a great love for America. This love and his affinity with its ideals were based not only on book learning but upon personal contact and observation as well. His American wife was a tremendous influence and inspiration in his life. Some 50 years ago, he lectured here at the University of Chicago. In the early days of May 1918, after returning from Siberia where he inspired his legionnaires in their courageous efforts, he came to this great city of Chicago to receive truly unforgettable acclaim.

Then occurred a highly significant event in his life. From Chicago he went directly to Gettysburg to visit its famous memorial battlefield. During his uninterrupted study and meditation, much of it while strolling along the silent paths of that sacred ground, Masaryk rounded out his thoughts, reevaluated the world situation, and formulated his historical message to Woodrow Wilson wherein he stressed the importance of Czechoslovakia's independence to the needs of world history then unfolding.

During this stay, Masaryk made the acquaintance of a local minister who was greatly impressed by the appearance, personality and thoughts of this lonely stranger gathering strength and resolve from the hallowed soil of Gettysburg. In appreciation of his sympathy for Masaryk, the minister gave him a souvenir—an old cannonball, taken from the battlefield there.

This cannonball Masaryk brought with him to Prague and treasured it always as a symbol and reminder of the insight which he gained at Gettysburg into the essence of the American proposition and of the great possibilities which that essence possessed for infusion into the lifestream of his own beloved Czechoslovakia.

What is it that he learned at Gettysburg? What was the deep truth and the inspiration which he grasped there? We can best tell that from his message of welcome delivered to a delegation of American Legionnaires at the Independence Day celebration July 4, 1919, at the Old Castle in Prague. Here are his words:

"The entire battlefield at Gettysburg is but a museum of monuments. Not only every officer but every single private who fought and fell there is remembered here, either by a headstone or by his name engraved on a joint monument. It was there that I fully realized the profound foundation of the American democracy, yes democracy in the Army too, a democracy which remembers not only its generals, but all those who have lost their lives in defense of man's liberties. And when later I read Lincoln's immortal words, engraved in steel, that the Government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from this earth, I was deeply moved and fully understood the meaning of American democracy. I say American democracy because there are as many forms of democracy as there are states and nations. For myself, I feel nearest to and accept the principles of American democracy. At this time I can declare that these principles always were, are now and ever shall be the guiding principles of the political aspect of my life, because they are near to our nation, and because our people accept them for their own, and will ever be united by them with America, united in this spirit of freedom and democracy."

Masaryk never wavered from this belief. He clung to it to his dying day. During all those years, the old cannonball from Gettysburg occupied a place on his writing desk as a steadfast reminder and memento of the deep, stirring, emotional experience at that memorial battlefield in Pennsylvania.

This is but one of many instances which clearly show how close Masaryk was to the spirit and soul of America.

It is highly fitting that this historical dedication be held in honor of this great champion of the rights and aspirations of individual man. We honor him as one to whom biographers and writers have referred as "the finest intellect of the century." We honor him as the philosopher who became a statesman in spite of himself, as the father of a state who was also its simplest citizen, and as an unchallengeably firm democrat who believed in the rule of tolerance. It is especially fitting that this memorial is being dedicated so close to the University of Chicago where 50 years ago Professor Masaryk delivered his first series of lectures on the problems of the small nations.

But let us note that at this same time there goes on behind the Iron Curtain a long and sustained program in which his memory is being vilified, maligned, and smeared by the Communists. Recently in Masaryk's own city of Prague there was unveiled a monument to Stalin the Conqueror, in further evidence of the uneasy anxiety of the powers that be to drive the memory of Masaryk from the hearts and minds of his faithful people.

Ladies and gentlemen, knowing history and human nature as we do, knowing the mind and determination of the Czechoslovakian people for what they are, we can state unequivocally our faith and confidence that no monuments like that of Stalin, no suppression, no oppression, no amount of slander and vituperation cast in Masaryk's direction will ever change or conquer the people of this brave nation.

These people will not accept the Communist credo of hate which is now busy trying to destroy all that is noble, fine, and lofty in man. Their inborn steadfastness and loyalty, developed through the centuries, will not change over night or in a few short years.

Only a few short weeks ago, after a decade of painstaking, torturous effort, the Austrian Treaty was signed. Under its terms, the Soviet will recede from its post World War II high watermark for the first time. May it be the first of similar additional retreats. Under the leadership of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles there have been other events of great meaning in the international field which have resulted in a new and optimistic trend for easing of tensions and toward real peace. This gives rise to renewed hope that restoration of liberty and freedom in Masaryk's native land will not be far off. Constant and renewed demand is in order for free and fair elections in the small nations still held in bondage, including Czechoslovakia, so that the great day will be hastened. Every suitable and legitimate avenue should be explored and used to the utmost in the incessant search for peace so that the President liberator's dreams for his fellow countrymen will once again come to full fruition.

Masaryk's own words inscribed at the base of this memorial well express an eternal truth which no Communist regime can eradicate, "Jesus, not Caesar." It is not blood, bestiality, and oppression which will rule the world, but rather love, brotherhood, and humanity. Let us all envision and pray for that better, peaceful world, the kind of world Masaryk believed in, worked for, and dreamed about. It is the kind of world in which the philosophers and the wise shall be as kings and yet as the simplest of citizens, and in which men like Thomas G. Masaryk will be better understood and looked upon with awe and reverence.

It is in this spirit that we dedicate this memorial.

Bananas on Pike's Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the estimated construction cost of the proposed upper Colorado River project is 16 times

greater than the assessed value of all farm lands and farm buildings in the 4 States that would benefit from the project. These States are Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

The concealed subsidy in the project which the Nation's taxpayers would have to pay is 40 times greater than the assessed value of farm lands and farm buildings in the 4 States.

Estimated construction cost of the project is $1,600,000,000.

The concealed subsidy of the project is $4 billion.

Assessed value of farm lands and farm buildings in the 4 States is $101,238,562.

Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pike's Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Reserve and Guard Enlistments Test "Complete Flop"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper article based on a statement by General Stackpole, of the Reserves, and General Biddle, of the National Guard, on the subject of enlistment. The article clearly shows the necessity of some incentive to cause men to join the National Guard and the Reserves. Probably the best way would be legislation providing for universal military training.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESERVE AND GUARD ENLISTMENTS TEST COMPLETE FLOP

HARRISBURG.—"Operation Penn Test," designed to swell the ranks of the State's Army Reserve and National Guard units, was described today as a "complete flop" by Pennsylvania's Army Reserve commander.

"Penn Test" was started by the Defense Department shortly after the Korean war and was aimed at men being released from the military service.

Part of each draftee's final processing included a talk on advantages of active or guard service. In addition units in hometowns were alerted that a prospective member was returning. If they joined an active unit, 3 years were knocked off the required 6 years' time in the Inactive Reserve.

Pennsylvania was chosen as the test area for the Second Army, and troops discharged at Fort George G. Meade were subjects of the experiment.

"Penn Test did little to combat the apathy that exists to Reserve service," Maj. Gen. Albert H. Stackpole, commander of Pennsylvania's 79th Reserve Division, said, "and if recruiting continues as in the past there will be no Reserve.

"Some type of universal military training," he said, "including mandatory Reserve service is the only way to maintain a qualified, trained manpower pool of the type asked by military leaders."

Congress is aware of this need, he reported, but has been subjected to strong pressure by some groups against drafting 18-year-old men for the Armed Forces.

State Adjutant General Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., took a similar tack.

"There is," he said, "an all around receptivity by Congress for a well-trained adequate Reserve and National Guard to help in an emergency. The question is, how to go about it?"

Stackpole attributed part of the reluctance to join the Reserve to the recall during the Korean war of World War II reservists while young men who never have seen the inside of a barracks remained in civilian status.

Another factor in the failure of Penn Test, said the overseas veteran of both world wars, was the guardhouse soldier who influenced discharges who might have taken advantage of Reserve pay, retirement and training, but were dissuaded by dissident or bitter men who think they know all the answers.

When Penn Test first was inaugurated in Philadelphia, Stackpole reported, Reserve units sent recruiters to homes of prospective members.

"In at least one case," he said, "the team was given the heave-ho off the front porch."

The response to Reserve recruiting has been better in rural areas than in metropolitan centers, according to Stackpole.

Biddle who assumed command of the Pennsylvania National Guard last month said he had not had sufficient time to study the effect of Penn Test on guard recruiting.

However, he added, any plan advanced by Congress should give an assurance to the guard and Reserve of an adequate annual intake of men.

Increase Minimum Wage to $1.25

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, legislation to increase the minimum hourly wage is being considered by the Committee on Education and Labor. I appeared before the committee today and made my plea in behalf of the underpaid workers who are looking hopefully to Congress for relief and a decent living wage. It is my sincere hope that the committee will act favorably so the bill can be considered by Members of the House whom, I am convinced, will set a minimum wage which will more nearly approximate today's high living costs.

My statement before the committee follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Education and Labor Committee, I wish to thank you for this opportunity to testify before this committee today on the proposed amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The proposal to increase the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and to extend coverage of the act to workers not now protected by a minimum wage floor and the provisions for time and a half for overtime work will continue to enlist my complete support.

An increase in the minimum wage is not only a family necessity, but it is a national economic necessity as well. We must think in terms of increasing the purchasing power of the low income earner. A clear analysis compels us to regard the worker as a consumer whose increased purchasing power could stimulate a lagging economy, rather than thinking of him as an economic liability to his employer whose wages, if increased, will either drive his employer out of business or raise prices for all of us.

Opponents of the $1.25 minimum wage repeatedly say that this would increase unemployment and many firms would be forced to reduce their payrolls or even go out of business. This is the same argument that was used when the minimum wage was set at 30 cents in 1939 and again when it was set at 75 cents in 1950. This grim prophecy simply has not been borne out by facts.

In 1950 when the minimum wage was increased to 75 cents an hour, there were practically no plant shutdowns or layoffs resulting from this measure. Opponents of the measure then, as now, had predicted economic disaster.

In fact, the Department of Labor studies revealed that in five low-wage industries—southern sawmills, men's dress shirts and nightwear, fertilizer, men's seamless hosiery and wood furniture—even though the higher minimum wage required increased wages for a substantial proportion of the workers in those industries the adjustment to the higher wage scale was made with "only minor determinable effects."

At that time the Secretary of Labor said in his annual report, "Prices for products of low-wage industries affected substantially by the necessity for the payment of higher wages do not seem to have risen as a group any higher than prices of other products. * * * Increased efficiency of production, particularly through mechanization and high volume operations, apparently absorbed much of the increased cost."

It is self-evident that every American worker is entitled to a decent standard of living. It is also axiomatic that no worker can enjoy what we like to refer to as the American way of life on less than $1.25 per hour.

The average worker putting in a 40-hour week will earn approximately $2,500 a year if he makes $1.25 an hour. An annual income of $2,500, although it may be an improvement over the income derived from the present 75-cents-an-hour provision, is still far from adequate to meet the minimum budget requirements of an average family.

In 1951, the Bureau of Labor Statistics worked out a minimum-income chart for an average family of 4 based on living costs in 34 cities throughout the United States. The budget required for a basic minimum standard of living varied from $3,812 to $4,454. It would require a minimum wage of $1.91 to earn enough to meet the lowest income requirements for a decent standard of living as defined by this study. The lowest budget figure was $3,812, the minimum necessary to live in New Orleans.

A minimum wage of $1.25 an hour does not sound unreasonable to me. I don't know of a single area in the United States where you could provide your family with decent housing, clothes, adequate food, and even minimum medical and dental care on an income of $1.25 an hour or $2,500 a year. And this includes no allowance for recreation or luxuries.

The administration proposal to scale down to 90 cents an hour what already appears to be a barely adequate increase in the minimum wage, to $1.25 an hour, is sheer ignorance of the basic facts of the living costs in today's economy.

The Consumers' Price Index rose 14 percent between January 1950 and November 1954, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Wages have been raised five times since 1950 in major American industries. The minimum wage was set at 75 cents an hour in

1950. Today, 5 years later, it is still 75 cents. It is totally inadequate and unrealistic in view of the economic picture today to increase the minimum wage to anything less than $1.25 per hour.

The administration proposal to increase the minimum wage to 90 cents an hour will not improve the living standard of 3 million workers who earn more than 90 cents an hour, but are still existing on a substandard level. The 3 million workers who earn 95 cents or perhaps $1.04 an hour would receive no benefit from such legislation. They will continue to exist on a powdered-milk and dried-meat diet. They will still be unable to afford adequate housing and even modest conveniences.

In addition to increasing the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour, I sincerely hope that coverage will be extended to many groups not currently protected by the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

According to recent estimates there are approximately 44 million people engaged in private employment, exclusive of proprietors, self-employed persons, unpaid family labor, and executive, administrative, and professional employees.

Of these 44 million employees, 13.6 million were not covered because they were engaged in intrastate activities and 6.4 million were specifically exempted from the minimum wage and overtime provisions.

The present Fair Labor Standards Act provides more limited coverage and contains more exemptions from the wage and hour provisions than the original act of 1938 did.

Coverage should certainly be extended and many of the groups now exempted should be protected under this law.

An inadequate minimum wage is responsible for unbalanced diets, the inability to afford medical and dental care and poor housing. These conditions foster malnutrition, sickness, slums, illiteracy, juvenile delinquency, and crime. The entire community and the Nation as a whole, suffers when our most valuable asset—our citizens—are forced to live on a substandard level.

For these reasons, the majority of the constituents of the 12th District of Illinois favor, and I shall support, a $1.25 an hour minimum wage and extended coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Death of Walter Magnuson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, a few weeks ago a very dear friend of mine and of Idaho died. His name was Walter Magnuson. He was a man who worked with his hands—truly a laboring man. He exemplified everything good that labor presents to this world. I was not able to attend his funeral, but I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "True Character Fades," written by Jim Phelps, and published in the Idaho State Journal, of Pocatello, Idaho, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUE CHARACTER FADES

(By Jim Phelps)

Walter Magnuson is dead.

I know, I attended his funeral.

But the imprint "Mag" put on this town will be a long time dimming. Mag's place of work was the Sherman Street switch shanty. Sherman Street, the place where westbound freight trains head out on the main line. The inbound men from the north and west drop off here, to phone the wife to "come and get me." Response varies, it is said, depending on the length of time to payday.

From 6:30 to 2:30 was Mag's time. Mag, and his longtime partner, Forrest "Brig" Young, held down the day shift. Brig is still on the job. The Sherman Street shanty is like a tired old harridan that's been around. Gets a new paint job at infrequent intervals, a facelifting now and then, but essentially the joint's the same. A yardmaster stationed here, but now he holds forth in a shiny new brick tower, high above the daily strife.

No one doubted the politics from 6:30 to 2:30. Republican. Yes, sir, not a doubt of it, Mag told you. Mag's temper got an awful working over the day some wag put Glen Taylor signs all over his car. But we nailed his feet to the decking and came up grinning. That was Mag.

Fabulous operator, some said. Rough? Yeah, man, rougher 'n a cob, too, sometimes. I miss someone bellowing into the telephone, "Sherman Street, sir." That Sherman sounded more like Sharmann, and the sir like sarr. Old time Army talk like that. Mag would have made a wonderful sergeant, topkick kind. Maybe he was, once, somewhere?

Switchman in overalls though he was, that didn't stop Mag from putting the bee on the good Republicans. You know Republicans—they stand around and cuss while the Democrats are out ringing doorbells.

A certain Republican lady in this town got asked by Mag to give $50 to the party.

"Walter," she told him. "You might just as well ask for five hundred."

"All right, Miss," he said, straight faced, "I'll ask for $500 for the Republican Party."

No one sold more Lincoln Day banquet tickets than Walter Magnuson. No one sold more Republican elephants. The list of names would surprise you. Waitresses, railroaders (yes, there's quite a few Republicans only they don't rabble rouse about it as a rule), farmers, bartenders, salesmen, small-business men.

Before Mag came to Pocatello he'd been a conductor on the Canadian National out of Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan, Canada. But after World War I things got tough up there and if you weren't a citizen they more or less asked you to leave. So Walter, who had some disagreement with one of the brass, migrated to that boomer town, Pocatello. Of course, hiring out new as a switchman, he drew all the night jobs.

One dark midnight it was raining down hard and flat, cow on flat rock style, the crew Mag was with crowded into a shanty to dry out. Mag's partner took a look at him.

"Say, fella," he said, "Either your hat's leaking or your hair's fading."

Mag took one look in the cracked mirror some one had nailed on the wall. His hair, indeed, was streaking from black to white.

Of course, Mag's hair was white when he came here. But he'd darkened it to get past the company hiring official. The shoe blacking he'd used faded under the first wet spell.

Mag grinned, and all he said, "So it has. So it has."

Many the Republican politician has had Mag thump them in the chest so hard a cough came up and got the political facts of life the hard way.

"Yesus Crhhrist," Mag would preface his remarks. And somehow it wasn't blasphemy. Sometimes Mag and the rest of Republican Party were poles apart. The Magnuson wing of the party might be down to one man, W. E. Magnuson. But he said what he had to say, and that was that.

No, the way it looks I think "Yesus" has gained a precinct committeeman.

Appropriations for Maritime Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement outlining my views with respect to current appropriations for various maritime activities of the Federal Government, which I made before the Commerce Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations on June 4, 1955.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate your kindness in making available to me this opportunity to express my opinions on appropriations for various maritime activities of the Federal Government. These opinions are fortified by detailed considerations and intense studies by myself, not only as a member of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but as chairman, last year, of the Subcommittee on Water Transportation. I shall be brief and to the point.

It seems to me that the time has come for the Congress to cease its irresolute pose in regard to the need for an American merchant marine.

Long ago, in 1920 and 1928, again in 1936 and 1946, and on numerous other occasions Congress has affirmed and reaffirmed as a national policy, that there must be maintained a privately owned merchant marine adequate to the needs of peace or war.

Yet there is always much hemming and hawing, whenever the question of financial implementation of that national merchant marine policy arises.

Our military leaders are unanimous in declaring that American shipping is an indispensable arm of defense in event of war. The Department of Commerce, after a most thorough study of all aspects of our maritime problems, proclaims that the national policy with regard to shipping is essentially sound, and enunciates certain reasonable conclusions as to what is reasonably necessary to assure establishment and maintenance of the prescribed adequate merchant marine.

Yet each year, again and again, there are those in the Congress who refuse to face squarely the obligations imposed by the national maritime policy. The Commerce appropriations measure for fiscal 1956 is a typical instance of congressional backing and filling in this respect.

The House bill as transmitted to the Senate might justly be termed an irresponsible bill, that ignores not only the Nation's contractual obligations toward the American shipping industry, but turns its back likewise on sound policies of preparedness, an

action that could result in incalculable harm should the Communist attack, so long feared, actually become a reality.

By eliminating $25 million from the budget figure for payment of operating subsidies to the shipping lines, the House has placed this Nation in the position of defaulting on its obligations. The Maritime Administration, acting under authority given by the Congress, agreed to pay these subsidies to the lines, to enable them to operate in the face of competition by foreign shipping whose lower wage and other costs give them an enormous competitive advantage. Without these operating subsidies, our shipping is confronted by even bleaker times. We have told them to continue operating—that we would help to the extent of the operating differential in costs. And now we are in the position of "welshing" on our promises—a position which I am certain you, the members of the Appropriations Committee, would not sanction.

In reducing the ship construction funds from $102,800,000 to $64,700,000, the House has uttered an emphatic—but I believe thoroughly unwise—"No" to provisions for the construction of prototype cargo vessels and tankers that would prevent, in the event of further war, another fiasco like the Liberty-ship program of World War II.

When emergency strikes, there is no time for planning the types of cargo ships and tankers that would be most useful to the military. We had no plans for such construction in World War II and, such was the need for haste, we had to settle for the slow Liberty ships that were outmoded before construction, and have been of little use since.

The prototype ships for which funds were eliminated by the House are intended to serve a most strategic purpose—they are to be the models upon which a construction program, to meet any future emergency, could be formulated. If constructed now, and thoroughly tested in actual use, they would save valuable time and probably millions or billions of dollars in any future war.

These penny-wise, pound-foolish cuts should be restored in the interest of our own self-respect, as well as in the interest of national security. We suffered the agonies of exorbitant costs in World Wars I and II for lack of forethought in the matter of ship planning. We certainly should not make that same mistake a third time.

Thank you so much for your courtesy. I fervently hope that your subcommittee will recommend the restoration of these funds.

Pennsylvania State University That Began With New Step in Education Marks Centenary

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the month of February 1955 Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa., celebrated its centenary with appropriate ceremonies on February 22 which are to be followed throughout the year by special events commemorating the centennial year.

The following articles on Pennsylvania State University appeared in the June 4, 1955, issue of the Christian Science Monitor and are of special interest since they record the progress of an institution of learning that has been the pride of the Keystone State for the past 100 years:

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY THAT BEGAN WITH NEW STEP IN EDUCATION MARKS CENTENARY—TRAINING FARMERS THEN UNHEARD OF

UNIVERSITY PARK, PA.—An exciting new experiment in education was inaugurated with the chartering of the Farmers' High School, forerunner of the Pennsylvania State University, in February 1885. It is still being carried on at the fast-growing land-grant institution in the hills of Central Pennsylvania. The ideals of the founders, broadened to meet modern conditions, still guide the destinies of the university which currently is celebrating its centennial.

Establishment of a school for the practical training of farmers was the primary objective of the university's founders 100 years ago. Several of them were successful farmers themselves. Their idea was a revolutionary one in a period when institutions of higher learning usually were devoted to developing "learned gentlemen" and members or such professions as the ministry, law, and medicine.

DIFFERENT PICTURE

The new institution opened its doors to 69 students on a bleak February day in 1859. The raw, rock-strewn campus with its one building only one-third completed and the austere living conditions faced by the first students were in sharp contrast to today's bustling, attractively landscaped campus. Today, a century later, the 3,000-acre campus is dotted with 140 major buildings and has a student body of more than 12,000 young men and women and a resident instruction faculty of 1,400.

The early years of the university were critical ones, and the institution was beset with pressing financial woes, declining enrollments, difficulties with the State legislature, building-construction problems, and manifold administrative hurdles. The War Between the States, with its call on the students for military service, added to the troubles of the University's first president, Dr. Evan Pugh, who served from 1859 until his passing, attributed to overwork in 1864.

The struggling young institution was aided by the Morrill Land Grant Act, passed in 1862, which allocated portions of the public land for support of agricultural and mechanical colleges. The curriculum was broadened to comply with the act's provisions and natural science and engineering courses were expanded.

The admission of women students in 1871 spurred expansion of the liberal arts program. An upswing in Penn State's fortunes began in 1881 under the administration of Dr. George W. Atherton, one of the university's outstanding presidents. Expansion of the curriculum and the physical plant improvement in financial conditions through increased State grants, and climbing enrollments marked his 24 years in office.

EXTRACURRICULAR

The growth of college spirit and the expansion of social, athletic, and other extracurricular activities during the 1880's led to the strong demand for the lifting of the ban on fraternities and other secret societies. The Greek letter societies were legalized in 1887 and the first national fraternity to organize a chapter at Penn State was Phi Gamma Delta in 1888. It was followed by Beta Theta Pi.

Women were not permitted to organize clubs until 1921 and sororities were not recognized until 1926. Today there are 54 fraternities and 22 sororities on the campus.

Continued expansion in all fields was the keynote of the early years of the 20th century at Penn States. When World War I disrupted the university's routine in 1917, facilities of the institution were placed at the disposal of the Nation. A quarter-century later, Penn State faced an even greater national crisis—World War II—and the campus, losing most of its male students, became a military and industrial training center.

After the war, the university faced the problem of accommodating a huge influx of students, half of them GI's, who swarmed onto the campus, many of them to complete interrupted educational careers. Penn State's current president, Dr. Milton E. Eisenhower, assumed administrative control in July 1950, and under his guidance the University's postwar years have become a story of continued expansion in physical and academic facilities and uninterrupted growth in enrollment.

SPECIAL EVENTS

Many special events have been planned for the centennial year of 1955. One of the major observances, the birthday celebration, was held on February 22, anniversary of the university's chartering. The day was climaxed by a birthday dinner, attended by 650 persons, held in the new $3 million Hetzel Union Building, a student center built by student funds. The structure was officially opened March 15.

Other birthday events included the dedication of the new Nuclear Research Reactor, laying of a cornerstone for the new All-Faith Chapel, and the opening of a new campus post office, University Park.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower, brother of the university's president, will be the speaker at the 1955 commencement exercises June 11. The centennial also will be observed at a faculty convocation in October. Other educational, cultural, and athletic events also have been planned for the year. Penn State will be host to unnumbered conferences during 1955 as it continues its long-time record of service to the Commonwealth and the Nation.

STREAMLINED "SHEEPSKINS"

(By Millicent Taylor)

If you belong to a family of college graduates or have a habit of completing courses yourself, you probably have been plagued through the years with what to do with accumulated diplomas. These handsome rolls of sheepskin (or an imitation) tied with fading ribbons and carrying impressive gold seals defy compact storage. Even the most determined housecleaning efforts, furthermore, cannot bring one to the point of throwing them out.

But the dilemmas of the future will pose no such a problem—that is, if the style of diplomas given out next week at Pennsylvania State University catches on.

Instead of the traditional roll of parchment tied with a ribbon, Penn State's graduates will receive a flat, smart-looking blue leather, satin-lined case lettered in gold and embossed with the university's seal, a modernized form said to be in use in only a few other institutions.

Inside, slipped through a diagonal band of blue and white ribbon, is a dignified and simple statement on high-grade paper 8½ by 11 inches, printed in clear Roman architectural type, to the effect that Joan or John Smith is now a bachelor or arts or whatever else. The university seal is its only decoration. Even the signatures are printed (in facsimile). Further, the name of the student is no longer hand-engrossed. For more than 30 years William S. Hoffman, who retired as university registrar in 1949, did the engrossing of student names and degrees. Up to last fall he had lettered more than 50,000 diplomas. This tradition, too, has bowed to the need of handling great numbers more easily.

The new diploma is a handier size—although we would settle for ordinary pass-

port size and binding with enthusiasm, especially with the curtailed storage space of modern houses. Best of all, it is flat, never has been rolled, and can be stacked with others (or perhaps stowed with the long-playing phonograph records) no matter how many degrees the family insists upon accumulating.

Penn State recipients of degrees on June 11 have one proud extra on their modernized diplomas that nobody else will ever have from there. For this year, only, the lettering "100th anniversary" will be added.

HISTORICAL LORE KEPT HERE

UNIVERSITY PARK, PA.—Headquarters of perhaps the State's largest organization for exploring and preserving the immense store of local Pennsylvania history is the Pennsylvania State University.

The organization is the Pennsylvania Historical Association with its 1,300 members in every county keeping in touch with one another through the central office maintained at Penn State.

The association had its origins in a meeting called by two Penn State history professors in 1932.

As a result of the meeting, a convention was held at Lehigh University, in Bethlehem, in April 1933, and the association was formed.

Since 1936 a member of Penn State's history department has served as secretary of the association. The late Dr. J. Paul Selsam was secretary until 1946. He was succeeded that year by Dr. Philip S. Klein. Dr. Robert K. Murray was appointed to the post in 1953.

One of the main purposes of the association is that of drawing together "all those throughout the State who prefer an interest in Pennsylvania history." The membership thus consists not only of professional historians but amateurs as well.

Giant Station Planned for Pennsylvania Railroad in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the Pennsylvania Railroad is entering into an agreement relative to its station in New York City. The agreement constitutes quite a forward step, as it relates to planning for railroads. I ask unanimous consent that an article on this subject, which was published in the Philadelphia Inquirer, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIANT STATION PLANNED FOR PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD IN NEW YORK

NEW YORK, June 3.—Pennsylvania station, the Nation's biggest and busiest, is to come down to make way for "the world's largest commercial building," the Pennsylvania Railroad disclosed today.

The railroad said it had reached agreement on terms for building a new station on the present site, which would be used also for the huge commercial building.

The papers will be signed Tuesday by James M. Symes, president of the Pennsylvania, and William Zeckendorf, president of the big New York real-estate firm of Webb & Knapp, Inc., the railroad said.

YEAR'S STUDY PLANNED

No details were immediately available on the agreement, but a spokesman for Webb & Knapp said it called for a year's study of possible plans before any building could be started. Negotiations with city authorities concerning building setbacks and other architectural details are involved, he said.

The station is used by about 70 million passengers a year normally. In the peak wartime year of 1945 it served 109 million.

The station, a massive granite structure of classic Roman design, was opened in 1910, at a cost within the station area of $28,800,000. Including tunnels connecting it with New Jersey and Long Island, the cost was $125 million.

ON 9-ACRE PLOT

The station occupies 7½ acres on a 9-acre plot between 21st and 33d Streets and 7th and 8th Avenues, the largest single block of property in Manhattan's midtown area.

The vaulted waiting room, as large in cubic content as the nave of St. Peter's in Rome, could contain a 15-story building. Only four stories on the perimeter, however, are used for office space.

Pennsylvania station was designed by Stanford White, famous architect who was shot to death by Harry K. Thaw in one of New York's famous scandals early in the century.

PREVIOUS AGREEMENTS

Last fall it was announced that agreement had been reached on terms of an option for sale of the air rights above the station to Webb & Knapp. At that time the plans, if consummated, called for complete modernization of the passenger station below street level and the erection of an entirely new building of undisclosed size about street level.

The present agreement is in addition to one reached between the railroad and Webb & Knapp in April giving it title to two blocks of Pennsylvania trackage near the station for the purpose of using the air rights above the tracks to erect a huge building. The cost of the building was placed tentatively at $100 million.

The world's largest commercial building at present is Chicago's Merchandise Mart, which was 4,023,400 square feet of floor area. The Pentagon in Washington has 6,200,000 square feet.

Scrimping on Research Is Indeed False Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Scrimping On Research Is Indeed False Economy" which appeared in the June 6, 1955, issue of the Louisville Times, of Louisville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

SCRIMPING ON RESEARCH IS INDEED FALSE ECONOMY

On the subject of reducing Federal expenditures, the Hoover Commission is almost fanatical. Thus there is major significance in its sharp criticism of "false and misleading economy" in the Government's research programs, especially those dealing with military weapons and public health.

The Government, it suggests, ought to be spending a great deal more in this highly important field.

This should be obvious to everyone in this age of wonder drugs and nuclear weapons. Yet the importance of scientific inquiry in these two life-and-death phases seems to have been sadly discounted by the Eisenhower administration.

One of Mr. Eisenhower's first acts as President was to slash $300 million a year from the military research expenditure proposed by outgoing President Harry Truman.

Even this was not enough for the unimaginative Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson. He urged a further reduction of $325 million, at the same time revealing that he put no stock in pure research but only what he termed "fruitful" projects. Many doors would be closed to scientists if they had to limit themselves to what he would consider fruitful.

In these circumstances, it is not at all surprising that the Hoover Commission now finds our military research is "not sufficiently daring and imaginative" in dealing with the radically new weapons of the atomic age.

Its report is equally critical of governmental skimping in the field of medical research.

By its failure to press for increased funds from Congress for the National Institute of Health's research program, the administration has indicated a tendency to deemphasize basic and medical research, the Commission pointed out. This was directed at Welfar Secretary Hobby and the Budget Bureau for failing to even ask for $7,500,000 needed for 723 approved research projects at NIH.

We quite agree that this is false and misleading econmy of the worst sort. As the Commission has pointed out, citing such dramatic laboratory conquests as development of the Salk vaccine: "We must make sure of general support to this field which daily demonstrates such potential benefits for mankind."

In too many instances lately the study group headed by former President Herbert Hoover has shown a tendency to turn back the clock in other fields of Government endeavor. Thus it is all the more gratifying to find it taking a forward view in the matter of research. Here, of all places, the clock hands must move steadily ahead if we are to meet the challenge of the age in which we live.

Protecting Gas Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with considerable amazement that I read an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on June 6 entitled "Speaking for the Consumer."

According to that editorial, the Federal Power Commission, an agency charged with certain regulatory duties, is ignoring its primary obligation to the American public. It was the Federal Power Commission that in the first instance took the position that it did not have the power to regulate the prices charged by natural gas producers, and for this reason it took no steps in that direction. However, the Supreme Court decided last year that the Federal Power Commission does have such power and responsibility.

The editorial points out, "the FPC apparently is biding its time in the belief that it will be rescued by Congress." I think this is a pretty brazen attitude for the Federal Power Commission to take, because they most certainly have a duty to function under the law as written and as interpreted by the Supreme Court. Certainly they have no right to anticipate that Congress will modify the Supreme Court decision. It is passing strange that Congress should be taken for granted this way. Such an attitude on the part of the Federal Power Commission is an affront to the Congress.

To further quote from the editorial:

The FPC is charged with regulating the price of gas at the wellhead. But it is not effectively carrying out this duty since it has established no procedures and has acted more or less automatically in approving schedules submitted to it. It has thus set off a chain reaction that will cost consumers in this area millions of dollars. Theirs is not the only interest at stake, but it is a primary interest, and the four utility commissions have performed a notable service in bringing the matter forcefully to public attention.

Mr. Speaker, I am this day dispatching a letter to the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission demanding a full explanation in this matter.

Upper Colorado Project Opposed by Many in Upper Basin States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the proposed upper Colorado storage project is even opposed by many in the States of Utah, Wyoming, Colorado and New Mexico in which it would be located. I have received many letters from residents of the area who strongly oppose the project and am including herewith two typical letters:

DENVER, COLO., *June 6, 1955.*
Representative CRAIG HOSMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Having noted from time to time news items in the Denver papers indicating your active opposition in Congress to Echo Park Dam, I am taking the liberty of writing to you to encourage your efforts in this direction.

I have just returned from a trip down the Yampa River, past Echo Park, and the confluence of the Green and Yampa Rivers, on down through the Whirlpool Rapids and Split Mountain. I have been in this country before this, and everytime that I visit it I have become more and more convinced that the proposed dams at Echo Park and Split Mountain are a horrible mistake. There are many, many Coloradoans who feel as I do, but since our own Senators and Representatives in Congress are all very actively in favor of the dams, we have no way to make our views known to the Congress, except to write to Representatives like yourself who are known to oppose the proposed dams. I hope that you will make the views of a large number of Coloradoans known to the Congress in the course of presenting your arguments to that body. It is unfortunate, of course, that there is a water controversy between your State and the States of the upper Colorado River Basin, because there are many sound points to be made not to put dams into Echo Park and Split Mountain which are over and above those involved in the lower versus the upper basin argument. I wish to state the two most important of them:

1. The proposed dams in the Green River will completely ruin a sweep of natural beauty which should be preserved. The argument that a large recreation area would be created is not a good one. The flooding which would result would not reach a height that would make the area any more accessible than it is now, both in terms of roads and camp sites. Improved roads into the rivers would develop the area for recreation just as much, if not more than creating lakes. They certainly would not ruin the beauty of the region, as a lake would.

2. Economically the dam sites are unsound. They are isolated locations, and the work involved to build them would be extremely costly. When they are built, their very isolation and the ruggedness of the terrain of the whole region make it very doubtful that the costs could ever be recovered in terms of benefits to the Nation as a whole resulting from a limited economic development of the region. It is a desert area that probably should never grow to the proportions contemplated. We have plenty of rich agricultural and industrial areas in this country without creating only potentially new marginal areas at a tremendous cost. Unless expenditures on new dams can be shown to benefit clearly the overall economy of the whole Nation, they should never be made. There are plenty of sound developments in the upper Colorado River project that should be made because they do contribute to economic development of the region which would be of nationwide benefit, but not the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams.

Sincerely yours,
WILTON P. CHASE.

WOLF, WYO., *June 5, 1955.*
Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: To preserve the few remaining unexploited areas of natural beauty and interest for future generations who will get power from atomic sources, not silted-up dams, kill the wasteful and ruinous upper Colorado River project.

Very truly yours,
KATHLEEN M. SCHILLER.

Remembrance of the Sick and Disabled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, Sunday June 5 was celebrated in many parts of our country as national Shut-Ins Day, and special efforts were made on that day to encourage remembrance of the sick and disabled. Part of the credit for the widening observance of this day goes to Mrs. Jean Kasper of 132 Water Street, Perry, N. Y. A shut-in herself, Mrs. Kasper has carried on a lively correspondence with all those whom she could interest in the establishment of a national Shut-In's Day, and so ably has her work been done that this year she received a national award for her efforts.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a copy of an editorial from the Perry Herald of Perry, N. Y., with respect to Mrs. Kasper's work and its significance:

POINT OF VIEW

Mrs. Jean Kasper isn't especially well known to Perry people, and for good reason. She is a shut-in, and doesn't have a normal opportunity to develop acquaintance with others.

But her plight has made her conscious of the extent of the handicap under which those similarly afflicted are forced to spend their lives, something that goes deeper than mere physical disability. To many the restriction of their social life is equally tragic.

Mrs. Kasper has made a hobby of trying to help others similarly handicapped. Recently she received a national award for her assistance in the promotion of National Shut-in Day, and as it was the second highest award in the Nation, it was quite something to get it. Few in Perry ever knew anything about her activities in that line.

Any woman in normal health would view with horror the prospect of being a shut-in for the rest of her life. And well she might. It would make any of her ordinary, everyday troubles look pretty puny in comparison.

Yet it would be hard to find in Perry, or anywhere, anyone with a more cheerful disposition and optimistic viewpoint than Mrs. Kasper. Her attitude toward life is a shining contrast to the chronic complainers who bog down and wail over every petty annoyance that crops up.

Statement by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, Before Senate Subcommittee on Refugees, Escapees, and Expellees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement made this morning by me before the Senate Subcommittee on Refugees, Escapees, and Expellees be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES IN SUPPORT OF S. 1794, AMENDMENTS TO THE REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

Mr. Chairman, I am extremely pleased to appear before this subcommittee on the critical matter now pending before you, namely the question of amending the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

As I understand it, the hearings today and tomorrow are to be devoted primarily to S. 1794, the bill introduced by myself in association with Senators HUMPHREY, KEFAUVER, and DOUGLAS. But there is also pending before this subcommittee S. 2113, introduced by Senator WATKINS and others, consisting of the proposals submitted by President Eisen-

hower. There has also been introduced within the past 2 days a bill by the chairman of this subcommittee, S. 2149.

Mr. Chairman, I have not had the opportunity, or the time, to study the bill you introduced, the Langer bill. I am sure that it contains constructive proposals. However, not having been able to study it, I shall direct my remarks today to my own bill, S. 1794, and the Watkins bill, S. 2113.

Although I am well aware of the fact that these hearings are on S. 1794, I am sure the subcommittee would want me to include reference to S. 2113 also and to compare the 2 bills. If I had the time to study it, I would have liked to make detailed reference to the Langer bill as well.

Mr. Chairman, I know of your personal interest—and I am sure of all the members of this subcommittee—in the subject matter at hand. This subcommittee has conducted hearings in the recent past on the manner in which the Refugee Relief Act and the refugee relief program have been administered. You have heard a number of witnesses and have compiled a most useful record.

I am sure it is plain to you—as it is plain to the majority of the American people—that the refugee relief program, hopefully inaugurated with the passage of the Refugee Relief Act in the summer of 1953, has gone very badly. In my judgment, it has been a failure. It has brought heartbreak and disappointments to thousands and even hundreds of thousands. This program has floundered on the rocks of administrative red tape, of administrative obsession with so-called security, and of primary defects in the law itself.

Almost 2 years have gone by since the Refugee Relief Act was approved by this Congress and signed by the President. In those 2 years, only a small percentage of the authorized number of 209,000 refugees and escapees have been admitted to the United States. Under this act, which was passed for the primary purpose of admitting refugees and escapees from behind the Iron Curtain, only a handful—some say about 1,000—the official figure is about 6,000—of actual refugees and escapees have received visas for entry into the United States.

This discrepancy in figures is due to the fact that some of these refugees and escapees are also relatives of persons already legally resident in the United States, including citizens. Under the terms of the law, it is much easier for relatives to enter the United States than for refugees and escapees who have no relatives. I am heartily in favor of admitting relatives of American citizens and of permanently resident aliens into this country, but that isn't what we set out to do when we passed the Refugee Relief Act. We told the world that we were going to do a great and humanitarian act. We were going to do our part to provide haven and asylum for those who had fled and might yet flee from behind the Iron Curtain, and for those who constituted the flotsam and jetsam of war and political upheaval in the Old World.

We were going to receive a fair number of these into America.

But the record shows that we haven't. We have failed. Shame has been cast upon the prestige of the United States. While exhorting people from behind the Iron Curtain to take flight from tyranny, we have turned our backs upon them, once they have escaped. We have herded them into concentration camps in Western Germany, Austria, and Italy. There they live, I am told, under the most incredible conditions of hardship—behind barbed-wire fences—not so very much different from the conditions from which they fled.

As far as coming to the United States is concerned, we tell them we are sorry, but the refugee-relief program has such high standards of security and eligibility that they can't come in. We have closed the door in their faces.

I have heard accounts of what goes on in those refugee camps, how the individuals and their families, wives, and children live and subsist. I hope some of the witnesses who appear before this committee, in the course of these hearings, will tell you what they have seen, so that your heart may be wrenched, as mine was.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I should like to read from a bulletin sent out by the American Friends Service Committee, the great humanitarian voluntary agency of the Quakers, reporting on some of the conditions in the refugee camps in Germany. I should like to quote an excerpt from a report submitted by a Miss Gwen Gardner, a Friends Service Committee field worker, who has been working among and with these refugees, trying to find jobs for them in Germany, while they are waiting for permission to emigrate some place—any place.

I am quoting from the report by Miss Gardner:

"Those of you who are cudgeling your consciences because you wonder if we ought to move DP's who prefer to stay where they are, come with us and visit Landshut. We'll show you things that will tear your heart and put your doubts to rest. Perhaps, as on my second visit with Doris Borrusch, the men will mob us in the dark corridor. They've got wind of our purpose. There is a man with an amputated arm. 'Aren't you the American Quakers finding jobs for people? Look, I'm a painter, too. Can't you get me a job?' And the tall thin man with pleading brown eyes: 'I'm a cook. I've worked with the Americans * * *.' And the burly man with the working overalls: 'I'm a metal worker * * *. You said you wanted metal workers. I'm 53, but I'm healthy. I can work.' But the whole camp is coming. There are rows of men advancing down the corridor. It's the same in the rooms. This gray-haired, square-built, honest-looking man follows us. 'I've got a trade. I'm a carpenter. I want work, too. I'm strong. I'm 55. But I'm stronger than that young man. He's sick. Don't help the young ones * * * *; they can get work. The employers take them. It's we older men who need your help. We'd work if they'd let us. Look at that chap. He's a welder. He's strong. He's fit. He doesn't drink. He wants to work. But he's nearly 60. Help him to get out of here.'

"'Two young men, both too slightly built to be suitable for the iron foundry that Doris Borrusch has come to offer, pursue us out of the room after we've filled in the questionnaire and seen their papers. 'Please get us out of here. Please help us. Don't leave us. We'll rot if we have to stay here,' says the one who has had a 2 months' prison sentence for fighting.

"We have 3 jobs to offer among 400 men. Which shall we choose? Whom must we reject? The ones who need our help most are the ones with handicaps, the ones who are sliding down. But the employers don't see it that way.

"Herr Marton, who has been filling in forms and interrogating since 7 a. m. looks tired and drawn, but he looks at me with a smile as we pack up our day's work as it gets dark, and says: 'I'm glad you've given me this to do. It's very worthwhile work. I don't think we shall do it in vain. We've got to get these people out of here. * * * Some of them can be saved.' "

There is more, much more to this report, but I am not going to read any more. I wanted only to indicate the nature of our obligation * * * and the enormity of our failure thus far to contribute significantly to its solution.

Oh, Mr. Chairman, descriptions like this one should haunt our dreams and bedevil our consciences, until we do something about it.

Thanks in part—in very large part—to the hearings held by this subcommittee on the administration of the refugee relief program some weeks ago, which in turn were largely inspired by the Corsi incident—and I hope Mr. Corsi is going to testify on the legislative proposals now pending before you—national attention was focused on the failure of the Refugee Relief Program.

As a result—and belatedly, if I must say so—President Eisenhower, just 2 weeks ago, sent a message to the Congress proposing certain amendments to the Refugee Relief Act. Even he admitted that "the purposes of the act are not being achieved as swiftly as we had all hoped." President Eisenhower said further in his message that "a number of the provisions of the act require amendment, if the act's objectives are to be fully achieved."

Mr. Chairman, I and other Senators, including members of this committee and Members of the House of Representatives, have been talking about the failure of this program for a long time. Regularly, for the last 18 months, we have been making speeches on the floor of Congress and elsewhere, warning against the collapse of the refugee program, decrying its frustration and urging its rescue, both by administrative improvement and by amendments to the law. Our voices were not much heeded in the past but now, at last, the President of the United States has taken cognizance of the situation—he has recognized it—and has proposed to the Congress a set of amendments to the Refugee Relief Act. He has also pledged that changes would be made—some of them have possibly already been made—in the administration of the act.

Let me say at this point that the amendments proposed by the President are, for the most part, sound ones. Some of them were proposed by Representative WALTER in the House early this year, and some by Representative CELLER. Other proposals for changes in the law, as contained in the President's message, are new and reflect both the experience of the administrators of this act, and a newborn anxiey on their part to make this program work. They know that they are going to be held to account before the bar of public opinion.

In any event, the President's proposals have been submitted to Congress and they have been introduced as S. 2113 by Senator WATKINS and others. The Watkins bill was introduced on May 31, just a week ago.

I introduced my set of amendments, S. 1794, on April 25, in association with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I shall explain in some detail the purport of our proposals.

I want to say, however, that I have no pride of authorship in the language of our bill. I would be glad to have S. 1794 amended, where appropriate, by this subcommittee, on the basis of either the President's recommendations or the Langer bill, in order that the best bill possible may be reported to the Senate and acted upon by both the Senate and the House.

I shall append to my testimony a detailed comparison between the President's proposals and those contained in S. 1794. I want to say, however, that in my judgment, the President's proposals do not go far enough in several major respects. I do not think that the Watkins bill, S. 2113, would fully accomplish what we all want to accomplish—and I am sure that the distinguished members of this subcommittee, including Mr. WATKINS, share with me a desire to make the refugee relief work. I have no doubt of that whatsoever. While the Watkins bill, in its present form, would certainly improve the act, it would not do the job altogether.

There are several provisions recommended by the President, however—and one especially—which are not included in my bill and which I think are very good indeed. I will mention one of these provisions particularly at this point.

I refer to section 3 of the Watkins bill, which amends section 4 of the Refugee Relief Act by authorizing the admission of up to 1,000 aliens who are members of family units eligible to enter the United States under the Refugee Relief Act but who would otherwise be prevented from entering on account of tuberculosis.

I think this feature of the Watkins bill is an excellent, a very humane and forward-looking one. If my bill is reported out by this committee, I hope it will be amended by adding to it section 3 of the Watkins bill. I commend the administration and Senator WATKINS for having proposed it. I will refer to the other sound feature in the Watkins bill, not covered in my bill, later on in my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, before going into further detail about my bill or S. 2113, I would like to refer to my personal interest in this general subject. I have been concerned with the problem of American policy toward immigration—toward displaced persons and refugees—for many years—indeed, since World War I. Even before I became a Government official, I took a very active part in the work of the joint distribution committee, which, as most of you know, has played an important role as a voluntary agency in arranging for the immigration and resettlement of persons of the Jewish faith who have been subjected to persecution, or who have been uprooted and displaced by war and political upheaval.

When I became a public official of New York State, I took, of course, a special interest in what the Government was doing and should be doing about the problem. New York City is the place where most aliens and immigrants arrive. We have a higher percentage of naturalized citizens and of first-generation citizens in New York than in any other State in the Union. In my judgment, this has been a major factor, perhaps the most important single factor, in the tremendous growth and development of New York State, not only in population, but in industry, commerce and individual enterprise.

I would like to say at this point that I consider New York State to be in a way the most typical State in the Union in the sense that it represents in essence one of the basic ideas which have made America great—the idea of the melting pot.

It is natural, therefore, for New York State to have a special interest in the subject before us. And New York State has such an interest, I assure you.

I would also like to recall that I served for some years as director-general of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—UNRRA. I was the first director-general, and in that capacity I was responsible for the program to relieve the hunger and sufferings of millions of refugees and dislocated persons during and following World War II. We set up refugee camps all over Europe and the Middle East. We fed people by the millions. We arranged for their migration to other parts of the world which were ready to receive these displaced persons.

I have seen countless thousands of refugees with my own eyes. I think I know, to some extent, what it means to be a refugee. There is nothing more heartrending and more appealing to the humanitarian instincts in all of us, than the sight of a refugee camp.

So let us look at the legislation before us in human terms. It should not be just a matter of statistics, of visas issued, or aliens admitted. No; it should be a question of succoring hundreds and thousands of homeless persons—of persons who have gone through the hell of war and of displacement, of individuals who have survived slave labor camps and who have escaped from the unbelievable tyranny and indignity of Communist rule.

I would like to digress at this point from the subject of the refugee relief program and say a few words concerning our basic immigration and citizenship laws. To me the question of the refugee program is collateral to the more fundamental question of amending the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Naturalization Act. As you know, the refugee program must work within the framework of the restrictions and regulations of our basic immigration law. In my opinion, this is one of the reasons—not the only one, by any means—why the refugee program has not been more effective. I hope that we can make the refugee program work by amending it—and then get on with the major problem—that of amending our basic immigration laws.

There is one major administrative action which I believe must be taken to achieve the major purpose of the refugee program. The President and the Secretary of State can and should direct the responsible officials to turn the present cumbersome program into a "crash" program. Such a directive from the President would do a great deal to change the attitude of many of the officials connected with this program who have, until now, insisted that this legislation was merely permissive and really didn't mean that refugees had to be admitted into the United States.

Yes; some changes in administrative attitude are necessary, if this program is to be snatched from the brink of failure. It is a fact that until the recent furor over the firing of Mr. Edward Corsi, no one in the administration seemed particularly concerned with the failure or success of the program.

Fortunately for our Nation, and for the refugees, Mr. Corsi had the courage to stand up and call attention to the failure of the program.

I do not know that in the last few weeks there has been an unusual flurry of activity on the part of the officials responsible for the operation of this program.

Mr. Chairman, one of the spokesmen for the administration who came before this committee some time ago and tried to explain the delays which have occurred in carrying out the operations of the Refugee Relief Act compared the processing of the applicants under the act to an automobile production line. The analogy with automobile production seems to come easily to the officials of this administration, for some reason or other.

It was explained that the slowness in issuing visas was due to the fact that it took time to establish a production line.

Mr. Chairman, I, for one, feel that this figure of speech, comparing the handling of human beings with the production of automobiles, was a most unfortunate one. Human beings are not automobiles and cannot be assembled or disassembled as such.

No, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that there is or was any excuse for the roadblocks thrown in the way of this program by the negative attitude of those who were in charge of it. Their attitude was, in my judgment, completely unjustifiable.

I have taken note of the assurances which have recently been given me that this attitude, on the part of the administrators of this program, has changed, at least on the part of the top administrators, and that they are now determined to carry out the program in the spirit in which it was originally intended.

I am willing to accept these assurances at something less than their face value, but still to accept them and to hope for the best if the Congress decides, in its wisdom, to continue to vest the administration of this program in the same hands which have held it up to now.

Even the administrators of this program now concede that amendments are necessary to the act. A year ago they said that no amendments were necessary. Now the President proposes some amendments and those in charge of the administration of this program are urging the Congress to follow the President's recommendations. Their conversion is tardy—and has been costly to the United States. And who can say what the cost has been to the human beings who have been forced to endure so much longer the sufferings and privations which have been experienced by the refugees and escapees from behind the Iron Curtain. That cost cannot be measured. It can only be felt.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I come to the details of the legislation before us. I address myself to S. 1794, and also to the Watkins bill, S. 2113. As I said before, I have not had a chance to study the bill introduced by you, Mr. Chairman, the Langer bill, S. 2149.

Comparing S. 1794 and S. 2113, Mr. Chairman, I would say that there are several good provisions in the Watkins bill which are not included in my bill. I have already referred to one of these, namely section 3 of the Watkins bill, which authorizes the admission of 1,000 tubercular members of families otherwise eligible under the terms of the act.

There is also language in section 2 of the Watkins bill which permits members of family groups to follow rather than to accompany senior members of the family group who have been found eligible under the act and have been granted visas. Thus, under the terms of this provision, children, wives and spouses could follow later, if for one reason or another they were not ready or not yet found eligible to accompany the member of the family who has been granted a visa under this program. There is no comparable provision in my bill. I strongly urge that the bill that is reported out include such a provision.

There is also a good provision in the Watkins bill which provides that the eligibility of the applicants under the refugee relief program shall be determined solely by the consular officer and shall not be subject to review by the immigration officer. This means that the consular officer will be given the authority to decide whether the applicant fulfills all the special requirements of the Refugee Relief Act, as distinct from the general requirements of the McCarran-Walter Act. Under the present Refugee Relief Act provisions, both the consular officer and the immigration officer have separate authority to determine whether an applicant is an eligible refugee or escapee. This has resulted in much confusion, delay and contradiction between the rulings of the consular officer and the rulings of the immigration officer. I believe this is a very sound provision. There is no comparable provision in my bill.

Otherwise, and in general, Mr. Chairman, I believe my bill is broader and better in its terms, although there are a few provisions which are virtually identical in their effect. One such provision is in section 7 of my bill and section 10 of the Watkins bill, which would eliminate the present requirement of a 2-year security check on escapees and refugees—a provision which virtually defeats the whole purpose of the act and the program.

Under present law each applicant must provide documentation covering 2 years of his past life, showing everything that he has been doing during those 2 years, and that he is anti-Communist, among other things. For those who have just escaped from behind the Iron Curtain, this is an obvious impossibility in all but rare cases. Both the Watkins bill and my bill recognize this fact and both bills would repeal this requirement which is found in subsection 11 (d).

The first major difference between the two bills is in the definitions. The Watkins bill relaxes somewhat the presently unworkable definition which requires an escapee also to be a refugee, under the very strict definition in section 2 (a) of the present law. My bill would combine the two definitions and elim-

inate entirely the term "escapee." I provide a sample, workable definition for "refugee," which would cover both refugees and escapees.

Under my amendment the term "refugee" would include persons who are displaced from their country of birth or nationality as a result of events prior, during, or subsequent to the outbreak of World War II, and as a result of present political conditions, fear of persecution, military operations, etc., are unable to return to their natural place of abode. This would cover both refugees and escapees. There is no reason to make a distinction between refugees and escapees. Any distinction is only cumbersome and contributes to delay and confusion in interpretation. I believe in this respect my bill is preferable to the Watkins bill.

In my bill the definition of expellee—those of German descent who were forced to flee when the Communists approached—is left the same as in present law. In the Watkins bill this definition is modified somewhat—in an obscure way, in my judgment. I do not understand the reason for it.

In both bills the requirement for a valid passport is eliminated, and this is a good thing. Many refugees and escapees cannot obtain passports. They are stateless. Obviously, it is difficult for an escapee to get a passport from the officials of the country from which he has fled. This has been a great source of difficulty in the administration of the program. Both bills relax this requirement.

There is a related requirement in present law which has also been a source of frustration, confusion, and delay, and that is the requirement for a certificate of readmission to the country from which he migrates for each individual who is admitted under the refugee-relief program. This has required agreements with other countries and resulted in endless delay. Some countries will not give certificates of readmission. My bill eliminates this requirement. The Watkins bill also eliminates it, but not quite as plainly, in my judgment, as S. 1794.

S. 1794 increases the quota for refugees now residing in North Atlantic Treaty countries by 15,000 and adds Spain and north Africa to the list of countries from which such refugees are eligible to be admitted into the United States. There are a number of Yugoslav refugees in Spain and a number of refugees of assorted national origins in north Africa whom we should surely include in the refugee program. They are as needy and as deserving as the others in the same group. This change is found in section 2 of S. 1794, amending paragraph 3 of section 3 (a) of the present law.

My bill would strike out the word "ethnic" wherever it appears in the bill, except in the definition of German expellees. I believe that this is an odious term at best. It has no use and no place in those parts of the bill, other than in section 2 (c) of the act, in connection with German expellees. The term is repugnant to our national concepts. It should be eliminated. It serves no purpose but to obstruct and delay this program.

My bill would raise the age of eligible orphans from 10 to 14. There is no real reason to limit the definition of orphans to children of 10 years or under. All the responsible voluntary organizations working in this field are agreed on this fact. An orphan is just as appealing, just as desirable, and just as adaptable to the United States at the age of 14 as at the age of 10. The Watkins bill raises the age limit to 12.

It has been brought to my attention that there may be some difficulty in raising the age limit to 14 because of the requirement by regulation that persons 14 years of age or older must undergo full security clearance. Setting the age limit at 13 years would obviate this difficulty. I am sure the committee will act justly in this regard.

My bill also repeals outright section 12 of the present act, a section which sets up a completely unworkable system of priorities for the issuance of visas. As far as I can learn, nobody has been able to understand thoroughly what Congress meant by section 12. This provision has been ineffective and it has caused delay and confusion without any constructive benefits for the United States or for the program. I propose the outright elimination of this section. I think it would speed things up considerably.

The provisions of both the Watkins bill and S. 1794 are similar in their effect in the important matter of agency assurances. The present act prohibits the use of agency assurances. This has been one of the chief barriers to the orderly operation of this program. The voluntary agencies have been ready, willing, and anxious to cooperate with this program and to help make it a success, but they have been severely handicapped in doing so by the language of this act—and by the administrative interpretation of it—which has prevented the voluntary agencies from providing the assurances and from assuming the responsibility for placing these immigrants in suitable housing and jobs.

There has been very bitter feeling about this provision and I believe it should be repealed and agency assurances should be accepted. These agencies are fine, upright, and reputable organizations. They did a marvelous job with the displaced persons program. They can be trusted to perform similarly with the refugee relief program. The agency assurances worked with the displaced persons program—and they will work with the refugee relief program.

The provision covering this matter in S. 1794, namely section 6 (a) is, in my judgment, preferable to that in the Watkins bill.

Both bills have a provision relaxing present restrictions for individuals already in the United States who qualify under the terms of the Refugee Relief Act. The Watkins bill increases the number who will be so eligible from 5,000 to 10,000. I strongly approve of this increase in the number. It is not included in my bill.

Both bills relax the present requirement that an alien, to be eligible to have his status adjusted, must have entered the United States legally. I propose to eliminate that requirement, presuming that the alien has conducted himself in a proper manner while he has been in the United States, and has otherwise conformed to the requirements of admission as a legally resident alien. The Watkins bill would specifically authorize the Attorney General to waive this requirement in cases where he finds such a waiver justified. My bill would accomplish the same purpose and in a simpler way. In the case of both bills the Attorney General would be required to rule on whether the alien in question should, in fact, be considered a suitable person to have his status adjusted.

Finally, we come to two major differences—the most vital differences—between S. 1794 and the Watkins bill, S. 2113.

These two differences pertain in the first place to the administrative setup, and in the second place to the use of unused visa numbers under the program.

My bill proposes that the present provision of the law dealing with the administration of the program—a legislative monstrosity, in my judgment—be changed to make the Administrator of the program responsible directly to the Secretary of State and only to him, and to free the Administrator from subservience to any bureau in the State Department.

At the present time, under the present law, it is required that the Administrator be the Director of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs—an incredible confusion of functions. The Director of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs has enough to do. His is a police and review function. The administrator of the refugee program should have no other job and no other responsibility. His is a humanitarian mission, not a police function.

I strongly urge upon this subcommittee the approval of my section 10, which sets up the Administrator of this program in direct line of responsibility to the Secretary of State. The President or the Secretary of State can redesignate the present Administrator, if they so desire. That is their responsibility. But the administration of this program should not be tied to the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.

I challenge anyone who believes in sound governmental and administrative principles to justify such an association.

I don't want to interfere with the orderly progress of the program. I can see that it would require quite a readjustment to break in a new Administrator in the middle of the program. But I think that this provision of my bill should be adopted. I am sure that the President of the United States will do what is necessary to keep the program going without interruption or delay. I think this change in the law will greatly accelerate the program.

Finally, Mr. President, my bill envisions, as the Watkins bill does too, the strong probability that many of the visa numbers in some of the categories established under section 4 of the present law will not be used up. I would hope this would not be true, but it is most likely to prove true. My bill would extend the life of the program until 1960 and provide that persons eligible under the act can be admitted until 1960.

My bill provides for the reallocation of unused visas among those groups which have the greatest need for visas.

In those categories under section 4 where there are long lists of applications which cannot be granted, the unused visa numbers would be distributed among the various categories in section 4 in proportion to the numbers of applications which have been filed and which have not been acted upon, due to the exhaustion of available numbers in those categories.

The Watkins bill would make these unused numbers available for a worldwide orphan pool. I do not think that such a pool would use up the unused numbers, nor do I think that this is especially the way to handle the orphan problem.

I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that President Eisenhower, in his message to the Congress, referred to the need for a provision for the use of unused numbers. He did not recommend the worldwide orphan pool as the only solution to this problem. He suggested it merely as an example of what might be done with the unused numbers. I refer you to the text of his message, the pertinent sentences from which I quote:

"I recommend that there be a provision for the use of unused numbers. Such unused numbers might well be used, for example, for orphans on a worldwide basis."

The Watkins provision on this subject is not necessarily the last word on this matter, even as far as the President of the United States is concerned.

Now Mr. Chairman, I have completed my summary of the differences and similarities between the two bills. I am going to submit for the record a detailed comparison between the two bills and a detailed analysis and justification for each provision of my bill.

I ask your permission, Mr. Chairman, that these two documents appear in the record at the completion of my remarks, to be made available to all the members of this subcommittee. I will file them subsequently.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like for a moment in conclusion, to refer to the experience we had with the displaced-persons program.

When the displaced persons program was launched in 1948, there was no staff. The

displaced persons program was organized as an independent governmental agency, faced with the vast problem of creating a completely new organization. But with all these handicaps, and with a law which in many aspects was even more unworkable than the present refugee law, the record of the displaced persons program in bringing refugees to our country is so far superior to that under the refugee relief program and it defies comparison.

The Displaced Persons Commission worked out many of the techniques which have been followed by the Administrator under the present act. The Refugee Relief Administrator has belatedly followed the precedent established in the displaced persons program of stimulating the organization of State commissions to aid in the resettlement of the newly arrived immigrants. Under the displaced persons program there were 36 such State commissions. I would point out that these commissions were started 1 week after the displaced persons program got underway. One year went by after the passage of the Refugee Relief Act before President Eisenhower wrote to the Governors of the States requesting similar commissions to be created.

Under the displaced persons program 4,182 orphans were brought to the United States. The Displaced Persons Commission pioneered in working out arrangements with welfare agencies in the United States and with the various European governments to expedite and safeguard the adoption of these orphans. It is my information that the experience of the Displaced Persons Commission in this field has greatly aided the orphan program under the Refugee Relief Act.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, for the record, I would like to correct a serious error which has cropped up at various times in discussions of the comparison between the displaced persons program and the refugee program. This error relates to the thoroughness of the security checks utilized by the Displaced Persons Commission. Individuals under the displaced persons program were checked by the following governmental security agencies—the FBI, the CIA, the CIC, the CID, the Provost Marshall's office of the Army, the DP investigative staff, the Consul's investigative staff, and the investigative staff of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Certainly the security program under the Refugee Relief Act could hardly be more thorough.

In light of these facts it is appalling to me that in terms of comparative length of operations under the displaced-persons program and the Refugee Relief Act, 152,528 visas were issued under the displaced-persons program after 20 months of operation while over a similar period, only 34,810 visas have been issued under the Refugee Relief Act.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I have not belabored this point too much. I hope I have not spent too much time reciting the past failures of the program. I had not intended to deal disproportionately with the mistakes of the past, which are, of course, irretrievable.

Now we face the problem of rescuing this program, of salvaging it, and of making the best we can of it.

I assume that this subcommittee will report out some kind of a bill. I am sure that this is your purpose. I am sure that from all the proposals that have been made, a very constructive bill can be put together. I hope this will be done by appropriate changes in S. 1794.

My purpose in appearing here, however, is not only to explain my bill, but to appeal to you to speed action on a set of amendments to revise the Refugee Relief Act in a way that will permit the refugee program to be carried forward to completion and to make it truly possible for the authorized number of refugees, escapees, and relatives to be admitted to this country.

Baltimore: Lacrosse Capital of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on Friday evening of this week the "world series" of lacrosse will be played in my home city of Baltimore, Md. In recent years, this fascinating game, which was originated by the Indians, has acquired considerable popularity. Much of this enthusiasm, now spreading to many sections of our Nation, stems from the tremendous public interest which has been prevalent in Baltimore since 1878. In my travels, I am frequently asked to describe the game of lacrosse and its antecedents. Therefore, I am certain that the people of America and the members of the Congress would enjoy reading an article entitled "Baltimore: Lacrosse Capital of the World," appearing in the June 5, 1955, issue of the Baltimore Sunday American.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BALTIMORE: LACROSSE CAPITAL OF THE NATION

(By J. William Joynes)

Lacrosse is the national sport of Canada, by legislative act, but Baltimore is the game's capital.

A Baltimore school, Johns Hopkins University, has held the United States intercollegiate lacrosse title for more years than any other team, and has twice played in the Olympics.

And no team is ever really considered to have earned the title until it beats the Mount Washington Lacrosse Club, a team made up mostly of former Hopkins stars.

Three of the big five of lacrosse—Johns Hopkins, Army, Navy, Princeton, and Maryland—are in the Baltimore area, and a dozen Maryland prep schools and, with one exception, all Baltimore public high schools, more than in any similar area, feed them players.

Though the past few years have seen a determined effort by some eastern colleges to break this lacrosse monopoly by raiding the Baltimore market for players to bolster their teams, the University of Maryland won the national lacrosse championship several weeks ago, while the Naval Academy, another Maryland school, although it belongs to the Nation, was the runner-up for the title.

Anytime a national championship doesn't go to a team in or near Baltimore, it's a pretty safe bet that the winner's lineup contains Baltimore talent or is coached by a former Baltimore player.

And you can be certain, too, that when Baltimore plays host to the North-South all-star lacrosse game at Homewood Field next Friday night, 50 percent or more of the players on both teams can trace some of their training to this lacrosse capital.

The 14th annual intersectional contest, this year's North-South game will be played where it began in 1940 and was played until 1949 (except for 1944 and 1945, when there were no games because of the war) and then again 2 years ago.

As usual, the all-star game will focus attention on lacrosse as a thrilling, rough-and-tumble game, and the proceeds will help foster the game that was played by Indians on the American plains before Columbus discovered the continent.

Lacrosse, the only contact sport played in the spring, is a game, say its hunkers—fans—that blends the power of football, dash of basketball, precision of baseball, and the speed of hockey. And it's a game, they say, that once you have seen you are either a rabid fan or it leaves you cold as yesterday's mashed potatoes.

Most become fans, they add, but still there are not enough to foghorn their enthusiasm across the United States.

In 1894, 27 years after the Canadian Government made the sport its national game in 1867, only 4 United States colleges were playing the old Indian game. Today only 60 play at all and only 41 of them play enough to belong to the United States Intercollegiate Lacrosse Association.

Of these 41, most are New England and Middle Atlantic colleges, for the game was not played by a single school west of the Alleghenies until 1948, when Ohio State, Oberlin, UCLA, and Loyola of Los Angeles, tried it for the first time.

It was once played in Atlanta, Ga., but that was some years ago and now the furtherest south that two lacrosse sticks are ever crossed is at Duke University in Durham, N. C.

Dr. Wilson Elkins, a recent importation from Texas, to the presidency of the University of Maryland, whose team is the national champions this year, said he had never heard of lacrosse until he came to Maryland.

But there are hopeful signs that the sport is on the increase. Most Long Island high schools have been playing for several years, and this spring one of them passed the record held by St. Paul's School of Baltimore. It won its 74th straight game.

Lacrosse has been to sport at St. Paul's what water is to fish, and for years its students have carried their crosses wherever they went, including classrooms. Playing any but a Baltimore team was child's play, but this cradle of lacrosse stars has finally met its match on distant warpaths.

Much of this spirit and enthusiasm that has kept lacrosse alive can be attributed to former players who have spent years coaching or serving in the United States Intercollegiate Lacrosse Association, people like Andy Kirkpatrick, Sunday editor of the Baltimore American, who is chief referee, which is tantamount to being commissioner of United States lacrosse.

Also coaches like Dr. William Hanson "Dinty" Moore III, who coached St. John's College to five national championships and has been lacrosse coach at Navy since 1938.

Howdy Myers, who coached St. Paul's to more championships than any other high school and JHU to three titles; W. Kelso Morill, author of a book on the game and a Hopkins coach for a number of years who replaced Kirkpatrick as chairman of all-American naming committee.

Others whose interest has aided the game are Oscar ("Kid") Norris, player and coach of the Mount Washington Club for well over 30 years; Doug Turnbull, executive vice president of the B. & O. Railroad, the only all-American for 4 years straight; and C. Gardner Mallonee, of Forest Park High, who was on the JHU coaching staff for 18 years and is chairman of this year's North-South game.

Most of the reluctance to play lacrosse has been attributed to school officials who feel that the game is still to rough, for even though rules, referees, and three centuries of civilization have softened the game since the Indians played it for exercise, it is still not what one would call a sissy game.

The object of the game is to hurl a 5-ounce India rubber ball into a 6-foot square net using a webbed hickory stick as a combination scoop and sling. If in the rough-and-tumble abandon of doing this, someone happens to clobber a rival with the stick and send him sprawling on his face, it is still all part of the game.

This pattern was set by the redskins when the land on which they played they could call their own. Baggataway, forerunner of modern-day lacrosse, was a brutal pastime. Scoring goals was incidental to cracking skulls in a game whose chief object was to get braves toughened up for the warpath.

One tribe would be pitted against another in a tilt that would last several days. Sometimes 400 braves fought for the ball at a time in a manner the Marquis of Queensberry would not have approved.

When a warrior scooped up the ball, he popped it into his mouth and raced half a mile for the goal, while opposing braves beat a tattoo on him like a tom-tom with their sticks—and if he lagged along the way, squaws dashed onto the field to spur the runner on with switches.

Canadian pioneers adopted baggataway, softened it up a bit, and called it lacrosse after a fancied resemblance between the webbed stick that looks like a snowshoe and a French bishop's crozier. But the only difference is that the mayhem became organized.

The first white men took up the game in the United States in 1868 in Buffalo and Troy, N. Y., but it soon died out or the players died off. There was some interest aroused in the game in New York City and Brooklyn in 1869, after a visit of Canadian Indians, but it did not last long either.

Then in 1878, it was introduced to Baltimore, and with evangelistic zeal Baltimore has never let go its interest. When other kids across the United States pick up their baseball bats in spring, the small fry in some sections of Baltimore fondle lacrosse sticks instead.

At first it was played by athletic clubs, one of which was the Druids, who became United States champions in 1889, although there were perhaps not more than 15 or 20 lacrosse players in the vicinity at the time.

Then in 1888 Johns Hopkins University took up the lethal weapon and has hardly let go of the ball or a title since. It has won 17 national intercollegiate titles between 1906 and 1950 and brought the international championship to the United States in 1928 and 1932, the 2 years the game was played at the Olympics.

Because Baltimore is the home of this school, it has become the unofficial national capital of the game.

A Baltimore sporting goods store is the only place where a lacrosse stick, which are made by Canadian Indians, can be bought, and in spite of its upper Charles Street stamping ground, the game has lost little of its wild Indian flavor, though the white man has brought to it the trappings of civilization.

Warriors now wear wire masks, protecting helmets, heavy gloves, and officials frown on bludgeoning.

Lacrosse is played on a field 110 yards long and 70 yards wide with 2 goals 80 yards apart. There are 10 men on a team, including a goalie, 3 defense and 3 attack men who carry, kick, or pass the India rubber ball as they run, dodge, and weave their way up the field to the opponent's goal during four 15-minute periods.

But it's a haphazard gauntlet he treads, and it takes a rugged character to make the trip. Rules are simpler and penalties less frequent than in basketball and football, and almost anything is legal to stop the ball carrier. "Deck him" or "Lay on the wood" is the battlecry, foghorned by players and hunkers, and for this reason many of its stalwarts are football players who want a peculiar way to keep in condition.

Long live lacrosse—and lacrosse players.

The Plight of Retired Civil-Service Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therewith, an editorial from the Council Bluffs (Iowa) Nonpareil of June 1, which explains some of the reasons why Congress should pass H. R. 3792, a bill to increase the retirement pay for postal and civil-service workers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these former public servants have for many, many years made substantial payment out of their wages to the retirement fund, which is now built up to several billion dollars. H. R. 3792 provides for a reasonable increase in their retirement pay out of their own bank account held in trust for them by their Uncle Sam. They need it now. I hope H. R. 3792 will be brought to the floor of Congress at a very early date.

The editorial follows:

THE PLIGHT OF RETIRED CIVIL-SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Congress undoubtedly will increase the pay of postal and other civil-service workers before adjournment. It is generally agreed they are entitled to a raise to meet increases in the cost of living.

At the same time something ought to be done for the forgotten men and women in the civil service—the retired employees and the survivors of deceased employees.

One need only look at current statistics to realize the unfortunate situation of most retired Government employees and their families.

The average annuity paid to retired civil-service employees in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952 was approximately $1,400, as a result of combined employee and Government contributions to the retirement fund. Those in the group retired for disability averaged less than $1,200 a year. Widows and dependent children averaged less than $600 a year.

Annuities have not kept pace with the cost of living. It would take approximately $2,400 of today's dollars to equal the purchasing power of a $1,200 annuity at the beginning of the inflationary cycle 15 years ago.

Annuities have been increased twice, once in 1948 by $300 or 25 percent, whichever was lesser, and again in 1952 by $324 or 21 percent. This latter increase did not apply to anyone whose annuity was in excess of $2,160.

What is needed is a practical permanent plan to gear annuity payments to living costs so annuitants will get speedy and adequate adjustments.

The $2,160 bar should be removed. It is manifestly unfair to limit relief to those whose annuities are less than that amount.

The pay of Senators and Representatives has been raised. Social-security benefits have been increased for those who have retired.

The same thing should be done for retired civil-service employees and their survivors.

Economic Conditions in Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, usually on Mondays, when I return from Saturday office hours and weekend conventions and conferences in my district, the State of Connecticut, many of my colleagues greet me with the inquiry, "How did you find things in Connecticut?" The question invariably concerns the economic or industrial situation, and the best and authoritative reply that I can give at this time is contained in the official release which has just been received from the employment security division of the Connecticut Labor Department. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to bring this notice to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress:

THE CONNECTICUT LABOR SITUATION

MAY 1955.

The Connecticut Manufacturing Output Index dipped a little in April. From 134.3 in March the index slipped to 132.4. Main factor in the production decline was a drop of over 3,000 in factory employment, largely the result of a work stoppage in electrical eequipment. A year ago the index stood at 128.

Unemployment throughout the State showed a decline for the fourth straight month. In mid-May job seekers numbered 28,400, the lowest level since December 1953. In mid-April 32,500 were looking for work, down by 4,100. Pickup in construction was reflected in a drop in unemployed men, down by 3,100 to 14,200. Jobless women also total 14,200, down by 1,000. None of the 18 areas of Connecticut showed a gain in unemployment. In the major areas declines were noted in Hartford, down 500 to 4,200; Waterbury, down 500 to 3,000; New Britain, down 470 to 1,340; Bridgeport, down 400 to 4,100. Except for the usual December-to-January rise, unemployment has been on a continuous downgrade since last July when a 1954 high of 51,000 was reached during the peak of the vacation period.

Employment in Connecticut continued at a high level in April, but signs were noted of a slight leveling off in the upward trend of recent months. Manufacturing industries which have been making consistent gains since last fall reported a slight pause in hiring activities in April. The slowup occurred mostly in metal-working industries, particularly transportation equipment. Biggest recovery from the economic decline of 1953–54 was in the machinery industry, up by by 3,700 since last August.

Connecticut still leads the Nation in average family income, according to Sales Management's Survey of Buying Power for 1955. Buying income left after State and Federal taxes averaged $6,786 in Connecticut in 1954.

In the metropolitan regions, the Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk area was the second highest in the country, with $7,486. The Hartford-New Britain area ranked third with $7,321. Washington, D. C., was first with $7,584. Family income for 233 metropolitan areas averaged $5,910 in 1954. National average was $5,274.

Weekly earnings in Connecticut dropped for the first time since last July. A string of 8 consecutive monthly increases ended in mid-April when factory production workers in the State averaged $76.04 a week, down by $0.96 from the all-time peak of $77 reached in mid-March. The hourly rate fell from the record high of $1.86 in March to $1.85. The workweek also edged downward, 41.4 to 41.1 hours.

Hours lost in labor-management disputes in Connecticut rose in April. Eleven work stoppages caused 775,600 hours of lost time and idled 10,600 workers at one time or another. In March 2,200 people lost 95,800 hours. Principal reason for the big increase in lost time was the continuation of a major dispute in the electrical equipment group, plus a stoppage of short duration in the rubber industry. As of mid-May a total of 11 disputes involved around 3,100 workers.

Farm Production Ever Climbing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Farm Production Ever Climbing," which appeared in the June 4, 1955, issue of the Owensboro Messenger, of Owensboro, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

FARM PRODUCTION EVER CLIMBING

Americans hear much about the way their remarkable economy goes on year after year producing more and more for less and less. Most of the time it sounds like a purely industrial story, but it isn't.

An important revolution has been taking place on our farms. Not much of it occurred before the 1930's, but in the last 20 years or more the forward strides have been tremendous.

In 1935 a United States farm worker turned out enough food and fiber to support 10 people. Today he produces sufficient to support 18. Farm output per man-hour in 1953 was 125 percent above the 1935 level. That's the statistical measure of the American agricultural revolution.

All this time, Americans have been streaming away from the farms and into the cities and towns. In the last 2 decades the number of farm workers has declined one-third.

Their place has been taken by machines, and these machines, along with better seeds, better planting techniques, greater use of fertilizer, soil conservation and other devices, have been responsible for the great boost in productivity.

In 1935 farmers had about a million tractors. By 1954 they had 4.4 million. In 1935 they had less than a million trucks. Now they have 2.6 million. The figures could be extended to many types of farm machines.

Reliance on fertilizer has mounted substantially. Consumption in 1935 was 1,153,000 tons, but today the annual tonnage is around 5,400,000.

The steady exodus of people from farm areas undoubltedly gave a strong push to the revolution. If output was to be maintained and increased, mechanization was absolutely essential.

Unquestionably, too, the heavy war and postwar demand for food and fibers exerted major leverage on the upward productivity trends. Farmers poured fertilizer onto their fields to step up acreage yields and meet the call of the market. In some cases, admittedly, tiring soils would not otherwise have turned out impressive crop totals.

The incredible days of great wartime and postwar foreign demand have passed. The Nation today is plagued by surpluses from farms which have learned how to produce more than our own people seem to need at this time.

But, however that problem is to be handled, it is evident that the farm revolution has not ended. Technical advances tend to snowball, and besides, people are still leaving the farms in considerable numbers. Their departure goads farmers into fresh efforts to get more from their land with fewer men working fewer hours.

Our farms may never get to the point where they look like factories. But if productivity and mechanizing trends continue their present pace, the farms may in fact one day be factories.

Personal Letters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, from time to time Members of Congress are deluged with organized communications on legislation which may be pending before a committee of Congress or before the Members on the floor of the House or Senate on final passage and consideration.

I know that most Members of Congress are appreciative of the views expressed by their constituents in personal communications as it is a way of keeping them informed of the effect various legislation will have on the individual.

The editor of the United Mine Workers Journal, Justin McCarthy, has written a timely article on this subject, and I am sure it will be of interest to every Member of the House.

The article follows:

PERSONAL LETTERS ON BILLS MOST EFFECTIVE

Well-timed, reasonable personal letters to Members of Congress and of State legislatures are still the most effective way to influence voting on specific legislation. And the time to write the letters is while the bills are in committee. Once the bills have gone through public hearings and have been voted out of committee the lawmakers usually have made up their minds how they will vote.

Stick to one issue in each letter and use your own words. The lawmakers are quick to detect planned campaigns in which hundreds of letters and postcards, all written alike, flood into their offices. Remember that the basic law of our land, the Constitution, gives every American the right to petition his Representative. All members of the UMWA should take advantage of this constitutional right.

Learn the number of the bill that you want to support or oppose and then let the lawmakers know how you feel about it and why. Don't ramble. Make your letters brief and to the point. The lawmakers have hundreds of complicated bills to consider. Don't scold. Don't call names. But write. Next to the sacred American privilege of the secret ballot, your right to petition your Representative is most important.

Will Scientists Destroy the Earth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the scientists of today attribute to themselves unlimited power and insight into matters that are invisible and are trying to remake the world and undo what God has done.

God hath made everything beautiful in His time; also He has set the world in their heart, so that no man can find out the work that God maketh from the beginning to the end. I know that whatsoever God doeth, it shall be forever; nothing can be put to it, nor anything taken from it, and God doeth it, that men should fear before Him. That which hath been is now, and that which is to be hath already been.

If anyone thinks that scientists can blow up the world and destroy civilization he is attributing more power to them than they possess. He is ascribing more divine ability to these long-whiskered individuals than their Creator possessed when he peopled the earth.

We get literature here every day explaining the possibility of the complete destruction of the world by the H-bomb, invented and made by scientists.

Since Christians believe that what God has created shall ever be, that nothing can be put to it, or anything taken away from it, can we put any trust in men who say they can destroy what God has made? If the instrument that man has made can destroy what God has made, then we admit that there is no power higher than the mind of man. God is the one who gave him life and God can take it away. We see that enacted every day.

Have we come to a time in this country where we deny the power of the Almighty and say that man is just as powerful, or maybe more so?

This sort of published information is put out among the people all the time, but I do not think it is intentionally done to show the superiority of man's mind over the Divine Creator of the universe. I believe it is done to keep the people in a constant state of fear, and thus to get them to approve a further continuance of our exploits in foreign countries, which have already caused us to expend over $800 billion since our first departure from the advice of Washington and other great men who founded this Government.

One of the astonishing things done here in Congress every year is this: George Washington's Address is read to us by some Member who can dramatically present that address. We listen to it with great satisfaction and approval, yet before another day passes Congress is right back appropriating billions to do just what we were admonished not to do.

Some of these days—I do not predict when—there will be a reversal of this sentiment, and we will get back on the proper course which we followed for 160 years, and which enabled us to build upon these shores the best form of government yet devised by man. Our example has been the guiding light of people everywhere, and at least one spot on the earth's surface should be maintained where liberty and freedom of the individual can be enjoyed. Further cripple this Nation with senseless expenditures and we are endangering the future of this great Government.

I, for one, am not going to sit idly by and see this experiment in government buried in the dust of history as a once grand and glorious institution, nor am I willing to transfer my faith from the Grand Architect of the Universe and rely upon a few midget-minded scientists who have challenged the power of our Creator. This earth is here to stay, regardless of the chanting of those ignorant individuals who feel it can be blown asunder by a few gadgets invented through man-made science.

Neutrality Not Just a Word

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, June 3, 1955, the Cleveland Plain Dealer carried a feature column entitled "Neutrality Not Just a Word," by Samuel J. Kornhauser. That article presents a most penetrating and realistic evaluation of the recently signed treaty of peace for Austria. It points out the major weaknesses of the Russian Communist conspiracy and why that conspiracy is seeking a temporary respite. It concludes that the so-called neutrality of Austria is nothing more than a Communist plot which we must immediately frustrate. I agree with the writer, Mr. Kornhauser, that the time was never more opportune for us to engage in an all-out political offensive against the tyrants of Moscow. Under leave granted, I insert in the RECORD Mr. Kornhauser's article, a follows:

NEUTRALITY NOT JUST A WORD

(By Samuel J. Kornhauser)

The horrors of war have become so dreadful and, in turn, the craving for peace so intense, that they tend to suspend capacity for clear judgment. The hungry mind grasps at every wisp of promised relief from the terrors of war, no matter how implausible.

WHAT IS AUSTRIA'S STATUS?

The recent arrangement by which Austria is accorded an ostensible independence, a neutral status and, for the time being, riddance of foreign soldiers has been widely acclaimed a turn toward the longed-for objective. After 10 years of truculent refusal, Red Russia has by some magic suddenly become benevolent.

What, viewed in the light of past experience and current realities, does this neutralization of Austria mean?

In 1815 Switzerland was neutralized by declaration of the European powers, and they, in return, guaranteed the inviolability of the Swiss domain. Likewise, in 1839, when Belgium was finally made an independent state, it, too, was neutralized.

This neutralization was an expedient by which to preserve the then existing balance of power which all the signatory nations desired to maintain. But now, in the case of Austria, there is not even a pretense of mutuality. Who dares to believe that the Red regime would respect Austrian territorial integrity?

You know what happened to Belgium in World War I. France was vulnerable to attack through Belgium; so, treaty or no, the Kaiser's armies tore through Belgium. Switzerland, to be sure, was not invaded in either of the great wars. But it is a mistake to assume that she was saved from Belgium's fate because of her neutralization. Her mountains, her lakes, her valiant people under wise leadership supply means to establish a firm and formidable defense against any aggressor.

But there lies Austria, impotent, at the feet of Red Russia, a pitiful little country, remnant of a great empire, now home of a mere 7 million people, without resources for defense, barred from alliance with friendly nations—a mere tenant at the will of the Soviet overlord. He withdraws his troops today and can march them back again unhindered tomorrow if it suits the Kremlin to give the order.

FACTORS DISTURB RUSSIA

Unless we are again beguiled by folly we will not fall for this transparent scheme. Red Russia's unabandoned inflexible purpose of dominating an enslaved world stares us in the face. Just now the Red leadership has need to play for time. They seek to lull the free world, by capitalizing on its craving for peace, while they reconstruct their power to strike.

Several factors cause them to be presently disturbed: Population outrunning means of subsistence; inadequate supplies of consumer goods; armament, made but 5 years ago, already obsolescent, requiring replacement; increasingly restive masses in Russia and her satellite countries. The Reds' ostentatious display of an apparent overwhelming war potential is itself a sure sign of actual inherent deficiencies.

Our own leadership will perform an invaluable service to the cause of freedom if it presses this present advantage intrepidly and with the utmost vigor and acumen. The first step should be frustration of the neutralization plot.

Value of World War II Pilgrimage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting editorial from the National Tribune—the Stars and Stripes, Thursday, June 9, 1955:

WORLD WAR II PILGRIMAGE

Speaking at Memorial Day exercises at Hagerstown, Md., May 30, Maj. Gen. D. John Markey urged a pilgrimage of Gold Star kin to the graves of their deceased loved ones buried overseas. General Markey, retired from the Maryland National Guard, not only saw exceptional war service in World War I but also served for 30 years on the Battle Monuments Commission and has an exact knowledge of the conditions that would be faced by those who mourn their family dead. He saw at first hand what happened on the pilgrimage arranged for the bereaved of World War I when many of them visited European cemeteries in 1929, so he knows the value of the small expense involved.

The United States has buried 93,000 hero dead of World War II alone in 14 beautiful national cemeteries overseas. Some 65,000 others are missing, many from the air and naval forces, and their names are carved in marble at these memorial burying grounds just as those of the known dead appear on their marble tombstones. There are still others who sleep the long sleep in temporary cemeteries in Korea and elsewhere and whose remains will be transferred in due time. Altogether some 175,000 World War II bodies will remain always in the foreign soil for which they fought. All but four of the permanent cemeteries will be completed by 1956, and the others in Manila, Belgium, and Luxembourg are due for completion by 1957.

Many families have been led to believe, rightly or wrongly, that in not requesting that their loved ones be brought home for burial the Government would arrange for them to visit their last resting places. Such a pilgrimage and its expense must be met by congressional legislation, and experience indicates that the cost would not be great especially if one measures that cost against the sacrifices made by the honored dead. Only 15 percent of all eligibles participated in the 1929 pilgrimage of those who could have visited the 30,000 World War I graves in Europe and it is reasonable to believe that the proportion would hold in a trip to visit the last resting places of the World War II dead by their next of kin.

The American Legion resolved for the World War II pilgrimage at its May national executive committee meeting. We are sure that it would be supported wholeheartedly by all other service groups. We urge the early introduction of enabling legislation as well as its support by all interested parties. It is a beautiful gesture—no less beautiful than the massive memorials that have been erected by a grateful people to those who gave their all to preserve our liberties.

Time to Plant Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appeared in the May 19, 1955, edition of the Elko Daily Free Press on farm price supports which I think will be of interest to my colleagues. Therefore, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I should like to insert the following editorial in the RECORD:

TIME TO PLANT IDEAS

Fortunately for the country, there's very little chance for final enactment of the bill endorsed by the House to restore rigid man-

datory farm price supports at their old level of 90 percent of parity.

The Senate clearly has no intention of doing anything to upset President Eisenhower's existing flexible support program. Even if it did, his veto of the measure would be a foregone conclusion.

A look at the breakdown of the House vote shows that, much like the earlier House action on a $20 tax saving per person, the high support bill was intended to embarrass the President politically. Some 185 Democrats voted for it, as against only 21 Republicans. There were 172 Republicans against, and just 29 Democrats.

The Democrats plumped for high supports on the theory that farmers are generally unhappy over the flexible setup and next year will reward the party which has shown a willingness to scrap it.

Of course, there already has been one test at the polls since the flexible plan was passed. And while most election experts judging the 1954 voting agreed that the President's farm policies had hurt the GOP in some areas, they could detect no widespread reaction of discontent.

Conceivably, restoring high supports may not be now or in 1956 the factor that will turn the farmers' vote.

But whether this is so or not is really beside the point. Responsible lawmakers know that both parties played fast and loose with the national interest for too many years in their efforts to capture the farm vote.

The resulting high-support system produced ruinous crop surpluses which still plague the Nation. Every housewife felt the burden in higher food costs, and every taxpayer felt it in charges to cover support payments and storage costs on Government-bought crops.

It was to try to break out of this box that the flexible plan was enacted. A program that had farmers producing for Government warehouses was seen as senseless. It was felt the lure for such output should be eliminated.

No one imagined flexible supports were the sole answer. Many other devices are needed to develop a healthy, balanced agriculture. But it surely cannot be considered progress to propose restoring old evils.

The men who lead the fight for high supports are irresponsible, for they have seen the fruits of that policy. If they have no other proposal, then they acknowledge a lamentable bankruptcy of ideas in the field they say most deeply concerns them.

American agriculture needs the help of bold imaginations to formulate new, effective policies. But neither the farmer nor the country will profit if that agriculture is turned back into the old, rutted road it so recently abandoned.

For a Federal Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 1955, I introduced a bill to provide for a Federal lottery as a means of raising additional funds for public welfare activities.

Simultaneously with said introduction, I spoke on the floor of the House. I suggested some of the reasons which I think justify the creation of a national, Government-sponsored lottery.

Up to this date, I have received hundreds of letters from people throughout the United States commending me for sponsoring a Federal lottery bill.

On June 5, the New York Sunday News, with a circulation of almost 3½ million readers, published an editorial supporting my bill. I am making the said editorial a part of this RECORD so that the Members of Congress may have an opportunity to read the views expressed by one of the greatest newspapers in the country.

FINE BILL, MR. FINO

President Eisenhower pursed those expressive lips of his at a news conference the other day, and muttered that he'd like to balance the budget before taxes are cut again.

Our thoughts at once went rolling around to a United States lottery, and what it might do to help Ike realize this praiseworthy ambition.

More to the point, the thoughts of Representative PAUL A. FINO, Republican, New York, went rolling around to the same question. Mr. FINO promptly introduced a bill to set up a lottery, run by a special Federal commission, and with the take after prizes and expenses earmarked for health and welfare services.

Mr. FINO, who is an authority on legalized gambling in all its aspects, says gambling, lawful and unlawful, is now a $30-billion-a-year industry in the United States. Most of it is controlled by professional gamblers and kindred racketeers, who pay the customers as little as they can and out of whom the Federal Treasury gets next to no income taxes.

About 57 percent of adult Americans gamble habitually, says FINO, and nothing can stop them. They spend from four to nine billion dollars a year on foreign lotteries. Therefore, why not establish a national lottery of our own?

FINO estimates that about $10 billion in revenues could be raised every year from this source. That would average out to a possible tax cut of $250 per year for each of the Nation's 41 million Federal income-tax payers.

SWEEPSTAKES

This $10 billion, moreover, would be raised with pleasure instead of pain to the contributors. It would come from voluntary lottery ticket buyers, all of whom would have the fun of anticipating victory until the drawings were held, and some of whom would actually win.

In case anyone fears that FINO's estimates are too high, it happens that some fresh evidence to bolster them is at hand. In the July issue of Pageant magazine, coming out next Thursday, there is an article by Walter Walsh, entitled "An Irish Mystery Story."

The piece concerns the Irish Sweeps. What interests us most in the article is its report on the sum the sweeps managers publicly admit having collected in the 25 years since the enterprise was started.

That intake came to $381 million. Of this amount, $237 million was paid out in prizes and $24 million in taxes, while Ireland's hospitals got $96 million. Promotion expenses are reported to have taken the remaining $24 million.

If Ireland can do that well with a legalized lottery, couldn't the United States expect to do many times as well with a lottery run under Federal supervision, paying generous prizes, and carefully safeguarded by law against grafters, chiselers, and counterfeiters?

In short, if General Ike wants a painless way to cut taxes and balance the budget, FINO's bill looks like Ike's dish.

Romanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Congress a resolution drawn up by the Romanian Americans of Michigan in commemoration of Romanian Independence Day, pointing out the great wrongs against humanity by the failure of Russia to abide by the terms of the Yalta agreements. I join with other Members of the Congress in looking toward the day when these wrongs may be peacefully remedied and freedom may be restored to the people of Romania and of countries in a similar plight.

The resolution follows:

THE ROMANIAN-AMERICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE AND ROMANIAN-AMERICANS OF MICHIGAN JOINT COMMEMORATION OF MAY 10, ROMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY—SUNDAY, MAY 8, 1955, CASA ROMANA, DETROIT, MICH.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Declaration of Liberated Europe of the Yalta agreement, to which the United States is one of the three signatory powers, provides that the peoples liberated from domination of Nazi Germany, and the peoples of former Axis satellite states of Europe are to be assisted to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems; and

Whereas the Yalta agreement further provides that the establishment of order in Europe and rebuilding of national economic life must be achieved by processes which will enable liberated peoples to destroy the last vestiges of nazism and fascism and to create democratic institutions of their own choice; that this provision is a principle of the Atlantic Charter—namely, the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live and the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those people who have been forcibly deprived of them by the aggressor nations; and

Whereas the three Governments, namely, the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, are pledged that they will jointly assist the people in any European liberated state or former Axis satellite state in Europe where in their judgment conditions require—

(a) To establish conditions of internal peace;

(b) To carry out emergency measures for the relief of distressed peoples;

(c) To form interim governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the populations and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsible to the will of the people;

(d) To facilitate where necessary the holdings of such elections; and

Whereas the Yalta agreement, on the part of the Government of the United States was, in good faith, a determination to build, in cooperation with other peace loving people, a world order under law, dedicated to peace, security, freedom, and general well being of all mankind; and

Whereas because of devious and underhanded methods employed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to avoid the fulfillment of their stated obligations under the terms of the Yalta agreement, in effect

has enabled the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to foist upon the peoples liberated from Nazi Germany, a government other than one of their own choice, and thereby have secured for the peoples concerned only a change of masters; and

Whereas this Nation has a sacred obligation to right the wrongs committed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we Americans of Rumanian origin first and foremost reaffirm our unswering loyalty without reservation to the Government of the United States of America; that we are determined at any cost to maintain our American form of democracy; that we are opposed to all forms of subversive idealogies, that we desire to alleviate in every way legally possible the sufferings of our Rumanian brethren; that we desire to assist our Government in every peaceful way to attain the restoration of the freedom not only of our Rumanian brethren, but of all enslaved peoples everywhere, from a tyrannical and Godless Communists regime; and be it further

Resolved, That we Americans of Rumanian origin urge our subjugated Rumanian brethren to remain steadfast in their devotion to democratic ideals, institutions, and processes and to await with faith and hope the day of their liberation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, the United States delegate to the United Nations, the members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the two United States Senators from Michigan, and to all Representatives from Michigan whose districts include citizens of Rumanian origin.

A Reappraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with current discussions as to the most feasible program for maintenance of the American merchant marine at its highest point of efficiency, it is timely to have the expressed views of such a well-informed executive as President Francis T. Greene, of the American Merchant Marine Institute. Recently, in Baltimore, Mr. Greene delivered a forceful address before the Propeller Club emphasizing the imperative need for a realistic appraisal of the problems confronting the maritime industry. Both because of its timeliness, and especially because of the authoritative source of these comments, under unanimous consent, I insert an editorial of the Baltimore News-Post commenting on Mr. Greene's speech to be reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A REAPPRAISAL

In an address here before the Propeller Club on National Maritime Day, Francis T. Greene, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, expressed the opinion that, if the shrinking of our merchant marine is to be checked, there must be a reduction in high operating costs.

When Mr. Greene spoke of high operating costs he was speaking principally of high labor costs. To effect a reduction therein, he would have the unions "reappraise and, where possible, eliminate from the contracts the obsolete and conflicting penalty and overtime provisions, many of which have been carried over from the era of the 56-hour week."

Such a reappraisal, we suspect, would hardly be palatable to the unions and their members, for everyone in every line of business likes to get as much as he can, in wages and in benefits. But these wages and benefits cannot be more than the traffic will bear. If they are, the business will go into a decline and ultimately into dissolution. In such an event the workers lose.

This is the point that Mr. Greene makes. By the shrinkage in our merchant marine, "labor is losing, and will lose, fully as much as anyone else," he says.

That is something for the enlightened leaders of labor to think about. It may be well for them to make the "reappraisal" which Mr. Greene suggests, although they may regret what he deems the necessity. There is such a thing as the law of diminishing returns and it may be working in this case.

This is something for labor to study, although the study may lead to a conclusion at variance with that expressed by Mr. Greene. By insisting on retaining specific gains labor will not wish to suffer overall losses. Whether such insistence is primarily responsible for the shrinkage of the merchant marine is a vital question, well worth a "reappraisal." This shrinkage does labor no good and may do the Nation great harm.

Inclusive Amendments to Refugee Relief Act Introduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill H. R. 6642, to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended. The bill as written by the administration—professedly following President Eisenhower's recommendations—and introduced in the House and the Senate contains provisions that are unrealistic and do not go far enough to insure that we achieve the humanitarian objectives of this legislation.

There is no provision to remove Mr. McLeod as administrator of the act. A change of law does not insure a change of heart, and Mr. McLeod's administration to date has been inept and frustrating.

My bill provides, in the main, as follows:

First. Increase of 15,000 in the number of authorized visas; inclusion, in addition to the NATO countries, Turkey, Sweden, Iran, and eligible refugees now residing in Spain and in the now highly disturbed areas of North Africa.

Second. Unused allotments of visas will be carried over to all categories in proportion to the original percentage set forth in the bill. If, after such allotments, there remain still unused visas, these shall be used to fill applications remaining unfilled on December 31, 1956.

Third. The administration of the Refugee Relief Act is taken away from the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs and given to a full-time administrator within the Department of State.

Fourth. In addition to individual assurances, voluntary agency assurances for housing and employment will be acceptable.

Fifth. Distinction between refugees and escapees is withdrawn and only one category is established, to include those who escape from behind the Iron Curtain and refugees dating to World War II.

Sixth. The requirement for a 2-year security history is eliminated.

Seventh. The cutoff date for all reallocations of unused visas is moved forward to December 31, 1960.

Eighth. Under the present law, members of a family must all be admitted together or not at all. I have provided that members of the family need not all leave together but may be reunited at a later date.

Ninth. The affliction of tuberculosis will not render a member of a family ineligible if he submits to the safeguards to be established by the Attorney General and the public-health authorities.

These provisions follow closely the provisions of the bill introduced by Senator LEHMAN earlier in the session and the last two follow the suggestions contained in the President's message. We shall have, then, both in the Senate and in the House, a bill designed to make the act effective, accomplish its purposes, and remove the impediments both in the law and in the person of the present Administrator. We have a bill that is workable, realistic, and humanitarian.

Labor's Power and Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we all joined in a sigh of relief that the combined good sense and management and labor resulted in an agreement between the Ford Motor Co. and the United Auto Workers. Incidental to all such negotiations is the threat of a strike which may be far reaching in its economic effects, just as this negotiated settlement may likewise have its long-range economic effects, both good and bad.

In any event we have been spared a situation similar to that presently threatening the British economy, which is explored in an editorial appearing in Monday's Evening Star. The editorial, in my opinion, rightly labels the British controversy as an interunion squabble and emphasizes British labor's total disregard of the national welfare in these words:

Meanwhile, Britain's economy is grinding to a halt under the impact of a strangled railway system and spreading jurisdictional strikes on the docks. Once again, a handful of people who happen to belong to unions are using their economic power to enforce selfish demands, and are doing this in total disregard of the welfare of the rest of the Nation. Governments put a stop to this sort of thing on the part of big business a long time ago. If unions continue to abuse the special privileges which have been conferred upon them, the day may yet come when public opinion will force the politicians to apply similar restraints to labor.

I am sure that labor in this country is fully cognizant of the fact that the national welfare takes precedent over the welfare of individual groups and that the right to strike must only be used as a last resort in opposing conditions of servitude or unbearable economic pressure. If the strike is ever again employed in this country to the extent we now see it operating in Britain, I am sure that public—and that means congressional—reaction will be prompt and decisive.

The entire editorial herein referred to is included as follows:

WAR AGAINST THE NATION

A major automobile strike in this country, if one develops, will divert attention from the crisis being forced upon Britain by irresponsible union leaders. Strike troubles of our own, however, should not serve to obscure the lessons implicit in the British situation.

Britain's pro-Labor Daily Mirror calls the strike of railroad engineers and firemen a "war against the nation." This is hardly an exaggeration. The striking union is the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen, whose 70,000 members constitute about 80 percent of the engineers and firemen on Britain's nationalized railways. The remaining 400,000 rail workers in all categories belong to the National Union of Railwaymen.

The members of both unions participated last fall in a general wage increase. But the ASLEF, claiming special skills for its members, is demanding an additional increase. The NUR, however, says that if the differential is widened in favor of the engineers and firemen, comparable increases will be demanded for its own members. The government, caught in the middle of what is essentially an interunion squabble, has refused to grant any increase, and is moving to arm itself with special powers under a state-of-emergency proclamation by the Queen.

It remains to be seen, however, what steps, if any, will be taken by the government against the strikers. British politicians, even more than our own, have been notably reluctant to use compulsion in labor disputes. Instead, the practice has been to rely on the Trade-Union Congress, with which some 8 million union members are affiliated. The TUC has tried, unsuccessfully, to prevent this strike.

Meanwhile, Britain's economy is grinding to a halt under the impact of a strangled railway system and spreading jurisdictional strikes on the dock. Once again, a handful of people who happen to belong to unions are using their economic power to enforce selfish demands, and are doing this in total disregard of the welfare of the rest of the nation. Governments put a stop to this sort of thing on the part of big business a long time ago. If unions continue to abuse the special privileges which have been conferred upon them, the day may yet come when public opinion will force the politicians to apply similar restraints to labor.

The Genocide Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of Freedom, a union of many patriotic organizations, recently met at San Francisco to consider the Charter of the United Nations. On April 30, 1955, among other resolutions, it adopted one concerning the Genocide Treaty. The objections voiced against this treaty reinforce what I have already said in many speeches and extensions in Congress, the only difference being that the findings of the committee give the people more detailed information, and it is couched in better language.

The resolution reads:

Resolution presented by the panel on the Genocide Convention and what it means:

"Whereas we are here assembled to study the United Nations from the American viewpoint and have completed a careful and objective study of the Genocide Convention, which is the particular phase of the United Nations assigned to this symposium; and

"Whereas we find the very concept of genocide un-American, unprincipled and un-Christian and that genocide (mass-killing) is a communistic, heathenish and immoral device based on the disbelief in the individual as a child of God; and

"Whereas we find the Genocide Convention to be a conspiracy to deprive the American citizen of his God-given rights guaranteed to him by the American Constitution for the following reasons:

"1. It deprives him of freedom of speech (art. II, b of the Genocide Convention).

"2. It deprives him of trial by jury (art. VI).

"3. It deprives him of trial in the State or district where the alleged crime occurred (art. VI).

"4. It deprives him of the right of habeas corpus by not guaranteeing this right in the Genocide Convention.

"5. It permits in the most flagrant manner the extradition of individuals across all boundaries (art. VII).

"6. It discriminates in favor of certain 'national' ethnical, racial, or religious groups' (art. II).

"7. It provides for no appeal from the decisions of the tribunal trying the accused according to U. N. International Law; and

"Whereas article II of the Genocide Convention includes the vague and flexible term of 'mental harm' which can be dangerously interpreted, among the offences of genocide; and

"Whereas article IV includes private individuals among those who may be punished; and

"Whereas article VI and VIII provide for international tribunals to proceed against individual citizens in accordance with international U. N. law as superimposed upon and above our domestic law; and

"Whereas the Genocide Convention does not even provide penalties for genocide mass-killing as the term means) as is evidenced by the fact that governments cannot be indicted and punished for the murder of political prisoners; and

"Whereas it is concluded that the Genocide Convention is an instrument of dictatorship designed by the U. N. for one-world government by which American citizens may be deprived of their constitutionally guaranteed individual freedoms: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of Freedom petition the Senate of the United States Congress that the Genocide Convention be not ratified.

Flag Day, June 14, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent article from the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes, Thursday, June 9, 1955:

LET'S FLY HER PROUDLY

"Here's to the Red of it; there's not a thread of it
In all th- spread of it from foot to head,
But heroes bled for it, faced steel and lead for it,
Slept with the dead for it, bathing it Red.

"Here's to the White of it; who knows the might of it
But thrills at the sight of it through day and night,
Womanhood's care for it made manhood dare for it;
Purity's prayer for it kept it so White.

"Here's to the Blue of it; heavenly hue of it
Star spangled view of it, constant and true;
And here's to the whole of it, stars, stripes, and pole of it,
Here's to the soul of it—Red, White, and Blue."

—*Selected.*

Next Tuesday is to be observed in this country as Flag Day, June 14 being the anniversary of the adoption of the Stars and Stripes as our national emblem. Ours was but an infant Republic 178 years ago when the Continental Congress declared that hereafter Old Glory was to be the symbol of the principles of Americanism, but there was no misunderstanding about its glorious significance. To look upon the new flag as it flew softly in the gentle breeze of a nation established through armed revolution was to vow a belief in the ideals of its founding—a secure government on this continent in which the governed chose their rulers and the goals of which were personal freedom, liberty of thought, and conscience, and a way of living that spelled absolute justice for all who strove for it and deserved to have it.

This Nation has been enlarged upon physically through the years since June 14, 1777. From a small Confederation of States, it has progressed from ocean to ocean and beyond the seas. With its expansion have come greater powers, a vast development of resources, the need for enlargement of relations with other peoples, and the acceptance of responsibilities that have resulted from the changes that were due to growth. New wars, both foreign and domestic, have been fought and won and to the flag has been added only luster with each victory. During all of the years there has been evident willingness to accept blessings that flow to a free people, and in spite of all assertions

to the contrary the ideals of its founders have remained constant. There has been no suppression of the individual or his rights. His freedoms have remained intact. The nationalism born of our own revolution has been the mainstay of those principles that were the basic reason for the flag.

And yet there has been a growing disregard for some of the priceless ideals that were won through war, and there are those today who are in idealistic conflict with others among us who toil to prevent their dissolution. Fear has built up in them a wish to replace nationalism, which is in fact patriotism, with a world alinement that would prove fatal to every concept of liberty to which real Americans have pledged their faith. Especially has their doctrine gained ground since World War II as the United World Federalists, the Atlantic Union Committee, and others with equal fervor but lesser influence have striven to achieve political changes that would alter radically the very things that are symbolized by the American Flag. There are among them Communists and fellow travelers, intellectuals who look to internationalism as an instrument of peace, misguided individuals who would surrender our precious freedoms at least in part as a means of obtaining universal amity, and propagandists who would permit foreign dictation of our lives with or without our consent. All are not Reds. Not all of them can see through to the end destruction they are forging, but organizations among them are battling for the minds of our children to instill in them the belief of world government, or limited world union, and an active membership in a community of nations in which they believe, many with honest conviction, they can serve without conflict many masters with varying interests.

No intelligent American wants to see the United States engage in further armed conflict. No war veteran to our knowledge desires additional privileges of combat. All of them hate war. That is why almost universally they believe in and support the original purpose of the United Nations that combined to stop wars and their causes. It is their hope and prayer that coming conferences will bring about further attempts to settle international differences without recourse to arms, but they realize that the international Communists are today the only barrier to permanent peace; they do not see an immediate promise of the leopard's changing his spots, and they know that no amount of proposed world government will alter the Reds in their program, which is a progressive development of the type of patriotism that serves only the higher level, their masters in the Kremlin.

Every American crisis through the past 178 years while Old Glory has flown over the land has been overcome through a wholehearted devotion to righteous causes. If in recent years the goals have been obscured and often made unrecognizable, it has been because we have been led to believe by one-world aspirants that we must not offend our allies nor even our only enemies whose ideals we despise. We are encouraged to not glorify our national traditions and harbor pride for American achievement because it smacks of "colonialism" and worse. To try to accent the things in which all real patriots have believed since the Nation's birth means that we are accused of jingoism and militarism, but we remind those among us who preach such doctrines that the Communist leaders also assert such patriotic activity springs from "the poisoned air of nationalism" which threatens to stop the spread of world conquest and that the will to preserve American institutions that is attributed to "reactionaries" by our one-worlder citizens is termed "counterrevolutionary" by the Moscow leadership.

We should remind ourselves, we think, of the riches we possess through national ardor, of the things that have made our country great and of the prizes we need to hold and cherish if we are to maintain our place in the affairs of men and resist the savage aggressors who threaten the survival of civilization. Our country has done well to follow the maxims of its founders. It grew and prospered as an entirely independent people. It has settled its internal quarrels up to the present hour without outside assistance. National independence was won in 1776. The Civil War led to freedom, to union and full self-determination. The Spanish-American War, while unselfish in its inception, preserved our shores against a foreign thrust. Two world wars and a still unwon war in Korea demonstrated that our people would tolerate no aggression against them and that we would defend ourselves come what may. No spirit of internationalism brought about those victories; it was patriotism which was nationalism. It was the fruition of an ideal such as prompted the early patriots of our country to die for the flag. During 1776, Nathan Hale, who had trained for the ministry and was a young Revolutionary officer, became a spy for the land he loved. Just before he was hanged by the British, he uttered the words, "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country." Hale was only 21, but he is remembered in history for his devotion to America, and it was that belief in this Nation that has produced the patriots who have brought it safely through from Valley Forge to Heartbreak Ridge.

As we display the flag of our country on June 14, may we do so with the thought that all America is bound within its folds. May we remember that its influence has waned only in proportion to the extent it has been permitted to dissipate its strength through the intrigue of international busybodies. Americans are renowned for the good they have done for others, and they need never cease their efforts to help their fellow men throughout the world, but all of their hopes and ideals depend upon our maintaining the Star Spangled Banner as representative of total independence. It is not only a heritage from the past but it is also a symbol of the future. What it has meant to Americans through the ages, it can hold for us through generations yet to come, but its stars will forfeit their light and its stripes will fade if we lose the will for nationalism. Let us remember that when we fly Old Glory on Flag Day.

Cedars in Lebanon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following significant editorial written by Leo A. Lerner, in a recent issue of the Rogers Park News, Chicago, Ill. The intelligent and far-reaching comments of Mr. Lerner on the subject of why the wrong so often appear to be right and why the right have such a hard time in life may be read with profit by many of us. Incidentally, the Rogers Park News has been a winner of the NEA Herrick award for Americanism and democracy:

CEDARS IN LEBANON
(By Leo A. Lerner)

A recent definition has been going the rounds, about the difference between a psychotic and a neurotic.

The psychotic, it appears, is a person who, when asked the sum of 2 and 2, says "5" and is quite unperturbed about it.

The neurotic, on the other hand, when asked the sum of 2 and 2, says "4," but he is nervous about it.

The people who "know" the wrong answer may be crazy, but it doesn't bother them.

The people who know the right answer are so painfully sane that they are disturbed by the very accuracy of what they know.

This may sound like double talk, but there is more than a grain of sense in it.

Apply the test to almost any local or national situation, and you will find that the formula fits; the wrong are happy in their ignorance, the right are unhappy in their righteousness.

The people who know that 2 and 2 are 4 are like a lot condemned to eternal damnation, the damnation of the just and reasonable. It is a big job to be right, a responsibility not many people can take.

The next time you hear a phony speech, or an obviously false statement made with great conviction, keep in mind that it might kill the poor guy if he had to tell the truth.

The truth is such a precise taskmaster it takes great courage to live with it. There are times when the truth is so painful, it is impossible.

It is a lot simpler to create a few silly illusions and live them as though they were great truths. This is a relief to the intellect and a soporific to the nervous system.

This may be why, in the battle of life, the right have such a hard time. (That sentence should be skipped by small children who have been told in school that right always triumphs. It does, but people don't always live that long.)

When the wrong are wrong, as they always are, they go ahead with banners flying and swords flashing as if they were right. They look neither to the right nor the left because wrongness never looks, it just leaps.

But the right is always nervous about its rightness. It wonders whom its rightness is hurting. It wonders if its facts have been properly justified and checked. It always moves slowly, and with lingering doubts.

That is why the people who know two and two are four usually wind up asking the psychiatrist what is the matter with them, while on the other hand those who say two and two make five are ignorantly blissful, and, in a sense, powerful, because power in the tightening modern world seems to come from a kind of inner ruthless ignorance, a disregard for human factors, a happy living with illusions and delusions, something like living blissfully in roomful of poisonous snakes.

Often I can imagine the gods on Mt. Olympus, somewhere 'way up on the heights with a clear view, looking down on us and roaring with laughter at the things they see, such as what we permit to be put over on us in an age that is supposed to be "civilized." Their sides must hurt from laughing at our leaders of politics, and our leaders of thought and at us for our apparent helplessness. The Olympians don't need television, just a window onto the earth, for an incomparable entertainment.

The entertainment they see on the Olympian TV is on the whole almost as bad in taste as "This Is Your Life." The raucous sound, the invasion of privacy and personal dignity, the frustrating illogic of nonsequitur are not confined to any particular hour, but form a kind of disease that penetrates the whole conduct of the human race.

It is as painful in the halls of Congress as it is on corny television; it is as sickening in the column of newspapers as it is in the seamy comic books and the fleshpots.

But the laughing Olympians may not have the last laugh.

The question boils down to who will inherit the earth, those who say two and two are five or those who say two and two are four and are nervous about it?

My own bet is still on the nervous. I go along with the Scriptures: "The righteous shall flourish like the palm tree; they shall grow like a cedar in Lebanon."

It may be slow, and it may take patience, and the road will be rocky and discouraging, but there is no other way to deal with life except with the truth, however nervous it makes those who know it.

The Public Be Damned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, questions of art have an intimate connection with government—through publicly supported museums, the sculpture, murals, and paintings in parks and public buildings, the work of art commissions, and otherwise. For that reason this challenging statement by Mr. Huntington Hartford was put before the public in full-page advertisements in many New York City newspapers by the Citizens Union Research Foundation, Inc.

I would like to set forth a condensed version of the article:

What is the purpose of the art of painting? If it is no more than to preserve a facsimile of the subject for the historical record, then the camera would quickly replace the brush and palette. If it is only to give sensuous pleasure by means of a careful balance of lines and brush strokes or to shock us by some hysterical outburst, then great art could be replaced by an opium pipe or a small charge of TNT under the nearest bush and the artist would become a thing of the past.

The purpose of great art, in my opinion, is a moral one; one would be at a loss, otherwise, to explain the tremendous veneration in which art and artists have been held even to the irreverent present. There are many great paintings, and perhaps it would be difficult for even the hair splitter in esthetics to find a moral in all of them. The fact that the lesson is not easily expressed in words, however, is no indication of its absence; the teaching is simply taking place without the knowledge of the pupil. It is the old lesson which beauty has taught for so many years without material compensation, the lesson of goodness and kindness and strength which has caused poets to identify it with the word truth. But in cases where such beauty is indeed absent, particularly if it happens to be replaced on canvas by distortion and ugliness, there is little doubt of the alacrity with which the average observer will recognize the loss.

A critic by the name of Aline Saarinen has written an article in the New York Times magazine entitled "Cultural Diplomacy: An Art We Neglect." In this article she strongly criticizes the American Government for its lack of interest in modern painting. Mrs. Saarinen remembers vividly the inquisition to which Congress subjected members of the State Department in 1946 when they sent an exhibition of our modern art abroad; she thinks of the prevailing violent antagonism of the majority of Congress toward modern art today.

May I suggest a reason why, Mrs. Saarinen? Do you ever read the bible of the art world in America today, the Art News? Would you like to hear a quotation from the February 1952 number of the magazine?

"The shock of the impact of these disgusting paintings should have indicated what a fine artist he was. * * * By throwing quality away, quality is what he attains."

Would you expect a Member of Congress or anyone else, for that matter, to react favorably when such verbal and pictorial garbage is constantly being thrown in their faces in the guise of roses?

For artists who paint in a confused and embittered manner there is always the stock defense: They are only mirroring the chaos of our time. The line between mirroring chaos and being so preoccupied with it as to encourage it, however, is a fine one. One cannot help recognizing the fact that the philosophy of hatred preached in many quarters of the world today has had its effect on the work of some of our contemporary artists, and our critics have done little to discourage the trend. If one dares to mention the ugly word "communism," in fact, in connection with a contemporary work of art, the critic will hasten to explain that painting in Russia today is completely regimented, and the Communists paint in a conventional and photographic manner. But what does that prove? The spirit of revolution which Lenin let loose upon a troubled world was forever silenced within Russia itself when Stalin dropped the Iron Curtain, and it would be surprising if the situation were otherwise in a dictatorship. But this fact has never prevented the Communists from peddling their wares outside the homeland.

At any rate, whether because of a twisted political philosophy, or an effort to shock the public into buying, or merely a desire to set themselves up as high priests of a culture from which the public is excluded, many artists today are certainly guilty of encouraging disorganization and violence in their painting. To anyone with doubts on this score, I suggest that he go to the third floor of the Museum of Modern Art in New York and see the nightmare which is currently on exhibition there.

In a Western World constantly professing to seek the dove of peace—a favorite symbol of Picasso's—it is strange that artists who are most aggressive not only in their personal philosophy, but also their work, are generally given the place of honor by the critics. "There ought to be a dictatorship of painters, a dictatorship of one painter," says Picasso, to suppress all those who have betrayed us, to suppress the tricks, to suppress mannerisms, to suppress charm, to suppress history, to suppress a heap of other things." So far as his career is concerned I will give Picasso credit—he has gone an amazing distance toward wiping out single-handed all the gains that have been made in the world of painting for the last 500 years. His dictatorships and his suppressions, with the help of an army of critics, museum directors, magazine editors, and dealers have gone further, I am sure, than his wildest dreams in destroying the culture of the past in his chosen profession.

"I don't know anything about painting, but I know what I like." How often has the average intelligent person blurted out this credo of false modesty. In the matter of good taste and judgment concerning the arts I believe that the average intelligent American can hold up his head with the best of the critics, and it is high time that we stop apologizing for our amateur standing. If anything is to be done to halt the downward trend of esthetic standards in America today, it must be done by the people. This is our responsibility, and we cannot escape it with the weak-kneed excuse, "I don't know anything about it." Ladies and gentlemen, form your own opinions about art. Don't be afraid to disagree—loudly, if necessary, with the powers that be in the painting world. Stand up and be heard. And when the high priests of criticism and the museum directors and the teachers of mumbo jumbo throughout the country begin to realize that you mean business, you will be astonished, in my humble opinion, how fast they will change their tune.

Anniversary of the Battle of Elizabethtown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Battle of Elizabethtown Day, June 7, marks an exciting and valiant chapter in New Jersey and American history, for it was on this date 175 years ago that 12 Elizabeth patriots held back a British Army of 6,000 and then, joined by the militia, turned back the British although outnumbered 6 to 1.

It was a pleasure for me to welcome to Washington on this important anniversary several distinguished citizens of the Elizabethport section of the city of Elizabeth, the site of the valiant defense commemorated yesterday. These gentlemen represent the new and growing Elizabethport Lions Club. They are Carl Schleck, Fred Wucker, Anthony Jasina, Joseph Heuser, Frank McGlynn, Jack Horbaly, Abe Rudd, Joseph Lieblien, William F. Crowley, and the comptroller of the city of Elizabeth, Patrick F. McCann.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Elizabeth Daily Journal on this 175th anniversary which describes the stirring story of the Elizabethtown Battle.

The article follows:

PATRIOTS STALLED INVADERS AT UNION SQUARE WHILE DEFENDERS RALLIED FOR VICTORY—ORGY OF PLUNDER MARKED RETREAT

(By Nadia Zigalka)

One hundred and seventy-five years ago tomorrow, a tiny band of 12 patriots set a British army of 6,000 back on its heels at what is now Union Square.

The skirmish later developed into the Battle of Elizabethtown.

The Americans, the handful grown into a force of 1,000 as militia joined the troops, won hands down—even though outnumbered 6 to 1.

The battle, which evoked wonderment among historians and orators to this day, was more than a lesson in history. It was a demonstration of psychology, proving that a man will work harder to defend his own home than to gain strange lands for someone else. On that basis, the feat was explainable.

EMBARRASSING DEFEAT

Audaciously, recklessly and impertinently, the motley defendeds slammed back the seasoned, superbly equipped—and beautifully dressed—army of what was then the greatest nation on earth. It was embarrassing for the enemy.

Although June 8 has been celebrated here as the anniversary of the engagement, the

fighting actually lasted for 2 days, starting June 7.

A resolution adopted by the legislature congratulates Elizabeth on the occasion, but mentions no date, except to point out that the battle occurred in June.

In a proclamation, Mayor Nicholas S. LaCorte has called on the citizenry to observe tomorrow as the Battle of Elizabethtown Day.

The invasion was launched from New York by way of Staten Island, the British landing at Elizabethtown in waves the night of June 6. The aim was to rout Gen. George Washington and the main body of the Continental Army from Morristown and drive them out of New Jersey.

USED FLATBOATS

Crossing Staten Island Sound in flatboats, the enemy landed in the meadows near what historians call Elizabethtown Point, in the general area of what is now the foot of Elizabeth Ave.

They worked in darkness, but word of their debarkation reached Col. Elias Dayton of the Jersey Brigade, who immediately set out to gather his troops. Before he hastened off, however, he posted the 12 guards at the Crossroads, now Union Square, with orders to delay the advance in any way possible.

At daybreak, the invaders formed a column and proceeded up Elizabeth Avenue, then known as Water Street. As they approached within musket shot, the brave little handful at the outpost opened fire.

Pandemonium ensued, with horses and men milling about it wild confusion. One of the bullets unhorsed General Stirling, who was leading the column.

Suffering a fracture of the thigh, Stirling was taken aside and treated for his wounds, the Redcoats remained disorganized until General Knyphausen took his place.

By the time the enemy had reformed, the rebels had fled to join the larger mobilization.

IN NEW UNIFORMS

As the sun rose, the British again set off, revealed now in all their glory. An eyewitness account in Hatfield's "History of Elizabeth" said every man, either on horse or afoot, was clad in a new uniform, "complete in panoply, and gorgeous with burnished brass and polished steel."

Their route took them into Broad Street, Jersey Street, and ultimately into Galloping Hill Road leading to Union, or "Connecticut Farms" as it was then called.

Meanwhile, at Prospect Hill in the rear of Sprinfield, a tar barrel atop a signal pole had been set afire, and an 18-pound gun thundered a warning.

Alerted thus to the approaching menace, the entire countryside rushed to arms. Seizing weapons—and a conglomeration of these there was, indeed—the militia sped to mustering places and soon afterward marched as companies to the area in which action was expected.

Elizabethtown's defenders came from within boundaries far beyond the city's present territorial limits. In those days, the town stretched from the Staten Island Sound to the Passaic River, and from Springfield to Rahway.

As the British pushed into the interior, there was a continual skirmishing until they reached rising ground just beyond the west branch of the Elizabeth River. There, a party of about 60 dauntless militiamen made a stand, armed only with muskets.

Once again, the British were disconcerted. Better than that, they were checked in their advance until the Jersey Brigade, reconnoitering, assembling and gaining strength brought them to a complete halt, then turned the tide.

Meanwhile, houses in the village were becoming filled with the wounded.

In the afternoon, the British commander learned Washington, with superior numbers, had reached Short Hills en route from Morristown and was headed this way. He decided it would be wise to retreat, and ordered that a return get underway after nightfall.

The Red Coats thereupon plunged into an orgy of plunder, setting fire to the Connecticut Farms Presbyterian Church, and several dwellings, besides stores and other structures. In this turmoil, Mrs. James Caldwell, wife of the pastor of First Presbyterian Church, Elizabeth, was shot to death by a British soldier while taking refuge in the Farms parsonage.

RETREAT IN RAIN

The enemy's withdrawal, begun at 10 p. m., was made in drenching rain over mud and marshes amidst a strict silence. It was so dark, the soldiers had difficulty seeing each other, and once or twice, the entire army was forced to stop.

British Lt. Edward Mathew wrote: "We continued our march until we reached the bank of the creek (the Sound) which we had crossed in the morning. Nothing more awful than this retreat can be imagined.

"The rain with the terrible thunder and lightning, the darkness of the night, the houses at Connecticut Farms, which we had set fire to, in a blaze, the dead bodies which the light of the fire or the lightning showed you now and then on the road, and the dread of an enemy completed the scene of horror. * * * We halted at the side of the creek, and took up our ground and the whole army encamped."

Later, most of the enemy departed for Staten Island, leaving about 500 troops behind. It was this force the Americans attacked on June 8, this time in columns numbering about 1,500.

The encounter, confined to what is now the Elizabethport section, failed to dislodge the troops, and is described by historians in lesser detail than the activities of the previous day.

On Friday, June 23, the British left their camp at the Point and headed inland again. This time, the fighting went down in history as the Battle of Springfield.

Reds Cry Peace—This Time They Mean It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Sunday Post of June 5, 1955:

REDS STILL CRYING PEACE, BUT THIS TIME THEY MEAN IT

(By John Fox)

For many years the leaders of the great slave State, the U. S. S. R. have cried peace, but they have not wanted it. What they wanted was to keep the world in a constant uproar with a minor war here, and another there, native insurrections in one place, border-shooting incidents in many others, with as little cost to themselves as possible, of course.

They are still crying peace, but this time there is no doubt that they really mean it. You can't tell what they want by what they say. There is not only no necessary connection between what they say and what they mean. But when what they say is actually what they mean, the situation is so rare as properly to merit the label coincidence. The only way to form an opinion about the real intentions of the Kremlin gang when they piously cry, peace—or anything else for that matter—is to appraise the situation in the light of real facts. Most of the time the facts necessary to such a conclusion are not available, and that has been the state of affairs for years at a time. At this moment, for the first time in at least 10 years, there are enough undeniable facts available to make clear beyond a reasonable doubt that the murderers in the Kremlin really mean it when they prate about peace and wanting to get along with everyone, and when they proclaim that coexistence between the Communist and free systems is possible.

What are the facts? The first time since the end of World War II that the Kremlin gave up any territory in Europe (or anywhere else) on which it had fastened its clutches, was in 1948 when a Communist supported mass murderer, Tito, himself an acknowledged Communist, who was and who has ever since been Premier of Yugoslavia, announced that he was, although still a Communist, severing his ties with the Kremlin, and that he was going to be his own kind of Communist. That is not so simple as it sounds, since the Kremlin type of communism has a set of basic principles which are the stones in the arch of Communist theory, each of which is so interrelated to and dependent upon the others, that if one of them should be shattered or removed for any reason, the whole Communist ideological structure must fall. The keystone of the arch, the one that has been more important than any of the others, has been the absolute Communist dogma that there is only one kind of communism anywhere, and everywhere on earth, and that its seat, its expression, its headquarters, its heart, and brain are in the Kremlin, from whose edicts there must be no deviation.

TROTSKY SLAIN FOR HIS DEVIATION

Trotsky, one of the founders of communism, was driven out of Russia, lucky to have escaped with his life, because he deviated, which is to say that he differed in his theory of communism from Stalin. For his deviation, years later, he had an ice pick driven into his skull in Mexico where he had taken up residence. The Kremlin agent in charge of his murder was almost certainly Vittorio Vidale, an old Kremlin type of Communist, who has for years been boss Communist in Trieste, who doesn't deny, although he has not admitted the crime.

In the late 1920's, and in 1936, there were so-called purges in Russia, which resulted in the deaths of millions of people, some of them summarily executed immediatley after arrest with or without trial, most of them murdered by the slower process of being worked, starved, exposed, and beaten to death in the slave camps which are scattered all over Russia and northern Asia—primarily because Stalin and the men around him feared that even though their victims were themselves often old Communists, they did not subscribe to all of the principles of communism exactly as laid down as basic Communist dogma by Stalin and his incredibly evil associates in the Kremlin hierarchy.

Last week, in Yugoslavia, the basic principle of the infallibility of the Kremlin was shattered to bits by a team of diplomats representing the Kremlin, itself, headed by the man who is perhaps No. 1 in Russia, Khrushchev. To dedicated Communists the world over, such an abandonment of principle was as serious and great a disaster as it would be to Roman Catholics if a committee appointed by the College of Cardinals, with the Pope's approval, were to deny the basic doctrine of the Catholic Church that the Pope is infallible in matters of faith and morals. For the first time since the very

beginning of Stalin's assumption of power, more than 30 years ago, the theory of communism is shown clearly, irremediably, and conclusively to be what it is—a ghastly fake to which have been sacrificed the lives and futures of untold millions, and hundreds of millions of people for more than a generation.

TITO CALLED RUSSIA'S BLUFF

Here is the sequence of events. In 1948, Tito, who had been the leader of a group of guerrillas during the war, with the powerful assistance of the Kremlin grabbed control of Yugoslavia. Almost his first act was to arrest Michailovitch, another partisan leader, who had fought the Germans first, and later the Russians. He was a true Yugoslav patriot, who had the backing and support of the United States, whereas Tito was a Yugoslav Communist, which means that his primary loyalty was to the Kremlin. When Michailovitch started to fight the Kremlin, Tito started to fight Michailovitch. Our State Department, with its usual blindness, did not recognize what was happening, and therefore failed to support Michailovitch whose loss to Tito was thereby assured. Tito promptly had him and his whole organization shot and liquidated in the approved Communist manner.

In 1948, having established himself as dictator of Yugoslavia, Tito publicly renounced the doctrine of the infallibility of the Kremlin for which he was promptly expelled from the Cominform by the Kremlin, and was anathematized by Communists all over the world as a Communist heretic. The feelings of the men of the Kremlin against Tito were so bitter and vicious for his heresy, which constituted saying that you could still be a Communist and not owe allegiance to Russia, that thousands of people in the satellites, the countries enslaved by Russia, were executed for the crime of "Titoism."

It is not known whether Tito's heresy had been caused by the promise of more swag—bribe money, if you will—by the United States than he could get from Russia. There is no doubt that later he got the swag or bribes, and cash, too, from us—as a Nation we haven't been particular for 20 years, either about making new friends or double-crossing our old ones. What is more important, Tito, Communist murderer though he himself was, had called Russia's bluff, challenged the Kremlin to its teeth and got away with it, despite the fact that weak and then almost defenseless Yugoslavia was on the very border of Russia, because he had brains enough to know that the Kremlin did not dare to wage an offensive war in support of Kremlin Communist theory.

A few months ago there was an abrupt change in the leadership of the Kremlin. Malenkov, who had apparently become the leader of the U. S. S. R., abdicated his position and publicly confessed his deficiencies, which need not be recounted at this time. It is not yet clear who is his successor as boss, since titles mean little or nothing in the Russian scheme of things. It could be any one of a half dozen of the Kremlin gang.

AUSTRIAN PEACE TREATY SURPRISE

Three months ago, the Kremlin, unexpectedly, announced a willingness to conclude a peace treaty with Austria, which, to the surprise of everyone was concluded, and without the usual degrading humiliating enslavement which the world has come to expect as part of Russian peace treaties.

A few weeks ago, the Kremlin notified the Governments of the United States, France, and Great Britain that they were willing to negotiate the differences which had for so long estranged the U. S. S. R. from the so-called free world, and the notifications were on such a different plane from all earlier messages similarly labeled that there was no doubt that they really meant it this time.

Last Tuesday, they began to release military personnel of the United States, men who had been illegally imprisoned by a satellite of the Kremlin, Communist China, which from a practical standpoint means that they had been held prisoner by orders of the Kremlin itself. This was obviously to gain public favor in the United States.

A week ago, a trio of Soviet big shots, Khrushchev, Gromyko, whom millions of Americans remember because of his villainous performance on television as Russian representative at the United Nations, and Mikoyan, the U. S. S. R.'s top economist (so-called) went to Belgrade, to court Tito. At the airport, Khrushchev made a speech which was broadcast throughout Yugoslavia, in which, on behalf of Russia, he crawled figuratively on his belly, to Tito. Khrushchev admitted that the Kremlin had been wrong. He blamed Beria, the murdered ex-boss of the Russian secret police directly, and also inferentially, Stalin, for having made a gigantic mistake.

The effect of such an admission was instantly recognized all over the world by non-Communist observers familiar with Russian ideology—and by dedicated Communists, too. The first result, the shock of which is still rocking Communists everywhere both inside and outside the Kremlin orbit, was the announcement last Monday by Vittorio Vidale that the Communist Party in Trieste no longer owes allegiance to the Kremlin or to the Communist Central Committee in Rome but that henceforth it would make its own decisions.

For the first time since the thing called communism made its ugly appearance as a thing of power, it is sick—visibly sick. It's no wonder that they want peace.

The Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Congress a resolution on the question of increasing the minimum wage which has been submitted to me by the Union County Industrial Union Council, CIO. Mr. James Trice is the president and Mr. Joseph Galante is the executive secretary of this council, which expresses the sentiment of American labor in asking the Congress to raise the minimum wage.

The resolution follows:

One of the most important things the new Congress can do this session is to pass a law raising the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 an hour. Such a law is of vital importance to the Nation, to union members generally and to the local community.

A look at the average income figures shows why it is so important to the Nation. Today, although we talk of our high living standard, millions of Americans still do not earn enough to buy the necessities of life. These families are a blot on the conscience of our Nation and failure of the promise of our wealth.

In every community, these families are a drag on their community because their low wages reduce purchasing power and this in turn means fewer customers for the builder, the retailer and the manufacturer.

Low wages are a burden to the community in other ways. They foster slums and juvenile delinquency, they impair the health of those in low income brackets, increase infant mortality and shift the tax burden to other segments of the community.

Six years ago, when Congress, after a long delay, got around to increasing the minimum to 75 cents an hour, it was already unrealistic in light of prevailing living costs. Since then living costs have gone up 14 percent for the average American family and 18 percent for those in the low income brackets.

Man-hour productivity during this period has gone up 19 percent. Both these factors must be considered if we are to have an adequate Federal minimum wage.

A $1.25 Federal minimum would narrow the gap between average hourly wages paid in organized industries and backward sections of our economy. It would put industry on a more competitive basis and yet not at the expense of labor.

An increased Federal minimum wage would stimulate consumer purchasing power and increase employment.

All segments of American labor, as well as other enlightened elements of the community are united in seeking passage of the higher minimum in the present session of Congress.

School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the problem of aid to education is of great concern to many of us here. The need for additional classrooms, the shortage of teachers, the problem of financing, and others are of utmost interest to millions of people throughout the country. I am hopeful that the present Congress will enact the necessary legislation to provide at least a partial solution to these problems in the near future.

In the meantime, there has come to my attention a most interesting letter from a man in Brooklyn who has some plausible ideas on the subject. His name is Anselin B. Kirsch, he is 83 years old, and still retains a deep interest in public affairs. He is familiar with the problems plaguing our educational system today, having served for many years as a member of the Bar Township School Board in Cambria County, Pa.

His letter and plan to aid the school districts to build and equip schools did not come directly to me. It was written originally to Mr. John Brophy, the noted CIO leader, whom he knows for many years. Since Mr. Kirsch is now a resident of Brooklyn, the CIO transmitted the letter to me. In view of its interesting ideas and the fact that a man of his age is still so much concerned with the welfare of children, I decided to insert the letter and the plan into the RECORD. They are as follows:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 12, 1955.*

Mr. JOHN BROPHY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROPHY: It is quite a long time since we have had any correspondence, but

at present I am interested in getting our public school system out of the worst predicament in its history.

President Eisenhower's program presented to Congress, if adopted, wouldn't even be a stopgap to the present difficulty, and his 30-year bond plan would mean that by the time the bonds were paid off the interest would exceed the principal.

Senator LISTER HILL, chairman of the Committee on Education, said the President's plan wasn't even peanuts, and then he introduced his own bill for the Federal Government to appropriate $200 million for the next 2 years. Under the present emergency that, too, would be pretty small peanuts, when $11 billion are needed at once.

I have always been interested in schools and did more to improve the schools in Barr Township than any other man who ever lived there. I have thought out a plan that will solve the problem without working a hardship on anybody and leave the management of the schools entirely in the hands of the local school districts. I have written dozens of letters, but so far I have received only one promise of help. The secretary of the Minnesota School Directors' Association wrote me that he was having my plan mimeographed and distributing a copy to every school board in the State.

It will take a united effort of all the people to put this plan across. The idea of non-interest-bearing bonds will get tough opposition. I received a statement from Dr. Brownell, the Commissioner of Education, saying that many school districts are bonded to the limit the State law will allow. I am enclosing the list he sent me which shows the limitation set by each State for ising bonds. As you will see, in most of the States the limits are very low, and a few allow none at all. This can easily be arranged by the State legislatures. The Eisenhower plan, if enacted, would not go into effect until the various States passed legislation to accept the plan. A school district can carry twice the amount of non-interest-bearing, long-term bonds than it could of interest-bearing bonds.

The only objection anybody has been able to raise to this plan was that it would be inflationary. That is not true. You cannot create inflation when you are creating values for the money spent. Getting our schools on a properly functioning basis is more urgently needed than what the Defense Department is doing. The Defense Department stated sometime ago that within the next 3 or 4 years they can outbuild the U. S. S. R. to such an extent with nuclear weapons that they will be afraid to attack us. The United States will graduate around 24,000 engineers this year; the U. S. S. R. will graduate some fifty thousand. A fat chance we will have to outbuild them.

The Defense Department has just completed the giant carrier *Forrestal* and is building four more just as fast as they can build them. I would be willing to wager that not one of them will ever be used in actual combat. If they are, God help the world.

Last Sunday evening Walter Winchell said in his broadcast that the Defense Department has several hundred million dollars worth of Jet fighter planes that have never been used, and are outdated, and are of no further use.

Very few men at my age are interested in public affairs and while I have passed my 83d milestone, I am still young and vigorous, and there is so much to be done for the welfare of mankind that I feel impelled to keep on working as long as God gives me the will and the power to do so.

It is very hard for me to get any typewriting done, and then I had the luck to accidentally get several copies torn through the middle, so I had to patch them up. I hope the CIO and the A. F. of L. (since you are now happily working as one) will see the necessity of this fight for our schools and use your vast influence to put this over. You have the organization and the press to do it. It will take a lot of publicity, but it will be worth it.

Very sincerely yours,

ANSELIN B. KIRSCH.

A CONSTRUCTIVE PLAN FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO AID THE LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS TO BUILD AND EQUIP SCHOOLS

(By Anselin B. Kirsch)

There is such a great shortage of classrooms in our public school system, that it has been estimated by our highest school authorities that it will take $11 billion to build enough classrooms to fill the immediate need and with a constantly increasing number of school children, it will take several billions more between now and 1960.

As it is conceded that the local districts and the State governments can barely raise one-half of that amount, and the Federal Government is not in a position to furnish the balance, we must try something new. We must develop an atomic age attitude that is willing to face new ideas.

I have developed a plan that is sound from a financial standpoint, that will solve the problem without any cost to the Federal Government, and will cut the cost in half for the local districts.

If Congress will pass a bill directing the Secretary of the Treasury to accept 20-year non-interest-bearing bonds, duly authorized by the local school districts, and issue (new) currency on the basis of these bonds to the districts supplying the bonds. These bonds to be paid by the districts at the rate of 5 percent per annum.

This would work automatically, and no appropriations would be needed. These bonds would represent real value, both in real estate and in a properly educated citizenry, and would be far safer basis for our currency than the gold at Fort Knox.

If we should be so unfortunate as to get into an atomic war and just one H-bomb would be dropped on Fort Knox, all that would be left of the gold would be a big hole in the ground, but we would still have our schoolhouses.

In regards to cutting the cost in half to the local school districts, I will give you an example. I was a member of the Barr Township School Board in Cambria County, Pa., from 1918 to 1932. In the early 1920's we issued $50,000 worth of 5 percent 20-year bonds to build two schoolhouses. During those 20 years this district had to levy $5,000 extra taxes, $2,500 to pay the interest on the bonds and an equal amount for a sinking fund to pay the bonds at maturity. When the 20 years were up and the bonds paid off, the two buildings cost the district not $50,000, but $100,000.

There are many thousands of school directors and members of the board of education who give millions of dollars worth of service to the schools without pay. Then why should money used for schools pay interest? But there is another big item in this plan. Once this plan gets into full swing, the Federal Government will be getting many millions of dollars annually in revenue from the school districts paying off the bonds.

Crucial Test on Hells Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, true conservation consists in making the best use of every natural resource. Among our resources that are constantly growing scarcer are desirable sites for dams to develop the power, irrigation, and recreational resources of our rivers and to provide for flood control and navigational aids. One of the most desirable remaining sites is that for the proposed dam at Hells Canyon. The following article by Thomas L. Stokes from the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., June 7, 1955, explains and summarizes some of the conservation issues at stake in the present battle to secure authorization for a high dam at Hells Canyon:

CRUCIAL TEST ON HELLS CANYON—TRIED-AND-TRUE CONSERVATION POLICIES AT STAKE IN HIGH DAM VERSUS LOW DAM FIGHT

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The great gash carved by the Snake River along the Idaho-Oregon border, known by the intriguing name of Hells Canyon, is isolated in nature, and seems remote perhaps to you who live in other more tame regions.

But what happens at Hells Canyon in the way of development of the river for electric power, irrigation, flood control, and navigation will affect you in the future wherever you live in the United States, as it will affect residents and industry of the great Pacific Northwest. You might as well recognize this; for it is recognized and being acted upon by the highly organized private utility interests which have seized upon the Hells Canyon issue to try to check further development of your rivers by your Government in your interest.

Two principles—each long established—are at stake in the battle over Hells Canyon which will move into the Senate for a showdown shortly.

First is the policy defined half a century ago by President Theodore Roosevelt for integrated development of our water resources for their best utilization for everybody in irrigation, flood control, and hydroelectric power.

Second is whether we will cling to the so-called yardstick policy established with the aid of Congress by another and later Roosevelt—Franklin D.—whereby such public projects as TVA and others were created as pilot projects to show what it cost to produce electricity and thus keep rates of privately owned utilities in line.

Both principles would be preserved if the Government is permitted to build a high dam across the Snake River as recommended by the Army engineers. Such a dam would be authorized in a bill sponsored by 29 Senators which is slated for final approval at a session tomorrow by an Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee that has been considering it, after which the measure would go to the full committee and thence to the Senate floor.

If, instead, this invaluable resource of the people is handed over to the Idaho Power Co., which is chiefly absentee-owned by eastern interests, for proposed piecemeal development by 1 to 3 low dams, that would stop forever the wise, sound, integrated development of the great Columbia River system. The Snake River is a part of this system that is so necessary for the expanding economy of the Northwest. It would also, of course, strike a deadly blow at the yardstick policy which, it is no secret, the private utilities are determined to break down.

Sponsors of the Government-built high dam, both in House and Senate, are attempting to exercise the prerogative that belongs to Congress to legalize it and to instruct the Federal Power Commission to license it. The FPC held hearings for months on Hells Canyon. Recently an FPC examiner issued a strange sort of report. He found that the high dam was the better project for the watershed, but then took it upon himself to decide that Congress never would approve

it. Consequently, he recommended that the Idaho Power Co. build 1 low dam instead of the 3 it proposed. The FPC, itself, has not rendered its decision. Meanwhile, champions of the high dam are taking the initiative in Congress on legislation that would supersede any FPC decision.

How President Theodore Roosevelt in 1908 ordered that the Hells Canyon power site be made a part of our forest reserve so it could be protected by the Government from private exploitation is described in an exhaustive and authoritative study of the Hells Canyon issue by a distinguished economist. Father Mark J. Fitzgerald, a member of the faculty of Notre Dame University, who argues for a federally built high dam.

"It was Theodore Roosevelt's firm conviction that a river system from its headwaters to the sea is a single unit and should be treated as such," he wrote in an article in America, going on to say later that there is more at stake than just Hells Canyon, itself.

"If this power source fails of realization, a number of other dams projected in the Columbia Basin may face congressional rejection because their economic feasibility depends on coordination with Hells Canyon. In a larger sense the national conservation policy first set forth over 50 years ago is facing serious danger. Invaluable power sites throughout the Nation, which have been under public protection as part of the Federal-conservation program, may become easy prizes for private exploitation at public expense."

As a plain dollars and cents matter, he points out how the three low dams proposed by Idaho Power Co. would produce 576,000 kilowatts of power less each year than the projected Government high dam. That would mean 26,000 fewer jobs in industry, about the same number in the service trades, and $180 million less each year in payrolls and more than a half billion dollars less in production annually.

"The oft-cited tax return of almost $10 million per year predicted from the 3-dam project appears small compared to the loss of tax revenue of 4½ times that amount on income and investment from private enterprise that would be excluded from the area because of the high power rates," Father Fitzgerald wrote.

Statement by the Honorable Daniel J. Flood, of Pennsylvania, on His Bill To Increase the Annual Income Limitations Governing the Payment of Pension to Certain Veterans and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have felt for some time that the income limitations for pensioned veterans has been restrictive and in too many cases has worked a terrible financial hardship upon the loyal and brave Americans who fought in the several conflicts in which we have found ourselves in comparatively recent history.

In the instances where the widow is the recipient of the pension, the financial burden imposed upon her by archaic income limitations is also of a severe nature.

I ask this session of the Congress, on the grounds of humanitarian relief and a logical analysis of the present economic situation in this country, to raise the annual income limitations for certain pensioned veterans and their dependents.

Therefore, I am introducing this bill which I trust will do justice to these long-suffering veterans and their families and with the fervent hope that it will assist them in living out their lives on a higher economic and social plane.

Well Written or Not, Newspapers Serve a Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article written by Tom Wallace, one of Kentucky's outstanding citizens and editor emeritus of the Louisville Times of Louisville, Ky. This article is entitled "Well Written or Not, Newspapers Serve a Purpose," and same appeared in the June 6, 1955, issue of the Louisville Times.

The article is as follows:

WELL WRITTEN OR NOT, NEWSPAPERS SERVE A PURPOSE

(By Tom Wallace)

A report of a survey, by the American Society of Newspaper Editors, of the press as "others see us" includes the statement, attributed to someone: "Newspaper writing is the lowest form of writing."

It includes the statement, of the surveyor, that some college professors "admitted" that they never read newspapers.

I challenge the suitability of "admitted."

I think the word should have been "declared," or "boasted."

The newspaper editorial has been described as the essay form nearest conversation; an essay form which, like conversation, is informal and as a rule is utterance closely following provocation.

It could be argued that literature is akin to sculpture, and that newspaper writing is akin to laying bags of sand, in a rush, to create a barrier.

It has been said of sculpture that the more the marble wastes, the more the statue grows.

Nothing like that could be said of erecting a barrier of sandbags against a flood or a barricade in a street such as one reads about in a history of France.

There are, in each newspaper, numerous varieties of writing.

It could be argued that inasmucn as a good deal of literature—I do not mean many books merely—is produced by newspaper writers and published between book covers, that a journalist may become, by due diligence, a writer—or that only those among journalists who are duly diligent and more intelligent than a majority of those who follow their calling can learn to write, as the term "write" is commonly used and understood.

Unquestionably a good deal of newspaper writing is, if not the lowest form of writing, at least a low form of writing. Whether that is true always because of haste or for other reasons might be left to discussion among journalists.

The report that some college professors are upon record as saying they never read newspapers is more interesting than appraisal of the quality of newspaper writing.

I have heard authors of books which as literature were not distinguished declare, with pride, that they do not read newspapers. They wish to convey the idea that newspaper writing is beneath the notice of persons who are capable of writing books.

Such persons are always, or almost always, liars.

They may have no respect for newspaper writing. But they do want to know facts that are ascertainable conveniently in newspapers.

It is, of course, customary to say: "If it is in a newspaper, is it a fact?"

That may be said so easily that saying it is a temptation to persons who could be classified, with regard to their intellects, or minds, with persons whose favorite wittiicism has to do with water being unfit to drink, although all right running under bridges or extinguishing fires.

Find for me an adult who never reads a newspaper and I shall show you, not by pointing merely, an individual somewhat handicapped; somewhat at disadvantage in contacts with normal persons.

The pretense of the educator or the author who says he never reads a newspaper—anyone may and most people do read newspapers hurriedly and not thoroughly—is designed to create the impression that newspaper writing and newspaper procedure; newspaper methods and newspaper morals are beneath the notice of superior beings. The pretense is not that of men or women whose careers contribute to human progress. If someone can cite an execption, it only proves the rule.

Newspapers are not, and do not hold themselves out as being, a part of literature. They have the faults of humanity. none of them is much better, or much worse, in culture or in morals, than the owner of 51 percent, or more, of the stock. None of them is free, I assume, of prejudice, inasmuch as in no case does an angel of the Lord exercise final authority over a newspaper.

But they are like the fishing of the Floridan who fished every day from a bridge near his residence. A winterer from the progressive, aggressive North asked the Floridan if there were not better fishing within a few miles of the bridge, where anglers were numerous, good catches rare. The native replied affirmatively.

"Why then don't you go somewhere else to fish?" asked the Yankee.

"Well," replied the Floridan, "this is handy."

When or if the time comes when something as handy as the daily newspaper is at hand and can offer all of the services a newspaper offers, at a bargain greater than the price of a newspaper, the daily press will sing its swan song.

In the meantime, those consciously superior persons who say they never read newspapers should beware of allowing anyone to search their pockets.

The search might reveal newspaper clippings.

Hon. Oveta Culp Hobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, last week the Texas Senate passed a resolution

praising Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for distinguished service she has rendered the Nation. The resolution is certainly most timely and expresses sentiment to which I subscribe. The people of Texas and the Nation can be justly proud of Secretary Hobby and the outstanding job she is doing. She is filling one of the most difficult Cabinet posts in our Government, with great ability and distinction.

Undesirable Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I most warmly commend the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON] upon her authorship of the bill, H. R. 3333, a companion bill to S. 600 passed by the Senate. Those who have had the pleasure of serving with her on the Committee of the Judiciary are aware of her keen interest in this subject and the zeal with which she has worked in bringing her convictions to a fruitful climax.

Early this year, I introduced a bill, H. R. 3456, on a related phase of the same subject, and I am only too pleased to say that Miss THOMPSON's bill is better than mine. My bill provided for the establishment of a commission to study the problem and recommend legislation to cure the problem; whereas, I conceive her bill to be the very kind of legislation which I expected the commission to recommend.

Under present law, it is difficult for the Federal Government to exercise any effective form of restraint in the sale or distribution of salacious literature. Publishers and vendors have evaded postal laws and regulations by the simple expedient of transporting the publications across State lines by vehicular conveyances. Once delivered to the local newsstand or retailer, public sale of this literature and other lewd objects, including obscene statuettes, snapshots, movie films, and phonograph records, loses its interstate character and thereby becomes subject to the laws, if any, of the individual State. The Thompson bill states that whoever knowingly transports in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of sale or distribution any such obscene objects shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, either or both. Under this language Federal jurisdiction would attach not only when the mails are used but also when vehicular conveyances are used for transportation across State lines.

It has been well said that a Nation's literature fashions a Nation's culture. In recently modern times our young people have been swamped with a great avalanche of literary barbarism in the form of so-called comic books and natural art magazines. To my mind, there can be no question but that such literature has in a measurable degree contributed to the alarming increase in juvenile delinquency. Magazine articles and pictures glamorizing crime and horror and glorifying sex cannot help but incite the passions of our young people. The printed page and the colored picture, in the inquisitive and impressionable minds of teenagers, tend to validate and legitimize the mode of conduct they portray. According to Dr. Frederic Wertham, consulting psychiatrist of the New York Department of Hospitals, it is not so much the emotionally maladjusted child but the emotionally normal child upon whom this literature has its greatest detrimental effect. The natural curiosity, the inventive nature, and the desire for social acceptability of the adolescent boy or girl makes him or her peculiarly vulnerable to this insidious appeal.

Some of these publications not only glorify crime and inflame the passions but actually teach the techniques of immoral and criminal conduct. Testifying before a Senate committee, Dr. Wertham gave an example in the following words:

> I had no idea how one would go about stealing from a locker in Grand Central, but I have comic books which describe that in minute detail and I could go out now and do it.

Because of American abhorrence of governmental censorship, and because of the basic American concept of a free press operating in a free land for a free people, the Federal Government has never been able to deal with this problem at the publication level. Be it said to the credit of the publisher that, especially since the Congress has manifested an interest in the subject, there has been a commendable campaign of self-regulation. Publishers themselves have the initial and primary responsibility for the contents of these publications. The national distributor, of which there are 13 in America, also holds one of the key positions in the industry. By refusing to handle certain publications, these distributors can control the contents of future publications. Local newsdealers and other retailers can help to solve the problem in a similar way.

Local citizens' groups, however, are perhaps the best weapons in the fight. In the Sixth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, many such groups are waging aggressive campaigns. Responsible and concerned men and women from every walk of life have taken time from their busy schedules and given voluntarily and generously of their substance and effort in combating the menace. Private organizations all over the Nation have taken up the challenge. In one city, interested citizens have organized a committee on evaluation of literature. Each spring it makes a study of publications which appear on local newsstands. After the study is completed, it publishes and distributes to parents an annual index of books and magazines, listing the morality rating of each. Other organizations conduct a comic-book exchange which operates as a trading post and clearinghouse for objectionable comic books donated by children of the community.

I realize that there are many who contend that, in the interest of a free press, Congress should pass no legislation whatever on this subject; that all regulation and censorship should be voluntary; that civic and religious organizations should shoulder the burden; and that the parents should solve the whole problem by selecting the child's reading material. This sentiment is splendid and, if workable, would be sufficient without the intervention of legislation. Human nature being what it is, however, we must be not only idealistic but realistic. The Thompson bill is a realistic approach to a practical problem.

No nation is truly strong unless it is morally strong. Someone has said that "nothing in the world is great but man, and nothing in man is great but mind and soul." Accordingly, in defense of the impressionable mind of young America, the cultural heritage which is ours and the moral fabric of our society, I am proud to support the Thompson bill.

Ike's Endless Buckpassing Denounced by Schnitzler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "Ike's Endless Buckpassing Denounced by Schnitzler," which appeared in Labor's Daily on the 26th day of May. It is, in part, as follows:

> ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.—President Eisenhower's "endlessly buckpassing" administration was thunderously denounced here by AFL Secretary William F. Schnitzler for the polio "vaccine mess" and a dozen other "conscienceless" blows at the public welfare.
>
> Schnitzler spoke before a banquet of the New Jersey State Federation of Labor. He set a new high for labor militancy under the GOP by charging that certain employer circles "will not shrink from kidnaping and even murder."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Labor's Daily of May 26, 1955]

IKE'S ENDLESS BUCKPASSING DENOUNCED BY SCHNITZLER

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.—President Eisenhower's "endlessly buckpassing" administration was thunderously denounced here by AFL Secretary William F. Schnitzler for the polio "vaccine mess" and a dozen other "conscienceless" blows at the public welfare.

Schnitzler spoke before a banquet of the New Jersey State Federation of Labor. He set a new high for labor militancy under the GOP by charging that certain employer circles will not shrink from kidnaping and even murder.

He ticked off the Eisenhower regime as government by avoidance. He left clawmarks on Newell Brown, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, and the President himself, describing the White House occupant as a man who meets questions by saying, "Don't ask me; I only live here."

"The pattern has been the same in every area," he said: "If, despite Federal inaction, constructive progress is achieved in some field, members of the official team are eager to horn in on the publicity that follows so as to foster the impression that they are in some way entitled to a shart of the credit, as did the administration in the case of the Salk vaccine.

"If, as a result of Federal inaction, matters turn out badly, and a mess develops, the technique is to shift the blame, hide behind the slogan of States rights and the voluntary way, deny that such a development could possibly have been foreseen in Washington, and, as a last-ditch move, announce with suitable flourishes another program which does nothing more than recommit the mess back to the States and private enterprise, as the administration is now attempting to do in the case of the Salk vaccine.

"A sensible and responsible government would immediately recognize that the marketing of a vital drug cannot safely be left to the free play of the profit motive, at the expense of the Nation's children.

"The traditional principles of private enterprise—Let the buyer beware, and charge what the traffic will bear—cannot be tolerated in the distribution of a product so essential to the public health and safety."

Schnitzler declared that the welfare of the country's children rated far above the special interests of the pharmaceutical and medical lobbies.

"Unfortunately," he went on, "those lobbies have had the ear of the administration from the beginning, to the exclusion of spokesmen for consumers and the public at large.

"On April 18, shortly after the announcement of the success of the vaccine, AFL President Meany called upon the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (Mrs. Hobby) to broaden the membership of her advisory group to include representatives of the religious faiths, workers, farmers, and women's organizations. * * *

DRUG INTERESTS' INFLUENCE

"Yet to this day, all of the interests involved in the marketing of the vaccine seem to have great influence with the administration—except the people.

"The result was inevitable. When a program of sorts finally emerged from the Department it was far too little and far too late."

Schnitzler compared this "bungling, confusion, and mismanagement" with the handling of the vaccine in Canada, where an effective program was ready as soon as the vaccine was released for public use.

The AFL secretary-treasurer, who came out of the bakers' union, threw some oldtime haymakers: He said:

"Recent developments have demonstrated that—contrary to the myth of managerial enlightenment expounded by the organs of business—the old-fashioned, feudal-minded type of employer is far from becoming extinct.

"The record of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad strike and other incidents in the South prove that the old doctrine of divine right still has powerful advocates in employer circles who will not shrink from kidnaping or even murder in the effort to maintain or to secure absolute control of the labor market."

He charged that the Eisenhower administration's technique is one of a perpetual rotating buckpassing which goes on until a scapegoat is finally found in some obscure hireling, who is then thrown to the wolves.

"There are other items for which we should, no doubt, be equally grateful. I am sure, for instance, that Newell Brown, whose antilabor record as employment security director in New Hampshire is well known to us, was the best nominee for wage and hour administrator that could be found in Sherman Adams' back pocket."

He found it natural that spokesmen for big business should raise a "cry of alarm" at the pending merger of the AFL and CIO.

"But the greater number of citizens who share our own basic interests and aspirations have nothing to fear," he added. "For them it holds a new hope and a brighter promise of a better tomorrow."

Address by Clifford F. Hood, President, United States Steel Corp., at Valley Forge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ADDRESS BY CLIFFORD F. HOOD, PRESIDENT, UNITED STATES STEEL CORP., AT VALLEY FORGE, FEBRUARY 22, 1955

It is with the deepest humility that I contemplate the significant occasion which brings us to Valley Forge on this day in 1955. It was on this hallowed ground that the dignity of man achieved its finest hour. This ceremony testifies that the flame of freedom has not been dimmed by the passage of time or the foreboding shadows of this perilous age.

The words we speak may live no longer than the fleeting moments it may take to carry them to all who may listen. But the sincerity of this gathering and the hope which this event may inspire in the hearts of Americans and others throughout the world will live wherever men struggle to be free.

In keeping with this purpose, Freedoms Foundation is pledged to reaffirm and thus perpetuate our responsibility to pass along the American way of life to each succeeding generation. Each year in this historic setting Freedoms Foundations seeks out and honors those individuals responsible for advancing belief in God, faith in free government based on the Constitution and the assurance of the rights of free men. I join with my fellow Americans in congratulating and encouraging the foundation and those who are being honored here today. This organization and these men and women are demonstrating by word and precept that they were attuned to the admonition of General Washington—"Put none but Americans on guard tonight."

Washington, in many ways, stands as the symbol of this occasion and those which have preceded it. It is not Washington the General that we think of; it is not Washington the President who comes to mind. Rather, it is Washington the man who overshadows all that will take place here today.

Into our minds there arises the image of an unforgettable man of principle. George Washington believed no sacrifice to be too great to achieve human liberty. His courage and his conviction are stamped in the annals of our heritage, just as his weary footsteps left their mark in the snows of Valley Forge. His selflessness found expression in his total devotion to the cause he espoused. His leadership brought victory to that cause and guidance to the Nation it established.

To cast aside the moral and ethical standards by which he lived would be to destroy the very fabric of our Republic.

America is governed by a Constitution written out of the experience of mankind. Our Nation is not merely freedom of opportunity, or of worship, or of assembly, or of the press. America represents the spiritual and moral strength of a free people. It is the composite of all that has been achieved to elevate our understanding and enable us to pursue our daily tasks, guided by a standard of ethical principles that free men have come to recognize as indispensable to their survival and the preservation of their liberties. America is truth and hope and faith and courage and patience—the merits of which were born long ago on these surrounding fields.

This is the America which our forefathers passed on to us. This is the America that freedoms foundation, today's honored guests and all of us, in every walk of life, in every corner of the land, should seek to perpetuate. This is the America whose people, through six generations, have weathered the trials of a growing nation to emerge as the last bulwark against the ancient tyrannies that have been revived to harass and betray mankind. There is no power on earth that can destroy a nation with such spirit.

Someone has said, "One man with courage is a majority," and in those few words is a creed for all who would strike out against the insidious efforts to destroy freedom at its roots. Each of us here and each individual who may hear or read of these ceremonies, can be a forceful, courageous majority with just as vital a role in the furtherance of human justice as those who stood in defiance before King John at Runnymede or those who placed patriotism above all else to give strength to our own Continental Army.

One man with courage in every segment of American life can so fortify our Nation that it will continue as the redoubtable fortress of liberty which is its destiny.

While we are paying tribute to freedom's defenders, there are those who are working at this very moment to destroy belief in God, faith in constitutional government and the rights of free men. It is difficult for principled people to understand the fanatical devotion that drives these enemies forward. It is equally difficult for us to combat their insidious techniques. But the ideological conflict of 1955 is a challenge greater than the problems which beset our Nation's founders or any succeeding generation of our people. Communism is ruthless, unhampered by any sense of moral responsibility because it eliminates the governing force of morality—it rejects God and enthrones the state.

We who are met at Valley Forge might well recall the words of the man who is now our President as he spoke on the occasion of the first presentation of the Freedoms Foundation Awards. He said: "Meeting on this spot to rededicate ourselves to the dream that is America, it is difficult to avoid giving away to emotion so intense as to still the tongue and to leave any American silently grateful, humble, and reverent."

To all of you—to those who have come to witness these ceremonies, to those who are being honored for their patriotic expressions—to fellow Americans everywhere, I say keep before you always the image of Washington and the memory of Valley Forge. You will find in this great leader and in this historic setting the pattern of spiritual and moral guidance which is the strength and the hope of our Nation. Take with you into your homes, into your jobs, into the voting booth, into the many facets of your

lives, those principles of human dignity and ethical conduct which are an unconquerable rampart guarding us against those who would revile the principles by which we live.

Most of us are familiar with the story of the Continental Army's long winter encampment. The hunger and bitter cold had reduced the Army to the last ounce of endurable suffering. The cause for freedom seemed hopeless. This was the situation when an aide of Washington rushed to the general's tent to deliver an important message. The aide was startled to find the general kneeling in the deep snow, his head bowed, his face solemn. With sudden unstanding, the young soldier realized that, despite the seemingly hopeless odds, the impending battle would bring forth victory for justice and freedom. Confronted as we are by forces that threaten our existence as a free Nation, I believe it is in order for all Americans, wherever you are, whatever your faith or creed might be, to join on bended knee in asking Almighty God for guidance and courage. In all humility, I join with you.

Energy From the Sun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to read in the May 15, 1955, issue of the Wisconsin Alumnus an historic article regarding the research which is now being conducted at Madison on the subject of the harnessing and storing of solar energy.

I am proud that my alma mater, the University of Wisconsin, has been honored by a three-quarter-million-dollar research allocation by the Rockefeller Foundation to explore this new frontier in man's search for a better, more prosperous, more abundant world.

Certainly, the imagination of man is challenged by the almost miraculous potentialities of the harnessing of the sun. Yes; that ball of almost inexhaustible fire, which is the very basis of life on this planet, can also be the very basis for inexhaustible power for heat, light, and energy.

I wish godspeed to the University of Wisconsin research scientists in their studies under the leadership of Prof. Farlington Daniels.

This is the type of research study which, as the Hoover Commission task force recently well stated, should be greatly expanded, in the interest of both the civilian and military well being of the people of our country.

Results will not come overnight. Long years of patient, no doubt often unavailing, exploration are ahead, but the important fact is that the project is underway. I commend the Rockefeller Foundation, the Guggenheim Foundation, and the National Science Foundation for their contributions to this project.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the alumnus article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENERGY FROM THE SUN—A WIDELY EXPANDED PROGRAM OF RESEARCH AT THE UNIVERSITY IS AIMED AT UNLOCKING A VAST NEW SOURCE OF POWER [1]

(By James A. Larson, 1947)

When the hydrogen bomb exploded on the first of November 1952, the world of science knew that man had chained the energy that burns in the sun. The energy of fusion—heat and light left over when two atoms become one—is the source of the hydrogen bomb's unbelievable power.

It is also the source of the oldest form of energy known to man—the sunlight that showers upon the earth each day.

Man first sought sunlight for warmth. Then, as he grew in mastery of the world around him, he trapped sunlight through agriculture, turning the energy that floods the earth into food and fiber.

Today, scientists are working to develop methods of turning the earth's one great source of continuing power into heat and electricity.

A University of Wisconsin expert on solar and atomic energy, Farrington Daniels, said recently: "If I had been asked in 1938 which would come first—atomic or solar energy—I would have answered 'solar energy.'"

Daniels now heads the University of Wisconsin's solar energy research program, to which the Rockefeller Foundation recently granted a quarter of a million dollars, to be expended over a 4-year period. This grant follows one of $30,000 for solar energy research provided by the Guggenheim Foundation a few years ago.

The Rockefeller grant gives an enormous boost to the solar energy program at Wisconsin, carried on in many of the University's departments and schools, including a newly organized laboratory in an obscure building on the College of Engineering campus. Dr. John A. Duffie of the experiment station of the College of Engineering has charge of administration and coordination of the Wisconsin research program.

Expansion of Wisconsin's solar energy research project dates back to September 1953, when a symposium sponsored by the National Science Foundation and organized by Professor Daniels drew some 30 of the world's topmost experts in the field to the Wisconsin campus for an exchange of ideas.

No formal research reports were presented, but university and industrial scientists gave glimpses of solar energy's future possibilities. In July, the University of Wisconsin Press will publish Solar Energy Research ($4) a volume to which many of the experts contributed a chapter. The book will most likely become the authoritative work in its field.

In his introduction to Solar Energy Research, Professor Daniels points out that:

"Our foods are grown annually, but our fuels were produced millions of years ago and through geological accident preserved for us in the form of coal, oil, and gas. These are essentially irreplaceable, yet we are using them up at a rapid rate. Although exhaustion of our fossil fuels is not imminent, it is inevitable. Water power supplements our fuels to some extent. Atomic energy will soon be able to supplement them effectively, but uranium, too, is irreplaceable and will eventually become exhausted.

"Theoretically, the sun's rays bring to the earth far more heat than is needed even for our present great energy-consuming civilization. The world's people consume food equivalent to 2,500 kilocalories per person per day while they consume fuel equivalent to 25,000 kilocalories per day. Thus, in the world at large, 10 times as much energy is needed for our machines as for ourselves. But in the United States, where the ratio of fuel energy to food energy is 50 to 1,150,000 kilocalories of heat per person per day is used to heat houses, run automobiles, trains, and tractors, furnish light, and carry out manufacturing operations, and do most of the Nation's mechanical work."

On an imaginary day in which the entire United States was cloudless, the sun would pour some 280 million kilocalories of sunshine per person onto the land—2,000 times our present per capita requirements for fuel. It is not possible to utilize this vast source of energy at the present time because it comes in so diffuse a form.

But with declining supplies of conventional power-laden fuels, sunlight affords mankind a possible source of energy. Demands for electricity and mechanical power are increasing by leaps and bounds—and in areas with abundant sunshine and without coal or oil, solar energy may come into actual use.

One scientist at the 1953 conference, Palmer C. Putnam, pointed out that the maximum plausible world population of six to eight billion in A. D. 2050 is not the largest "possible" one on that date, and that the population of the United States is growing nearly twice as fast as world population. "Our population will be nearly 375 million * * * and per capita demands for energy, already large, are growing at 3 or 4 percent a year."

The United States and much of the free world, Putnam adds, have been living high, off the cream of the earth's accumulated capital energy—coal, oil, and gas reserves.

In outlining solar energy research needs, Professor Daniels points out that "there is little chance in the near future of solar energy competing with coal, petroleum, and electricity in the industrialized nations, but there is a good chance of its competing now with animal power and human labor in underdeveloped regions."

The greatest stumbling block in the trapping of solar energy is the large collecting area required. An acre of conventional concrete or glass costs in the neighborhood of $10,000—an investment requiring too large a return in terms of heat or electricity.

A new research approach is called for, Daniels says. Low cost and simplicity are keynotes today in all projected solar energy devices. An acre of ground, for example, can be covered with plastic solar-heat collectors at a fraction of the cost of glass, metal, or concrete, and in addition, rolls of thin sheet plastic are easily transported.

Solar distillation of sea water for drinking, irrigation, and salt may be one of the first practical applications of the sun's energy; one of the earliest and simplest of industries may, thus, be the first to benefit from man's newest energy source.

A plastic solar still has been devised by Professor Daniels which collects fresh water from salt water at "about 25 percent of the theoretical maximum." Calculations have shown that a square foot of land in some parts of the world receives enough energy to evaporate a quart of water per day—Daniels' device evaporates about a quarter of this amount and with certain improvements a higher efficiency can be achieved.

Additional research is needed to make solar distillation of salt water less expensive, but some method, when perfected, will supply drinking water for people and animals and make possible a limited amount of irrigation in areas where water has a high value.

Solar heaters for cooking and house heating may also be just around the corner. At a world conference held last year in New Delhi, the Indian Government exhibited several solar cookers that gave heat equivalent to 350 watts. Using parabolic metallic mirrors a yard in diameter as energy-collectors, the cookers cost about $14, too expensive for most Indian families. A cost of $5 or less would be required for wide acceptance in that country and a thin plastic mirror offers some hope of reducing the cost of these cookers.

[1] "The conversion of sunlight into chemical energy is likely to prove, in the long run, as important in human technology as it is in living nature."—Eugene Rabinowitch

In heating houses, high temperatures are not required, scientists point out, and heat absorbed during the day can be stored in hot-water tanks, pebble beds, or in chemicals. In addition, solar house heating is probably the most direct application of solar energy because a comparatively slight rise in air temperature is sufficient. Houses have already been built that are heated entirely with sunlight—and particularly in the mid-latitudes this method holds great promise. Commercial laboratories are already interested in this phase of solar-energy research, Daniels points out.

A major effort is being put forth—at Wisconsin and elsewhere—on research which may lead to the design of a practical solar engine. As one industrial scientist writes: "A solar powerplant could never be as compact as an internal-combustion engine; but it is probable that the cost of power could be comparable."

Solar power would be welcomed where fuel costs are high, or in remote areas where the people have not yet acquired the ability to maintain and repair gasoline and diesel engines. Most current solar-engine research is based on steam generation with mirrors or on piston engines in which the power is obtained from intermittent heating and cooling of hot air or gases.

When efficient engines are developed, they can be used for nighttime power by pumping water into an elevated reservoir, then letting it flow back through a turbine operating an electric dynamo.

Professor Daniels tells of an ingenious New Mexico miner whose small mine was lighted day and night by a solar engine and dynamo. A parabolic mirror focused on a small steam engine that pumped water 20 feet up to a 5,000-gallon water tank. The water-power operated a small generator.

"In practice, very large reservoirs would be required to meet extensive demands for urban electricity," Daniels points out. Cities near plateaus or vacant mines, however, might have ready-made reservoirs, and those near hydroelectric plants could pump water back over the dam.

Perhaps the greatest hope of utilizing solar energy on a large-scale basis lies in the conversion of solar heat directly into electricity through the use of devices known as thermopiles, photovoltaic cells, and photo-transistors.

None of these have been developed to the point where they are useful, but the Bell Telephone Co. recently announced an important advance—with a transistor. Bell scientists produced 50 watts continuously from a square yard of sunlit surface.

Scientists have also found that some of the energy of ultraviolet light can be stored in solutions of the salts of cerium, and ways may be found to increase the efficiency of this or some similar process to the point where part of the energy can be stored.

An obvious difficulty in utilizing solar energy is that only low temperatures are ordinarily produced by sunlight, and some method must be found to concentrate this heat. Despite the fact that experimental solar furnaces have produced some of the hottest temperatures known to man—3,000 degrees centigrade and more in laboratory work—it is ordinarily difficult to collect enough sunlight to make solar energy economical. In one experimental furnace, a French scientist put together many small mirrors to make an effective parabolic mirror of large area, but so far, such furnaces have been used solely for studies of chemical reactions at high temperatures.

Scientists are also working to find chemicals which break up in sunlight by absorbing heat, then recombine in the dark, giving off the heat absorbed. The fact that nature accomplishes a similar task in living green plants gives scientists hope that they may some day be able to duplicate the process in the test tube and eventually in industrial installations.

Daniels has worked for many years on photosynthesis—the process by which green plants combine carbon dioxide and water to form food. Nature has cleverly concealed the key to this everyday miracle, but it is possible that photosynthesis may provide the clue to the utilization of chemicals to directly tap the energy of sunlight.

Although many scientists believe large-scale culture of algae is without promise as a means of harnessing solar energy, others have spent a great deal of time attempting to overcome the technical difficulties involved. At the present time, the capital investment in an algae factory—for pumps, equipment, and carbon dioxide supplies—would exceed any probable financial return. The same amount of money spent on good agricultural land would be a far more profitable investment. However, if it is ever necessary to do so, photosynthesis in mass algae cultures can be carried out on land unsuitable for anything else.

One scientist has suggested that small crops such as peas and beans might be more efficient than algae at converting sunlight to energy—and that power for simplified steam engines might be produced by burning leaves and vegetation. Crops that efficiently cover the ground with a mat of green leaves are very efficient solar energy conversion units.

To show that the idea of utilizing the energy of sunlight is not a new one, Dr. Duffie points out in Solar Energy Research that some 240 United States patents, dating from Ulysses Pratt's process for sunbleaching ivory (1852), have been taken out by hopeful inventors.

The devices patented range from stump burners, fruit and fish dryers, solar broilers, and a method for bleaching Irish moss, to systems for space-heating, air conditioning, water heating. In general, the patents fall into seven types: solar energy collectors, concentrating devices, storage methods, engines and pumps, distillers, cookers, heating systems, and thermo-electric generators.

Rockefeller-financed research at Wisconsin will stress the development of solar engines, solar cookers, solar distillation of sea water, solar-operated refrigerators, irrigation pumps, and radiation instruments and measurements. The long-established program at Wisconsin on the growth of algae will be expanded to emphasize harvesting and drying and other aspects of the practical production of algae for fodder.

Field experiments to test laboratory developments will be an important part of the program.

"Tests will be made in areas of the United States which are sunnier than Wisconsin," Daniels says. "After practical working devices are fully tested here, they should be tested under primitive conditions, by the peoples who will most likely use them."

Daniels points out that solar energy-operated cookers, irrigation pumps, refrigerators, and other similar devices would find their greatest market in nonindustrialized areas such as India, Egypt, and Mexico.

"In some areas the demands for heating and cooking have led to the removal of available trees, shrubs, and grass, with the consequent acceleration of soil erosion and still greater agricultural poverty," he says.

Some desert lands have been created by destruction of vegetation resulting from the demand for heating and cooking fuel. For example, in one area of western Mexico, the women walk 6 miles to obtain twigs and firewood for cooking and heating. Cooking in northwest India is now done with camel and cow dung. Cheap solar cookers can make such material available for good, much-needed fertilizer instead of for interior fuel.

"Refrigeration is badly needed in nonindustrialized areas of the world to conserve the supply of food, and to decrease some of the causes of disease," Daniels adds. "Solar refrigeration is certainly possible, but extensive research is still necessary to make it economical," Daniels added.

"It is hoped that Wisconsin's 4-year program will help solve some of the pressing problems of the nonindustrialized areas of the world, and enable us to evaluate possibilities for the more general utilization of solar energy."

Treatymaking Power in the United States and the Need for a Constitutional Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, my interest in the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 1, the Bricker amendment, continues unabated and I believe that more and more people are realizing the need for such a constitutional amendment.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very fine paper on this subject prepared by Irving P. Schwartz, of the faculty of Queens College, Flushing, N. Y.:

TREATYMAKING POWER IN THE UNITED STATES AND THE NEED FOR A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

(By Irving P. Schwartz)

CHAPTER I

The debates show that the members of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 considered the treatymaking power, like the military power, to be extremely important and capable of grave abuse to the detriment of the safety of the people. The members of the Convention thought that they would, therefore, protect the treatymaking power by dividing the responsibility for treaties. Hence the provision relating to treatymaking in the Constitution of the United States reads:

"He [the President] shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." [1]

Beyond this, was the problem that all States of the Union face, to wit, what effect can a treaty be made to have upon the internal or municipal law of the sovereign States which comprise the federation? This is a particularly urgent question in negotiating with foreign states since the Constitution of the United States forbids the constituent States from themselves making treaties.

The Constitution provides:

"No States shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation." [2]

It is obvious that in this type of a Federal Union it is intended that the Federal Government have competence to negotiate treaties on subjects which are reserved to the States' legislative powers, as well as on those matters which have been delegated to the Federal Government.

As Mr. Justice Swayne, delivering the opinion of the Court, stated in the case of *Hauenstein* v. *Lynham:*

"If the National Government has not the power to do what is done by such treaties, it cannot be done at all, for the States are expressly forbidden 'to enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation.' (Constitution, art. 1, sec. 10.)" [3]

The Founding Fathers of this Nation solved the problem of treaties as the supreme

Footnotes at end of speech.

law of the land by inserting the following provision in the Constitution, sometimes known as the supremacy clause:

"This Consttiution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all the treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." [4]

Hence in the early case of *Ware* v. *Hylton*, the Supreme Court allowed a second recovery on a bond previously paid by the debtor, to the State of Virginia which had discharged him of the debt, upon the authority of the subsequently negotiated Jay Treaty which recognized the title of the sequestered Tory owner. The Court stated that article VI of the Constitution made the treaty law binding on the debtor, superseding the State's own laws and action on the debt. The exact wording of the Court in 1796 was as follows:

"If doubts could exist before the adoption of the present National Government, they must be entirely removed by the sixth article of the Constitution, which provides that 'All treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or the laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.' There can be no limitation on the power of the people of the United States. By their authority the State constitutions were made, and by their authority the Constitution of the United States was established; and they had the power to change or abolish the State constitutions or to make them yield to the General Government and to treaties made by their authority. A treaty cannot be the supreme law of the land, that is, of all the United States, if any act of a State legislature can stand in its way. If the constitution of a State, which is the fundamental law of the State and paramount to its legislature, must give way to a treaty and fall before it, can it be questioned whether the less power, an act of the State legislature must not be prostrate? It is the declared will of the people of the United States that every treaty made by the authority of the United States shall be superior to the Constitution and the laws of any individual State, and their will alone is to decide. If a law of a State, contrary to a treaty, is not void but voidable only, by a repeal or nullification by a State legislature, this certain consequence follows, that the will of a small part of the United States may control or defeat the will of the whole." [5]

Again, in the case of *Hauenstein* v. *Lynham*, the real-property law of the State of Virginia prohbiting the inheritance of land by an alien was held to be so far superseded by the provisions of a treaty negotiated and ratified by the Federal Government with Switzerland that the real-property law of Virginia was set aside to permit the Swiss citizen plaintff to obtain the proceeds of the escheator's sale of the land by right of inheritance, as the treaty provided.

It was held, however, that article VI of the Constitution necessarily could apply only to treaties that were self-executing, that is, treaties which contained provisions sufficiently specific enough to be used as rules of law in the State courts. Treaties which are general in their terms were not laws of the land immediately applicable but specific acts of the State legislatures are required to substantiate them. These treaties are known also as non-self-executing treaties. This consideration was well expressed in 1829 in the case of *Foster and Elam* v. *Neilson:*

Footnotes at end of speech.

"Our Constitution declares a treaty to be the law of the land. It is, consequently, to be regarded in courts of justice as equivalent to an act of the legislature, whenever it operates of itself, without the aid of any legislative provision. But when the terms of the stipulation import a contract when either of the parties engages to perform a particular act, the treaty addresses itself to the political, not the judicial department; and the legislature must execute the contract, before it can become a rule for the court." [6]

A State not approving such an executory treaty would not pass the necessary legislation.

Henceforth shrewd foreign ministers in making treaties with the Federal Government would strive to obtain provisions sufficiently explicit and detailed that courts could apply them immediately as rules of law, as such treaties made by the United States Government on matters reserved to the jurisdiction of the States would then automatically be binding on the judges of the States.

Before a full century had elapsed, the executory treaty in matters reserved to the State governments gave rise to a new constitutional doctrine in the case of *Missouri* v. *Holland* in 1920. This case held that Congress itself could implement such an executory treaty by legislation although the subject matter was one in the reserved powers of the States. If Congress was willing to act, then, there was no difference in enforcibility of executory and executed treaties.

The wording of Mr. Justice Holmes on the point is as follows:

"If the treaty is valid there can be no dispute about the validity of the statute under article 1, section 8, as a necessary and proper means to execute the powers of the Government." [7]

The Court remarked:

"As most of the laws of the United States are carried out within the States and as many of them deal with matters which in the silence of such laws the State might regulate, such general grounds are not enough to support Missouri's claim. Valid treaties of course 'are as binding within the territorial limits of the States as they are elsewhere throughout the dominion of the United States.' No doubt the great body of private relations usually fall within the control of the State, but a treaty may override its power." [8]

It was argued by the State of Missouri that the treaty itself was unconstitutional. The court answered:

"It is said that a treaty cannot be valid if it infringes the Constitution, that there are limits, therefore, to the treatymaking power, and that one such limit is that what an act of Congress could do unaided, in derogation of the powers reserved to the States, a treaty cannot do." [9]

Mr. Justice Holmes failed to see that the wording of article 6 of the Constitution was directed principally to the Federal problem under discussion, namely to enable the National Government to make treaties on behalf of the constitutionally impotent States. Holmes construed article 6 in its extreme, literal sense. To save this Federal situation, he sacrificed the constitutional protection in all. He pointed out the Constitution's peculiar grammatical construction thusly:

"Acts of Congress are the supreme law of the land only when made in pursuance of the Constitution, while treaties are declared to be so when made under the authority of the United States. It is open to question whether the authority of the United States means more than the formal acts prescribed to make the convention." [10]

Footnotes at end of speech.

In short, a treaty, if negotiated by the President of the United States and ratified by the consent of the Senate, is the supreme law of the land regardless of whether it conforms to the Constitution in other respects. It has been said, therefore, that treaties act as quick constitutional amendments.

Two widely differing types of situations have come before the Supreme Court. The first relates to the delegation under an act of Congress of administrative regulation to the President under which he has adjusted tariff rates or forbidden exports, or may make tariff or lend-lease agreements with foreign states. This is clearly brought out in the words of Chief Justice Taft in 1928 in the case of *Hampton* v. *the United States* (276 U. S. 394), specifically on pages 411 and 412.

As in all cases involving delegation of power, the question of where delegation of administrative regulation ends and where alienation of the legislative power begins is always with us. In 1936, in the case of the *United States* v. *the Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation*, the President had been authorized by congressional statute to prohibit the sale of munitions to the belligerents in the Chaco war whenever he deemed it would contribute to the peace between the countries to do so. The Court, in upholding this delegation of power to the President as being constitutional, stated:

"It is important to bear in mind that we are here dealing not alone with an authority vested in the President by an exertion of legislative power, but with such authority plus the very delicate plenary and executive power of the President as the sole organ of the Federal Government in the field of international relations—a power which does not require as a basis for its exercise an act of Congress, but which, of course, like every other governmental power, must be exercised in subordination to the applicable provisions of the Constitution." [11]

This thinking, which was followed through in the Curtiss-Wright case, was applied in the same year of 1936 to a very different type of situation. The second article of the Constitution confers on the President these related powers, the first in section 2 of the article, and the second in section 3:

"He [the President] shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls."

"He shall receive Ambassadors and other public ministers."

These powers have resulted in the President being that organ of the United States which recognizes foreign states.

The President acts by Executive agreements, which are not submitted to the Congress in exercising his power of recognition. The question arose in the case of the *United States* v. *Belmont* whether settlement of outstanding property claims of United States citizens contained in such an Executive agreement becomes the law of the land, setting aside a disposition of the properties involved already made by State law.

The Court acknowledged that the property agreements had never been acted on by any legislature, State or Federal:

"The assignment [of properties] was effected by an exchange of diplomatic correspondence between the Soviet Government and the United States." [12]

The nature of the resulting agreement was as follows:

"The assignment and the agreements in connection therewith did not, as in the case of treaties, as that term is used in the treatymaking clause of the Constitution (art. II, sec. 2), require the advice and consent of the Senate.

"A treaty signifies 'a compact made between two or more independent nations with a view to the public welfare' (*Altman & Co.*

Footnotes at end of speech.

v. *United States* (224 U. S. 583, 600)). But an international compact, as this was, is not always a treaty which requires the participation of the Senate. There are many such compacts, of which a protocol, a modus vivendi, a postal convention, and agreements like that now under consideration are illustrations." [13]

But the Court held:

"We are of the opinion that no State policy can prevail against the international compact here involved. * * * It was part of the supreme law of the land." [14]

While it was not a treaty within the meaning of treaty in article II of the Constitution and hence did not come within the urgency clause by enumeration as a treaty, the Supreme Court put this "international compact" within the supremacy clause by implication.

The Court stated:

"And while this rule in respect of treaties is established by the express language of clause 2, article VI of the Constitution the same rule would result in the case of all international compacts and agreements from the very fact that complete power over international affairs is in the National Government and is not and cannot be subject to any curtailment or interference on the part of the several States. Compare *United States* v. *Curtis Wright Corporation* (299 U. S. 304, 316, et. seq.)" [15]

A treaty as the supreme lam of the land may be repealed by a subsequent act of the Congress. In the Head Money cases it was held that a subsequent act of Congress providing for a head tax on immigrants superseded any earlier treaty with their countries of origin exempting them from such taxation. The Court stated:

"A treaty, then, is the law of the land as an act of Congress is, whenever its provisions prescribe a rule by which the rights of the private citizen or subject may be determined.[16]

* * * * *

"The Constitution of the United States places such provisions as those in the same category as other laws of Congress by its declaration that 'this Constitution and the laws made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land.[17]

* * * * *

"It [a treaty] is subject to such acts as Congress may pass for its enforcement, modification or repeal." [18]

CHAPTER II

Reflection upon the condition of our treaty law at the present time shows the situation to be one of incompatibility with the governmental institutions of a Nation which believes in a government of laws founded upon the consent of the people. The remedy for our situation should be a permanent, realistic treaty law based on solid constitutional foundations.

The condition of treaty law as shown in the first chapter violates basic American constitutional and juridical principles. The Constitution of the United States was written by the people of the United States as the fundamental law of the land. It was intended that its provisions be binding on every organ of the Federal Government in the operations in whatever field, foreign or domestic. The manner of changing the Constitution provided in the fifth article shows the intention of as direct a popular control of the Constitution and as widespread popular approval of it as the continental situation of the Nation and increase of population will allow.

If treaties are to be of equal obligation with the Constitution these laudable safeguards of the people's rights against governmental abuse no longer exist. Not only do we have the problem of entering into treaties, but the treaties become binding internal law in any conceivable range of matters, whether these matters be delegated to the States or reserved to the people by the terms of the Constitution itself. Also, under existing law, a single officer of the Federal Government, namely, the President, may set aside the structure which the whole people have so laboriously erected for their protection.

Chief Justice John Marshall put this fundamental juridical principle succinctly when he said:

"That the people have an original right to establish for their future Government, such principles as, in their opinion, shall most conduce to their own happiness, is the basis on which the whole American fabric has been created. * * *

"Certainly, all those who have framed written constitutions contemplate them as forming the fundamental and paramount law of the nation, and consequently, the theory of every such government must be, that an act of the legislature, repugnant to the constitution, is void.[19]

* * * * *

"The Government proceeds directly from the people; is 'ordained and established' in the name of the people; and is declared to be ordained 'in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, and secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and to their posterity.' [20]

* * * * *

"The principles, therefore, so established, are deemed fundamental; and as the authority from which they proceed is supreme, and can seldom act, they are designed to be permanent." [21]

Who can maintain that treaties, multifarious in number, emanating from many different authorities, and subject to repeal by legislative acts, can ever supply a satisfactory fundamental law according with these considerations of statesman-like policy? Is it not apparent that one instrument most carefully drafted, adopted by widespread public approval after mature deliberation, and not suseptible to mercurial changes, is necessary to satisfy the juridical premise of a writen constitution?

Secondly, it is unwise to bring about a redistribution of the powers of the Federal and State Governments by indirect means. As Justice Marshall states concerning the United States:

"This Government is acknowledged to be one of enumerated powers. The principle, that it can exercise only the powers granted to it, would seem too apparent to have required to be enforced by all those arguments which its enlightened friends, while it was depending before the people, found it neccessary to urge. That principle is now universally admitted. But the question respecting the extent of the powers actually granted, is perpetually arising, and will probably continue to arise, as long as our system shall exist." [22]

The plan of the distribution of powers of government between the Federal Government and the States is found in section 8 of the 1st article and also in the 10th amendment of the Constitution. Some maintain with great force and good supporting evidence that some of these powers retained by the States should now be exercised by the Federal Government.

It is both juristically desirable and politically wise that any redistribution of powers be made by amendment to the Constitution and not by such indirect erosion as the use of other powers to bring this about in an incomplete way. An amendment would give plenary power such form that it could be fully exercised and the matter properly controlled by the Congress and the Executive. The attempts to slide these powers in under the treaty powers will result, as this approach under the taxing powers has already resulted, in incomplete and unsatisfactory exercise of powers which fall between the two stools of Federal and State control, with the result that the subject matter of the powers are properly supervised by neither and that Federal and State authorities are constantly in dispute and conflict. Juridically, therefore, such ersatz engrafted powers are weakened in government. Politically, the public will support an amendment the country has agreed to adopt, and without that sanguine public opinion, any exercise of governmental power is so weak as to be totally impotent.

Thirdly, it is the experience of English constitutional history, that property rights should never be entrusted to an executive. In the darkest days of their political history, never was the understanding of the British people so dulled that they did no reserve from their executives power over their persons and property.

[1] The Constitution of the United States of America, art. 11, sec. 2, clause 2.
[2] Ibid., art. I, sec. 10.
[3] 100 U. S. 483, 490.
[4] The Constitution of the United States of America, art. VI.
[5] 3 Dall. 199 (1796), 3 U. S. 198, 237.
[6] 2 Pet. 253, 314; 27 U. S. 253 (1829).
[7] 252 U. S. 416, 432.
[8] Ibid., 434.
[9] Ibid., 432.
[10] 252 U. S. 416, 433.
[11] 299 U. S. 304, 319.
[12] 301 U. S. 324, 326.
[13] 301 U. S. 324, 330.
[14] Ibid., 327.
[15] Ibid., 331.
[16] 112 U. S. 580, 598.
[17] Ibid., 598.
[18] Ibid., 599.
[19] *Marbury* v. *Madison* (1 Cranch 137, 176).
[20] *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (3 Wheat. 316, 404).
[21] *Marbury* v. *Madison* (1 Cranch 137, 176).
[22] *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (3 Wheat. 316, 405).

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Statement by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo Concerning House Concurrent Resolution 149.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, on House Concurrent Resolution 149, introduced by Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism:

I wish to congratulate Congressman MCCORMACK for his initiative in introducing House Concurrent Resolution 149.

Nothing can enhance American prestige more than a reaffirmation of America's policy as formally expressed in a resolution by the House to support the legitimate national aspirations of the non-self-governing peoples of the world. The McCormack resolution is

a reiteration of that policy and it will be hailed by all freedom-loving peoples, especially in Asia and Africa. It will again show America's sincerity and it will prove that it is the true sentiment of the American people to live up to its libertarian tradition which communism has tried to distort and misrepresent. The McCormack resolution is the best and most effective reply to Communist propaganda and those of us who have upheld the principles of freedom and democracy rejoice that Congressman McCormack has the vision and the statesmanship to file his resolution.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, since I first came to the House of Representatives in the 82d Congress, back in 1951, I have supported foreign aid authorizations and appropriations every year except one. I have frequently voted for amendments to reduce the amount of aid to certain areas and for certain purposes, but I have supported the overall purposes of mutual security by favorable votes except in 1953 when the amount exceeded that which I felt we could afford for the program, forcing me to vote against the bill and the conference report. I cannot support an omnibus foreign aid bill again this year.

In casting these votes in previous years on behalf of my half million constituents I have carefully examined and reexamined not only these programs but my own position. I have regretted the fact that technical aid has gradually been perverted from its original concept of providing carefully trained technicians at the request of an underdeveloped country to a point where it seemed to emphasize the transfer of equipment and aid supplies. It has disturbed me to discover that frequently reports providing a clear, comprehensive and tightly written statement of the previous programs on a country by country basis were not available to the Congress as a whole. This increased immeasurably the difficulty of an individual Congressman making either a postaudit review or a careful evaluation of future needs. The fact that 34 separate agencies with a total of over 115,000 employees overseas have been engaged directly or indirectly in activities related to foreign aid has not simplified congressional consideration of this complex problem nor has the utilization of security classifications to surround many of these projects facilitated congressional scrutiny except for the privileged few on appropriate committees.

The Eisenhower administration and the 83d Congress under Republican leadership deserve credit for taking preliminary steps to bring foreign aid spending under control. The 83d Congress appropriated for fiscal years 1954 and 1955 a total of $7,313,006,816 for foreign aid under President Eisenhower's program as contrasted with the 82d Congress, which appropriated for fiscal years 1952 and 1953 a total of $13,330,851,726 under President Truman's program. This represented a saving of $6,017,844,910 in foreign-aid appropriations during the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration. It should, in all fairness, be pointed out that actual grants and credits in the form of actual net payments and deliveries show a total of $11,558,000,000 for 1953 and 1954 as compared to $9,020,000,000 in 1951 and 1952. This, of course, represents delivery of end items previously contracted for and possibly an expenditure of uncommitted or committed items from previous appropriations. It is significant that even now the Foreign Operations Administration has about $8,728,000,000 in previous authorizations and appropriations left over which it, or its successor, could spend next year even if no appropriations were made in this session.

So complex is the present organization and so diverse the commitments for foreign aid that no two sources agree exactly on the overall carryovers from previous appropriations for the various agencies. The Hoover Commission task force currently estimates that there will be $7,900,000,000 in unexpended balances available on June 30 of this year. In addition, they note, there was available as of December 31, 1954, in foreign currencies the equivalent of $973 million in counterpart funds, some of which will remain as of June 30, 1955. I find myself in agreement with the Hoover Commission that it is time to ascertain how much of these unexpended funds are committed by definite contractual obligations as of June 30, 1955, with view to finding whether these unexpended appropriations do not permit a substantial reduction of cash appropriations for the fiscal year 1956.

Since the end of World War II there have been many agencies charged with responsibility for economic and military aid and there have been many different terminal dates suggested for such worldwide assistance programs. Congress determined in the Mutual Security Act of 1954 that the Foreign Operations Administration in particular should be ended as an independent agency on June 30, 1955. I suggest that the omnibus concept of mutual security appropriations be allowed to die with it and be replaced by a realistic country by country authorization and appropriation. This is not an untried idea. Our concept of foreign aid was born on a country by country basis back in 1947 when the British Ambassador informed the Secretary of State that Great Britain was no longer able to subsidize Greece and Turkey at a time when the Greek Government was fighting a Communist-led rebellion while Russia was threatening Turkey. The 80th Congress passed the Greek-Turkey aid program. It was a specific program designed to help two specific countries solve specific problems. It worked.

In connection with that specific program, President Truman told the Congress it was American policy, "to help free peoples maintain their free institutions and national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes." This loosely formulated policy statement has been cited ever since as authority for the grand assortment of worldwide projects lumped together as mutual security. It started with $400 million to Greece and Turkey. To date the military and economic assistance given by the United States to foreign countries since the end of World War II, including both ECA and MSA totals $46,847,000,000 through fiscal year 1954 with some $4,300,000,000 more to be spent in accordance with the 1955 budget. The Marshall plan was sold to Congress as a worldwide 4-year plan to make non-Soviet Europe self-supporting again. I say, after 8 years, the time is up, at least for worldwide omnibus programs. Where individual countries request, merit, and justify aid let it be appropriated in that manner, not as a worldwide package deal, take it or leave it. Careful consideration to several bills, each providing aid tailored to the specific needs of an ally requesting our assistance might well be substituted for the more expansive and more expensive omnibus bills which reportedly caused economist C. Hartley Grattan to write:

> It seems to me that we are getting more foggy and evasive about the kind of reality we are facing every day that passes. We never quite say what we are doing, or what is being done to us, for fear apparently that if we begin giving things their right names they will really and truly scare us to death.

By and large the economy of war-torn Europe has been rebuilt to levels far above those of pre-war days. Our attention has now been turned to the vast and eternal problems of Asia. Here, many sound thinkers abroad and at home urge us to program in terms of individual Asiatic countries and their problems rather than of Asia as an homogenous whole. Only 3 weeks ago, meeting in Simla, India, representatives of 13 Asian countries who met to discuss utilization of a $200 million regional aid fund proposed by President Eisenhower, are understood to have welcomed the prospect of these additional funds but only if distributed to individual Asian countries. The delegates were subcabinet officials of the Asian nations involved. United States Foreign Operations Administrator Harold Stassen visited Asia earlier this year and said Asians must decide for themselves how to use the money. As far as I am concerned, they have now decided.

I am bitterly disappointed that our own national budget is not yet in balance. If we cannot balance the budget in this era of Eisenhower peace and prosperity, when will we ever start to pay our own way and stop living off the future earnings of our children. I am one who did not find it amusing or reassuring when Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Blyth said recently in Atlantic City that our national debt has its constructive side, which includes the billions in public debt interest paid each year to individuals, banks, insurance companies, and others on the Government bonds and securities they hold.

"These interest dollars we are paying out are helping to provide jobs," Blyth said. Evidently the man does not realize that money invested in industry does the same thing without saddling the taxpayer with the interest rates and the obligation.

Because I believe in a balanced budget, and because I believe that, at a time most of our allies are either reducing taxes or refusing to collect taxes from their elite, the American taxpayer merits tax reductions, I cannot again vote to support a world-wide omnibus foreign-aid package. I could and would vote to appropriate funds to carry out our obligations in such areas as Korea, Spain, and Turkey on an individual country basis. I cannot include such other countries as India and Yugoslavia in the same package any more than I can vote aid to areas which were thrown in largely to round out the bundle.

I am disappointed that the Foreign Operations Administration will not be discontinued June 30 as Congress thought it provided. It dies, momentarily, only to be reincarnated as the International Cooperation Administration. When, through the courtesy of our chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], I was allowed to occupy the chair of the Government Operations Committee during hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 7, I heard a parade of able witnesses from the State Department and from Foreign Operations Administration testify as to the essentiality of separating these two agencies in the interests of efficiency, economy, and intelligent implementation of our foreign economic policy. Scarcely 2 years later the same people argue that the 2 agencies can function properly only if they are again back in essentially their former relationship.

As a well-prepared mourner at the funeral of FOA I find it difficult to consort publicly with its capricious ghost, ICA, especially before the body is interred.

I believe in international cooperation and in the fundamental concept of some United States aid in creating a strong, free bloc of nations. I do not believe our program of economic and military aid can continue forever at its present high level. I cannot conceive of the need for $757 million more for aid this year than last, especially with an $8 billion hold-over. Surely the time has come to apply the brakes and re-examine the objectives and techniques of the program in the interest of the American economy and the American taxpayer. I am convinced that the day of the shotgun approach to foreign aid programs is over. Is it not time to reach for the rifle, pinpoint our aid targets and save on ammunition?

Mr. Speaker, had I more time, I would like to quote at length from last Sunday's lead editorial in the Indianapolis Star, Representing Whom?; last Monday's editorial from the Indianapolis News, Let This Set the Pattern; and from Peter Edson's column in today's Washington Daily News which will probably be carried by the Indianapolis Times, Foreign Aid, Like the Weather, Goes Right Along. Under unanimous consent, I ask they be inserted in the RECORD.

[From the Indianapolis Star of June 5, 1954]

REPRESENTING WHOM?

Sometimes we wonder just whom our "representatives in the House and Senate really think they represent. Some recent votes on bills to increase expenses, add new projects, increase foreign aid without decreasing either taxes or the budget deficit are surprising.

The American people are paying and have been since 1948, the biggest tax bill in American history. Yet we still have no balanced budget. We still have had only token tax reduction. We are still adding to, not subtracting from, the expensive and expansive nature of a government that is today the biggest in our history.

This year one or both Houses of Congress have approved bills to increase Government salaries—including their own—but they have not decreased the people's taxes. The Senate has just increased foreign aid over last year and the new total is about the size of the Federal deficit. It is noteworthy that in the foreign aid bill is $40 million for Communist Dictator Tito plus some planes and guns of undisclosed cost. Also about $65 million is earmarked for "neutralist, socialist" Nehru of India. Both of these gentlemen have of late expressed direct opposition to American foreign policy plans. Each vigorously support entrance of Communist China into the U. N. which only 10 percent of the American voters (according to the Gallup poll) support and 67 percent vigorously oppose. Now whose interest does a Senator or Congressman serve by voting against the wishes of 67 percent of the American people—and probably more?

If foreign aid were stopped right now, we could immediately balance the budget. If foreign aid were stopped right now we would save enough to reduce individual income taxes by 10 percent. Do Members of the Senate or House think their constituents would oppose such a tax cut or an end to deficits? Do they really believe the voters would rather send out more foreign aid than pay 10 percent less in taxes?

As a matter of fact how much do we really need that additional money just approved by the Senate for foreign aid? The Foreign Operations Administration right now has $8,728,000,000 left over which it can spend for foreign aid next year if it wishes. The Senate voted to add $2,500,000,000 to this for next year. That is over $11 billion. Do you know how much money that is? It is enough to reduce your taxes by more than 25 percent. It is enough to give us a Federal surplus of $7,500,000,000 next year. It is over 18 percent of the total Federal budget. And it is all going abroad.

Almost every European nation we propose to aid has a balanced budget or surplus. Asiatic nations, no doubt, can use technical help, administrative help, and medical and agricultural assistance. But most of them cannot absorb large amounts of capital, they have no industrial base. Special programs for States like Pakistan, or Nationalist China or Korea and the Philippines, which support us, might be worthwhile. But $11 billion? That is almost one-third of what we spend on our total arms program.

Congress is making foreign aid a permanent, not a temporary program. It is leading other nations to expect foreign aid whether they help themselves or help us or whether they do not. Congress, at least the majority, is now in the very strange position, for a democratic body, of paying greater heed to people in foreign countries and listening more to Washington bureaucrats than they do to the American people and their own constituents.

We do not believe the inevitable and angry backfire from the American people is going to be long in coming.

[From the Indianapolis News of June 6, 1955]

LET THIS SET THE PATTERN

In a new agreement with Pakistan, the Washington Government is getting onto the right track in its foreign-assistance programs. It is providing incentives for private capital investment.

Pakistan, with a dynamic industrial and public-works program, is an inviting market for American investors. Prime Minister Mohammed Ali declares: "We believe without reservation in the free-enterprise system."

Our State Department has announced that we are prepared to consider making guaranties to any person of new investments for the establishment, expansion, modernization, or development of enterprises in Pakistan.

In return, the Karachi Government has pledged to permit repatriation of capital and profits, to grant special tax concessions, and to allow accelerated-depreciation allowances.

This is a welcome return to sound foreign economic policy. It is the very opposite of down-the-drain free Government grants. It is a policy of mutual profit.

Such a policy, of course, requires that private capital be freed of the possibility of seizure, nationalization, and confiscatory taxation. Other countries which need and expect our economic assistance should take note.

And our own Government could well follow this pattern in encouraging free-enterprise financing for projects in Latin America and elsewhere.

The first test should be proved friendship for the United States. The second should be stability of government. And the third should be the removal of all discriminations against the outside investor, with fixed safeguards against expropriation.

The sooner needy countries take the attitude of Pakistan in these matters, the sooner can they receive the benefits of our free-enterprise brand of prosperity. It is up to them. Meanwhile, it is to be hoped that the Pakistan agreement signals the end of American taxpayer doles for indefinite indigence abroad.

[From the Washington Daily News of June 8, 1955]

FOREIGN AID, LIKE THE WEATHER, GOES RIGHT ALONG

(By Peter Edson)

In spite of all the objections, American foreign-aid programs roll on year after year.

Last year Congress ordered the Foreign Operations Administration liquidated as of June 30. But the United States Senate has now approved continuation of this spending under a new International Cooperation Administration in the State Department.

New funds of nearly $3,500,000,000 are authorized for next year. This is $800 million more than was appropriated last year. It is some $17 million more—for technical assistance—than President Eisenhower recommended to Congress.

The battle today moves over to the House where the usual opposition to foreign aid is expected.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST

It will be argued that aid to neutrals like India and maybe Yugoslavia, too, should be cut off.

It will be maintained that any country having trade with Iron Curtain countries should not get aid so long as Americans are held prisoner by Chinese Communists.

Figures will be cited that the foreign-aid programs have $8 billion worth of carryover funds and that therefore no new appropriations are necessary.

It will be patriotically declared that no American aid should be given to build up the industrialization of foreign countries so that they will become competitors.

HOOVER REPORTS

These principal arguments will be backed up by recommendations made in the latest task-force report from Herbert Hoover's Commission on Government Reorganization.

The Hoover report recommends savings of $360 million on nonmilitary foreign aid for the coming fiscal year. This is a little over 20 percent of the $1,700,000,000 economic half of the foreign-aid budget.

It is noteworthy that the Hoover task force recommended no cut at all in the military aid budget of $1,700,000,000. Also, it does not recommend that the economic-aid program be completely discontinued. It merely wants the program reorganized.

Gen. George Marshall, as Secretary of State, thought foreign aid should be administered by his Department. Congress wouldn't have it that way and set up an independent operation.

So after 7 years of kicking the dog around under various names—ECA, MSA, FOA, and ICA—the Eisenhower administration and the Hoover Commission recommend that the business be put back in the State Department kennel, to complete the walk around the block.

DULLES IS RELUCTANT

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles apparently isn't too keen to have this responsibility thrust upon him. John B. Hollister, designated as the new administrator of the program, hasn't revealed his ideas on the subject.

Anyway, it's their pup now. And what all this juggling has accomplished is impossible to determine.

Friends of the foreign-aid program maintain that it would have been far better to set a firm policy and then stick to it. This would have created more confidence in American intentions among the friendly countries being helped. It would also cause more consternation among potential enemies.

Senator John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am privileged to insert the following editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, May 25, 1955, saluting the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, JOHN F. KENNEDY, upon his return to the Senate after a prolonged absence due to illness caused by his wartime injuries. I am sure that the entire membership of the Congress joins in the sentiments expressed in this fine tribute and wish for Senator KENNEDY a return to his usual vigorous and constructive legislative life in which he so well serves the best interests of his country and his State. The New York Herald Tribune is to be commended, too.

The editorial is as follows:

SENATOR KENNEDY RETURNS

It is a pleasure to welcome Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, back to the United States Senate. Mr. KENNEDY has been away from his desk in Washington for 8 months, the time it took him to recuperate after an operation for an injury he received when his PT boat was rammed by a Japanese destroyer in World War II.

Senator KENNEDY is a Democrat and, teamed with Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, the Massachusetts Republican, he has helped give his State vigorous and intelligent representation in the Senate. He was one of the first legislators in Washington to take a clear and unequivocal stand in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway; on this and other issues he has displayed characteristic forthrightness and understanding of national interests.

When he fell ill, there were some who doubted that he would be able to return to the stress and strain of Senate life. But young JACK KENNEDY comes from a bold and sturdy breed, and he is back on the job again. We join his colleagues on both sides of the Senate in greeting him warmly.

Victory by Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very truthful statement that appeared in the editorial column of the Boston Post of June 8, 1955:

VICTORY BY MAIL

Tens of thousands of Americans of Italian descent can take a good deal of the credit for the whopping victory scored in the Sicilian elections by the pro-Western Christian Democratic Party.

Working individually by mail in letters from here to their homeland they urged friends and relatives to vote against the Communists and with the friends of freedom. Although there were other factors in this victory their campaign had much to do with giving the Christian Democrats their biggest success.

No paid Red propagandist however zealous and hardworking could hope to persuade those voters who heard from their friends and families over here the truth about democracy at work.

Our own national propaganda agencies should make more use of American patriots like these. A similar campaign by mail directed at all the European nations where the Reds have power or are seeking it could do more than all the broadcasts of the Voice of America to sway the people for new victories like that which the Sicilians won.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*--------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*---------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*---------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*---
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*----------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*-------4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*---
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2737 Devonshire Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*--------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----1727 Mass. Ave.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*-------
Bell, John J., *Tex*---------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----7304 Bradley Blvd. Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*--------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*-----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*-------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*------
Bray, William G., *Ind*-----
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*-------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*-------
Buchanan, Vera, *Pa*-------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*---------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*-------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*-----1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*------
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*-----The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*-----
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*-----The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*---------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*-------
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*-----The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*----The Dorchester
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*--------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*----
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---4454 Tindall St.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*--------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*-------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*---
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*--
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*---------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*--
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*---------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*--------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*-----The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*------
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*---------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*---------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*--------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*-----
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fine, Sidney A., *N. Y*------
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*--------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*-----
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*-------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*-----3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*-------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*. 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*------
Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*----
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*-----
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*--------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*--------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*----
Granahan, William T., *Pa*--
Grant, George M., *Ala*-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*--------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*--------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*-----
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*-------2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*-----The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*------
Harris, Oren, *Ark*---------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*--------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*---------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*------The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*------
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*-----104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--125 Marthas Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*-----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--2108 Suitland Terrace SE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*--------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*----------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*--------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*------
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*---------
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*-------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*------The Washington House
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*--------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*---
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*--
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*----3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*-----2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1249 31st St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*-----
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*-------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*-------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*-----
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*-----
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----The Coronet

Appendix

Commencement Address of the Honorable Talma L. Smith to Graduating Class, Oklahoma City University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on May 23, 1955, a gentleman who hails from the 18th Congressional District of Texas, but who has worked for many years with the Congress, delivered the commencement address to the graduating class at Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City, Okla. He is the dean of official reporters of committees in the House of Representatives at the present time and has devoted over 40 years of his life to work in the Capital in various branches of the Government.

It is my distinct honor and pleasure to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the outstanding address of Mr. Smith on that occasion, as well as the introductory remarks by his outstanding brother, Dr. C. Q. Smith, president of Oklahoma City University:

INTRODUCTION OF THE HONORABLE TALMA L. SMITH BY DR. C. Q. SMITH, PRESIDENT OF OKLAHOMA CITY UNIVERSITY

I am almost overcome with emotion at the opportunity I have tonight to introduce the speaker. I can best say what I think of him by saying I would rather be like this speaker than any other man in the world. I have known him all his life. I grew up with him. I was in college with him. He was valedictorian when he graduated from high school. He graduated from Clarendon (Tex.) Junior College. He holds a bachelor of arts degree from George Washington University, and a bachelor of law degree from that school. He is an attorney in Washington, D. C., and a member of the bar of the District of Columbia, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals of that District, and of the Supreme Court of the United States. He served for a time as special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States. He is now the dean of official reporters of committees of the House of Representatives. He has worked in the Capital in and for various branches of the Government for over 40 years. He is a great churchman, and spends about as much of his time in church work as he does in his business.

I am happy to present to you as the speaker for tonight my mother's youngest son, Talma L. Smith.

TAKE HEED LEST YOU FORGET

(Commencement address by the Honorable Talma L. Smith at Oklahoma City University, Monday, May 23, 1955)

Of course I appreciate the honor of being your speaker on this occasion, but I would be an egotist to try to counsel you with so many choices open in this time of rapid change from calm to turbulent ways, with so much confused thinking about life and where we are going; when the people of faith are assured that this is our Father's world, and through those who follow Him He controls its destiny, while to people of doubt and fear "the world is but a tinderbox" in which God has matches; man has found them and helpless under the leadership of the devil is about to blow it apart: Fear that if the atomic bomb does not get you, its fallout will; and if you escape that, the Communists will get you, and if you escape them, the tax collector will get you—all is confusion, nothing makes sense.

But confused thinking is not new. It accompanies every upheaval—social, economic, or religious. Dickens, in the Tale of Two Cities, said of his time, that it was the best and the worst; the age of wisdom and of foolishness; the epoch of belief and of doubt; the spring of hope, the winter of despair. And we may well add of our time: The era of brotherhood and of hate; of courage and fear.

POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE CHOICES

Free to chose between positive and negative forces some thrill at the unfolding of life, others shrink from the new. To the mind of faith, the best, hope, belief, light, brotherhood, love are the dominant, controlling forces of life. To the mind of despair, foolshness, fear, distrust, darkness, and the worst are the dominant forces. You, seniors, have selected the positive, the more potent factors, and I have every confidence in your future.

OUR THRILLING ERA

I congratulate you for choosing to be born in this the most thrilling period in history. I am not a pessimist. I think we are living in the most thrilling period of all history. Not a dull or drab hour need be yours as you journey on your way. But much of your time has been spent in preparation, and I think it worth your will to pause long enough to consider some of the things others have provided for your welfare. I would not have you be a filliloo bird—you know the duck that flew and swam backward because he was not interested in where he was going, only in where he had been.

THE PAST IS PROLOG

Chiseled on the pedestrals of the Archives Building in Washington are these words: "What is past is prolog—study the past." To appreciate what we have received in our wonderful land we must not forget others help make it possible. Moses spent 40 years readying his people for their Promised Land, and before taking his leave, gave them this wise counsel:

"When the Lord your God bring you into the land * * * with great and goodly cities, which you did not build; houses full of all good things, which you did not fill; wells of living water, which you did not dig; vineyards of olive trees, which you did not plant, when you eat and are full, take heed lest you forget the Lord."

OUR PROMISED LAND

We too have been brought into a great and goodly land, whose frontiers others pushed back, daring to move out ahead of their day to make of this land the wonderful place in which we live. Theirs was not a united movement. Nor did they have a full Treasury to fall back on. Just about 100 years ago, when Congress was considering legislation to open the West, Daniel Webster, leading the opposition, said:

"I will not vote 1 cent from the public treasury to place the Pacific Ocean 1 inch nearer to Boston than it is. What do we want with this worthless area, this region of savages and wild beasts, with its shifting sands and its whirlwinds of dust; its cactus and prairie dogs? To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts and endless mountain ranges?"

Fortunately some were not discouraged by such dismal outlook, and we enjoy the fruits of their efforts, the blessings of their sacrifice. Doubtless if Webster were here he too would rejoice in the daring spirit that has brought Boston and the Pacific Ocean so close together. But He is not here. You are here. Yours is the opportunity to develop other and greater fields.

"THINGS" ACCOMPLISHED

What are some of the things done in more recent decades toward solving problems that plague man? Taking up where others left off, and contrary to the popular concept that they have "made a mess of the world," those who labored during this period have brought greater security from want, protection to health, assurance of employment, speed of communication, convenience and comfort to homes, and opportunity for wholesome recreation than society has heretofore known, and in so doing has made of our land the richest in "things" on earth.

EVOLUTION OF PROGRESS

Let us take a few examples to illustrate how the evolution of progress makes for greater security in our social and economic life.

The specter of want has ever stalked the path of man; and is still the companion of multiplied millions of people in the world. You were wise; you chose to be born in a land of plenty. Only one-third of your time will be required to supply your wants for food and clothing, leaving two-thirds for other pursuits. No other people has been so blessed. In Russia, we are told, it is just the reverse: Two-thirds of the effort is used to provide food and clothing, and in many countries of the world, despite long hours of toil and abundant natural resources, there is never enough to eat.

TRAINING—KNOW-HOW

With our God-given resources, plus training and know-how, we produce more food and fiber than we can consume. Yet less than 50 years ago a recognized authority in his field predicted that within a few generations, because of the loss of nitrogen from the soil, reduced yield, increased population, only the more fortunate would escape the pangs of hunger. But in two decades after his book went to press, overproduction of food and fiber helped bring on our worst depression. Wheat, corn, pork, beef, poultry and dairy products, cotton, became so abundant the marts of trade were glutted, prices fell, income of producers declined to the point where they ceased to be consumers of the output of industry, and the whole economy became deathly sick.

Of course there are many facets to a depression, but what had happened to upset that dire prediction of want? The coming of soil conservation, and the application of know-how in the use of land? Important as they were, alone they were not sufficient.

NITROGEN AND CHEAP POWER

Nitrogen, with which that writer was dealing, and so essential to plant growth, was rapidly disappearing from the soil. It had to be recaptured. Chemists, college-trained chemists, after long experiments, found a means of extracting it from the air, fixing it, and feeding it to the soil. But to do so, at a price users could afford to pay, cheap power had to be found.

Nitrates are needed for making gunpowder, which we needed to help win World War I. A dam was built on the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, and a hydroelectric plant began producing nitrates for making gunpowder. The war ended. A long legislative battle followed, which resulted in changing Muscle Shoals "operation gunpowder" to "operation fertilizer," and we entered a new era, freed of the fear of want; plants could be made to grow on leeched-out soils: Food in abundance was assured.

TO HIM THAT HATH SHALL BE ADDED

The Great Teacher said: To him that hath shall be added. Follow that logical thinking in the growth of our economy. Development in one field of activity brings advance in others. What wonders have followed the work of the chemist and demand for cheap power. Other trained minds grasped the meaning of cheap power from hydroelectric plants, and soon other dams began to rise on streams in the land, where for centuries billions of kilowats of energy had been wasting down uncontrolled, devastating rivers. That wasting power was salvaged, and in less than 30 years time has been put to work lifting the burden of mankind.

With rising dams came control of floods that had been taking lives and property, reclamation of waste areas, irrigation of parched lands, navigation, and recreational benefits.

Compute, if you can, the million of jobs which have become available to you and others, with the income available for the purchase of homes and all the gadgets that make for conveniences, as a result of the progress in this one area of our industrial life.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

You remember when people groped about their dimlit house on the farm, read by kerosene lamps, prepared their 5 o'clock breakfast on a wood-fired stove, starting their trek after a horsedrawn plow, and at the close of the weary day, felt their way about the barn—if they had a barn—to feed the horses, milk the cows, and slop the hogs. Now what? Just 21 years ago, less than three farms in a hundred in the State of Oklahoma had electricity. Today almost 85 percent have electricity, with all the benefits that flow from refrigeration, washing machines, irons, pumps, stoves, radios, television—and television alone has become an $11 billion industry in less than 15 years.

Again at your convenience, compute if you can the wealth that has flowed from the manufacture of electric appliances, with the millions of jobs opened to you as you start your journey in life, not to mention the other benefits that flow from gainful employment.

PROTECTION TO HEALTH

But let us turn to another field of progress—protection to health. One or two illustrations will suffice. Smallpox, that used to pockmark so many people when I was a lad, caused our family to move from Altus, where it was running rampant over the community. Quarantine and pesthouses were the means used to block its onward march. Doctors spent much time learning how to treat it to prevent death. Now what? Just a few months ago I heard the Surgeon General of the United States Public Heatlh Service tell a committee of the Congress that few, if any, medical officers now in the Service, have ever seen a case of smallpox. And it is being eliminated.

Double lobar pneumonia that so often meant a call for the hearse, is now cured in 4 or 5 days. Penicilin. Polio, that brought terror to parents and children alike, is losing its battle of crippling. Cancer is on the list to be whipped. Radioactive treatment is showing the way to stop its onward march. Pure food laws protect us against ptomaine poisoning. For centuries, few people knew or cared that dairy cows with tuberculosis supplied most of our milk, butter, and cheese. And only in the last 20 years have all the States in the Union banned such cows from dairy herds. Five million dairy cows—for which so many political tears were shed following the awful heartless days of the thirties when the cow population was being reduced for economic reasons—were killed and eliminated from heards because they had tuberculosis.

Child labor laws now prevent textile and other mills from sacrificing the health of little children on the altar of ignorance and greed.

What of workmen protection? A few decades ago when a workman broke his back in a mine, or lost a limb working on an unguarded machine, he was told by his boss: you'd beter take off, see your doctor. When you get well come back and your pay will start again. If he did not get well, he and his family scrounged as best they could for food and clothing, with little hope for the future. Now what? In the United States and 60 other nations, medical care and compensation are provided for injured employees. Unemployment insurance is provided in 23 of these nations, and 32 of them provide care of the aged.

Retirement pensions or annuities are available to nearly every earner—and soon $90 billion in reserve funds will offer a cushion against panics and depressions.

ORIGIN OF PROGRESS

From whence came these advances? Many of them originated in classrooms, carried into forums and into legislation, after long tedious study and adjustment to our whole economic and social order. No one group could have done it alone.

CARE OF WOUNDED

We even demand better care of those called to the colors to defend our way of life. Scarcely any provision was made some decades ago for the sick and wounded. In the Civil War more men died from lack of medical care than from battle wounds. By World War I 92 percent of all wounded who lived to reach a hospital, got well. And in World War II, 96 percent.

In the Spanish-American War more soldiers died from poison food and disease than from wounds. By World War I, of those treated for disease in military hospitals, 1 of every 60 died. Some 25 years later, in World War II, but 1 of every 1,666; and 15 million received hospital treatment. Few hospitals existed a few decades ago, even for the care of civilians and military patients. Now every community of any size, is provided with some such facility.

SPEED OF TRAVEL AND COMMUNICATION

I will not tire you by recounting the advance made in modes of travel and communication, since the attack made on the horse by the gasoline engine. At your leisure, consider what progress in this field has meant in the way of jobs, wealth—roads, recreation, hot-dog stands, wrecks, repair shops, and the unlimited number of things that flow from the discovery and use of just plain, greasy oil, that for millions of years lay dormant in this State of Oklahoma.

THE TIRE

I will invite your attention to just one item in the evolution of the automobile, the tire. The museum model was equipped with raw-rubber, puncture-easy tires, good for about 2,000. What brought about their longer service? A chemist, college-trained chemist, seeking to make a colored tire, mixed some carbon black with latex rubber, and stumbled on the missing link that makes rubber tires almost indestructible. And today the "imitation" blue-northers over the Texas Panhandle are but escaping smoke from plants where carbonblack is collected for use in tire making.

NO HORSE SENSE IN CARS

These palaces on wheels today are equipped with about everything except horse sense. And perhaps after we reach a kill of 100,000 a year—and we are getting there fast—maybe one of you engineers will find some means of building that into them. It does not seem drivers can acquire it.

Speed and comfort in air travel is too well known to require any mention.

MORAL AND SPIRITUAL PROGRESS

With rapid advance in removing fear of want, and supplying all of these benefits, I raise the question: Have the arts and sciences outdistanced our moral and spiritual advance? Are we in danger of substituting temporal things for permanent realities? This is an age-old question. Isaiah (II: 7–8) put it in this manner:

"Their land is filled with silver and gold;
There is no end to their treasure.
Their land is filled with horses,
There is no end to their chariots.
Their land is filled with idols.
They bow down to the works of their hands,
To what their own fingers have made."

ERA OF BROTHERHOOD OR HATE

With security from want, and the progress in every area about us, with our wisdom and foolishness, our hope and despair, our light and our darkness, are we making similar strides toward the era of brotherhood? I am fully convinced that we are, despite gloomy forbodings of people who refuse to see rainbows or silver fringes to dark clouds. The positive forces at work for the welfare of peoples everywhere, at home, and in distressed areas are evidence of it. The widespread willingness with which we share our progress with the needy is proof of it.

SHARING WITH OTHERS

For years and years only in churches were heard appeals for help to relieve the needy—in our own land and in dark continents. Messengers of hope and medical care were found almost alone among the ministry and missionaries. True, wherever their message went it took root, and in jungle islands fuzzy angles grew up later to minister to lost American soldiers and others. Today at home there are so many agencies of relief at work that we have to organize them into chest movements, and people in and out of the church gladly join in the effort to relieve the suffering of their fellow man.

Abroad: Through the point 4 program of the United Nations medical care, economic, and educational know-how are being shared with multiplied needy millions of people in areas that have never known anything but want. And note this: More tax-raised money is contributed from the United States Treasury toward the support of this program than is raised and expended on similar work by our combined churches.

The World Health Organization of the U. N. is today crossing national, religious, color, and political lines in providing polio serum to children in other lands, friendly or unfriendly.

We feed our enemy with tax-collected funds. Former President Hoover told the Appropriations Committee of the Congress that we must either provide food to starving children and others of the defeated countries or bring home the American soldiers,

because they could not eat their rations and watch others starve.

WHENCE THIS URGE

From whence comes this urge to share what we have with others?

Paradoxical as it may seem, many of our people did not become zealous for such programs of relief of peoples in underdeveloped countries until they feared they would become Communists. God moves in a mysterious way, and maybe he is using even the Commies to wake us up to the need of others. But to others the relief of distress is but the answer to the heart's prayer, the response to the Great Commission.

NO PEACE WITH STARVATION

The world can have no peace with one-third of the people living in luxury beyond the wildest dreams of avarice, while the others exist on starvation diets and writhe in agony from disease. Mere handout of food is not the answer. Sharing our know-how will solve their problem as it has ours.

BROTHERHOOD'S LEAVENING

The "yeast" of brotherhood, placed in the measure in our land, is slowly but surely leavening the whole. Today in every community, county, city, State; in the legislative halls, the executive branch, on the judiciary, among labor, in industry, in every walk of life are found men and women of Christian character, who do not bow down to gods of Baal.

RISING HOPE OF MANKIND

Today that leavening influence is at work among the peoples of the world. Wherever that message goes it stirs hope. When we join in moves to stir the hope in hopeless people, let us take care lest we block their struggle upward. We must not be so confused by the threat of isms that we fail to detect the rising surge of individual personality asserting itself, as it has and always will, when the hope that is ours becomes theirs too. Basic to respect for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is a conviction that all men are created equal in the sight of God. On that belief we founded a government to protect our freedom, and we must not allow it to crumble from attack, without or within. "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do," asked the Psalmist 2500 years ago.

FIRST THINGS FIRST

I congratulate you, also, for selecting parents who are concerned that your education be gained in an atmosphere where Bible study is a must. Where you absorb by association and instruction a proper relation between economic progress and moral and spiritual conduct.

"Seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness and all these things will be added," said the Great Teacher. Today we are in danger of adding all these things first, believing they will bring on an era of brotherhood. They have their place, but some would boast that our abundance of things, our unequaled comfort and ease are the answer to movements of isms, and would use public funds to proclaim that theory over the Voice of America to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, and display our pomp and power as the towering strength of America. What does the Lord require of us, as individuals, as a nation, but to "do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with our God." Three things: justice, mercy, humility—and too many things are undermining our humility.

PROTECTING OUR COUNTRY

People may differ as to the means to be used, but no one will deny that we must protect and defend our country, our institutions, and our way of life. Liberty so dearly bought, must not be surrendered. Someone has aptly said:

"All men suffer when freedom fails,
The best men rot in filthy jails,
And they who cry appease, appease,
Are hanged by men they tried to please."

But freedom has its security, not in fear or hysteria, but in eternal vigilance. Freedom is the birthright of all, not the few, and must not be lost to fear, or threats of fear. There exists fear. Very respectable writers of our day claim that fear is threatening our freedom, and that panics of fear will continue. There is fear among some that communism will overrun the world, including free lands; that the atheism of its slavish teaching will win over godliness, and they adopt methods to stop its advance that make others fear that our freedom is endangered more from within by the methods to overcome it than by the ism itself. Creating dissention, division, and hate but play into the enemy's hand. When suspicion and distrust become rampant in the land we lose our greatest advantage, that of mutual regard, respect and trust, which bring out the best in our citizenry, and without which neither our way of life nor our country can long endure.

What has become of our faith in our God, in our way of life? Have we become so "namby pamby" that we tremble in fear lest we give up our belief to some ism? Can one put so many to flight?

IGNORANCE OF THE BIBLE

Are we losing our faith to growing ignorance of the Bible? Its reading is entirely ignored by many. Its teachings are rarely the topic of conversation outside the classroom.

Did you see the TV program recently—one of the chance-to-get-rich-quick type—when the master of ceremonies asked a grown couple to "name in 10 seconds as many books of the Bible as you can at $40 for each book named"? I expected to see them walk out with a pocket full of money. They had answered other questions that seemed difficult to me. Apparently they went away sorrowing, for they named not one. I repeated the incident to a well educated, retired businessman, and to my surprise more than to his chagrin, he said: "I could have done no better. I must have been fishing when Bible study was being passed around."

Essential to keeping our country's foundation secure is a widespread knowledge of the truths revealed in the Bible. How much the lowering of moral standards results from its ignorance I would not hazard a guess. Jeremiah warned in his day of the results of such ignorance, in these words:

"An appalling and horrible thing has happened. The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests rule at their direction; and my people love to have it so."

NEW RESPONSIBILITY ON THIS INSTITUTION

A new responsibility now rests on this and similar schools where freedom still exists to teach the Bible. For over 150 years Bible reading was permitted in tax-supported schools. Millions of people acquired some knowledge of it only in that manner. Now that is gone. One objector was able to stop it. The Supreme Court of the United States has held that the clause in the Constitution which reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion" forbits the teaching or study of the Bible in tax-supported institutions. I am not quarreling with the Court's decision. I do not see how it could have decided otherwise. It was construing the meaning of language found in the Constitution, not writing it. The dangers of mixing church and State were too fresh in the minds to the authors of the Constitution; they left little doubt as to their intent. Be that as it may, the law of the land today prevents the use of tax-raised funds for Bible teaching. Therefore, upon this and similar institutions rests a large responsibility for its teaching.

You, because of your association with OCU, will be expected to carry a message, freed of much of the confused thinking about life in our day.

YOUR OPPORTUNITY

Today you join some 350,000 others who graduate from colleges and universities in the United States—over 10 times as many just 50 years ago, although the population has only doubled in that period. You have become a marked group. Your reception will not be the same in your community. People will rely on your judgment, your leadership, and influence. You have become important to them. They will expect you to use your training for the benefit of others.

THE ATOMIC AGE

To your generation is given the opportunity to put to work the pentup power of the atom; to say whether this terrifying force was discovered before man was ready, morally, to direct it. While atomic bombs are making the headlines, radioactive isotopes are at work in hospitals treating diseases that do not yield to other methods. Atomic powered plants are under construction for the production of electricity. Atomic powered engines are on order to pull our trains. From its pentup energy, skillfully directed, seawater may be made to give up its salinity, and be applied to parched lands for the production of abundant food for hungry peoples around the world.

PROGRESS—ADVANCEMENT

Ours has been an era of unprecedented progress in many fields. Yours must be one of determined advancement toward the era of brotherhood. There is no other course open. The peoples of the world must learn to live together or be blown apart. You, with all the gadgets that have been developed and the proper direction of unlimited power, can bring relief from hunger, thirst, disease, ignorance, and hear the Master say, here and now: "Inasmuch as you have done it unto one of the least of these, you have done it unto Me."

On the threshold of your promised land, I think of no better counsel than this:

Hear, O Seniors, the Lord our God, is one, You shall love Him with all your heart, soul, and might.

When you enter your new land with great and goodly cities, which you did not build; storehouses full of all good things, which you did not fill; security of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, for which others gave their last full measure of devotion—and we owe them a debt we can never pay—when your wants are satisfied, then take heed—that is, give some real concern—lest you forget the Lord.

Remember this is His world. Follow not other gods and you need never be afraid.

I salute you. Commence.

Recommending Construction of Federal Penitentiary in Southern Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Budget, through a request by the United States Bureau of Prisons and Attorney General Brownell, has just recommended the erection of a new maximum security Federal penitentiary to

be built somewhere near the center of population of the United States.

I have the honor of representing the good people of southern Illinois in the 15 southernmost counties comprising the 25th Congressional District. My district is very near the center of population of this country, and I am very hopeful that, should Congress appropriate funds for the erection of this penitentiary, it can be located somewhere in my district. We meet all the requirements such as adequate transportation facilities, power, water supply, and are classed by the United States Labor Department as being IV–B which means a very substantial labor surplus. We have 30,000 able-bodied unemployed persons in my district, and the erection of this penitentiary would be a great boom to the sagging economy of southern Illinois. I hope the Members of this Congress can see fit to support me and the people of southern Illinois in our bid for the location of this proposed Federal penitentiary. I am happy to include in the RECORD 2 resolutions; 1 adopted by the Mayors Association of southern Illinois at their regular monthly mayors meeting held in Herrin, Ill., and the second petition signed by over 4,000 residents of Franklin County, Ill., proposing that this prison be built in or near West Frankfort, Ill. The petitions show conclusively that all of the people of southern Illinois are wholeheartedly in favor of having this penitentiary built in their respective community and is also an indication of our dire need for some type of Federal project to help alleviate our critical unemployment situation.

The petitions follow:

RESOLUTION OF MAYOR'S ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHERN ILLINOIS, INC., HERRIN, ILL., MAY 19, 1955

Whereas the Mayor's Association of Southern Illinois, Inc., did meet in regular session this date in the city hall at Herrin, Ill.; and

Whereas the mayor's association is representative of all the municipalities of southern Illinois south of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad which at this date has some 53 dues-paying cities and villages in this area participating in the affairs of this organization through their respective mayors; and

Whereas the mayor's association is most interested in the betterment of the economic conditions in this area and the advancement of this area in any and all phases; and

Whereas it is a matter of public record that the Federal Bureau of Prisons has been charged by the Congress of the United States to construct a Federal penitentiary in the center of the United States, and that such location has tentatively been listed as to be in the State of Illinois; and

Whereas according to the 1950 Federal census, the population center of the United States is located close to Olney, Ill., in Richland County; and

Whereas in the area represented by the Mayor's Association of Southern Illinois is to be found this population center, along with an untold amount of unemployed skilled and unskilled labor, the best in railroads, highways both United States and State, interstate waterways, secluded acreage including a tremendous acreage already owned by the United States Government, all most suitable for the security necessary for such a penitentiary along with an abundance of transportation and personnel required for the construction, maintenance, and operation of such an institution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Mayor's Association of Southern Illinois endorse and recommend that the Federal penitentiary, authorized by the Congress of the United States to be created by the Federal Bureau of Prisons, in the approximate center of the United States, to be constructed in a location of southern Illinois south of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad for the reason set forth in this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately sent to the United States Senators from Illinois, Members of Congress from this area of southern Illinois, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, the Governor of the State of Illinois, area and local chambers of commerce, and all mayors of this area so that their support of this project may be enlisted so that southern Illinois may be granted this proposed Federal penitentiary.

Approved:

DAVE H. MILLER,
Mayor of Herrin, Ill.; President of Mayors' Association.

Attest:

K. NEIL THURMOND,
Mayor of Johnston City, Ill.; Secretary of Mayors' Association.

APRIL 27, 1955.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS,
Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN,
Congressman KENNETH J. GRAY,
Attorney General HERBERT BROWNELL:

The undersigned residents of the county of Franklin, in the State of Illinois, do hereby petition you to locate in West Frankfort, Ill., the Federal prison to be established in the immediate future near the center of population of the United States.

West Frankfort is 28 miles from Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Ill.; 20 miles from Crab Orchard Lake, maintained by the Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Division, as a recreation center; and 12 miles from the veterans' hospital, Marion, Ill.

West Frankfort is 50 miles southwest of Olney, Ill., the center of population of the United States. It is located on Illinois State highways running north and south and east and west, Ozark Airlines, C. & E. I., Illinois Central, and C., B. & Q. Railroads. It is accessible from every direction in all seasons.

West Frankfort has adequate elementary and high schools and a city-park system. The streets are paved with brick, concrete, or otherwise hard surfaced. It has adequate electric, natural gas, telephone, water, sewer, and sewage-disposal facilities.

Industrially West Frankfort has been a coal-mining town. Most of these mines have been worked out, causing many of its residents to be unemployed. There is an excess-labor supply in this territory. The critical unemployment classification is IV.

By establishing this new Federal prison in West Frankfort, you will relieve a critical economic situation and at the same time locate the prison in central United States at a point accessible from all directions and in all seasons.

Approve John Day Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I have an editorial from the Gresham Outlook of May 26, 1955, which is published in Gresham, Oreg. This editorial comments on the Gresham Chamber of Commerce's unanimous endorsement of H. R. 5789, legislation which I introduced for the immediate construction of the John Day Dam on the Columbia River. This editorial points up the extreme need for the early passage of this legislation and so that my colleagues may have the benefit of this vital information I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

APPROVE JOHN DAY PLAN

The Gresham Chamber of Commerce last Monday joined a long and growing list of civic and business organizations and individuals in approving the proposal now before Congress for construction of John Day Dam on the Columbia River as a "partnership" project. The chamber unanimously approved a letter of resolution urging immediate passage of the bill providing for commencement of the John Day Dam introduced recently by Representative SAM COON.

The bill provides for the Government to pay only $37 million of the $310 milion cost of the project. This amount would liquidate cost of the so-called nonreimbursable navigation and flood-control features of the dam. The balance of $273 million of the cost would be paid by a combination of both private and public utility organizations. The groups which participate in that payment would share in ratio to their participation in the distribution of the 1,500,000 kilowatts of power to be produced by the dam over a period of 50 years. The dam would be the property of the United States Government right from the start and would be operated by the Government.

The unanimous approval of the resolution by chamber members was a direct result of the recognition by them of the urgency of need for additional power facilities in the Northwest, and of the fact that waiting for approval by Congress of a John Day Dam to be built solely as a Government project offered no guaranty of when it might put power on the lines, if ever.

That fact is one of the most vitally important factors for all citizens to consider in weighing the merits of the various types of financing for more great power dams in the Northwest. Each day it is becoming increasingly evident that time is the essence of the problem so far as the welfare of the region is concerned. It far outweighs all other economic considerations in both the immediate and long-term pictures. Aside from the philosophical question of private versus public power, the element of time is overpowering as a factor in consideration of the construction of power dams. The need is so great that the economic welfare of Oregon and the entire Northwest will brook no delays.

Address by Congressman Edwin E. Willis, Democrat, of Louisiana, Before Noon Luncheon Meeting of the Sugar Club of New York, June 9, 1955, at Downtown Athletic Club, New York, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to incorporate in the RECORD a speech delivered by my colleague, the

Honorable EDWIN E. WILLIS, of the Third Congressional District of Louisiana, before the Sugar Club of New York on Thursday, June 9, 1955.

The Committee on Agriculture will soon begin consideration of amendments to the Sugar Act. I recommend this speech to all the Members of this and the other body as it sets forth very clearly the problems confronting the sugar industry and shows persuasively the necessity for the quick passage of the legislation now pending.

The speech follows:

While that substance which we know as "sugar" has lost none of its characteristic sweetness to the taste, it has, within recent months, become a subject of great bitterness, politically and economically, in certain American and Cuban circles.

So bitter, in fact, have become the arguments in some quarters, that all objectivity is being submerged in the welter of claims and counterclaims, maneuvers, and countermaneuvers. There is little sweetness and light, only acrimonious name calling.

I state these things as unfortunate facts, not as a prelude to launching my own diatribe on the subject. I should prefer to consider and discuss with you, dispassionately, if I may, certain basics which can help lead us to formation of accurate conclusions.

It is correct to say, I believe, that we all take a great deal of satisfaction from the fact that development of our foreign trade has been, and continues to be, one of the basic purposes of our American sugar legislation. I feel equally assured, there are none among us who would deliberately act in such fashion as to diminish those benefits we and our foreign neighbors enjoy under this law.

Such a high regard for the basic principles of our sugar legislation was uppermost in my mind on last March 31, when it was my privilege to introduce a bill in the 84th Congress to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948.

Twenty-eight such bills now are awaiting hearings a little later this month in the House Agricultural Committee. Identical legislation, introduced by Senators ELLENDER and BENNETT with 47 cosponsors, is pending in the Senate.

I want you to know that my colleagues and I devoted painstaking conscience and care in designing this proposed legislation in order to provide not only a small measure of relief to our own harassed domestic sugar industry, but also to assure expanding trade relations with our Caribbean neighbors.

Our Congress has given no man cause to doubt its intent to continue the policy of encouraging foreign trade—that policy under which Cuba has since 1902 been the recipient of countless trade and tariff privileges.

A look back into the history of American sugar legislation shows that in 1934 the first really workable Sugar Quota Act became law. This was a measure which, aside from providing other benefits, effected the rescue of the Cuban sugar industry from certain economic ruin and guaranteed Cuba a huge, growing, and exceedingly profitable market for its sugar in the United States. In this act, and in its successor of 1937, the American market was divided percentagewise. A certain percentage of total demand was apportioned to each of the domestic producing areas, and a percentage was designated for foreign suppliers. Therefore, as American sugar consumption grew along with population, all producing areas, domestic and foreign, shared proportionately in the annual increases.

In 1948, however, Congress changed the pattern. Cuba faced definite difficulties in adjusting back to normal levels her wartime production. The temporary plan adopted extended vast concessions to Cuba. Fixed marketing quotas were established for domestic producing areas—not a percentage of the whole, but flat tonnage maximums which were not to be exceeded in any one year.

That was but one part of the temporary concessions extended to Cuba at that time. In addition, Cuba was given the privilege of supplying 95 percent of that amount by which the Philippine sugar industry could not fill its quota while rebuilding from the ravages of World War II.

Cuba was also permitted to share with domestic areas the deficits that might occur in any domestic area where, because of the shift to other production during postwar Government farm programs, any area could not fill its quota completely.

The establishment of fixed quotas for domestic producers as a temporary expedient in 1948 has had the effect of giving Cuba virtually a monopoly on all American market growth since that time. Each year, as population has risen in this country, and along with it the demand for sugar, Cuba has received 96 percent of the total increase. Only the remaining 4 percent goes to other foreign suppliers, none to domestic producers.

In total, the temporary concessions of 1948 have enabled Cuba to market more than 5¼ million tons of extra sugar in this country.

Now, to appraise accurately Cuba's market for her sugar in the United States since 1948, it is necessary to keep separated in one's calculations Cuba's windfall tonnages and her basic quota tonnages. Everyone realized, and fully expected in 1948, that the deficits of the Philippine and domestic areas gradually would be eliminated as those areas returned to full production. This, in fact, was the gentle elevator on which Cuban return to normal production levels following the war was to be cushioned. The idea was to prevent any sudden, disastrous cut in Cuba's marketings.

There are those persons, however, who insist upon confusing the facts by claiming that Cuba's market in the United States is now smaller than it was a few years ago. They are speaking of her temporary windfall marketings, not her basic quota.

As a matter of fact, Cuba's basic quota is now between 700,000 and 800,000 tons a year larger than it was in 1948. Her basic quota in 1948 amounted to 26.7 percent of the total quotas of all participants in our market. Today Cuba's percentage of the total has risen to 33.

This year the Cuban sugar industry will sell at least 2,668,000 tons of sugar in the United States and at a price in excess of 5 cents a pound. Compare this, if you will, with 1933, when, before the first Sugar Act was passed, Cuba sold about a million and a half tons of sugar in this country at an average price of less than a cent a pound.

Let me interject here that under Sugar Act legislation since 1934 Cuba has also received preferential duty treatment. The tariff on Cuban sugar has been reduced from $2 per hundred pounds to 50 cents a hundred. The full-duty countries, meantime, have paid tariffs ranging from $2.50 per hundred pounds down to 62½ cents. These special tariff concessions alone have meant some $2 billion extra income to the Cuban industry—$2 billion which otherwise would have accrued to the Treasury of the United States.

So much for the United States' record of special concessions to Cuba during the past half century since our fighting men were instrumental in establishment of Cuba freedom and independence. Let's take a look at the other side of the coin—the situation of our domestic American sugar industry today.

One of the stated purposes of the Sugar Act is the maintenance of a healthy domestic sugar industry. As it is operating now the act simply is not meeting that criterion. Our domestic industry is facing critical problems which demand immediate solution.

Our domestic industry is in something of a vise. Tremendous technological advances, more efficient farming methods, and the application of research findings have resulted in the domestic industry's ability to produce more sugar per acre than ever before. The average mainland sugarcane tonnage per acre has increased more than 20 percent since 1948 and sugar-beet tonnage has risen by more than 20 percent in the same period of time. And the sugar-beet people are on the threshold of developing new types of hybrid plants which may bring additional major tonnage increases almost overnight.

This constant devotion to self-improvement—the kind of thing which has built this Nation—is gradually crushing our domestic sugar industry against the rigid marketing ceilings which have remained virtually unchanged for more than 7 years.

Last year sugar-beet acreage was 10 percent less than the year before the first Sugar Act became effective, yet beet-sugar production was 14 percent greater—almost 2 million tons, against the fixed quota for all beet-sugar areas of 1,800,000 tons. This meant that sugar-beet acreage had to be cut back this year, and so our acreage of beets is 10 percent lower in 1955 than it was in 1954. Some farmers took acreage cuts amounting to 15 percent in 1 year.

The situation is fully as acute in the mainland cane areas. In spite of acreage cuts of 10 percent in 1954 and another 8 percent in 1955, mainland cane-sugar production last year soared 115,000 tons above the 500,000-ton quota ceiling which was set by the 1948 law. This production in 1954 was on fewer acres than produced 477,000 tons of sugar back in 1948.

Unless the law is changed this year, the cane areas face a further 30 percent acreage cut to bring stocks in line with normal carryover. This, of course, exceeds the limits of practicability.

With tight acreage controls on wheat, corn, and other surplus export crops, what crop can these sugar farmers possibly turn to? Is it our desire or intention to take out of production our own American farmlands in order to maintain at any cost the agricultural priority of our foreign neighbors? Do we intend to force our farmers off their land for want of a saleable crop which they may be permitted to grow?

I think the answers are clear enough. We obviously cannot afford to follow any such foolhardy course.

The answer to the apparent dilemma lies in the proposed legislation now pending in our Congress, legislation which not only would commence to bring relief to our domestic industry, but which would also insure a continuing increase in our sugar imports from Cuba and other foreign suppliers.

The bills awaiting action in both the House and the Senate have two main provisions: First, there would be restored to the American industry its historic right to grow with the country. Secondly, moderate increases in basic quotas out of current growth would be provided domestic producers.

In the first instance, the bills provide that future American market increases would be divided by much the same percentages as those which applied before fixed quotas were established as a temporary expedient in 1948. Fifty-five percent of annual increases in consumption requirements would be prorated among all domestic producers (in the United States, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands). Forty-five percent would be earmarked for foreign suppliers. Under the present quota system, as I have mentioned, Cuba has a practical monopoly on the annual market increases, enjoying 96 percent of the total. Only the remaining 4 percent is reserved to other foreign producers. Not one ounce goes to domestic suppliers.

I cannot stress too strongly that all adjustments in quotas will be made without

disturbing our present trade relationships with any foreign country, that all adjustments in quotas will be made out of the expected increases in our Nation's sugar needs, and that neither Cuba nor any other foreign country will suffer any reduction in the tonnage now allotted to it. On the contrary, that tonnage will continue to increase as our market continues to grow.

And speaking of market growth, I was quite interested a few days ago when the Department of Commerce announced our Nation's population had reached the 165-million mark. It seemed to me no time at all since the day the Department had announced our reaching 160 million. Such a striking growth in population can only mean that our national demand for sugar—and many other commodities—is rising every day. We have more mouths to feed, more persons to clothe, more of the necessities and luxuries of life to provide each and every day that passes.

But returning to the matter of our proposal to amend the Sugar Act, here, in precise terms, is what our bill provides:

First, it provides these moderate increases in the basic marketing quotas of some of the domestic areas:

An 80,000-ton increase in the quota for our southern cane producers, to a total of 580,000 tons.

An 85,000-ton increase in the beet-sugar quota to 1,885,000 tons.

A 20,000-ton increase for Puerto Rico, to a total of 1,100,000 tons.

And 3,000 tons more for the Virgin Islands, to a total of 15,000 tons.

The sum of all these basic quota increases, to be effective this year, is a mere 188,000 tons—scarcely more than 2 percent of our anticipated consumption.

Of equal importance is the fact that the bill provides for these increases to come out of this year's anticipated rise in total United States sugar requirements, which means that there will not be any cut in any foreign country's announced quota for 1955. The Secretary of Agriculture's initial 8,200,000-ton estimate of United States sugar consumption for 1955 is the base for computing all increases provided for in this bill. It was from this base that Cuba's 1955 quota was set at 2,668,000 tons.

Actually, final distribution of sugar to the United States market this year is expected to reach 8,400,000 tons—200,000 tons above the Secretary's initial estimate. It is from this more than ample amount that the 188,000-ton increase in basic domestic quotas will be filled. It, therefore, simply is not honest for those who oppose this bill to claim this measure would reduce Cuba's quota.

As to the growth formula, the base to be used would include the 188,000-ton increase I have just described. All consumption above 8,388,000 tons would then be divided on the 55-45 basis between domestic and foreign suppliers, respectively.

A point to be emphasized and reemphasized is that the proposed quota amendments would assure Cuba's participation in continuing United States market growth and, therefore, would increase her ability to buy American products.

There has been a great deal too much facility in some quarters to attribute, without due qualification, any fluctuation in Cuban import of American commodities directly to sugar transactions. Cuba's purchasing power does, of course, depend largely upon her principal export commodity, sugar. Proposed quota changes will not in any sense impair this purchasing power. On the contrary, it should prove to be enhanced.

But along with her purchasing power, Cuba's imports of basic commodities depend upon the level of her ability to produce some of her own needs internally. Rice is an example to illustrate the point I wish to make. There have been efforts of late to frighten our Louisiana, Arkansas, Texas, and California ricegrowers with the bugaboo of a declining Cuban market for United States rice, and the allegation has been made that amendment of the Sugar Act will have a strongly adverse effect upon future Cuban import of American rice.

The fact of the matter is that the Cuban market for rice will decline no matter what happens to the Sugar Act, because for several years Cuba has been increasing tremendously her own production of rice. Cuban rice production has increased from 87 million pounds in 1949 to 250 million pounds in 1954. That's an increase of nearly 300 percent. Naturally, her imports of rice decline as she produces more of her own requirements.

American farmers may also expect a decline in Cuban purchases of certain other agricultural products, but, again, not because of the Sugar Act or amendments thereto but because Cuba at last is beginning to diversify her agriculture, a practice many times recommended by study missions as being vital to the stabilization of the Cuban economy. A report of last December 3 from our Embassy in Habana to our State Department said that "it can be expected that (Cuba's) domestic production will eventually supplement some of the food imports now coming from the United States," and the report added:

"Corn has shown one of the greatest increases in production. Hybrid seed corn and government programs, assuring the grower a reasonable return, have been responsible." Further on, this same report says that "it is expected that once corn surpluses are established in Cuba, increased swine production will follow as a consequence."

Yet there are those who have been telling our Iowa hog producers and other farmers that Cuban sugar sales in the United States are the only factor influencing Cuban purchases of American pork.

The same type of approach has been used on some of our wheat farmers, because Cuba now buys less wheat flour from us that she did a few years ago. The drop in purchases has nothing to do with sugar sales or the Sugar Act, however. The real reason is that Cuba in 1951 completed a huge flour mill of her own, so she naturally has less need to import flour.

And although Cuba is now importing United States wheat—which she did not do prior to 1952—the combined value of United States wheat and flour now imported by Cuba is less by about $3 million than in the late 1940's. Principal reason for this is that Cuba now obtains from Canada a greater portion of her wheat flour supplies than previously.

It is to be expected, of course, that the pattern of our exports to Cuba will continue to change with her diversification of her agricultural and changing economy. But because Cuban sugar sales to the United States will, under terms of our bill, continue to grow, we may also expect Cuba's ability to import needed United States goods to improve.

The trouble with the Cuban sugar industry is largely of that industry's own making. It is a 2-million-ton surplus of sugar Cuba produced in 1952 when she deliberately stepped up production to an unprecedented 8 million tons—about 1½ million tons more than in 1947 when the present Sugar Act was passed—and at a time when it was obvious there could be no market for such increased output. This excess has also been a major factor in depressing the sugar price on the so-called world sugar market.

Cuba's preferential position in the American market also enable her to be aggressively competitive in the world market, a fact which often results in hardship for other Latin American sugar producers who lack a major share of the United States quotas.

This situation, coupled with unwarranted attacks of certain Cuban sugar interests against amendment of the Sugar Act, can very possibly produce a reaction that will in the long run be very detrimental to Cuban interests. Cuba's whole-hog attitude in opposing the restoration of the historic right of American farmers to growth along with sugar demand in this country, is difficult for any fair-minded person to understand. Without exception, several others among our neighboring foreign nations—sugar producers who are our good friends, too—have recognized the right of the American sugar industry to a share in its own Nation's growth. These other neighbors are in excellent position to argue that they should receive more than just the token quotas now assigned to them, and they are looking longingly at Cuba's highly remunerative position. They, too, are all good customers for our goods.

As times goes on, the pleas of our foreign neighbors and friends for a share of the market, now almost wholly monopolized by Cuba, will grow louder. The selfish attitude of certain segments of the Cuban sugar interests who are opposing, tooth and nail, any relief to our domestic industry this year is breeding resentment among many Americans.

Those selfish Cuban interests cannot expect us to place our billion-dollar domestic industry on the sacrificial altar. It is much more to their advantage to take a reasonable attitude so that the traditional good will and friendship between our two nations shall guide our trade relationships in the future as in the past.

I repeat, my congressional colleagues and I are fully aware of the need for foreign trade, for imports from other countries and foreign markets for our own products. We are deeply cognizant of the fact that trade builds good friends and stronger neighbors than any other instrument of international relations.

We are equally aware of the importance of vigorous domestic industry and of our basic obligation to give due consideration to the interests and aspirations of our own people.

With these things in mind, we were quite interested yesterday morning when the Departments of State and Agriculture presented their sugar plan. Their plan recognizes three basic principles set forth in our pending bills:

First, that the Sugar Act should be amended in 1955 and extended to the end of 1962.

Second, that the historic right of the domestic sugar industry to share in the future growth of the United States sugar market should be restored.

And, third, that the domestic industry needs an increase in authorized marketings this year above present fixed quotas.

We do not intend to discontinue our efforts to achieve the goals set forth in our bills. And I do not think it is necessary to belabor the point here that in the final analysis, it will be the Congress which will decide upon the specific details of any legislation to be enacted into law.

In our total efforts, we do not seek to take away the market now enjoyed by our foreign neighbors. I sincerely believe that our good Cuban neighbors should study very carefully our bill and unemotionally weigh the trade advantages it offers them, as well as our own citizens. If they do this, I am sure they will recognize and appreciate the thoughtful consideration which has been given to their problems and the good faith which has motivated our actions.

Radioactive Fallout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by Dr. Willard F. Libby, Commissioner, United States Atomic Energy Commission, at the alumni reunion, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., Friday, June 3, 1955:

RADIOACTIVE FALLOUT

Radioactive fallout is the radioactivity which falls out of the atmosphere after the explosion of a nuclear weapon. The nuclear reactions furnishing the energy in atomic and thermonuclear weapons produce radioactivities as end products. In the ordinary atomic bomb, for each 20,000 tons of TNT equivalent, about 2 pounds of radioactive materials are produced. In these 2 pounds are some 90 different radioactive species, varying in natural lifetime from fractions of a second to many years. The mixture as a whole decreases in radioactivity in such a way that for every sevenfold increase in age, the radioactivity is decreased tenfold. Thus the radioactivity by 7 hours after the explosion has decreased to 1/10 the radioactivity at 1 hour; at 49 hours (roughly 2 days) to 1/100; at 2 weeks to 1/1000; and at 3 months to 1/10000.

The conditions of fallout, of course, are largely determined by the amount and type of material vaporized into the fireball of the bomb itself. A bomb fired in the air contributes such a small amount of matter to the cloud that the particles are of necessity very tiny and very slow in settling. The result is that most of the radioactivities are expended in the air and the area of dissemination is very large indeed, usually extending to the ends of the earth in minute though detectable amounts.

A bomb fired on the surface of the earth, however, may have a major portion of its radioactivity reprecipitated within short distances. In fact, bombs fired beneath the surface of the earth may place essentially no radioactivity in the atmosphere. So, the question of the area of contamination to be expected from atomic and thermonuclear weapons cannot be answered categorically without specifying the degree of contact of the fireball with the surface of the earth, and probably also the chemical characteristics of the surface. Certainly it seems clear that firing over water should create very different precipitation conditions from firing over soil. It also seems likely that firing over various kinds of soil must affect, to a great degree, the rate and extent of contamination by fallout.

In general, the principles are simple, although difficult of exact application. The radioactive cloud, formed by the cooling of the fireball, has in it the radioactivities characteristic of the nuclear explosion. Many of these are nonvolatile materials and will settle upon and condense upon the first solid surface which they contact. In this way, they are precipitated in and upon the solid particles formed by the condensation of the bomb materials and any other materials drawn into the fireball. It also is true that material drawn up into the stem and passing through the cloud can be contaminated superficially and can in itself serve as an important precipitation mechanism for the radioactivity. Thus, we see that it is difficult, indeed, to predict in advance exactly what fraction of the radioactivity the bomb produces will fall near the test site as compared to the fraction falling at great distances. One can say that the fraction precipitated near the test site usually is large for surface shots and relatively small for aerial shots, defining aerial shots as those in which the fireball does not touch the ground and surface shots as those in which the fireball does come in appreciable contact with the surface of the earth.

The extent to which the radioactive fallout is spread, is determined, of course, by the winds, the particle size in the cloud, and to a certain degree by the atmospheric and meterological conditions, such as rainfall All of these factors are complicated and require close and careful monitoring, in order to predict with any real accuracy, the probable contamination of a given area. Thus, when we say that the March 1, 1954, shot in the South Pacific, contaminated 7,000 square miles to a dangerous level, it should be borne in mind that these were under the particular weather conditions operating at the time, and that on another occasion, the area might be larger or smaller by a considerable factor. The point made in the AEC statement of February 15 was that the area is large and constitutes a real problem for civilian defense.

Let us consider for a moment, the fundamentals of the effects of radioactive fallout on living systems. How does radiation affect the organism? It disintegrates molecules in the system. This disintegration in itself constitutes a change, but possibly just as important is that the disintegration products may themselves have effects. This latter point is not clear although there is some evidence to indicate that it may be a very serious consideration. If the latter point is sound, it may afford us an opportunity to counteract the radiation-generated chemicals with medicines which will thus counteract the effects of exposure to radiation. Some evidence that this is possible is already available.

It is known that radiation dosages in the levels of 400 roentgen units (called r units later) are lethal to about half the individuals exposed, the symptoms following the exposure being remarkably predictable and reproducible. It is obvious that these radiation levels cannot be tolerated under present conditions, only some major discoveries in therapy could change them appreciably. Assuming for the moment that levels of 400 r are lethal, we can sketch out areas which might be contaminated from explosions of various dimensions. The uniform dissemination of 1,000 curies per square mile leads to a dosage rate of $\frac{1}{10}$ r per day. At the present time, or rather on January 1 of this year, the average contamination of the United States corresponded to a dosage rate of $\frac{1}{1000}$ r per year. The actual contamination of the United States was determined by direct measurements at a large number of stations located over the country. These data have been presented in a recent publication by Mr. Merril Eisenbud and Dr. John Harley of the New York Operations Office. This article appeared in the May 13 issue of the magazine Science, a few weeks ago. Of course, the rate of disintegration of the radioactive fallout decreases so rapidly with time that the low dosage rate on January 1 of this year should not be taken to indicate that the dosage during the Pacific tests was correspondingly low. In fact, as we can best estimate the average dosage in the United States was about 15 times higher, or about $\frac{15}{1000}$ r during 1954. If all of the dosage from all atomic tests in all time, that is since 1945, be added together, the total dosage for people in the United States averages considerably less than $\frac{1}{10}$ r, or the dose that would be attained in 1 day for a distribution of 1,000 curies per square mile, and is in itself, $\frac{1}{6000}$ of the lethal dose.

To understand this situation more completely, let us follow a nuclear explosion releasing 10 megatons of fission energy, or 1,100 pounds of fission products. For purposes of illustration and simplification, let us make some assumptions about the rate at which the material will precipitate. Let us assume that it is airborne for 1 day and then is disseminated uniformly over an area corresponding to 100,000 square miles. Since the total fission products from an explosion of a bomb giving 10 megatons fission products, 1 day old, will be 66,500 million curies, the initial dosage rate will be 67 r per day. In other words, a residence or exposure time of a few days in such an area could be dangerous. Of course, realizing that the disintegration rate decreases rapidly in time, we might well say that a matter of several days would be available for evacuation, or more importantly for decontamination of the inhabited parts of the area. An area of 100,000 square miles is so large that evacuation may be a bit impractical. One should remember that the contaminating material is a light dust which, of course, will settle extremely gently on the surface of the earth and should be easily dislodged and removed. One envisages all sorts of devices and methods so that a contamination of 67 r per day dosage rate, one ought really to be able to do very considerable in decontaminating an area. Of course, if this same amount of radioactivity had been precipitated over a 10 times smaller area, there would have been no hope of decontamination until the material had cooled about tenfold, but, it is always true that in regions of heavy fallout, such as these two, decontamination and protective measures must follow. In a period of waiting for cooling to occur to a level where decontamination is possible there is only a choice between staying indoors in shelters and shielded evacuation in shielded cars or by helicopter. Under no conditions in such areas should people remain resident without shelter or decontamination.

How should decontamination be conducted? In the first place, there should be some way of measuring the radiation—such as geiger counters, or scintillation counters. Some type of instrumentation is necessary. Then with just native intuition and good sense the clean up should be conducted according to the rules of the Federal Civilian Defense Agency. One should know that a yard of earth or water is fairly good protection and that 2 or 3 feet of concrete is excellent, and that getting away from a contaminated area is best. For example, a basement of a house will have low radiation levels, since the contamination will lie on the roof. The interposition of the distance in itself is protection. All of these matters are matters of commonsense which are not difficult to grasp. It would seem that the use of brooms, fire hoses, and similar devices and methods as well as the intervention of natural forces, such as rain and wind, may do a very great deal to decontaminate an area. Probably it would be necessary to keep an area posted so that the levels of radiation be known to the inhabitants. It is clear that this type of activity of the Federal Civilian Defense Agency could be one of its most important and deserves the fullest cooperation of all of us. Mose tests on methods of decontamination need to be made.

Returning to the fission products themselves, one can imagine that certain of the materials which last longer deserve special attention. Among these is a long-lived isotope of strontium, strontium-90. Its average lifetime of 30 years means that it will be with us for a generation. It also is produced in high quality, about 2.5 percent of all the fission explosions or fission acts yield this particular isotope. It also is chemically so similar to the element calcium, which is so fundamental to the human

body that it is incorporated into living organisms in the bone structure and thus irradiates it and constitutes a potential source of bone tumor. The Atomic Energy Commission has conducted careful assays of the strontium over the earth's surface and in the biosphere—the living matter in the world. The article of Mr. Eisenbud's and Dr. Harley's, referred to earlier, gives quantitative data for the occurrence of strontium-90 in the soil of the United States obtained over the last several years, the latest figure being 1/1000 curie per square mile in the top few inches of soil. This is an interesting number to consider. Assuming that the whole earth is contaminated at this level, and remembering the strontium-90 fission yield, one can say that the 200 million square miles which constitute the surface of the earth corresponded to 200,000 curies of strontium-90, or to about 2 megatons total fission, since 1 megaton of fission corresponds to 90,000 curies of strontium-90. Actual assay of the soils in various places over the earth indicates that the value for the United States is fairly typical, although possibly a little higher than average, and that the world does have in its topsoil something like the amount of strontium-90 produced by 1 megaton of fission products. The level of strontium-90 in the milk products and other products carrying calcium which are derived from the soil corresponds well. The level is about 2.2 disintegrations of strontium-90 per minute per gram of calcium in the biosphere, though it varies somewhat with conditions and localities. This fairly average assay for bone structures and other calcium containing systems in living organisms is to be compared with the natural radioactivity of the carbon of the body which has 15 disintegrations per minute per gram and the potassium which has 2,000 disintegrations per minute per gram.

The question of the safe level for strontium-90 contamination of the biosphere is, of course, a very important one. It is estimated that the first noticeable effects of strontium-90 would be in the formation of bone tumor. Estimating from the experience obtained with radium—which, by the way at the present time is approximately as hazardous at the moment as strontium-90, that is the radium in ordinary drinking water happens to constitute about the same level of radiological hazard as does the strontium-90 in ordinary foodstuffs—all of the evidence indicates that the first effects, namely the formation of bone tumor would appear at levels about 10,000 times greater than the present. In other words, instead of having 2 disintegrations per minute per gram of calcium in the body, 22,000 disintegrations per minute per gram might well be expected to give an observable increase in bone tumors. It is interesting in this connection that since the strontium-90 segregates to the bones it constitutes no genetic hazard insofar as we know, because the genetic hazard arises from direct irradiation of the reproductive organs.

The interesting question arises as to why the strontium-90 level is not higher since much more has been produced than is found scattered around the world. However, on further thought it is obvious that the large bombs fired at the Pacific testing grounds had a large fraction of their radioactivity precipitated rather immediately into the depths of the ocean and, therefore, removed from the biosphere. Possibly an additional explanation of the low strontium-90 assay in the world is that there is a considerable amount of it still residing in the atmosphere. It seems likely that both considerable local precipitation into the Pacific, and long residence in the atmosphere are involved. In fact, direct samples of the atmospheric dust do show a higher strontium-90 content than of other fission products. And there is no doubt a considerable amount of strontium-90 stored in the atmosphere which is slowly being precipitated. In the case of strontium-90, in contrast to other fission products, storage times of many years in the atmosphere will not be effective in reducing its activity appreciably, so we can be quite certain that whatever strontium-90 resides in the atmosphere will find its way to the surface of the earth and probably have a chance to enter the biosphere before its radioactive disintegration. However, the amounts in the atmosphere probably are small compared to the fallout of strontium-90, so we need not fear any large additional contamination from this source.

To recapitulate—the explosion of nuclear weapons has given a detectable quantity of fission products over the whole earth's surface and in amounts which are fractions of the total amounts actually fired. It seems that the local fallout removes a considerable fraction of the fission products produced. The largest bombs fired, namely, those in the Pacific, have all been surface shots so this seems a reasonable conclusion. In fact, it probably is a prediction. We know, therefore, that no hidden sources of fission products will be discovered and we believe that the data at present available from the measurements made at the monitoring stations of the Atomic Energy Commission are valid and sound—the whole set of assays make a reasonable and integrated picture. A good fraction, but a small fraction, of the fission products produced in the surface shots are carried over great distances, in fact, over nearly the entire earth's surface. But the most of the radioactivity is precipitated locally, from surface bursts.

If we return now to our 10 megaton figure and imagine that the bulk of the radioactivity is precipitated locally, say in an area of 100,000 square miles, producing at the time of 1 day, 67 r per day dosage rate, we can say that the people who live in this area would have a good chance of survival if they were educated in the facts of radioactivity, and proceeded without panic and with good sense, to take care of themselves. What should they do?

First, they must have instruments to know what the dosage rates are. They should set reasonable tolerance limits such as 10 r. This means that during the first day they must be extremely careful not to run into pockets of radioactivity and they must stay indoors most of the time in shelters. After a week, the permissible exposure time will be 10 times longer and the radiation rate will have been reduced to about 6.7 r per day, so that it will be possible to spend several hours outside. It is also clear, of course, that ingenious devices such as streetsweepers, in which the driver sits on a bag of sand or a thick metal slab to protect him from radiation, could be used with great effectiveness. It is also clear that crews could operate with street-cleaning and fire-fighting machinery, to decontaminate cities. In the countryside such devices as plowing fields might be most effective. The natural weathering processes which occur in the open probably are extremely effective in reducing the contamination level, in fact, just the blowing of the winds and the movement of dust and soil will help to cover up the material.

Remembering that the natural disintegration rate decreases tenfold for every sevenfold increase in age, we can say that after a week we are down to 6.7 r per day, and considerable freedom of motion is allowed. Even at the time of first contamination in 1 day, a matter of a few minutes is allowable. In fact, several people have received dosages of 100 r and survived. This is well below the lethal dosage rate of 400 r. However, dosage rates of 100 r are serious, particularly if applied to large populations.

At the rate of 100 r, about 12 percent of the reproductive cells will be expected to have 1 or more new gene mutations. Since new mutations are usually deleterious in effect, exposures of people to dosages like 100 r can lead to undesirable genetic effects in later generations. We can expect, therefore, exposures of large numbers of people to dosages like 100 r can lead to deaths and mutilations in later generations. However, in the case of a nuclear war, the immediate deaths and the question of survival may somewhat outweigh the genetic effects which will be introduced and, in keeping our minds on the question of survival, we can see how an area of 100,000 square miles contaminated wtih 10 megatons of fission products, will still allow people to get along although at considerable inconvenience until radioactive decay, human efforts at decontamination, and natural weathering processes have returned the area to a completely safe condition.

At this point, I should like to speak to you about the facts of life as far as natural radioactivities are concerned. As of January 1 of this year the total dosage rate averaged over the United States due to all nuclear explosions as I said earlier, was about 1/1000 r per year, though the total received during the year was higher at about 15/1000 r. To orient ourselves, the workers in the Atomic Energy Commission plants are allowed to have a maximum tolerance exposure of 15,000 times this. Of course, it is to be remembered that such a rate if applied to the entire population of the world might have significant genetic effects. However, a small fraction of the population can accept such irradiations with relative safety since the chances of individuals having genes mutated in the same way, marrying, are so infinitesimally small if a small fraction of the population is exposed. However, as far as immediate or somatic damage to the health is concerned, the fallout dosage rate as of January 1 of this year in the United States could be increased 15,000 times without hazard. In fact, it seems clear that it is very, very conservative indeed as far as these immediate effects on the health are concerned. Tests, therefore, do not constitute any real hazard to the immediate health.

Let us examine now the radioactivities which are always present and compare them with the fallout radiations, because these general background radiations do affect the question of the genetic effects from fallout since everyone in the whole world has always been exposed to these natural dosages. The world in all its parts in the sense is radioactive and always has been. The carbon in the body, in your bodies, is naturally radioactive. It has in it enough radioactive carbon so that 15 atoms disintegrate every minute for each gram of carbon. In this disintegration a certain amount of energy is released which can be described in r units. You receive from the radioactive carbon in your body 1.5/1000 r per year. However, carbon in the body is the smallest part of its radioactivity. The largest source of radioactivity in the human body is potassium. It gives 1,800 disintegrations per minute per gram to form calcium and 180 disintegrations per minute per gram to form argon. In other words, 1,980 disintegrations per minute total. From these the human body receives 19/1000 r per year, to give a total together with the radiocarbon of 20/1000 r per year of natural inherent dosage. In fact, the radioactivity of the human body and the nature of its radiation is such that people receive dosages from one another which are measurable and considerable in terms of the fallout dosages. It can be calculated that people packed in a dense crowd receive about 2/1000 r per year dosage from the radioactive potassium in their neighbors' bodies, somewhat more than that which applied in the United States on January 1 of this year from the total of test fallout.

The principal sources of natural dosages, however, are not the human body, but the cosmic rays and the radioactivities in the earth itself. The cosmic rays at sea level give between 33/1000 and 37/1000 r per year, depending on latitude, being least intense at the equator. At 5,000 feet altitude, the dosages climb and range between 40/1000 and 60/1000, depending. on latitude; at 10,000 feet, they range between 80/1000 and 120/1000; at 15,000 feet, between 160/1000 and 240/1000; and at 20,000 feet, between 300/1000 and 450/1000 r per year. It is clear, therefore, that people dwelling at high altitudes, receive dosages from the cosmic rays which are large as compared to the body dosages and to the test fallout dosages. In addition, the surface of the earth is radioactive because of the potassium, thorium, and uranium which are naturally present. In ordinary granite rock, there are about 13 grams of thorium per ton, about 4 grams of radium, and about 30 kilograms of potassium. These give dosages, which together with those from the cosmic rays and the human body radiation produce total radiation dosages due to normal background irradiation at sea level over granite rock of between 143/1000 and 147/1000 r per year, depending upon latitude. These are increased at 5,000 feet to 150/1000–170/1000; at 10,000 feet, to 190/1000–230/1000; 15,000 feet, to 270/1000–350/1000; and at 20,000 feet, to 414/1000–560/1000 r per year. All of these dosages are for people living on the surface of the earth. In other words, the 15,000 feet figure here pertains to natives living in the high reaches of the Andes Mountains. The 5,000 feet level would apply to people living at that altitude on the surface of the earth.

If one considers the dosage rates for airplane pilots, the radiation from the surface of the earth is absorbed by the air, 50 percent absorption occurring in about 370 feet of air at sea level. In other words, at something like 100 yards, the radiation dosage from the rocks and earth surface is cut to half, and so the dosage for airplane pilots is very largely due to the dosage in their bodies themselves, about 20/1000 r per year and, to the cosmic rays which at 20,000 feet may amount to as much as 450/1000 r per year, and even at the equator as much as 300/1000 r per year. Interestingly enough the open ocean is the least radioactive of the various portions of the earth's surface. The total dosage of open oceans is 53/1000 r per year at the equator, and may rise to as high as 57/1000 r per year in northern and southern latitudes, the large decrease relative to the granite surface figures being due to the fact that uranium and thorium are practically absent from sea water, being less than 1/1000 as abundant as in granite rock. Although potassium is present, it also is only 1/100 as abundant as in granite rock. Therefore, the seafarer has the lowest natural dosage rate of any other profession.

Sedimentary rocks are less radioactive than granite rocks for the reason that opportunities have presented themselves for the removal of natural radioactive constituents. Of course, by the same token certain sedimentaries may be even higher than granites, but on the average, we take that the typical sedimentary rock has about one-fourth of the uranium, thorium, and potassium content as granites. In this way, we expect that at sea level, the typical dosage rates over typical sedimentary rocks will vary between 76/1000 and 80/1000 r per year. All of these dosages are applied to the whole of the human population, and so we can expect that whatever the genetic effects of radiation be, they have been in application since the beginning of human time.

There are certain other hazards which apply to a limited fraction of the population. For example, the luminous dial wristwatch, which on the average contains about 1 microcurie of radium per watch, will give 40/1000 r per year to the central portions of the body, if we assume that the average distance from the wrist is 1 foot, a very considerable dosage comparable to the natural dosages. If we take our airplane pilot again and assume he has 100 dials, each with 3 microcuries of radium per dial, at an average distance of 1 yard, his dosage from these dials alone is 1300/1000 r per year, a very, very large increase over the natural. It, of course, is to be borne in mind that the airplane pilot is like the Atomic Energy Commission worker, he is a very small and selected fraction of the population and the principal hazards to the human race must be to his immediate health. Tolerance for this type of hazard being some 15,000/1000 r per year, a conservative basis, he really runs very little hazard. However, it is obvious that it could be dangerous for the whole human race to fly airplanes under these conditions. Other types of abnormal exposures are X-rays, although these, of course, are fairly common. The lumbar spine, anterior-posterior exposure, involves 1500/1000 r for each exposure; the lumbar spine, lateral, involves 5700/1000 r; pregnancy, anterior-posterior, involves 3600/1000 r; pregnancy, lateral, involves 9000/1000 r. It is well to remember that the roentgen is itself a measure of the energy added to the system by the radiation per unit weight of tissue and high local doses are not necessarily dangerous. In other words, our principal worries are about whole body radiations and not about local radiations. However, some of the X-ray exposures cover considerable portions of the body.

Uranium miners have higher dosage rates. The ore of lowest uranium content which the AEC will buy corresponds to 0.1 percent contained uranium. A surface rock made of this material will give people living on it 2800/1000 r per year, and a worker in a mine, all of the walls and ceilings of which consist of ore of this type, will receive 5600/1000 r per year. This neglects radon gas which may also be present and constitutes a slight additional hazard. Phosphate fertilizer also can constitute a radiation hazard on these levels. Phosphate fertilizer may vary between 0.01 and 0.025 percent uranium. Flat ground surface consisting of this rock will give radiation of between 280/1000 and 700/1000 r per year.

Considering all of these things, it is quite clear that the natural radioactivities of the body, the effects of the cosmic radiation and the natural radiation of the radioactivities of the earth's surface constitute hazards which are much greater than the test fallout hazards. It is also clear that if the genetic damages from radiation are real at these levels, we have always had them in much larger measure. This does not, of course, mean that they are desirable but it does mean that any genetic effects of the test fallout must indeed be small fractions of the effects which are normally present in the human population. It also means that in case of a full scale atomic war, where the amounts of fallout might well be expected to increase by large factors like a thousandfold, there will be additional hazards due to the fallout, additional to the blast and thermal and other better known effects of nuclear weapons, that should be seriously considered. In fact, there is a possibility that the strontium-90 in the foodstuffs at such level might increase the occurrence of bone cancer. Also, we should expect that genetic effects might be appreciable if they are appreciable for the normal radiation background. We should expect also that the immediate effects on health would be noticeable. These latter effects, of course, are well known to those who have studied the unfortunate Japanese people who were subjected to the full effects of the nuclear detonations in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August of 1945.

I would like now to read a statement on the genetic question prepared by Drs. Failla, Warren, Burnett, Cantril, Doisy, and Stern of the Advisory Committee for Biology and Medicine to the Atomic Energy Commission:

"In its recent meetings the Advisory Committee for Biology and Medicine has carefully reviewed the state of our knowledge concerning the genetic effects of ionizing radiation with particular reference to the problem in relation to radioactive fall-out from atomic weapons. The following statement, in which we all concur, represents our best analysis of the problem and our considered opinions based on all of the evidence which has been collected.

"GENETIC CONSIDERATIONS OF ATOMIC WEAPONS TESTS

"One of the important tasks of the Division of Biology and Medicine of the United States Atomic Energy Commission has been the safeguarding of the public against the effects of atomic radiation. The Advisory Committee for Biology and Medicine, consisting of independent scientists from various institutions throughout the country, share this concern.

"The ability of radiation to change the genes, the heredity material of mankind, has been a topic of much public discussion. In view of the widely contrasting opinions which have been voiced, the Advisory Committee wishes to point out the following facts and estimates.

"1. The AEC from its inception has supported a large number of studies on animals and plants in order to increase knowledge on the genetic effects of radiation, particularly on mammals. These studies, conducted in numerous universities and research institutes, have been freely published in the scientific literature. The AEC has also supported the extensive investigation carried out, under the auspices of the National Academy of Sciences, on the survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the children born to them.

"2. Experiments on animals and plants and observations on man show that mutations occur spontaneously at all times. Most of these mutations act unfavorably on the development, growth or well being of individuals. The spontaneously mutated genes have accumulated in large numbers in all human populations. Their presence accounts to a considerable extent for the fact that at least 1 percent of all newborn exhibit developmental abnormalities, most of them to a very slight degree but some in a more serious way.

"3. Irradiation of animals and plants adds to the number of more or less detrimental mutations. Human genes must be considered as being equally subject to the mutagenic effect of radiation. Indeed, a considerable fraction of the so-called spontaneous mutations of man are probably caused by the natural background irradiation from cosmic rays, soil, and food.

"4. The radiation produced by fallout from atomic weapons tests as well as from present and future peaceful applications of nuclear energy will result in additional mutations in human genes. The number of these cannot be estimated accurately at this time. At the current rate of irradiation from fallout, among the 4 million children born each year in the United States perhaps from a hundred to several thousand may carry as a result of this irradiation a mutated gene. At most, a small percentage of these genes will produce any noticeable effect in the first generation. Only slowly, over hundreds of years will the majority of these radiation-induced genes become apparent, in a few individuals at a time, usually by causing a less than normal development or functioning of the person concerned. It will be impossible to identify these individuals among the large number of similar ones, affected by genes already present in the pop-

ulation due to accumulated spontaneous mutations.

"5. No measurable increase in defective individuals will be observable at any time as the result of current weapons tests, since the few radiation-induced defectives will not change measurably the number of about 40,000 defectives who will occur spontaneously among the 4 million births of each year in the United States. It may be pointed out that no significant change in the percentage of malformed children has been observed among those conceived after the war whose parents had been exposed to the atomic bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

"6. The foregoing conclusions apply only to the genetic effects of weapons tests carried out at the present level and of foreseeable peactime uses of atomic energy. The genetic effects of a generalized nuclear war would be one of many catastrophic consequences of such a disaster.

"May 12, 1955."

As you all know, the National Academy of Sciences is to undertake a general study of the effects of fallout on life. It is to be supported financially by the Rockefeller Foundation. The Atomic Energy Commission has offered to collaborate fully in furnishing information and other aid necessary. A similar study is underway in England by the Medical Research Council under the chairmanship of Sir Harold Himsworth, and we hope that the American and British studies will be fully coordinated.

Electoral Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the New York Times today, June 9, 1955, by the distinguished commentator and reporter, Arthur Krock, concerning proposed reforms in the method of electing Presidents:

MATHEMATICS OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, June 8.—The March–April hearings before a Senate subcommittee on proposals to change the Presidential electoral system are now available in printed form. The document consists of 469 pages, many in small type. But, considering the importance of the subject and the long span of years in which electoral reform has been agitated, it is probable that public interest in a major constitutional amendment has never been less.

This condition is both the cause and effect of the insignificant place these hearings have held in the news from Washington. And the continued lack of public interest in a matter of such consequence may extend, until the next session of Congress, at least, the long history of legislative inaction.

Without the aid of public opinion, or a national organization to arouse and make it articulate, proposed amendments to the Constitution perish in the pigeonholes of committees on Capitol Hill. But with that aid, it is remarkable how quickly the political machinery can grind out an amendment. In the space of 1 year, two-thirds of Congress had submitted, and three-fourths of the legislatures of the States had approved, the change whereby United States Senators are elected by popular vote. It required only 13 months to put national prohibition into the Constitution, and, after the disillusionment of 15 years, less than 10 months to obliterate it by repeal.

There was a longer period—almost 4 years—between the submission in 1947 to the States and their ratification in 1951 of the amendment that limits Presidential terms to 2 of 4 years each. That was because the first and only breach of the two-term tradition in behalf of Franklin D. Roosevelt was not sufficient to arouse the public to make a law of the tradition. But when Roosevelt's miscalculation of Soviet Russia's postwar policy produced the cold war, and the Democratic Party split in civil conflict over the policies of the Truman administration, public opinion in favor of the amendment was quickly aroused and effectuated.

TWO PRINCIPAL PROPOSALS

If a similar sentiment for electoral reform is latent and can be evoked, there are no reliable signs of that so far. But the Senate Judiciary Committee, by a vote of 10 to 3 (2 members not recorded), has now reported Senate Joint Resolution 31. And the ensuing debate—if and when it comes—may result in action of some kind by Congress and the States.

Senate Joint Resolution 31 is sponsored by Senator DANIEL, of Texas, and 19 colleagues from both major parties and their factions. In substance it is the old Lodge-Gossett amendment. It provides that voters cast their ballots directly for their choices for President and Vice President, and provides further that each candidate receive the same percentage of the State's electoral votes that he receives of the popular vote. In event of a tie among the electors the candidate with the largest popular vote would win. There are other provisions, but these represent the important change from awarding all a State's electors to the candidate with the highest number of popular votes, however tiny his margin.

When the Senate takes up this measure a motion will be made to substitute the Mundt-Coudert proposal, Senate Joint Resolution 3. This retains the so-called electoral college and still entitles each State to a number of electors equal to its delegation in Congress. But its vital departure from the Daniel amendment is that these electors would be chosen in the same manner in which its (a State's) Senators and Representatives are nominated and elected. Thus the national candidates who get statewide pluralities would win as many electors as the State has Senators (2) and Representatives-at-large. The national candidates would get the elector from each congressional district in which they polled a plurality.

THE BETTER PLAN

The superiorities of this method over the Daniel proposal are several. Special-interest groups could no longer swing the electoral blocs of great States. The power of the "big city" States in national conventions would be greatly reduced. The electoral system would be brought into conformity with the Constitution, which makes all States equal in the Senate and gives them House membership in ratio to their population. The President and the Congress elected with him would derive their offices from visible, and the same, constituencies. There are other virtues in this method, which was the practice until Jackson's time. It owes much of its revival to Dr. Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., of Princeton, whose research was of great assistance to Senator MUNDT and Representative COUDERT in preparing their case.

But unless electoral reform can be impressed on the public, the machine politicians in and out of Congress and in the State legislatures are likely to sustain their preference for the current method. By this a special-interest group in, say, New York can in a close contest offer prima facie evidence that it has delivered the entire State electoral bloc of 45 to the party it knows or hopes will produce the quid pro quo.

Bridgeport's Alert Day—Radio and Community Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a report on Bridgeport's Alert Day, a civil defense exercise which has won wide acclaim and which should be duplicated throughout our Nation.

This report, prepared by the staff of the radio station WICC, demonstrates what can be accomplished when a radio station such as WICC, dedicated to the welfare of its listening public, puts full force behind a program which in too many sections is not being properly pushed forward.

I wish to congratulate Mr. Philip Merryman, president of WICC, for his able supervision of the alert day, for his dedication to the public good and for his vital contribution to civil defense.

The report follows:

BRIDGEPORT'S ALERT DAY—RADIO AND COMMUNITY ACTION

On Saturday, May 7, 1955, radio station WICC, Bridgeport, Conn., devoted 24 hours to a civil defense alert day, built around three principal elements: Bridgeport's evacuation plan, a question-and-answer panel on civil defense, and a firsthand report by Philip Merryman, president of WICC, of the briefings and bomb shot at Yucca Flats, Nev., on May 5.

Initiation: In February, Mr. Merryman suggested to Mr. Chris Wesche, head of Bridgeport's civil defense, that WICC should help rouse needed interest in the civil defense of the city—one of the Nation's high-priority bomb targets—by some sort of all-day program.

Mr. Wesche agreed, and a date of May 7 was tentatively set for the event. When it subsequently developed that Mr. Merryman would be able to participate in the civil defense bomb shot at Yucca Flats, and further that the Bridgeport civil defense organization would complete the detailed evacuation plan for the community about May 1, the outline of the round-the-clock program became evident.

Programing: WICC and Bridgeport's civil defense officials agreed that the functions of such an alert day, in order of importance, should be: (1) to take full advantage of WICC's dominant local coverage by using the station as the primary vehicle for the dissemination of the city's evacuation plan; (2) to alert the people to the importance of civil defense; and (3) to educate the people in civil defense.

Overriding these in importance was the need to keep WICC's audience at peak right through the transition from the normal music and news programing to this community education.

The program dictated by these demands was based on the maintenance of the station's usual pattern of shows. Into these were inserted the following elements:

A. A radio translation of the evacuation plan, released to the public for the first time that day. This was repeated three times during the day.

B. The 10 most relevant talks and interviews taped by Mr. Merryman at the preblast briefings at Yucca Flats.

C. Mr. Merryman's description of the actual bombshot, repeated three times during the day.

D. Informal lectures by local, Defense Department, and FCDA experts on Nike, the national warning system, radiation, and fallout, equipment of a shelter, atomic first aid, and disaster communications in the city. These ran from 4 to 15 minutes in length and were repeated twice during the day.

E. Very brief interviews of 36 community leaders, including both United States Senators, the fourth district's Congressman, members of the State legislature, the governor, the mayor, and local business and religious leaders. These were designed to convey community endorsement of civil defense.

F. A panel of 11 experts to answer any questions phoned in to a battery of 6 special operators between 8 a. m. and 6 p. m. This panel included the actual authors of the city's evacuation plan. Response was so heavy that the panel ran 20 minutes over its scheduled air time of 1 hour, and had to refer still unanswered questions to civil-defense headquarters.

In order to make the whole operation readily accessible to the community and to dramatize it, the regular studios were shut down for the day while all necessary equipment and personnel were moved to the Hotel Stratfield, in the center of the shopping district, where alert day studios were set up in two large public rooms. Uniformed civil-defense guards acted as guides for the public.

Mayor Jasper McLevy proclaimed May 7–8 as civil-defense days.

Commercial aspects: All commercial advertising was eliminated from the station for the 24-hour period.

Significance: From the State director of civil defense ("tremendous public service effort") to Variety ("there's been no more impressive exercise of local radio impact"), the consensus was that WICC's Alert Day achieved its objectives. But to students of the role and potential of radio in mass communication, this May 7 also provided some provocative data.

At a conservative estimate, about twice as many people heard the city's evacuation plan and related data over WICC as learned of it through all other public media combined.

The Bridgeport evacuation plan, as written, runs to about 14,000 words, more than a full page of solid newspaper text. As broadcast for the people of Bridgeport by WICC, the plan was translated into a 15-minute dialog.

The number and caliber of the questions phoned in to the panel show that this advice fills a basic need; such two-way communication gives the public an easy way to get its questions answered right away. This ready access performs two vital functions. By making it easy to ask questions, the phone and panel broadcast invites public participation in civil defense. And by providing answers fast, it removes those mental roadblocks which can build up so rapidly to rejection of the plan.

From these three considerations, it may legitimately be concluded that in civil defense—as in other operations involving the general public—radio can be treated as the basic means of communication.

Demonstration tape: To give the flavor and detail of the Alert Day program, WICC has excerpted the highspots on four 7-inch tapes (7½ feet per minute), the contents of which are as follows:

Tape 1: The Bomb Shot at Yucca Flats. Radioactivity, a report for laymen by Frederick B. Oleson, AEC consultant.

Tape 2: Radioactivity (conclusion). First Aid, by Ray Guy, Bridgeport Red Cross. Shelter, by Charles Barnes, Bridgeport Community Council. Bridgeport's Evacuation Plan, which includes a report on the city's disaster communication setup. Question and answer panel (15 minutes).

Tape 3: Question and answer panel (continued).

Tape 4: Question and answer panel (10 minutes—conclusion).

Observations and Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, recently made some very timely and pertinent observations concerning the world situation. This administration could profit by Mr. MCCORMACK's recent statement on a nationwide radio hookup. I commend to the House part of Mr. MCCORMACK's remarks as summarized by James R. Young, associate editor of the Anderson (S. C.) Daily Mail:

OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENT
(By James R. Young)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—During the past winter I have come across items around the country, one from Savannah, Ga., relating the heavy exports of scrap iron and steel to Europe, believed to be going to Russian controlled countries which in turn, it is presumed, would be using the scrap to convert for the Soviet war effort.

I heard on a CBS-WAIM panel discussion, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, quite a fighter he is, take a few people around in a verbal battle, charging that the Harold Stassen administration in the Foreign Operations Administration, is approving these activities of overseas shipments. His bedate opponent was Representative ARENDS, of Illinois.

In my files, dated 1938–41, I have ample material to show the same policy was that with Japan when we sought to appease the Japs. We diplomatically condemned them for their invasion of China, but we supplied them war goods—scrap, oil, steel, and cotton, and they continued to bomb and invade China, with our support.

The same stupid, mealy-mouthed diplomacy is being practiced again. I got in touch with Representative MCCORMACK, who says:

"As we know from Administrator Harold Stassen the reason, or excuse, is that it is a peace gesture, meaning, of course, on our part to the world killers of today, the Communists.

"And the very next day we are informed of the warlike actions in Indochina and southeastern Asia of the Red Chinese, inspired and backed by the Soviet Communist Union.

"On one hand warlike actions by the other side directed at the United States and the free world. On the other hand a peace gesture by our country and other countries of the free world toward the Soviet Union which will give to the Soviet Union great benefits in trade and probably be considered by them as a sign of fear and weakness on our part.

"Assuming this action was justified, which I do not admit, was the timing on our part right?

"There are many persons who feel if anything of this kind was to be entered into that it should have been left for the coming Geneva Conference; that it might well have constituted a trading point for Secretary Dulles and our representatives at that conference.

"To me, it seems to be a noticeable and strange inconsistency for a peace gesture to be given to the Communists at a time when they are engaged in war actions—not mere gestures—toward the United States and the remaining free countries of the world.

"This calls for considerable explanation on the part of the present administration, which will have difficulty in satisfying the great majority of our people.

"In any event, I have expressed myself very strongly against the sale of property, of any kind, to the Soviets or any Communist dominated country, particularly those goods or manufactured products that would be helpful to these countries for military or war purposes. You will remember that, several months ago, our Government took between 800 and 1,000 items off the prescribed list, and many of them could be utilized for wartime economy.

"I well remember in the talk I was making over a national hookup, both TV and radio, I condemned strongly the action taken at that time. I am also having an inquiry made as to where the large amount of scrap iron, that is being exported from our country, is going, particularly to find out if any of it is ultimately getting into Communist countries or Communist-controlled countries.

"You will remember, some months ago, that Mr. Stassen gave to our country and to the world a new idea of bringing about 'peace through trade.' I assume he meant by 'peace through trade,' unlimited trading with Soviet Union and Communist-controlled countries. To me that was ridiculous, and I took sharp issue with him. He overlooked the fact that the evidence is convincing that the Kremlin leaders are determined upon world revolution and world domination. Until the Communist leaders disavow such intent, and there is no evidence that they will, I think it is against our national interest to do anything to strengthen them, either directly or indirectly.

"I think it was a dangerous calculated risk to sharply reduce our Army and to bring about reductions in our Navy and Air Corps, as have been made and will be made in the future. I am frank in stating that 'the only thing Communists respect is what they fear,' and that is greater military power and strength than they possess. 'It is better to have too much military strength and not need it—than to have too little and need it.'

"In a broad and general way, these are my views."

Caseload in Federal District Courts in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, at the 82d annual meeting of the Iowa State Bar Association, a resolution was adopted calling on the Congress to adopt

legislation which would bring relief to two Federal districts in Iowa where the courts are overcrowded with litigation.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution adopted at the June 1955 meeting of the Iowa State Bar Association:

Whereas the members of this association are seriously concerned with the heavy load of cases pending in both the northern and southern Federal judicial districts of the State of Iowa and with the fact that the amount of litigation is increasing rapidly and that as a result, a congestion of cases and of business has been avoided only through the almost superhuman efforts of the judges both in the northern and southern districts of Iowa; and

Whereas not only are the judges overworked but serious strain is placed upon jurors, court reporters, litigants, and attorneys, and other officers of the court; and

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a measure designed to bring relief for this situation to the northern and southern districts of Iowa and to similar situations now existing elsewhere in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Iowa State Bar Association in its 82d annual meeting assembled, That we urge upon the Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Iowa that they give the strongest possible support to the proposed legislation referred to above and to any other legislation which may be designed to bring relief to the two Federal districts in this State; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of this association to each of the United States Senators from Iowa and to each of the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Iowa.

A Plan for Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the people of Virginia are now in great distress because of the recent deplorable ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States declaring segregation in the schools unconstitutional. As stated before, this ruling is shocking and contrary to all legal precedent. Our people in Virginia are now facing a crisis. It is necessary that the issue be faced forthrightly and a decision be made by our people.

In an endeavor to acquaint the public with the problem and to preserve for our people their individual liberties which are being gradually taken from them by a grasping arm of the Federal Government, an organization has been formed in Virginia known as the Defenders of State Sovereignty and Individual Liberties. Only yesterday this organization issued a forthright statement, which I herewith include with my remarks and commend it to the people of Virginia:

A PLAN FOR VIRGINIA

The Defenders of State Sovereignty and Individual Liberties has, since its organization last fall, been giving itself to a study of the questions posed for Virginia by the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954. It was not surprised by the implementing decision handed down on May 31, 1955. It did not anticipate that a court, composed of such judges as now constitute the Supreme Court of the United States, would in any respect weaken in its determination to force upon the people of Virginia and the South the unsupported views of the socialistic and radical sociologists whose opinions it has accepted as constitutional doctrine.

The Defenders are amazed that there be those in our midst who would lull our people into a false sense of security by assuring them that under these decisions we have all the time we want in which to chart our course. The Court has not given that time. It requires that in "good faith" we "make a prompt and reasonable start" toward mixing the races in our schools. If we make that start and thus begin the process of mongrelization, there is then the possibility that we will be given additional time to complete the process, but only in the event we do so "at the earliest practicable date." If this were not clear enough to satisfy these false prophets that time, in the opinion of the Court, is of the essence in this matter, the Court emphasizes that fact by saying that schools must be mixed "with all deliberate speed."

There be those who, after a year of talk, still advocate that nothing now be done, but that we take our time in an endeavor to "hammer out" some plan of procedure unknown to them and to us. We call upon such persons, and particularly any such who have been honored by election to the general assembly, to meet their responsibility and to state in frankness and candor to the people of Virginia what they have to offer.

Unless something be done, and unless something be done now, integration will begin in Virginia, and, once begun, it, like every other vile pestilence, will spread to the point where it has covered the whole body politic. Whether it come in our day, our children will see the death of our Anglo-Saxon civilization.

The Commonwealth of Virginia has a right now to expect of every one of her sons and daughters who may have any proposal to make by which we can preserve our way of life that he speak. Procrastination is not only the thief of time; in this instance, procrastination will be the thief of our civilization.

The Defenders have certain broad proposals to make to the people of Virginia. They do not make them on the spur of the moment. They make them after long study and after consultation with very many persons both within and without the State of Virginia.

1. We recommend to His Excellency the Governor that he immediately call a special session of the general assembly. That session should begin the process of amending our State constitution, and it should adopt certain needed legislation. That session should be held not later than the middle of July. If we are to amend our constitution through the plan that permits the people of Virginia to vote on the amendments (and this matter is too important to deal with otherwise), the initial step should be taken by the general assembly not later than the 1st of August of this year. Otherwise, notice of the proposed amendments cannot be published in sufficient time to permit the general assembly at its regular 1956 session to deal with the matter and to permit the people to vote next year. Unless this initial action is taken by the 1st of August, we cannot amend the constitution by the procedure which gives the people a right to pass on the proposals until 1958. That would mean a delay of three school sessions. This matter does not permit of such delay. If other considerations did not require immediate action, the situation in Prince Edward County demands it. The people of that county will next year educate their children without help from the State or the locality. They will, in addition, pay their full State taxes. Tax money paid by them will go to help support the public schools in other localities. It is not right that a people who have so courageously fought the battle for the whole State should thus be penalized and oppressed by the Commonwealth of Virginia.

2. We call upon the general assembly to initiate procedures to amend section 129 of the constitution so as expressly to give to the general assembly the power to adopt such laws in relation to schools as the welfare of this people requires. That section and the provision for segregated schools are each a part of chapter IX of our constitution. We are aware that there are those who are of the opinion that the invalidation of the segregated-school provision by the Supreme Court of the United States has wiped out of our State constitution the whole of chapter IX. Indeed, as we read the decision of the Circuit Court of Hanover County rendered last week in the Hanover School Board case, that is the view of the great constitutional student who sits on that bench before which Patrick Henry was accustomed to appear. There are others who take a different position. This question is too important to leave to any uncertainty, and as matters now stand certainty cannot without such amendment be attained until the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia has ruled on the question.

3. We call upon the general assembly to initiate procedures to amend sections 134 and 141 of chapter IX of the Constitution so as to remove any doubt that, in case of necessity, State and local moneys may be used to pay the tuition and other school expenses in private schools, of children of localities in which it becomes necessary, as in Prince Edward, to close the public schools. We do not believe there is a self-respecting man in the State of Virginia who would advocate that people so situated should be relegated to educate their children as best they can, and at the same time be compelled to pay taxes to assist in the education of children of other areas.

4. We call upon the general assembly to take out of our law all mention of compulsory education. We have yet to hear one single man advocate that compulsory education be retained in Virginia, and that any man be prosecuted and convicted who may elect to hold his child out of school rather than subject him to the degrading influences of an integrated school. If there be such a man in Virginia, particularly if there be such a man in public life, honesty and candor compel him so to state, and especially if there be one who is now a candidate for the general assembly, he will, if he be honest, so state to the people whose support he seeks.

5. We call upon the general assembly to enact such laws as may be needed to prevent the expenditure of $1 of public moneys, State or local, in the support and maintenance of any racially mixed public school. The Supreme Court of the United States has the power perchance to prevent us spending our money as we see fit, but the Supreme Court of the United States can scarcely be so oblivious to the Constitution which governs it as to attempt to compel a State to levy taxes and to spend tax money for a purpose for which that State is not willing to tax its people or to make any appropriation. The

people of this commonwealth are unalterably opposed to integration. That being our position, then as self-respecting men and women, our course is determined. It demands, in self-respect, that we refuse to give any support to any integrated public school. Integration, like cancer, cannot be contained and limited to one isolated spot. If it exists, it spreads until it kills the whole.

6. We call upon the general assembly to adopt such laws as may be required to make public moneys available to meet the private-school expenses of children of those localities in which the closing of public schools may be compelled. Again, we cite the present situation in Prince Edward County, a situation that may shortly exist in other localities. We point to the rank injustice of subjecting those people to the necessity of educating their children out of private funds, and at the same time compelling them to pay taxes to help the more fortunate areas of the State meet their public-school expenses.

7. We pledge to His Excellency the Governor, to the general assembly, and to the people of Virginia our support of this program, or, if someone can advance a better, which will also preserve education in Virginia and which will prevent the mixing of the races, we will give our support to it.

8. We call upon all those who are candidates for the general assembly—Democrats, Republicans and Independents—to state openly, frankly and fearlessly what, if anything, they have to propose, and whether they can be relied upon to give their full support to a program that will prevent integration in Virginia public schools. There may be a time when a candidate is justified in indulging in political trimming in order to obtain a seat in the general assembly. Upon that we express no opinion. But we do assert, that in this emergency, no honest person has the right to seek that high office without frankly telling those whom he hopes to represent what may be his position. To act otherwise will be the height of personal, political, and moral cowardice.

9. Too long have many of those who represent us in the halls of Congress and in the general assembly remained silent. Some have spoken out frankly and have told the people of Virginia that in which they believe. We call upon those who have been honored by the people of Virginia and its localities with public office, elective or appointive, from United States Senators down, now to give their advice to the people of Virginia in a forthright manner and to meet the responsibilities of the leadership to which they have been chosen by assisting to guide us along a road that will preserve our race.

We do not consider that these proposals mean death to public schools. We think that the only hope of public schools lies in their adoption. Those who talk of preserving our public-school system know not of what they speak. Our public-school system—that system which we have known for many years in Virginia, which has been so beneficial to white persons and which rescued the Negro out of illiteracy—cannot be preserved. The United States Supreme Court has killed it for years to come, and it will remain dead until such time as the American people may by constitutional processes correct the error of that Court, or the personnel of the Court may be changed to include those who recognize that the judicial power may not rightfully be used to amend the Constitution to make it conform to that which the Court may think it should be.

No system of public schools not approved of by the people can exist. Virginians want nothing of an integrated public-school system. Our white citizens who have paid the greater part of the taxes which have educated both white and Negro children will not submit to the enormous cost of maintaining schools to which they are not willing to subject their children.

Only 1 of 2 public-school systems can now exist. Each is novel and new to Virginia. The one is an integrated public-school system. That system the people of Virginia will not support. The other is a segregated public-school system—segregated not as a matter of law and by State compulsion, but segregated by the good sense of our people, white and black.

If it be said that the NAACP will not consent to the maintenance of the latter, but will excite some ill-advised Negroes to apply for admission to the white schools, and thereby cause the school to be closed, or that one of that pitiful little group of white persons who fraternize with the NAACP will sacrifice his child by seeking his admission to the Negro school and thereby cause the school to close, we admit that possibility. Virginians do not choose, however, to be ruled by such elements. If that happens those schools will close. They will regret that the Negroes for whom they have done much will no longer receive their help, but that will be at the wish of their leaders. We will care for our own and they will care as best they can for theirs, each assisted by the same help from public funds to the extent that help is sought and within the limits of available funds. We do not believe many schools will close before our Negro citizens, fine as most of them are, will see to it that their people throw off the leadership of these radicals who have done so much to destroy good race relations, and together we can put our educational system on a firm and lasting basis. If our belief in that respect be not sustained we will put other schools for our children on a firm and lasting basis and let the Negroes do with theirs as they will.

We are not unmindful of the ultimatum thrown down to the people of Virginia at a radio forum held in Richmond on May 17, 1955, by one of the chief Virginia counsel of the NAACP, who in an unguided moment cried out: "Like it or not, your schools will be integrated." Virginians are not ready to accept that dictation.

We have heard of no specific proposal that would look to integration in Virginia. We hope we hear of none. Should one be forthcoming which would propose that a start be made on the road to integration without it having first received approval of all governing bodies of the locality affected, both State and local, and also approval by the people at the ballot box, we would know of no way to characterize it save by the use of such a word as dastardly. We do not believe our people, or any segment of them, is ready to condemn their children to a complete socialization of the races. We do most solemnly assert that the man who would advocate that that be permitted without first giving the people an opportunity in solemn vote to express their views is entitled to no respect and to no support from the people of Virginia.

We realize that there are those timid souls among us who will say that we advocate an extreme program. We have no fear of adjectives. We are confronted by an extreme emergency. We have been served with a decision so extreme that it has abandoned all rules of constitutional interpretation; it has denied the validity of the views held for 175 years by the American people; it has accepted as our fundamental law not the Constitution adopted by this people, but the views of foreign and radical sociologists which have nothing to support them other than the opinions of the authors—men who would mix the races in all features of life. To attempt to compromise between the segregated school and the integrated school, is not to compromise. It is to accept the integrated school. That we are not willing to do.

We call upon all the good people of the State of Virginia who would protect their children and their children's children from the deteriorating and deadly effects of integration to bestir themselves, to join with us, and to help in this our day to protect that pure way of life which our fathers preserved for us, and preserved it when they were in a situation nowhere nearly so strong as we, and when they were threatened with forces equally as destructive as those which now seek to encompass us.

Why Make Our Children Pay for Our Highways?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to draw the attention of my colleagues to a thoughtful discussion of America's highway needs which appeared in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

This article was written by Mr. F. R. Sproule, of Northville, Mich., with whom I am personally acquainted. I might add that Mr. Sproule has not been a highway expert all his life but his example is that of an interested citizen who has made a serious personal study of our highway needs.

The article, which was published May 21, 1955, follows:

WHY MAKE OUR CHILDREN PAY FOR OUR HIGHWAYS?

(By F. R. Sproule)

President Eisenhower's proposed 10-year program in which the Federal Government would spend $25 billion and the States a like amount represents an effort to catch up with the new demands on our highway system. The proposal that the Federal half of the improvement program be financed by a newly created authority which would issue long-term bonds has been criticized by Senator BYRD, of Virginia, and others, including the new Comptroller General, Joseph Campbell, on the ground that it is a device to bypass the Federal budget.

Apparently the President's advisers are pessimistic as to their ability to persuade people to pay for roads as they are built. At any rate, the administration proposal provides for no increase in the Federal gas tax. Other proposals have been made, but most of them omit reference to hiking the Federal gas tax or requiring the States in which Federal money is to be spent to contribute equal amounts.

Thus the States will be tempted to follow the Federal lead in trying to do it the easy way—by borrowing or letting the Federal Government take over.

Such a policy suggests a lag behind public opinion. It has been proved that good roads cost the vehicle owner less than poor ones. The business done by toll roads indicates that people understand this and will gladly pay for better roads when they get their money's worth. In California, for example, the gas-tax rate has been doubled since 1946 because the people have discovered that the extra amount they pay for better roads pays dividends in gasoline saved and in reduced

wear and tear on automobiles and human nervous systems.

Undoubtedly, bond issues will be needed for some part of the program, but the more pay-as-we-go money that goes into it the better. If we can't cut down our debt charges when the country is rolling in prosperity, we never can. Anyway, most of our gas-tax rates—as low as 3 cents per gallon—are as obsolete as a 5-cent cup of coffee and pitifully inadequate, as compared with the usual 1½ cents per mile, for passenger cars, which we gladly pay to travel a toll road. At 15 miles per gallon of gas, a highway toll of 1½ cents per mile works out as a tax of 22½ cents per gallon of gasoline.

It should be possible to capitalize nationally on the experience of the few States which have attempted to capture for their own use some of the saving which individual motorists and truckers enjoy because of better highways. Such States have done two things. They have made a study of the State's highway problem. They have then presented the problem and the cost of doing something about it to the people. Where this has been done, there has been no lack of support for modern highways. If the Federal Government were to require each State, as a condition for receiving Federal aid, to provide every vehicle owner with a nontechnical presentation of a sound long-range highway program, including financing, the results in terms of public support would be astonishing. The presentation could be in the form of an easy-to-read pamphlet, perhaps distributed to automobile owners along with their license plates.

It is ridiculous to assume that a man paying from $800 to $1,000 a year to drive a car will not consent to increase his road contribution by $40 a year when he knows that the $40 will be saved in car operation costs, with a bonus of savings in time and possibly even his life.

Cuban Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last month Cuba celebrated its 53d year as an independent nation. Cuba was discovered by Christopher Columbus, October 28, 1492, on his first voyage. He originally called this "Pearl of the Antilles," the largest island in the West Indies, by the name of Juana. Cuba is its Indian name.

In commemoration of Cuban independence and of the exemplary relations between our two countries, it is a distinct honor to submit the following proclamation issued by Gov. G. Mennen Williams of the State of Michigan:

CUBA INDEPENDENCE DAY
PROCLAMATION

The Republic of Cuba was created, with its own Constitution, on May 20, 1902. This date marked the end of the United States military occupation which had been instituted after the defeat of the Spanish forces.

Cuban relations with the United States have given testimony to the validity and inherent worth of the good-neighbor policy. Cuban agriculture and industry play an important part in world trade. Some of the most eloquent words on liberty and independence have been given to posterity by Cuban spokesmen.

It is fitting that the State of Michigan recognize the long struggle which the Cuban nation has engaged in for self-government,

Therefore, I, G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim Friday, May 20, 1955, as Cuban Independence Day in Michigan, and urge all our citizens to join with their neighbors of Cuban descent in paying tribute to the efforts of this small Republic whose centuries-long struggle for independence is renowned throughout the world.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Michigan, this 19th day of May in the year of our Lord 1955, and of the Commonwealth the 119th.

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor.

By the Governor:

JAMES M. HARE,
Secretary of State.

Trans-World Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, this year Trans-World Airlines is celebrating 30 years of airline service. This company maintains its home office in Kansas City, Mo. Within the next few months, TWA plans to dedicate the airline industry's most modern maintenance and overhaul base, an $18 million plant to be situated at the new 4,600-acre Platt County Airport. I am proud indeed of the fact that this new installation will be erected in my district. Completion of the new facilities will provide TWA with hangar space and buildings of the most advanced design for airplane engine overhaul, airframe overhaul, engine testing, and various other maintenance functions. Servicing of TVA's entire aircraft fleet, operated over both TWA's domestic and international routes, will be performed in these modern shops.

I am especially pleased that TWA is bringing these new facilities to my district. I know that the thousands of employees who will locate there will find Platte County a wonderful and friendly community in which to live and to work.

I think it is significant to note also that Trans-World Airlines is the only scheduled airline conducting both domestic and transoceanic service without 1 penny of Federal subsidy. This is a tribute to that company's efficient management, and to its 15,500 employees. Recognition of TWA's subsidy-free status was offered by the Postmaster General in the form of a special citation. I should like to insert a copy of that citation which was presented in Washington, D. C., on June 1.

The citation follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., June 1, 1955.

A CITATION TO TRANS-WORLD AIRLINES, INC.

Whereas the United States Post Office Department appreciates the services rendered by the United States air-transport industry in delivering the mails; and

Whereas it has long been the goal of the United States scheduled airlines to maintain their service without Federal subsidies, the Post Office Department presents this citation to Trans-World Airlines, Inc., on the happy occasion of its completion of 30 years of service and its attainment of a subsidy-free operation over both its domestic and international systems.

ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General.

Military Manpower Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. MURRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on May 18, 1955, I addressed the House in support of the military manpower bill now under consideration. At that time I included in the text of my address a letter I received from W. W. Waymack, former Atomic Energy Commission scientist.

I recently received a letter from Mr. Waymack amplifying and clarifying his views. I would like to include in the RECORD the amplification of Mr. Waymack's views. In his letter Mr. Waymack points up the need for maintaining scientific strength in the years and decades ahead.

I hope the committee now considering the military manpower bill will consider Mr. Waymack's well-reasoned views. His letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURRAY: I have read with real interest the text of your statement prepared for delivery on the floor.

I note that you declare your intention to vote for the military manpower bill now under consideration. While I have only the most general understanding of the measure in its present form, I personally think your decision is the right one.

I am more impressed by some of the other responses to your recent questions, quoted in your speech, than I am by my own when I look at it in type. If I were expressing myself afresh I should certainly want, for completeness, to accept the point made by Dr. Bush that much depends on what each of us means by UMT. I believe strongly that in raising adequate military forces, as in all other necessary preparation for defense, all the truly major and foreseeable national needs for strength should be taken into account.

Specifically, I think that our method of raising military manpower, whether it be called UMT or something else, should not ignore the national need for maximum scientific strength in the years and decades ahead. The total problem is indeed complex. It is essential to avoid, in creating one essential element of strength, the serious weakening of another essential element of strength.

With this amplification or clarification, I stick to my original response. I'd be more content if, in any further publication of my reply, an awareness of what I've tried to say here were shown.

W. W. WAYMACK.

Reserves in a Box

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald:

RESERVES IN A BOX

The period before the conference with Russia is the worst possible time for this country to trifle with its military strength. This is an urgent reason for Congress to heed President Eisenhower's emphatic plea of yesterday for passage of an adequate military manpower bill without the impossibly restrictive amendments tasked on in the House. The manpower cuts which the administration has proposed in the standing forces—and which Congress has been approving—are questionable enough in view of the newly disclosed Soviet air prowess. They will become highly risky unless the armed services can depend upon trained Reserves that could quickly supplement the regular forces in an emergency.

This newspaper yields to none in its belief that racial segregation in public facilities is morally repugnant. But the Powell amendment adopted by the House is the wrong way to eliminate segregation in the Reserves and National Guard in the South; all it has succeeded in doing is tying up the House bill in a tangle of States rights considerations that make defeat inevitable. On this point it is necessary to respect the sincerity of President Eisenhower's own convictions, the good record of the administration in eliminating segregation in the Regular Armed Forces and the assurance of the Defense Department that no reservist would be compelled to train in a segregated unit.

The objections to the debilitating Bow amendment are no less strenuous. This would prohibit the sending of men called to duty under authority of the manpower bill to any country with which a status of forces agreement was in effect permitting the trial of Americans by local courts for civil crimes. These status of forces agreements are a basic feature of NATO, and they are completely reciprocal. Although large foreign contingents have not been stationed in the United States, this country would never tolerate a situation of extraterritoriality in which foreign troops enjoyed immunity from local prosecution for crimes committed off military reservations. The House cannot have realized how this restriction would injure this country's own defense—by impeding support of NATO—when it approved the Bow amendment.

National security simply is too important to allow such distractions to impair it. The Reserve bill is not only essential to backstop the Regular forces by channeling new men into the Reserves and making sure that they have at least a minimum of training if they should be called; it also provides the only feasible way, as Mr. Eisenhower said yesterday, to avoid imposing yet another possible burden on "men who have already done their stint * * * in defending our country." There is a further consideration in the civil defense aspect which the President touched upon indirectly. Every city and hamlet would become a front line if the country were attacked. It would be well to ponder Mr. Eisenhower's question: "If this is true, why do we not want someone in those front lines that is trained and ready to do something sensible * * *?"

In the circumstances two courses are open. The first is for the Senate to abandon reservations about priority and pass its own Reserve bill without crippling amendments. The second is for the House to make a determined effort to rescue its bill, either by obtaining withdrawal of the amendments or if necessary by passing a new measure. Legislators who understand the importance of giving the President the strongest possible hand at the "summit" meeting ought to insist on action along both lines.

The Case of Narcotics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, Treasury officials have estimated there are 60,000 narcotic addicts in the United States. Assistant Treasury Secretary H. Chapman Rose states that despite progress in narcotics control, drug addiction remains a serious problem and amply justifies the public's determination to correct what is regarded as a dreadful situation. Mr. Harry J. Anslinger, Commissioner of the Bureau of Narcotics, says that two basic steps that can be taken to control the narcotics traffic are severe punishment for the traffickers and compelling addicts to undergo treatment. He further states that the addict spends on the average of $10 a day on drugs—many of them stealing to raise the money.

With these situations in mind, I have introduced a bill providing for a more effective control of narcotic drugs—and in addition, a plan for the treatment of those who have become addicted to the use of narcotics. This measure is known as House Joint Resolution 188.

This measure provides that anyone convicted of traffic in narcotic drugs shall be imprisoned for the first offense for not less than 5 nor more than 10 years. For a second offense, the offender shall be imprisoned for not less than 10 nor more than 20 years. For a third or subsequent offense, the offender shall be imprisoned for life. These penalties are more severe than anything on the statute books at present and should be a deterrent to those who try to make profits from these deadly drugs.

House Joint Resolution 188 goes much further, however, than stricter enforcement of the law. Placing an offender behind bars does not solve the problem insofar as the addict is concerned.

Those who traffic in drugs are motivated by large profits. It is understood that a grain of heroin which the peddler may sell for from fifteen to twenty-five dollars can be secured by a physician for a few cents. It is this excessive cost which impels addicts to steal or pilfer in some way to get the money to purchase these harmful drugs.

House Joint Resolution 188 provides a method of treatment which, in most cases, will restore addicts to useful members of society. The fact seems to be established that an addict, who is under the care of a physician, can in most cases be cured of this habit at a small fraction of the amount paid for the drugs when purchased from the traffic violator. Resolution 188 sets up a plan for the treatment of these unfortunate victims in Government hospitals, when necessary, and offers encouragement to such individuals to consult their own physicians in many instances. The sympathetic help that can be offered by physicians and Government hospitals will do much to discourage traffic in narcotics, as well as play an important part in the restoration of addicts to a normal life.

Bond Issue for Schools in Hanover County, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a very able and scholarly opinion rendered on May 13, 1955, by the Honorable Leon M. Bazile, judge of the 15th judicial circuit of Virginia, on the subject of a bond issue for schools in Hanover County, Va.

Judge Bazile has a statewide reputation in the Commonwealth of Virginia for being a constitutional lawyer. Prior to his ascending the bench, he served for many years as an assistant attorney general for Virginia.

I am sure that many would be interested to know that Hanover County is the birthplace of Patrick Henry and that this opinion was handed down in the very courthouse in which Patrick Henry delivered the celebrated oration in the parsons' cause and against the tyranny of the parsons of that day.

The opinion is as follows:

[From the Ashland (Va.) Herald-Progress of June 2, 1955]

THE BAZILE OPINION ON THE SHELTON CASE

(In the circuit court of Hanover County, Samuel W. Shelton against the County School Board of Hanover County, a corporation; Louis S. Herrink, Jr., and Samuel W. Shelton for the plaintiff; Robert R. Gwathmey III for the defendant.)

OPINION OF THE COURT

This is a bill filed by the plaintiff as a resident, freeholder, and taxpayer of Hanover County, Va., seeking an injunction to restrain the defendant from expending or using the proceeds of a bond issue voted by the people of Hanover County on July 14, 1953, authorizing the issuance of bonds in the amount of $1 million for the construction of schoolbuildings in said county.

The bill alleges: "* * * that on June 27, 1953, in case No. 24–a styled "Bond Issue," this court entered an order fixing July 14, 1953, as the date for a bond-issue election in Hanover County for public-school purposes, pursuant to section 22–168 to 22–178, inclusive, Code of Virginia, 1950, and prescribed therein the form of the official ballot to be used in said election."

The bill then alleges: "That in view of the then existing law in the State of Virginia and the wording of the aforementioned ballot the voters of Hanover County were asked to authorize, or deny, a bond issue for the

construction and improvement of buildings, and the procurement of sites therefor, for segregated or nonracially mixed public schools; and that by answering the question contained on the aforesaid ballot in the affirmative, a majority of the voters of Hanover County did authorize a bond issue in the sum of $1 million to promote segregated schools and for that purpose only."

It is next alleged "that the county school board of Hanover County has instituted condemnation proceedings against certain lands in Henry District, Hanover County, Va., which proceeding is now pending before this court; and also at the present time negotiating for and in the process of procuring sites in other parts of Hanover County, upon which to build public-school buildings, with proceeds from said bond issue."

The bill then alleges "that the county school board of Hanover County intends to construct on the property sought to be condemned and on the other sites sought to be procured, public-school buildings in which to operate nonsegregated, mixed, or integrated public schools, such buildings and the sites therefor to be paid for from the proceeds of the bond issue authorized July 24, 1953; that the expenditure of the proceeds from the aforementioned bond issue for the promotion of and the operation in Hanover County of mixed schools will be for a purpose other than that authorized by the voters of Hanover County on July 14, 1953."

It is then alleged: That the county school board of Hanover County will authorize and conduct only such types of public schools as are permitted by law; and that since sometime in May 1954, segregated, or nonmixed schools have been made unlawful."

On April 2, 1955, the school board filed a general demurrer to the plaintiff's bill.

It is argued in support of the demurrer that the bill instead of alleging facts alleges conclusions of law.

In the article on Bills in Equity in 3 Encyclopedia of Pleading and Practice it is said: "It is only necessary to state facts in a bill in chancery; it is generally improper to state legal conclusions except, perhaps, where law and fact are so blended to render it unavoidable."

This is a case in which to raise the issue sought to be raised here, it is necessary to state both the facts and the law involved and the court can see no objection to the method pursued by the plaintiff in his bill (12 Enc. of Pl. and Pr. title "Legal Conclusions," p. 10b8, subject, Surplusage and Id. 1045. subject, Apparent Conclusions of Law).

The demurrer is, therefore, overruled.

The defendant also on April 7, 1955, filed its answer to the plaintiff's bill in which it denied paragraph 3 of the plaintiff's bill and alleged "that in the election * * * held on July 14, 1953, the voters of the County of Hanover, Va., were asked to authorize, or deny, a bond issue for the construction and improvement of buildings and the procurement of sites therefor and for other purposes as set forth in the ballot to provide adequate facilities for the efficient and lawful operation and maintenance of public schools for white and Negro school children in the county of Hanover, and that in answering the question contained in the aforementioned ballot in the affirmative, a majority of the voters of Hanover County did authorize a bond issue in the sum of $1 million for the purpose of providing sufficient facilities for the efficient and lawful operation of public schools in Hanover County for white and Negro children."

The answer also admitted the allegations of paragraphs No. 1 and 2 of the bill and paragraph 4 of the bill. It denied the allegations of paragraph 5 of the bill "except it is admitted that the defendant will authorize and conduct only such types of schools in Hanover County as are authorized by the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia."

The defendant also contends that the plaintiff cannot maintain this suit because section 22–176 of the Code of Virginia limits such a suit to 30 days after the date of the order entered pursuant to code section 23–173.

Code section 23–176 reads as follows: "For a period of 30 days after the date of an order entered by the circuit court * * * certifying that a majority of the qualified electors voted in favor of the issuance of bonds, as herein provided any person in interest shall have the right to contest the legality of such bonds or the taxes to be levied for the payment of the principal and interest of the bonds, after which time no one shall have any cause or right of action to contest the legality or regularity of the election or the validity of the bonds or the validity of taxes necessary for the payment of the principal and interest of such bonds or for any cause whatsoever. If such contest shall not have been begun within 30 days herein prescribed, the authority to issue the bonds and validity of the taxes necessary to pay the principal and interest of bonds, shall be conclusively presumed and no court shall have authority to inquire into such matters."

This is a statute of limitations on the right to contest the legality of a school bond issue election and it is limited in its application to a contest of such an election and the things necessarily incident to such election.

It has no application to a proceeding such as this, where the legality of the election is admitted but the contention is made, as here, that due to the happening of a subsequent event the proceeds of the bond issue cannot be lawfully expended for the purpose for which the bonds were voted.

The authorities are well settled that the right of a resident taxpayer to invoke the aid of a court of equity to prevent an illegal disposition of the moneys of the county are beyond dispute. *Appalachian Power Co.* v. *Town of Galax* (173 Va. 329, 4 S. E. (2d) 390, 332 (1939) and authorities there cited).

In so holding the court in a unanimous opinion written by Mr. Chief Justice Campbell said (173 Va. 332): "In *Crampton* v. *Zabriske* (101 U. S. 601, 609, 25 L. Ed. 1070), it is said: 'Of the right of resident taxpayers to invoke the interposition of a court of equity to prevent an illegal disposition of the moneys of the county or the illegal creation of a debt which they in common with other property holders of the county may otherwise be compelled to pay, there is at this day no serious question. The right has been recognized by the State courts in numerous cases; and from the nature of the powers exercised by municipal corporations, the great danger of their abuse and the necessity of prompt action to prevent irremediable injuries, it would seem eminently proper for courts of equity to interfere.' "

In *Appalachian Power Co.* v. *Galax*, supra, the court further said (173 Va. 1329): "In *Redd* v. *Supervisors of Henry County* (31 Gratt (72 Va.) 695) the determinative question was the right of a citizen and taxpayer to file his bill in equity to enjoin the board of supervisors from issuing bonds for the payment of the county subscription to the stock of a railway company. In delivering the opinion of the court, Judge Burks, Sr., said, 'The jurisdiction of a court of equity in a case like the present, unless it has been taken away by statute, is too well established to admit of dispute.' "

See also *Lynchburg R. R. Co.* v. *Dameron* (95 Va. 554, 28 S. E. 951 (1898)).

In the case at bar the ballot voted on was as follows:

"Shall Hanover County contract a loan in the amount of $1 million and issue bonds therefor in that amount for the purpose of providing funds to supplement State school construction funds for the construction of school improvements in said county for white and Negro schoolchildren, including the purchase of sites for school buildings or additions to school buildings, the construction of school buildings, or additions to or alterations of existing school buildings, and the furnishing and equipping of school buildings or additions to school buildings?"

The order calling the election was entered June 27, 1953, by this court and the date fixed for said election was July 14, 1953.

The above question submitted was voted in the affirmative at said election and October 20, 1953, the order was entered by this court pursuant to code section 22-172.

At the time when the election was held, section 140 of the constitution of Virginia was in full force and effect. This section provided: "White and colored children shall not be taught in the same school."

This section is a part of article IX of the constitution and it is inconceivable that any part of that article would have been adopted without the incorporation of section 140 therein.

At the time when said election was held, code section 22–221 was also in full force and effect. This section was as follows: "White and colored persons shall not be taught in the same school, but shall be taught in separate schools under the same general regulations as to management, usefulness, and efficiency."

At the beginning of the public-school system in Virginia by the act of 1869–70, chapter 259, section 47 (code of 1873, p. 694) and continuing through all subsequent codes of Virginia (code 1887, sec. 1492; code 1919, sec. 719), to the present code the declared law of Virginia has been that white and colored children were to be educated in separate schools.

The Supreme Court of the United States when its membership consisted of great judges who were educated in constitutional law and who respected the Constitution of the United States and the high office which they held had occasion to construe the 14th amendment of the Constitution of the United States in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U. S. 537, 40 L. Ed. 256, 16 S. Ct. 1138 (1896)).

In construing the 14th amendment in that case Mr. Justice Brown, speaking for the Court, said: "The object of the amendment was undoubtedly to enforce the absolute equality of the two races before the law, but in the nature of things it could not have been intended to abolish distinction based upon color, or to enforce social, as distinguished from political, equality, or a commingling of the two races upon terms unsatisfactory to either. Laws permitting and even requiring their separation in places where they are liable to be brought into contact do not necessarily imply the inferiority of either race to the other, and have been generally, if not universally, recognized as within the competency of the State legislatures in the exercise of their police power. The most common instance of this is connected with the establishment of separate schools for white and colored children, which have been held to be a valid exercise of the legislative power even by courts of States where the political rights of the colored race have been longest and most earnestly enforced."

This Court does not agree with the opinion in *Brown* v. *Board of Education, supra*, that what was said in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* about schools was dictum. It is true that case arose under a statute separating the races in railway coaches. But the Court was construing the 14th amendment and what it said with reference to schools was directly in point because if the amendment prohibited segregation in the one case then it prohibited it in the other. In any event *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was decided by one of the greatest bodies of judges who ever sat upon the Supreme Court of the United States; and this decision was reaffirmed when the direct issue of the separation of the races in schools came before the Court in *Lum*

v. *Rice* (275 U. S. 78, 72 L. ed. 172, 48 S. Ct. 91 (1927)). In an able opinion written by Mr. Chief Justice Taft, who was one of the greatest judges thus far produced in America, probably second only to Marshall as a judge, said: "The question here is whether a Chinese citizen of the United States is denied equal protection of the laws when he is classified among colored races and furnished facilities for education equal to that offered to all, whether white, brown, yellow, or black. Were this a new question, it would call for a very full argument and consideration, but we think that it is the same question which has many times been decided to be within the constitutional power of the State legislature to settle without intervention of the Federal courts under the Federal Constitution."

The Constitution of the United States is a written document. A particular section cannot mean one thing at one time and another and different thing at another time.

As Judge Cooley in his great work on constitutional limitations has pointed out (8th ed. 124) "It is with special reference to the varying moods of public opinion, and with a view of putting the fundamentals of government beyond their control, that these instruments are framed; and there can be no such steady and imperceptible change in their rules as inheres in the principles of the common law. The beneficient maxims of the common law which guard person and property have grown and expanded until they mean vastly more to us than they did to our ancestors, and are more minute, particular and pervading in their protections; and we may confidently look forward in the future to modifications in the direction of improvement. Public sentiment and action effect such changes, and the courts recognize them; but a court or a legislature which should allow a change in public sentiment to influence it in giving a written contution a construction not warranted by the intntion of its founders, would be justly chargeable with reckless disregard of official oath and public duty; and if its course could become a precedent would be of little avail. The violence of public passion is quite as likely in the direction of oppression as in any other; and the necessity for bills of right in our fundamental laws lies mainly in the danger that the legislature will be influenced by temporary excitements and passions among the people to adopt oppressive enactments. What a court is to do therefore is to declare the law as written, leaving to the people themselves to make such changes as new circumstances may require. The meaning of the constitution is fixed when it is adopted, and it is not different at any subsequent time when a court has occasion to pass upon it."

In the Judge's cases (102 Tenn. 510, 532 (1899)) the court said: "The rule stare decisis is peculiarly applicable in the construction of written constitutions. Says Mr. Cooley: 'A cardinal rule in dealing with written instruments is that they are to receive an unvarying interpretation and that their practical construction is to be uniform. A constitution is not to be made to mean one thing at one time and another at such subsequent time, when the circumstances may have so changed as perhaps to make a different rule in the case seem desirable. A principal share of the benefit expected from written constitutions would be lost if the rules they establish were so flexible as to bend to circumstances or be modified by public opinion' Constitutional Limitations (2d ed.) star page 52."

Such was the law on July 14, 1953. It has been twice decided by the Supreme Court of the United States that the separation of the races in the public schools was within the police power of the States unaffected by the 14th amendment. The same view had been taken by the courts of Massachusetts, Ohio, New York, California, Kansas, North Carolina, Indiana, Missouri, Arizona, Nevada, and the inferior Federal courts. *Lum* v. *Rice* (275 U. S. 78, 86, 72 L. ed. 172, 177, 48 S. Ct. 91 (1927).)

If the voters had sought the best legal advice prior to July 14, it must have been that segregated public schools were legal. In fact no other public school was permitted in Virginia.

The law presumes every man to know the law. *Wimbish* v. *Commonwealth* (75 Va. 839 (1880)); *Evans* v. *Michaelson* (146 Va. 64, 135 S. E. 683 (1926)); *Xippas* v. *Commonwealth* (141 Va. 497, 126 S. E. 207 (1925)); *Camp Mfg. Co.* v. *Green* (129 Va. 360, 106 S. E. 394, (1921)); *McKinister* v. *Garrott* (3 Rand. 554 (1825)); *Hicks* v. *Wynn* (137 Va. 186, 119 S. E. 133 (1923)); and *Dickenson* v. *Buck* (169 Va. 39, 192 S. E. 748 (1937)).

It must be conclusively presumed that when they voted for the bond issue on July 14, 1953, that they knew of section 140 of the Constitution and its contents and section 22–221 of the code and its contents. At that time it was a matter of common knowledge that only segregated public schools could be operated in Virginia.

Indeed the very ballot that they voted specified that the bond issue was for white and Negro schools. Indeed at that time no other issue could have been submitted to them. Section 140 of the Constitution of Virginia and section 22–221 of the code were in full force and on July 14, 1953, no integrated public school could have been lawfully operated in Virginia.

The bond issue was, therefore, voted for such schools as could have been lawfully erected on July 14, 1953, that is segregated schools, the white schools for white children and the Negro schools for Negro children. No other proposition could have been or was contemplated by the voters.

In *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka et al.* (347 U. S. 483, 98 L. ed. 873, 74 S. Ct. 686 (1954)) the Supreme Court of the United States in a purely political opinion based on certain psychology books overruled *Plessy* v. *Ferguson, supra,* and *Lum* v. *Rice, supra,* and we are for the first time in American judicial history presented with an opinion which overrules well-considered and rightly considered opinions by some of the greatest American judges on the authority of the unestablished opinions of certain psychologists.

Mr. Chief Justice Taft was a much greater and abler judge than is any member of the present Court. Wherever lawyers are assembled his opinions are treated with the greatest respect. The same may be said for Mr. Justice Brown. He was a great judge and lawyers respect and admire his opinions. But their successors on the Court which they once honored see fit to overrule their opinions on the authority of the opinions of certain psychologists who have no training in the legal field or knowledge of constitutional law.

It is generally conceded that *Dred Scott* v. *Sanford* (19 How. 393–633, 15 L. ed. 691–795 (1857)) had the most disastrous effect on the American Nation. Examination of the opinion of the Court shows that it was based upon numerous authorities and well reasoned.

But *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka, supra,* consigns to the scrap heap the opinions of some of the greatest judges who have sat on the bench on the worthless opinions of certain psychologists and it, like *Dred Scott* v. *Sanford, supra,* may well have as disastrous effects on the American people.

Unfortunately, the present Court has the power—not the right—to reconstrue the 14th amendment, and, having done so, however erroneous and worthless its opinion may be, the several States are bound by it.

Whereas on July 14, 1953, only segregated schools were authorized in Virginia, today if the State remains in the public-school business it can in the future operate only nonsegregated schools. The inferior Federal courts are bound to enforce whatever decree the Supreme Court may enter in *Brown* v. *Board of Education, supra,* and the people of Virginia are helpless.

It may require further litigation with persons not parties to the litigation in *Brown* v. *Board of Education, supra,* before the nonsegregated system can be put into effect. But that is a mere quibble. If the State continues the public-school system, it is inevitable that its public schools must be operated on a nonsegregated basis.

Therefore, the school buildings to be constructed out of the proceeds of the bond issue here will have to be operated as nonsegregated schools.

It follows that the bonds were voted for the building of segregated schools both white and Negro. If the money is spent now, the schools that will be built with it must be integrated or nonsegregated schools.

Is this such a change as will invalidate such bond issue?

Marsh v. *Board of Supervisors of Fulton County* (10 Wall. 1076, 19 L. ed. 1040, 1042 (1871)) appears to be the leading case on this subject.

In 1853 the Mississippi & Wabash Railroad Co. was incorporated by the Legislature of Illinois and authorized to construct a line from Warsaw on the Mississippi to the east line of the State. In September 1853 the Board of Supervisors of Fulton County, through which the projected line was to run ordered that the question be submitted to the voters of the county at the ensuing November election whether the county should subscribe $75,000 to the capital stock of the company and a like sum to the Petersburg & Springfield Railroad Co., payable in the bonds of the county, such bonds not to be issued to the former company until its secretary should certify to the board that $700,000 had been subscribed to its stock and 5 percent thereof had been paid. At the ensuing election the vote was taken and a majority of the voters voted for these subscriptions.

In February 1857, before the bonds had been issued, as in the case here, the Legislature of Illinois amended the charter of the Mississippi & Wabash Co. by which the railroad was divided into three divisions each under a separate corporation.

Following the direction of the board, its clerk subscribed the $75,000 worth of bonds to the central division.

Later an effort was made to collect 15 of the bonds thus issued.

Mr. Justice Field, speaking for the Court, said:

"The questions presented for our consideration are, first, whether the bonds issued by the clerk of the county court of Fulton County to the central division of the Mississippi & Wabash Co. were at the time of their issue, valid obligations of the county of Fulton, and whether they have become obligatory upon the county by any subsequent ratification.

* * * * *

"The amendatory act of 1857 dividing the road into 3 divisions and subjecting each division to the control and management of a different board, clothed with all the powers of the original board, so far as the division was concerned, worked a fundamental change in the character of the original corporation, and created 3 distinct corporations in its place. A subscription to a company whose charter provided for a continuous line of railroad 230 miles across the State, was voted by the electors of Fulton County; not a subscription to a company whose line of road was less than 60 miles, and which, disconnected from the other portions of the original line, would be of comparatively little value."

The Court then held that the board was without authority to issue the bonds and that no act on its part could validate such

bonds. That only another election by the voters could validate the same.

In *Whitner* v. *Woodruff et al.* (68 Fla. 465, 67 S. 110 (1914)), bonds had been voted for the construction of specified roads. The authorities charged with the building of said roads attempted to alter the route designated and to substitute a different route. An injunction was sought by certain taxpayers to restrain the diversion. The chancellor denied the relief. On appeal to the Supreme Court that Court reversed the case and in so doing said after quoting the chancellor's language:

"From this language we understand the holding to be that the county commissioners may change the proposed route within a municipality after a different location has been submitted to popular vote as the one to be paved. To this we cannot give our assent. While the citizens might, if requested, have such confidence in their officials as to give them power in general terms, yet when the request is for specific limited power those officials must keep within its limitations. If the county commissioners obtain the consent of the people by a vote to pave at public expense a designated road or street, those owning property fronting on that road or street may justly complain, if the officials undertake to pave not that street, but another parallel street three blocks distant.

* * * * *

"Whether as taxpayers seeking to prevent the further unauthorized expenditure of money or as abutting owners peculiarly interested in the diversion of the proposed route, the complainants have a standing in a court of equity."

In *Ravenswood S. & G. R. Co.* v. *Ravenswood* (41 W. Va. 732, 24 S. E. 597, 56 A. S. R 906 (1896)) a vote was had in the town of Ravenswood for the purpose of subscribing $3,000 in the stock of a railroad company on the understanding that the railroad would be built as then located through the corporate limits of the town. After the vote was taken the railroad company changed the location of its road so as to throw its line without the corporate limits of the town and several hundred feet to the south thereof.

In denying the railroad company's petition for a writ of mandamus to require the issuance of the bonds, the court said (56 A. S. R. 910): "The change of the settled location of the road, as understood by the voters at the time they gave their assent to the issuance of the bonds, whether for the benefit of the plaintiff or others, is undoubtedly a breach of the condition of their authorization, and an abandonment of the plaintiff's right to demand them."

In *State* v. *County Court of Davis County* (64 Mo. 30 (1876)) an election was held for the purpose of issuing bonds for the building of a railroad and the location of a station within 1 mile of the town of Pattonsburg. The county court refused to issue the bonds because of a breach of the condition. Mandamus was sought to compel the issuance of the bonds. It was admitted that the railroad and station had not been built within 1 mile of the town but the excuse was made that the change had been made at the request and desire of the inhabitants of said town.

In denying the writ the court said: "It is obvious that this could constitute no valid excuse for the nonperformance of the conditions which were the basis of the subscription. For the power of the voters * * * is purely statutory, and exhausts itself when such voters give expressions at the polls of their assent to or dissent from the proposed subscription. Any subsequent action on their part, therefore, being unknown to the law is possessed of no legal validity and can by no means absolve the railroad company from the conditions which were imposed at the time the vote to subscribe was taken. * * *"

In *Norsen* v. *Town of Port Washington et al.* (37 Wisc. 168 (1875)) the town subscribed to the stock of a railroad company with a definite route fixed for the construction of the road at the time. Subsequent to that date the railroad made a change in its route which the court held was a material change. It then held that the taxpayers of the town could maintain a suit to enjoin the issue of bonds in payment of stock subscription for which the town was no longer bound.

It is true that *Board of Public Instruction* v. *State* ((Fla.) 75 S. (2d) 832 (1954)) the court held that where a bond issue for schools was voted prior to the decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education, supra,* that the validity of the bond issue was not affected by that decision. This court has read the main opinion by Terrell, justice, the concurring opinion by Matthews, justice, and it is not impressed with either the reasoning or the correctness of the opinion and concurring opinion, and does not feel bound to follow such case, even though it may be a school-bond case, in the face of the overwhelming weight of authority to the contrary on the issue here involved.

As was so clearly pointed out by Matthews, justice, in his dissenting opinion in that case (75 S. (2d) 848–9): "The proposed bond issue as submitted to the freeholders was for the purpose of building and improving separate schools for Negro and white children, and, as has been noted, is in direct conflict with the United States Constitution, as now construed by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Brown case. Therefore the purpose for which the money is to expended is illegal. The purpose being illegal, it follows that the bonds are illegal. The purpose for which said bonds were to be issued cannot now be changed to build and improve schools where Negro and white children may be permitted or forced to attend the same schools. Such purpose would be in direct conflict with the Constitution of the State of Florida and in violation of the contractual obligations with the freeholders."

In *Turkey* v. *Omaha* (54 Neb. 370, 74 N. W. 613, 69 A. S. R. 711 (1898)) bonds were voted for the acquisition of land for and the erection of a market thereon. After the election the town authorities sought to erect the market on a park owned by the municipality. The Court held that this was a diversion of the purpose for which the bonds had been voted and that at the suit of a taxpayer an injunction would be issued. In so holding the Court said (69 A. S. R. 714): "That when the governing body of a municipality is authorized by a vote of the people, and only thereby, to incur a debt for a particular purpose, such purpose must be strictly complied with, and the terms of the authority granted be strictly and fully pursued, is so well settled that it would be idle to cite authorities on the proposition."

See also, to the same effect, *Harshman* v. *Bates County* (92 U. S. 569, 23 L. Ed. 747 (1876)).

The underlying position of the Supreme Court in *Brown* v. *Board of Education, supra,* is something more than mere nonsegregated education. It goes further than this. From what was said in *McLaurin* v. *Oklahoma State Regents* (339 U. S. 637, 70 S. Ct. 851, 853–4 (1950)) object is so far as that Court can coerce the States, to compel complete socialization of the races. In a graduate school it was held that assigning of a special seat and table in the classroom and library and a specific table in the cafeteria to a Negro student violated the 14th amendment. Under this decision no regulation can be imposed as to where the respective children will sit in the classroom and the library or what part they will play on the athletic fields and no restraint can be placed by the school authorities as to how they will be served in the cafeteria or where they shall sit after being served; nor can the school authorities prevent or prohibit the "intellectual comingling of the students" (339 U. S. 641, 70 S. Ct. 854).

That is the real underlying purpose of the political opinion rendered by the Supreme Court in *Brown* v. *Board of Education, supra,* and that is the real objective of the psychologists whose opinions the present Supreme Court regards more highly than the ablest and soundest opinions of its great predecessors.

Is this such a change from the situation that existed when the bonds were voted as renders the expenditure of the proceeds thereof for nonsegregated school building invalid?

From an examination of the law which has heretofore been cited the Court is of the opinion that the change wrought by the Supreme Court since July 14, 1953, makes any expenditure from the proceeds of the bond issue for nonsegregated schools illegal.

An injunction will therefore be issued restraining the school board from issuing said bonds or using them for any school purpose.

If the people are interested in building nonsegregated schools another election may be readily held to determine this issue.

LEON M. BAZILE,
Judge.

MAY 13, 1955.

Applicability of Davis-Bacon Prevailing-Wage Provision to H. R. 4260, Federal Highway Construction Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement expressing the position of the building and construction trades department, American Federation of Labor, local building and construction trades unions, and the 3 million organized building and construction tradesmen of America on the subject of the Federal highway construction bill which is presently pending before the House Public Works Committee:

BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION
TRADES DEPARTMENT,
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., June 8, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Congressman MACHROWICZ, Democrat, of Michigan, will in the next few days sponsor an amendment to H. R. 4260 to include a prevailing-wage provision in the bill.

I would like to take this opportunity to express the position of the building and construction trades department, the affiliated 19 international unions, local building and construction trades unions and the 3 million organized building and construction tradesmen of America on the above subject matter.

Agitation for a prevailing wage law on Federal construction came to the fore in the middle twenties. The construction industry was riven with industrial warfare caused by foreign contractors who attempted to import predatory labor practices into a locality which, if permitted, would have resulted in the destruction of the prevailing-wage customs and practices in the locality. Typical of the incidents related to demonstrate the urgent need for remedial legisla-

tion to protect local contractors, construction craftsmen, and the local communities where the work was to be performed; and to eliminate the source of disputes was that described by Republican Congressman Bacon, of New York, one of the sponsors of the Davis-Bacon Act in 1927:

"I want to cite the specific instance that brought this whole matter to my attention. The Government is engaging in building in my district a Veterans' Bureau hospital. Bids were asked for, several New York contractors bid, and in their bids, of course, they had to take into consideration the high labor standards prevailing in the State of New York. I think I can say that the labor standards in New York are very high. The wages were fair, and there has been no difficulty in the building trades between the employee and employer in New York for some time. And the situation existed therefore and the New York contractors made their bids, having the labor conditions in mind. The bid, however, was let to a firm from the South and some thousand nonunion laborers were brought to New York in my own congressional district. They were hired onto this job, they were housed, and they were paid a very low wage, and the work proceeded. Of course, that meant that labor conditions in this part of New York State where this hospital was being built were entirely upset. It meant that the neighboring community was very much upset."

The Davis-Bacon Act was passed nearly a quarter of a century ago, in 1931 during the Hoover administration. It was sponsored by two Republicans. The legislative history shows that virtually all segments of our society banded together to demand that unscrupulous contractors be prevented from importing foreign wage practices into a community on Government construction. The contractors demanded that they be protected from unfair competition by contractors who were securing Government contracts solely because they based their bids on wage levels lower than those which actually prevailed in the locality for that type of work. Local craftsmen protested because their wage standards and conditions were broken down and they were denied work by these contractors who recruited labor from distant cheap labor areas. The local communities requested assistance because of the loss of work and purchasing power to its citizens. Fair-minded public citizens demanded that the source of the disputes that had ignited industrial warfare throughout the country be eradicated, and that the Federal Government should set the standards to which the entire industry would repose.

The Davis-Bacon law was designed specifically to eliminate these conditions. As originally enacted, the law required the payment of prevailing wages to laborers and mechanics engaged in the construction, repair, and alteration of public buildings. The act was amended in 1935 to—

1. Extend the coverage of the act by making it directly applicable to public works as well as public buildings.

2. Require the Secretary of Labor to predetermine "* * * the minimum wages to be paid various classes of laborers and mechanics which shall be based upon the wages * * * prevailing for the corresponding classes of laborers and mechanics employed on projects of a character similar to the contract work in the city, town, village, or other civil subdivision of the State * * * in which the work is to be performed."

This change was designed to make clear that Congress intended the prevailing rate of pay to be determined by comparison with similar-type construction in the locality, and to eliminate a host of devices (e. g., evading responsibility by hiring laborers and/or mechanics as independent contractors, paying journeymen mechanics apprentice rates) which resulted in the circumvention of the legislative intent.

The act applies directly to all Federal buildings and public works such as all construction by the Department of Defense, but does not automatically cover the myriad of various programs devised during the past 20 years by the Federal Government for pumping its resources into State and local construction; e. g., programs such as grants-in-aid for schools, hospitals, local airports, slum clearance, public housing, etc., or insured multifamily rental housing under the FHA, which were not even thought of at the time the Davis-Bacon law was enacted.

However, the Congress of the United States has long recognized the need of prevailing-wage legislation on Federal grant-in-aid construction programs and insured or guaranteed programs; and ample precedent for the inserting of prevailing-wage provisions in the Federal highway-aid program can be drawn from the following acts which contain express provisions making the Davis-Bacon Act applicable to these programs:

1. The Federal Airport Act.
2. School Survey and Construction Act of 1950.
3. Hospital Survey and Construction Act.
4. The slum-clearance and urban-renewal program in the Housing Act of 1954.
5. National Housing Act.
6. Multifamily rental housing under the FHA.
7. Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951.
8. Lease Purchase Contracts Act of 1954.

The Davis-Bacon Act was founded upon the sound principle of public policy that the Federal Government would not be a party to the destruction of the prevailing-wage customs and practices in a locality. As the various grant-in-aid and guaranteed programs developed, the Davis-Bacon Act was made applicable so that public money would not be spent in a manner that depressed the prevailing local wage structure. The act is based upon these decent, vital humanitarian principles. It was extended to these grant-in-aid and insured programs because it fulfilled the purposes for which it was created. In practice, it has proved of immeasurable value to our society.

It has served as a stonewall to exclude foreign wage practices from a locality, and has eliminated the prime cause of industrial warfare on these projects. It has insured the prosecution of the contract work to completion without interruption. It has contributed to the preservation of harmonious relationships between contractors and craftsmen, and has encouraged collective bargaining.

Local contractors are protected, for no longer do they have to compete in fear that some unscrupulous contractor will obtain a contract solely because his bid is based upon wage rates lower than those which actually prevail in a locality on similar projects. The prevailing wage standards of the men who construct these projects has been stabilized. Contractors have been compelled to compete on the basis of efficiency rather than human lives. The community's wage pattern has been stabilized, and its craftsmen are guaranteed work because the reason for importing labor from a lower wage area has been eliminated. It has enabled contractors to receive an adequate supply of skilled, experienced, and competent construction craftsmen at the wage rate contained in the contract specifications.

Thus, the Davis-Bacon Act is a time-tested and proven law based upon a sound, fundamental concept of the role of government in Federal programs. It has been in existence for over a quarter of a century, and is accepted by all elements in our society.

If the prevailing wage concept is sound for direct Federal construction programs and for the Federal grant-in-aid, and insured-construction programs enumerated above, it is just as sound for a grant-in-aid program for highway construction.

The need of fair contractors and construction workers alike is no less—in fact, is even greater on a program of this magnitude—today for a provision that would prevent unscrupulous contractors from coming into a locality and obtaining jobs by breaking down the established wage rates. The Government's purchasing power should not be employed to depress the wage standards in a locality. The Government should not be a party to a highway robbery of those construction craftsmen who will build our interstate system under the greatest of all Federal construction programs.

Already, the advent of accelerated highway construction and intensified competition has spawned the specter of the same inhuman conditions that compelled Congress 24 years ago to declare that the Government would not utilize its purchasing power to break down local wage conditions. Into Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Maine, Connecticut, New Jersey, New Mexico, and other States have come certain foreign predatory contractors who obtained large road contracts solely because they bid under the prevailing wage rates in the locality. Local contractors have been discriminated against because they cannot cope with this unfair competition. Local craftsmen have been denied work because the contractors have imported their entire work force from low-wage States to man the job. Industrial warfare has been rampant as local craftsmen have reverted to economic action to meet the threat. To cite but two of the recent 1955 examples:

1. On a Federal-aid highway project in western Pennsylvania a contractor imported his entire work force from North Carolina. The Pennsylvania craftsmen picketed the employer to compel him to hire Pennsylvania citizens. The job was shut down. In this particular area, thousands of craftsmen were unemployed at the time. The employer instituted injunction proceedings. The craftsmen urged in defense that a Pennsylvania law required that its citizens receive preference. An injunction was issued. The court stated:

"The Federal Government has a right to insist that the contractor does not discriminate against workmen who are not residents of Pennsylvania * * *. If the (contractor) should deliberately so discriminate, the result might well be that the Government would refuse to pay its part of the matching funds."

2. In New Hampshire on another road job a North Carolina contractor imported 500 men to man the job. They pitched their tents on the side of the road, and were accompanied by the usual devices such as armed guards. After much strife, he was compelled finally to return these men to North Carolina. It is readily apparent that contractors and construction workers alike are no less dependent today than they were in the past on congressional aid in protecting established standards. Unless we are to revert to the jungle state of industrial relations, the David-Bacon Act should be applied to the highway program.

The following is a summary of the objections which have been advanced to the inclusion of the prevailing wage provision:

1. It would increase the costs of the program.

2. Predetermining wages would cause delay, bookwork, and redtape.

3. States would lose control of the program. The workers will be protected because half of the States have minimum-wage laws.

4. The Congress will be considering minimum-wage amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act (wage-hour law) soon. Action should be postponed until that time.

5. The present procedure of the Department of Commerce prevents the exploitation of labor.

With the exception of the final reason, these arguments are not new, nor are they of special applicability to the highway program, but are the same old meat (covered with new garnishings of parsley) that was served and rejected by Congress when the Davis-Bacon Act was extended to these other programs.

1. IT WOULD INCREASE THE COST OF THE PROGRAM

The most vigorous objection is that to pay the prevailing wage would result in less highways being built. One could argue with stronger force that more roads could be built if Chinese coolies were imported to work on this program at 25 cents a day, or if land were condemned at less than a fair value. This argument would apply with equal force to all Federal construction programs. This approach fails to consider the other factors mentioned previously, and seems to be based upon the "iron law of wages" concept. Breaking down the standing of living of construction craftsmen promotes neither the well-being of a locality nor of the Nation.

2. PREDETERMINING WAGES WOULD CAUSE DELAY, BOOKWORK, AND REDTAPE

The mechanism for predetermining wage rates exists in the Department of Labor. Wage rates are predetermined for inclusion in the specifications. An analysis of the testimony of the Solicitor of Labor on the requested budget for fiscal year 1956 will show the celerity at which wage rates are determined. The other programs are not delayed. This program would prove no different.

3. STATE WOULD LOSE CONTROL

This is a Federal program. The proposed amendment would apply the Davis-Bacon to the Federal interstate system which would be constructed almost entirely with Federal funds. The Davis-Bacon Act applies presently to highway construction where the Federal Government absorbs the entire cost. Does 10 or 20 percent less change the principle? The Federal contribution is much less percentagewise on the other Government grant-aid programs, covered by the Davis-Bacon Act, for, in the aggregate, the Government contributes only 50 percent of the costs of these programs. Further, on the insured or guaranteed programs to which the Davis-Bacon Act applies, the Government does not contribute any funds toward the actual cost of the project.

The construction industry itself is a local industry, with craftsmen and contractors scattered throughout the land. This provision would protect local communities, the craftsmen, and the contractors, because it provides for the payment of wages actually prevailing in the city, village, town, or other civil subdivision of the State where the work is to be performed.

Vital to a proper perspective of the act is the understanding that it provides for the payment of not less than the prevailing wage as distinguished from a minimum wage. State minimum-wage laws are virtually useless and many of the State "little Davis-Bacon Acts" do not apply to highway construction.

4. THE CONGRESS WILL BE CONSIDERING

Construction workers are not covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act (wages and hour law) nor by any other Federal minimum-wage law.

5. THE PRESENT PROCEDURE

Under the present Federal Aid Highway Act, the Secretary of Commerce, through regulation, directs that the specifications of each contract shall contain a minimum wage as determined by the State highway department for unskilled, intermediate, and skilled workers. These regulations do not prevent the exploitation of labor, but actually promote it.

There are two essential differences between the regulations of the Secretary of Commerce and the Davis-Bacon Act:

First, the Davis-Bacon Act provides for the determination of a prevailing wage by the Secretary of Labor through comparison with projects of a character similar to the contract work in the locality where the work is to be performed. Under the present Highway Aid Act the regulations of the Secretary of Commerce provide that all contracts must contain a provision which sets forth the minimum wage as determined by the highway departments of the various States.

Generally, minimum rates determined by the State highway officials are totally unrealistic and on the level of 50 cents an hour for unskilled labor, 70 cents an hour for intermediate and $1.10 an hour for skilled workers. The regulations do not set forth any standards by which this minimum rate can be determined, and the highway officials are free to determine any figure whatsoever.

State highway departments make determinations with little regard to the actual wage conditions in their States. It is a universally recognized fact that contractors in the States pay considerably higher wages than those determined, and in many instances, the determined skilled rate is appreciably less than the actual rate paid to unskilled workers. The wage determination cited above represents the general, rather than the exceptional, wage determinations made by State highway departments. Further, some State highway departments have been determining the same rates without revision for periods up to 10 years.

These determinations are virtually worthless, for they have no contact with wage rate reality in the construction industry, and in no way prevent any of the unsavory conditions which the Davis-Bacon Act was designed to prevent.

Second, the Davis-Bacon Act provides that prevailing wage rates should be determined for the various classifications of laborers and mechanics to be employed. Under the regulations of the Secretary of Commerce, only three minimum-wage rates are determined; one each for skilled, intermediate and unskilled.

It is utterly unrealistic to make group-wage determinations designating construction workers as unskilled, intermediate, and skilled workers; for rarely, if ever, is a construction worker referred to in the industry as such. To do so creates confusion, e. g., it would be impossible to fill a contractor's requisition for an intermediate worker inasmuch as this term could apply to any number of different construction workers, such as a dozer, scraper, or air-compressor operator, different types of laborers, or truck-drivers. Further, only 3 wage rates are determined as compared to as many as 60 under wage determinations made by the Secretary of Labor. There is no wage area where only three construction rates are recognized in the industry.

Let us assume, arguendo, that there are 40 different wage rates recognized in an area. Since the 3 rates determined would, in essence, represent the 40 different rates, the contractor has a great latitude with regard to classifying workers for payroll purposes. No such latitude is permitted under determinations made by the Secretary of Labor. In short, in group determinations, there is no recognition of existing wage differentials as between crafts or within crafts. The great latitude that a contractor has under group determinations, in classifying workers for payroll purposes is a tool to assist any unscrupulous contractor in the exploitation of labor, rather than its prevention.

Group determinations fail to recognize area industry practices. Consider the definitions of unskilled, intermediate, and skilled workers as defined in "Policy and procedure memorandum No. 40–4," United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads, quoted below:

"Skilled: Skilled labor shall include the operators of complex, heavy power equipment, and skilled craftsmen of the journeyman grade.

"Intermediate grade: Intermediate-grade labor shall include—

"(a) Operators of power equipment except: Complex, heavy power equipment trucks of 1½ tons or less (manufacturer's rated capacity)

"Tractors of less than 20 horsepower (manufacturer's rated capacity)

"(b) Persons performing any other labor which requires considerable training and experience.

"Unskilled: Unskilled labor shall include—

"(a) Operators of trucks of 1½ tons or less (manufacturer's rated capacity)

"Operators of tractors of less than 20 horsepower (manufacturer's rated capacity)

"Operators of passenger cars.

"(b) Helpers to journeyman craftsmen and all other labor which requires no special skill or experience or the exercise of discretion and independent judgment."

From the very nature of the construction industry, it is evident that in all instances local conditions govern the industry and that construction customs and practices vary in each locality.

Contrary to the regulations, the intermediate grade truck driver, in some areas, is classified on the type of truck he operates, axle or wheel rating, rather than tonnage. Likewise, tractor operators are also rated on attachments, rather than horsepower, and an equipment operator need operate no complex, heavy power equipment in order to receive the skilled rate of pay. The definitions only compound the confusion. Consider the definition of an unskilled worker as a helper to journeyman craftsmen. It is not altogether clear as to what is meant. Helpers to journeyman craftsmen learning the trade, are usually designated as apprentices. Those not so classified are generally, and this is said advisedly, designated as various types of laborers. No provisions are made for the recognition of apprentices in "policy and procedure memorandum No. 40–4," although the United States Government spends $3 million, more or less, a year on apprenticeship training.

These group determinations fly in the face of the prevailing customs and practices of the construction industry, and serve only to stimulate disputes and break down the actual wage rates in a locality.

The proposed amendment would also require the payment of not less than time and one-half over 8 hours in 1 day. This is merely extending the provisions of the 8-hour law, first passed by the Congress in 1892, which presently applies to virtually all Federal programs. The requirement of not less than time and one-half after 40 hours in 1 week is merely applying to the construction of interstate highways what the Congress enacted for certain interstate industries when it passed the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938. The recent administration has recently introduced companion bills which would amend the 8-hour law to include time and one-half after 40 hours in a week and would be applicable to such aided programs as the grant-in-aid highway bill.

In the interest of all laborers and mechanics, fair contractors, and local communities, and the Nation as a whole, it is respectfully urged that whatever bill is adopted by the Congress to aid in the construction of highways, should contain a prevailing wage provision.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD J. GRAY,
President.

We Have Chosen Our Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "We Have Chosen Our Side," appearing in the November 1954 edition of the Albanian-American, published monthly in Boston under the statement, "This newspaper organ of the Albanian-American Literary Society supports the United States foreign policy in its fight against international communism."

The article was written by Mr. Theodore M. Robis, national president of the society and editor of the publication.

WE HAVE CHOSEN OUR SIDE

The 20th century and our generation are destined to witness and partake in a titanic struggle between two ways of life. The outcome of this conflict will decide whether or not humanity shall go forward to a brighter, richer, and more enlightened future that had its beginnings in the Greco-Roman and Christian concepts, or whether it shall retrograde into the darkness of the totalitarian and tyrannical concepts and beliefs.

Freedom, our heritage, the dignity of the individual, the sacredness of his soul, and western civilization, itself, are all on trial for their lives. This trial is very close to our hearts for it reminds us of the suffering and degradation of the people of our native land, Albania, and we don't want to see that suffering and degradation in America. For this reason, the Albanian-American Literary Society has openly fought for the liberation of Albania with the boundaries of 1939, which were recognized and ratified at international treaties; and have agreed to cooperate with any group that has the backing of the United States Government in its fight against the communistic menace both here and abroad.

Albanian-Americans like many other minority groups who have lived and prospered under the great American Constitution and Bill of Rights stand behind the United States Government's solemn and magnificent declaration repeatedly made by the President and other high officials that this country will not tolerate nor become part of the enslavement of any people anywhere in the world. This kind of a stand is not new to Albanian-Americans. Over 40 years ago, Albanian-Americans left their homes in America to fight for Albania's liberation from the Ottomans, 3,000 miles away; and they contributed much toward the achievement of Albania's independence of 1912, which we are so proudly and reverently celebrating this 28th of November.

We salute all of those who made the supreme sacrifice that Albania may be free. On this solemn occasion we urge, and invite all Albanian-Americans in the United States to join with us and help us convey to the suffering Albanians in Albania the fact that the Albanians in America are united and are fighting together for their liberation. Regardless of our individual faiths and churches, like good American citizens, let us work together for the salvation of Albania and our suffering brothers and sisters. Let us assure them that we have not forgotten them.

Believing in the self-determination of each person, we are not espousing the cause of any person or party; but rather are dedicating our efforts for the deliverance of our country of origin from the terrible bondage of communism; and when that day arrives, let the Albanian people decide for themselves the kind of government they want.

In closing let me leave you all with the following quotation of Mr. Malcolm Muggeridge, the editor of Punch, which so brillianty expresses the central question of the crisis of the 20th century.

"In one of the most terrible conflicts of human history, I have chosen my side, as all will have to choose sooner or later, and propose to stick by the side I have chosen through thick and thin, hoping to have sufficient courage not to lose heart, sufficient sense not to allow myself to be confused—and sufficient faith in the civilization to which I belong, and the religion on which that civilization is based, to follow Bunyan's advice and endure the hazards and humiliations of the way because of the worth of the destination."

Richard Elmer Truchses, Superior Student

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, among the seniors who are graduating from the Carlisle High School today is Richard Elmer Truchses, who was elected by his class as the senior boy most likely to succeed and who has won a national award in the Thom McAn success awards.

This young man is to be congratulated. Throughout his high-school career he has been a superior student. He was chaplain, student director, and president of the band, and treasurer and vice president of the National Honor Society. He has been a member of the junior and senior band, the orchestra, the Boy Scouts—eagle rank with palms; president, town youth council—religious; president and treasurer, church youth organization; master councilor, DeMolay; and still he found time to carry a paper route, be a counterman and clerk in a store.

He also was active in many intramural athletics and is rated as an expert rifleman by the National Rifle Association.

Mr. Speaker, I include the essay which this splendid young man submitted to the national competition:

MY PLANS FOR THE FUTURE
(By Richard E. Truchses)

Today, more than ever before, we Americans must have strength of character to face the problems before us. In our practical world ideals must not be thrown to the winds. My conviction is that our problems can be solved only by turning to God for help. Because of this belief, I have made the most important decision of my life—to spend my life in the service of God and man.

Although during my youth I have been fascinated by many occupations, I have returned to the desire I first voiced at 4. My goal in life—using my talents for man through God, thereby strengthening democracy—can best be obtained by becoming a pastor.

The American Field Service, under whom I lived in Germany last summer, has enabled me to meet many people from other countries. My experiences abroad have tremendously enriched my life and my understanding of others. I now realize more than ever before how basically alike are all men, especially youth, their minds still open, trusting, and unprejudiced. Because of the military training laws of our country, youths in service have become one of our greatest concerns, as many of our future leaders will there begin their careers. These conditions have influenced me to enter the Armed Forces as a chaplain, for in that capacity I can work with tomorrow's citizens when they need help most.

The ministry is certainly not the easiest profession to choose. Yet I feel that its rewards are greater than that of any other. Monetary gain I do not expect, because I have learned that allegiance to the dollar does not bring happiness. Rather, I anticipate intangible returns on my life and talents. The success of those I have tried to help will be my reward.

Disposal of Agricultural Surpluses—Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Cotton Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture issued a report entitled "Disposal of Agricultural Surpluses—Cotton," which has caused great discussion in the Midsouth.

One of the outstanding cotton farmers and agricultural leaders in Arkansas, Mr. Lloyd Godley, of Osceola, Ark., has analyzed this report in the light of his experience and knowledge of the cotton business, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his analysis for the benefit of the Members.

Mr. Godley's analysis follows:

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF SENATE COTTON SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT, DATED APRIL 25, 1955, ENTITLED "DISPOSAL OF AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES—COTTON"

(Analysis by Lloyd Godley, Osceola, Ark.)

I would like to state in the beginning that there are certain economic data in this report with which I am not familiar. My analysis is based upon years of observation of the farm program, contrasted with the decade before we had a farm program, and my many years of participating in the benefits of the farm program, and my very definite knowledge of the cotton farmer's opinion of the program.

The report states: "The primary cause of the present deplorable condition in which the American cotton farmer finds himself is the farm program of the United States."

That statement is set out as a definite fact. To me, this question is very debatable. As a matter of fact, I feel that it is an erroneous statement that cannot be proven by the record or history, and it certainly has not been proven by this subcommittee's report. In the first place, the American cotton farmer is not in a deplorable condition, at least I am not and my neighbors are not.

It is true that there is a carryover of some 9 to 10 million bales of mostly very short

staple cotton, but if the Congress will reestablish 90 percent of parity support, and have the patience to leave our program on that basis and keep controls, we can within a few years work the carryover down to a point that will not be burdensome.

The flexible-support program in the act of 1954 was an error in the viewpoint of 95 percent of us who grow cotton, and it will not do the things claimed by its sponsors.

Let us examine the facts regarding our farm program and see if it has caused the so-called deplorable condition in the cotton industry. When World War II started, we had on hand a surplus of cotton for which the world may be thankful. It vanished during the war. We had again accumulated some surplus at the outbreak of the Korean conflict. Farmers were called upon for increased cotton production. The price went up and up, and a ceiling was placed upon American cotton prices, and export quotas were set.

We were requested to produce 16 million bales of cotton each year during this conflict. No one knew when it would end or that it would not become a world war; therefore, we were caught with an acreage sufficient to produce 16 million bales when the Korean action came to an end.

The surplus now on hand was brought about by conditions—not by a faulty cotton program.

I am not familiar with what CCC has done or has not done to sell our cotton abroad, but I do know that if we should become engaged in war—even a small war—our so-called cotton surplus would be considered a blessing. Why do we appear so much concerned about a cotton surplus? Why not consider it in the light of what it is—strategic material as insurance for war.

The report states "the entire system, because it held American cotton prices above foreign prices and above American produced rayon, resulted in drastic shrinkage of the American cotton producers market both foreign and domestic."

There are indications that this statement may be in error. Evidently much of our foreign market has been lost due to the fact that foreign countries are short on dollars. Who can say with assurance that the market loss to rayon and other synthetics is due to price rather than to the fact that the synthetic may be best for a specific use—such as auto tires.

Should our cotton be selling at 20 cents per pound, a price that would break every cotton farmer in America, no one can be sure that cotton would take over any great amount of synthetic use. If the spinner had his cotton free, evidently cotton cloth would sell very little cheaper.

This report says in one paragraph, "but it (meaning the cotton program) has priced American cotton above value in international markets." In the next paragraph the report states: "The 90-percent support price program of the United States has largely fixed the level of world cotton." The report further states: "Foreigners have placed their cotton prices just under ours in order to get this export business."

This first statement indicates that our support price is too high for the world market.

The second statement indicates that our support price has fixed the world market.

The third statement indicates that other countries place their prices just under ours—which might be the case if we should materially lower our supports or if we had no supports at all.

If a deplorable situation exists in the cotton business, our support price and control program do not appear to be a factor.

Foreign expansion has been brought about in a large measure through the expenditure of private American capital furnished by certain factors in the cotton trade, through the furnishing of technical assistance by our Government, by the use of American equipment and by planting American seed. When the American farmer has all that against him, let us not accuse him of pricing himself out of the market.

The report states: "Our Government policy has been to force the United States cotton farmer to reduce his cotton acreage in this country to bring world supply into balance with effective world demand."

Our Government has never forced us to reduce our acreage to world demand. We have always voted to reduce to demand, because we honestly believe that this is the only logical way to keep supply in line with demand, to bring about general farm diversification, and to keep a price that will pay for production and leave a reasonable profit.

In my conversation with many cotton farmers, I have come to the conclusion that cotton farmers would vote a 5- or a 10-year control program if the proposition should be put to them and they could be assured of a price in line with their cost of operation, which is the parity concept.

The subcommittee's statement regarding the relationship between 90-percent supports and banker lending is a very fine argument for keeping 90-percent supports. It is true that bankers and other lenders cannot make safe or sound loans on cotton where there is no support price. Such lending in the twenties, when we had no farm program, broke many lenders. No bank can safely make a loan on a commodity that has its price based upon a violently speculative market such as the cotton market.

It is absolutely true that American agriculture could not have expanded to its present proportions without support prices, nor can it maintain its present position without supports.

Bankers have always been able to finance public service utilities and industry for expansion because utilities have their prices set by Government and industry is in position to control its own prices. Our support price system is the only device that has ever given agriculture any semblance of the same economic protection that industry has enjoyed.

You who have always been our friends, please do not let our only hope of continued economic equality be taken from us.

The subcommittee report, page 7, states: "When it was announced that the American price would be lowered next August, the Egyptians lowered their price below the reduced American support price and will, therefore, continue to sell our mills their cotton and additional bales of our long staple cotton will again move into storage." In the next paragraph the following statement occurs: "This is a specific example of what has been going on in the cotton trade because of our 90-percent umbrella for the rest of the world."

The first paragraph indicates that certain foreign countries may undersell us regardless of a lowered price and the next paragraph gives 90-percent-support price as a specific example of our trouble. It is difficult to reconcile the two statements.

The balance of the second paragraph, page 7, refers to the faulty method being followed by CCC in disposing of commodity-owned stocks and suggests a remedy. No doubt the cotton producer would benefit by the method suggested regarding the sale of cotton by CCC.

In reviewing the subcommittee's figures on cotton consumption in 1938 as compared with 1952, we note that consumption in the United States has risen from 21.4 pounds per capita to 31.3, or 26 percent; and we also note that the population has increased only 23 percent since 1936. This healthy increase in cotton consumption does not indicate that our so-called high-support price nor synthetics has stopped the progress of American cotton.

The subcommittee's showing that 83 percent of the world population show a decline in per capita consumption of cotton for the years 1949 and 1952 as compared with 1938, is significant but it certainly reflects in no way against our support program at 90 percent, or our acreage-control program because the rest of the world cotton had no control or support price.

This subcommittee report leaves unanswered a number of important questions. How can the American cotton farmer run the rest of the world out of the cotton business? Many parts of the world have the land, the climate and much cheaper labor together with the know-how that has been given to them by America. Should we go into a price war, they will most certainly win because they hold the ace card—plentiful and cheap labor. A price war will destroy the American cotton farmer.

How can the American cotton farmer produce at lower prices when his cost of operation is constantly on the increase? Higher equipment cost—higher interest rates—an indication of high labor cost, and now comes social security.

What does the subcommittee consider to be a realistic price or a competitive price? Just what support price would be adequate to preserve the farmers' economy and prevent the weakening of our credit structure?

We farmers consider the present support price adequate, but we feel that any lowering of the support price will greatly handicap the cotton farmer and in the end, will injure the economy of the Nation.

We consider acreage control a sound method, and that in addition to controlling cotton to the demand, it induces a sound diversified type of agriculture.

In conversation with many cotton farmers, I have concluded that the majority would prefer a permanent control program with 90 percent supports; acreage to be allotted each year based upon the recommendation of the USDA as to quantity of domestic and export cotton needed.

Research should be intensified in the processing of cotton to assure that it will outdo synthetics in American preference. A breeding program should be such that nothing be left undone that would improve our cotton as to customer demand. We should have a foreign marketing service dedicated to the idea of operating for the benefit of the American cotton farmer.

A comparison of the economic position of the American cotton farmer today with his tragic condition before we had a program, should convince us that we should not disrupt our present program until we know that we have a substitute that is better.

Any change in the farm program should be devised by farmers and the Congress, rather than by the cotton trade and the Congress.

The intent of this summary is constructive criticism. Most certainly I would never question the motive or the good intention of any Senator who participated in the preparation of this cotton subcommittee report.

My motive is to give the farmer's viewpoint as I see it.

On the Detroit Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include

herewith a brief editorial from the Oregon Statesman, of Salem, Oreg:

News from the Detroit front seems to indicate that labor is doing rather well under the Taft-Hartley "slave-labor law."

Robbie Burlage: Success Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, as you know, each year the Thom McAn shoestores and Scholastic Roto, high-school newspaper supplement, jointly sponsor the Thom McAn success awards for high school senior boys. In addition to encouraging and assist in higher education, the purpose of the awards is to emphasize the qualities of true success and good citizenship. Winners in participating high schools are elected by senior classes as "the most likely to succeed," based on academic standing, extra-curricular activity, leadership, and student respect. Then the local winner submits a paper on My Plans for the Future, with their scholastic records for judgment for national awards.

I am most happy to announce that one of the young men from my district, Robbie Burlage, son of Dr. and Mrs. H. M. Burlage, Austin, Tex., was selected 1 of the 12 winners from throughout the United States and the only winner from Texas for this outstanding award for 1955. The excellent paper which Robbie wrote in the national competition follows:

MY PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

I now face the future with stars in my eyes, a high-school diploma almost in my grasp, and one of the biggest decisions of my life on my mind.

With so many different interests, so much conflicting advice, and the complexity of modern times, it is quite difficult to make the choice of one's lifework.

In my case I have progressed from the cowboy, policeman, fireman aspiration stage to the crossroads of today with many choices discarded for lack of lasting interest. However, I now feel very strongly that my chosen career must certainly be in some phase of journalism.

I like people and ideas. Writing and talking are my favorite pastimes. I feel at home at a typewriter or at a speaker's stand. I like to tackle problems, and I like to organize things. Ignorance and injustice are my biggest enemies, and I feel very strongly about civil rights and raising the position of the common man.

These comments sound strangely like the rantings of a budding politician, but I actually feel that the problems of our world can be better solved through education than legislation.

In this direction I want to pursue the career of public relations, influencing public opinion. I would also like to teach in a college or university as well as write some articles and maybe a book or two if I get the chance. I would eagerly snatch an opportunity for Government service if it came along, also.

I plan to prepare for my career with at least 5 years of college work, aiming for my master's degree in journalism or liberal arts. I also plan to serve a hitch with Uncle Sam in the Armed Forces sometime between now and when I embark on my career.

Briefly, these are my future plans. However, I realize that fate, fortune, and the future have much more control over me than I have over them. Meanwhile, I will hope, pray, study, and sweat to meet these goals.

Questions Tito's Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, 1955, a very significant letter written by a citizen of Cleveland was printed in the letters to the editor section of the Cleveland Press. Mr. Allan P. Steiger, in his letter, raises the basic question concerning the United States-Red Tito relations during the past several years. He wants to know how the Russians maintain their lines of communication and supply with Albania—where the three Red divisions are commanded by Russian officers—without having Tito's permission. It would be well for the administration to find the answer to the questions he raises before doing any more business with the Russian stooge Tito. Because this letter reflects the views of a thoughtful American who has kept in touch with developments in Yugoslavia since the war, under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD:

QUESTIONS TITO'S FRIENDSHIP

This week's issue of U. S. News & World Report carries an interesting discussion of why the United States and the allied western nations are worried about Tito. The assumption is that Tito's Yugoslavia has been on our side all along and might now possibly defect to the Russian satellite coalition.

Question: If Yugoslavia has been on our side—or at any rate, has been truly independent of the Soviet sphere of influence—thees past few years, how have the Soviets managed to maintain such a tight control of Albania all this time?

According to reports, Albania has three divisions staffed by Russian officers and her government is in control of Soviet citizens. Logically, then, the Red lines of communications must run across Yugoslavia. Without Tito's permission? Or have the Russians been airlifting supplies across northern Greece? Seems unlikely.

Not being schooled in foreign diplomacy, I am at a loss to figure out such a logistics problem for myself.

In recent years an American plane was shot down over Yugoslavia for an alleged border violation. Isn't it reasonable to assume then, that if Tito is a true ally of ours, a Soviet plane en route to Albania would be even more unwelcome over Yugoslav territory?

Frankly, it looks as though more than one neat trick is being played in that little corner of Europe and the American people might be interested in learning how it's done.

ALLAN P. STEIGER.

American Motion-Picture Industry Promotes International Goodwill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the motion-picture industry of the United States has been and is doing much to further international goodwill and understanding between the United States and the other nations of the world.

Not only have motion pictures carried the message of our American way of life to every corner of the globe, but the motion-picture companies have sent units to all parts of the world in their film-making efforts.

The men and women who have traveled to far lands have acted as individual goodwill representatives of the United States, and have, in their relationships with peoples of other nationalities and backgrounds, impressed upon them the effectiveness of American methods and the ability of the American people to work in harmony with the people of other nations to accomplish a united purpose.

Foremost among those who have paved the way for the path of good international relations is the motion-picture director, Mark Robson. Mr. Robson 3 years ago took a company of American film workers into the remote areas of Samoa to make the motion picture Return to Paradise. He instructed his coworkers to enter into the civic life of the capitol city. Spending 4 months with the Samoans, Robson and his company were model emissaries for this country—so much so that they were given a ceremonial farewell feast by the natives of six villages.

Last year, Robson extended his operations to Japan, where he filmed much of the motion picture The Bridges at Toko-Ri. To the Japanese, he brought a true view of the Americans at work. He integrated his production crews with those of Tokyo studios, and Americans worked alongside Japanese in perfect harmony. He exchanged professional views in public meetings with the Japanese film creators, and made a number of personal appearances in Tokyo theaters to praise the efficiency of the Nipponese studio workers. Robson's visit resulted in an added respect for American methods and conduct.

Later in the year, the director completed a motion picture that was made in England and Germany. In the latter country, where our public relations often are in the critical stage, he performed in the best diplomatic tradition by utilizing West Germany's motion picture facilities to the fullest extent and always considering that nation's film experts on a par with our own.

In another case, producer-director, John Huston, endeared himself recently to the natives of the Canary Islands by staging special public sports events for

the people while he was making the film Moby Dick in that part of the world. He created enormous goodwill also in the Azores, where he filmed another portion of his motion picture. In India last month, Mr. Huston provided the same effective international relations through his appearances at official functions and his superb press relations.

By the time the year ends, it is estimated that 40 feature motion pictures will have been made by American companies on foreign soil. If past experience is a criterion, the people who participate in these productions may be numbered among America's best missionaries of goodwill.

Public Statement in Behalf of the Hoover Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include an editorial from the May 27, 1955, issue of the Petaluma (Calif.) Argus-Courier entitled "War on Waste."

This editorial endorses functions of the Hoover Commission and likens them as "Waging a war primarily on waste in Government."

I feel it is an appropriate expression of public opinion, coming at a time when new recommendations of the Commission are being prepared. Upon completion, many of the recommendations will undoubtedly be submitted to the Congress in the form of Presidential reorganization plans.

I respectfully call the following editorial to your attention as an indication of the public's interest in the elimination of waste and duplication in Government functions:

WAR ON WASTE

The second Hoover Commission, like the first, is waging a war primarily on waste in the Government. The first Commission presented a series of proposals to Congress, and some 70 percent of them have already been adopted. These proposals are credited, potentially, with savings of $4 billion per year. The new proposals, when completed, according to a recent speech of the former President who is Chairman of the Commission, represent an aggregate of $6 billion of savings. "And beyond that," he said, "there could be returned to the United States Treasury about $7 billion which could be provided otherwise."

When the first Commission finished its work there were loud cries from various officials in Washington, and complaints that the Commission was unrealistic. Yet 5 years later 70 percent of the recommendations had been adopted. Today, as the new reports are being made to Congress, there are similar cries and complaints. To date not a single new recommendation has been adopted. There has not even been a recommendation from the administration to Congress that it adopt any of the proposed reforms.

There is a difference between the work of the two Commissions. The first Commission was concerned mostly with mechanical reforms to eliminate waste and overlapping. The second Commission went on from that point to policy. And for this reason the work of the second Commission is more controversial. But the second Commission, by the 1953 act setting it up, was told to recommend methods and procedures for "eliminating unessential services, functions, and activities which are competing with private enterprise."

The Commission found many agencies in the Government competitive with private enterprise. Some of them were created in wars and emergencies for some special needed task. "But when the task was completed, each had aboard it an empire-seeking bureaucracy and a large pressure group which benefited from it. With these high inspirations, they developed an extraordinary longevity."

When the new proposals are completed it will then be up to Congress to adopt those that seem advisable. Whether or not some 70 percent of them will be adopted in the next 5 years remains to be seen. When the Commission presents its last report its job will be done. It will then be the task of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report to rally public opinion in support of the new recommendations.

David Marcus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 9, 1948, 7 years ago today, a fine American, David Marcus, died fighting for Israel. He had a distinguished World War II record behind him, and a promising law practice ahead. But he dropped everything to answer the call and on the eve of victory, a few hours before the truce, his life ended.

Mickey Marcus, as he was known, had led a good life. An American soldier, trained and commissioned at West Point, he served 6 years as a deputy commissioner of correction in New York City under Mayor LaGuardia, and became full commissioner in 1940. With the coming of World War II, he left this career to return to his earlier one and entered the Civil Affairs Division of the Army. He became head of this division in 1943. During the war he saw action on many fronts, serving in the Pacific theater and the Normandy landing. V–E Day found him a full colonel and at this time he left the Army to reopen a law practice.

Then came a summons from Palestine. The new nation sought an experienced soldier with advanced professional training who could command the loyalty of its then undisciplined and unorganized guerrilla fighters. It was Col. Mickey Marcus who organized these guerrillas, supervised their training, and created the blueprint for the fighting Army of Israel. He then returned to Brooklyn, N. Y. But not for long, for he was to be called to Palestine once more—there to end his life.

He was mourned by Americans of all creeds—those who knew him as a soldier, lawyer, city official, or simply as a neighbor. Today fighting continues in Israel and I am sure that those fighting still remember the good American who came to help his coreligionists in their struggle for peace and freedom. May his soul rest in peace.

Hold the Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Panama City Star and Herald of June 6, 1955:

HOLD THE LINE

Howard E. Munro, legislative representative of the powerful Canal Zone Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council, has appealed to the United States Congress for a thorough investigation on plans to abandon the Panama Railroad and replace it with a new trans-isthmian highway. Cheers for the Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council and Howard E. Munro.

For once we who live in Panama and know its problems are able to raise a voice of approval of the CLU–MTC stand. Not that we have not often secretly agreed with the Canal Zone labor organization's efforts in behalf of their local labor problems. As a matter of fact most of those problems affect Panama directly or indirectly. Nevertheless, it has ever seemed indelicate for Panama spokesmen to meddle in Canal Zone problems, whatever they may be.

But, in the Panama Railroad, Panama and all of its people have a special interest. The Panama Railroad was started long before the Panama Canal became a gleam in Teddy Roosevelt's eye. Its construction over a century ago brought the first real traffic to this isthmus. It was the first big employment project. It not only gave work to Panamanians but to vast numbers of foreigners called to complete the job.

On its completion it brought travelers from the eastern United States of America in a hurry to reach California's El Dorado and have a shot at the gold fields. It brought travelers from Europe and elsewhere seeking a shortcut to the west coast of Central and South America. It brought wealth and opportunity to an area which had lain forgotten from the days when the depradations of the buccaneers had killed all the trade between Panama and her neighbors of Central and South America, to say nothing of that with Mother Spain. All that trade was routed around through the Straits of Magellan. Panama as a trade route between the Old and New Worlds was dead.

The Panama Railroad was one of the great aids to construction of the Panama Canal which also brought new life to Panama, world trade, and tourist traffic. We cannot see that it could be replaced by a new Canal Zone highway, not even with the aid of the Boyd-Roosevelt Highway. Note the number of Panamanians traveling daily over the railroad. Also the many tourists. These people pay their way.

Assuming that it is a financial loss, careful reorganization of rates, passes, and schedules might reduce the loss. Furthermore it is an added defense measure. A lot more troops

can be transferred faster by train than by truck.

Imagine an area as large as the Isthmus of Panama without a railroad. True there are United Fruit Co. railroads but they carry bananas. There is occasionally an operative railroad in Chiriqui though we hear less and less about that.

Lastly, there is the employment problem. Some 90 United States rate men would be jobless, together with an estimated 200 local raters were the railroad closed down.

Panama simply would not be Panama without a Panama Railroad. It is a venerable institution. The United States is investing many millions around the world today to keep up morale and buck communism. The comparatively small figure in the red today seems a small price to pay for the good will the railroad means to Panama. With a little clever streamlining that might even be rectified and the balance would no longer be red.

Who Makes Our Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, for a brief, fleeting moment it appeared that there might be some unity in administration foreign-policy thinking. For a short period—perhaps 4 or 5 days—the American people were given the impression that President Eisenhower was firmly in control; that he had at long last grasped the reins; that he had finally stamped out the practice of members of his team issuing differing and conflicting statements, which served not only to confuse the American people but puzzled and befuddled our allies. Sometimes our allies were practically scared to death.

We all breathed a sigh of relief. We felt that we were finally to see that long-awaited great capacity for leadership exercised by the President.

Our relief was premature. We forgot that Vice President NIXON had another speaking engagement coming up. Mr. NIXON kept his date in Chicago, and we returned to our state of confusion.

Mr. Speaker, the confusion resulting from Mr. NIXON's words before the Rotarians in Chicago is well described in an editorial published on June 7 by the Carlisle Evening Sentinel, which I include as a part of my remarks:

CONFLICTING STATEMENTS

Either Vice President NIXON has made another in a long list of serious errors, or the administration has been telling the public one thing while secretly holding an entirely different view.

While speaking in Chicago last Thursday night Mr. NIXON, in discussing the big four summit conference now under consideration, attached enormous importance to the talks, and, as he has done before, in two sentences completely upset the Big Four applecart when he told his audience of Rotarians in convention that the Big Four conference "could be the world's last chance to settle differences peacefully and avoid a catastrophic war," and that the big question which the conference may answer is whether the danger of nuclear war is to hang over the world for generations.

Mr. NIXON's statements were directly contrary to what was said before the people in a very recent discussion of world affairs between President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles. In that discussion the President and Secretary stressed, as they had previously, that nobody should expect any miracle solutions from the top-level conference, and, that should the conference fail to bring any concrete results, failure would not be of great moment or call for drastic action.

Somebody has their lines mixed but, except for a State Department official's refusal to comment and refusal to support Mr. NIXON's statements, all has been hush-hush, somewhat like the situation during the Republican campaign of 1952 when Mr. NIXON denounced and attempted to defame not only the Democratic Party and its candidates but former President Harry Truman as well. During the campaign Mr. NIXON talked as he wished, but without the open sanction of the GOP National Committee or the Eisenhower clique. After the campaign and just lately, of course, the Vice President has been receiving loud ovations from the GOP for his clean maneuvers and hailed as a goodwill ambassador for his trips to the Far East and South America, neither of which amounted to anything more than vacations for Mr. and Mrs. NIXON at the expense of the taxpayers.

The Vice President, it is our opinion, has been and will always be a problem child to the Republican Party, and the administration. He often goes off on a tangent without, it is evident, approval from above. However, so long as he "brings home the bacon," no matter what the method he used to obtain it, he will be praised and protected. But his discussion of what he believes the immensity of the proposed Big Four Conference may bring trouble. He took it upon himself to warn Russia and Britain and France that either the conference must be a success with immediate constructive results, or there will be war, nuclear war. Unless this is the secret line of the administration, it behooves the President or Secretary Dulles to refute Mr. NIXON's Chicago statements at once, lest the other nations involved, especially Russia, take offense and refuse to confer and become open enemies of the United States.

The Postal Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, 1955, when the postal pay raise bill was before the House, I am recorded as "not voting" on rollcall No. 79. I have always been in favor of a well-deserved and fair salary increase for the postal worker and have supported the administration's recommendations on this legislation. If I had been present, I would have voted in favor of this bill and "aye" on rollcall No. 79 and would like to have the RECORD show my support of it.

The Struggle for Peace—World Academy for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the eighth of a remarkable series of articles on "The Struggle for Peace," all of them originated in and copyrighted by the Pulitzer Publishing Co. in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE—WORLD ACADEMY FOR PEACE URGED BY JEWISH LEADER WHO PROPOSES ALSO A 10-YEAR WAR MORATORIUM

(By Israel Goldstein, president, American Jewish Congress)

NEW YORK, May 31.—It is both sobering and distressing that a mere decade after the end of World War II the threat of a third world war looms large. Never before has there been so brief an interval between the end of one major conflict and the apprehension of the imminence of the next one. Never before has mankind been so fearful of its future, alarmed that its survival hangs on a slender thread. A sense of doom, reminiscent of the fatalism of the ancient Greek tragedies, seems to be gathering as a pall over the horizon of the future.

The only hopeful aspect of the situation is that people are not lulling themselves with anodynes into a false sense of security, are not unaware of the danger that local minor conflicts may readily spread into major global wars, and are not sanguine about the possibility of fighting wars without resorting sooner or later to the use of the most destructive atomic weapons available.

In a situation fraught with such precarious developments, the portals of discussion should be thrown open to broad segments of public opinion. It is a subject in which amateurs should not be dismayed by the professionals in the field of international relations, for where so-called experts have been stumped, laymen should not fear to tread. World peace is so desperately urgent and its prospects are so alarmingly uncertain that suggestions should be welcomed from whatever source they may derive. Even an amateur may hit on a worthwhile idea.

THE VIEW FROM BOTH SIDES

It will not help this situation to discourse on the ravages of atomic warfare or to belabor one or the other side in the present-day conflict of interests. Whoever wants to be helpful with suggestions must try to see the situation as it is viewed by both sides.

It would be helpful to put the diagnostic finger on the main source of the international tension. This is the profound fear and mistrust of each side by the other. Whether or not the fears and mistrusts are well founded is not the question. It is enough that they are sincerely held. On either side, they are probably justified in measure by events of the recent or not so recent past. Americans have ample reason to mistrust the Communist orbit, after its record of recent years in attempting aggression in Korea and subversion wherever they could find an opening.

On the other hand, it is important that we should understand that the Communist world has had some reason to be suspicious and fearful of the free enterprise world, remembering the willingness of the Western

powers to give Hitler a free hand against Russia in 1938. At the present juncture the air has been filled for months with belligerent threats on the one side and ideological attacks plus military adventures on the other. Besides, there are unresolved problems which, as long as they remain fluid and unresolved, are sources of tension. The question of uniting divided Korea, divided Vietnam, and divided Germany, and the future of Formosa, are the troublesome geopolitical questions of the day, any one of which can become a springboard for menacing conflicts.

INTERIM SOLUTION

The ideal desideratum would be that the United States and Soviet Russia, the two principal contestants and the central nuclei in their respective orbits, should persuade each other that they have no designs upon each other or upon each other's allies. Since that ideal is hardly attainable under present circumstances, an artificial interim solution must be devised. It means little to say that the people want peace, unless a formula is found which translates the will of the people into a workable plan that would safeguard peace even if only for a limited period. The fact that the people want peace encourages the hope that governments may agree to a reasonable formula.

I would, therefore, propose an agreement to be joined in by the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, on the one side, and Soviet Russia and Communist China on the other, to freeze for the next 10 years the unresolved problems between the two blocs and to employ this decade of status quo for trying to find permanent peaceful solutions to the outstanding problems.

It should be part of the agreement that Communist China will be admitted to membership in the United Nations without divesting Nationalist China of its continued membership therein. Such an agreement should be supplemented by arrangements for active trade relations and exchanges of visits by scientists, artists, men of letters, and representatives from all walks of life. These visits would tend to reduce mutual suspicions and increase mutual understanding between people.

A 10-year guaranty of world peace would be a major gain in and for itself. If it could be accomplished, it would be important to secure as part of the agreement an undertaking by both sides to freeze also the further development and manufacture of atomic weapons, and to subject that part of the agreement to an effective system of international supervision and control.

Irrespective of any such arrangement, however, the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes would most certainly progress substantially, perhaps even startlingly, the peaceful constructive uses of atomic energy, raising the standards of living in countries where present standards are low, would itself be a stabilizing, pacifying factor. Such a decade of peace would reduce tensions, build up better relations, and make a second 10 years of peace the more likely. Achieving a warless world by installments may be the only realistic method.

SUBJECT FOR U. N.

In the meantime the subject of world peace should continue to be persistently on the agenda of the United Nations. The continued functioning of the United Nations organization, despite its limitations and shortcomings, is itself an asset in the struggle to achieve a warless world.

The Security Council should extend its agenda so as to include not only discussions and decisions on situations which threaten world peace but also discussions on ways and means of improving the prospects of world peace. Even if the discussions do not lead to unanimously acceptable proposals, they will not be without value in focusing the attention of world opinion on the positive aspects of the problem. If the Security Council should deem such discussions inadvisable, the Secretariat of the United Nations organization could be entrusted with the continuous responsibility of exploring additional possibilities of strengthening the prospects of world peace.

I have one proposal on the nonpolitical level, which does not depend upon governments, and therefore may be more readily implementable than the other proposals.

The moral and spiritual leaders of the world should be harnessed into a permanent collective effort to find a solution for the No. 1 problem of our time—how to abolish war. The goal is of such tremendous importance for humanity's present and future that, even if the chances of success are remote, the effort is worthwhile.

It should not be impossible to bring together into a permanent form of association and consultation, 20 or 25 of the world's preeminent moral and spiritual personalities who would carry authority not by virtue of any official positions but by virtue of their life records and achievements in religious and secular fields. They should be men and women of the caliber of Albert Schweitzer, Thomas Mann, Jacques Maritain, Martin Buber, Bertrand Russell, Bishop Oxnam, Eleanor Roosevelt, Rabbi Leo Baeck, Arnold Toynbee, Toyohika Kagawa, Helen Keller, Edmond Fleg, Nahum Goldmann, and Ralph Bunche (if he will not hold office in the U. N.). Alas, Albert Einstein is no longer alive. He would have been preeminently qualified.

These men and women should be politically independent, untrammeled, and unbound by commitments to governments. They should be personalities known as citizens of the world whose vision transcends national boundaries. The members of this group should be in communication with one another continuously. They should meet once a year for a period of 2 weeks in a neutral country such as Sweden, Switzerland, or India, in an atmosphere free from political pressures. The group should be small enough to permit of intimate exchanges of views both orally and in writing.

They would constitute a World Academy for Peace. Their findings, published once a year, would inevitably arouse wide repercussions, would stimulate thought and discussion on proposals for insuring the peace of the world, and would carry considerable moral weight with governments as well as people.

Who would choose the group? One or more of the aforementioned personalities, if approached, may be persuaded to take the initiative in inviting a number of his colleagues to join him. The founding group would then nominate additional members, up to the limited maximum of 20 or 25.

A council of this nature, however devoid of formalities, would nevertheless require a modicum of organization to bring it into being, set it in motion, keep it going, arrange its annual conferences and communicate its findings to the world. It would be a relatively simple organizational procedure, requiring a relatively modest organizational budget. It is not unreasonable to hope that one of the great philanthropic foundations interested in the cause of world peace, would make the necessary funds available.

ADVANTAGES OF NEW APPROACH

Millions of dollars have been expended by these foundations, with relatively little to show for the cost. The promotion of a world academy for peace would be a venture worth making. At best, suggestions of first-rate importance might emanate therefrom. At the very least, it would have the advantage of a new approach resulting in the stir of new interest on a worldwide scale, and of annual evaluations and proposals carrying the weight of moral authority and independent judgment. It could make a significant contribution toward improving the climate and the possibilities for an enduring world peace. Unlike the Nobel peace prize project, the academy for world peace would be a collective, continuous effort on the part of the leading minds and spirits of our time bent on saving man from himself.

Collective effort in the field of medical research has brought tremendous good to mankind in the healing and prevention of disease. Is it too much to hope that collective effort in the struggle against war may also be productive of good results? To men and women dedicated to the well-being of humanity, prizes are not necessary as inducements. They will give their utmost for the sheer love of humanity.

FAITH ESSENTIAL

Of fundamental importance is the rejection by all of us of the premise that war is inevitable. The first step toward abolishing war is the faith that war can be abolished. Faith, therefore, becomes the first essential. The great world religions are based upon faith in the improvability of the human species under God. Such faith is the indispensable dynamic of very enterprise which aims at the achievement of a warless world.

One day each year should be set aside as a day for prayer for world peace, every race and creed, and even those who have no formal creed, invoking their own respective fountainheads of inspiration and hope. Such an exercise would be helpful in sustaining the moral climate for peace. An appropriate day for this purpose would be September 2, the anniversary of the end of World War II. On that day, it would be appropriate to communicate the findings of the world academy for peace to a world eager for the new era, when nations shall not learn war any more.

The Struggle for Peace—Secrecy Is No Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the ninth of a series of St. Louis Post-Dispatch articles running under the general title of "The Struggle for Peace":

(By Ralph E. Lapp, nuclear physicist)

On June 15 the United States will be attacked by enemy bombers carrying nuclear weapons. Bombs will be dropped on St. Louis, Chicago, New York, Philadelphia, and many other American cities. The bomb detonated over St. Louis will have the power of 1 million tons of TNT—or 1 megaton in the grim shorthand of our present day.

The bombing will be part of Operation Alert. It is a nationwide civil-defense operation or paper drill designed to dramatize what a modern attack would do to the United States. Civil-defense planners are grappling with the problem created by the advent of the superbomb—an utterly revolutionary weapon created at Bikini on March 1, 1954. This bomb has added a new dimension to the problem of protecting America's populace. In fact, we may rightly say that it has added two dimensions to an already immense problem.

OLD DIMENSIONS: HEAT AND BLAST

Prior to the emergence of the superbomb or so-called H-bomb, civil defense had to contend with the A-bomb. By and large this meant dealing with blast and heat. Blast was nothing new. Millions of tons of TNT had been used in World War II. In the case of the A-bomb the blast was vastly greater than that from a single TNT bomb but it was a familiar and easy to understand phenomenon. Nor was heat new. Jelly bombs and incendiaries of the last war were a hideous reality. The A-bomb, again, was an immensly greater heat-bomb but searing flame was visible—an everyday hazard.

The A-bomb did give birth to the menace of radioactivity—an unseen and unfamiliar killer. However, except for very special circumstances the radioactive hazard did not rank with blast and heat as a killer.

The Federal Government was slow to recognize the necessity for civil defense against the threat of A-bombs. Like a man drugged with sleep our country could not be aroused to the danger. This was not so much due to apathy among the people but rather to a wierd notion by the Nation's leaders that the Soviets could not possibly duplicate the United States development of the A-bomb. Or if they could, it would take them many years. So the United States could sleep on.

The amazing fact is that as a nation we continued to sleep even after the Soviets tested their first A-bomb in August of 1949. This was 2 to 3 years ahead of the shedule which Government optimists had set for the Soviet development. The atomic storm signals had gone up. Yet America slept on.

CIVIL DEFENSE THROUGH 1952

Korea served to jolt the United States far more than the first Soviet A-test. For the first time in its history the United States passed a Federal Civil Defense Act establishing an independent Government agency for civilian defense. Known as the Federal Civil Defense Administration, this agency inherited very little from any previous Government organizations. Prior to its birth, FCDA functions were scattered throughout Government. It may be said that FCDA inherited mostly bad habits and wrong ideas.

The wrong ideas FCDA received or carried over consisted of a notion that the most you had to worry about was a 20-kiloton bomb such as was dropped on Nagasaki; that is, one equal to the power of 20,000 tons of TNT. The bad habits consisted of the World War II thinking that the answer to the A-bomb was "duck and cover" or "fall on your face."

FCDA was born as an orphan, disdained by other older Federal agencies. Two agencies in particular towered over the young orphan. One was the Defense Department. The other was the Atomic Energy Commission. A full inquest into the way in which these two agencies treated FCDA would unearth a shocking scandal in our national planning. It is simply this: Civil defense was actually denied data about atomic-weapon development and about our military defenses. Even in 1955 this situation has not been fully rectified.

Thus FCDA had two strikes on it before it stepped to bat. Atomic and military secrecy operated to withhold vital data from the very planners who had to have it. Quite apart from secrecy, there was no sense of urgency in Government. FCDA was treated as a vermiform appendix. After all, how could you be serious about it when President Truman, himself, doubted that the Soviets had a bomb?

THE NOVEMBER 1, 1952, BLAST

In retrospect the jolt which activated civil defense occurred on November 1, 1952. It was a mighty big jolt. In fact, it blew an island right out of the Pacific. This was the forerunner of the superbomb.

This gigantic explosion has since been estimated as 6 megatons. Some say it was even more powerful. The area of total destruction, according to Val Peterson, head of FCDA, was 28.3 square miles, or 18,000 acres. This corresponds to an area of 0.8 square mile of complete destruction at Hiroshima. But at Hiroshima the blast also spread out over larger areas with varying degrees of destruction ranging from heavy to moderate to slight damage: As the layman usually thinks of destruction we may say that some 7 square miles were destroyed at Hiroshima. On the same scale, the November 1, 1952, blast packed a punch capable of destroying 250 square miles.

When he was appointed by President Eisenhower, Gov. Val Peterson took one look at the color films of the November 1 explosion and he mentally tossed FCDA's plans out the window.

NEW POLICY—EVACUATION

The moment Governor Peterson translated the November 1 blast into terms of destruction in an American city, he abandoned the previous policy of stay-put, duck-and-cover. To stay put, as Peterson recently commented: "It's just futile. It means death."

Swinging FCDA policy around by 180 degrees was difficult. In fact, there are still many in his own organization who as yet "haven't got the word." It was a radical shift in policy. Moreover, it was a highly unpopular recipe to make cities swallow.

Here it must be remembered that there are three levels of civil defense organization—Federal, State, and city or local. They mix about as easily as oil and water. There is much bickering about who is supposed to do what and who pays for what. Take a city like Washington, D. C., nestled in the midriff of Maryland and Virginia. How do you plan in such a muddled setup? The answer is to be found in the fact that the Nation's Capital is undoubtedly one of the least prepared cities in America.

The concept of evacuation is bewitchingly simple. All you have to do is to empty the human contents of a city well outside city limits. Then if a bomb drops on the city the blast and heat will not hurt the dispersed population. Even if the bomb doesn't drop smack on the corner of Main Street and Spruce, you still profit enormously because you have spread your people out into a huge doughnut ring. The bomb can only bite out one sector of this ring. In general, this would meant hitting at only about 15 percent of the dispersed population.

Actual implementation of the evacuation policy is not so simple. It is a political-psychological nightmare. Will you get enough advance warning? Won't people panic? How far out do you have to go? Will parents be separated from their children? How long will you have to stay out?

These are all vexing questions. Anyone who has spent even a few minutes discussing the problem with Governor Peterson is aware that he is a highly intelligent man. He knew in advance that evacuation would be a very bitter pill for cities to swallow. Yet he decided on this radical policy and he has resolutely stuck to his guns. Though you may harass him with a hundred arguments against evacuation, he has one single shotgun question to floor you: "Do you have a better plan?"

IS EVACUATION THE BEST POLICY?

Think it over. What would you do if you knew that a Soviet bomber were going to lay its megaton-egg on St. Louis in a few hours? Would you stay put? Would you dash to some nearby shelter? Or would you get out of town?

To help answer the question, look at the chances of survival which you would have against a 20-megaton superbomb. This is 20 times the power of the one-megaton hypothetical bomb of June 15. However, it is not the largest bomb which can be made.

Table I

	Likelihood of survival	
	50 percent	95 percent
	Miles	*Miles*
Man in the open on clear day	13	17
Inside ranch-type house (1st floor) sheltered from heat and glass	9	12
In basement of sturdy brick house	7	10
In special subsurface shelter in subbasement of modern apartment building	5–6	7–8

It is this grim table of life and death that has forced the Federal Government with President Eisenhower's approval, to adopt its evacuation policy. Your initial reaction to this lethal atomic scorecard may be:

"Oh, well, if it happens, I hope that I'm right there so it will all be over quickly." This fatalistic attitude has been adopted by a good many Americans. It is a dream world and unrealistic reaction to a threat now below the horizon. As that threat emerges and becomes inescapable, dream-world thinking will evaporate. You will want to survive if for no other reason than that it is the age-old and immutable law of mankind.

Given the present attitude of Americans, given the present attitude of the Government, evacuation is the best—in fact—the only sensible policy for civil defense. This for the simple reason is that there is no other practicable alternative. That is unless you welcome death.

In making this statement that there is no other alternative the author is forced to swallow hard. There is an alternative but most people, especially those who pride themselves as being hardheaded, reject it out of hand. It is the policy of deploying people and plants beyond the city limits long before there is a radar alert. Atomic scientists have pleaded for this long-term insurance policy which would reduce the organic vulnerability of a target. But the Federal Government has shied away from doing anything serious about industrial dispersal or population decentralization because it regarded the program as political poison.

Currently in Washington, the Central Intelligence Agency is looking for a site on which to build a single structure to house its more than 6,000 Washington employees. Where does it want to locate? Well outside of bomb range? No; just across the Potomac about 8 miles from the White House. This is a clear-cut example of flagrant disregard for national security. If CIA does locate eight miles from the White House, the Government cannot expect any industrialist to be persuaded that he ought to disperse his own industry.

CAN EVACUATION WORK?

Evacuation works every week day in every American city. When the 5 o'clock whistle blows, every city is like a disgruntled beehive with thousands of cars, busses, trolley cars and pedestrians moving at cross purposes. Yet we manage to rearrange our metropolitan populations twice a day, albeit in a rather disorderly fashion with bumped fenders and jangled tempers.

Plans are being laid to move metropoliton populations in a single direction—out. All streets will be one way. Instead of one person per vehicle maximum occupancy will be the rule. These plans are still paper, but they can be made to work even in time of stress, if we practice them in peacetime.

However, evacuation as a national policy must be altered to face the facts about the

newest dimensions in killing power—radioactive fallout hazards.

RADIOACTIVE FALLOUT

On March 1, 1954, United States nuclear experts touched off a new type of bomb. It was the so-called H-bomb. According to informed sources this superbomb packed a wallop of between 14 and 16 megatons. This was then the largest thermonuclear explosion but its blast power was not its most startling effect. It was 600 to 700 times more powerful than the bomb detonated at Nagasaki. But what was most significant was its immense radioactivity. An H-bomb would not be expected to be very radioactive at all. Yet this superbomb was the equal of about 500 times the radioactivity of the Nagasaki bomb.

The world now knows what happend on March 1, 1954, thanks largely to an accident. A squat Japanese trawler, the *Lucky Dragon No. 5*, was 120 miles from the point of explosion. Although untouched by the heat or the blast, it received a chalk-white mantle of fine dust which fell out from the bomb cloud. The crew did not know anything about radioactivity and took no precautions to get rid of the highly radioactive dust. Fortunately, the *Lucky Dragon* was a small ship.

Had it been larger, or had the men been on dry land they would have all been killed by the radioactive fallout. It takes about 500 roentgen units of this radiation to kill you, whereas the Japanese received only about 200 roentgens. Only the dust which fell on the decks of the ship kept irradiating the crew since that which fell in the water was swallowed up by the ocean. Had the *Lucky Dragon* been a rowboat, then the fishermen would have received very little radiation.

SHELTER FROM FALLOUT

The lesson to learn from the Japanese fishermen is of life and death significance to Americans. They will not be on an open ocean which will swallow up the radioactive debris, but they can make use of the same principle which saved the lives of the Japanese crew. The principle is simply this: Allow as little as possible of the radioactive fallout to "look" at you. This means getting below the surface on which the radioactive fallout deposits. Once you are below ground, let's say in the basement of a house, then only that fallout can "look" at you and hurt you which is above you. This, in effect, means that which is on the roof of the house. In an ordinary house this means that you would be "looked at" by only 5 percent of the fallout. The rest of the 95 percent would be on the ground, street, and driveway outside your house but as long as you kept below ground level it would not hurt you.

A hastily dug foxhole could save your life in an emergency if you had no access to a basement. It is the land equivalent of a rowboat at sea. Even though you had no roof over your head the small area open to the sky overhead and thus to fallout would allow only a few percent of the fallout to "look" at you. Thus you do not have to have 3 feet of earth between you and the fallout as long as you are below surface level. In the case of a basement shelter you also take advantage of the fact that the building material in the house will absorb some of the fallout radiation. This will further improve your chances of survival.

SHELTER CONSTRUCTION

After careful study of the fallout problem, coupled with that of the primary blast-heat of the superbomb, the writer concluded that the Federal Government ought to launch an immediate program of shelter construction designed to protect evacuees from metropolitan centers. Such shelters ought to provide good enough resistance to blast that inhabitants would be protected against a bomb hit 6 miles away. By locating these shelters in a cordon or web around a city the whole evacuation problem could be simplified. One would not try to get 20 miles away but would rather head for a close-by shelter to which one had been assigned ahead of time.

Thermonuclear shelters must provide triple protection. First, they must resist the heat, second, the blast, and third, the radioactive fallout. The best way to protect against the enormous blast is to build flush-to-the-surface concrete communal shelters, covered with earth. Such shelters will automatically protect against fallout.

However, the persistence of fallout in the downwind areas may pin down shelter occupants for many days and even weeks. Designing long-term occupancy shelters would skyrocket their cost and multiply many fold the human problem of compressing people underground. Fortunately, the fallout dies off after a few days, so that limited trips aboveground can be made. People then can either evacuate from the fallout area if this is practicable or they can seek more spacious shelter in the basements of other buildings which give good fallout protection.

The author believes that the concrete shelters should be built on public grounds just outside city limits, close enough to permit easy access without mile-long traffic jams, yet far enough away to survive the blast of the superbomb. Such shelters could be built to accommodate the 35 million residents who live inside the city limits of our largest 40 cities.

Suburbanites should be encouraged and aided in the construction of one or more communal shelters per block. Such a shelter program designed to protect about half of the United States population would be a huge public-works program but it could cost less than what the military spend in 1 year on radar, jet interceptors, and Nike missiles to protect against Soviet bombers.

PERSISTENCE OF FALLOUT

The United States Government was extremely tardy in releasing official facts about fallout. In fact, the Atomic Energy Commission announcement on fallout came on February 15, 1955, almost a year after fallout was known. Even then the AEC revealed only a few facts about fallout. It did, however, state the magnitude of the effect, showing that an area of 7,000 square miles could be lethally contaminated with fallout radioactivity.

But to this day the Federal Government has yet to spell out how long fallout will persist. The implication is that it is over and done with quickly. The author has gone on record before a Senate subcommittee (Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, chairman) that radioactive fallout can persist for weeks and months. It is this long duration effect which the author believes is the second revolutionary aspect of fallout.

It is an incredible fact that local civil defense directors have not been given access to the official facts about fallout. In many cases, local directors are retired generals and admirals with a lifetime background of keeping secrets. These men are handed the job of civilian defense but are screened off from the vital facts which they need to have. It is understood that some individuals in the Federal Civil Defense Administration have access to these facts but that they are not allowed to pass them on to their lower-level brethren. Atomic secrecy is roadblocking civil defense, and until this impasse is shattered, civil defense must plan in a partial vacuum.

When the official facts are broken loose and the local civil-defense people face the challenge of dealing with the persistence of fallout, they may be dismayed. It is entirely possible that some will throw up their hands and say, "It's an impossible situation." The author would be the first to admit that it is an extremely serious hazard, but it is foolish to say that it dispenses with civil defense.

EVERYONE'S PROBLEM

Radioactive fallout makes civil defense everyone's problem. Even the tiniest hamlet may be dusted with the fallout from a bomb dropped on a city 100 miles away. Both the farmer and the city dweller have an equal stake in civil defense.

The Nation needs to be reassured that civil defense planning is realistic, that it is based on all the facts, and that it will be effective. In order to fill the bill, a presidential commission should be appointed to examine the overall civil defense situation, to assess the impact of fallout and to recommend a national program to the President.

The President must be advised how many of our 165 million people are vulnerable to expectable Soviet attacks. The Commission must determine how much money will be required to provide various degrees of protection for our population. It may be that the Commission will find that it is impracticable to buy protection for people living in central cities. If so, it is the responsibility of the President to gear our national planning with this radical assumption, namely, that if war comes our survival will depend upon writing off our central cities and depending upon the remaining 135 million Americans.

Such a surgical approach to national survival may well be crucial when a realistic appraisal is made of the Soviet threat. Though AEC officials have not even hinted at the possibility, there are reliable reports which indicate that the Soviets have mastered the art of making "cheap" megaton-class superbombs. If these reports are true then those who prattle on about "staying ahead" of the Soviets in the nuclear arms race are misleading the American people. Once the Soviets acquire a sufficient number of modern nuclear weapons to knock out the United States of America, then no superior number of similar bombs in our stockpile can offset this threat.

IN SUMMARY

In summary, we note that United States of America was slow in getting its civil defense started. The newness of the problem, lack of cooperation between governmental agencies, atomic secrecy, and World War II thinkers all combined to hamstring early work. The advent of the superbomb knocked previous civil defense plans for a loop and caused FCDA Administrator Val Peterson to announce a bold policy of city evacuation. This radical policy was still in the paper stage when radioactive fallout emerged as a potent weapon of war. United States of America is still, in the words of a Senate Civil Defense Subcommittee, "unprepared to deal with disaster resulting from a thermonuclear attack on this country."

The author proposes a civil defense system based upon triple protection against blast, heat, and fallout. He recommends a web of shelters built out from a city's center to which people can be evacuated. The cost of the shelters would be high—a billion dollars at the least. Thus, he proposes an evacuation-plus-shelter policy. However, he urges the appointment of a Presidential Commission to assess the whole civil defense program in the light of new weapon developments.

The Struggle for Peace—Freemen Must Agree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks,

I offer the 10th of a remarkable series of articles running under the general title "The Stuggle for Peace" in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

(By Arthur H. Compton, distinguished service professor of natural philosophy, Washington University)

The extraordinary state of tension in today's world should impel us to work the harder toward establishing a peace with freedom. There is sound basis for hope. But that hope will become a reality only if we do our part toward building a social order that is worthy to survive.

An open society, where men and women can grow to their best by sharing responsibility in the work of the world, is a dream of all persons everywhere. The inexorable forces of social evolution are compelling men to work together more fully and more widely. True, the powers of tyranny are mighty and are being used against us with cunning guile. Even our great Nation cannot by itself prevent the spread of these powers throughout the earth. But we can do much. And we can take courage from the knowledge that other nations also desire to build a world where men can breathe in freedom. Working together, a harmonious peace with freedom can be achieved.

The requirements of living in a society based on science and technology are making it necessary for man to learn to work cordially with man. These forces are not confined by national boundaries. Ideologies as well as organizational patterns must work toward ever wider cooperation if they are to have survival value. Not the remarkably rapid rate of the social changes now going on. If we can prevent the current tensions from developing into catastrophic war, and I believe we can, it is reasonable to expect that within a generation we shall somehow have passed through the most critical period of our existence as a sharply divided world.

As I see it, it is highly unlikely that wars between the great military giants will be undertaken. For the next decade, at least, it would appear that the balance of power between the United States and Russia will remain so close that neither can be confident of the considerable degree of superiority required for victory.

Without victory as a likely consequence, a nation will not initiate a war. Over the longer period, if time should work in favor of the free nations and they gain a substantial superiority, the fear of major war will be absent. On the other hand, in the unlikely event that time should favor the Communists, whenever they shall have secured sufficient military superiority I should expect them to exert whatever pressure may be necessary to bring the world under their control. If the free world remains alert the power is available to us to prevent such a disaster.

Wars are not yet obsolete, but they are obsolescent. This is because they are becoming too costly for the gains that war may bring. Two factors are responsible for the greatly increasing human cost of modern war. The first is the development of new weapons, such as airplanes and atomic bombs, that open an entire nation to devastating attack by the enemy. The second is the increasing interdependence of individuals and groups within the social order, with the result that any breakdown of this order makes life extremely difficult.

TIME SCALE OF OBSOLESCENCE

The time scale of the obsolesence of war is essentially the rate of social change, the rate of growth of the interpendence among nations for their economic and cultural welfare. If by any means whatever major war can be held off for a few decades, it is entirely reasonable to hope that the growth of this interdependence will have gone so far that by common consent war will be ruled out as a means of settling disputes among nations.

There is concrete evidence that these social forces are becoming effective toward peace. It seems hazardous these days to talk of the hope for peace because of the way in which such talk has been exploited. Again and again the Communists have staged a peace offensive to prepare the ground for military aggression. Recognizing this as a fact, it would nevertheless appear that the present relaxation of pressure by the Soviet government reflects a true desire to reduce the military tensions, and that this desire arises from recognition of the conditions essential to the survival of their social order.

A possible reason for this is the growing importance to the Communist world of developing their internal economy. Their industry has been going strongly ahead, but agriculture in Russia, and especially in China, has lagged seriously behind. A program recently has been announced for the extensive development of trade within the Communist world. It is intended that each area will concentrate increasingly upon the products that it can best supply and will receive in return those from other provinces that will contribute most effectively to their strength and prosperity.

We see here an effort to demonstrate such a superiority of the Communist social system that they will gain the following of the world. Even if so conceived, we should nevertheless sincerely welcome such an economic development. A prosperous neighbor is not so much to be feared as one who is lean and hungry. There is a Chinese proverb that poverty dulls the wits. The converse is also true. Where health and prosperity reign, balanced thinking becomes possible.

The conditions responsible for prosperity in a technological, industrialized world are universal. They are not confined to either side of the Iron Curtain. We find that such conditions include, for example, honesty and reliability in business dealings, an aspect of morality which has developed enormously in the West during the past century. If this should develop extensively within the Soviet social structure, we may expect it to extend likewise to her conduct of international relations. In this case the free world could begin to do business with the Soviets with an increasing degree of confidence.

We have sound evidence, also, for the value of freedom itself as a source of strength. True, freedom becomes a source of strength only when those who are free commit themselves to a common purpose. But such a purpose the nations of the free world have before them, and on it they are agreed. That purpose is simply that their people shall live in a social order where all share freely the common responsibilities, a society where every person's dignity is recognized. Toward this end these nations, like our own, are shaping their courses.

It has become very evident that the United States alone cannot shape world conditions so that an era of peace will develop. But our Nation is not alone. Powerful allies throughout the world are working with us. Because their methods may differ from ours, all too frequently we fail to recognize them as allies. But so they are, all nations inspired by the common purpose of achieving an increasing freedom for their people.

The resourcefulness and strength of free peoples thus committed to a common human cause is, as I see it, the power of God working in the world toward the establishment of an enduring peace with freedom. If, indeed, we have judged rightly that the great forces working in the world are on our side, in the long run our efforts cannot fail.

REQUIREMENTS FOR PEACE

What, then, are the requirements for achieving an enduring peace with responsible freedom? The first requirement is a firm defense against the encroachment of those who would take our freedom from us. This defense is to be considered as a means of buying time. It cannot be of itself a permanent solution to our problems, for the hazards of the development of war are too great. But the defense must be maintained in order that a world of peace and opportunity may grow to impregnable strength.

The second requirement is supplying the most favorable possible conditions for the healthy growth of a free society. These conditions include economic opportunity, the improvement of health, and the development of a sound culture.

The third requirement—and this is the most vital of all—is that we shall find challenging goals toward whose achievement freemen everywhere will agree. The importance of these goals lies in this: That only by their common acceptance can the strength of a free people show itself in united action. The nature of the goals is that they shall provide for men and women an increasing opportunity for their full personal development. The practical realization of the goals will come as they are made specific in terms of human needs and are achieved by appropriate action.

STEPS TO BE TAKEN

These, then, are the steps that need to be taken:

1. Defense: The free world's major problem of defense is that against the encroachment of communism. As we have just indicated, there is no reason to believe that in the long run this problem may not yield to a peaceful solution. In the meantime, however, we must neither permit ourselves to fall into a position of relative weakness nor should we take a belligerent attitude. We must make it completely evident to Russia that we are ready to share in the defense of those whose freedom is threatened, but that if she herself remains unaggressive she will have nothing to fear from us.

We must recognize that however falsely they may be based, the Russian fears of the social system represented by the United States are deeply ingrained. These fears will not be removed by an attitude of belligerence. A firmness based on a knowledge of our own strength combined with a willingness to cooperate where this is to our mutual advantage would seem to be the effective means of reducing these fears.

2. Economic and cultural development throughout the world: The really important task before the free world is the development of its economic and cultural strength. This is a problem for each nation itself, but it is also an international problem. Such strength depends on many factors. Important among these are industry, commerce, technology, science, and the understanding of human relations. It is important to note that in all of these aspects of human life, growth to our full strength requires extension of our activities beyond national boundaries. International cooperation is needed.

We are properly proud of the strength of our American industrial and commercial operations. Our productive achievement during the recent war astounded not only the rest of the world, it surprised us ourselves. But this we must remember, our business strength is in very large measure a consequence of the fact that we operate high on a vast, almost continental, scale.

Another factor is that through high wages the large majority of our people have been given a level of prosperity that has made them not only good consumers but more effective producers and more responsible citizens. The success of this method of developing our national strength by plowing into our citizenry a substantial part of the product of the national labors is what Frederick Lewis Allen has called "the great American

discovery." It is this great discovery that needs to be applied more fully on a worldwide scale. The investment will be large, but the returns will be immeasurably greater.

Many examples could be given of the importance of international cooperation in all fields of economic and cultural activity. The benefits go to everyone concerned. If we can hold off another major war, it is the development of international ties in the economic field which perhaps more than anything else will establish a firm peace for the society of free peoples.

Our Nation needs to be needed. This is a truism with regard to individuals. We know that our lives take on meaning and that we have a place in society only so long as we perform some useful function. We make our livelihood by serving effectively the business of which we are a part. That business, in turn, thrives insofar as it is of service to the community. In its turn the community becomes strong as it contributes to the life of the Nation. What we have been too prone to forget is that a nation likewise is not sufficient unto itself. It is as it becomes a valued member of the society of nations that a nation can shape the life of the world, and that in time of critical danger it will find that it has friends.

This statement is true not only of a little country such as Switzerland, which makes its healthy way by fine manufactures and as host to the holiday world. It is equally true of the nation that would call itself great. In the words of Charles Burton Marshall, veteran student of the internation scene, "The greatness of nations is measured not in glory and majesty but in the capacity to carry burdens." Among nations, as among individuals, "he that would be greatest among you shall be servant of all."

As a purely practical matter it is necessary to note that the differences among peoples in the free world are immense. They differ as to historical tradition, as to racial customs, as to political and religious ideals, and as to many other factors. If they are truly to be counted among the free nations, they will however have this in common—that their prime concern is with the welfare of their people.

If their basic interest is that the lives of their citizens shall have meaning this is enough to give us confidence in their support of an enduring peace with freedom. This common aim may not be an adequate basis for a close political union. It will, however, strengthen the free world if we develop such ties as are to our mutual benefit. This would mean agreement at least in the realms of mutual defense and of economic operations. The importance of such international agreements is greatly enhanced by the increasing interdependence that is a part of the atomic age.

3. The common purpose of achieving a greater freedom: If there is any one lesson of greatest human importance from the experience of releasing the atom's power, it is the effectiveness of free men who are agreed upon one common purpose. It is such a purpose that brings harmony to the choices that free people make. The harmony comes as each sees and chooses the part that he can do best toward the attainment of the desired end. It is only in terms of the purpose for which one lives that he can distinguish between good and evil and thus become a responsible citizen.

We have seen what that purpose is—it is nothing less than to create a social order in which every man and every woman has an opportunity to take a responsible share in the life of which they are a part. In the endeavor to do his part well each will grow toward the best that is possible to him. He will be recognized and rewarded in his society for the way he does his part. Thus his life will take on dignity and meaning.

Such has been the dream of Americans throughout history. It has become the dream of many men and women throughout the world. Nor is it an idle dream. It was in the effort to achieve such a social order that our Nation was born, and other nations also. It was the moving force back of the foundation of the United Nations. It has been crystallized in the universal declaration of human rights. I think of the President of the General Assembly of the United Nations telling a great St. Louis audience that it is this dream of an open opportunity for a worthy life that is the hope of all people everywhere. I hear a minor clerk on the island of Bali say, "We want to share the life of the world."

Truly the purpose is known and agreed upon; but it needs drafting into plans and the putting of these plans into action. Such steps require bold leadership. Our Government showed such leadership as it undertook the Marshall plan.

It is reflected again in Clarence Randall's proposals for opening the channels for more extensive international trade. Spaak and Schumann and Adenauer are pointing the way toward unified action in Europe. Pakistan and India and the Philippines and Japan all have among them men of vision who are laying plans for their nations' destinies that will mean greater opportunity for their citizens. Working together, the task can be done.

Within us is the still small voice—compelling, insistent. As we listen we know that the important thing is not the state, nor the power of the atom, nor the mighty machines of industry; it is the heart of man. To all persons everywhere the inner voice gives the same message. Because it speaks thus to all we have a firm basis for hope.

Sea Lamprey Control on the Great Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the House conferees on the Interior Department appropriation bill for their foresight in agreeing to increase the appropriation for control of the sea lamprey in the Great Lakes. The conference report on this bill, passed by the House yesterday, contains $350,000 for this purpose, the same amount appropriated in fiscal 1955. The bill, as it passed the House, contained $150,000 for this program.

The House reduction was made in anticipation of the ratification of the Great Lakes Treaty with Canada which provides for a joint effort in eradicating the sea lamprey from the Great Lakes. This treaty was ratified, in fact, by the Senate last week. However, the funds for the Fish and Wildlife Service contained in the Interior bill will still be needed because it will take time to pass implementing legislation, organize the Commission called for in the treaty, and obtain funds for its activities. It is estimated that about 18 months will be required before the international sea lamprey program can be put in operation. Commissioners must be appointed, regulations and policies under which the Federal Government, the Government of Canada, the States, and provinces would operate must be established, and considerable planning is required before the joint program can begin.

In the meantime, it is absolutely essential the work already begun by our Fish and Wildlife Service be continued. Two million dollars have been spent on this project and a great deal has been accomplished. It would have been shortsighted to disrupt the continuity of this program.

It is important that the seriousness of this problem on the Great Lakes be understood.

We have a silent invader among us. By this I mean a vicious killer which is destroying the lake trout and other fishes on which commercial fishermen depend for a livelihood. These invaders sneak up on their prey, attach themselves to the side of the fish, grasp the flesh, inject juices which prevent blood and body fluids from coagulating, and suck the fish until the blood is removed and the fish dies. I am speaking of the sea lamprey—a salt-water invader by way of the Welland Canal.

These lampreys attain a length of about 15 inches, and in the 2 years they spend as parasites in the lakes they make about 87 attacks on fish and kill about 19 pounds for each individual. A hundred thousand lampreys destroy more than 1,867,000 pounds of lake trout during their lives.

The adult lamprey migrates up streams tributary to the Great Lakes and lays its eggs in the riffles, in much the same area as the trout. The young lampreys, after they hatch, remain in the mud at the bottom of the stream for about 5 years. There are five generations of young lampreys in the bottom mud at all times. As they mature they migrate to the lake to prey upon food fishes.

As a result of these depredations, the catch in Lake Ontario has dropped from in excess of 5 million pounds to approximately one-half million pounds, and in Lake Michigan from nearly 5 million pounds to practically nothing. The invaders are now in Lake Superior, which is the only one of the Great Lakes with an abundance of lake trout.

In 1946, when the downward trend in the fishery became readily apparent, the States and the Fish and Wildlife Service, with their available resources, undertook limited studies to determine what kind of attack should be made on the problem. Congress appropriated money in 1950 to undertake investigations that would be required in order to control the sea lamprey. These investigations included methods by which the lamprey could be used for food or other commercial purposes, and a study of its life history and relationship to other fishes in the lake in order to determine the weak link in its life history so that a more direct approach to control could be made. Electrical and mechanical devices were developed and tested on a large scale, so that sufficient work has been done to indicate that control of their abun-

dance can be accomplished by means of these devices and the stocking of hatchery fish to rehabilitate the population.

Surveys have indicated that sea lampreys spawn in about 230 streams on the United States side of the Great Lakes and in a considerable number of streams on the Canadian side. Under the program already in progress, 71 streams are equipped with control devices. About 159 additional streams on Lakes Superior, Michigan, and Huron need to be equipped in order to eliminate the larval lampreys in all streams suitable for the spawning adults. Because the larval lampreys live in the streams for at least 5 years, and 5 generations are present, 5 years of such control measures will be required to effect a decrease in the population. In the meantime, experiments are being conducted with poisons and other techniques for the purpose of attempting to shorten that period.

The appropriation contained in the Interior bill, therefore, will permit research in this field to continue, will enable the staff to stay together, and will permit the continued operation of the control devices. Adult spawning of the eel in streams already under control can be prevented, and the length of time needed to accomplish control can be reduced.

We who are vitally concerned with the future of the fishing industry on the Great Lakes are encouarged by this action of Congress and are looking forward to the day when this program, and the expanded international effort, will bring about the return of the lake trout and other commercial fish to the waters of the Great Lakes.

Toledo Teamsters Help Needy Children Get Free Salk Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, last month the Joint Council of Teamsters of Toledo, Ohio, voted to undertake a campaign to raise $50,000 from its own members and employers in order to provide free antipolio vaccine to all needy children in the area. The resolution which appears below, introduced by Chief Steward and Educational Committee Chairman LaVerne Lynch, sets forth the objectives of the splendid program initiated by the teamsters:

Whereas Dr. Jonas Salk and his associates have lifted a burden from the hearts of all parents by developing an effective vaccine against the scourge of infantile paralysis; and

Whereas the American people deserve assurance that Dr. Salk's great discovery shall be used to meet most urgent needs first, such as children in the most critical age group; and

Whereas inability of a child's parents to pay high fees must not deprive any child of inoculations to which he or she is entitled, nor should any child be faced with barriers of economic condition, color, or creed; and

Whereas people of all kinds, of all conditions, have given in the past to make this wondrous serum a reality against this cripler and killer of children; and

Whereas this serum, more than any other miracle of modern medicine, is a people's victory, for they made it possible; and

Whereas we the teamsters in Toledo accept the children of those less fortunate than ourselves as our responsibility as workers; and

Whereas we who work under teamster contracts can better afford to provide such protection to our own families, but realize that tragically soon enough some children will be stricken and perhaps die unnoticed, because their families could not afford the vaccine as we can: Therefore be it

Resolved, That no taint of official indifference or income preference shall be allowed to tarnish this bright record of national achievement here in northwestern Ohio, and that to guarantee this objective, we, the stewards, will go back to the people we represent and raise a minimum of $50,000 to provide the ways and means of making this lifesaving preparation available to the more than 5,000 needy children in this area; and be it further

Resolved, That in the event either the Federal, State, or municipal governments provide the serum free to these unfortunate children, then in such case, the moneys so raised should be used for research in some other branch of medicine aimed at raising our children to be strong, healthy citizens, mentally and physically; and be it finally

Resolved, That a fitting dedication be erected in front of this building as a lasting tribute to Dr. Salk, and as a reminder to all who pass our home what can be accomplished by a united effort of the teamsters.

The Lower Mississippi's Program for 1955–56

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very fine speech made by my distinguished colleague, Hon. EDWIN E. WILLIS, from the State of Louisiana. This speech was delivered before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress on June 1, at its 42d national convention, in the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C. The speech is as follows:

THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI'S PROGRAM FOR 1955–56

We who live in the lower Mississippi Valley look forward to a year of great progress in 1955–56, not only in physical accomplishment but in planning for the future in a rapidly expanding economy which depends in large measure for its stability on the program of flood protection.

As perhaps most of you have experienced in other sections of the country, appropriations in recent years have not been sufficient to allow us to make even minimum progress on the construction, not only of our mainstem system, but on the almost equally important side-basin works.

So our first objective for the next year is an all-out effort to bring our appropriations to a point which will allow us to go forward in a reasonable and orderly manner with our program. During the current year the Mississippi River Commission has had a total appropriation of $45,400,000. When we subtract $15 million from this for maintenance purposes, only a little more than $30 million is left for new construction.

Now this may seem to be a lot of money, but by the time it is allotted to such a large and comprehensive program as that which is necessary to protect some 20 million acres in 7 States from disastrous overflow, the spreading becomes pretty thin.

For example, there are approximately 1,500 miles of main-line Mississippi River levees. Although the program has been under way since 1928, there are still some 270 miles of those levees which are not built to a grade and section calculated to make them secure in the event of a project flood.

At the rate of appropriation for the current year, it will take about 25 years to complete these levees. We think such a rate of progress is inexcusable and uneconomical.

Already we have high hopes for a stepped-up pace. In the first place, the Bureau of the Budget has recommended appropriations of $50,885,000, which is some $5,500,000 more than the money available this year.

Our association, following the budget message in January, made a very careful study of our situation and decided that if we are to carry out the protection of the valley in an orderly and economical manner, then a minimum appropriation of $62,500,000 is required. Two weeks ago, witnesses from the valley presented this program to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate and were well pleased with the reception they received. For the present, about all we can do is wait for the results.

It is significant on a national basis that the budget has recommended initiation of construction on the control of Old River in Louisiana. As most of you are aware from the national publicity, the Atchafalaya River has reached the point in its development where it is about to capture the Mississippi River, leaving New Orleans, Baton Rouge, and that area high and dry and at the same time causing great havoc in the Atchafalaya basin proper. If the capture should occur, the ensuing disaster would be of national proportions.

The Army engineers estimate it will take some $80 million and require about 10 years to cope with the situation through an elaborate control structure at Old River, which is a short stream connecting the Mississippi and the Atchafalaya. Old River joins the Mississippi about 75 miles above Baton Rouge.

We are hopeful it will be possible to step up our levee program, the vitally important bank stabilization work, and dredging in the Atchafalaya Basin, so that these measures which are of prime importance to our protection can go along at such a rate that we can foresee the day when they are essentially complete.

In such a large valley as the lower Mississippi our tributary basins are of such a size as to in themselves present a constant threat to the safety of the area. We can be protected from a main stem flood and at the same time suffer great damage by the flanking action of a tributary flood. We are now at the stage of our development where we can reach over and do something about these tributary streams and for that reason we are striving to get some of this work started. Practically all of this work is in the "new start" category and I need not elaborate to this gathering the great difficulty we face in getting the work underway. We will keep fighting the battle until we have won, as we must do.

The second important phase of our program for the next year involves a restudy of the overall project by the Mississippi River Commission. This study can materially affect the entire future of the valley for generations to come.

This study has for its main purpose a new look at the program in the light of developments over the approximately 20 years since a similar study was made. It will not be directed toward the usual purpose of expanding or enlarging of the project, but rather will attempt to determine if it is economically and engineeringly sound to cope with present day conditions.

Just last month a series of 12 hearings at strategic points throughout the valley was concluded. At these hearings, conducted by the various district engineers, the local people made known their needs. In the meantime the involved technical studies have been underway, and, no doubt, in the future additional hearings will be held. In all probability, some 2 or 3 years will be required to complete the report.

In our opinion, this report will be of transcendant importance to the growth and prosperity of the valley for many years to come. Our economy in the alluvial portions of the seven States is tied directly to the whims and caprices of the mighty river. It is an artery of commerce. It is an abundant source of water for industrial purposes. Properly harnessed, it has been one of the important factors in the unprecedented industrial growth of the entire region. Yet it is still capable in times of flood of wiping out hundreds of millions of dollars in industrial plants and destroying one of the richest agricultural economies in the entire Nation. The great calamity of 1927 would shrink into insignificance insofar as damage is concerned if it should recur today.

We believce that a program of protection geared to an economy of 1927 is insufficient for the economy of 1955. General Jadwin foresaw this in his 1928 report, and it is everywhere evident throughout the valley today. We have great confidence that the Army engineers, who have worked so long and so well for us, will recognize the need and recommend the necessary steps to meet it.

These are momentous days for us in the valley not only for the present but for the future. We have long enjoyed your help in the furtherance of our program. We sincerely hope that we will continue to merit your assistance in the years to come.

Dinosaur National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in a chapter from Psalms, Old Testament, you find these words:

The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament proclaims His handiwork.

The significance of this expression becomes more pronounced when one admires the celestial infinity from natural surroundings which themselves stand as special monuments to the Divine Being. America has been generously endowed with such awe-inspiring landscapes as ocean shores where billowing seas surge relentlessly against rocky coasts; the beauteous mountain wonderlands of Pennsylvania and other Appalachian regions; the verdant grasslands in fruitful valley regions; the fertile plains that grow the golden fields of grain in our Middle West; and the majestic peaks of the Rockies which earth and sky appear to have selected as their meeting ground.

One of the most impressive wilderness areas in all the world is the Dinosaur National Monument, with its tremendous canyons of unparalleled beauty. Through these canyons flow the Green and Yampa Rivers, still carving—as has been their custom for centuries—spectacular passageways through a colorful region unspoiled by the hands of man. This scenic recreational area has been set aside by the American people for the enjoyment not only of those fortunate enough to be able to visit this region in our time, but also of succeeding generations.

Unfortunately there has been advanced a proposal to remove this landmark from the panorama of natural grandeur in our great Rockies. What is particularly distressing is the fact that advocates have succeeded in gaining the support of some responsible Government officials who obviously have been denied the true implications of the whole vicious scheme.

Not long ago the distinguished Secretary of the Interior talked to the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce about what he described as a vision relating to the multibillion-dollar upper Colorado River project, of which Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument is a part. In his vision the Secretary saw a great lake behind Echo Park Dam, with thousands of gay and healthy persons fishing, boating, picnicking, and golfing along beautiful shores under the spell of a beneficent sun shining under the auspices of the Bureau of Reclamation. Then the Secretary read this line:

What has been done in Lake Mead is what we have in mind in Dinosaur National Monument.

When he read that line then it became apparent that his vision had been spuriously molded by those who have no more hesitancy about misleading a Cabinet member of our Government than they have about deceiving any other individual or group of individuals who will listen to their false claims. The Secretary would not have made that statement had he ever had an opportunity to look into what remains of Lake Mead, which was made when Hoover Dam was built.

Today Lake Mead is nothing to be admired. It cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be pointed to with pride as a mecca for recreation. Around it are uncounted miles of mud flats. Great reaches of ashen silt deposits bake and crack under the desert sun. The recreational areas are far removed from water, standing forlorn and useless. The playground of Lake Mead is a gigantic desert enjoyed exclusively by lizards and insects.

While the Secretary, quite obviously, was not aware of these conditions, his comparison nevertheless inadvertently demonstrated what can be expected to happen at Dinosaur if the upper Colorado planners have their way: Burning mud flats, dust-bearing crusts, and treeless mountains.

Mr. Speaker, to attempt to improve the beauty of Dinosaur by making it another Lake Mead would be like applying an air hammer to the chiseled features of the Venus de Milo, or using a house painter's brush on a Rubens' masterpiece. Pressure to the contrary notwithstanding, it is the duty of Congress to protect this natural wonderland from all such schemes as that which is planned for the destruction of Dinosaur.

America Needs an Increase in the Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement before the House Committee on Education and Labor in support of an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am glad to have the opportunity to reaffirm my support of an increase in the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.25.

On March 15, 1955, I introduced a bill, H. R. 4908, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide for such an increase. I did so for a number of reasons.

In the first place, the workingman and his family have watched the cost of living jump about 14 percent between January 1950, when the minimum wage was raised from 40 to 75 cents an hour, and the end of 1954.

But in 1955, the worker with a family still has a wage floor, if he works a normal 40-hour week, of just $30. The Eisenhower administration wants to raise the minimum wage to 90 cents an hour or $36. This proposal comes from the Republican Administration which boasts that although conservative in economic matters, it is liberal with respect to human beings.

Mr. Chairman, the American workingman needs a decent minimum wage if he is to maintain a decent standard of living. An hourly wage of a $1.25 is certainly not too much for any man to earn in these days of high costs in the greatest nation in the world.

Another reason I introduced a bill with the $1.25 figure is to give some protection to the employer who pays a decent living wage as against the businessman whose employees must work for substandard wages.

There is a lot of talk in this country today about competition. But the fair-minded employer, who wants to make the free enterprise system work and who really believes in competition, is often confronted by employers in his own community who pay such low wages that they cripple fair competition.

An increase in the minimum wage to $1.25 would also greatly discourage employers from leaving one community to take their plants into cheap labor areas. The problem of runaway shops is a very serious one in the United States today and it is in large part caused by the low minimum wage.

According to a Department of Labor study released last March, the proportion of factory workers in the Middle West earning less than 90 cents an hour was 2.3 percent, while in the

South 20.2 percent of such workers earned less than 90 cents.

In spite of glowing administration reports to the contrary, there are far too many areas of substantial unemployment in America today, many of them in the Northeast and Middle West. The persistence of a low minimum wage simply encourages more unemployment by luring industry south with the bait of cheap wage rates. But exploitation of cheap labor in the South is no way, Mr. Chairman, to encourage industrialization in that area or to cut down on unemployment in other parts of the United States.

A higher minimum wage is not only essential to the welfare of the workers and employers directly concerned, but it is also vital to the economic well-being of the merchants and farmers of the region. When workers earn, workers buy, and they buy the products of the farmer and the small-business man.

Farmers and small-business men, neither of whom have any reason to expect generous treatment from a Republican administration, should be fighting alongside the worker and the fair-minded employer for a substantial increase in the statutory minimum wage. The stake of the one is the stake of the other.

I would like to take a moment to point out, Mr. Chairman, that while many bills have been introduced to increase the minimum wage to $1.25, most of these also include proposals to extend coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act. My bill does not.

It seems to me that two separate issues are involved here and that the extension of coverage is an infinitely more complicated question than the increase in the hourly wage. I feel that each issue must be considered on its merits if there is to be a fair determination of each and for that reason I commend the judgment of the committee in limiting the present hearings to the proposed increase.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that it is my earnest hope that this committee will report a bill providing for a substantial increase in the minimum wage for American working men and women.

How To Advertise and Promote the Credit Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a speech delivered by J. O. Shipe, manager, Credit Union National Association—CUNA—advertising and promotion service, Madison, Wis., and published in the Texas Credit Union League Bulletin of May 1955 issue.

It is as follows:

HOW TO ADVERTISE AND PROMOTE THE CREDIT UNION

(J. Orrin Shipe, manager, CUNA advertising and promotion service, Madison, Wis.)

There are many reasons why the United States has the highest standard of living in the world.

Two of them are especially interesting to us. I mean installment credit and advertising.

In no other country have installment credit and advertising been developed as they have in the United States. I suggest to you that these are two major reasons for our high standard of living. Without them, I do not believe the United States would be ahead of the Western European countries in any substantial degree. Without them, in other words, we would not have reached our present stage of mass production and mass distribution. Without advertising, the demand would not exist to justify investing huge amounts of money in producing new products. Without installment credit, most consumers could not manage to scrape up enough money to buy such high-priced merchandise as washing machines, refrigerators, and television sets.

Both advertising and installment credit are as old as the hills. Even before the Christian era advertising was used, and goods were sold on credit. Credit is older than money; it was used in Babylon before money had been invented anywhere in the world.

In our own country, installment credit developed earlier and faster than advertising. It developed in connection with selling products that could not easily be sold for cash, especially clocks. A Connecticut clockmaker named Terry sold his clocks from house to house, or more accurately from farm to farm, on the installment plan about 1805. He found he could sell so many more on the installment plan than he could for $25 cash that he opened up mass production. For the first time clocks were made on a kind of assembly line, with all parts made interchangeable. This brought prices so low, that the clocks of Connecticut became famous all over the world. Meanwhile Eli Whitney was developing mass production methods at the New Haven, Conn., arsenal. So it is fair to say that Connecticut is the home State both of mass production and of modern installment credit.

Just where modern advertising was born would be harder to say. The early advertisements were small. When they used artwork, it was line drawings, because photography and half-tone engravings had not been invented, not to mention high-speed color printing. There were no advertising agencies in those days, and the advertising might be prepared either by the manufacturer who had something to sell, or by the newspaper or magazine that sold him the space.

Much of the early advertising was aimed at creating mail-order business. All sorts of gadgets were offered for sale by mail, and if you take a look some time at the old advertising I think the thing that will strike you first is that much of the old advertising wouldn't be allowed today. There was much patent medicine advertising even in respectable magazines that would send people to jail nowadays. There were hundreds of electrical devices guaranteed to cure you of all sorts of fatal illnesses.

You hear a lot of criticism of advertising these days, but the character of advertising has improved tremendously in the last 60 or 70 years.

What happened?

Mass distribution is what happened. The early advertisers were fly-by-nights, street-corner pitchmen. They were selling products of dubious virtue in small quantities to small numbers of people. They were so small themselves that they could make a living indefinitely by fooling some of the people some of the time.

But along came the big distributors—the soap companies, the big department stores, certain food and tobacco processors. These advertisers were interested in making steady customers, and they had to go on the principle that you can't fool all the people all the time. Their advertising had to be honest, and it had to be interesting. Furthermore, they found that spending more money for bigger space produced more orders in proportion than small-space ads. They made a bigger profit on a large ad than on a small one. And they also found that spending additional money for better art, for extra colors, and for expertly written copy also paid extra profits.

Suddenly it became possible for a manufacturer to sell this product in every town in the United States. People know about it from seeing it in big ads in their favorite magazines and newspapers, dealers knew about it, it was easier to sell something that had been advertised than something that hadn't been. A salesman could cover more ground and sell more at a time, when the product he was selling was well advertised. For many types of product the cost of distribution went down, despite the large sums spent for advertising.

At first the big national advertisers were all manufacturers of small items that people bought repeatedly during the year—soap, food products, tobacco.

In our country, a hundred years of advertising have gradually built into the American people an automatic favorable response to new products that promise to improve their comfort or efficiency. It is now safe to invest large sums of money in products for which the consumer will be asked to pay large sums of money. This is very new. Much more money is being spent on product research today than was spent in 1929. It is really only since World War II that the advertising of the last 100 years has begun to pay its full dividends.

I mention all this in order to make a basic point about advertising.

Advertising is like farming; you've got to do it steadily and with a plan in mind. You cannot jump in and out. You cannot expect to plant 1 ad and reap a harvest any more than you can plant 1 turnip and make a million. Advertising is a process of cultivation. Individual ads may produce a big response, and you may feel that you have found some sort of magic key. But these occasional big successes, pleasant though they are, should not blind you to the fact that you are working with growing things, just as if you were growing corn or teaching children. Your overall program is much more important than any single advertisement in it.

Now it is perfectly true that credit unions are not a business. We must never stop reminding ourselves that we do not judge the success of a credit union the way we judge the success of a bank or a grocery chain. Bigness is not the point, dividends are not the point; the real point is the service we give each other. A bank may reject loan applications because it feels that the time calls for retrenchment. It may decide that an investment in bonds is wiser at some particular time than an investment in consumer loans. A credit union cannot make such decisions. When it puts such consideration ahead of its members' needs, then it is no longer a service organization.

Fortunately, however, advertising works for service organizations just as well as for profit organizations. Advertising, after all, is always an offer of service or benefits. It offers you a prettier home, or a quicker way to cook dinner, or a car that will impress your neighbor more than the wreck you are driving now, or something that will stop headaches faster. Unless you have something to offer that people want, there is no use advertising. You cannot just say, "Send me your money." You've got to tell them why.

The whole trick in advertising is figuring out what they want and saying it so clearly that they will say to themselves, "That's what I'm looking for!"

Now there are some ways in which this is easy.

We know, for example, the nine words that are most attractive in a headline. They are "New, free, who, which, how, these, easy, success" and above all "you." We also find

that people are more interested in a question than in a statement.

Hence it is easy to say that the perfect headline would be something like:

"Do you know these easy rules for successful borrowing? Send for your free copy!"

This headline follows the easy rules for successful headline writing.

It is direct; it speaks personally to the reader.

It promises him something he wants and he knows he wants.

It asks him a question; it is hard for people to resist answering a question, and most people will automatically answer this question with "Yes."

It offers him something for nothing.

It uses short familiar words.

It explains itself immediately; the reader has no trouble finding out what it's about.

I hope this makes it clear that there is a terrible danger in writing fancy advertising. Anybody who can write at all is always under a temptation to write impressively, cleverly, amusingly, using big words, puns, allusions to famous historical figures or quotations from poetry or epigrams of great thinkers. Writing is an occupation that gives us a wonderful chance to show off how much we know. The advertising writer has to struggle constantly against this temptation and remember; he is not writing to amuse people, he is not writing to impress people, he is writing to tell people how they can get something they want.

You can use humor in advertising, but it has to serve in someway the purpose of telling people how they can get what they want. You can use big words sometimes too, but you have to remember your purpose.

You are safest when you write an advertisement the way you would write a letter to a close friend. Or the way you would speak to a friend who works in the same place you do.

But we said earlier that one advertisement does not make an advertising program, any more than one turnip makes a farm.

How is a credit union going to plan a program?

Let's start by agreeing not to plan for 20 years, but just make a plan for 1 year.

You want to ask yourself four questions:

Whom do we want to reach?

What do we want them to do?

Why should they be interested in doing it?

How are we going to tell them about it?

It is pretty easy to make up your mind whom you want to reach and what you want them to do.

You want to reach nonmembers and get them to join. Or you want to reach people who are likely to borrow money in the near future, and get them to borrow from the credit union. Or you want to reach people who could save more regularly than they are doing, and persuade them to do it in the credit union.

Undoubtedly you would like to accomplish all these things at once, but it is better to do one thing at a time.

It is much easier to drive home one simple idea at a time than to explain the whole credit-union operation.

So you tell them what you want them to do:

"Join the credit union."

"Borrow from the credit union."

"Save in the credit union."

But our third question is "Why should they be interested in doing it?" and this is where we begin to have to scratch our heads and do some hard thinking.

Why should they be interested in joining the credit union? Why should they be interested in borrowing from it? Why should they be interested in saving in it?

To make our advertising as effective as possible, we have to tell people exactly the reasons that appeal to them most. Should we say: "in order to live better," "in order to save money," "in order to be secure," "in order to have money for your old age," "in order to save time and trouble," "in order to deal with your friends and neighbors," "in order to have control over your finances"?

These are all rather vague reasons, rather abstract. They do not create vivid pictures in people's minds. You want the reasons you give to be as clear and delightful as possible. You will have to search for something more definite, such as:

"Do you want a rich friend? Join the credit union."

"When you save in the credit union, you are buying years of smiles."

"You can save 10 percent on your car with a credit union loan."

I do not mean that these are the best possible statements you can make, but you see what I mean. They struggle toward saying something clear, inviting, simple and memorable.

Our fourth question is, How are we going to tell them about it?

To some extent we have answered this question already. We are going to tell them directly, clearly, personally, forcefully. We should also decide, we are not going to give them just one reason for joining, or borrowing, or saving. We are going to give them several reasons.

There are two mistakes we don't want to make: we don't want to give them too many reasons, because in the first place this might get simply confusing and in the second place when you force yourself to think up a lot of reasons some of them are bound to be trivial. So we will limit ourselves to 3 or 4. The other mistake we don't want to make is to limit ourselves to one reason; we have various kinds of people of various ages and various family situations in our group, and there are different reasons that will appeal to these different people. The older people are more interested in money for retirement; the younger people are more interested in money for home and children, just to take one obvious example. We've got something for all of them.

But the other answer to the question: How are we going to tell them about it? is the most important answer of all, which is why I have saved it till the end.

We are going to tell them repeatedly.

Repetition is the very heart of advertising.

You tell people something once, and about 3 percent of them may be impressed. The other 97 percent are thinking of something else, or forget what you said, or put off doing anything about it, or don't believe you, or don't understand what you are saying.

The problem in advertising therefore, is not so much to tell people something, as to remind them of it.

So you use letters, bulletins, postcards, pay envelope stuffers, posters, counter displays, lapel buttons, book matches, pocket calendars, imprinted pencils, publicity stories, banners, contests, leaflets, pamphlets, newspaper and house organ advertisements, possibly even radio and television—just to remind them.

This is what makes advertising work, it is not enough to create a piece of advertising. You have to create a lot of pieces of advertising, and you have to be sure they get to people. Advertising doesn't work until somebody sees it, and your job is only 25 percent creation. It is 75 percent promotion, distribution, exposure, circulation—whatever you want to call it.

I hope I have not made this sound like a big job. Actually it is not. Organizing it in the first place calls for hard thinking, but once an advertising program is well launched it is not as hard as weeding a garden or washing dishes.

And a credit union that gets even a modest advertising program going has a great many factors in its favor.

It has unique service to offer. It has the advantage of local concentration, which makes advertising much easier than advertising to a national market. It has the warm friendly feeling created by the common bond of membership. Every effective advertisement in such a close group echoes and is magnified by the talk of the members at lunch time or after work.

With such advantages, it is not hard to do an advertising job that will make a credit union really boil.

The Military Code of Justice Is in Need of an Immediate Congressional Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, last month I appealed on the floor of the House for an immediate review of the Military Code of Justice by pointing out many defects in the law.

Since my statement on the floor of the House all branches of the armed services, the Military Court of Justice, and many individuals, while not agreeing entirely with my viewpoint, admit that a review for the purpose of eliminating defects should be accomplished during this session of Congress.

On June 6, 1955, Mr. John G. Norris, a staff writer for the Washington Post, wrote the following article regarding the Military Code of Justice which I feel is a timely discussion of the subject:

MILITARY JUSTICE

(By John G. Norris)

CODE CHANGES SOUGHT

Congress has been asked to throw out another of the postwar reforms in the military forces that were hailed at the time as making the services more democratic. In the past year, the Defense Department has restored off-post saluting, the wearing of swords, many privileges of rank and other facets of military tradition that were dropped after World War II as the result of criticism of the military caste system.

President Eisenhower tightened up on discipline by authorizing stiffer penalties for men who go A. W. O. L., and Congress has granted a pay increase favoring officers and noncoms more than privates.

Now Pentagon officials are calling for sweeping changes in the 1950 Uniform Code of Military Justice and a return in large part to the traditional military system of administering justice. Before Congress is a Defense Department plan for amending the law, and individual proposals of the Army, Navy, and Air Force judge advocates general that go much farther in restoring the earlier system. Civilian judges of the United States Court of Military Appeals, a body created by the 1950 code, oppose many of the proposed changes on the ground they would destroy some of the substantial rights granted by Congress to members of the Armed Forces.

Disregarding the many complexities of the new Pentagon legal proposals, there is no question that they would do away with many of the safeguards that the code throws around an accused serviceman to protect him against arbitrary or overly severe dis-

cipline handed down by military commanders or courts-martial.

Traditionally, military justice has been simpler and cruder than the civilian criminal code. This makes abuse easier. But military men used to say, with some reason, that they'd prefer a court-martial if innocent, but a civil court if guilty. The 1950 code, however, made military justice more complicated than before. Pretrial investigation, the trials themselves, and appeals procedures were greatly formalized.

As a result, the services have had to commission more lawyers and give abbreviated legal training to large numbers of officers and noncoms. The code also greatly restricted the right of commanding officers to hand out "nonjudicial punishment" for minor offenses.

But while all this served to protect the individual from Captain Queegs and safeguard him from mistakes of inexperienced defense counsel, it without doubt has worked badly from the overall viewpoint of the Armed Forces.

Pentagon officials stress these points in this connection:

There has been a big upsurge in courts-martial—some 247,000 of them last year, largely due to the curtailment of the power of commanding officers to order punishment without holding a trial. Unless minor offenders are tried and given the severe punishment authorized in such cases, discipline suffers.

This has created more "military criminals"—men with court-martial convictions on their records—for the fines, restrictions or confinement ordered by commanding officers eventually are erased from the record. In the Navy, more than twice as many men are undergoing confinement today than before the code was adopted—8 per 1,000 men now compared to 3.5 per 1,000 then. All this has proved more costly in both time and effort.

But far more important is the potential effect of the present system, if all-out war should come. It now takes about a year for a court-martial case to go through the mandatory reviews required at various levels and up to the civilian Court of Military Appeals for decision.

As any conviction can be taken to the court as a matter of right, Pentagon officials predict the whole system would break down in a major war. The Army particularly fears what would happen to battle zone morale if appeals could go all the way to Washington and there could be no contemporary punishment of front-line deserters."

The various changes suggested by Pentagon officials include: Curtailing the right of review to the civilian appeals court; permitting commanding officers and lower grade court-martials to impose stiffer punishments, including confinement on bread and water; dropping enlisted men from court-martial (the right is seldom exercised, as accused have found that top sergeants are tougher than young officers); and abolition of many of the present time-consuming procedures and restrictions inserted for protection of the accused.

But on the other hand, many of the proposed changes are opposed by some civilian lawyers familiar with military procedures. They call attention to a number of recent cases in which the Court of Military Appeals reversed convictions because the rights of the accused were denied them before courts-martial.

In the proposal to make far-reaching changes in the Nation's fundamental military law, the inevitable conflict between the rights of the individual and the good of the state arises.

The Pentagon case for some reforms is a good one. But Congress doubtless will examine all of them carefully before voting to restore the traditional military legal ways.

Korean Prospects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address of Col. Ben C. Limb, Ambassador of Korea to the United Nations. Colonel Limb's words, delivered during the congress, hold added meaning during this season which marks, on June 22, the fifth anniversary of Communist aggression in Korea.

The address follows:

Today's headlines deal with Formosa, but Korea remains in acute danger and may well be still the most critical scene of the Communist versus free world conflict in Asia. The reasons are many and may be easily itemized:

1. The Republic of Korea is the only continental land base for the free world military power that can threaten the industrialized centers of Red China and Soviet Siberia. As such, it remains what Paul Hoffman called "a bastion of democracy in Asia." So long as the Republic of Korea remains free, the Red imperialists cannot count confidently on the indefinite possession of their huge Chinese conquest. In their minds, as revealed in the barrage of propaganda broadcasts, a South Korean army allied with the military strength of the United States, is a constant threat. All experience with Communists indicates that they are coldly and callously realistic in dealing with the problems they think most pressing.

2. In Communist strategic plans, the conquest of southern Korea probably has a definitely higher priority than any attempted conquest of Formosa. Formosa is for them a luxury item, not a necessity. If they wished, they could by-pass it entirely. It does not shut off their projected advances into southeastern Asia or into Japan. On the other hand, Korea is a pocket of free world resistance tucked back into the heartland of Asian communism. From air bases in southern Korea, Mukden, Dairen, Peiping, and Vladivostock are within easy jet-bomber range. The Red strategists know they cannot push on into new military adventures without first securing their rear against retaliatory attacks from southern Korea.

3. Ideologically, the Reds appear to have special reasons for attacking Formosa; specifically, they are pledging "liberation" of Formosa in their present propaganda, and are therefore investing "face" in its conquest. However, their far more basic ideological problems revolve around the conquest of southern Korea.

The Republic of Korea is the only continental democracy in all north Asia—offering sharp contrast with the totalitarian police power of the Communist regime. All Asia knows that more than 4 million Koreas have "voted" against the falsely labelled "workers' democracies" of northern Korea and Red China, by fleeing to sanctuary in the south—or by remaining there voluntarily when offered repatriation. The West never should underestimate the dependence placed by the Reds upon their propaganda claims of their superiority to American style capitalism. In all Asia there is no more immediate or potent threat to the stabilization of Red China than the constant memory of the millions of Koreans who have seen both communism and democracy in action—and have sacrificed their property, risked their lives, and abandoned friends and relatives to escape from the "people's paradise" into the free (if devastated) area of the Republic of Korea.

4. Another reason for fearing an attack against the Republic of Korea is the very fact that the Reds sedulously avoid talking about it while patently preparing for it. The Swedish-Swiss members of the "Neutral Nations (Truce) Supervisory Commission"—which is ham-strung by its Polish and Czechoslovakian members—have declared publicly and officially that the Communists are pushing military supplies into northern Korea on four railways (in violation of the truce terms) and they will not permit them to be inspected. As has been amply demonstrated in the past, the Reds do not telegraph their punches. In June 1950, the Pyongyang radio was insistently broadcasting demands for a "unity conference" right up to the hour of the sneak attack. True, the Communist propaganda now threatens attack upon Formosa; maybe it will come, but more likely, behind the screen of those diversionary threats there, they may be preparing a renewed attack upon southern Korea.

5. Communist military power in Asia is especially suited for a renewal of the warfare in Korea. Neither Red China nor Russia (if the latter is willing publicly to become involved) has naval power for a Formosa invasion. But Red China has at least 2,500,000 front-line ground soldiers, with another 1,500,000 in reserve. At least 1 million of these troops are already concentrated in northern Korea, where they are heavily supplied with huge quantities of munitions, tanks, and artillery brought in in direct violation of the truce. Furthermore, the Reds have built up a series of military airfields in northern Korea and have based at least 450 jet fighters and bombers on them—again in flagrant violation of the truce terms. Finally, the military forces of the Allies in Korea have been reduced by about four-fifths, thus leaving southern Korea as a tempting prize.

6. As the Reds pursue their firmly established policy of pushing ahead with the conquest of all Asia, Korea appears to be relatively exposed diplomatically. The United States-ROK Mutual Defense Treaty must be offset (in their thinking) at least in part by the frequent statements of American officials that they would never favor getting into any more "Korean type" wars. An attack upon Formosa would touch off an immediate conflict with the United States. An attack on southern Korea might well start an involved argument among the "neutralists" in the United Nations—while the Red armies have time to roll ahead under their strong cover of air power. We Koreans remain strong in the belief that an attack launched against us would instantly bring to our aid another American expeditionary force. But in view of all the distaste that has been expressed in U. N. and United States circles for such renewed struggle, the Reds may well be figuring differently.

MAYBE I'M WRONG

Of course it is difficult for anyone outside the Kremlin and its Peiping anteroom to be certain of what military aggression is being planned. In anticipating that southern Korea is a more immediate target than Formosa, maybe I'm wrong. But even if the Republic of Korea is not to be once again the central target of the road to Paris through Peiping program, we have ample reason for concern about our general prospects.

Let me itemize some of the probabilities that exist:

Economically, Korea, which is potentially a rich country, was ruined by the 38th parallel division. What industrial and mineral potential we have in southern Korea has largely been devastated by the war, and the rehabilitation program moves with pon-

derous slowness. What is painfully evident is that southern Korea, with its population swollen by 4 million refugees, cannot become self-sufficient while separated from the north. Meanwhile, no one expects that the American Congress will indefinitely support our large annual deficits. The time will come when our outside support will dwindle below the point at which our subsistence can be maintained. It is possible that the Communists have sufficient patience to wait for us to be starved into submission. The alternative is to establish industrial capital in southern Korea as quickly as possible, so that Korea can defend itself.

Diplomatically, a new threat is already posed against us in the forthcoming April conference on the so-called Asia-Africa bloc where Chou En-lai and Nehru will provide the leadership in what may prove to be an intensification of the decade-long program of making just one more territorial concession to the Communists. In view of those who will be attending the conference, Korea and her friends must guard themselves with great determination and courage against their wiles.

Meanwhile, the entire free world seems to be nibbling greedily at the Communist bait of "coexistence." No one, to my knowledge, has defined clearly just what this concept means. Indubitably, it is contrasted with the earlier promise of "liberation." What "coexistence" appears to mean is that free world powers agree to let the Reds keep what they already have stolen, so long as they will at least "promise" not to steal any more. (Lion and lamb.) That kind coexistence means no existence for Korea, which cannot long exist half-slave and half-free.

Militarily, the balance of power has already swung disastrously against us. In 1950–53 we and our Allies could at any time have won the war and reunited all Korea if such had been desired by the West.. But after the entry of the Chinese Reds into the conflict, "victory" was specifically ruled out as an Allied goal. This was the stand taken even though every military expert who has spoken out has declared that the war in Korea could have been—and should have been—won. However, the Red armies which were demoralized and famished (for supplies) in the spring of 1951, when they were "saved by the bell" of the start of truce talks, are now cockily arrogant with their boast of having met and defeated the greatest military powers of the free world—and they have a tremendous buildup of air and land supplies in northern Korea. Meanwhile, the Allied air force has moved its base out of southern Korea and the land armies of our allies have been drastically reduced. While this has been going on, our pleas for a concomitant buildup of ROK military strength has been vetoed. True, we are now stronger than we ever have been in the past—but not anywhere nearly as strong as was the entire U. N. force in Korea at its peak.

Politically, Korea is effectively united under the leadership of the most indomitable, capable, and farsighted anti-Communist leader in the world today—President Syngman Rhee. We pray and expect that his leadership may continue for a long time to come. But the Communists undoubtedly have their strategic eyes trained for the time when the Republic of Korea will have to undergo the throes of transition to new and untried leadership—necessarily to be elected in an atmosphere of sharp competition.

GROUNDS FOR OPTIMISM

From Valley Forge and Waterloo to the Pusan perimeter, when freemen have confronted aggressive evil that threatens to destroy their concept of civilization, they have stanchly stood upon and fought back. History proves over and over again that without such devoted sacrifices, there never could have been the development of a Christian democratic civilization. In 6,000 years of recorded history there has scarcely been a single generation that did not have to beat down imperialistic conquest in order to safeguard its right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The Communist hope that our generation is different. As they see it, all through the free world a rising standard of living has made the people so comfortable that they no longer seem willing to bestir themselves to confront the surrounding dangers. We may feel soundly sure that this Communist views is false. However, one of the commonest assertions by the free-world statesmen is that their people simply will not permit them to pursue any policies that involve risks.

If perpetual peace is now possible, we may all utter heartfelt prayers of thanksgiving. No one could long for assurance of peace more than the war-ravaged Koreans. But blind hope should not divert our attention from realities; an atomic stalemate is far from being real peace.

The Communists have maintained a steady and rapid advance for 10 full years. Russia, which itself was conquered by a handful of Communists in 1917 has, between 1945 and 1955, gone on to conquer more than 600 million additional people. The Soviet bloc now controls one-third of the world's population and about one-third of its surface area. Nor is the end in sight. The last major advance was made just last spring, at Geneva, and the newest war maneuvers are being conducted right now in the Formosa Strait.

Time after time the world's democracies have made grievous sacrifices to relieve tension—at Yalta in 1945; in the "white book on China" in 1949; in the Korean truce in 1953; in the Geneva Conference in 1954, to mention just a few highlights. But the Communists do not want, and will not permit, the tension to be relieved. With utterly cynical ruthlessness, they keep rolling forward apparently confident that the free world can be whittled down to digestible size before the strongest allies will be aroused to fight back.

In my own view, the situation is far from hopeless. I think there is sound logic in the view that the Communist bloc lacks the iron, oil, coal, uranium, industrialization, and long-range bomber forces with which to dare now to wage a world war. It is highly probable that the free world still has a margin of time in which it can boldly strike back in limited wars of liberation, thus doing its own whittling down in the only kind of strategy that can prevent a final global atomic war.

Cautious souls (and we have a plethora of them today) may argue that this course is risky. They should recall it is based on more than logic. In the early summer of 1953 President Syngman Rhee shocked the free world by risking the truce in Korea when he freed some 26,000 prisoners who refused repatriation to communism. Panicky spokesmen of the free world cried that he had destroyed the hope for a truce. The fact was quite the contrary. As soon as the Communists were confronted by a man of iron, rather than by cautiously conciliatory negotiators, they hastily gave up stalling and signed the truce documents almost at once. By this act they showed conclusively that rather than seeking a cause for world war, they could hardly be goaded into one. The courageous action by President Rhee gave the free world a positive proof that bold countermeasures can succeed—where nothing else will or does suffice.

I hope the counsel I am giving does not sound strange to American ears. It never has been true in the past that democratic patriots feared to stand against bullying aggression. Today the Soviet strategists believe, as did the Kaiser in 1914 and Hitler in 1939, that the decadent democracies are too soft to resist conquest. My own conviction is that the Soviets are wrong. But we must not wait for them to awake us from our dream of hope by any Pearl Harbor blast. Instead, they will whittle and whittle and whittle, hoping the free world will slumber on until it is too late.

Address of Hon. Allen J. Ellender, Jr., of Louisiana, Before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the 42d annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has just concluded its deliberations held in the city of Washington, D. C. At this convention there were many splendid addresses delivered and not the least of the major addresses was a speech delivered by my friend and colleague, the senior Senator from the State of Louisiana, ALLEN J. ELLENDER, SR. This speech deals with our correct position as a nation toward internal development and toward the foreign economic relief policy, sometimes known as the giveaway policy.

This speech, when made, received a tremendous ovation from delegates from 46 States out of the Union and in addition, from Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska. The demand has been heavy for this speech, and I present it to you for inclusion under leave to extend my remarks:

TEXT OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER, OF LOUISIANA, CHAIRMAN OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF PUBLIC WORKS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, BEFORE THE 42D ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 31, 1955

Ladies and gentlemen, I was most gratified to accept the invitation of your president to address this meeting. As most of you already know, the conservation and development of our precious water and land resources are subjects in which I am keenly interested. Since I first took the oath of office as a United States Senator, over 18 years ago, the twin problems of preserving and conserving our God-given natural resources, in all their forms, have occupied a great deal of my time and effort. I cut my legislative teeth on the problems of our agriculture from 1937 through the present. As one born and raised in the southern reaches of the Mississippi Valley, I have lived through several disastrous floods. I have seen eroded lands come to life, but I have also seen the staggering and needless waste to which our precious land resources have been subjected—waste which, to my mind, is inexcusable. Today, however, I do not intend to take up your valuable time with a review of that which is now history; rather, I want to talk about today, tomorrow, and the years to come. To a certain extent, the future and the past are inseparable. The National Archives building on Constitution Avenue bears the legend "What is past is prologue." In a strictly historical sense, that legend is no

doubt true. In a general, overall sense, I hope and pray that it is not—at least, not with respect to rivers, harbors, flood control, and soil conservation.

When I first came to the Senate in 1937, there were rumblings of war coming from across the seas. Here at home, most of those rumblings went unnoticed. We had our own problems to cope with—and these problems were manifold and varied. The Congress acted boldly—and in perhaps some cases, unwisely—but in so acting we laid the groundwork for some of the finest, most necessary, programs which this country of ours has ever experienced. Earlier, the problem of flood control was attacked on a comprehensive basis by the Federal Government. The Flood Control Act of 1928, and subsequent authorizing legislation, has left us with a basic legislative skeleton upon which it should be possible to place the flesh of a truly realistic program of water and land conservation. That program had really just begun when, in 1941, this country was plunged into war. Since that time, emergency after emergency has made it impossible, according to our planners, for us to have enough money on hand to meet our domestic military commitments and our international obligations and yet remain with enough left over to do anything like an adequate job in conserving our natural resources.

As a result, we are barely keeping abreast of the problems. In some places, we are moving downhill. In my own State of Louisiana, we lose almost 2,000 acres of land each year along a 150-mile stretch of the Red River alone. Other States lose a comparable amount. Several years ago, the Department of Agriculture estimated that when the Pilgrims first arrived in this land there were some 9 inches of topsoil, on the average, on our arable lands. Today, 3 inches of this irreplaceable topsoil—one-third of the original, natural, God-given topsoil—has gone down the drain, so to speak. How long, may I ask, can our Nation continue to survive under circumstances such as these? How long can we continue to feed and clothe our growing population as you and I are fed and clothed today when our very lifeblood—our precious topsoil—is being dissipated at this rate? The answer to that is simple: We cannot, unless we begin now to stop this senseless waste and to make the maximum practical use of the land we now have.

We are all proud of our country. We take great pride in our economic growth, in the fact that our standard of living is the highest in the world. "Made in the U. S. A." is a label of which we Americans boast.

How proud are we going to be a generation hence when our children and grandchildren face the prospect of insufficient land, and antiquated waterways? Can we, as the trustees of our Nation's future, take pride in the fact that we have willfully neglected two phases which are vital to economic growth, that is, conservation of land, and conservation of our water resources?

My friends, to my way of thinking, we have been putting the cart before the horse. We have, it is true, had to live in a constant state of emergency over the past 20 years; but we have not even done all the things we could, under the circumstances, to guarantee the continued growth of our country. That is a shocking statement for a Member of the Congress to make, isn't it? Yet, it is a true statement—unfortunate though it may be.

The hard facts are that we have been inexcusably niggardly with the vital projects which await completion here at home. We have permitted our fine programs of river and harbor development, flood control, soil conservation, land reclamation and others to not only lag, but in many cases to stagnate. At the same time, we have voted billions upon billions for economic aid, for development assistance, for defense support, to be spent in lands across the seas.

I was one of the Senators who helped pass the original Marshall plan. I voted to do so in good faith. Our leaders told us that all we had to do was get Europe back on its feet—"Raise European industrial production 25 percent above prewar levels, and we can quit," they told us. Today, European production is better than 150 percent of prewar and we are still passing out the greenbacks. We have even done more. We have begun to do for these countries the very things that we have neglected to do for our own people. I shall explain what I mean in just a moment.

In the meantime, we have progressed in our assistance programs from Europe to Asia. We have found new bugaboos of communism to use as an excuse for doling out more American funds to foreign lands. And the end is not yet in sight; Europe is healthy, but Asia is sick. And Dr. Uncle Sam has just the prescription—more American greenbacks.

Where, may I ask, are our European friends, whom we have nursed back to health? Where are the Belgians, the French, the British, and the Italians? We pour American dollars into the Belgian Congo, into French Equatorial Africa, into Indochina, Malaya, and other areas—but we receive no help from our partners in peace. When we knock on their doors there is nobody at home. And why not? Because they are knocking again on ours for more money—and we foolishly continue to make it available to them. All are in a position to pay for their own obligations if only we permitted them to do so.

Now, I do not want to leave the impression that all foreign assistance should end immediately. I think, however, that we should confine our aid to those countries that are willing to help themselves. I also believe that the time has come for us to terminate all assistance except some military aid in some quarters and point 4—that is, technical assistance. Point 4, incidentally, should be administered on the basis in which it was conceived; that is, as a means of making our technological know-how available to underdeveloped countries. It should not be turned into an economic-aid vehicle—as was attempted just a few years ago. Technical assistance, point 4, should not involve our funneling large sums of cash into foreign lands in order to Americanize them overnight. We should permit them to start at the bottom rung of the ladder and not advocate the development of projects beyond their own financial capability. We should relegate our assistance to teaching the peoples of underdeveloped lands how to best utilize their resources—and we should encourage them to produce the funds for actual development projects. That is a function of the nations involved—it is not a responsibility of the United States Government. We have enough to do at home; as a matter of fact, I sometimes wonder if we have not permitted our backlog of necessary projects to grow too large.

As chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, it has been my privilege during recent weeks to preside over hearings on budget requests for flood control, navigation, and rivers and harbors appropriations for the next fiscal year. In January, the administration sent the Congress a budget calling for the expenditure of roughly $523 million for all Corps of Engineers public-works projects. This amount represents less than 1 percent of the total fiscal 1956 budget. According to Bureau of the Budget figures, the administration has asked Congress for only about a billion dollars for all water resources development, plus all soil-conservation expenditures during the fiscal year to come. The reason cited for this meager amount of funds to perform the vital functions concerned is the fact that we must gird ourselves and our free-world allies in order to repel Communist aggression. This is a laudable purpose, and one in which I am in full accord. However, what we are not expressly told is that nearly $2 billion—or roughly double the amount available here at home has been earmarked for nonmilitary expenditures abroad.

We have spent, since 1948—the year the Marshall plan was begun—nearly $50 billion in rendering assistance to our friends across the seas. During that same time, we have spent roughly $6 billion for all civil functions projects here at home—for all flood control, navigation, and rivers and harbors projects. We have fallen far behind in the process.

It is now time, in my humble judgment, for us to begin doing some of the things which we have neglected here at home for so long. Unfortunately, there seems to be but little consideration given to our domestic projects by those on the policymaking levels. Oh, of course, we are told every year how important our domestic projects are. We receive platitudes in abundance, but only a pittance in hard cash. And platitudes don't build dams or levees; good intentions do not deepen waterways or dredge new channels. If we do not start getting adequate cash as well as adequate platitudes, we shall, indeed, find that the road to ruin is paved with good intentions. Now, I want to make one thing clear. I am not complaining about the expenditure of one penny of our tax money in building a true global defense against communist aggression. I am complaining, and I shall continue to complain, about our leaders refusing to ask for enough money to do an adequate job; here at home, while they insist upon more money to do just the same things in foreign lands.

I have already mentioned the fact that the 1956 fiscal year budget contains only about a billion dollars for all water and soil conservation here in the United States, and that we are being asked to spend nearly twice that amount in nonmilitary assistance in foreign lands. The logical question to ask is this: "where and how are these nonmilitary foreign aid funds being spent?"

During the past year, it was my privilege to visit approximately 45 foreign lands, located in Europe, Africa, southern Asia, and the Near East, in connection with my duties as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee. I made a similar inspection trip throughout Africa, in 1953, and I was privileged to visit South and Central America in 1952.

I am convinced that if our American taxpayers could but see the things I saw, they would rise up in righteous wrath against the way their money is being spent. In all sincerity, I am forced to say that much of our aid funds is being frittered away. We are trying to teach Arabs to grow sugar cane on desert land. We are spending large sums in teaching foreign countries how to balance their budgets—when we have been able to balance our own only three times in the last 20 years. But, even more disturbing, we are embarking upon public-works projects abroad while our leaders steadfastly insist that we cannot afford similar projects here at home.

In 1954, for example, our Government signed a long-term agreement with Egypt whereby we pledged ourselves to put up $40 million for economic development in Egypt. The 1956 budget request for foreign aid includes projected expenditures of staggering amounts of money for public works projects in Egypt. Here is how the funds would be earmarked. First, $10 million for highway improvement; 7.5 millions for potable water supplies, 4.3 millions for the improvement of waterways; 16 million for the improvement of Egyptian railroads, and nearly a million

and a half for the purchase of machine-shop equipment.

But Egypt is not an isolated instance. Here are some of the other ways in which we are spending money for public-works projects in foreign lands. We have provided funds in Greece for an integrated national electric system, for land and water development, and we have backed an $80 million loan for projects in Greece involving mines, highways, and railroads, among others. This in spite of the fact that Greece has reached industrial production in excess of 170 percent of prewar. In Turkey, $46 million was made available during the first half of 1954 for equipment to increase hydroelectric power, for the development of highway systems and to improve grain handling and storage. In Iraq, we are planning an ambitious reclamation project—one which, by 1961, envisions the reclamation of 1 million acres of new land and the generation of large amounts of hydroelectric energy. This is only a beginning. Our planners in Iraq have been hard at work blueprinting dams, irrigation systems, and flood-control works—while our engineers here at home have starved for planning funds. A good job has been done in that country by our technical assistants and my hope is that we will not be called upon to furnish funds for actual construction.

Now, let us look at Jordan. Jordan has refused to put up any of her own money for internal improvements because she claims she does not have it. As a result, generous Uncle Sam, burdened with a $277 billion debt, has contributed liberal amounts of money for capital improvement projects—including irrigation, afforestation, road construction, and construction of school buildings and hospitals. On last June 28, FOA announced the allotment of $8 million to Jordan for highway construction, reforestation, and flood control.

In Lebanon, we spent during 1954 about $6 million to increase agricultural production and to build roads. That country refused to contribute any of her own money to help pay expenses of work there because she claimed that in so doing she would have to operate in the red. For fiscal 1956, the administration wants to spend $2.5 million in connection with the Litani River project—a reclamation scheme which has been condemned by many as impractical.

In 1954, our Government announced its intention to initiate a $105 million economic aid program in Pakistan. With this money, we will build irrigation dams, and flood control works. We will also help Pakistan import steel, textiles, and other commidities. This scheme also involves the generation of counterpart funds to be used for internal development. We are already involved in a Marshall plan undertaking in Asia.

Now then, let us look at our contribution to India—a contribution which our planners seek to continue in spite of Premier Nehru's attitude toward us. The administration has earmarked $70 million for economic aid to India during the next fiscal year. With this money, India will irrigate land, build power generation facilities, build roads, and buy railroad equipment. Since India has recently agreed to purchase a steel mill from Russia, American funds are going to help finance this project, also, at least, indirectly. The important thing to note is that our planners insist that we must give India funds, or India will line up with Russia. But, when the erection of a steel mill is involved, the Indians find enough money in their treasury to pay the Russians for that facility.

This Indian program, incidentally, is nothing new. In the 1954 fiscal year we granted to India about $60½ million in economic aid to begin a project to irrigate 15 million acres of land and to help buy 100 locomotives and 5,000 freight cars for Indian railroads. I have no doubt but that a large portion of these acres we are helping to irrigate will be used to produce cotton and that our Indian friends will not hesitate to undercut the price of American cotton in world markets—thus further helping to increase our surplus and reduce American farm income.

Let us look now at Libya. I think Libya offers a grade-A example of what our planners are up to. Last June, the United States gave Libya $1 million for economic development. On September 9, our foreign-aid planners commited this country to a 17-year economic aid program in Libya—despite the fact that Congress has repeatedly warned the executive branch that foreign economic aid should be soon terminated. Under the terms of this program, the United States has promised to give Libya $7 million in development assistance during the present fiscal year, and to provide Libya $5 million a year for the next 6 years, plus $1 million a year for 11 more years. In other words, we are committed to a 17-year economic aid program in Libya, whether we like it or not.

I, for one, am sick and tired of this budgetary double-standard. I am disgusted at the attitude taken by some of our leaders—leaders who proclaim majestically from the foot of Pennsylvania Avenue that vital projects here at home must limp along on inadequate budgets, while they just as majestically pass out American dollars for similar projects in foreign lands. Let me say now, that unless this practice is halted, unless we begin catching up on the backlog of projects here at home, we are going to be in for trouble. We cannot forever neglect the conservation of our land, the development of our waterways, the protection of our homes, fields, and businesses from floods without inviting to our shores the very evil we are seeking to combat abroad.

It is time for us to tell our allies, all of them, that we have gone the limit—that they must now shoulder their fair share of the free world's responsibility. We have pampered the British, the French, the Italians, and others for too long. They are in good economic health. It is time for them to help us do the job—and for us to begin to adequately take care of our own domestic problems for a change.

It is time for Britain, with an industrial production index of 147 percent of prewar, to begin spending more than 36 percent of her budget for her own defense, while the United States spends 68 percent for similar purposes. France, who earmarks 34.4 percent of her budget for defense, must not expect the United States to continue to equip her NATO armies and to funnel American dollars into her economy, which is producing at 148 percent of prewar. The same holds true for Norway, the Netherlands, Belgium, Italy, Greece, and others. It is time for us to put our cards on the table. We must let these people know that our national debt is $277 billion compared with 15 billion for France, 73 billion for Britain, 5 billion for Belgium, and 6 billion for Italy. It is time for some of our allies to begin taking over the development of underdeveloped lands—particularly their own territories, such as Kenya, the Belgian Congo, French Equatorial Africa, Morocco, and others.

If it were up to me, I would double the amount of money requested for soil conservation and subtract it from foreign aid. I would double the amount of money for flood control, navigation, rivers and harbors projects, and subtract it from foreign aid. Perhaps if this were done often enough our planners would get the idea that there are certain basic functions which a government must perform for its own people, if it is to survive.

I want you to know that I intend to squeeze every dollar I can out of Congress this year in an effort to see that funds for these vital purposes are increased over initial budget requests. I do not know precisely how much can actually be done, but I shall do my best. I hope, when the 1956 civil functions bill is reported to the Senate, that you folks out there in the audience will be pleasantly surprised—at least in many instances. And I intend to do the same thing next year.

Now, I realize that some of the things I have said here today may fall on deaf ears. I also realize that some of my comments may have been rather harsh. But now is no time for us to pussyfoot around. We have roughly $10 billion in vital water conservation projects authorized. At the present rate, it will take us nearly 20 years to complete them—if they are completed at all. Our country is growing, both in numbers and in productive capacity. We need better protection for our homes, lands, and businesses. We need to develop our inland waterway system in order to provide the increased transportation our growing economy requires.

We will not get these things done unless we speak frankly, bluntly, and truthfully. We need to get our message to the people. We must help our leaders understand that we cannot continue to survive if our growth is measured only by generous promises and little cash. We must eliminate this double standard of Federal financing, and get to the task of catching up on the things which emergency after emergency have forced us to delay.

That is my message to you today. I think it is an important message, and one which needs to be understood and appreciated. You also have my pledge that I shall do everything in my power to see that our people, our Nation, and our economy all get the kind and volume of Federal assistance we need in order to grow, to prosper—and to survive.

We Must Raise the Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 2, 1955, I appeared before the House Education and Labor Committee in support of legislation to increase the minimum wage to $1.25 per hour with the broadest kind of coverage.

I did not appear before the committee as an expert economist but as the representative of a community which is predominantly one of workers in industry. Although most of these workers are not affected by the proposed minimum wage legislation, I was astonished by the great numbers of workers in my district who would be helped. Our last increase of the minimum wage took place in 1949. If 75 cents per hour was determined by the Congress as a reasonable minimum wage in 1949, certainly $1.25 per hour is a reasonable minimum wage today. The increase in the cost of living demands this increase.

During the course of committee discussion, the question was raised as to how it was determined that $1.25 per hour would be a fair and reasonable minimum wage. And the question was further raised as to what formula was used in determining this amount of in-

crease. It seems to me that a fair and reasonable formula would be based upon that hourly wage which would produce a weekly minimum sufficient to provide for a normal family of four under the minimum conditions of decency in which we can permit Americans to live. An hourly wage of $1.25 per hour would produce a gross wage of $50 for a 40-hour week and a take-home pay after tax and deductions of approximately $37. In my opinion, there is no place in America, North or South, East or West, where a family could exist at a decent standard of living with less than $37 per week.

The need for increasing the minimum wage is not only an economic question. There is a vital question of morality involved. Americans cannot permit their fellow citizens to live under inhumane conditions. Goods produced under conditions in which the worker does not earn a sufficient income to decently provide for his family are better not produced at all.

The minimum-wage law is in effect a code of fair play between the States which provides that the States shall not compete against each other on the basis of indecent wage levels. We in America must avoid destruction by sectionalism. It is tragic to see one part of America competing with another when the competition between regions is not in the quality of the product—but in the differential which may exist in labor costs. It is competition at the expense of the living standards of the workers and it thereby becomes unfair. Production regions in America should compete on the availability of resources, utility facilities, skills, and markets, but never on the basis of cheap labor forces. This kind of labor competition could sap the strength of the country.

To point up the unfair effect of regional competition, permit me to call attention to a recent situation in a plant in my district which lost its Postal Department contract of long years standing to build mailboxes. A southern company underbid the Cleveland company in the sum of 15 cents per box. The underbidding company pays an average wage of $1 per hour while the Cleveland company pays an average wage of $1.90 per hour. With 6½ hours required in the construction of each box, the Cleveland company paid a total labor cost of $12.35 for the construction of each mailbox while the southern underbidding company pays a labor cost of $6.50 or $5.85 less per item. So that while the Government has saved 15 cents per mailbox, the economy has lost $5.85 per mailbox in purchasing power and living standards for each mailbox produced. This kind of competition is not good for America.

An increased minimum wage is essential to stable family life. Today, in addition to the employed heads of families, there are millions of working wives and other family workers. These additional workers have left their vital home responsibilities in order to supplement the family budget. Their loss to the home is irreparable in the costly development of juvenile and family delinquency. These working mothers would prefer to dedicate their efforts to family care instead of supplementing family income by their necessary employment. However, the increased costs of living demand their employment. A minimum-wage increase to $1.25 per hour would increase the income productivity of the head of the family and thereby permit the return of millions of working wives and mothers to their families and their vital household responsibilities. Their places in industry would be thus opened to the increasing numbers of our expanding working force.

There is concern about the inflationary effect of an increase in the minimum wage. The increase would hardly be noticed in our growing economy. The principal effect of $1.25 per hour minimum wage would be to lift the workers at the lowest income-productivity levels to a more dignified plateau. The cost of an increased minimum wage would be more than offset by the savings in the high cost of community social services to this group. But an equally important gain would be achieved in reducing the tension of regional competition between areas of production. An increased minimum wage is, in effect, a code of fair play between the several States for the benefit of the marginal worker.

Two Kinds of Selfishness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the June 6 issue of the Green Bay Press-Gazette there appears an editorial which I commend to the attention of all Members of Congress. Since we are all politicians, this editorial has a message that we might well take to heart:

TWO KINDS OF SELFISHNESS

Most of the headlines garnered by the Democrats in the last 2 years have done the party little good and some harm. The $20-per-vote tax scheme, criticisms of the President for playing too much golf, Mr. Butler's wishful thinking about Mrs. Eisenhower's health, and Senator NEUBERGER's "cause celebre" regarding the White House squirrels have given an impression that the Democratic leadership is scurrying around desperately trying to find something with which to harass the calm and confident Republicans.

But the party's leadership in Congress has been quietly working to build a record for the presidential campaign next year. It is based on the old political axiom that the citizen votes with his pocketbook and his prejudices, rather than with a regard for the welfare of the whole Nation.

With this in mind, the Democrats passed a postal pay increase bill that they knew would be vetoed, and then proclaimed that the Republicans care not for the welfare of the millions of Government employees who of course constitute a strong voting bloc. In the House the Democrats pushed through a farm price-support bill based on 90 percent of parity so that they could claim a greater interest in the needs of the Nation's farmers. The next step will be a fight to raise the minimum wage to $1.25 from the present 75-cent level—again in the knowledge that the President will not stand for such a boost.

Thus the Democrats are ready to go into 1956 with strong appeals to the three great voting blocs that have supported them in the past—Government employees, farmers, and workers. The assumption is that the vast majority of these people will vote for an administration committed to giving them a greater share of the national wealth at the expense of the rest of the Nation. In other words, the Democrats are preparing for the campaign on the theory that the people of this country are inherently selfish and self-centered, a political idea that has had long credence among all parties.

It is interesting that in their appeal to labor the Democrats are not trying to revise or repeal the "slave labor" Taft-Hartley law. In fact, it has been some time since the Nation has heard either a Democratic politician or a union leader moan about this foul stab in the back to our working men and women. The inability of unions to gain pay raises and other benefits for their members, the miserable poverty into which the working people have been reduced, the breaking up of unions all over the Nation that has taken place since this conspiratorial law was passed—of this we have heard nothing. In fact, both the Democrats and their friends among the union leaders seem embarrassed whenever the subject is brought up.

Do the American people really vote with their pocketbooks? Of course, we all vote according to what we deem to be our best interests; we would be fools not to. But do not our best interests include the benefit of a wise and firm foreign policy, which has unified the Western World as never before in the face of aggressive communism? Has it nothing to do with the weeding out of incompetents and traitors from the halls of Government? Is it unrelated to a reduction of Federal spending with a resultant lowering of taxes for everybody? Is "welfare" something that can only be handed out through congressional benevolence, or does it include policies which make our free economic system work better than ever before, as it indeed is now doing?

The Eisenhower administration is violating a lot of old political axioms. It is marching steadily down the middle of the road, which, according to tradition, is the sure political way to lose friends and alienate people. It insists on following policies that put the welfare of the entire Nation above that of any group or class or special interest, thus doing what the Democrats confidently hope will drive thousands of voters away from the Republican Party. To say the administration is not appealing to our selfish instincts would be inaccurate, for it is appealing to a higher kind of selfishness—a selfishness that we sometimes call patriotism, and sometimes altruism, but which is actually simply the realization on the part of the average American that without his country he would be a miserable creature indeed. That is a concept the Democratic politicians just cannot understand.

Bananas on Pike's Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress might as well appropriate

public money to grow bananas on Pike's Peak as to approve the central Utah irrigation project.

The central Utah project is a part of the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The cost to the Nation's taxpayers of the central Utah project would be $4,700 an acre.

The project would produce agricultural products now supported by the taxpayers and in great surplus in this country. Among these are grains, dairy products, and wool.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*_____Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*_____
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* 6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*_____
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*_____The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*_____
Bender, George H., *Ohio*___The Mayflower
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*__
Bible, Alan, *Nev*_____
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*_____The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*_____
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*_____
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*_
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*_____The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*___The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*_____Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*_____
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*_____4545 Conn. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*____3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*_____2800 Woodley Rd.
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*_____
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*_____
Daniel, Price, *Tex*_____
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*____
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*_____
Duff, James H., *Pa*_____
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*_
Eastland, James O., *Miss*___5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*_____
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*__
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*_____
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*____
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*__
George, Walter F., *Ga*_____The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*__
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*_____
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.* University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*_____
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*_____
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*___Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*____
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*_____
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*__
Jenner, William E., *Ind*____
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*__
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*_____
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*_____4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*____
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*_____
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*__3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*__
Langer, William, *N. Dak*___2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*__Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*_____
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*__
McClellan, John L., *Ark*____
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*_____
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*____The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*_____
Martin, Edward, *Pa*_____
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*____
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*__
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*_____5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*____122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*___The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*__
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.* Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*_____
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*_
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*___
Purtell, William A., *Conn*__
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*___
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*____
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*_2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*_____
Smathers, George A., *Fla*___
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*__Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*____4920 Upton St.
Stennis, John, *Miss*_____
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*____
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*____
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*_____
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*__
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*____4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*_____2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*_____
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*__Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Bridges, Saltonstall, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Morse.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Gore, Bible, McNamara, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, Allott, and Morse.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, Capehart, and Morse.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

Lyndon Johnson: Senate Strategist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 10, 1955

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article entitled "Senate Strategist," written by Albert Clark and published in the Wall Street Journal of June 10, 1955. The article deals with our distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE STRATEGIST—LYNDON JOHNSON RUNS THE SMOOTHEST DEMOCRATIC SHOWS IN YEARS

(By Albert Clark)

WASHINGTON.—The day before yesterday the Senate passed a highly controversial bill—raising the minimum wage from 75 cents an hour to $1—with hardly any controversy. The day before that the Senate rejected the Eisenhower administration's housing bill, which most everybody had expected to pass.

A week or so ago, the annual foreign aid authorization measure, usually a source of considerable dispute, slid through the Senate uncut after just 3 days of tame debate. And just before that, the Senators passed, again in 3 days, the Reciprocal Trade Act extenion that was, by most predictions, supposed to take 3 weeks of senatorial wrangling.

Behind these legislative feats was the skillful hand of LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, of Texas, who, at 46, is not only the youngest floor leader in the Senate's history but by common consent one of the most adroit politicians to occupy the post in recent years.

Mr. JOHNSON was picked for his job by conservative Southerners. But he manages to get along surprisingly well with Northern liberals—despite this week's blast by Americans for Democratic Action, who accused him of acquiescing in a Republican assault on liberalism.

In fact, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, a former president of ADA, is one of Mr. JOHNSON'S closest political allies. The day after the ADA attack, Mr. HUMPHREY defended, on the Senate floor, the integrity of Mr. JOHNSON'S liberalism and went on to praise the Texan as "a genius in the art of the legislative process. * * * I have no hesitation in saying that I am proud of the leadership and of the skills portrayed by the Senator from Texas."

THE BEST COMBINATION

Virginia's conservative Senator HARRY BYRD, who agrees with Mr. HUMPHREY on few matters, will also talk in glowing terms of his party's floor leader. And Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON'S mentor and idol, recently remarked that "LYNDON JOHNSON hasn't got the best mind in the Senate. He isn't the best orator. He isn't the best parliamentarian. But he's the best combination of all those qualities."

Senator JOHNSON, for his part, might explain his admiration for Mr. RUSSELL with one of the earthy sayings he likes to quote. "My daddy," he says, "used to tell me that you're going to have about the same kind of friends as you are." He considers the Georgia legislator the Senate's most influential Member and has been known to say that if he had the power to pick the next President, it would be DICK RUSSELL.

Whatever one may think of Mr. JOHNSON—he has his share of critics, as the ADA attack suggests—nearly everyone agrees he has succeeded in welding Senate Democrats into a more unified force than anyone thought possible when he took over 2 years ago. And he outwits his GOP adversaries almost by habit.

The Texas Senator's customary mode of operation is to grease the skids before a bill ever reaches the floor, as with the reciprocal trade bill. Before the measure left Senator BYRD'S Finance Committee, a powerful bloc of protectionist forces was pushing import quotas for such products as oil, fluorspar, hardboard, lead and zinc. Mr. JOHNSON, who had an oil problem himself, decided that if one of these provisions ever got into the bill it was dead.

So quietly behind the scenes, where he likes to operate, Senator JOHNSON worked out with Mr. BYRD and administration representatives a compromise which said the President could adjust imports of any article he found coming into the United States in such quantities as to "threaten to impair the national security."

"To be for this amendment," one Senator noted later, "you didn't have to be for oil, or fluorspar, or lead. All you had to do was vote for national security." Looking backward, this all seems very simple. But at one point some reciprocal-trade backers had serious doubts that the bill could be saved from protectionist onslaughts.

Perhaps Mr. JOHNSON'S smoothest feat resulted in last year's Senate vote that dashed President Eisenhower's hopes for keeping his campaign promise to amend the Taft-Hartley law. In this instance, Senator JOHNSON is credited with—or blamed for—prevailing on southern T-H supporters to vote to send the GOP bill back to committee. They could go home and tell their constituents they had helped save Taft-Hartley. Getting liberals to vote accordingly was easy.

UNIQUE UNANIMITY

The upshot was the first unanimous Democratic vote in history on a major labor issue, so far as anyone knows. Senator JOHNSON, of course, hadn't unified his party on Taft-Hartley. He had merely buried their differences. Had the measure come to a vote on its merits, Democrats would have split wide open on its specific provisions.

When Senator JOHNSON ascended to the Democratic leadership as the GOP returned to power, the liberals made little attempt to veil their misgivings. Moreover, the experts expected 2 more years of wrangling, with the North and the South struggling for control of a defeated party. The struggle has gone on, of course.

But the Texas-sized Texan remembered another one of his homey sayings—"in adversity the family draws closer together"—and applied it by persuading some of the elder Democrats to give up their claim to choice committee seats. Thus, the way was cleared for coveted assignments for the crop of liberal freshmen Senators who won despite the 1952 defeats. Everybody wound up with at least one good assignment. With 1 or 2 exceptions, everybody was fairly happy.

Despite this initial stroke, not everything went smoothly with the Democrats. Last year, for instance, the liberals mumbled mutiny against the fast-working JOHNSON when he helped Senator KNOWLAND break up a liberal filibuster against the atomic energy revision bill. The liberals were perhaps more surprised than anyone else when they later discovered they got most of the amendments they wanted.

When the atomic measure was returned from House-Senate conference, however, the conferees had dropped the Senate's anti-monopoly amendment and provision for preferential treatment of co-ops, among others. Thereupon Mr. JOHNSON got back in solid with the liberal wing by rallying Southerners to the support of the Northerners to force modification of the conference measure.

That LYNDON JOHNSON is a Senator and the Democrats' floor leader is no accident. He decided long before he got there that he was going to the Senate. Once there, he wasn't going to be just another member. He looked after that, too, by hard work and getting to be friendly with the right people.

BORN TO POLITICS

LYNDON was figuratively born to politics on a farm near Johnson City on August 27, 1908. His father, Sam Ealy Johnson, was a sort of community counselor and served in the Texas Legislature. As a boy, LYNDON began to learn about politics and people by listening to his father advise his neighbors and playing around the Texas House chamber when the legislature was in session.

Somewhere along the way LYNDON acquired another trait of his father. "He talked less and got more bills passed than anybody," oldtimers recall of the elder Johnson. This bit of philosophy is summed up in a framed motto on Senator JOHNSON'S office wall—"You ain't learnin' nothin' when you're talkin'." He seldom makes a speech on the Senate floor.

After working his way through college, LYNDON taught in the Texas public schools for a spell and then came to Washington in 1932 as secretary to the late Representative Richard M. Kleberg. He had scarcely arrived when he got himself elected speaker of "the Little Congress," an organization of congressional secretaries. He took over this group just as he runs the Senate—by going out and rounding up the votes.

Apparently young LYNDON decided after a couple of years there was no future in being a Congressman's secretary. So he gave up his job—and took a cut in pay—for a job as House door boy. This gave him an opportunity to get personally acquainted with the politicians and learn more about their way of doing things.

In 1935 he went back to Texas as State National Youth Administration director. And 2 years later, upon the death of Representative James P. Buchanan, of Texas' 10th District, LYNDON jumped into the race and won against a dozen candidates on a down-the-line New Deal platform, including Mr. Roosevelt's Supreme Court packing plan.

In the House, Mr. JOHNSON attracted little national attention, though he became an expert on naval affairs and was the first House Member to volunteer for active duty after Pearl Harbor. Nor was much heard from

the young man from Texas when he first came to the Senate; he won in 1948 after having narrowly lost a special election in 1941.

His first real political break in the Senate, in fact, came only in 1951. Under the sponsorship of Senator RUSSELL, he was picked to fill a vacancy as party whip, or assistant floor leader. This post carries little prestige but requires a lot of work—and in Senator JOHNSON'S case it put him in the right place at the right time.

His predecessor, former Senator McFarland, of Arizona, was defeated for re-election in 1952, leaving the leadership spot open. No sooner had the election returns come in than Senator RUSSELL—and Senator JOHNSON—again got busy rounding up the votes to elect the Texan to the job.

Though he manages to get along with all Senate factions, Mr. JOHNSON occasionally is accused of thinking more in terms of advancing himself politically than of looking after the good of his party. When one asks for details, the first thing usually mentioned in his support of State ownership of tidelands oil—just as if he'd be in the Senate or have any hope of coming back if he did otherwise.

TAKING CARE OF TEXAS?

Still another criticism of the Texan is that he left his seat on the Commerce Committee this year to join Finance to look after Texas' interest in protecting oil and gas depletion allowances. That he is in better position to do so is true, of course. But that's not the whole story. More nearly what happened was that Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, was bidding for a Finance Committee berth, and Senator BYRD all but laid down the law that he wouldn't serve as chairman with two additional New Dealers, Senators BARKLEY and DOUGLAS. So Mr. JOHNSON decided to take the job himself to head off a party crisis. Even so, Mr. DOUGLAS was not left out; Mr. JOHNSON wangled him the chairmanship of the House-Senate Economic Committee.

Other Johnson critics, usually the "liberals," think the Senator doesn't attack President Eisenhower as much as he should. To this, the Texan's friends reply that any Democrat is free to attack the President any time he wants. Moreover, Mr. JOHNSON is said to feel that the mood of the country demands "responsible, constructive" Government and not a lot of "television shows."

But whether his fellow-Democrats agree with him or not, they all seemingly agree that he is one of the most accomplished professional politicians who's guided the Senate in a long time. And the impression is inescapable that the Texas Senator considers politics one of the most honorable of professions. Were he not from the South there's little doubt he'd have to be reckoned with for the Presidency. There are those who think he might wind up in the White House anyway.

American Abundance and World Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 10, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was extremely interested to read in the most recent issue of the La Crosse Register, the diocesan newspaper for La Crosse, Wis., the text of an important new policy statement on American abundance and world need, as published by the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, in cooperation with the other great religious faiths of our country.

Among the 88 signers of the statement were the Most Reverend Joseph P. Treacy, bishop of La Crosse, and Father Urban J. Baer, pastor of St. Wenceslaus' parish, Eastman.

I believe that this policy statement is an exceedingly important contribution to the spiritual and lay thinking of the American people. I congratulate its signers for their demonstration of the application of spiritual truth to today's problems.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article as published in the La Crosse Register be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BISHOP TREACY SIGNS PLEA FOR SHARING OF UNITED STATES WEALTH ABROAD

DES MOINES, IOWA.—Eighty-eight American religious leaders supported and endorsed a policy statement on American Abundance and World Need published by the National Catholic Rural Life Conference here in cooperation with leaders in the Jewish and Protestant communities.

The statement lays down basic moral principles that should regulate America's abundance and world poverty; it does not spell out the details for the enactment of these principles.

"It is contrary to the will of God that islands of prosperity should persist amid oceans of poverty, hunger, and distress. Bread for myself is a material concern; bread for my brother is a spiritual concern," the statement stressed.

LOCAL SIGNERS

Among the 88 signers of the statement were the Most Reverend John P. Treacy, bishop of La Crosse, and Father Urban J. Baer, pastor of St. Wenceslaus' Parish, Eastman. Other signers were religious leaders from all parishes of the country.

The statement emphasized that, from a moral viewpoint, "the continued prosperity of one nation can only be justified by its faithful and courageous efforts to make comparable abundance available to all nations." America's international goal "should be greatly expanded sharing of our material substance, our technical skills, and the dynamic spirit of a free society." This goal should be pursued, the statement continued, in a spirit of international friendship and good will. While dedicated to advance free institutions and to oppose all types of totalitarianism, "we must avoid making our participation contingent upon political conformity or subservience on the part of other nations.

SIX-POINT PROGRAM

The policy statement specified six general observations in the field of business, labor, agriculture, and politics. These include:

(1) Full employment and maximum production at home; (2) just industrial wage and agricultural prices; (3) food and nutrition programs giving adequate and healthful diets at home and abroad; (4) expanded programs of technical assistance; (5) progressive removal of international trade barriers; and (6) aid programs to meet emergency and long-time human needs.

The statement concluded by calling on all Americans of moral and religious convictions to join in an all-out crusade to employ the God-given abundance of America in an expanded program of world development, human progress, and international peace.

The full statement, American Abundance and World Need, is published below.

"AMERICAN ABUNDANCE AND WORLD NEED

"(The following is the full text of the policy statement on American Abundance and World Need endorsed and supported by 88 religious leaders in the United States, including Bishop John P. Treacy, of La Crosse, and Father Urban J. Baer, of Eastman.)

"God has blessed the United States of America with abundance. A vast endowment of natural resources, brilliant achievements in science and technology, a free society, and a dynamic economy have united to bring us to heights of material productivity never before known to mankind. Both our natural resources and our human skills of hand and brain are the gifts of God. We are His creatures and stewards in His vineyard.

"The abundance which is ours and the potential productivity within our grasp are at once blessings to be enjoyed and a trust to be administered in the name of God and in the service of mankind.

"It is contrary to the will of God that islands of prosperity should persist amid oceans of poverty, hunger, and distress. Bread for myself is a material concern; bread for my brother is a spiritual concern.

"In a moral universe, the continued prosperity of one nation can only be justified by its faithful and courageous efforts to make comparable abundance available to all nations.

"These basic ethical considerations point toward certain goals which should be firm guides to national policies and programs. In the domestic sphere, the appropriate goals are an expanding peacetime economy and equitable distribution of the national product. These goals are fundamental because as a nation we cannot share what we do not possess.

"In the international sphere, America's goal should be greatly expanded sharing of our material abundance, our technical skills, and the dynamic spirit of a free society. This goal must be pursued in a genuine spirit of international friendship and goodwill. Although our efforts should always be dedicated to the advancement of free institutions and opposed to any form of totalitarianism, we must avoid making our participation contingent upon political conformity or subservience on the part of other nations.

"We pledge ourselves, and we call upon our national leaders, both in the social sciences and in the practical realms of business, labor, agriculture, and politics, to work together for the following specific policies and programs:

"1. National economic policies designed to achieve and maintain full employment with full and efficient production both in industry and agriculture. With growing population, increasing labor force, and mounting productivity this means not a level, but an annually rising gross national product.

"2. Industrial wage and agricultural price policies which will produce a just and equitable distribution of consumer purchasing power throughout the economy.

"3. Food and nutrition programs which will assure adequate and healthful diets for all Americans and for as many as can be reached and served abroad.

"4. Expanded programs of technical assistance in the fundamental work of world economic and social development.

"5. International trade and monetary policies designed to facilitate and expand the international flow of goods and services. Appropriate public aid should be provided to agricultural and industrial enterprises facing adjustments as trade barriers are progressively removed.

"6. Foreign economic aid programs geared to meet the situations of emergency and long-time human need. For this purpose both the offices of Government and the voluntary and religious agencies should be used.

"In order to minimize suspicions of nationalistic or imperialistic motivation on the part of the United States, to reduce international tension and to promote world peace, we believe the following three principles should be observed in all programs of foreign trade, aid, and technical assistance:

"(a) Complete separation of United States economic and technical aid from programs of military aid.

"(b) Full utilization of private and nongovernmental agencies in trade, aid, and technical assistance programs.

"(c) Maximum utilization of the United Nations and the specialized agencies associated with it.

"In the last analysis, American policies and programs are determined by the will of the people. This is the glory of our free and democratic society. Therefore, our ultimate appeal is to the people of America. We call upon all Americans of moral idealism and righteous conviction to join us and their neighbors in an all-out crusade to employ the God-given abundance of America in an expanded program of world development, human progress, and international peace.

"'And they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore; but they shall sit, every man under his vine and under his fig tree and none shall make them afraid.'" (Micah iv: 3–4.)

Stevens Treaty Council Centennial Observance at Walla Walla, Wash.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 10, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by him relating to the celebration of the 300th anniversary of the first Swedish mission in Pennsylvania and the observance of the Stevens Treaty Council Centennial at Walla Walla, Wash., on June 11.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Only a few days ago I attended a meeting in Philadelphia and talked with people celebrating the 300th anniversary of the first Swedish mission in Pennsylvania. The same occasion was the 175th anniversary of the arrival of the Swedish officers who helped us in the American Revolution. Along the eastern seaboard especially, history is a vital subject. It is along our west coast, too.

But our history, as Members of the Senate well know, doesn't extend back into the hundreds of years; we are still celebrating our centennials. One of these is coming in Walla Walla, Wash., on June 11.

It is the Stevens Treaty Council Centennial observance and will furnish the occasion for many Indian tribes in the Pacific Northwest to gather with descendants of the pioneers who settled the area. Significantly, there will be a plaque unveiled at the June 11 ceremony which carries the words "Pe-Wa-Oo-Yit." Of course, they are Indian words, but their English translation is just as important today as when the Stevens Treaty was signed in 1855, because they mean "May the promises of our treaties always be kept."

In other respects, the plaque to be unveiled carries a story, too. It says, "To commemorate the 100th anniversary of the signing by their forefathers of the treaties with the United States of America near this place on June 9 and 11, 1855, this plaque is presented by the people of Yakima, Nez Perce, Cayuse, Walla Walla, and Umatilla Indian Tribes."

To get the setting of the treaty signing, you must look back 102 years to be exact. The Washington Territory had just been organized. Isaac Stevens had been appointed first Territorial Governor. The Oregon Trail, which we today traverse by car in a comparatively few days, or by airplane in only a few hours, was crowded with immigrants heading west by covered wagon. Only 3 years before, in 1850, Congress had passed the Donation Land Act which promised a square mile of land free to any citizen and his wife who would come west and claim it.

Most of these people traveling the Oregon Trail by covered wagon were farmers. With them were their plows, their cattle, and horses. In their hearts was a determination to take their square mile of land, build a home on it, fence it, cultivate it and make it their own.

Cut were the ties of the Eastern States and the homes that they had known. With them was a determination to enter this land to stay in this Pacific Northwest Territory. Watching this westward migration with evergrowing interest and considerable foreboding were the Indians of the tribes I've just named.

This land had been theirs. They had not been able to till the soil. Theirs had been homes of wigwams, ready to move as the food supply dwindled in one place, expanding in another. They looked with considerable curiosity, too, at these whites. There had been considerable bickering. Here and there had been quarrels between the reds and the whites. Killings had occurred on both sides. Only a few years before, there had been a war. Isaac Stevens knew this. So did Gen. Joel Palmer, Superintendent of Indian Affairs for Oregon. Something had to be done to insure permanent peace between the Indians and the whites in the Pacific Northwest. The lands which had belonged to the Indians now had to have their titles clear. These new settlers must actually own the land on which they were locating. All the Indian tribes had to be dealt with by treaty. Treaties must be drawn up which would place the Indians on reservations as had happened earlier in the East.

It finally was decided that the place for the treaty signing would be the Walla Walla Valley. It was to be a big occasion. Governor Stevens and General Palmer made their camp on the north bank of Millcreek. They arrived first. Both hoped the meeting would be peaceful. But in case it should not be, Governor Stevens had asked the military post at The Dalles, Oreg., to send a detachment of cavalry to the Walla Walla Valley to guard them and give some display of strength before the Indians. He had hoped for several hundred soldiers, but only 47 men arrived. There would be thousands of Indians. The Nez Perce Tribe arrived first. Twenty-five hundred of them. Next came the Cayuse, Walla Walla, and the Umatillas. Then the Yakimas came.

In all, there were same 4,000 Indians, representing the 5 most powerful Indian tribes, at the treaty conference. At the first council some 50 chiefs representing the various tribes took up the preliminaries. The meeting settled down; it went on for many days.

Perhaps, significantly, the first Sunday found the Indians worshiping with the white conferees, just as the missionaries had taught them to do.

During the long days of meeting such things were settled as the location of the reservation where the Indians would live, the right of fishing, gathering roots, and other food that they needed. There had to be grazing land for their animals. There must be farms available for the Indians who wanted to farm. There had to be payment for the lands the whites were taking. Finally, the treaty was signed.

Now, 100 years later, on June 11 will come the centennial celebration which will find in attendance many of the descendants of those who participated in the signing. Probably as significant as the treaty itself and as the celebration which is to be held, is the fact that that treaty has held for 100 years, and has been respected by both sides—both whites and Indians.

Equally significant is the fact that the Members of the United States Senate have made sure through the years that our Government has lived up to the commitments made by Gov. Isaac Stevens in that Stevens Treaty.

I hope that our Indian brothers will always feel that their ancestors represented them ably and well, and that there is a treaty until perpetuity.

Memorial Day Address by William H. McIntyre, National Vice President, Society of American Legion Founders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 10, 1955

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, Mr. William H. McIntyre, national vice president of the Society of American Legion Founders, on May 30, 1955, delivered the Memorial Day address at the New York Veterans Rest Camp, Mount McGregor, N. Y. Because of the significance of this address, I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, we have had Armistice and V days to celebrate the cessation of hostilities. Today, throughout the country, we observe a day of remembrance for those who gave their lives that our country might live.

In April 1863, while the conflict between the States still raged, a group of ladies in Columbus, Miss., gave expression to their devotion by laying spring flowers at the graves of the fallen Confederate dead as well as those of the Union Forces who were buried in the same cemetery, other communities followed this example.

In 1868, Gen. John A. Logan, of the Grand Army of the Republic, directed that May 30 of that year be designated Memorial Day; that the graves of those who died in the defense of their country be decorated in memoriam. In some Southern States this day is observed earlier, however, there is no difference in the spirit of the day nor in the hearts of those who commemorate it.

This Memorial Day we again pay tribute to the memory of those known and unknown dead of all wars, from Concord Bridge in Massachusetts, to Heartbreak Ridge in Korea. It is the simplest debt we can pay. We can take this little time to remember gratefully the services which our dead rendered. Great

and imposing monuments have been erected to the sacrifice made, and no doubt others will rise. Our heroic dead did not die to be so honored, but so that freedom will live and the future would be better than the past.

Not far from where we are standing, Ulysses S. Grant, a great general and a President of the United States, died; he well knew the ravages of war. On his tomb in New York City, inscribed are the words, "Let us have peace."

In the White House today, we have another great general, who also knows the horrors of war, and the suffering caused by it. He is also a lover of peace.

In the feeling of unrest that is rampant throughout the world today, President Eisenhower is making every effort to unite the free nations of the world in a common cause against the cold war with world communism. Through his patience, firmness, calmness, and determination, he is beginning to resolve some of the problems and has given hope to those oppressed people behind the iron and bamboo curtains.

We pray that his efforts will soon bear fruit, so that we can progress toward an honorable peace, and so that we can build a secure nation in a world that will never again turn to war.

Let us, the living rededicate ourselves to support the truths for which so many died, and may God in His wisdom help us.

That concludes this Memorial Day address.

The AD–X2 Battery Additive Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 10, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in Chemical Week for May 28, 1955, on the controversial AD–X2 battery additive case. I want it to be known that I do not prejudge this case, but only wish to bring it to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN 11-STATE HEARING, THE FINAL CURTAIN

At long last, the 5-year feud between the Federal Government and a small chemical specialties concern appears to be coming to an end. And it looks like peace with honor for California's Jess Ritchie and his battery additive AD–X2, while the governmental agencies now seem to be chiefly concerned with face-saving.

The hearing that started last autumn in Washington and has continued off and on in 11 States across the country now is winding up in Oakland, Calif.—right where the dispute started. Oakland is Ritchie's home base, and it was at nearby San Francisco that a local battery manufacturer set off hostilities by complaining about how AD–X2 was affecting business.

Since then, AD–X2 has been blasted by the Association of American Battery Manufacturers, National Better Business Bureau, the United States Bureau of Standards, the Post Office Department, and the Federal Trade Commission. The hearing expected to be concluded this week in Oakland's Tribune Tower is on FTC's charges that AD–X2 doesn't live up to its advertising claims.

DECISION NEXT MONTH

Hearing Examiner William Pack is expected to make his decision by late next month, and his decision can be appealed first to the Commission and then to the United States court of appeals. But observers are predicting that—on the basis of the testimony going into the hearing record—the Federal agencies will have to let Ritchie walk off with general clearance for his product claims.

In presenting its side of the case, FTC produced 9 witnesses who had used a total of 43 packages of AD–X2, but their criticism of the product was weakened by the fact that either they hadn't kept records on battery performance or else Ritchie was able to argue that they hadn't used the additive according to instructions. On the other hand, Ritchie has called in 40 witnesses, all of whom have praised AD–X2 as doing all that's claimed for it. For example, a battery mechanic at a naval supply center testified that AD–X2 had more than doubled the useful life of lead-acid batteries, and that "I'd still be using it if the Government would let me."

One possibility: that Ritchie might accept a ruling that he should drop 1 or 2 minor claims—an order that would save face for the Bureau of Standards, which has called the product worthless.

Western Reclamation and Irrigation Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 10, 1955

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, among the topics under discussion during this session is reclamation. I have long supported a vigorous reclamation program. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter, written by Lewis A. Lincoln, of Harrisonville, Mo., and published by the Denver Post.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILLER'S LOST CONSISTENCY

(By Lewis A. Lincoln)

Leslie A. Miller, former Governor of Wyoming, recently wrote an article for a popular magazine in which he opposed any more western irrigation because of the already large surplus of farm products. One wonders, until he reads Mr. Miller's article, how a man who had been the chief in an arid area like Wyoming could take such a position. Let, to be perfectly fair, there is a certain logic in Mr. Miller's argument. Which is, briefly, that there are too many farmers.

So Mr. Miller advocates the "closed shop" in agriculture. Yet, chances are, he would be most vehement in defense of free enterprise and the right to work.

Some of our legislators, writers, and economists get their consistency lost in such a contradictory wilderness that the whole picture of the interests of the national economy are obscured or made to appear hopeless of solution. So the "closed shop" idea has come to agriculture as in other things.

Now this is exactly what Mr. Miller's argument amounts to with reference to agriculture. However, I suspect that Mr. Miller, if he were asked about the necessity for expansion in every branch of our economy would be among the first to agree that such expansion is necessary unless we eventually want communism to "git" us.

All over the country the right to work is being discussed by groups of laborers and farmers. Even lawyers are concerned about a man's right to work in spite of the fact that they would deprive the law graduate fresh out of college the right to work until he had passed the bar examination and joined some association.

What is expansion? It is the making of new investment in new plant facilities. And is just as necessary to a dynamic agriculture as it is to a dynamic steel industry or a dynamic any-thing-else. Industry either grows by expansion or atrophies and disappears. And that is true also of peoples and nations. Mr Miller (always in the public interest) reminds his readers how much it costs people in New York State to irrigate lands in the arid West. In the public interest he would limit the right to work for a half million new farmers in the West and at the same time he would have various industries move to the West and so produce more steel, oil, textiles—just anything but more food. And this would be tougher on the industrial States than would the paying of taxes to irrigate additional Western acres.

If we follow the trend of the times it looks like there may eventually be so many of us that, for one reason or another, have no right to work there may be 10 or 12 million sitting around drawing union wages while watching the rest.

For one thing seems certain: If industry, regardless of whether it be making cigarets or growing string beans, is to be dynamic and thrifty then there must be enough purchasing power per pocket as well as per capita to buy industry's output. This is the problem of the 20th century: to make the products of industry available to all people everywhere. No regional or even national approach is big enough for the job.

Fair Trade Laws: A Consumers' Benefit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 10, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the continuance and effective enforcement of the fair-trade law is of vital concern and importance to the retail merchants of the United States. Recently I was privileged to read an article in the New York Journal-American of Wednesday, April 13, 1955, by Mr. E. F. Tompkins, entitled "Fair Trade Laws: A Consumers' Benefit." Mr. Tompkins has stated the case for fair-trade laws in a most persuasive, cogent, and logical manner. I call to the attention of my colleagues this worthy article. It does much to set the record straight and to explode the many myths that have been encouraged by the opponents of fair trade.

Effective enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act permits the independent businessman to buy right. The continuance of fair-trade laws permits the merchant to sell right. Both of these important acts represent the legal

framework of a code of fair competition. Any effort to weaken either the Robinson-Patman Act or the fair-trade law—the McGuire Act—will result in the increase of monopoly, an even more accelerated trend of mergers, and a wave of discriminatory pricing and unfair competition that can and will lead to serious difficulties in our free-enterprise system.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Tompkins be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR TRADE LAWS: A CONSUMERS' BENEFIT

(By E. F. Tompkins)

Prudent housewives want to buy good merchandise at honest prices, backed by a manufacturer's guarantee of quality.

They are able to do this by purchasing goods which are made and sold under a manufacturer's advertised brand name at a price which the manufacturer can determine on the basis of costs of production and distribution, and which in turn supports the integrity of the product.

This excellent system can be broken down if unscrupulous competitors are allowed to imitate a manufacturer's brand in order to sell a spurious article.

The same result can follow if dealers are permitted to infringe on a manufacturer's earned reputation by offering his genuine product at an unauthorized price—and even at a loss to themselves—as a means of enticing customers into their shops.

RESALE AGREEMENTS

To prevent these evils, Congress some years ago passed the Miller-Tydings and McGuire Acts, better known as the fair trade or price maintenance laws, which enable manufacturers of brand-name goods to protect their market prices—and their patrons—by making resale agreements with their distributors.

Housewives should therefore be interested in a report just made by a blue ribbon committee of 60 experts which has been issued by the United States Attorney General with his implied approval.

For the report proposed that the fair trade laws be repealed and that price maintenance be penalized under the antitrust laws.

Titularly, the experts were delegated to investigate monopoly problems.

Their findings as regards fair trade seem to have another purpose.

These findings seem to be directed against quality merchandise, against advertising, and against the economic principle of consumers choice.

In fact, the recommendation looks like a well-planted design to impose grade labeling on the public by indirect methods.

A few years ago grade labeling was a prime objective of the socialistic economic planners who wanted to abolish advertising and brand names.

Grade labeling assumes, of course, that a Government bureaucracy would direct or regulate the grading and labeling of merchandise.

But Congress and the public rejected grade labeling and propaganda for the collectivist reform subsided.

LACKS GUARANTY

Now comes the proposal of the Attorney General's committee to rescind the fair-trade laws—an obvious long step toward general grade labeling.

The issue is simple. Grade labeling means essentially anonymous merchandise, without guaranties. Price maintenance, carried on with advertised brand names, means guaranteed identifiable products on which housewives and other consumers may rely.

Price maintenance enables an ethical producer to adopt a standard of quality, to select a trademark or brand name that distinguishes his product from all others, to label or package his goods accordingly, and to advertise his wares, at an acceptable price, in an orderly market that is free from infringement or commercial piracy.

That is fair trade.

And it is not true that fair trade laws foster monopoly. Factory priced goods must meet the competition of other advertised goods, and even of unidentifiable goods. Moreover, the laws apply only in States that so permit and under competitive conditions.

A producer has a property right in the good will which he establishes. Patent and trademark laws protect his insignia from plagiarism. Fair-trade legislation similarly guards his price lists against trespassers.

Address by David W. Armstrong Before National Convention, Boys' Clubs of America

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 10, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from Kenneth E. Weaver, administrative assistant of the Boys' Clubs of America, a splendid address delivered by the national director of the Boys' Clubs of America, Mr. David W. Armstrong, on the occasion of the national convention of that great organization in Milwaukee, on May 9.

This address was another outstanding presentation regarding the boys' club movement in our country.

Boys' Clubs in America have become indispensable parts of the community scene throughout the land.

There serve as directors of these boys' clubs an outstanding group of Americans as heads virtually any similar organization in our country. The caliber of this leadership of the clubs is indicated by the fact that a former President of the United States, Hon. Herbert Hoover, is chairman of the board.

I wish continued great success to these clubs, more than 400 of which serve more than a third of a million young Americans. These lads are the leaders of the America of tomorrow. The value of the fun, the health, and the guidance which they receive from the boys' clubs cannot be measured.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Armstrong's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, preceded by a list of the officers and board members of the boys' club.

I may say that as a member of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, I am particularly gratified at Mr. Armstrong's stress on building character.

There being no objection, the list and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF OFFICERS AND BOARD MEMBERS OF BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA, 381 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Officers: Herbert Hoover, chairman of board; William Edwin Hall, honorary president; Albert L. Cole, president; Stanley Resor, vice president; William Ziegler, Jr., secretary; Jeremiah Milbank, treasurer; David W. Armstrong, executive director.

Board of directors: Hoyt Ammidon, New York; Wendell W. Anderson, Detroit; Sewell L. Avery, Chicago; Arthur T. Burger, Boston; Hendry S. M. Burns, New York; John L. Burns, New York; Peter Capra, New York; James B. Carey, Washington; Colby M. Chester, New York; Frederic Cameron Church, Boston; Albert L. Cole, Pleasantville; Carle C. Conway, New York; Donald K. David, Boston; Morse G. Dial, New York; Robert W. Dowling, New York; Kempton Dunn, New York; James A. Farley, New York; J. Francis Finnegan, Philadelphia; Horace C. Flanigan, New York; E. E. Fogelson, Dallas; M. Preston Goodfellow, Washington; J. Peter Grace, Jr., New York; John S. Griswold, New York; Powell C. Groner, Kansas City; Edgar A. Guest, Detroit; William Edwin Hall, New York; Herbert T. Hart, Bridgeport; Robert B. Heppenstall, Pittsburgh; William Edwin Hill, New York; Allan Hoover, New York; Herbert Hoover, Palo Alto; J. Edgar Hoover, Washington; Arthur Huck, New York; Austin S. Igleheart, New York; Ernest Ingold, San Francisco; Edward Ingraham, Bristol; Frank R. Jelleff, Washington; Grant Keehn, New York; James S. Kemper, Chicago; Philip Le Boutillier, New York; Philip Le Boutillier, Jr., Toledo; James A. Linen, New York; John C. Macfarland, Los Angeles; David I. McCahill, Pittsburgh; Charles P. McCormick, Baltimore; Everett McCullough, Wichita Falls; Jeremiah Milbank, New York; J. W. Mitchell, Little Rock; Theodore G. Montague, New York; W. R. Nicholson, Jr., Philadelphia; Nicholas H. Noyes, Indianapolis; Harry L. Olden, Cincinnati; August K. Paeschke, Milwaukee; H. Bruce Palmer, Newark; Thomas I. Parkinson, New York; Richard S. Perkins, New York; James W. Pettit, Cincinnati; Samuel F. Pryor, New York; Stanley Resor, New York; Capt. E. V. Rickenbacker, New York; Victor F. Ridder, New York; Irving Rudolph, Chicago; Fredric E. Schluter, Trenton; George A. Scott, San Diego; Grant G. Simmons, New York; P. C. Spencer, New York; Edward K. Straus, New York; Lewis L. Strauss, Washington; Kenneth C. Towe, New York; Maxwell M. Upson, New York; Virgil P. Warren, Atlanta; Albert C. Wedemeyer, New York; Morgan D. Wheelock, New York; J. Dugald White, New York; Myron A. Wick, Jr., Stamford; Alfred G. Wilson, Detroit; Charles E. Wilson, New York; William S. Wilson, New York; Matthew Woll, New York; Gen. Robert E. Wood, Chicago; E. A. Wright, Detroit; Clinton R. WyCkoff, Jr., Buffalo; C. K. Xander, Wilmington; William Ziegler, Jr., New York.

ADDRESS OF DAVID W. ARMSTRONG, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL CONVENTION, BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA, MILWAUKEE, WIS., MAY 9, 1955

Ladies and gentlemen, it wasn't very long ago that some of us were advocating that the juvenile delinquency problem should be soft pedaled so far as Boys' Clubs are concerned for fear that we should be thought of as delinquency prevention organizations.

The extent of the problem and the interest of the people in it has knocked that idea into a cocked hat. We have to be very much concerned about it as everybody and every organization that deals with boys and girls has to be concerned about it. People are asking what we are doing about it and we must have an answer in something besides generalities.

There was a fear that a stigma would be attached to Boys' Clubs if we said they prevented juvenile delinquency. That fear may have been justified a short time ago but it is justified no longer. Almost every organization with the remotest relationship to the problem is making claims in delinquency prevention. Certainly no single organization has accomplished more or has greater potentialities for further accomplishment in lessening delinquency than the Boys' Club because our boy membership is not restricted by costs or class, because we provide activity and leadership every day, because of the variety of our activities which attract boys, and because of our guidance program. Certainly no parent need fear association by his son with other boys in such an environment and under such leadership when weighed against the dangers of other environment and leadership. The time has come for a positive attack on the delinquency problem.

Let me tell you what we are up against. In 1952 there were more than 1 million delinquents in the United States. In 1953 delinquency had reached its highest point and had jumped 13 percent over 1952 and 24 percent over 1951. Predictions from various sources are that by 1960 there will be from two to five million delinquents at the present rate of increase.

It is estimated that boys and girls 10 to 17 years of age constituted 11 percent of the population last year. This 11 percent of the population committed 57 percent of all auto thefts, 49 percent of all burglaries, and 43 percent of all other thefts, and 4 out of 5 delinquents are boys. In the last 20 years the number of murders committed by boys under 16 years of age increased 47 percent, sex crimes 69 percent, and assaults 60 percent.

Millions of words have been said and written about the causes from bumps on boys' heads to the emotional makeup of the grandmothers. There are about as many opinions as there are people who express them. We know from our own experience and our studies that delinquency, apart from vandalism with no motive, is most prevalent in crowded and poor areas; that those having the least opportunities for constructive activity and good leadership are most likely to be delinquent; that the patterns of behavior of the group and the gang often outweigh the guidance and overcome the discipline of parents; and that many boys simply get off on the wrong foot because no man is his friend. Let's not be concerned about all the causes but with those which we can do something about.

The cures suggested are many and varied, from fixing the bumps to racing hotrods and the whole emphasis is on treatment and the teen-ager. The so-called experts are saying that recreation has no effect on the problem; that one more boys' club won't solve the problem; that our schools, recreational centers, and boys' clubs were failing to reach the child who was rebelling against society; and that the vast majority of delinquent youngsters do not regularly attend church or belong to what might be called a character-building organization. They even quote from a study of a boys' club made 27 years ago which was not even then typical boys' clubs and was no more like a modern boys' club than the model T Ford is to the present model.

Some of those who are saying these things are largely in the correctional field although many of them have had no experience with boys whatsoever. They quote from studies of small groups of boys and often they merely repeat what some other so-called expert has written or said. One expert has said there is no correlation between the delinquency rate and housing and the delinquency rate and poverty. We know differently.

How long are we going to take this stuff? Of course, the already delinquent is less likely to attend a boys' club, a church, or any other character-building organization, and the older they are the less likely they are to engage in constructive activity and seek good leadership. We've got a chance with the youngsters if we get them at the beginning of their delinquency, and we do get them. However, we prefer to get them before they begin. Shall we, as people, wait until boys become teenagers and delinquent before we do anything about the delinquency problem? That's like waiting until a child has polio and then treat, not prevent, the disease. The time to stop delinquency is before it starts.

We know from experience with thousands upon thousands of boys that the lessening of delinquency has been the byproduct of our activities and leadership in the building of character. We can prove it in case after case. We don't know which of the thousands of members would have become delinquent had we not provided them with the safe activities and the guidance of trained leaders. We do know, however, where Boys' Clubs have gathered the facts that the establishment of a Boys' Club has resulted in less delinquency, and where there is a Boys' Club there is less delinquency than in like areas without a Boys' Club. We have a great deal of evidence and a mass of testimony from the police, courts, and even correctional officials but most of us have not felt that proving our case in the prevention of delinquency has been either necessary or desirable. I believe our reluctance to deal with the problem openly should be a thing of the past.

The time has come for a positive approach to the prevention of delinquency and that can only be by the building of character in our boys and girls. It is not only the job of Boys' Clubs but also of parents, churches, schools, recreational departments, youth agencies, social agencies, clinics, and all who deal with children. It's a long-range approach, but it is the only one that will work. There is no quick or magic formula.

It cannot be accomplished on a temporary basis. It will require continuous effort. Delinquency must be dramatized as a menace to children and the country just as polio has been dramatized. The public must be kept constantly aware of it. We must step up our activities, particularly in the field of guidance. We shall need greater support to reach more children and to improve our programs and leadership.

I believe that the Boys' Clubs here and now should launch a national attack on juvenile delinquency by increasing their efforts to build character and good citizenship in our members. We should publicize the fact to parents and the public that a boy in a Boys' Club is in safe activity and under safe leadership. We should build up our memberships to the limit of our capacities in facilities and staffs. We should relate all our activities to building character. We should step up our guidance programs. We should create a greater awareness among our workers that guidance is their most important function and we must improve our ways of training them. We must deliberately seek out the problem boys and those with problems. We must deal with these problems so far as we can ourselves, but we must also work with the parents of the boys concerned, and we must enlist the resources of all the community agencies in dealing with the boys.

Let's bring the boys into the attack on delinquency. We can do a great deal with the boys themselves by creating an atmosphere of decency among them. I think we can convince them that delinquency is not something apart from them, so long as they themselves are not delinquent. If we can get the 98 percent of the boys who are decent to thinking that delinquency is as much their problem as one for adults, they can do much to deglamorize it and they can exert a powerful influence on those who may be headed the wrong way. We can organize the leaders among them. I think we can dramatize delinquency as a menace to the boys as well as the public.

This is a challenge for us. Let's prevent juvenile delinquency by building juvenile decency.

AEC Nominee and the Crawford Estate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 10, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, portions of an article written by Clark Mollenhoff and published in the Des Moines Register of Sunday, May 15, 1955, relating specifically to Mr. Whitfield's connections with the R. A. Crawford estate. I am certain that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will seek answers to all the questions raised by the review of the R. A. Crawford estate. I hope Mr. Whitfield has a full and satisfactory explanation. I imply no prejudgment, but merely emphasize the desirability of full investigation and hearings.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISCUSS ROLE OF WHITFIELD IN AN ESTATE—CONGRESS STUDYING AEC NOMINEE

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Congressional investigators have completed a 6-week investigation of Allen Whitfield of Des Moines, preparatory to a hearing on his fitness to serve on the Atomic Energy Commission.

The issue on Wihtfield's confirmation has narrowed down to his connection with the estate of the late R. A. Crawford, who owned a major interest in the Valley Bank & Trust Co., Des Moines.

OTHER DATA SET ASIDE

Information on other business and political activities of Whitfield submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, largely by Democratic sources, has been set aside as having little or no bearing on his fitness to serve on the AEC.

However, members of the committee will have wide discretion in asking questions of Whitfield at the hearings.

Therefore, although the Crawford case will be the major issue pursued, individual members may bring up any material they wish to explore.

DIRECTOR OF BANK

Whitfield long has been a director of Valley Bank & Trust Co.

Crawford, under his will, left his assets for the use of his widow, Melissa Crawford, during her lifetime. A later codicil provided that a special trust be created for his Valley bank stock.

Several educational and charitable institutions, including Drake University and Iowa Methodist Hospital, were named to be beneficiaries upon Mrs. Crawford's death.

The three trustees of the bank stock, designated in the codicil, were the late Frederick M. Morrison, Whitfield, and the late James A. Howe. Mr. Morrison died in 1953. He

served as president of the bank after Mr. Crawford's death. Mr. Howe, a Des Moines attorney, died in 1953 at the age of 88.

The record of the Melissa Crawford estate is also a part of the study of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

MICROFILM RECORD

Supporters of Whitfield contend that the transactions receiving most serious study by the investigators were handled while Whitfield was in the Army in World War II. They feel that this relieves Whitfield of any responsibility in connection with transactions arising in the handling of the trust property in that period.

Whitfield was commissioned an Army lieutenant October 14, 1942. He came out of the service November 3, 1945, as a lieutenant colonel. Among other assignments, he served as Deputy Chief of the Civilian Supply Branch.

Investigators for the committee have obtained a microfilm record of the bulky files of the Crawford estates from the clerk's office in the Polk County courthouse.

They also have obtained statements from a number of Des Moines attorneys and other persons.

The major job of the committee staff has been tracing bank stock transactions through the voluminous files in the estates, and also through other records.

IN SEVERAL WEEKS

Oral reports on the investigation have been made to some of the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and written reports are in the process of being completed in preparation for public hearings.

* * * * *

IMPLY NO WRONGDOING

The Democrats make it clear that they are implying no wrongdoing in insisting on a full explanation, but are merely seeking to establish in public hearings the precise relationship of all parties in the handling of the trust set up in connection with the Crawford property.

* * * * *

The Whitfield nomination to the $18,000 a-year job as a member of the AEC was announced on March 16 by the White House.

* * * * *

The only public attacks on the Whitfield appointment have been leveled at the fact that he has been a prominent and active Republican.

* * * * *

A congressional investigator came to Des Moines several weeks ago and obtained the microfilm record of the files in the Crawford estate and in the guardianship of Melissa Crawford, the widow.

Crawford died August 7, 1937, at the age of 81, after a lingering illness. His widow died May 22, 1944. They had no children. Their home was at 2143 Grand Avenue.

The Polk County district clerk's office made the microfilm record at the request of the congressional committee. Picturing the record took nearly 40 feet of 35-millimeter film.

Whitfield was one of the three trustees of the bank stock in the Crawford estate.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY DOLLARS A MONTH

Crawford was president of the Valley Savings Bank, now the Valley Bank & Trust Co. He also was president of the Valley Investment Co., and was executive vice president of the old University State Bank.

Crawford's will was dated April 12, 1935. It gave the widow a life estate in all his property.

The Valley Savings Bank was named executor. The will provided that Mrs. Crawford receive at least $250 a month.

After her death, a number of small bequests were paid to distant relatives and others, as specified by the will. The will provided that the remainder of the estate ultimately be divided on the following basis:

Drake University, one-half; Iowa Methodist Hospital, one-fourth; Des Moines Children's Home, one-eighth, and the Piney Woods School in Mississippi, the final one-eighth.

CREATED A TRUST

On July 7, 1937, Crawford signed a codicil (amendment) to the will. The codicil created the R. A. Crawford trust. All the capital stock owned by Crawford in the Valley Savings Bank was placed in the trust. This totaled 678 shares, or nearly half the bank's 1,500 issued shares.

The codicil named Whitfield, Morrison, and James A. Howe, Des Moines attorney, as the three trustees. Morrison and Whitfield were stockholders in the bank at the time. The 1939 records show that Morrison held 42 shares and Whitfield 159 shares in that year.

CONTROL FOR 10 YEARS

The trustees were given full power to control Crawford's stock during a period of at least 10 years. Crawford in the codicil said he was of "sound and disposing mind and memory" in making the change.

"For many years I have been associated with the Valley Savings Bank * * * an institution in which I hold a large proportion of the capital stock and in the future welfare of which I am greatly interested," the codicil said.

"In view of my many years of service with that institution and my efforts in its upbuilding and development, and my desire to promote its welfare even when I can no longer take part in the direction of its affairs, I have determined to make this codicil to my said will above mentioned."

STOCK DISPOSITION

The codicil called for management of the stock as the trustees "may deem for the best interests of the said institution (bank) and for the promotion of the welfare of the Valley Savings Bank."

The codicil then provided for the ultimate disposition of the assets as provided in the will.

The codicil expressed Crawford's desire to use the trust to make it (the bank) one of the great and reliable financial institutions of Iowa.

The original will provided that no sale of bank stock belonging to the estate "shall be made without at least 10 days' written notice of such proposed sale to Drake, the Methodist Hospital, and the children's home. This provision was canceled by the codicil.

The codicil was witnessed by Nora Barnes, a registered nurse, and Harold J. Howe, a Des Moines attorney.

DIED A MONTH LATER

On August 7, 1937, just a month later, Crawford died. The will and codicil were admitted to probate August 17, 1937. The bond of the Valley Savings Bank as executor was fixed at $10,000. The bond of the three trustees of the R. A. Crawford trust was fixed at $1,000 each.

Incidentally, the Valley Savings Bank had combined with the Valley National Bank under the savings bank's name in 1933. Crawford was chairman of the board of the new bank. The institution's present name, the Valley Bank & Trust Co., was adopted in 1946.

By 1940, Morrison was president and a director of the bank. Whitfield also was a director. Both continued to serve as trustees of the R. A. Crawford trust.

Drake and the Methodist Hospital filed objections July 15, 1940, to paying unspecified fees to the trustees.

The objectors said the "only duty of the trustees is to vote the capital stock" of the bank and for "the act of voting said stock the trustees are not entitled to large compensation."

TWO THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-TWO DOLLARS DIVIDENDS

The objectors said Morrison as president was employed by the bank "on a fulltime basis and at an adequate salary." The statement added that Morrison was under obligation to devote his time and attention to the affairs of the bank. The objectors pointed out, too, that Whitfield also was serving as a bank director.

The objectors said the trust had received $2,772 dividends up to that time and "under no circumstances" should the fees paid the trustees exceed that amount.

The statement concluded: "The trust estate at the termination of the trust is all to be conveyed to charitable institutions in which the deceased R. A. Crawford had a keen personal interest * * * as nearly intact as possible."

SEVEN THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLAR COMPENSATION

On December 24, 1941, Judge Loy Ladd signed an order fixing the total compensation of the trustees at $7,500 for the period from August 17, 1937, to August 17, 1941.

On July 31, 1943, F. W. Lehmann, Jr., filed an application in behalf of Mrs. Crawford, who then was 93 years old.

Lehmann recalled Saturday that Morrison asked him to enter the case to protect Mrs. Crawford's interests.

The application said that in 1937 Crawford was "fatally sick and confined to his bed at his home for weeks before his death."

"The full burden of caring for him during this last sickness fell upon (Mrs. Crawford) who was then about 87 years old," the application continued.

"After the death of Mr. Crawford, this applicant was exhausted by the long labor of caring for him during his last illness and overwhelmed by grief at the loss of her lifelong companion."

"STILL HAS CONFIDENCE"

The application said Crawford generally had selected the officers and employees of the Valley bank and had full confidence and trust in them.

The application added that the will and codicil appointed as trustees "three men with whom he had been closely associated and in whose ability, character, wisdom, and good faith he had full confidence.

"This applicant shared the confidence of R. A. Crawford in these men and still has such confidence and trust in them."

The application said Mrs. Crawford consulted these trustees as to what she should do after her husband died.

"ENTITLED TO INCOME"

"She was advised by them by the terms of the will and codicil that she was entitled to all the income from all the assets," the application continued, "and that she would receive all such income at reasonable intervals without trouble or worry so long as she lived and that such income would be safe and secure and would be ample to satisfy her needs, supply her wants and support her about as she had lived while her husband was alive."

For this reason, the application said, she was advised to accept the terms of the will, and they "drew up an instrument and advised her to sign it."

The application expressed belief that such was the opinion of her advisers, but "they were mistaken in the opinion they had and the advice they gave."

The application said that "it is now claimed * * * she is not entitled to the income from such of the assets as are held by the trust."

ASKED FOR DIVIDENDS

This interpretation was called "a serious threat to the peace, security, and comfort" of the widow. The court was asked to rule that Mrs. Crawford was entitled "as long as she

lives to all income from all the assets of the estate, including assets held by the trust and especially stock dividends on stock held by the trust."

Dring Needham, now a Polk County district court judge, was referee in probate at the time. He also was named guardian of Mrs. Crawford's property on November 1, 1943.

Needham's bond first was fixed at $5,000. When it developed 10 days later that Mrs. Crawford had $18,000 cash, the bond was increased to $20,000.

On November 9, 1943, a decree signed by Judge Ladd permitted Mrs. Crawford to change her previous position and to take instead a one-third interest in her husband's property, as provided by law.

ACCEPTED $15,000

Ultimately she elected to take $15,000 cash, which was paid by the bank as executor. Under this agreement she also was permitted to occupy the homestead, with all taxes paid, during her lifetime.

A third arrangement guaranteed her $9,000 a year for the rest of her life, payable on August 1, annually. She died in May 1944.

Needham negotiated this settlement with a corporation known as the Valley-Des Moines Co. That company agreed to provide the money in return for assignment to the company of all her rights in the estate of R. A. Crawford. All this happened while Whitfield was in the Army.

COMPANY OWNERSHIP

The Valley-Des Moines Co. in recent years has been two-thirds owned by the Morrison family and the other third by Whitfield. In 1943, however, the company appears to have been wholly owned by the Valley Savings. Morrison was president of the company then.

In 1952, Whitfield was listed as vice president, secretary, and director of the Valley-Des Moines.

1943 TRANSACTIONS

The Valley-Des Moines Co., however, was not involved in a November 30, 1943, series of transactions.

At that time, Morrison bought out the interests of Drake, the Methodist Hospital, and the other residuary heirs of the estate.

The records in the probate file do not show what price he paid.

In these negotiations, Drake was represented by the late Truman S. Stevens, Gardner Cowles, and Gamble, Read, Howland, and Rosenfield; Iowa Methodist by Ralph L. Jester and Gamble, Read, Howland, and Rosenfield; the children's home by Mrs. B. L. Jewett and Craig Wright; and Piney Woods by Grover C. Hubbell and Gamble, Read, Howland, and Rosenfield.

Apparently as a result of those transactions, the Valley Bank stock held by the trust all was transferred in 1947 to the Valley-Des Moines Co. The trust held 924 shares by that time. The original amount of stock held by the trust had substantially increased, principally because of a stock dividend of 231 shares. The trust was closed in 1947, under the terms of the codicil to Crawford's will.

STOCK INCREASED

Since Crawford's time, the capital stock of the Valley bank has been increased more than sixfold. From the original 1,500 shares with a par value of $150,000, the bank today has 10,000 capital shares and $1 million capitalization.

The records show that in 1954 the Morrison interests held 5,327 shares, or slightly more than half the outstanding total. Whitfield was the largest other individual stockholder, with 869 shares.

The bank has more than $27 million in deposits. It has a surplus of $500,000 and undivided profits of more than $600,000.

The Career of Former Governor Oswald West, of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 10, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an informative article from the Oregon Journal of June 5, 1955, on the career of Oswald West, one of Oregon's most outstanding Governors.

During his service in our State capitol, Governor West pioneered in such reforms as abolition of capital punishment, protection of women and children in industry, maximum-hour and minimum-wage laws, and in expanding the initiative and referendum and recall.

The article about Governor Oswald West, a lifelong Democrat, is by Frances Blakely, of the Journal staff.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OSWALD WEST, WIFE TREASURE OLD DAYS—EX-GOVERNOR, WIFE PAID $25 MONTH RENT DURING HIS TERM

(By Frances Blakely)

In 1911 Burton Hendricks, political writer for McClure's magazine, was sent to Salem to interview Oregon's young Governor, Oswald West, 36, and his wife, Mable, 34. Though Republicans then outnumbered Democrats 4 to 1 in Oregon, West, a Democrat, had won over his friend, Jay Bowerman, a prominent Republican, by 650 votes. No recount was demanded.

Hendricks had his story—all but an interview from the Governor's wife, when he rang the doorbell of the modest little cottage the Governor rented in Salem for $25 a month. When there was no answer, he wandered to the rear of the house where he saw a slim young woman hanging out the family wash.

"I'm looking for the Governor's wife," he told her. The young woman shook out a tiny gingham dress, put it on the line and pinned it there with clothespins from her mouth.

"Well, take a good look at her," said Mable West. She continued hanging clothes of the Wests' primary-grade daughter, Helen, until the basket was empty. Then they sat on the back steps for the interview. The stories appeared in the July, August, and September 1911 issues of McClure's.

Today, as then, Mrs. West has been satisfied to remain in the background of the Wests' colorful life, making a comfortable home for her husband, their 2 daughters, Helen and Jean, their grandchildren and 1 great-grandchild. There was a little son, too, who died at the age of 3 months. It was the same when she was the wife of Governor West, and later the sister-in-law of another Governor of Oregon, Ben W. Olcott, married to Mable's sister, Lena.

Os West was born on a stock ranch near Guelph, Ontario, Canada, May 20, 1873. Mable was born in Salem and is the great-granddaughter of men and women who crossed the plains in prairie schooners pulled by oxen. Her great-grandmother, Mrs. John Hutton, who came in 1851 from Mercer County, Ky., brought her apron pockets full of black walnuts and planted them on their donation land claim on the Abiqua River, Evans Valley, near Silverton. Several of these first walnut trees ever grown in Oregon now measure 3 and 4 feet at the trunk, says Mrs. West.

Her parents were Mr. and Mrs. Owen D. Hutton who lived all their lives in Salem. The Hutton family crossed the plains in 1845, settling in Mission Bottom, north of Salem. Some of their old apple and prune trees still bear fruit.

Os' father moved his family to Salem when Os was 4 and from the time he and Mable entered grammar school, where Os was, Mable was somewhere near. The elder West, Os' father, dealt in horses and cattle and Os rode every animal he could throw a halter. onto.

Once he redeemed a little racing mare for a friend who was about to lose the horse on a $100 mortgage. Somehow Os raked up the $100; then he kept the horse and drove her hitched to a buggy, Mable recalls. A Salem preacher also had a racing horse on which he bragged a lot and Os was laying for that preacher after he took over the little mare.

"The first time I rode with Os behind the horse, he and the preacher met—the preacher also driving his prize horse, at the railroad track, 12th and Main (Salem)," said Mable. "Both drivers took off toward the river. We sailed down Main past the sheriff, chief of police, and my father," Mable continued. "Os got to the bank of the Willamette first of course."

"And we didn't get arrested for speeding," chimed in the ex governor. "The day Mable and I were married, September 22, 1897, I was broke, though I worked in the Ladd & Bush bank for $50 a month. I didn't even have money to pay the preacher. That morning, a sister of the friend whose horse I had redeemed, brought me the $100 and took the horse home. So the Wests were married in state."

The best man lived next to the house the young couple had rented and furnished, so after the ceremony, he rode home with the bride and bridegroom.

When Os got the Democratic nomination for governor of Oregon, he rented a room in the Salem United States bank building and without help tried to carry on a campaign. He wasn't getting very far when his old friend and hunting companion, Ben W. Olcott, heard about it. Ben was in Alaska, where Os had been for awhile many months before, and he, Ben, had saved up $3,000. He drew the money out and took a boat for home.

One day he walked into my office and said, "I'd better get out and do a little campaigning if I wanted to be elected," Os related. "So I turned over the office to Ben and my hunting dog and I took to the skyline. Ben told me to use the $3,000 as I needed it but as I got over the State by train, buckboard, and horseback, contributions came in little by little—enough to keep me going and to send enough home to Mabel and Helen to pay the bills."

Mrs. West has a little bundle of letters written by her husband on his trips. Most of them began "Dear Hut," his nickname for Mable, and after 4 or 5 cheerful lines ended with "love and kisses for you and Helen." When he got back from his last trip, 2 days before election, he told Ben he thought he'd win by from 500 to 1,000 votes. The day after election, Helen rushed up to her teacher, Margaret Cosper, and announced excitedly:

"We won; we won."

Os was $1,500 in debt on campaign expenses just before election day, so Olcott drew out half of his life's savings and paid all the debts. Os was inaugurated as governor free of debt. Out of his first $5,000-a-year salary as governor, he paid the $1,500 back to Ben.

The Governor had no expense account in those days and he paid his own rent but the governor's wife did all the entertaining that was necessary. Distinguished visitors from the East always got blackberry pie for dessert, the pies made by Mable from the small Oregon wild blackberries.

Governor West loved every minute of his 4-year term and he put through much liberal legislation, especially for working women, gaining distinction for himself and his State. He firmly refused to run for a second term because he had to think of a financial future for his family. At the end of his term, the Wests moved to Portland where the ex-governor developed a successful law practice.

Surrounded by old friends, their daughters, Mrs. West Stone and Mrs. Frank McHugh and grandchildren—all of whom are in Portland, the Wests now live in a comfortable apartment with a flower-bedecked balcony, at 636 Northwest 20th Avenue.

Tribute to Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 10, 1955

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the May 20 edition of the Elizabeth Daily Journal, Elizabeth, N. J., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The editorial makes deserved reference to this administration's distinguished Secretary of Labor, the Honorable James P. Mitchell, a resident of New Jersey.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MITCHELL BACCALAUREATE SERMON

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell has just released a baccalaureate sermon of helpful suggestion in the form of an open letter addressed to the nearly 300,000 young men and women who will be graduating from college in a few days. It is a splendid sermon delivered from the background of a Cabinet member whose influence has grown great through performance since President Eisenhower called him to Washington to be labor chief.

"The success of our material adventures," Mr. Mitchell tells the seniors who will so soon become freshmen in the world, "is founded firmly on the rich tradition of liberty, the ethical and moral values that are part of the American way of life. This tradition is strong and insists that morality be the measure of all actions, public and private. You are a part of that tradition. It is part of your responsibility to see that heritage is kept safe and passed on to your children in the same condition in which you received it from your fathers.

"Our material well-being is the result of a scheme of things in which your place is of importance. The creative and inventive talent of a few cannot be translated into useful objects for the many without an array of experts, skilled workers, specialists, supervisors, management heads, production planners, and the like. It is to the men and women who can abstract, visualize, envision, direct, promote, and invent that the country turns for continuing skill and direction. It is on the people who can translate vision into reality the country depends for its future health. Whatever your place is in this dichotomy, it is important."

And what is that place? What is the job? Where the opportunity? Mr. Mitchell has not overlooked that, either.

"The job opportunity picture as I have skimmed it," he writes, "looks like this: Business and law—demands flexible and moderate. Civil service—demand constant and moderate, high for technologists. Engineering—demand growing, supply insufficient. Health—demand growing, supply insufficient. Natural science—demand great, supply insufficient. Social work—demand steady and increasing, supply moderately short. Teaching—demand very great and growing, supply greatly inadequate."

But, where to find the job you want? Mr. Mitchell has not overlooked that, either. With good service to the country the Department of Labor has prepared a book called the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, listing 22,000 titles which represent 60,500,000 people at work, while there is likewise a wealth of material available in publications like the Occupational Outlook Handbooks, also produced by the Department of Labor.

Once Mr. Mitchell stood exactly where the young folks of Elizabeth so soon to face the world now stand. Once there was a graduation day for him in Elizabeth when there was no Secretary of Labor to preach a baccalaureate sermon and no Labor Department to make available the books we have mentioned. And having once stood where the graduates of Elizabeth now stand somehow we can't escape the conviction that knowing all the wondering attending a brand new diploma—somehow the publications of his national office would be available for the young men and women back home who might ask for assistance.

Minnesota Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 10, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Sam Romer on Minnesota Politics Respectable Now, appearing in the June 6, 1955, issue of the New Leader.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA POLITICS RESPECTABLE NOW

(By Sam Romer)

ST. PAUL.—In Minnesota, practical politics is now within the shadow of respectability, thanks to a law passed by the last legislature. It allows John Citizen to deduct up to $100 a year from his taxable income for political contributions, just as he does for donations to the Red Cross or the cancer drive or his church. Another section of the new law recognizes campaign expenses by political candidates as legitimate business expenditures. It allows deductions up to $5,000 by aspirants for governor or United States Senator, lesser limits for other Statewide offices and up to one-quarter of the annual salary for county and local jobs.

The law—first of its kind in the Nation—is the brainchild of Byron G. (Barney) Allen, a real estate dealer and farm management specialist from Detroit Lakes, Minn., who vigorously preaches the gospel of responsible politics. Allen's speeches on this topic have all the earmarks of a Johnny-come-lately political reformer; yet he is a veteran politician who was weaned in smoke-filled backrooms. He served a hard political apprenticeship in the Iowa Legislature; more recently, he has helped guide this State's Democratic-Farmer-Labor party as its national committeeman. He now has given up his party post to become Governor Orville L. Freeman's key commissioner of agriculture, but remains high in partisan councils.

Allen has been obsessed for several decades with the notion that politics is important. As a working politician, Allen knows that too often campaign contributions have strings attached which the candidate might like to cut but can't. A start has been made in Minnesota toward an alternative; the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party is hoping to fill its political war chest with small monthly donations during noncampaign periods. The results haven't been spectacular.

Allen is an admirer of political machinery in Britain and the Scandinavian countries. He likes the idea of full-time party agents, of schools for candidates, of political reading rooms. American election campaigns, he complains, are emotional binges; political contests are "popularity contests in which real and important issues are obscured by name calling. "To counter the trend, he has helped found the Minnesota Foundation for Political Education to assist young persons who want to make a career of public service.

Allen's efforts in this direction have been helped by the active entrance of intellectuals into the State's politics—and not on its fringes, either. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of course, was a political science professor for a short period, but he is an example of a politician turning professor rather than the opposite. But Minnesota's Democratic national committeewoman and Freeman's administrative assitant is Mrs. Dorothy Jacobson, who teaches political science at Macalester College. Prof. George Selke, commissioner of conservation and before that the Governor's executive secretary, is a former chancellor of the University of Montana and president of St. Cloud Teachers College.

A third key Freeman aide is Arthur Naftalin, who has worked both the political and academic sides of the street with equal ability. Naftalin learned practical politics as secretary to HUMPHREY when the latter was mayor of Minneapolis; he then spent 6 years on the University of Minnesota campus as associate professor of political science. After Freeman's election victory, Naftalin took a leave from his academic duties to undertake the enormous task of reorganization of the State government. While on the campus, Naftalin kept his hand in the political pot both as an active participant (in party strategy councils) and an observer (through a weekly column for rural newspapers). He also conducted a nonpartisan field work course in practical politics during which students received college credit for participating actively in political conventions or campaigns. Many of his students have gone into politics.

This combination of practical politicians and academic experts still has a long way to go. The legislature bypassed other proposed electoral reforms, including one which would have prohibited stooge candidates with politically potent names from running against convention candidates. In 1950, four of these stooge candidates trounced the regular candidates; one of them (a grain shoveler named Joe McCarthy) explained: "I may not be very smart, but I'm just as smart as the people who voted for me." Democratic politicians don't object to what he said; they hope it will have a different meaning in the future.

The Great Polio Botch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, there is a suggestion that somebody is trying to play politics in the discussion of the failures of the Government in the polio-vaccine program.

The plain fact is that the administration is so frightened at the idea of Government action about anything that it ran away from its responsibilities in the polio program.

Canada faced the same kind of problems we did—but the Canadian Government did not flee from responsibility. The Canadian Government did not act as if all Government planning was necessarily evil.

The result is that the Canadian innoculation program is a brillian success—but in this country millions of children will not get the Salk vaccine shots needed before the polio season reaches its peak. They will not get the vaccine because the Secretary of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department refused to follow a system paralleling the Canadian system.

If anyone thinks that a Member of Congress has not his duty to face this fact, and to assert it, let him answer to his own conscience, and not go around muttering politics behind a hand.

In this connection, I offer an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, entitled "The Great Polio Botch":

THE GREAT POLIO BOTCH

It is a shame that polio has got into politics. That it is there cannot be doubted. One need only look at the vaccination bill introduced by six Democratic Members of the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee, in competition with an Eisenhower administration bill.

The administration asks funds to pay for vaccine for needy children. The Democrats want free vaccine for everybody. But the unpolitical truth is that, in view of the resources of States, cities, and private organizations, how to pay for vaccinations has never been a major question.

Yes, it is a shame that polio is in politics. Yet when President Eisenhower at every press conference acclaims the handling of the inoculation program as proof of the administration's great wisdom and concern for public welfare, who can expect the opposition to refrain from using the same program as proof to the contrary.

For the unpolitical truth is that the inoculation program under Secretary Hobby's direction has been a miserable botch.

If there were any doubt about that, one need only look at Canada. With one-tenth the population of this country, Canada has given 700,000 children their first shot, 350,000 children their second, and will have immunized 1 million by July 1. Once started, its vaccination program has moved steadily ahead, with no stops, no starts, no hysteria, no switches. And how many vaccinated children have developed paralytic polio? Exactly one.

How has Canada done it? The program is entirely in the hands of the Canadian Government. Cost of the vaccine is paid for half by the Dominion Government, half by the provincial governments which corresponds to our States. Free of charge, inoculations are administered, usually at schools, by local public-health officials. From the start, manufacture of vaccine has been under strict and direct Government supervision, with exhaustive Government tests (not reports) being made on every batch. The Government got vaccine manufacture started early by agreeing to buy the entire output.

Smaller population and cooler climate may contribute to Canada's success, but they cannot account for it. Neither can the fact that the vaccine is Government-subsidized in an all-government program. The basic reason for Canada's success lies in strong Government leadership and bold, decisive advance planning. Canada's program was carefully thought out 7 months before the vaccine became available. As long ago as last September, public health officials were drawing up their plans in case the Salk vaccine proved effective. This was the time when Mrs. Hobby was deciding that there probably would not be much demand for the vaccine.

Mrs. Hobby's Department of Health, Education and Welfare turned scarcely a wheel until the photographers came in to take her picture licensing the vaccine. She left to the Polio Foundation such advance planning as was done for the immunization of first and second graders—who represent about a third of the most susceptible children. And when trouble struck, her Department lost its head, stopped, started, backed up, started again—and plunged the program into such chaos that nobody knew where he stood.

So it is now clear that only a fraction of the children of most susceptible ages will be immunized against polio this season. President Eisenhower, still trying to paint the program as a triumph, told his press conference last week that by August 1 all first and second graders will have had their two shots. We think he was overoptimistic. But even if he is right, consider the shrinkage of the target.

On April 12, the day it licensed the Salk vaccine, Mrs. Hobby's department announced that by August 1 every child aged 1 to 9 would be inoculated. That would be 30,800,000 children.

On May 16, a week after the Government suspended inoculations, Secretary Hobby told a Senate committee that by August 1, enough vaccine would be available for 29 million children through age 9.

And on May 31 the President said that by August 1 all first and second graders would be inoculated. That would be just 9 million children—the group which the polio foundation (not the Government) originally set out to protect.

Some delay in the program doubtless was inevitable after trouble developed with one manufacturer's vaccine. But the utter collapse can be accounted for only by the administration's failure to plan boldly in advance, to offer vigorous and decisive leadership, to meet a crisis calmly and courageously.

The consequence? Millions of children who could have been immunized this year will now go through another polio season unprotected. That is the measure of Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby's great botch.

Poor Housing Poses Threat to Urban Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include a noteworthy address by my colleague on the Banking and Currency Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable THOMAS LUDLOW ASHLEY. The address, which was delivered at the annual banquet of the north central regional council of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials held at the Commodore Perry Hotel in Toledo, Ohio, on May 23, 1955, follows:

Thank you very much. If I were to say that the very kind invitation to address you this evening was accepted by me with unmitigated pleasure, I would be guilty of a half-truth (or possibly even less), and, of course, this is dangerous for anyone, especially one engaged in political or public activity.

For me to address you on the subject of public housing, slum clearance, and the related areas included in urban renewal puts me in the position of a carrier of coals to Newcastle, and if there's anything worse it's a carrier of coals to Newcastle who arrives at Newcastle only to find that what he carried is an inferior substitute for coal.

I think it's personal fear which is responsible for a certain and perhaps sizable share of the so-called wisdom which Members of Congress either have ascribed to them or, in the absence of this, ascribe to themselves. I've often thought that if it weren't for the voluminous and generally frantic research which the congressional expert is forced to undertake before fulfilling his speaking obligations, he would be far less of an expert than he is cracked up to be and under certain circumstances, and this is the real motivating fear, he might even make a complete fool of himself.

This is simply by way of saying at the outset that I know considerably more about the areas in which all of you are so vitally interested than I did a month ago. And I think this is fine and as it should be, and certainly I don't offer this up as any sort of an apology. As many of you know, the House Committee on Banking and Currency, on which I'm privileged to sit, is so-called because it has jurisdiction over (1) public and private housing; (2) financial aid to commerce and industries; (3) price controls of commodities, rents, and services; (4) deposit insurance; (5) Federal Reserve System; (6) gold and silver, including coinage; (7) issuance of notes and redemption thereof; (8) valuation and revaluation of the dollar; and also over banking and currency.

You know along about last Tuesday, just when I was finishing my research, I was advised by my very efficient office here in Toledo that my engagement this evening might possibly be complicated by the fact that there was certain verbal activity taking place locally between various officials on the very subject I planned to discuss. I told them that I had taken judicial notice of the reports in the Toledo Blade and Times and that I hoped to come in on a wave length which wouldn't interfere.

So having failed to disturb me on that score, my good assistants announced in rather pleased tones that I would undoubtedly address a number of men and women who view the merits of public housing with a rather jaundiced eye, and perhaps with no eye at all.

JOINT ACTIVITY REQUIRED

I could only reply to this that the subject matter was extremely broad and complicated, and that since I would be talking to experts my best hope of getting a base hit would be to take an honest swing rather than a cautious one.

This may sound funny to you, but in my original draft I got into the meat of my talk with a statement to the effect that I was

sure we could all agree that, at the present time, shelter constitutes a very real material need—above politics, which requires for its solution some sort of joint activity by private enterprise and by the Federal Government through low-cost public housing.

Having laid this seemingly solid foundation, my talk began to go together very nicely until I suddenly overheard what was being said before the Senate Housing Committee. The words which I overheard were those of Henry Waltemade, of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, whose broad experience led him to state that "it is politically and morally wrong to require the taxpaying public to subsidize the shelter of the privileged few. Public housing is unnecessary because of the high volume of home construction * * * and the continued marked reduction in the number of low-income persons since 1946."

This pronouncement, of course, destroyed the foundation I had been building on, since in one sweeping blow it indicted public housing as both politically immoral and unnecessary.

After recovering from my initial surprise, that a person could actually get paid for making a statement of this sort, I decided to start over again by saying that I am here tonight because I believe just as strongly as Mr. Waltemade—and I think with a good deal more reason—that Federal aid to low-rent public housing is both a legitimate and a necessary function of Government, so long as private enterprise is unable to provide decent, safe, and sanitary shelter at rents low-income families can afford to pay.

From the bleating outcries from some quarters, you'd think Government responsibility in this area was no more than a deliberate and devious device to compete with private enterprise.

Actually nothing could be further from fact. The bipartisan supporters of the Housing Act of 1949 and of subsequent public housing amendments to the bill have almost unanimously agreed that the job of providing decent housing at reasonable rates for low-income families is properly the function of private enterprise.

WHERE GOVERNMENT FITS IN

The sole question is whether it has done or is doing the job? If not, then it falls within the legitimate province of the Government to meet this human need until such time as private enterprise is able to fulfill the function.

Despite Mr. Waltemade's profound utterances to the contrary, the volume of construction today is far from sufficient to provide shelter for those whom he terms "privileged few"; that is, those whose low-income presently qualifies them for public housing.

The late Senator Taft, who in Mr. Waltemade's book would be a politically immoral supporter of public housing, stated in 1949 that the ratio of public housing to private housing would have to be at least 1 to 10 to meet the increasing need for low-rent shelter in the United States. But from 1950 through 1954 there was a total of only 230,000 public-housing units started as against nearly 6 million private units. Instead of public housing providing 1 unit for every 9 by private enterprise, the ratio from 1950 through 1954 was 1 public unit for every 26 private.

Yet if we ask whether private enterprise has done the job during this period, or whether it shows any signs or possibility of doing the job in the foreseeable future, the answer has to be "no." Private enterprise has done a good job but it hasn't done and can't do the whole job.

The more than 1 million new nonfarm units provided annually by private enterprise since 1950 have benefited mainly people able to pay the market price of the homes provided by private enterprise. There has been little abandoning of substandard housing for better quarters and most of the progress which has been made in this area has come from Government construction for low-income families.

THE ILL-HOUSED FIFTH

The appalling fact is that today one-fifth of our Nation continues to be ill housed. Despite the heavy construction since 1950, of the forty-odd million nonfarm homes in the United States, more than 11 million still need major improvements today. According to the last statistics of the Census Bureau, 8½ million nonfarm dwellings lack private indoor flush toilets and another 3.2 million dwellings were classed as dilapidated.

All of you know that these aren't just dry statistics. These figures tell the story of a human need which hasn't been faced squarely by private enterprise or by our Government.

The philosophy of our present administration was clearly stated last January in President Eisenhower's budget message when he said: "The basic principle underlying budget recommendations for programs in the field of transportation, housing, and business is that the national interest is best served by privately owned and operated industry, which is assisted by a minimum of Federal funds and Federal basic facilities operated at the lowest feasible cost and financed, where possible, by charges levied on the users of the services."

This is the kind of statement which is impossible to disagree with, because it doesn't really mean anything until you find out, in terms of positive programs, what is meant by such phrases as "a minimum of Federal funds" and how far the actual figures go in meeting the housing needs of our people.

We do begin to get a pretty clear idea of what the present administration has in mind in the field of public housing from the fact that a total of less than 55,000 public-housing starts were made in 1953 and 1954, as compared with nearly 130,000 in the preceeding 2 years of the Truman administration.

AN INFINITESIMAL EXPENDITURE

And I think this picture becomes clearer when we consider the infinitesimal housing expenditure of only $12 million for fiscal year 1956. Actually, the Government proposes to put up $301 million for public housing, veterans housing, urban renewal, and other home-building projects, but the Treasury expects to take in $289 million from Fannie Mae, FHA, and other self-supporting Government agencies assisting private housing.

In view of the fact that other welfare programs are slated to receive Federal aid amounting to more than $2 billion, I think the conclusion is inescapable that the present administration is doing little more than paying lipservice to the need for public housing.

Whether or not Congress will provide some teeth to give this lipservice meaning remains to be seen. As you know, the Senate has just concluded hearings and the House Committee on Banking and Currency today began hearings on the same legislation.

My own view, as you may have suspected by now, is that greatly increased public housing is urgently needed to meet the problem threatening our urban civilization. It's also my view, as well as many of my colleagues in Congress, that our housing laws must be liberalized to allow aged and single persons to qualify for public housing projects and to make it possible for public housing and urban renewal projects to dovetail more closely and more effectively.

PUBLIC IS UNINFORMED

I'm sure many of you will agree with me that the slum clearance and urban redevelopment programs under the Housing Act of 1949 and the urban renewal extensions under the Housing Act of 1954 though inadequate are absolutely essential weapons in attacking the core of the housing problem. The job which you and other housing and redevelopment officials are doing is one of the most dramatic in America today, but it is a story which most Americans know little about, and, of course, this makes your task all the more difficult.

For example, I wonder how many people have been startled by the fact that slum and blighted areas comprise nearly 20 percent of the metropolitan residential areas in the United States? And I wonder how many realize that these blighted districts account for 33 percent of the population, 35 percent of the fires, 45 percent of the major crimes, and 55 percent of the juvenile delinquents, and 50 percent of the arrests in our cities? I wonder how many realize that this 20 percent of our metropolitan areas accounts for 50 percent of the disease and 60 percent of the city tuberculosis victims? And I wonder how many know, outside of our city officials and those of you who make this work your life, that only 6 percent of urban real estate tax revenues are collected from these extensive blighted areas? While they account for 45 percent of city service costs.

COMMUNITY UNDERSTANDING NEEDED

It seems to me that these basic facts have to be known if your programs and efforts are to have any meaning. Actually, of course, such community understanding is one of the seven requirements of the workable program which each city must present in order to qualify for financial aid for urban renewal projects, and I think this is as it should be, without community understanding there is no hope for community participation and without community participation there can be no real hope of meeting the slum problem successfully. The kind of organization which developed in New Orleans, where every church, school, and civic group unified in a joint effort, is perhaps the ideal, but it was attained and I am told that it was an essential ingredient to the successful job which was done against great odds.

It also seems to me that city people should know what can be done under the urban renewal provisions of the Housing Act of 1954. They should know that the Federal Government pays two-thirds of the net cost of a redevelopment project, and that the city puts up the remaining one-third, using public improvements as a credit against its one-third share, but even more relevant, in many areas, is the knowledge that Federal aid can be obtained on the same two-thirds to one-third basis even where there are no slums to clear and without the acquisition and sale back characteristics of rehabilitation.

I've noticed in the Toledo Blade during the past week or so, a number of statements from public officials. The municipal league and other sources urging that bond issues be reserved for "critically needed projects of long-term usefulness."

PROJECT OF REAL USEFULNESS

Certainly, no project is more critically needed or of more long-term usefulness than urban renewal, but I wonder if enough every-day citizens know this? How many know that the Federal Government is ready to assume two-thirds of the cost of preparing the plan, the cost of public improvements, the net cost of any property that has to be acquired, and the cost of carrying out the voluntary rehabilitation program?

It seems to me that this knowledge is just as important as a workable plan, because those are conditions precedent to obtaining Federal and local shares of the cost of urban renewal projects.

Finally, and this you know far better than I, there is the basic necessity for America to know just why the housing needs of our Nation have not been met, and why they cannot be met under the regulations and policies which prevail today. The not-so-fine

Now, let us mention some of the favorable and objectionable features of this kind of a program.

Under this sort of an arrangement, the free market determines the differential in prices between the top qualities and kinds of wheat, not an artificial legislated differtial.

Producers are encouraged by differences in price to produce the kind of wheat consumers want. Thus, the tendency is to encourage production of wheats with a strong market demand, discourage production of wheats with a weak market demand.

Producers who have good alternatives to producing wheat, and are now engaged in producing cheap wheat, would be likely to shift out of wheat into more profitable crops. Producers who have poor alternatives for wheat, but who raise a strong wheat, would be free to produce as much as they wish.

With price differentials for different types of wheat, production would tend to shift geographically, out of areas producing the least-wanted wheats and into the areas producing the hard wheats that are in demand. It also would tend to shift production with changing consumers' preferences, such as durum wheat.

The Government would be out of the storage business, because the wheat market would move freely in the best traditions of a free capitalistic marketing system, with no artifices or restrictions. The consumer would pay for wheat just what he needs to pay to get the kind and quality he wants. The consumer would pay to clear the market to whatever extent he wants to clear it each year, in competition with those who want to store wheat and carry it over, because they think it would be good business to hold it.

There would be no surplus, in the sense that we would now have bulging bins of cheap wheat hanging over the market, stirring up he consumers' anger, when there is at the same time a scarcity of the kinds of wheat the market wants but can't get.

This arrangement should permit wheat to flow freely into foreign markets, at whatever price the foreign market would pay for wheat of the kind and quality they want, in relation to the kinds and qualities that are on sale in the markets.

Farmers could decide, for themselves, what kind of wheat to produce, where to market it, and when. That is individualism in the best tradition of the capitalistic marketing system. There is freedom of choice, with no Government interference.

Some of the criticisms that will be raised against such a program are:

The program is a subsidy, a direct payment to wheat producers, and is dependent on Congress for money. The only answer is that there is a mere psychological—not a real—difference in being paid to produce a wheat that is wanted and in producing a wheat that the market won't take but the Government is required to.

The farmer would be required to wait until the end of the marketing year before getting his Government payment.

There would be strenuous objection to this program by producers of what I have called cheap wheat, meaning varieties that bring a lower price because of smaller demand. These producers, who live in the more populous States, would object to a lower average price.

I have said this program would require a minimum of regulation. I feel there would be no need for acreage restrictions, but assuming some would be required, it might be possible to apply heavier restrictions on those varieties of wheat that have a historic low-price compared to those with a historic high-price. Certainly we can use some other device than lowering the support price all across the board for all varieties.

In conclusion, let us summarize how this program would work:

First, the Government would set a single support price, based on parity or some percentage of parity, for the average of all wheat produced in a given marketing year in the United States.

Second, the Government would determine at the end of the marketing year, the actual national average price at which all wheat actually sold for during that year. This determination would be based on sales receipts as processed through ASC committees.

Third, the Government has already set its support price, and now knows what the wheat actually sold for in the marketing year. Now the Government would determine the percentage increase necessary to raise the actual sales price to the support level.

Fourth, the Government would pay every individual wheat producer, on presentation of his sales slips or receipts, a support premium based on this fixed percentage of his actual sales price, whatever the amount is.

You'll remember my illustration, when I said that if the support price was to be established at $2 a bushel and the average national price was $1.50 a bushel, the difference would be one-third. So the support price premium would be one-third of the average price each farmer received, whether it was $1 or $1.50 or $2 or $4 a bushel.

I do not believe acreage restrictions would be necessary. But assuming that they are, they could be applied on a differential restriction basis, with heaviest cuts applied to the least desirable varieties of wheat, pricewise.

There would be no restrictions on the free judgment of farmers as to what kind of wheat to produce, how to produce it, how to sell it, when to sell it, and what to do with it. Yet, wheat would be supported on the basis of national averages.

There is no such thing as a perfect system. Whatever is proposed will have bugs in it. But our goal is the most workable system—not the perfect one.

Tribute to Hon. Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine, and Hon. H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 10, 1955

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the June 5 Sunday Times-Advertiser of Trenton, N. J., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The editorial pays worthy tribute to Senator SMITH of Maine and Senator SMITH of New Jersey, who have served this body so well and so long.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TWO SMITHS

New Jersey shares with Maine a deep sense of pride in the honor bestowed by Columbia University upon two Smiths who are Members of the United States Senate—MARGARET CHASE SMITH and H. ALEXANDER SMITH.

Columbia has displayed admirable judgment in singling out for distinction the lady from Maine, who for 7 years has been a member of the "most exclusive gentlemen's club in the world," and the gentleman from New Jersey, who for more than a decade has represented his State with "unchallenged integrity, with eloquence and with wisdom."

The two Smiths have indeed been creditable public servants. They have consistently brought intelligence, independence, and courage to their political careers. In many ways, they have done a great deal to deserve the degree of doctor of laws conferred upon them.

Fair Trade Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 10, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. E. G. Shinner, on the fair trade laws, appearing in the June 6, 1955, issue of the New Leader.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR TRADE LAWS—WHOM DO THEY SERVE?
(By E. G. Shinner)

Few thinking people—economists, professional men, businessmen, or even the man on the street—will question the statement that a high degree of business activity and national prosperity go hand in hand. The speed with which goods and products move in trade is of itself a measure of our national well-being. This same group of people, if asked whether profit is essential to our private enterprise system would answer with a resounding "Yes." If these facts be fundamental to our national prosperity, then the question arises: What are the best means for creating a high degree of business activity and protecting the profit motive? How can we best promote and nurture these basic factors?

Long years of experience have shown that competition generally serves a useful purpose in our private enterprise system. The same experience likewise proves that competition is multicolored, many-sided and ofttimes destructive. Competition can be unfair, vicious, dishonest or harmful; on the other hand, it can be reasonable, completely wholesome, highly beneficial. Unfortunately, the public is seldom in a position to differentiate between wholesome and vicious types of competition; and the conclusion is easily, though erroneously, reached that he who sells the cheapest is the most efficient and, as such, is entitled to the fullest degree of public confidence and support.

This brings us to the major point to be considered in this article, namely: Which is of greatest value (or, stated inversely, least destructive) to our national economy—wide-open, unrestricted competition following the old jungle law of the survival of the fittest, or a program of cooperation between the manufacturer and retailer, intended to maintain a fair and equitable price at the retail level on articles which are and must remain always competitive in the market place? This latter practice is presently sanctioned by law in more than 40 States and known as fair trade. It is the writer's belief that fair trade serves a legitimate and useful purpose and, accordingly, should be retained.

Let me illustrate this need by citing an incident in which my company was one of the principals. Some 40 years ago, the Shinner Co. was operating one of its modest meat markets in a small northern Illinois city. We were doing a nice volume of business and

making a fair and legitimate profit—roughly, 2.5 to 3 percent net on sales.

Directly across the street was one of the largest grocery stores in northern Illinois—this before the days of supermarkets. The owner of this grocery—a Mr. Cyle—was, in the vernacular, a "big shot," the leading grocer for miles around. He had the most complete stock of groceries and the largest organization of clerks, delivery wagons (a few trucks), etc., within a radius of 50 miles. His establishment, however, did not include a meat market.

Now, Mr. Cyle had a flair for the spectacular. Every year, about January 1, when the weather was cold enough to carry meats without refrigeration, he would buy 20 to 25 barrels of pork loins at a price of, say, 12½ cents a pound. Then he would run a full-page ad in the local paper offering them for sale at 10 cents a pound, thereby making every meat dealer in the territory look like a cheat and a fraud. The loss he sustained on these 20-odd barrels of loins would amount to, roughly, $5 a barrel, or a total of $100 or $125.

The publicity he gained, on the other hand, was tremendous. His store was simply swamped with customers Their reaction to this sale was, of course, that Mr. Cyle was a genuine public benefactor. He not only sold this product at 20 per cent below his actual cost, but he delivered it without charge and permitted his customers to buy on credit.

Cyle's stature as a merchant was tremendously enhanced as a result of this operation. His custom was to pursue this procedure for about 6 weeks during midwinter; hence, his total out-of-pocket loss for the season's venture amounted to, roughly, $600 to $700—a loss which he was happy to sustain in exchange for the great popularity it brought him.

It requires no profound reasoning to analyze the motive behind Cyle's temporary venture into the sale of fresh pork. It so happened that the major competitor who was most severely harmed by his program was the Shinner Co., and our company happened to be at least Cyle's equal, both financially and in merchandising ability. Cyle's sortie into the meat business was, however, comparatively short-lived for reasons which I shall now elaborate upon.

Among other things, Cyle had a quality brand of coffee on which he had spent years in developing a reputation and which was one of his most profitable items. Good coffee at the time was selling at retail for about 25 or 30 cents a pound. This fact we carefully noted and reached the conclusion that the footballing (selling the other fellow's merchandise and/or fair-traded items at or near cost) of this item was our best means of retaliation.

We proceeded to purchase a substantial quantity of the finest coffee in the market and offered it at about half the price at which it was being sold by our overzealous neighbor and you—my dear reader—can probably guess what happened. Cyle started to rave and tear his hair—the tables were turned, the shoe was on the other foot. The net result was that he realized that footballing the other fellow's product for his own personal aggrandizement was a perfectly wonderful game to play but only when his competitors were not sufficiently financially strong or mentally alert to retaliate in kind.

About a month of this type of vicious competition served to resolve the issue. Cyle discontinued the sale of pork loins, the Shinner Co. got out of the coffee business; accordingly, no great harm resulted from this episode. The only reason for citing this incident is to illustrate the purpose and principal involved in so-called footballing.

When these same tactics are indulged in by the giants of retail industries, the results are quite different. As everyone knows, big stores like Macy's in New York are in the thick of this fight. But how they differ from the simple story just told is this: They are financially able to take advantage of television, radio, metropolitan press, etc., and to publicize their campaigns. In other words, a new dimension has been added. They can pound the life out of the independent merchant, or they can sell fair-traded articles at a loss and make up the difference elsewhere, which, because of the difference in volume, the average independent merchant can't do. Result? When giant mercantile establishments sell fair-traded items at a figure below even the markup needed to pay their operating expenses (much less make money), the inevitable result is that they put their smaller competitors squarely behind the eight-ball.

Now, there are no means available to the average dealer whereby he can retaliate in kind or expose the motive behind this type of footballing, as was the case in *Shinner* v. *Cyle*. Hence, the reputation of the merchants who pursue these predatory tactics remains unchallenged and unscathed, and their stature as merchants is greatly enhanced as they pursue their uninterrupted and merry way, wearing a halo, born of subterfuge and sharp practice, while they pose as the friend of the common man.

The power of great aggregations of capital for either good or evil has been demonstrated endless times. The railroads were among the first to abuse the public trust with which they found themselves endowed. Rebates and favoritism to certain other big interests resulted in the creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Utilities of virtually every name and nature have been brought under public regulation for similar reasons. Liberal labor legislation, minimum wage laws, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, etc., were all created to prevent ruthless and unconscionable employers from exploiting labor; again, a means of controlling great aggregations of capital—curbing the power of concentrated wealth. These various remedial measures have become a fixed and permanent part of our fundamental law. There appears not the remotest chance that they will be either relaxed or repealed.

The theory that the sole purpose of such regulations is to protect the public against the misuse of economic power is erroneous, or at least a half-truth. Whereas these regulations in the past served to prevent the abuse of economic power, they now function primarily to maintain a healthy and profitable condition for the industries which they cover. A plethora of bankruptcies is known and accepted by all to be destructive to the economy. The modern concept of a sound national economic policy is to protect all industries against a repetition of the debacle of the 1930's. Hence we continue periodically to raise the rates charged by railroads, bus companies, airlines, pipelines, and all public utilities. We go a step further and put a floor under the price of agricultural products for a similar reason.

Fair trade laws are the only means so far devised to give a measure of protection to the retail industry, and to the manufacturer as well, against another form of misuse of economic power—the footballing of merchandise. Can it be reasonably contended that the health of some 2 million merchants and countless manufacturers is of less importance to the economy than is that of the above-mentioned groups?

More than 40 States have enacted fair-trade statutes, and the United States Supreme Court has repeatedly approved the principle. Like the 40 million Frenchmen, these 40-odd State legislatures, plus numerous State supreme courts, and, finally, the United States Supreme Court, can hardly be wrong. Notwithstanding the overwhelming support that fair trade has received in the past, its opponents have recently succeeded in marshaling their forces for another all-out attack.

With the present media of communication all functioning in favor of national distributors and/or mass local distributors (many of whom are willing to indulge in an unethical type of competition), there simply are no means available to the local ethical merchant whereby he can meet, on anything like equal terms, the type of competition with which he is confronted; hence, some form of governmental aid or regulation is the only alternative.

Since the very existence of these mass media of publicity depends on their advertising accounts, it is inconceivable that they should be critical of—let alone reject the account of—an advertiser for the reason that the client's methods may have an adverse effect upon the national economy, especially when the public applauds and approves his action. To nail the situation down even tighter, a large percentage of our professional economists are standing back in the wings echoing their approval and demanding ever lower and lower prices on the theory that the public will be able to buy just that much more. They forget entirely that the purchasing power of the public is irrevocably tied to the profit margin on the very goods which they are buying. No, indeed; the purchasing power of the public is not, nor will it ever be, a fixed or permanent thing; hence, forcing prices always down, down, and down is, under our private enterprise system, simply economic suicide.

The principle can be graphically illustrated by an incident in the Chicago Union Stock Yards back in the thirties. A Montana rancher shipped a carload of sheep to the Chicago market. On the day the sheep arrived, the market was glutted with livestock, more particularly with sheep. The commission man to whom the car was consigned finally concluded a sale, but the proceeds fell some $12 short of paying the freight, commission, feed, yardage, etc. He wired the rancher to send him $12. The rancher, in turn, replied collect: "Sorry, I have no money but I can send you some more sheep." This is by no means an isolated case. It is still happening all too frequently, especially in the case of perishables (fruits and vegetables).

Unfortunately, the vast majority of our citizenry is not concerned about the economics of our fair trade laws. They are too busy making a living to give the proposition more than a passing thought. Give them bargains and ever more bargains and they will, by and large, voice their approval. Their voices, it seems, have now reached the ears of high Government officials—Attorney General Herbert Brownell, to be specific—and he in turn appointed a committee which has recommended that we legislate our fair trade laws out of existence. The odds, of course, are all against repeal. This very attempted repeal, however, will undoubtedly succeed in strengthening the public's subconscious mind in the belief that some way, somehow, profits are not really essential to our economy.

Many sincere and well-meaning people, more specifically the professional economists, will reluctantly admit that fair trade laws do offer a measure of protection to the profit motive; but they counter with the proposition that fair-trade laws are per se a breeder of monopoly.

The facts prove how fallacious this theory is. As Al Smith would have put it: "Let's pause for a moment and have a look at the record." The greatest era of consolidations and mergers, most fertile period for the creation of monopolies and trusts, in the history of America took place during the period of the twenties before the first fair-trade laws were conceived or enacted. Furthermore, the fair-trade laws were a direct result of the squeeze put on the manufacturer and pro-

ducer by the great mass distributors that came into being during this decade. The mail-order houses, variety stores, and national chains, covering nearly every conceivable form of merchandise, exercised the great economic power with which they were quite suddenly possessed to force prices on all articles of trade and commerce virtually to the vanishing point. The fair-trade laws were indeed made necessary by monopoly and by the greed of the huge enterprises which so completely changed the merchandising complexion of Main Street and the Nation during the decade of the twenties.

If further evidence be needed that fair-trade laws do not foster monopoly, let us take a look at what's happened in the automobile business in the last few years. Virtually from the inception of the automobile business until the resumption of production after World War II, the manufacturers steadfastly, religiously, and openly advertised and maintained a retail sales price on their cars. The particular medium of policing the price was exercised through the power of franchise. Throughout the history of the industry, it was unthinkable to walk into a dealer's showroom and offer him less than the list price. The dealer knew only too well that, should he violate his contract by cutting below the list price, he would do so at his peril—presumably a cancellation of his franchise.

Did this sort of policy over a long period of years foster monopoly? This question might be answered by admitting that although General Motors and Ford gained tremendous size during this era, there also developed a substantial group of stalwart independents, as well. Furthermore, it should be remembered that these independent manufacturers withstood the greatest depression of all time.

Suddenly, without warning or ballyhoo, and hardly noticed by the general public, the major automobile producers ceased to advertise the price of their products, reverting to the law of the jungle—the survival of the fittest. They proceeded to load up their dealers with cars entirely beyond their normal requirements or ability to market; hence, the scramble was on—"move the cars at any price" was the dealers' only alternative. In a matter of hours after new models appeared in dealers' showrooms, they could also be obtained on the secondhand car lots. The principle of an orderly supervised market was abandoned overnight, and by this sales policy the strong grew stronger and the weak fell by the wayside. If a single franchise was forfeited for failure to maintain the price, this writer has been unable to discover it.

Now, it is common knowledge that the last 5 years have been the most prosperous in the history of the Nation and the sale of automobiles has been at an alltime high; yet, in 1954, 38.7 percent of the Nation's car dealers reported an operating loss, and the whole industry operated on a gross profit of six-tenths of 1 percent on sales as compared with 3.6 percent on sales in 1952 and 2.2 percent in 1953. The rate of profits for the dealers in 1954 was the lowest in 50 years.

Another phase of this newly found method of operation is the loss of dealers during the calendar year of 1954. As of January 1, 1954, they numbered 41,910; 1 year later, January 1, 1955, the figure stood at 40,433, representing closeouts of 1,477 units. In Cook County, Ill., alone, 76 dealerships were closed. Whereas dealerships for the major lines of cars were for many years extremely difficult to obtain and were frequently bought like a seat on the New York Stock Exchange, they can now be had, in many instances, for the proverbial song. Pursuing this investigation a step further, it develops that the 2 major companies doing 82 percent of the total automobile business of the Nation lost 18 dealers in Cook County, against 58 for the independents who have the other 18 percent of the business.

So much for the sorry plight of the retail auto dealers, dealers who in the final analysis have simply been used by their giant masters as a cat's paw to destroy all competition at the manufacturers' level. The present deplorable status of the independent auto manufacturer is well known. Willys and Kaiser-Frazer have been virtually eliminated. The Studebaker-Packard Corp. reported a loss of about $5.7 million for the first quarter of 1955 (by far the most prosperous quarter in the history of the industry). This is typical of the industry. Even the plethora of mergers is proving inadequate to save the independents from extinction.

In view of these striking and incontrovertible facts, how can it henceforth be contended that maintaining a fair price on a standard and competitive product promotes monopoly? The evidence all points in the diametrically opposite direction. The thing that really happens under fair-trade policies is that manufacturers everywhere know approximately what their competition is going to be and can make their plans accordingly. The production of automobiles or any other major item must be viewed as a long-range enterprise. It is not a business that can be gotten into quickly and, once in, neither can it be disposed of quickly, except with disastrous results to the economy.

As all too many stockholders and investors know as a result of the debacle in the automobile industry, the major automobile manufacturers, by the simple process of ceasing to advertise and maintain a fair price for their product, have reduced the industry to the status of the bazaars of the Middle East, where the asking price is a mere sham, dickering is traditional, and the merchant's motto is the equivalent of let the buyer beware. Repudiation of selling practices based on the principle of caveat emptor was hailed as a great advance in western civilization. The automobile industry, by reverting to these long since repudiated practices, has turned the clock back two centuries.

The chaos which they have wrought should and will serve as an everlasting lesson that, although we may abandon ethical dealings in our major industries, if we so choose, we do so at our national peril. It could be argued with equal logic that Marshall Field, Altman, Bonwit Teller, etc., and the thousands upon thousands of other ethical merchants could serve the cause of prosperity by abandoning their one-price policy and resorting to the principles presently in vogue in the automobile industry. Silly, isn't it? But if Mr. Brownell and his cohorts have their way, that is the direction in which we are headed.

Bananas on Pikes Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the La Barge irrigation project in Wyoming.

The La Barge project is a part of the proposed multibillion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The cost to the Nation's taxpayers of the La Barge project would be $1,250 an acre.

The project would grow agricultural products now supported by the taxpayers and in great surplus. Among these are grains, dairy products, and wool.

Tribute of Chicago Press Veterans to Richard J. Finnegan and Col. R. R. McCormick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding event of the year in Chicago is the annual banquet of the Chicago Press Veterans Association. Newsmen who worked on the Chicago dailies in the rich yesterdays of journalism come from all sections of the country. No one is eligible to attend who was not a bona fide editorial worker on one of the Chicago daily newspapers.

The meeting with old and dear friends, the rekindling of memories of individualized personalities and of famous scoops, and the enwrapping atmosphere of the fourth estate's eternal youth and tireless optimism combine in making these annual banquets attended for a night and talked about for a year. It has been my happy privilege never to have missed a press vet banquet. It has been my sorrow at each banquet to feel the void of absence of some who were present the year before and now were gone.

In 1950 the press vets proclaimed Richard J. Finnegan as press veteran of the year and honored him as such. In 1953 the press veteran of the year was Col. Robert R. McCormick, and although gravely ill he came for a spell to receive the affectionate greetings and the expressions of esteem from his coworkers in the reporting of the news in eventful and colorful decades of a great city in peace and war.

Mr. Finnegan and Colonel McCormick, both great newspapermen, each proclaimed by the Chicago Press Veterans the press veteran of the year, died within weeks of one another. They were of different philosophies, of different political beliefs. I think, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will find of heartening interest the following from the June 1, 1955 edition of Press Vet, the organ of the Chicago Press Veterans Association:

PRESS VETS MOURN COL. R. R. MCCORMICK, RICHARD J. FINNEGAN

Deep grief fills the hearts of Chicago Press Veterans with the passing of Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and published of the Chicago Tribune, and Richard J. Finnegan, consulting editor of the Chicago Sun-Times.

Colonel McCormick was honorary life member of the Press Veterans and in 1953 was proclaimed Press Veteran of the year with an outstanding tribute held in his honor.

Mr. Finnegan served five terms as chairman of the Press Veterans and was honored as Press Veteran of 1950.

Colonel McCormick was perhaps best known for his vigorous defense of the right

to a free press throughout his journalistic career. A memorial resolution by his Tribune associates referred to Colonel McCormick's life as a dedicated one, pledged without reserve to the advancement of the Tribune company in all its activities. The progress of the company meant more to him, it stated, than anything else in the world, save only the welfare of his country.

Mr. Finnegan's half-century of service on the newspaper scene had that quality of rising to the highest office in metropolitan journalism from the humble beginning of newsboy-reporter. In his earlier role he experienced that rare distinction of having delivered newspapers which carried his own stories.

Mr. Finnegan reached the top as editor and published of the Chicago Times.

Press Veterans feel the loss of Colonel McCormick and Mr. Finnegan keenly. They will long remember and revere them.

A stunned and saddened newspaper profession respects and honors a treasured memory.

COL. ROBERT R. M'CORMICK

The greatest tribute in the history of the Chicago Press Veterans was paid Col. Robert R. McCormick when the Veterans proclaimed him Press Veteran of the Year the night of October 9, 1953.

Colonel McCormick had been cautioned by his physicians not to attend the banquet in his honor, that it would be an added drain on his failing strength. But his decision was not to disappoint the Veterans.

As the tall, erect figure of the publisher appeared at the door of the banquet room the Veterans rose as one and greeted him with resounding applause and singing, "Hail the Colonal, the Press Vet of the Year." Colonel McCormick waved back smilingly, cheered by the tremendous showing of respect and affection.

But the veterans, many of whom had come from various parts of the country, caught the tired look behind his smile and the halt in his step as he walked to his seat of honor. Their affection rose even more for his determination to come in person, in spite of his physician's advice, so that he could personally express and show his appreciation for the honor bestowed upon him.

Colonel McCormick's last address to the veterans was on the freedom of the press, the cause of which he had championed throughout his newspaper career.

Veterans chairman, Everett Norlander, managing editor of the Chicago Daily News, whose leadership was responsible for the impressive program, presented Colonel McCormick with a gold card representing life membership in the Chicago Press Veterans Association.

In making the presentation, Chairman Norlander cited the publisher as "an aggressive, courageous editor, a strong and constant defender of the freedom of the press."

"Colonel McCormick has been an outstanding example to all employers in and out of the newspaper business," Norlander declared, "by the close attention he has always given to the well being and security of his staff."

Of the gold card and banquet in his honor, Colonel McCormick afterward wrote to Chairman Norlander: "Thank you very much for the dinner party and for the golden card, which I am putting in a prominent and secure place." When first told he had been named "Press Veteran of the Year," he had written Norlander: "I am indeed honored to have been selected for such a tribute, and look forward to the Chicago press veterans' dinner on October 9 with a great deal of pleasure." Copies of the banquet edition of Press Vet he had permanently preserved in a scrapbook.

This memorable night in the historic gold room of the Congress hotel will live long in the minds of the veterans.

DICK FINNEGAN

With the passing of Richard J. Finnegan, the Chicago press veterans have lost their most active member and director, their chairman who served 5 consecutive terms as their leader and one of the best liked and most helpful members of the organization.

As his distinguished journalistic career had stretched into 55 years and his "leisure time" had been filled with activities in behalf of the sick and for the betterment of Chicago, so was his association with the veterans just as active and as interesting.

This was Dick Finnegan's patern of life.

Mr. Finnegan joined the Press Veterans Association a short time after its founding. He helped draft many of its bylaws. He rarely missed a directors' meeting.

As would be expected from him he was present for the last meeting held by the directors in January and he took an active part in the selection of this year's new officers.

Mr. Finnegan was elected chairman in 1943 and continued to lead the press veterans until 1947. He then was chosen honorary life chairman and in 1950 was again honored by his selection as Press Veteran of the Year.

When Colonel McCormick was chosen press veteran of the year 2 years ago, Mr. Finnegan represented the publishers at the banquet honoring the Tribune publisher. (One of Mr. Finnegan's last published articles was one he wrote for a special edition of Press Vet on the occasion of Colonel McCormick's Press Veteran award.

In this article, Mr. Finnegan recalled Colonel McCormick's service as an alderman in the Chicago City Council in 1904 from his own observations in the role of page of that same city council.

So as their paths crossed frequently in life Mr. Finnegan's passing followed Colonel McCormick's demise by a matter of 5 weeks.

The newsboy who doubled as a reporter and delivered newspapers which carired his own stories, who rose to the highest post in his own profession, also experienced holding many other important positions and receiving many honors.

Among these Mr. Finnegan had been president of the City News Bureau of Chicago, a director of Field Enterprises, Inc., a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the citizens advisory board of Loyola University, Northwestern University Associates, and the citizens board of the University of Chicago. He was a director of the Fund for the Republic of the Ford Foundation, Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago, Chicago Area Hospital Fund and Chicago Council on Community Nursing. He was chairman of the board of the LaRabida sanitarium and he received the degree of doctor of journalism from Northwestern University.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*_____Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*_____
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* 6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*_____
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*_____The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*_____
Bender, George H., *Ohio*___The Mayflower
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*__
Bible, Alan, *Nev*_____
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*_____The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*_____
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*_____
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*_
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*_____The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*___The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*_____Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*_____
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*_____4545 Conn. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*____3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*_____2800 Woodley Rd.
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*_____
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*_____
Daniel, Price, *Tex*_____
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*____
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*_____
Duff, James H., *Pa*_____
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*_
Eastland, James O., *Miss*___5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*_____
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*__
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*_____
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*____
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*__
George, Walter F., *Ga*_____The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*__
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*_____
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.* University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*_____
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*_____
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*___Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*____
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*_____
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*__
Jenner, William E., *Ind*____
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*__
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*_____
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*_____4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*____
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*_____
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*__3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*__
Langer, William, *N. Dak*___2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*__Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*_____
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*__
McClellan, John L., *Ark*____
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*_____
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*____The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*_____
Martin, Edward, *Pa*_____
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*____
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*__
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*_____5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*____122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*___The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*__
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.* Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*_____
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*_
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*___
Purtell, William A., *Conn*__
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*___
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*____
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*_2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*_____
Smathers, George A., *Fla*___
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*__Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*____4920 Upton St.
Stennis, John, *Miss*_____
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*____
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*____
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*_____
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*__
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*____4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*_____2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*_____
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*__Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Bridges, Saltonstall, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Morse.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Gore, Bible, McNamara, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, Allott, and Morse.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, Capehart, and Morse.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

Centennial Commencement Address by President Dwight D. Eisenhower at Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa., June 11, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, despite inclement weather over 20,000 persons greeted President Dwight D. Eisenhower at Beaver Field, Pennsylvania State University, Saturday, June 11, 1955, when he received an honorary doctor of laws degree from his youngest brother, Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, president of the Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.

The President delivered the following centennial commencement address to a class of 1,828 graduates:

Commencement speakers, by tradition, scan the future. They strive to predict, in general terms at least, the sort of success that awaits the graduates who properly apply themselves to their jobs and professions—and, of course, follow the advice of the speaker.

But the man who spoke at my commencement did not hint that I should be the first in a half century to receive an honorary degree here. Certainly I could not foresee, by the widest stretch of imagination, that one day the faculty and trustees of this university should consider me worthy of honorary membership in the class of 1955 at Pennsylvania State—the centennial class of this most distinguished school. I am grateful for this honor and delighted by my association with this class. I am particularly grateful that my youngest brother—younger brothers being confirmed skeptics about their elders—raised no objection and in person made the presentation.

Earlier this week I joined in reunion with my own class of 1915 at West Point. Most of us had grown gray and some of us more than a little bald; but these changes were slightly compensated, I thought, by an appearance of wisdom that we did not possess 40 years ago. I am sure we all felt privileged, greatly privileged, to have lived in a day of marvels and of tremendous growth in America's stature. Although we were silent about it, I am certain that every one of us envied the men in the class of 1955 as much for the opportunities and discoveries ahead of them as for their youth, their boundless energy, and their idealism. And in this feeling I am doubtless joined by thousands of alumni here as they applaud and congratulate you of this class of 1955.

Of course, you men and women venture forth into a world where human nature differs little, if at all, from human nature in 1915 or in the age of Pericles. Human relations—the art of getting along with the people who work beside you and with those who live thousands of miles away—does not change in its essence with the centuries. But the age of nuclear energy, in its industrial and economic aspects, will likely bear no more resemblance to the age of steam than a jet-powered plane to an old-fashioned box kite. Indeed, the social pattern of living may be transformed beyond recognition, for I think it can be stated almost as an axiom, demonstrated by the history of mankind that:

Out of the use of a new and great energy source, along with boundless opportunities, come new and great human problems that require new and great solutions produced by broadly informed, wisely sympathetic, spiritually inspired minds.

On this campus this morning, I had the privilege of inspecting the first atomic reactor of its kind established under university auspices. This research facility was made possible by the foresight of the trustees of this university who financed the structure and its operation. The Atomic Energy Commission provides only the fuel. In consequence, within several weeks, the atom will be at productive work here at Penn State. Here also the economic and human problems created by this new enery will be simultaneously studied by the distinguished faculties of this institution of learning.

Nuclear energy is too new for any man to chart its limits or predict its course with accuracy. But in 10 short years the curtain has been pushed aside sufficiently to afford glimpses that have aroused atomic hopes commensurate with the awful dimension of atomic fears.

The extent of the economic and industrial changes that we can anticipate is indicated by estimates that world sources of uranium potentially available contain as high as 20 times the energy of the known world reserves of coal, petroleum, and natural gas combined. But power is only one of the results of nuclear fission. Many engineers and scientists believe that radiation and radioactive isotopes may provide even greater peacetime benefit. They are already opening new horizons in medicine, agriculture, and industrial processes.

Our Nation has no desire for a monopoly on the knowledge and practice of these possibilities. We want the world to share—as we always have.

Moreover, we know that the human talents essential to the advancement of science are not restricted to this country. Throughout the free countries there are men and women of great ability who, given the opportunity, can help further to advance the frontiers of knowledge and contribute to the peace and progress of the peoples of all nations.

Progress to date in nuclear science is not, of course, exclusively an American achievement. An international cooperative effort broke the barriers and made possible man's use of atomic energy. For maximum progress in the future, we must work for a continued partnership between the world's best minds—in science, engineering, education, business and the professions.

In recognition of these facts, I proposed before the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 8, 1953, that governments begin then and continue to make joint contributions from their stockpiles of fissionable materials to an international atomic agency. Although a year later, the United Nations adopted the resolution recommending the formation of such an international agency, the Soviet Union has indicated no willingness to share any part of its nuclear stockpile with such an agency. Our offer still stands.

But we cannot wait on Soviet decisions.

Already we have made substantial progress under congressional authority toward agreements with friendly foreign governments for participation with us in the task of forwarding peaceful, atomic progress. Agreements with Turkey, Lebanon, Israel, Italy, Spain, Switzerland, Denmark, Colombia, Brazil, and the Argentine Republic have been initialed. Others are being negotiated. Now we move in further action.

We have developed two new programs that I shall submit to the Congress in the conviction that they reflect the spirit and intent of law and of the American people.

First. We propose to offer research reactors to the people of free nations who can use them effectively for the acquisition of the skills and understanding essential to peaceful atomic progress. The United States, in the spirit of partnership that moves us, will contribute half the cost. We will also furnish the acquiring nation the nuclear material needed to fuel the reactor.

Second. Within prudent security considerations, we propose to make available to the peoples of such friendly nations as are prepared to invest their own funds in power reactors, access to and training in the technological processes of construction and operation for peaceful purposes.

If the technical and material resources of a single nation should not appear adequate to make effective use of a research reactor, we would support a voluntary grouping of the resources of several nations within a single region to acquire and operate it together.

Our purpose is to spark the creative and inventive skills latent in the free world, to pool them and to put them to work for the betterment of the conditions under which men must live.

The research reactors acquired under this program will be fertile seeds for progress sown in the receptive soil of the free nations. The cost to the people of the United States will be small indeed when measured against the certain returns, tangible and intangible.

The second proposal will be of immediate interest mainly to the power-short areas of the world where atomic power may be economically feasible even today. Some of the countries, however, lack the knowledge and experience needed to construct and operate a commercial power reactor. This we can share for constructive purposes with friendly countries without real risk to our national security. Such sharing is expressly contemplated by the new Atomic Energy Act.

Together, these two provisions are designed, within the limits of prudence, to clear away some of the obstacles that have impeded progress in nuclear science and to permit its peaceful application by all who propose to make it serve mankind. Here is an invitation—to scientists and engineers, to indus-

tries and governments—to pool their energies and creative talents that this great achievement of the human mind may bear the fruit of its infinite promise.

The people of the United States instinctively reject any thought that their greatest scientific achievement can be used only as a weapon. Our increasing progress in its peaceful applications is evidence of that fact.

While we build atomic-powered ships for war—because we must—we have the desire, the determination to build atomic-powered ships for peace. And build them we shall. The first atomic-powered merchant ship, at its ports of call, will be a laboratory demonstration that man can harness this unlimited energy for normal, peaceful, prosperous life.

While we design bombs that can obliterate great military objectives—because we must—we are also designing generators, channels, and reservoirs of atomic energy so that man may profit from this gift which the Creator of all things has put into his hands. And build them we shall.

The two proposals I have outlined here are the gateway to a broad avenue of world progress in the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Surely those of the Russian people—who, despite their Communist overlords, still think for themselves and who still retain respect for human dignity—are moved by the same feelings as we.

I still hope earnestly that the Soviet Union may join in an international effort to harness the atom for man's good. But I have such unlimited confidence in the creativeness of free minds and in the capacity of freemen that I know we will, with or without the Soviets, achieve a more abundant life for those who join together in this historic venture.

As for the social and political problems that will accompany this development, their outlines can be foreseen but dimly. Their solution will be a task in which you men and women who graduate today will be engaged intensively, probably throughout your lives. Some questions immediately suggest themselves.

Will there prevail the deep desires shared by the vast majority of all people on the earth who want peaceful use of this and all other technical advancements? Can they defeat the designs of those few evil men who would use command of this energy for their control of human destiny? In this question are involved such vital alternatives as war and peace, armament and disarmament, death and life.

Another group of questions is of a somewhat different character. As nuclear and other technological achievements continue to mount, the normal life span will continue to climb. The hourly productivity of the worker will increase. How is the increase in leisure time and the extension in life expectancy to be spent? Will it be for the achievement of man's better aspirations or his degradation to the level of a well-fed, well-kept slave of an all-powerful state?

Indeed, merely to state that question sharply reminds us that in these days and in the years ahead the need for philosophers and theologians parallels the need for scientists and engineers.

These two questions merely hint at the enormous problems and possibilities that will confront your generation. Scores of others will present themselves in the changing picture in agriculture, industry, and the arts. The answers can be found only by broadly informed, wisely sympathetic, spiritually inspired minds, the product of general education that properly blends the practical and technical with the liberal and cultural.

In this country we emphasize both liberal and practical education. But too often it is a liberal education for one and a practical education for another. What we desperately need is an integrated liberal, practical education for the same person—for every American youth who can possibly obtain its blessings. Hand and head and heart were made to work together. They must work together. They should be educated together.

In colonial Philadelphia, there was a printer who was likewise a scientist and who was hailed the wisest man of his day—a builder of international understanding and friendship. In 19th century Illinois, there was a railsplitter who was likewise a lawyer and who was hailed a champion of humanity—a builder of freedom for all men. Despite their lack of formal schooling, they were educated men. Education today can nurture for us the possibility of a thousand Franklins and a thousand Lincolns in a generation, where before we were fortunate to have one.

To gain proficiency, sometimes even world acclaim in a specialized skill or profession, knowledge and training are the principal requisites. But to understand how one skill fits into another, how one profession complements and depends on another, how all human enterprises constitute an immense, interdependent society—only education can develop that understanding.

In our modern higher education, we have, I believe, three principal difficulties. First, in its practical aspect, we simply are not providing it to sufficient numbers of young men and women.

Second, we are not as proficient as we should be in providing a broad citizenship education to those who specialize in the many technical fields.

And third, even in liberal education, we have permitted it to become too much a specialization, rather than a broad, liberating influence on the mind, the attitude, the character of all students.

What we need is general education, combining the liberal and the practical, which helps a student achieve the solid foundation of understanding—understanding of man's social institutions, of man's art and culture, and of the physical and biological and spiritual world in which he lives. It is an education which helps each individual learn how to relate one relevant fact to another; to get the total of relevant facts affecting a given situation in perspective; and to reason critically and with objectivity and moral conscience toward solutions to those situations or problems.

I repeat: This kind of education is sorely needed in this country and throughout the world.

The peoples of this earth share today a great aspiration. They all have a common dream of lasting peace with freedom and justice. But the realization of the dream calls for many types of cooperation based upon sympathetic and thorough mutual understanding. In turn, such understanding is dependent on education that produces disciplined thinking.

Throughout the world mutual suspicions flourish in ignorance and misunderstanding. They can be dispelled only with knowledge and wisdom.

If we are to have partners for peace, then we must first be partners in sympathetic recognition that all mankind possesses in common like aspirations and hungers, like ideals and appetites, like purposes and frailties, a like demand for economic advancement. The divisions between us are artificial and transient. Our common humanity is God made and enduring.

I know that you who today complete your education at this great university in its centennial year recognize that truth. As you apply it to the problems you meet—as productive leaders, as American citizens, as members of the free world community—you will grow in personal stature and in your contribution to human peace, human independence, human advancement.

Honoring William K. Shibley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, we have had many occasions to pay our respects and appreciation to those Americans among us who came here from other lands and who have given much to the progress and greatness of our country.

Recently, in a resolution, the State Legislature of Oklahoma paid special tribute to one of its own members, Representative William K. Shibley, of Bristow, Okla., who came here as a boy from his native Lebanon and who has achieved great success in life, both as a businessman and as a public servant. The occasion for this particular resolution was a recent trip made by Mr. Shibley to his homeland at his own expense. He proved himself such a good ambassador of good will and understanding for America among the people of this far-off land that his colleagues wanted to show him their appreciation.

Having enjoyed a close personal acquaintance with him myself for many years, I am happy to join with my fellow Oklahomans in praising him for his fine work. I know of no man who holds our country in higher esteem or who gives it a greater love. He is to be commended for the fine work he has done in helping to build among other nations a better and closer understanding of our country and its aims. I think his services could well be used in greater degree if our State Department availed itself of his services.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolution recommending that the President of the United States appoint Hon. William K. Shibley Ambassador without portfolio to the Republic of Lebanon

Whereas Hon. William K. Shibley, of Bristow, Okla., representing the third district of Creek County, has had a distinguished career as a member of the Oklahoma House of Representatives for more than 10 years; and

Whereas Mr. Shibley, an outstanding American citizen who was born in the Republic of Lebanon, was signally honored by that country upon his visit there last year by having conferred upon him the coveted Order of the Cedar by the President of the Republic, and having also received the highest medal of the Greek Orthodox Church, the Grand Commander; and

Whereas Mr. Shibley is one of the founders of the League of Americanized Syrians known as the Cedar Club of Oklahoma and, in spite of an outstanding and busy career as one of Oklahoma's outstanding citizens, has found it possible to devote much valuable time to such organizations as the Boy Scouts of America, the Salvation Army, the infantile paralysis committee, war bond drives, and other civic activities too numerous to mention; and

Whereas the said William K. Shibley is a man of great ability and highest integrity who is possessed of much love for his adopted country and a true understanding in love for the country of his birth, whose every act is one of good will toward fellow men: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 25th Oklahoma Legislature, That this honorable senate does hereby recommend to the President of the United States that he appoint the Honorable William K. Shibley Ambassador without Portfolio to the Republic of Lebanon, with the firm conviction that such an appointment and designation of our esteemed citizen will do much to cement the splendid relations already existing between two great countries; be it further

Resolved, That an authenticated copy of this resolution be presented to the Honorable William K. Shibley, and that copies likewise be forwarded to the President of the United States and to the Oklahoma congressional delegation in Washington, D. C., as a token of the sentiments herein expressed.

Adopted by the senate the 11th day of May 1955.

PINK WILLIAMS,
President of the Senate.

Donation of Surplus Working-Capital Fund Property to Health, Education, and Welfare Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a letter sent to me recently by the Honorable W. J. McNeil, Assistant Secretary of Defense, together with a copy of the Department of Defense instruction implementing the provisions of Public Law 61 of the 84th Congress. The instruction issued by the Department of Defense is a matter of interest to many persons throughout the country, particularly those associated with our universities, colleges, schools, and hospitals, as well as the Governor of the several States and the officials of the subdivisions of our several States.

The matters follow:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: I am pleased to send you herewith copy of Department of Defense instruction which I have signed this day to implement the provisions of Public Law 61, 84th Congress which now authorizes the donation of surplus working-capital fund property to health, education, and welfare purposes under procedures set forth in General Services Administration's regulations.

Your efforts in obtaining the enactment of this legislation have resulted in clarifying the previous difficulties which arose under our stock fund operations so that we may now proceed to maintain an authorized donable program and, at the same time, continue our best efforts to carry on our vast operations on a businesslike basis.

Sincerely,

W. J. McNEIL.

AUTHORIZED DONATIONS OF SURPLUS MATERIEL FROM WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS TO HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

1. AUTHORITY

Under the authority contained in Public Law 61, 84th Congress, approved June 3, 1955, amending section 203 (j) (1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, the secretaries of the military departments are authorized to donate working-capital fund property to Health, Education, and Welfare purposes under the provisions of this instruction.

2. PURPOSE

Surplus personal property will be donated from working-capital funds (stock and industrial funds) without reimbursement therefor, in accordance with departmental procedures, provided that, (a) the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has determined in writing that such property should be allocated for educational purposes or public health purposes, including research, and (b) the Administrator of General Services Administration has certified its availability and approved its transfer as donable property for those purposes, as stated in the General Services Regulations, chapter IV, section 202, Donations to Educational and Public Health Institutions, dated April 7, 1955.

3. ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ACCOUNT TO REFLECT THE AUTHORIZED DONATIONS OF MATERIEL TO HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

There shall be established accounts in each industrial fund and departmental stock fund and division thereof to reflect the authorized donations of surplus materiel to Health, Education, and Welfare. The amounts accumulated in these accounts shall be summarized on stock fund and industrial fund statements prepared by each department.

4. STANDARD PRICING POLICY

The value of materiel donated to Health, Education, and Welfare to be recorded in the accounts shall be priced at the current stock or industrial fund price at which carried in the fund.

5. DIRECT COSTS OF TRANSPORTATION, CARE, AND HANDLING CREDITED TO ANNUAL OPERATING APPROPRIATIONS, OR WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS SUPPORTING THE FUNCTIONS

Attention is directed to the fact that paragraph 202.05 of the General Services Administration Regulations provides that the applicant agrees to pay the cost of care and handling incurred incident to donation. Such costs are construed to be generally those charges for packing, preparation for shipment, shipping, loading, and transporting such property. Reimbursements received for such cost will be credited to the annual operating appropriations, or working-capital funds, supporting these functions.

6. PARAGRAPH 203 (J) (1), FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT, AS AMENDED

There is attached a composite draft of paragraph 203 (j) (1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, by the above cited act.

7. IMPLEMENTATION AND EFFECTIVE DATE

At a subsequent date this instruction will be incorporated into the basic Regulations Governing Stock Fund Operations, Department of Defense Directive 7240.1. Copies of these instructions will be reprinted intact in departmental procedures which will be provided to my office after publication. This instruction is effective immediately.

W. J. McNEIL,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

PARAGRAPH 203 (J) (1) OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Administrator is authorized in his discretion to donate for educational purposes or public health purposes, including research, in the States, Territories, and possessions without cost (except for costs of care and handling) such equipment, materials, books, or other supplies [whether or not capitalized in a working-capital or similar fund] under the control of any executive agency as shall have been determined to be surplus property and which shall have been determined under paragraph (2) or paragraph (3) of this subsection to be usable and necessary for educational purposes or public health purposes including research. [In determining whether or not property is to be donated under this subsection, no distinction shall be made between property capitalized in a working-capital fund established pursuant to section 405 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, or any similar fund, and any other property.]

NOTE.—The matter in black brackets is supplied from the cited act amending the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

Baltic Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a proclamation issued by Gov. G. Mennen Williams proclaiming Tuesday, June 14, 1955, as Baltic Day.

As a member of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, I have had the opportunity to learn at firsthand the methods of the Communist invaders of the Baltic nations. The aggressor's policy and objective is to destroy civilization as we know it, to take over by force all that stands in his way of complete domination, and to impose strict rules under which the invaded country must live. Persons unwilling to bow to the aggressor were sent to forced-labor camps where many perished under the hardships encountered there.

In spite of these hardships, the people of the Baltic nations have stubbornly resisted the domination of their lives and land by the Communists, and to this effect the Governor has issued the following proclamation, which I am happy to have inserted into the RECORD at this time.

The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION—BALTIC DAY

On June 13 and 14, 1941, thousands of Estonians, Lithuanians, and Latvians were deported to slave-labor camps in Soviet Russia. This mass deportation represented the attitude of the Communists to break the national spirit of the Baltic countries.

Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia have always presented stubborn resistance to oppression in any form and it has been particularly evident as directed against Russia. All citizens in America of Estonian, Lithuanian, and Latvian descent remember June 13 and 14, 1944, with deep sorrow. They have each year on these days reaffirmed their determination to fight against communism wherever it may appear and have dedicated themselves to the restoration of freedom and liberty in their home countries.

It is appropriate that the citizens of Michigan of all nationalities and descents should join with our fellow men of Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia in their year's observance.

Therefore, I, G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim Tuesday, June 14, 1955, as Baltic Day in Michigan, and urge all our people to give every possible evidence of their stand alongside all our citizens of Estonian, Lithuanian, and Latvian descent in their determination to keep alive the fires of independence in their mother countries.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Michigan this 6th day of June, in the year of our Lord 1955, and of the Commonwealth the 119th.

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] JAMES M. HARE,
Secretary of State.

Hon. Charles W. Vursell Says Dairy Industry Reaching Peak Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, during the week of June 13 my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] made a radio address on the subject of the dairy industry and the problems confronting it. It was one of the best discussions I have seen on this subject, and I know it will be of interest to members of the dairy industry and to the rest of the country as well:

My friends in Illinois, this is CHARLES W. VURSELL, your Congressman from the 23d District, reporting to you from Washington.

Since the American Dairy Association is now intensively publicizing a June Dairy Month campaign in another big step forward to put more dairy foods where they belong—in the stomachs of American consumers—in my report today I want to bring to those engaged in the great dairy industry, some facts as to the future optimistic outlook for the dairy industry, which should be of great interest to the consuming public as well.

You will recall that up to about a year ago in April, the Government had been supporting dairy prices at 90 percent of parity. The people didn't and couldn't buy all of the milk and butter produced at the then high-price level.

The Government, under the high 90 percent of parity was compelled to buy millions of dollars' worth of butter, cheese, dried milk, and other dairy products to keep them off the market, and keep retail prices up.

It was at that time that Secretary of Agriculture Benson cut to 75 percent of parity the Government support level price on dairy products. The Secretary became the target of abuse and severe criticism, much of it leveled at him for political advantage. Courageously and honestly he fought back, taking the sound position that the Government and the dairy farmers must recognize that the Government could not continue to buy and store all of the excess dairy products produced; that they must come to grips with the problem, even though it would cause some sacrifices for a time to the dairy farmer to find a permanent policy that would cause the people to use more of the most nutritious food produced in the Nation; reduce the amount of surpluses purchased and stored by the Government; and, at the same time, begin to dispose of the mountain of surplus products owned by the Government.

He had a plan that was simple and sound. He proposed that the leaders of the dairy industry and the farmers with the cooperation of the Government, should help themselves by putting on an intensive advertising and sales campaign, explaining to the people that they could and should consume more of the wholesome, most nutritious, and finest food produced in America—milk and dairy products.

The Secretary knew that through intensive advertising at unlimited cost, Coca Cola sales had been increased in the United States till it became a household word and beverage and that with a much smaller advertising campaign, the dairy industry could certainly sell and expand the market for nature's best food—milk. This food that from the cradle to the grave has within it all of the food value necessary for the human body. The dairymen and the farmers agreed with his suggestion, and from the very beginning of the campaign the consumption of milk and dairy products has increased by leaps and bounds. In addition to that, under the suggestion of the Department of Agriculture, the Congress passed Public Law 480, in the 83d Congress, for the purpose of increasing the export of dairy and farm products, and to get rid of our surplus farm products of over $6 billion owned at that time by the Commodity Credit Corporation and paid for out of the taxes of all of our people.

DAIRYMEN PREDICT END OF SURPLUSES NEAR

The plan has been so successful that the American Dairy Association on June 1 issued the following optimistic report: The dairy industry is approaching the end of surpluses in the near future. Lower price support operations and increasing consumption of dairy foods are the bases of the optimistic outlook for the dairymen's future."

Dairy statistics show that the Government had to buy only 4.8 percent of the total milk produced compared with the Government purchasing 9.3 percent in the previous marketing year, even in spite of greater milk production.

That the people bought and consumed during the past year 2,800,000,000 more quarts of milk than in the previous year.

That each of the 160 million people averaged buying 4.3 percent more quarts of milk in the marketing year just closed, and that they ate one-half pound more butter and one-half pound more of cheese on a per capita average.

My friends, in the past year, we have come a long way from the gloom and doom of a depression that was sweeping through the dairy industry early in 1953, when surpluses were piling up in Government warehouses.

We had a tremendous increase in the consumption of butter, cheese, and milk, last year. Some of this increase was due to the increase in population but a great part of the expansion was due to the sales and advertising campaigns being waged by dairy farmers in all parts of the country. The American Dairy Association alone spent $5 million and when we add to this the amount spent by local and State dairy groups you can readily see that a great amount of money has been spent educating the public and showing them with facts that milk is the most economical of foods.

For instance, 4½ quarts of milk at the grocery store today cost about $1. By comparison, $1 buys you just a trifle over 1 pound of round steak. Four and one-half quarts of milk contain 3,000 calories and 1 pound of steak contains 900 calories. Milk has three times the nutrition value of steak. The same amount of milk contains 157 grams of protein, compared with 97 grams for a pound of round steak. Four ond one-half quarts of milk contain 175 grams of fat and a pound of steak only 55 grams. Your intake of calcium in 4½ quarts of milk is a little over 5 grams, while the calcium in 1 pound of round steak is almost not worth talking about.

The tremendous drop in dairy surpluses astounded me when I started my study which I am not reporting to you. In the last year we disposed of 286,691,000 pounds of butter; almost 168 million pounds of cheese, and about 485 million pounds of milk.

Few of us, I suppose, have ever stopped to think of the great role the dairy industry plays in our economy. Dairy farming is really big business. Last year dairy farmers had cash receipts of $4,130,000,000, while the total farm income for 1954 was $30 billion. In other words, dairy farmers are now capturing almost 14 percent of every dollar spent on food.

I am glad to report to you that our export shipments abroad of butter, cheese, and milk were far greater last year than for the preceding year, and there are definite indications that these exports will be still greater during the present year. This expansion of our foreign markets for dairy products partially explains the amazing drop in surpluses. For the year ending March 31, 1955, we had shipped abroad about 75 million pounds of butter, while for the preceding year we had shipped out only 36 million pounds of butter.

We sent abroad 41 million pounds of cheese, compared with only 26 million pounds the year before.

Between April 1, 1954, and March 31, 1955, we shipped abroad 313 million pounds of dry milk, compared with 233 million pounds for the previous year.

Now, what are the prospects for the dairy farmer? I think that they are better than ever. On his own and with little Government help, the dairy farmer has gone out and made a pitch for the consumer's dollar which is already showing results and will show still better results as this campaign continues and more dollars are spent in educating the public about the nutritional value and relatively low cost of drinking milk.

I fully realize, of course, that dairymen and farmers have been caught in a temporary squeeze and that they are not sleeping in a bed of financial roses. But I do feel that farmers and industry and labor as well, could learn a lesson from the dairymen, and that is: Get out from under the protection of the Government umbrella as soon as possible.

I know that the temporary pains dairymen are now suffering are just that—temporary—and that, as the trend toward greater production and consumption continues they will be out of the woods by this time next year, and will move into years of the greatest prosperity they have ever enjoyed.

Bananas on Pikes Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the Navaho irrigation project in New Mexico.

The Navaho project is a part of the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The cost to the Nation's taxpayers of the Navaho project would be $11,000 an acre. Yes, that is right, $11,000 per acre.

The project would grow agricultural products now supported by the taxpayers and in great surplus. Among these are grains, dairy products, and wool.

For a Traffic and Transportation Service Within the General Services Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have felt strongly that the establishment of a separate and independent transportation and traffic agency, preferably in the General Services Administration, was most desirable from the angle of efficiency and economy.

My attention was first attracted in this direction in the 80th Congress, as a member of the Bender subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, which committee made certain investigations into the question of traffic overcharges to the Federal agencies and the reasons therefor.

It was evident to me that the Government was paying millions of dollars more than it should, which could be averted if a central control agency on transportation and traffic was in existence with authority to act to protect the interests of the Government.

Under date of May 5, 1955, I wrote Edmund F. Mansure, Administrator of the General Services Administration, on this subject, copy of which letter I include in my remarks together with a copy of a bill I had drafted asking for his comment on the same, as well as other suggestions contained in my letter.

Under date of May 10, 1955, I received a reply from Administrator Mansure, which I also include in my remarks.

I strongly urge that Administrator Mansure take immediate steps to give the Division of Transportation and Public Utilities within his agency a separate and independent status.

As long as the present organizational setup exists, where the Division of Transportation and Public Utilities is subordinate to procurement activities, the present situation where the Government is paying unnecessarily millions of dollars more each year than it should for traffic charges will continue.

If Administrator Mansure should take such action, further legislation will be necessary to accomplish the desired objective which legislation will be introduced and should quickly be enacted into law.

I note that the Hoover Commission has made such a recommendation.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D. C., May 5, 1955.

Hon. EDMUND F. MANSURE,
Administrator,
General Services Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSURE: Under date of April 25 I wrote you in care of Mr. F. L. Barton, Director of Transportation, in connection with the lack of consideration being given to the port of Boston as a port of entry and in connection with other shipments within the United States. I have been making further inquiry into the matter.

I feel sure you have in mind the strong recommendation made by the Hoover Commission and the Task Force with reference to the importance of transportation facilities of the various agencies of our Government, particularly in strengthening the traffic management functions of the General Services Administration, all having in view more economy in Government.

I note in examining the setup of your Administration, and comparing it with the chart of the Hoover Commission that the transportation service of your agency is in a subordinate position, and certainly a position which is not consistent with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and its task force. It seems to me that the importance of transportation of traffic, etc., cannot be overemphasized.

While there are many recommendations of the Hoover Commission which I find difficult to accept, this is one recommendation that I think is a good one. You are probably aware that I was a member of a subcommittee in the 80th Congress investigating traffic conditions and, as a result of that service in that committee, I obtained valuable information. One of the most pointed impressions made in my mind was the importance of transportation services of our various departments and agencies, and this is particularly so, having in mind the vast amount of traffic being transported.

I might say that, since the 80th Congress, I have followed the Federal supply management problems in the transportation field very closely. It has been my experience, in observing procurement problems of the Government that too often the procurement aspects have dominated the transportation factors, which are so productive of economy and savings in the Government agencies. It is my strong feeling that the transportation services of your Agency should be placed on equal standing with the procurement services.

I am so strongly impressed with this that I am seriously considering introducing a bill to that effect, to make traffic and transportation services coequal with all the other services in your Administration. I am enclosing a rough draft of a proposed bill, which would seek to achieve this objective. I will appreciate it if you will send me your comments on same.

I realize that the purpose of the proposed legislation can be brought about administratively; I sincerely hope that you will take such action, which will obviate the necessity of my introducing the enclosed copy of bill.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. McCORMACK.

A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to improve the quality of transportation and traffic management services for the executive agencies of the United States, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, be amended as follows:

SECTION 1. Add a new section 110 to read as follows:

"SEC. 110. There is hereby created within General Services Administration, a traffic and transportation service which shall be coequal with all other services in said Administration. This service shall be directed by a Commissioner whose salary shall be $14,800 per annum."

SEC. 2. Add to section 602 a new paragraph (g), as follows:

"(g) Notwithstanding any provision of the preceding paragraph (d), all executive agencies shall be required to procure all transportation, traffic management and related services from the Administrator of General Services, or in accordance with regulations issued by him, with the following exceptions:

"(1) The functions of the Secretary of Agriculture specified in section 602 (d) (9) (e) herein;

"(2) The transportation of mail;

"(3) The transportation of security-classified goods which have been so classified pursuant to regulations issued by the Administrator."

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, May 10, 1955.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Majority Leader,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCORMACK: Thank you for your letter of the 5th, and I read with with interest your comments on the Hoover Commission recommendations. Appreciate your views as I know that you have followed this whole matter very closely and given it a great deal of thought.

I agree with you that procurement should not dominate transportation, and we have been very carefully reviewing this operation for several months. We have some more digging to do before we can comment on whether or not there should be legislation. If the answer is "Yes," we would certainly appreciate your help. In the meantime we will keep you advised.

As to the port of Boston, and last Friday's meeting, we are already at work on this and will have some definite information shortly. Will then advise all those who were present at the meeting. We realize the importance of this and will push it all possible.

Cordially yours,
EDMUND F. MANSURE.

Secretary Humphrey Receives Honorary Degree From Williams College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am more than glad to advise my colleagues that on Sunday, June 12, Secretary Humphrey received the honorary degree of doctor of laws from Williams College at Williamstown, First Congressional District of Massachusetts. Williams College is one of the oldest, best known of our American colleges, and is highly respected not only in this country but throughout the world.

I am confident that my colleagues join with me in congratulating Secretary Humphrey upon receiving this well-deserved honor and in wishing him well in the difficult tasks which lie ahead of him. He has made a most significant contribution to the fiscal welfare of this country and has laid a sound foundation upon which it should be possible for all of us to join in any further legislative measures necessary to make this country even stronger from a fiscal point of view.

Traditionally, Williams College makes these awards with a very brief citation.

I do want to include the full text of the citation which was as follows:

George Magoffin Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, doctor of laws. A lawyer who became a leader in the steel industry, he has brought ripe wisdom and great administrative skill to the direction of the Nation's finances, on which depend both our own fortunes and in large part the strength of the free world.

Postal Employees Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the House, June 7, adopted and sent to the President a previously passed Senate bill granting an 8.1 percent pay increase to postal employees.

It is a compromise between what the administration first said could be consistently given and the demands of the officers of some postal employee organizations.

The bill is retroactive and the increase will be effective as of March 1, 1955. All postal employees will presently receive 6 percent of the increase from March 1, 1955. The remainder will be paid within 6 months as reclassification becomes effective. The estimated cost is approximately $166 million per annum.

The passage of this bill ends for the present a long controversy over postal pay. It grants to the postal employees an increase in compensation which, since 1945, amount to some 90 percent.

Employees working in industrial plants or for business organizations are dependent upon the ability of the employer to safely conduct the business which creates the job and continue it at a profit. If the employer cannot do that, the employee is out of a job.

In contrast, the postal employee's job is continuous, even though the Department operates at a continuing substantial deficit. Postal employees also are entitled to 14 days' sick leave; from 13 to 26 days' vacation—with full pay.

Postal employees are among the most efficient and faithful of all those serving the Federal Government.

There are reasons for this efficiency and faithfulness.

Postal employees have what amounts to a guaranteed annual wage. Uncle Sam never misses a payday nor can an employee be discharged except for inefficiency or misconduct.

Postal employees have job security. Their employment is continuous. There are no shutdowns in the postal service. Retirement, optional at 62 to 65, is not compulsory until the age of 70. On retirement, the postal employee is entitled to a pension.

The foregoing facts are set forth because the folks should know that, for the present, the controversy over the pay of postal employees has come to an end and that a substantial increase in pay has been granted since 1945.

POSTAL JOBS

It is my hope that applications for postal jobs will not continue to come to me until the applicant is sure there is a vacancy in the position which he seeks.

Resignations or removals from the service are comparatively few, as are new postal jobs. So, before applying for a job in the service, those desiring a position should ascertain whether there is or soon will be a vacancy in the position sought; whether the pay is satisfactory, the work congenial. Also, be prepared, if there is a vacancy, to pass the civil-service examination required by law.

The Dominican Republic: 25 Years of Peace and Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include an article which is featured in the summer edition of the Washington magazine World Affairs. This piece, entitled "The Dominican Republic: Twenty-five Years of Peace and Prosperity," was requested by a unanimous vote of the editors of World Affairs from the author, who is my personal friend, the Reverend Dr. Father Joseph F. Thorning, honorary professor in the University of Santo Domingo and in the Catholic University of Chile, a pontifical institution. The article relates the facts about the outstanding progress of the Dominican Republic, a nation that gave the United States 100 percent cooperation throughout World War II. Moreover, I am glad to add that the leader of the Dominican Republic, Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo, LL. D., is one of the most loyal friends our country has in the present crisis of history.

The article follows:

THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC: TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF PEACE AND PROSPERITY

(By Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, honorary fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil)

In 1930, while an economic blizzard was sweeping over the globe, a tropical hurricane ravished "the land Christopher Columbus most loved." Every modern building in Santo Domingo (now Ciudad Trujillo) was ruined. Desolation and something like despair oppressed the populace. A country which had been the nursing ground of Christian culture in the New World seemed on the verge of becoming a pesthole of disease, ignorance, and starvation. This was the tragic fate which faced a nation on whole soil European man first offered liturgical worship to God in 1498, where the first government, the first school, the first university, the first cathedral, and the first hospital in the Western Hemisphere had been established. Today a traveler approaching Ciudad Trujillo from the sea can see a gleaming white capital that combines the beauty of contemporaneous architecture and landscaping with the charm and historic interest of massive Spanish structures erected in the epoch of Bartholomew Columbus, brother of the famous explorer. In 1955 one finds no trace of the disastrous hurricane or of the financial panic of the early thirties.

Since facts are more impressive than opinions, it may be recorded that the current national budget of the Dominican Republic amounts to more than $108 million. The figure stood at $7 million in 1930, after a drop from a total of $15 million in predepression years. Commenting on this contrast, one of our most responsible United States Treasury officials remarked to me: "The most gratifying feature of the Dominican Republic's annual budget is that expenditures do not outrun income; the country and the people are paying for every improvement and the standard of living is rising without inflation such as has occurred in Argentina, Chile, and Brazil." As a result, the Dominican peso is exchangeable for $1 everywhere. Banking authorities know that the Republic has neither domestic or foreign debts. This happy situation exists in 1955 because the Dominicans are producers as well as consumers. Exports, largely of sugar, coffee, cacao, tobacco, rice, bananas, and minerals, aggregate $119 million, the highest in the country's history. Imports, which help to maintain prosperity in the United States, total $82 million. Within the last 5 years, iron, salt, and gypsum mines have been developed side-by-side with marble quarries. In January of this year rich veins of nickel and copper were discovered. One of these lodes runs for a distance of 140 miles. This is mentioned in order to show that initiative and resourcefulness are master keys to the Republic's progress.

Inspiring and supporting these economic advances have been the elementary schools, colegios, and technical institutes which dot that two-thirds of the island once known as "Hispaniola." Whereas there were only 50,739 pupils in such institutions in 1930, the number has soared to almost one-quarter of a million in 1955. This is a good percentage in a population that hardly exceeds 2 million. Moreover, plant and equipment for educational purposes are on a par with the first-class installations which mark the new University City on the outskirts of Ciudad Trujillo. Here, amid beautiful gardens and attractive laboratories, 3,000 university students seek instruction from a faculty of about 300. Three hundred, approximately, was the number of students, most of them hungry and apathetic, in 1930. Although the University City does not boast the monumental structures which have been constructed for the National University of Mexico and the Central University, of Caracas, it may confidently be reported, on the basis of first-hand observation, that the professors and students in the University of Santo Domingo, founded in 1538, are as conscientious and curious as any of their counterparts in the American Republics, including those in the United States.

Women students have made a notably good record in the University of Santo Domingo. They are enrolled in all the professional schools. Many of the women medical doctors, lawyers, pharmacists, engineers, and architects in the Republic gained their entire education in their own country.

The international character of the institution is manifested by the fact that many European professors are on the faculty, while students are attracted from almost all the countries of the Caribbean, including the Puerto Rican Commonwealth. After an attendance of 1 year, students can win scholarships for outstanding grades and ability. The present rector of the university, Dr. Pedro Sánchez Troncoso, enjoys an international reputation as an educator. Another talented alumnus, Dr. Joaquin Salazar,

is now Dominican Ambassador to the United States.

University leadership has accomplished a good deal in developing popular interest in music, painting, folklore, dancing, and national literature. A palace of fine arts is being built at a cost of $3,500,000. In Ciudad Trujillo, the national symphony orchestra has been established for many years and plays regularly during the winter season. Dominican music of quality is found in the orchestra's wide repertoire.

Sound education, intensified annually since 1930, has produced a well-rounded national program of social welfare. Fundamental in this effort has been the construction of low-cost homes for farm and city workers. When I visited several of these housing projects 1 year ago, I found that 5-room homes were equipped with electricity, potable water, and modern sanitation. By paying monthly rents of $14 to $24 for 10 years the workers acquire ownership of these homes. Incidentally, the fact that water is drinkable throughout the Dominican Republic may best be appreciated in connection with the fact that great Latin American capitals, such as Habana and Mexico City, continue to struggle with this problem.

The Republic's social security system embraces old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, health insurance, charitable aid for orphans, mobile medical clinics, an enlightened workers' retirement plan (at the age of 60) and one of the largest maternity hospitals in the world. A prominent New York physician, Dr. Robert Wallis, who visited Dominican hospitals in 1952, described his impression in the following words: "The workers' hospital, the Cancer Institute, and the Childrens' Tuberculosis Sanitarium have the finest equipment available anywhere with highly competent personnel."

Inasmuch as 80 percent of the Dominican population works on farms, it is clear that vastly increased production has been the result of intelligent argricultural reform. Featured in this program have been irrigation canals, experimental stations for crops and livestock, land distribution and cooperative farm colonies. Diversification of agriculture has helped to stabilize the entire economy of the nation.

Today, there are 63 irrigation canals in comparison to the one and only ditch of this type in 1930. The total acreage now watered amounts to 234,230 whereas 25 years ago the total was 7,542. This explains 1955's profitable rice cultivation, an industry that did not exist in 1930.

Land reclamation led to an equitable distribution of soil resources. Farmers who previously had holdings of 1 or 2 acres were encouraged to try new seeds and given loans to buy new farm machinery. Government agents helped these farm families to clear ajdacent land and to feed this land with water from the irrigation projects. Consequently, many workers have expanded their holdings to 10 or 20 acres. Loans for this purpose continue to be negotiated through the Agricultural and Industrial Credit Bank. It is estimated that more than 100,000 farmers benefited from this program. The total land distribution in 17 years amounted to 526,956 acres. Plentiful supplies of fresh fruit and vegetables have been a factor in the Republic's health improvement.

Farm colonies have shown a measurable increase. In 1930 there existed 1 such colony, with 909 farmers cultivating 3,220 acres. Now there are 50 farm colonies, with 13,312 persons working 130,541 acres. These colonies produce thousands of cattle, pigs, goats, sheep, mules, horses, and an abundance of poultry. United States-made tractors, harvesters, mowers, driers, huskers, and milking machines are used on Dominican farms. Today, the cultivated area of the Dominican Republic exceeds 20 percent, whereas the average for the rest of Latin American is a mere 3 percent, according to a 1948 survey by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

Although Dominican industries are on a much more modest scale than those in the United States, they have two interesting features: (1) They utilize domestic raw materials in production for the home market; (2) they utilize imported raw materials or semi-finished goods primarily for export. This reflects the national concern to live within one's means.

At this point, it is fair to ask: "Granting that the citizens of the Dominican Republic are self-respecting, industrious, and patriotic, how were they able to accomplish so much in a period of 25 years?" The answer may be given in the words of an American essayist, Ralph Waldo Emerson: "Most great institutions are but the lengthened shadow of one man." That leader was, and is, Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo, who was inaugurated 2 weeks before the devastating hurricane of 1930. Wise enough to avail himself of the best talents of the Republic and an indefatigable worker himself, he saw his country's problems and possibilities and found proper programs for most of them. During the past 25 years, he had more than his share of enemies and detractors. It is an indication of his achievements that more and more is being heard about his success, while the voices of his critics are fading into silence. As the Ambassador of the United States, the Honorable William L. Pheiffer, remarked to me on one of my visits to the Dominican Republic, "Generalissimo Trujillo is an authentic genius who thinks and labors, primarily, in terms of the best interests of his people. This leader was needed for the stage of development we find in the Caribbean and all Americans can be grateful that he is a loyal friend of the United States."

These words of the Ambassador could well be inscribed on the United States pavilion which will grace the international exhibition and fair in Ciudad Trujillo which is due to open on December 20, 1955.

Postal Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following statement by William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM C. DOHERTY, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS, AFL, ON THE POSTAL SALARY BILL

President Eisenhower's approval today of the postal salary bill ends the game of postal pay percentages. The insistence of the administration in haggling over pennies over a period of months is inexcusable.

For almost 2 years the executive branch has been playing musical chairs with postal wages. While administration advisers called the tune, postal workers and their families were obliged to pay the piper. It is regrettable that President Eisenhower did not step in months ago and stop the music.

Last year the Postmaster General saw fit to label postal employees "treasury robbers" before a 5-percent postal pay was vetoed. Four months later the administration was on record as recommending a 5-percent increase.

In a matter of weeks word was sent out that President Eisenhower would regard any increase in excess of 7.6 percent with grave apprehension.

The band played on. Postal employees and their families continued to be denied a wage increase which everyone agreed was in order and fully merited.

Less than a month ago the President vetoed a second postal bill calling for 8.8 percent. Today he approved an 8.4 percent bill. For the average letter carrier, as well as the great bulk of all postal employees, the difference between the bill vetoed on May 19 and the measure signed into law today amounts on the average to 4 cents a day per employee.

Perhaps the delay in approving a pay raise for 500,000 postal workers while haggling over a few pennies will be heralded as "fiscal responsibility." It is not unlikely that most people will prefer Senator BARKLEY's observation: "The lightenings flashed, the thunders roared—and killed a chigger."

Foreign Aid—What Are Tito's Intentions?—State Department Should Answer This Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a pertinent editorial from the Milwaukee Journal which properly reflects the attitude of the American people on the subject of foreign aid and Mr. Tito. The editorial follows:

WHAT ARE TITO'S INTENTIONS?

The House Foreign Affairs Committee, now studying the President's foreign aid proposals, is asking for some firm assurances that Yugoslavia can be trusted with continued American aid.

This makes sense.

The committee is concerned about the results of the recent visit of Russian leaders Bulganin and Khrushchev with Marshal Tito in Belgrade.

zTito treated his ardent suitors from Moscow with a disdain that sometimes bordered on the insulting. Nevertheless, the joint statement that followed the many conferences caused considerable eye lifting in Western capitals. While it carefully avoided anything seriously disturbing to Western leadership, it showed parallel thinking of Russian and Yugoslav conferees on a number of subjects.

Inasmuch as the United States has already contributed $4½ billion in aid to Yugoslavia, and the foreign aid bill proposes another $40 million, this country has the right to ask Tito what the meetings with the Russians were all about. Where would Yugoslavia stand in case a showdown between the free world and Russia should ever develop?

And even if Tito wants to be a neutral along with Nehru, as he indicates, it even seems proper to ask: "Neutral toward whom?" For nearly $5 billion we should at least be entitled to assurances of some kind. Something more, say, than the statement, without supporting testimony, of Aid Director Harold Stassen that Yugoslavia still stands firmly independent of Soviet Russia.

Is Eisenhower Invincible?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the New Era, official publication of the Conference of Eastern Pennsylvania Central Labor Unions:

IS EISENHOWER INVINCIBLE?

Never before in American history has a President been as protected and sheltered by the big press as President Eisenhower.

Those who can recall the steady barrage of trumped-up criticism leveled at Eisenhower's two forerunners can only ask the question whether the man now living in the White House is just an ordinary human being.

Many of the qualities attributed to him by the press agents and propagandists would convince the unknowing that our country is now run by a President who is fautless, guiltless, invincible, and beyond reproach.

When you talk to people close to the Washington scene, including those in the administration, it becomes apparent that the President is being used as a front man. His personal knowledge of government and domestic matters is extremely shallow.

In the field of foreign affairs, his global popularity is based more on hero worship of World War II than on any profound understanding of worldwide diplomacy and effective anticommunism. As a matter of fact, the Eisenhower foreign policy is, in many basic respects, merely a continuation of the Truman program.

These facts are recognized by Eisenhower's political advisers. That's why he is constantly surrounded by the elite corps of policymakers. That's why the press is kind in questioning him. That's why the Nation's publishers by and large are protecting him.

The technique is a familiar one. Ike is placed on a pedestal and surrounded with an aura of irreproachibility. His name is virtue personified, and he is clothed in the divine rights philosophy that the king can do no wrong.

Then whenever anyone legitimately seeks to attack an Eisenhower appointment or policy or decision, the press promptly howls that Ike is being victimized by unfair criticism. They pass the buck for mistakes to unfortunate subordinates. They shield the President in every respect and even try to create the idea that there is something criminal about opposing the President.

This psychology apparently has scared some Democratic leaders into inaction. We cannot understand why. The same Democrats will concede quietly that Eisenhower will be hard to beat in 1956, yet they are reluctant to expose the hypocrisy that starts in the White House and carries straight through the administration.

Eisenhower has flopped on housing, new schools, handling of the polio vaccine, adequate pay raises for postal people, the minimum wage law, repeal of Taft-Hartley, and even in halting the Red advance. The Geneva debacle should be pinned directly on Eisenhower's front door because that's when his administration handed millions of Indochinese over to the Chinese Communists without even a fight.

This administration has blundered badly.

When will the opposition throw down the gauntlet and tell this sordid story to the American people?

It's true they will be forced to fight both Eisenhower and the big press, but F. D. R. and Truman did that successfully for many years.

Don't Lose Your Heritage by Default

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago Elmira College was founded at Elmira, N. Y., as the first college in America to grant a bachelor degree to women on a comparable basis with that previously given to men. The courage and vision of the founders of that institution and those who have fathered its interests during the century of its growth and development indicate to a large degree the attitude of people in that area of our country in recognition of the equality of womanhood. During the many decades of its history, Elmira College has educated and sent into the world along all pathways of human endeavor many women who have performed vital contributions to our national progress.

At the commencement exercises for the graduating class of 1955, the century class of Elmira College, the commencement address was delivered by a person who is probably among the most unique and outstanding women in this country. Certainly in her own field of aviation she is the outstanding aviatrix of the world. This address of Miss Jacqueline Cochran, entitled "Don't Lose Your Heritage by Default," coming from a person of such outstanding success and such humble origin, contains counsel and wisdom which can be of value to all Americans, men as well as women, adults as well as college seniors. The address made a profound impression upon the graduates of Elmira College and was so widely acclaimed that I feel it should be shared with the country at large and, therefore, have the privilege of extending it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The address follows:

DON'T LOSE YOUR HERITAGE BY DEFAULT

(Commencement address at Elmira College, June 6, 1955, by Jacqueline Cochran)

While I have spoken often before groups, I have never found it easy to read a formal speech. Therefore, today, formal or fine phrases will be avoided.

It was my misfortune to have had only 3 years of classroom schooling in my entire life. That puts me about 13 years behind you as to schooling. I was earning my own living at 10 years of age. At that age you girls could look forward to 10 years or more of association with teachers, classmates, and books. That is an extremely valuable association which I missed, to my great regret and definite detriment. With what you have had in these respects I could do most things far better in half the time.

With such a background you can imagine that I am somewhat scared today standing before you. But your school authorities knew that I had never received a degree of any sort when they honored me with the invitation for today. Perhaps they asked me for that very reason. Your lives to date have been so different from what mine was up until your age. Yet we both have to face the problem of successful living.

What has been the principal difference between your early training and mine? At your age I possibly was wiser than most of you are today. That is because wisdom and learning are two different things. Wisdom, to the extent it comes at all, comes mostly from contemplation of issues and from experience in solving them. But you have been exposed for a long time to the wisdom of others. You have become familiarized with what I choose to call the logistics of learning. You have been trained to marshal your mental resources. As a result, your efforts need not be smattered. You can plan the strategy or tactics of mature living with far more than average chance of success. You are able to move forward in meeting life's problems with well-coordinated mental functions and under your own power. These problems are primarily connected with getting along with yourselves and your fellow men.

It is a strange topsy-turvey and somewhat hysterical world of affairs that you are going into. It needs people like you to stabilize it. Many words have lost their meaning. Russia chooses, for example, to call herself a democracy and to call us imperialistic. Don't be fooled by words; look to substance. Why do I say we need people like you to stabilize us? It is because you are not tied to the old and can analyze the present and its possibilities for good or bad with trained minds. Twenty years from now you and the graduates of today from all over the country and the graduates of the next few years will be running our country. That is true whether or not you choose careers for yourselves outside the home. Women's place in our democracy has become a very important one. Women's changed status is one of the great shifts that has taken place. It was not so long ago that few women had the advantage of higher education. This June more than 100,000 girls like you are receiving their bachelor's degrees. Women here gone into business and the professions. Women control most of this country's wealth, income, and spending powers. All this carries with it a great responsibility for our sex.

I have had a great deal to do with young women during my life. In my own cosmetics business I employ hundreds. But my experience during World War II gave me the greatest understanding of the capacities of our sex.

I have been in aviation as a pilot for nearly half the time since man first flew powered planes. To the extent that you know of my activities you probably know me as a speed pilot. The air, or more strictly speaking the atmosphere, has been a new medium for human beings. We became jealous of the birds and ambitious to outfly them. We have succeeded. I have been an explorer of the air—a sort of a female Daniel Boone of the atmosphere, if you please. On the surface my activities have been to fly fast or high and to establish new world records. What I have been doing in fact is to try out new planes, new engines, new fuels or instruments and the like and to bring back from each test flight some added bit of knowledge to advance the cause of aviation. Such advance has come with a rush. Yesterday's fast is tomorrow's slow. Today's dangerous is tomorrow's safe. The world is now tied together closely with a web of airlines. I have been a part of that process. To date it is a question whether it has been for the

good. It has made all peoples of the earth close neighbors who in a way are looking into each others' windows. Jealousies and strife have resulted from this so-called huddling together. Other inventions of the last half century have also intensified this understanding by the "have nots" of what we have. I refer to the radio, television, and the many things we have that add up in our country to the highest standard of living for our people that the world has ever known.

But to come back to my experience with women in World War II. I took a group to England to do noncombat operational duty with the British Air Force. They did themselves proud. Then, I was called home to organize, train and put on operational duty as pilots a large group of American girls. Thousands applied for service. I chose about two thousand. About twelve hundred of them finished their training successfully and became operational pilots. They were known as WASPS. It was a coined name standing for Womens Air Force Service Pilots. My work was an experiment to test what women could do en masse as pilots in case the drain on our manpower through a long continued war became too great. It was therefore closely followed by the top military authorities. The results were set forth in a report I filed with the War Department at the end of the war. The report was to the effect that there was no difference between men and women as to piloting. The women trained as easily, had no greater percentage of flunking, could fly as regularly and for as long hours as the men with the same accident and death rate as in the case of the men. You can be sure I was very proud of my sex. God forbid that we should have another war, but if we do and the women are needed in the air, they can be there by the hundreds of thousands fighting it out toe to toe with the men. Many things of great interest happened during that women pilot program. We had gone to great expense in designing and building a fast bomber called the B–26. It was starting to come off the production line in quantity. But it was called a "tramp" by the men because its wings seemed too small and consequently it had no visible means of support. We needed that plane in our defense and we needed confidence restored in it. General Arnold, head of our Air Forces, asked for my suggestions. I flew it and did not think it too difficult or dangerous. In fact, it was stable and safe, measured by many of the so-called racing planes of earlier days. I therefore suggested that we put a group of WASPS—new graduates just out of flying school—on operational duty with this plane. They flew the B–26 for more than 80,000 operational hours with not a single fatal accident. Confidence was restored. It became a very much used and valuable plane in our subsequent war efforts. Then there was the B–29 which was our largest bomber—the one that dropped the atomic bombs on Japan. There was lack of confidence by many pilots in its performance with only 2 of its 4 engines in operation. A group of WASPS—flew B–29's from base to base and just by chance demonstrated at each base how it would fly on two engines. This made a great change in the attitude of a lot of men.

The aviation industry in a short half century from the time the first contraption was built and flown has grown to be our biggest industry. It has surpassed the automotive industry in men employed. The airline branch of the industry is big and growing. More than 20 percent of all employees in the airline industry are women. For you who wish to do so, it is a good place to carve out a career. Besides you get a chance to go places and see things for free in your work or during your holidays. I am not referring to piloting in this statement. To take your seat on the left side as a captain of an airliner requires long training which is costly to the company. Continuance of a service is a necessity to justify the training. Women usually end up getting married and raising children. That is a good career in itself but it does not fit in with continuous years of airline piloting.

Then there is coming along a new era. It is known as the atomic era. It started with the atomic bomb and will end with numerous peacetime uses in agriculture, industry, and medicine. Nuclear energy assures us cheap and bountiful power in the future and it is cheap energy that has caused our high standard of living. The splitting of the atom to release and use a part of its energy has opened the way for much new, interesting employment. If I were a girl just graduating and wanting a career, I probably would go into aviation. If not, I think I would try to find a place in the atomic field so that I could see the new develop and become a part of it.

But wherever you go in your work—whether into the home or into office—please remember that you have democracy to protect you as your basic duty.

You should protect it in your discussions with others of public issues and by your role one election day. It matters little whether you are a Republican or a Democrat. We have the party system and properly so. What these parties and their leaders stand for at any particular time is what matters. You have the education and training to enable you to separate the political wheat from the chaff. You should do so and keep democracy on the beam. We have the best form of government the world has ever known. But it is no more stable than the judgment of people at the polls on election days. That is democracy's weakness. It can be upset by influencing temporarily the minds of voters. Sometimes I think additional votes on a cumulative basis should be given, based on educational qualifications. In any event, the educated should not leave the voting to others. You should weed out and sterilize the seeds of destruction that democracy carries with it. You should not lose your heritage by default.

Don't stop learning because you have received diplomas. Learning exercises your mind. Keep it exercised. Learn something new each day—even though it be some small fact—and you will have a much fuller and happier life.

My knowledge came the hard way. I learned my A, B, C's, from lettering on boxcars that passed my door on their way to faraway places. I wondered where they were going. I also watched the stars at night and they beckoned me on. My imagination developed into determination. I have seen the faraway places. I have flown with the stars and I have seen the stars at noon. You know, way up high around 50,000 feet, the sky is not bright like on the surface. It is dark and the stars shine all the time.

This I would like to say to you. Throughout history, the great changes, such as the discovery of fire and the use of the wheel and steam, have been spaced far apart. Thus man has been able to adjust slowly to his new environment. But today great environmental changes are taking place all at once. We are in a turmoil of understanding and adjustment. We see and hear people at great distance from us and can get to them in almost no time at all. Life has become most complex with a myriad of conflicting impacts. Our leaders float in a new political and social atmosphere. Diplomatic landmarks have disappeared. In this period of turmoil and doubt and topsy-turvy drive, we must reorient ourselves and find a sound framework to cling to. You of the class of 1955 have an important part to play in this reorientation process. This is because of your educational advantages. You must apply your abilities and effort so that we will get order and routine and not chaos. See that man's recent scientific achievements are justified and used constructively and peacefully. See that the shrinking of time and space which we have been witnessing will be for the good. See if our less fortunate neighbors around the earth can be built up without ourselves being torn down.

I am often asked what the elements are that make for success. There is no one formula. I believe in all cases there must be honesty and imagination, backed by faith and determination. The determination must be sparked by will power. Fear must never be allowed to hold one back from a proper objective. Add work to all this and then more work. If you have all these things in a mixture and will try and try again, notwithstanding early or intermediate failure, you are pretty likely to be successful. And so, I say, open up your jets of energy and get cracking under your own power. Keep your eyes on the compass of good intent and follow the beacons and beams that lead to sound objectives.

Along with your well-earned diplomas, you have from me in imagination a beautiful jeweled cup, filled with my good wishes. Whenever you are having trials and tribulations, take it in your hand and sip from it. That little sip will bring you the message that you are not going to fail. It will come from a girl who came up the hard way and also had her many trials and tribulations.

Keep trying. Happiness comes with the trying.

May your mental travels always be accompanied by tailwinds of good judgment and may your horizons be unlimited.

A Free Trader Speaks—Despite Vigorous Competition in Camera Field From Low-Wage Countries, Bell & Howell President, Charles H. Percy, Supports and Endorses Reciprocal Trade Program in Thoughtful Article in Atlantic Monthly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1955

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, we hear so often and so emphatically from businessmen who feel they are or may be damaged by the existence of a reciprocal-trade program that it is easy to come to the conclusion that every businessman who faces competition from imports is against reciprocal trade. Of course that is not true, but it is always refreshing and, I might say, a little of a surprise to see evidence that it is not.

I know I have received a good deal of mail from firms in St. Louis and elsewhere who warn that the competition of imports, particularly when they come from low-wage countries, cannot be met profitably by American enterprise paying fair wages.

Since I feel strongly that America must trade with other countries—buying from them as well as selling to them—I have supported the principle of reciprocal trade as we have seen it in operation in the two decades since Cordell Hull first launched the program in the first administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. I have been disappointed that so many businessman so often ob-

jected to the program solely out of fear that it would hurt their firms. Of course where there is definite harm to American enterprise, that is one thing; but so often the opposition is based only on fear of what might happen.

In this connection, then, I was deeply interested in an article which I read in the June issue of the Atlantic Monthly, entitled "A Free Trader Speaks."

This article, by Charles H. Percy, president of the camera manufacturing firm of Bell & Howell, tells how this firm was spurred to greater effort, greater efficiency, and better products by the stiff—the very stiff—competition from abroad in the camera field.

I have seen skilled Japanese workers paid 27 cents an hour, Italian workers who received 34 cents an hour, and German workers who earned 37 cents an hour—

He wrote.

In contrast, at Bell & Howell in the American photographic manufacturing industry, the average wage is in excess of $2 an hour.

He continued:

Since our purchasing division is authorized to buy where it can get high quality at the lowest prices, our own lens division competes with foreign manufacturers for the business of our own purchasing division. I think this is the way it should be. For a while our lens division continually lost orders on a very high volume of lenses. When they lost an order for 10,00 lenses, it broke their hearts, and they really started to dig in.

The vice president of manufacturing, the factory superintendent, and the manufacturing superintendent of the optical division held a meeting with 150 people to discuss the tooling and engineering phases of our lens designing and manufacturing program. Working together, they approached the making of this particular lens in an entirely different way. As a result, the last order for some 20,000 lenses was awarded to our own lens division, on a strictly competitive basis. In the lens division, they had big signs on the bulletin board, "We beat foreign competition." In talking to the foreman about it, I said, "In all honesty, would you have done this without the spur of foreign competition?" and the reply was, "No."

An industry that is protected is in a dangerous position. Its shelter can be taken away at any time. But an industry that is strong because of competition is an industry based on a firm foundation.

Mr. Speaker, while everyone, I'm sure, would not agree with everything in the Bell & Howell president's Atlantic Monthly article, I am also sure that each Member of Congress, no matter what his views on this subject, will be interested in reading the full text of it in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—particularly as we are taking up in the House tomorrow the conference report on H. R. 1, the reciprocal-trade bill.

Under unanimous consent, I therefore include the article "A Freetrader Speaks" as it appeared in the June Atlantic Monthly, as follows:

A FREETRADER SPEAKS

(By Charles H. Percy)

(A freetrader in a field where he faces the stiffest possible competition from abroad, Charles H. Percy became president of Bell & Howell, manufacturers of cameras, lenses, and photographic equipment, at the age of 29. He entered the cooperative training program of his company while he was still an undergraduate at the University of Chicago, and was elected to the board of directors the year after his graduation in 1942. After serving in the Navy in the war, he came back to Chicago, where his keen interest in economics, industry, and education has made him one of the most intelligent, outspoken men in his field.)

1

What happens when an American manufacturer faces foreign competition? As a strong supporter of President Eisenhower's reciprocal trade program, I wish to present a few facts about freer trade and its effect upon our company—a manufacturing company that is protected, that is strategic, that faces foreign competition.

The photographic industry employs about 50,000 people. It is a relatively small industry, but it competes with manufacturers in Belgium, Germany, Italy, France—one can hardly name a country that doesn't make some kind of photographic product.

I have seen skilled Japanese workers paid 27 cents an hour, Italian workers who received 34 cents an hour, and German workers who earned 37 cents an hour. In contrast, at Bell & Howell and in the American photographic manufacturing industry, the average wage is in excess of $2 an hour.

Germany alone exports to the United States over 150 different models and brands of still cameras. In 1949 the United States imported 16,000 lenses; last year imports rose to a quarter of a million lenses competing with the products of domestic manufacturers.

Bell & Howell's position is this: We are a company employing more than 3,000 people in Chicago. We have a very high labor content in our product, 38 percent of our total cost of sales being the cost of labor. We have a great deal of foreign competition.

We manufacture annually a total of about $40.5 million worth of products, only 6 percent of which goes abroad. So exports are not an important percentage of our business, though they do play a strategic part in maintaining our prestige and keeping our name before the public in some 68 countries. We also manufacture under license in England.

We at Bell & Howell have done a good deal of soul searching on this subject over the past several years, to determine our position with regard to the world economy. We believe that it is in the interest of the free world to trade. Many people abroad—2.5 billion of them—want the products of the United States. If we don't trade with them, we are going to limit our market to 160 million people in the United States—a market too small for our productive capacity. At the present time our exports exceed our imports. But we cannot mantain our export market if we refuse to trade with the world. It is difficult for the American people to understand that the only place the American dollar can ultimately be spent is the United States. When we import products and pay dollars for them, we do not lose those dollars. They always come back to us.

To import products which foreign manufacturers can make better than we can is as beneficial to us as it is to the rest of the free world. It simply means that we shift our domestic capital and labor to items which we can produce more efficiently.

Last year as I stood on a street in Tokyo I asked our agent who was escorting me what the loudspeakers on the mobile trucks were saying. I think he was a little embarrassed, but he gave me a straightforward answer. He said, "They are denouncing American imperialism and demanding that the United States troops go home."

I talked to our Ambassador, to educators and business people, both Japanese and American. They all told the same story—a story of the sagging Japanese economy. For example, they predicted that 40 percent of the graduates of Japanese universities this year will not be able to find jobs.

The United States has told Japan, "We cannot trade with you freely because of your cheap labor. We have imposed restrictions and barriers against you, and the free world has followed our example." But we have also said, "We shall be very unhappy if you trade with the Communist bloc."

So we have placed Japan in an untenable position by saying in effect, "You cannot trade." I believe that no nation can endure such a situation. More and more, Japan is becoming susceptible to the wooing of the Chinese Communists and Russians.

A few months ago the President submitted a message to Congress on the Formosa question. He asked authority to use ships, guns, and planes to defend the security of our country and its allies. Within a week, the House of Representatives and the Senate voted overwhelmingly to give him this authority.

This was an issue that Congressmen could clearly understand; it was an issue they would have no trouble explaining to their constituents at home. But for a year and a half the President has said, "It is in the national interest that we liberalize our trade abroad." And he has gone so far as to say, "If we fail in our foreign trade economic policy, we may fail in all."

If the President today should send a message to Congress asking for billions for a network of radar and guns to ring our coastline and for planes to patrol our shores, Congress would not hesitate to appropriate the money if he said it was imperative to the national interest. It couldn't defend its position if it refused.

But the President has said that in a nuclear era it is in the national interest to surround this country with a network of free nations which will form an integral part of our national security. This is more difficult to explain to the constituents back home. It steps on a few toes. Despite the fact that heads of labor, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Farm Bureau, and an ever-increasing number of business people favor it, the bill was passed by only a slim majority and was almost sent back to committee on three different votes.

However, there is little doubt about the interest of the consumer in freer trade. It is he who benefits when competition lowers prices, and he is entitled to the benefits of foreign competition.

2

I can best demonstrate what sometimes happens when an American manufacturer faces foreign competition by telling our experience when we entered the high-priced 35-mm. still-camera market a few years ago. Our Foton camera had many features. It wound like a movie camera and clicked off five pictures a second, taking wonderful action photographs. But it required a lot of handwork that necessitated a selling price of $700. In competing with foreign manufacturers we lost $1.25 million.

We had to decide what to do. We could say we were being hurt by foreign competition and we could seek higher tariff protection. But, from the moral standpoint, we would be prohibiting the American consumer, who happens to like German cameras, from buying them unless he paid a higher subsidy in the form of a higher tariff. In other words, the consumer would be penalized because we had decided to enter a field in which we were not as efficient (from a cost standpoint) as the Germans. We decided to write off our $1.25 million loss.

I have heard many protectionists say, "You can't compete with cheap foreign labor if your product has a high labor content." Manufacturers in our own industry have repeatedly testified that there is a high labor content in photographic equipment—and it is high, particularly in a photographic lens.

There is the aluminum we use to make a half-inch f/1.9 movie camera lens. Then there is the chunk of optical glass we mold into four different elements and assemble into this lens. The raw material costs 43 cents and the finished lens has a retail value of $87. So the difference between 43 cents and $87 is the cost of labor in manufacturing and merchandising.

Since our purchasing division is authorized to buy where it can get high quality at the lowest prices, our own lens division competes with foreign manufacturers for the business of our own purchasing division. I think this is the way it should be. For a while our lens division continually lost orders on a very high volume of lenses. When they lost an order for 10,000 lenses, it broke their hearts, and they really started to dig in.

The vice president of manufacturing, the factory superintendent, and the manufacturing superintendent of the optical division held a meeting with 150 people to discuss the tooling and engineering phases of our lens designing and manufacturing program. Working together, they approached the making of this particular lens in an entirely different way. As a result, the last order for some 20,000 lenses was awarded to our own lens division, on a strictly competitive basis. In the lens division, they had big signs on the bulletin board, "We beat foreign competition." In talking to the foremen about it, I said, "In all honesty, would you have done this without the spur of foreign competition?" and they replied, "No."

An industry that is protected is in a dangerous position. Its shelter can be taken away at any time. But an industry that is strong because of competition is an industry based upon a firm foundation. The best weapon of management is its ability to meet competition. The ability to improve its manufacturing techniques cannot be developed under the soft blanket of protection.

Again and again manufacturers have pointed out the disparity between American and foreign hourly labor rates. Never in any of those testimonies have I found reference to the unit cost of production. Yet this is the important element of cost and the answer to the problem of cheap foreign labor.

Here is an illustration. We had cheap domestic labor in this country a relatively few years ago. When I worked on the Bell & Howell assembly line, we were paid 40 cents an hour to assemble a particular 8-mm. movie camera. We sold this movie camera for $49.95. When the war ended and our labor cost had almost tripled, we asked ourselves whether we should ever again be able to sell a movie camera for less than $50.

We started to work on a design concept, a tooling concept. Groups of people worked on it as a team. We prdouced, for $49.95, a camera with six exclusive features that the other camera did not have. It is made with such precision that the parts resemble those of high-priced American and Swiss watches, yet it is assembled on a conveyorized line. We did it with labor that cost $2 an hour, but we desgined the camera and developed manufacturing methods to use the minds of our workers more than their hands and their muscles. And our labor cost per unit was very low.

I'm not an expert on farm problems, but I have studied the impact of our export trade on the farm market. My wife and I own a farm in Iowa, and frankly I am ashamed to sell crops that are not needed to the Government each year and then approve the plans of the farm manager to plant these same crops the next season. Yet we do it because, if we didn't, our farm manager would think we should be committed to a mental institution. But how wrong it is to freeze unneeded capital and labor on the farm. What if they had done this about a hundred years ago when the population distribution was 90-percent rural and 10-percent urban, instead of the reverse? It is little more sensible today to freeze the 10 percent and keep labor and capital employed where it is only relatively efficient.

Where does the farmer stand? On an average, about $1,000 of his cash receipts comes from exports. We export 25 percent of our tobacco and soybeans, 33 percent of our wheat, and 40 percent of our cotton and rice. The dairy farmers in Wisconsin, who were successful in forcing the infamous cheese quota, export 42 percent of their dried, evaporated, and condensed milk. If it weren't for the export market, they would be hard pressed. Yet they, like too many other economic groups in the United States, including business, want a one-way street. Farmers favor a freer trade policy almost universally, until it permits a volume of imports that interferes with the artifically protected high prices of their own products. They do not ask where the dollars for their exports are to come from if we refuse to trade with their foreign customers. Are we to give dollars away, or are they to be siphoned from some other part of our economy?

It is often said that freer trade is all right in theory but would not work in practice. And to the protectionists we are the theorists and they are the practical men who build America. They know that we have to keep our cheap foreign labor and keep our market to ourselves. The fact that almost every economist in the United States favors the President's reciprocal trade program does put us in a category with college professors and economists. But I submit that the real theorist is the protectionist, because protectionism has never really worked in practice.

Who is to decide what infant industry is to be protected? Who is to decide when an infant industry has grown to maturity? Many are protected but few, if any, are ever weaned.

The argument that our national defense depends upon strategic industries that must be protected is essentially theory. In practice, must of our defense industries—the aircraft, automotive, and electronics industries—have little if any tariff protection and have never needed it.

I wish to mention that the Bell & Howell executives have stood with me in my support of the President's foreign economic trade policy. Without their support I could not have acted.

I am sure that the bylaws of our corporation are not very different from those of other corporations. And nowhere do I see that the officer of a company is required to subordinate the national interest to the immediate short-range interest of his own company.

I think we must always, in American industry, in farming, and in labor circles, determine what is in the national interest and then find a way to adjust our own programs to that interest. It is not always easy, but it is necessary. And the appeal of the President's proposed program and H. R. 1 is its moderation and gradualness. Tariff rate reductions for most product categories are proposed at only 5 percent per year for 3 years. It is inconceivable that such a reduction could cripple an industry unless it is already on the brink of disaster. H. R. 1 does not remove any of the appeal provisions found in existing legislation.

I believe that a liberalized trade policy in the national interest will make industry in this country more efficient. It will help lower our unit cost of production, raise our standard of living, strengthen our allies, weaken our enemies, and provide a greater measure of strength and support for the defense of this Nation than will countless billions' worth of guns.

I believe in a freer trade policy for our country because political friendships through the centuries have followed the trade lanes. Never has there been a greater need to strengthen the political ties between the free nations of the world. Mutually beneficial trade forms a solid foundation on which to build lasting political friendships.

Upper Colorado River Project—Recreational Features

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to defeat the upper Colorado River project, some Representatives from southern California have attacked the recreational features of storage reservoirs. For the edification of Members I am inserting at this point a column by Don Brooks, outdoors editor of the Salt Lake Tribune. The editorial follows:

OUTDOORS
(By Don Brooks)

The Honorable CRAIG HOSMER, congressional Representative, 18th District of California:

We have here in front of us an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 26, 1955, in which you claim that Bureau of Reclamation economics are as phony as a $3 bill. At least, that's what the headline reads.

It is not the writer's purpose to get in an argument with you about economics. But you made some cracks about Lake Mead fishing and that's a subject we know something about.

Here's what you said, Mr. HOSMER:

"LOOK AT LAKE MEAD TODAY," HE SAYS

"The proponents of the upper Colorado River project cite Lake Mead, behind Hoover Dam, as an example of fine recreation areas made from big dams. They ought to look at Lake Mead today. The only good recreation there is enjoyed by the lizards. The beaches are a mile from the beach houses. Boats are several miles inland from water.

"Fishing is horrible."

That's what you said, Mr. HOSMER. Now we got the news for you.

On the very date your statements were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, this writer was on Lake Mead.

And fishing wasn't horrible. It was dog-gone good. Four of us caught 17 bass ranging up to 4 pounds the first day. The next day we caught 22 ranging up to 5 pounds 10 ounces. And we lost a lot, Mr. HOSMER. Lynn Hansen of Salt Lake, one of our partners, lost one that Floyd Wells of Overton figured weighed better than 12 pounds. Ol' Lynn was sick for an hour after that baby threw the hook.

It's true that the water level was down, Mr. HOSMER, but why was it down? One of the major reasons was because of the excessive power demands from your country down in southern California. And despite the lake's low level a powerful lot of folks, including plenty from California, were having

the time of their lives fishing and boating. We've heard Californians called many things, Mr. HOSMER, but this is the first time we've ever heard 'em called "lizards."

"EXPERTS" VIEW OF ECHO PARK

You also stated that if Echo Park is built "it will be barren of vegetation and the fishing in the lake will be lousy. There will be no algae in the water, no weeds, no beneficial conditions for fish," you stated.

Can't figure how you arrived at those conclusions, Mr. HOSMER, and we know a lot more about intermountain fishing than you do.

We're not going to argue that Echo Park fishing will be as good as Lake Mead's. But we do know that there isn't any fishing on the Green River now. And a lot of fisheries biologists, who know more about it than we do, have told us that if the sediment is cleaned out of the Green there is an excellent chance that fine trout fishing will result.

Reckon that's it, Mr. HOSMER. If you still figure April fishing at Lake Mead was "horrible," please let us know when you figure it will be "good."

Here's one bait dunker who wants to be there.

Looking Toward 1956—Some Sound Advice for Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following editorial from Town Journal which should be of great interest to Republicans everwhere:

LOOKING TOWARD 1956

The President's personal popularity does not appear to lessen. If anything it grows. People believe in his integrity and in his good intentions.

Nevertheless, a small change in public opinion within the next 18 months could disappoint his party in 1956 and could defeat him. What factors could cause such a change? It may be constructive to look at some of them this early.

Mr. Eisenhower's advisers seem to have convinced themselves that all Republicans will naturally vote Republican in 1956. "Where else can they go?"

They forget that Republicans have homes to go to, and thousands did just that in 1940, 1944, and 1948 to avoid having to vote for Willkie and for Dewey.

Eisenhower won in 1952 because he brought out the Republican vote, plus the vote of thousands of Democrats who wished to rebuke the sins of their own party. He was supported by Democrats and independents who hated socialism, extravagance, and one-worldism.

* * * * *

Because small margins determine elections, it is not too early to face up to some of the disappointments being voiced by friends of the administration.

No sweeping reduction of Government and no dramatic abolition of questionable agencies have been accomplished.

Despite small economics, no notable decrease of expenditures has been brought about.

The budget remains unbalanced even in a period of exceptional prosperity. Reduction in taxes, accordingly, so far has been small and further reduction is postponed.

The foreign aid expenditures continue on a gigantic scale with the taxpayer's dollar now going farther than ever—to Asia instead of merely to Europe.

For a Federal highway program proposals of debatable merit are advanced, along with unsound financing ideas.

The administration has given weak and wavering support to the outright opponents of communism within the United States.

In agriculture, only a slight change of direction has been taken. Despite big talk about the importance of research only piddling increases have been recommended.

The White House has stood in the way of the much-needed Bricker amendment to prevent international treaty law from superseding United States constitutional law.

No effective effort has been made to free American airmen or other citizens held captive in Red China.

These are enough to suggest that the Republicans will risk their 1956 reelection if they try to out-socialize, out-New Deal, and out-internationalize their opponents. Their strength lies among those who want less Government, more economy, and faithful adherence to basic American principles in domestic and world policy.

The middle-of-the-road is marked by a white line, and those who try to straddle that line can be headed for a crash. It is a service to the country—and a friendly act to Mr. Eisenhower and his many admirers—to face up to that fact while the election is still some distance away.

Diamond Jubilee, Red Lion, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to draw to the attention of my colleagues and the entire Nation an important celebration now in progress in one of the towns in my congressional district.

Red Lion, Pa., a thriving and alert community located in the southern portion of York County, Pa., has reached its 75th milestone and is, this week—from June 12 through June 18—celebrating its diamond jubilee.

Each day of this week has a special significance. Yesterday, Sunday, was designated as Religious Day, which was devoted to the moral and spiritual welfare of the community. Red Lion might well be described as a church town as its church and Sunday school attendance is higher than in most communities. The good citizens of the town realize that problems arising from material changes in the community can only be achieved with mental and spiritual tranquillity.

Today, Monday, has been designated as Industrial Day, exemplifying "What Red Lion makes, makes Red Lion." On this day, all Red Lioners will reflect upon the diversity of means by which the people of the community and environs make their living. While the manufacture of cigars, furniture, and metal products constitute the major industries, there are many others which contribute to the overall economy of the community, including the dairy, milling, lumber, and dress manufacturing enterprises. In the diversity exemplified by these many enterprises, an insight might be had as to the productivity of these good citizens. The people who are the backbone of these efforts bring to the community a dignity, a spirit of industry, which has encouraged the growth of Red Lion, and its recognition as a good town in which to live.

Tuesday, June 14, will be School Day. Realizing that the progress of a community depends largely upon the success of its educational efforts, Red Lion provides for educational facilities in keeping with the material progress of the town and surrounding community. Indicative of the philosophy which pervades the community are two pertinent factors. Not content with its presently excellent school plan, and farsighted in its approach, Red Lion is planning an addition to its modern high school to care for those who will soon have need for additional facilities. In keeping also with the progressive spirit which is typical of its citizens, a merger of schools in eight contiguous districts has been effected, providing a more coordinated system for elementary school students. A recognition of the proper place of education in this highly technical and complicated age, and a willingness to levy the assessments for this desired objective, are expressive of the foresight inherent in the character of the Red Lion citizens.

The following day, Wednesday, June 15, is Young People's Day. Realizing youth is the strength of our Nation, Red Lion is meeting and promoting the welfare of its teen-agers and young people by proper recreational facilities. A monument to the concern felt by its good people is the outstanding edifice which serves as a youth center. Unique to a community the size of Red Lion is the one-story, brick building fronting on West High Street, where wholesome, properly supervised recreation is available to the town's young folks. Civic and fraternal organizations have contributed substantially to the services and facilities used by the young citizens in their enjoyment of athletic endeavors. Providing a healthy outlet for the natural enthusiasm and vigor for teen-agers, and those even younger, these groups have combined in financing and supervising baseball teams for the boys of the community. Champions in spirit, whatever their comparative standing in county league play, these ranks will provide the men who, 25 years from today, will be the respected citizens planning Red Lion's centennial. Juvenile decency, not delinquency, runs rampant in Red Lion because the adults care enough.

This coming Thursday has been chosen as Community Day, a day set aside for emphasizing the interest and community pride held by the citizens. It is my personal opinion ,from my knoweldge of the character, habits, and morals of the community, that this day is superfluous. A reading of the accomplishments contained in this necessarily brief outline of Red Lion's community facilities, the very evident community spirit which made these things possible, lead one to the conclusion that this day can be but a forerunner to further accomplishments.

rather than a celebration of what has already been done. That is the Red Lion way, look not backward, but forward, there is much yet to be done.

Appropriately, 1 day, Friday, June 17, has been set aside as homecoming day. Like any other community, Red Lion is proud of its present residents and those who, while no longer permanent citizens of the community, have moved to other locations. It is true that people leave Red Lion, as happens in every community throughout the Nation. We are a restless, migratory kind of people, always seeking the greener pasture. It is as true that Red Lion does not leave people. Once having lived in this wonderful corner of York County, the son or daughter of Red Lion yearns to return, never having having left, in the strict sense of that word. Homecoming day will be a joyous occasion, one for renewing friendships, for reminiscences, for reliving the days less laden with worldly care. One of the events scheduled for this day is a baton-twirling contest, to honor three of Red Lion's outstanding young ladies in the persons of Miss Alta Burg, national baton-twirling champion; her sisters, Miss Dawn Burg, runner-up for national honors, and Pennsylvania State baton-twirling champion, and Miss Joyce Burg, junior champion of Pennsylvania.

The last day, Saturday, June 18, is parade day. Climaxing the week-long celebration will be the mid-afternoon parade, the elements of which will represent all of the community interests. Bands, pretty girls, youth groups, and other civic organizations will exhibit a martial air and tempo as they march before the assembled citizens. The family of Pennsylvania's first citizen will look on proudly as our great Governor, George M. Leader, takes the place of honor beside the parade marshal. Governor Leader, a York County native, will, in a sense, be among home folks on the day which ends their week-long celebration of 75 years of progress.

Every American municipality, be it large or small, urban or rural, has one person who personified all that was good, all that signified the character of that community. Red Lion is no exception. Sad it is that Harry L. Haines, chief burgess of Red Lion, and general chairman of its golden jubilee in 1930, could not have been spared to participate in the diamond jubilee. The life he lived provided enrichment to the town and its people. A distinguished Member of Congress for 10 years from the district I am now privileged to represent, Harry L. Haines never lost the homely realization that each person is essentially a portion of a hometown. Harry Haines was Red Lion. Though he served with distinction in this National Forum he, I think, would like to be remembered on this occasion for his countless contributions to Red Lion. No written or spoken tribute could express sufficiently well what Harry Haines gave of himself to the town he called home, but no celebration of progress could be complete without recognition of Red Lion's, and this Nation's debt to him. The United States is a confederation of hometowns, and in each there is, or was, a Harry Haines who collectively made the greatness of our country possible.

A Tribute to Humboldt State College and Its Cancer Education Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I desire to include an editorial from the June 2, 1955 issue of the Eureka (Calif.) Humboldt-Standard.

The editorial congratulates Humboldt State College for its significant achievements in the field of advancing public education in the control of cancer. Several years ago, a committee of the American Cancer Society designed a pilot project on cancer education and presented it to several colleges throughout California.

Humboldt State College has followed through with a concentrated course in cancer education, and in so doing has pioneered in this field. The American Cancer Society believes, that through public education, much of the fear and hysteria associated with this dread disease can be dissipated. Reports indicate the education program is paying off. More victims do seek medical advice in early stages of the disease, facilitating early detection and treatment of the malady. In this way, another avenue is opened in the fight to control cancer.

As a result of the progress made by Humbodlt State College with its public education program on the control of cancer, similar projects are being planned for introduction to the curriculum of other colleges and universities throughout the State of California. To Humboldt State College, for its foresight and achievement, I add my congratulations to those expressed in the following editorial:

HUMBOLDT STATE COLLEGE PIONEERS IN CANCER EDUCATION

The most effective way in which the average person can assist in the fight to control cancer, we are assured repeatedly, is through seeking information on the subject of the disease in its general aspects, particularly as related to early detection of signs and symptoms that facilitates treatment of the malady should it develop. Indeed, it is this educational aspect that has been emphasized during late years in the nationwide cancer-control campaigns conducted by the American Cancer Society and other agencies concerned. Moreover, reports indicate that this program is paying off as more victims do seek medical advice in early stages of the disease and, conversely, as much of the fear and hysteria formerly associated with the disease are dissipated through a more intelligent approach and attitude on the part of the public.

But, in looking about for channels through which to implement this public education program, where turn for the most effective means and media? The answer to that query should be obvious—what medium could be more effective than the school system which, after all, is in the education business.

At any rate, it would appear that just such a program is in prospect for this north coast region of California, based on the recent report of the success of a pilot project carried on at Humboldt State College, through which students studying to be teachers and administrators in the public schools have been participating in training toward this objective.

By way of background, several years ago the subcommittee on teacher training, of the education division committee of the American Cancer Society, designed a pilot project on cancer education and presented it to several colleges throughout the State. Of the colleges selected at that time, Humboldt State is the only one which has followed through with a concentrated course in cancer education and, by virtue of that achievement has pioneered the way in this field.

At Humboldt State College the training course has been conducted as a part of the health and hygiene course of the department of physical education, under the chairmanship of Dr. Joseph Forbes, aided by Francis Givens and Robert Doornink, assistants in the department. In the conduct of the training the college has had the professional support of the State subcommittee, whose membership includes Dr. Paul Roberts, of Eureka, chairman; Givens, of Humboldt State; Dr. Margaret Leonard, San Francisco State; Dr. Edith Lindly, Fresno State, and Dr. Anita Layton, San Jose State.

The scope embodied in the possibilities of this program is, needless to say, tremendous. In the first place, the instructors trained at the college are well qualified to carry their training into effect in the schools; second, the program lends itself to ready implementation through the public schools; and third, a new generation now in the schools will grow up with a far better concept and appreciation of the disease, including, as well, the elimination of misconceptions.

As a result of the fine cooperation of the faculty of Humboldt State College in this program, and the enthusiasm with which it has been received by the students, it is now reported that the subcommittee on teacher training is planning to introduce a similar project in the curriculum of a large number of colleges; and universities throughout the State.

Thus to Humboldt State has accrued the signal honor of being a real pioneer in the prpogram, this in addition to the material achievements attending the project. And in congratulating Humboldt State College upon its distinguished achievement we feel that we speak for all Humboldt.

Guaranteed Wage Sought for 65,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I am including in the Appendix of the RECORD the following Associated Press dispatch:

GUARANTEED WAGE SOUGHT FOR 65,000

CHICAGO, June 11.—The CIO United Auto Workers announced today it will demand a guaranteed wage for 65,000 farm implement workers in negotiations later this month with International Harvester and the Allis Chalmers Co.

A union official hinted that strikes may be called to get the farm implement manufacturers to follow the recent example of the Ford Motor Co. in granting some form of guaranteed wage.

Freedom for Austria?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the United States joined with Britain, France, and Russia in signing a treaty liberating Austria.

The signing of this treaty brought into focus the fact that for 10 years, Communist Russia, alone among the Big Four, has gouged at least a billion dollars worth of reparations out of Austria and, under terms of the "liberation," will continue to extract the equivalent of hundreds of millions of dollars for the next 10 years.

Equally as important, it focuses attention on the fact that up to January 1, 1954, United States taxpayers handed out approximately a billion dollars in various forms of aid to the Austrians. In other words, as one writer aptly puts it, taxpayers of this country have been feeding the Austrian cow while Russia has been milking her.

It is almost beyond belief that the representatives of this Government, in the light of what has happened, would join in a new treaty with Russia which would permit that government to continue its inhuman gouging of the Austrians. The time has come for some of us in Congress to demand an accounting of the State Department. There must be an end now to this business of handing over hundreds of millions of American tax dollars to the Kremlin even though it is purportedly designated as aid to Austria.

The following article throws more light on this situation:

RUSSIANS FREED AUSTRIA AT A JUICY PROFIT

(By Konrad Bercovici)

We have all heard our Secretary of State report to our President how the people of Vienna danced in the streets with tears running down their cheeks when the treaty liberating Austria was signed by the four powers. The Russian signatories were all sweetness and light to have liberated that country after 10 years of occupation. From whom did the Communists liberate Austria? From the Communists themselves.

For 10 years they had enslaved that poor country and sucked it dry, carting away its industrial machinery and everything else they found of value, under the pretext that it had been German property during the Nazi occupation. And they arrested and sentenced thousands of men and women to work in the slave camps of Siberia. Now, as an act of kindness, they shipped back to the liberated country, so-called, 700 broken men from the slave camps, presumably the only ones still alive when the act was signed.

THEFTS ARE LEGALIZED

Among other conditions of liberation, Austria was compelled to agree to deliver, free, to Russia, 10 million tons of oil a year for the period of 10 years. What this means in practical terms is that one-third of the working population of Austria will slave for 10 years, without pay, to produce and deliver 100 million tons of oil to the Communists as one of the prices of their liberation. It must have occurred to the Austrian authorities agreeing to such a condition that no price was too high to free themselves of Russian occupation.

Another feature of the agreement between Russia and Austria, if an act in which one of the parties has a hand on the throat of the other can be called an agreement, is that every property confiscated during the occupation, valued above $10,000, becomes legally the property of the kindhearted liberators.

Looking carefully at the young people "dancing in the streets with tears running down their cheeks," I noted that they were all undersized as a result of 10 years of Nazi occupation followed by another 10 years of Communist rule. The picture shown of the signers of the agreement was particularly revealing. To the fore stood Figl, the Austrian Secretary of State, not quite 5 feet tall, and in back of him the Russian liberators, each one over 6 feet and weighing over 200 pounds. Between the Russians stood the French Secretary of State, who is just about 5 feet tall and surely weighs less than 100 pounds. A few more such liberations, and the people of Europe will be reduced to the stature of midgets.

SATELLITES COULD PAY BILLIONS

Either because the rulers of Russia are unconscious of the enormity of their crimes or because they are convinced that the rest of the world is idiotic, the Russians took immediate advantage of the good will they created by liberating Austria to propose another act of liberation to the Yugoslavs. Announcing to the world and to Marshal Tito that they wanted to talk to him with open hearts and pure souls, Khruschchev and Bulganin went to Belgrade to rekindle the flame which once fused together the two countries.

Placing all blame for the original rupture between them on Lavrenti Beria, who is dead and cannot defend himself, they asked Tito to return to the Communist fold as a member in good standing. Whatever one may say about Tito, he is nobody's fool, and having himself been a party to many a purge he knows what such a return to the fold would do for him and his country.

On conditions similar to those by which Austria was liberated, Moscow could profitably liberate all its satellites. It is quite possible that after a time Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria would be willing to pay the price to get out from under the heels of the Communists. And it is also possible that Germany would be made to pay an even higher price to be once again reunited with that part of its country now occupied by the Communists.

Tuttle Creek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, in the next few days much will be heard about Tuttle Creek, a key reservoir for water conservation in the Kansas River Basin, a reservoir to hold back devastating floods and to provide water in time of drought.

In connection therewith, the following editorial in the Kansas City Star June 11, 1955, is interesting and enlightening:

BACK TO THE RIVER BATTLE

The drive for Kaw Valley river control is going forward again and it will have to continue until the job is done. In Washington the rise from past defeatism is emphasized by the committee amendment that will put the Tuttle Creek Dam project before the House. This is a surprise committee victory for Representative ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, of Kansas, who offered the amendment, and Representative RICHARD W. BOLLING, of Missouri.

This success doesn't necessarily mean that the Congress will approve the funds to reopen work on Tuttle Creek this year. But it is given a real chance after it had been counted out for this session. And you can sense that this time the drive will continue until it brings full control of Kansas floods and water resources.

In the Senate, Tuttle Creek has the active support of Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL and the apparent support of Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas. This week appropriations were urged vigorously by the Missouri Senators, STUART SYMINGTON and THOMAS C. HENNINGS.

Four years after the great billion-dollar flood the Kaw Valley has received nothing to prevent a return engagement. After 2 years of extreme droughts this area has made no tangible progress toward conserving its water for time of need. Such inaction is shocking. It suggests the irresponsible fellow who never worries about his leaky roof until a big rain.

For the long failure this area must accept the greater part of the responsibility. The State of Kansas has been divided and confused. It has lost many millions in development projects by its own failure to seize opportunities.

Now the State is beginning to face its problem. A new State agency, a seven-member water resources authority, has been created and shortly will be functioning. Based on factual studies, it will speak for the State in determining the State's role in flood control and water conservation. Kansas finally is awakening to its responsibilities in the all-important subject of dealing with its water. In Washington and at home, the drive for a complete water control program moves on from here.

Mr. Speaker, during the debate I will furnish the House facts and figures which will prove the need and feasibility of Tuttle Creek Reservoir.

California Thrice Blessed—Full Employment, Abundant Natural Resources, and Desirable Climate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, California is today fulfilling all of the fabulous predictions for its future that were made by the early settlers who with rare foresight gave it the name of the Golden State.

The State of California has indeed been blest by divine providence. Its

mountain slopes are covered with great forests of finest timber, its mineral wealth still awaits full exploration and development, its valleys are fertile and productive, its desert land has blossomed with the development of irrigation and new sources of water supply, and its cities have grown in size and industrial capacity until they rank among the first in the Nation.

Added to all this is the finest climate anywhere in the world, mild for those who dread the harsh winters and simmering heat of summer, but diversified in the inland areas to offer a climate to satisfy every taste.

California, since the gold rush days of 1849, has been the boom State, the one State above all others in the Union to become the goal for Americans migrating westward, and the expansion still goes on.

The California State Chamber of Commerce announced recently that the results of State and Federal labor surveys agree that California now leads the Nation in the upswing of business activity during the first quarter of 1955.

The following report of this survey appeared in the June 7 edition of the Los Angeles Examiner. The figures in this survey again proclaim the vital importance of California's expanding industrial might to the economy of the Nation:

CALIFORNIA JOBS TOP NATION

State and Federal labor surveys yesterday agreed that California leads the Nation in the upswing of business activity during the first quarter of 1955.

The California State Chamber of Commerce estimated total employment at 4,965,000 in April, 3 percent over that of 1954. The State's manufacturing employment rose 4.8 percent against the national gain of 1.8 percent.

The State chamber surveys showed biggest gains in paper products, rubber and motor-vehicle assembly, while construction showed its first rise in 18 months.

Building permits, up 36 percent, confirmed the building boom trend, with major gains in Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, and Santa Clara Counties.

The United States Department of Labor counted 3,945,600 nonfarm employees in California during April, a gain of 156,000 from a year ago, or 1.3 percent. Washington and Oregon showed gains of 2 percent.

The Federal survey showed average weekly earnings in California nonfarm jobs to be $84.47, up 9 cents from a year ago. Oregon had an average of $87.17, up $1.05.

An Invocation by Rev. G. Wayne Glick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, this invocation was given by Rev. G. Wayne Glick of the department of religion, meeting of the Young Democrats, Lancaster, Pa., at the Lancaster County meeting of the Young Democrats, Lancaster, Pa., on May 26, 1955. The invocation is notable for its clear, strong thought:

Almighty God, in whose hands are the issues of men and of nations, we acknowledge the blessings that have come to us as a people. Gratefully do we remember the guidance which has been honestly sought and received by those who knew their dependence and yet were not willing to make this dependence an excuse for lassitude. We remember with gratitude those who have acted in the time of peril, with dedicated reason, and with high human motives; who were unwilling to use religion as a crutch to support egocentric schemes; who have not abused that high religion which claims the total man by resorting to pious sham. And if we think we see, O God, this very abuse in high places today, we would beseech Thee the more that we be delivered from using the gifts Thou hast given for obscuring the minds of men, and perverting their allegiance. Make us to know that doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with Thee are more than pious platitudes, to shield inadequacy; but rather, that justice and mercy and humility are virtues won in the hard struggles of our daily life. And as we confront the hypocrisy that covers its shortcomings with piety, the injustice that blackens character by innuendo, and the exploitation that mates with callous privilege, let us not dodge our clear duty, nor use Thee. We would not abuse Thy gifts by that evasion that prays in public and vegetates in the place of responsibility.

Bless Thou those who would work, but cannot; chasten those who could relieve the suffering of mankind, but will not. Guard us from that superpatriotism which would play politics with those who are oppressed, and hungry, and anxious. To the end that we may be faithful in our given duties, seeking to use our energies that justice may prevail for men of all colors, races, and creeds, to this end we ask Thy blessing upon this occasion. Amen.

Minimum-Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement which I submitted to the House Committee on Education and Labor in support of my bill, H. R. 576, which would establish a national minimum wage of $1.25 per hour:

STATEMENT IN FAVOR OF $1.25 MINIMUM WAGE

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

Some time ago the Department of Labor determined that it costs at least $3,800 a year to provide an urban family of four with a modest standard of living. In some cities the amount is considerably higher. Here in Washington the family budget would require at present an annual income of $4,500 to provide the family with the same modest standard of living.

Several States and municipalities have conducted similar studies. They found that the minimum required to support a single woman would vary today between about $2,000 in Massachusetts to $2,700 in Washington. In my own district the annual cost is $2,488.

These budgets provide only for minimum decent standards of living and do not allow for luxuries and frills. It is strictly a stew and hamburger budget, without steaks or chops.

It would take at least $1.25 hourly rate to provide a single worker with a minimum decent living in my district. A worker with family obligations needs at least $2 an hour to provide his family with basic needs. However, the present Federal minimum wage requires only a 75 cents hourly rate.

LOW MINIMUM WAGE A THREAT TO ALL INDUSTRY

This floor on wages is entirely too low. It denies millions of American wage earners to share in what we would like to believe is the birthright of every American—a minimum decent standard of living. The low minimum wage also represents a constant threat to millions of more prosperous workers who succeeded with the aid of unions and under the ever-increasing productivity of our American free-enterprise system to gain higher standards of living. Some unscrupulous employers have, unfortunately, taken advantage of low rates that prevail in some sections of the United States by moving their business there and then tried to obtain unfair competitive advantages over employers who pay decent wages. A few misguided persons of authority in the low-wage communities have tried to perpetrate the wage-cost advantages of the runaway industries. They even stoop so low as to violate the law of the land by using the powers within their command to keep out unions from their areas which would work to raise wages and the standard of living in these communities. A spokesman for the development board of one of our great States where, unfortunately, low wages prevail declared recently:

"We don't encourage any company to come into the State if it's going to bring a union with it. Our people don't want unions. They are individualistic and don't want outsiders telling them what to do."

Mr. Chairman, we must act to remove substandard wages as a competitive factor in our great industrial system. Superior management, efficient production, increased productivity, and lower costs are the proper bases for our free competitive system. Starvation wages are not a proper weapon in the play of our great free competitive system.

THE ECONOMY CAN SUPPORT $1.25 MINIMUM

The question arises, Can our economy support a $1.25 minimum wage, which I am proposing? The answer must be unequivocally in the affirmative.

Almost 6 year ago Congress voted a 75 cents minimum. Buckets of crocodile tears were shed then by some spokesmen for low-paying firms. They asserted that the new minimum wage would result in the ruin of their businesses and the loss of jobs to their workers.

The facts proved these prophets of doom to be completely in error. Several months ago the Department of Labor released the results of its studies on the economic effects of the 1949 minimum-wage legislation. The studies disclose that the 75 cents had only minor effects upon employment and that industry displayed a high degree of adjustment to the increased minimum wage.

The Department of Labor concludes that the effect of our minimum-wage legislation has been "to improve the position of employees involved by increasing earnings in the affected industries and that the relative improvement has been substantially maintained."

The evidence seems to be conclusive that the 75 cents minimum had only salutary effects upon the economy. And I believe that Congress was overcautious then in selecting that low a minimum. I am confident that today our economy could easily

support the $1.25 hourly rate I am recommending now.

Since 1949 the cost of living has risen by some 13 percent, and the best estimates are that the overall productivity of the American economy has increased at an annual rate of better than 3 percent. Rises in cost of living and productivity alone would thus justify at least a $1.05 minimum hourly rate. But if our economy is to continue to grow and flourish, we must strengthen the purchasing power of our consumers. Grave warnings have been expressed about the dangers of another recession before the end of this summer. A higher minimum wage would offer a prop to the economy.

But aside from any economic consideration, I believe that we have a moral obligation to increase the minimum wage to at least $1.25. It would allow more Americans to share in the bounty that is our free American competitive system, and it would aid millions to better appreciate and count the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which our beloved country must offer to all its citizens.

Distinguished Chairman and members of this committee, I urge upon you the favorable consideration of H. R. 576, calling for a $1.25 minimum wage legislation, which I introduced at the beginning of this session of Congress.

Address by Hon. John A. Matthews, LL. D., K. M., at the Dedication of Don Bosco High School, Ramsey, N. J., May 28, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by the always eloquent Hon. John A. Matthews, LL. D., K. M., distinguished judge, lawyer, and citizen of New Jersey. Judge Matthews has been one of our State's outstanding citizens since the days of his youth when he served in the State legislature down to the present where he enjoys the distinction of being one of the most eminent members of the New Jersey bar. As a judge, a lawyer, a father, and devoted American, Judge Matthews' career is almost without parallel in our State. The address with its profound analysis of the basic causes of juvenile delinquency is as follows:

I appreciate the honor of addressing this assemblage in the distinguished ecclesiastical presence of His Excellency, Archbishop Boland, Very Rev. Father Ziggiotti, rector major of the Salesians of Don Bosco, Father Provincial, Father Giovannini, and the other reverend and revered fathers, sisters, brothers, and cooperators gathered here this afternoon.

This is an auspicious and purposeful occasion. We have witnessed the dedication of a new high-school building, within the hallowed halls and classrooms of which, young men will receive intellectual and moral education and training to make them, not only good citizens of our beloved Nation, but also citizens of the city of God.

I cannot better express, in epitome, the purposefulness of this occasion, than in these words of Sir Shane Leslie, which appear in this month's edition of the Salesian Bulletin. They will serve as the textual motif of my address. Speaking of The Preventive System of Don Bosco, Mr. Leslie said:

"Don Bosco prepared a way for the good that lies in every soul to come to the surface, instead of neglecting and then assaulting the seeds of evil. His method was to keep the boy's mind filled to overflow with the legitimate interest and pleasures of boyhood. There was no space for any other influence. There was no mansion of the soul to let."

This high school is dedicated in and to the Don Bosco tradition. It practicalizes the truth of the adage that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." This high school and its teachers and administrators, given the reasonable cooperation and family good example of the parents of its students, is insurance against juvenile delinquency, which has become a nationwide problem today, basically because religion and morality, which George Washington called "great pillars of human happiness, the firmest props of the duties of men and citizens," have so largely been neglected or abandoned in the training of youth.

Indeed, it is my reasoned opinion, based upon my erstwhile experience as a teacher in public and private grammar and secondary schools, and in a college of law, as well as from my life-long reading and study of educational trends, methods, and purposes, that the widespread, overpublicized, and often too luridly publicized, juvenile delinquency among our youth of today is basically due, in large part, to a betrayal of the youth of America that goes back farther than present-day parential indifference, neglect, and bad example, which are, of course, contributing factors in juvenile delinquency.

This betrayal of the youth of America was perhaps unwitting—certainly it was unintentional—on the part of those primarily responsible for it. It is a betrayal that is sourced in a philosophy of education, which, over the greater part of the last half century, has progressively abandoned what a recent Harvard report called the common practice of American education generally, less than a century ago, namely, "the appeal to the Christian view of man and history as providing both final meaning and immediate standards for life."

Because this Christian view of man and history has ceased to be the common ground of training of our American youth, "final meaning and immediate standards for life" have largely disappeared, and, in their stead, youth have come to believe that whatever is useful is good, with the result that a religionless system of self-indulgence, euphemistically called the new morality, expediency morality, has become the widely accepted norm of conduct.

Thus it is, and it was, that the youth of this generation, and the youth of predecessor generations, many of whom are the parents of the youth of this generation, have been deprived of their fundamental, cultural American heritage.

It is, of course, true that the more than a million youths of today, who, court statistics show, are presently juvenile delinquents, as well as other millions of our present-day youth who are proximately exposed to delinquency by such a philosophy of expediency morality, have received and are receiving intellectual training.

Progress in teaching methods and virtually nationwide compulsory education laws have, over recent years, made our system of public education successful and efficient in imparting intellectual knowledge to the youth of America.

But what about the moral training of youth? George Washington, in his Farewell Address, warned us: "Let us not indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Regardless of the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience forbid us to expect that national morality can long endure an exclusion of religious principle."

For those who may regard these words of Washington as old fashioned, may I offer a similar warning from a recent treatise by Sir Richard Livingstone, who is not of the Catholic faith, and who is President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, England. In his book, The Future in Education, Livingstone wrote, "We have lost—at any rate in the post primary school—our grip on education. * * * Neither mind nor character can be made without a spiritual element. That is just the element which has grown weak, where it has not perished in our civilization, with disastrous results. Nothing can be done until that element is restored."

Don Bosco High School builds mind and character in its students with a spiritual element. Don Bosco High School teaches that religion and morality are, in the words of George Washington, "great pillars of human happiness, the firmest props of the duties" (notice he said duties, not rights) "of men and citizens." The teachers at Don Bosco High School, again in the words of Washington, "do not indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion." Religion in the sense that Washington and Jefferson used the term, namely, faith in God, the Creator of all men, the Endower of our lives and our liberties, the Supreme Judge of the world, as the Declaration of Independence speaks of God, is religion that may and should be taught in our public schools. Such teaching does not violate any Federal or State constitutional mandates because it is fundamentally the belief of every God-believing American, whether he be Catholic or Protestant, Jew or gentile.

Those who do not believe in God as the Creator of all men, as the Endower of our lives and our liberties, as the Supreme Judge of the World, equivalently foreswear what the Founders declare to be the reason why "governments are instituted among men," namely, "to preserve our God given rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." It is out of such unbelievers that subversives are spawned.

To those modern philosophers of education, who, in the words of their deceased chief leader, say that "it has become impossible for cultivated minds of the Western World to have faith in the Divine Author and Authority in which Western civilization confided," we may well address the inquiry, What has science discovered, what scientific theory has been proved, since, or before the days of the Founders, that makes faith in God impossible?

All too long have the youth of our land been lured by the siren song of so-called academic freedom into the bondage of faithless, hopeless, loveless doubt, the shackles of which are forged of despair and delinquency.

If, therefore, America is sincere and not merely utilitarian in its desire to rid our Nation of what I deem the basic, and too long tolerated, underlying philosophy of education, which seeks to build character in the young, not upon religious virtue, but upon sanctionless social codes of good behavior, let us have a nationwide restatement of our philosophy of education in terms of man as a creature of God.

In pursuance of this idea, may I quote further, from Sir Richard Livingstone's The Future in Education, these purposeful words of advice: "To treat a disease, we must diagnose its causes, and the diagnosis of our disease is not difficult. It is a sickness of the spirit; the loss or weakening of the spiritual elements which should order life, discipline and overrule discordant elements, and bring unity, purpose, and direction into it."

I realize, of course, that the family and the home are, or they should be, the kindergar-

ten of the school of fundamental American citizenship. Respect for decency disciplined and good exampled parental authority, honor by children of parents whose character and good example beget such honor, is the first educational step in respect for law in the future citizens.

I realize, too, that our churches are, as they should be, potent factors in the teaching and development of religion and morality in the young and old alike.

But, I am also poignantly aware, as are all God-believing men and women everywhere, regardless of sect or creed, that the banishment of God from thinking and living in modern civilization, largely through the secularization of education over the last 50 years, has robbed youth of its fundamental American heritage, and has made of our civilization what Sir Richard Livingstone calls "The civilization of means without ends; rich in means beyond any other epoch, and almost beyond human needs; squandering and misusing them, because it has no overruling ideal; an ample body with a meager soul."

It is such a civilization into which the youth of this and its immediately predecessor generations, were born and in which they were educated.

It is not the juvenile delinquents of today who have created the cyclorama of filth that is largely the present-day proffer of the cinema, the theater, and literature from comics and magazine to pornographic best sellers.

Juvenile delinquents don't own, or edit, or publish newspapers, the pages of many of which, to such an alarming degree, detailedly publicize and luridly picturize public sinners against decent family life, and crimes that sicken even stout adult hearts.

It is not juvenile delinquents who are faithless servants in offices of public trust, whose bad example gives rise to the frequently heard flippancy, "public office is a public trough."

Indeed, this widespread letdown in national morality, this dollar morality, may well be the fallout, as it were, of the bombs of secularism that were fashioned years ago out of our partially imported philosophy of education.

The time has arrived, therefore, for us to do something more than talk about juvenile delinquency in a civilization that is itself delinquent to such an extent that legislative halls have to be stormed by the decent remnant in our country in attempts to thwart, by man-made legislation, the threatened widespread disregard of the Ten Commandments of God.

Don Bosco High School, on this purposeful occasion, proclaims its dedication to cooperate in the fundamentally American task of recapturing for the youth of America their cultural inheritance. God love and God bless the youth of America.

Eisenhower and Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the edition of Labor's Daily, Saturday, June 11, 1955. It becomes a matter of deep appreciation for everyone holding high hope for the success of the United Nations Organization; that at the tenth anniversary of its founding, our greatest living American contributing to its birth, Harry S. Truman, should be recognized and invited to speak through the good offices of its Secretary, Dag Hammerskjold of Sweden.

The editorial follows:

EISENHOWER AND TRUMAN

(By Willard Shelton)

A number of newspapers are expressing "regret" that former President Truman has "declined an invitation" to attend the San Francisco ceremonies celebrating the 10th anniversary of the United Nations. The facts need to be put straight, and some questions should be asked of General Eisenhower about his attitude toward his predecessor in the White House.

Mr. Truman had a great deal to do with the organization of the United Nations. The first major decision he made after succeeding Franklin D. Roosevelt on April 12, 1945, was a decision that the scheduled U. N. conference would go on.

Among his other early major decisions was his determination that the conference should not fail. He sent Harry Hopkins, a sick man, to Moscow at one point, so that Hopkins could tell Stalin that on at least a few matters the Russians would have to yield. And they yielded.

Now it is 10 years later, and Mr. Truman is a private citizen of Independence, Mo. He has been succeeded in the Presidency by Mr. Eisenhower. But he is still a man who held the Presidency through nearly 8 bitter years, was elected to that office in his own right, and who has always shown his deep respect for the office.

What kind of invitation went from Secretary Dulles to Mr. Truman in regard to the U. N. celebration? It was an invitation to attend as a kind of sightseeing tourist, a fellow who could sit upon the rear chairs.

Mr. Eisenhower himself will make the principal speech for the United States, of course, as President.

But wouldn't it be the most natural thing for Harry S. Truman, as the former President who helped create the U. N., to be invited to speak?

Is he supposed to travel to the west coast pretending that he is just a man who came along for the ride, unconscious of the facts of history and the role he played in history?

Stanley Woodward, a former career State Department official, wrote a letter to the newspapers carefully explaining that Truman had not refused to go to San Francisco, but simply had never gotten the right kind of invitation. If he once got the right kind of invitation, Woodward suggested, Truman wouldn't have to be urged to accept.

An invitation from the administration to Mr. Truman would demonstrate, at a stroke, the continuity of American foreign policy. It would demonstrate the respect our present leaders have for those who previously held office, just as Truman himself has repeatedly shown respect for the difficult problems of Mr. Eisenhower in the Presidency.

General Eisenhower has every right not to seek advice and counsel from Mr. Truman—although he might well profit if he did. But the San Francisco meeting is ceremonial in nature, rather than policymaking, and fitness is important in ceremonial matters. With a single gesture the President could give Mr. Truman his due, and he could be sure that in other nations, where Truman is greatly admired, the gesture would be welcomed. Why not send to Independence the right kind of invitation?

Proposed Amendments to Railroad Retirement Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with every indication that this session of Congress may adjourn late next month I wish to take this opportunity to call to the attention of the House the necessity of amending the Railroad Retirement Act before adjournment.

Representing, as I do, one of the largest retired and active railroad populations in the country, not a day goes by that I do not receive numerous inquiries concerning pending amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act—and asking the question—when is Congress expected to take action on them? In addition, I receive a lot of mail from retired and active railroaders who do not live in my congressional district. For that reason I know that interest in amending the Railroad Retirement Act is nationwide.

At the moment there are over 50 bills pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, all of them designed to amend the Railroad Retirement Act. Among these bills are five measures which I introduced at the request of the active and retired railroaders of the central Pennsylvania area. In fact, I had these bills pending in previous Congresses since they have been reintroduced by me on several occasions.

Mr. Speaker, my five bills include H. R. 859, which I reintroduced on the first day this Congress convened and which provides for a 25-percent across-the-board increase in annuities and pensions paid to retired railroad employees or their survivors. Facts and figures prove that this group of retired railroaders or their survivors who, today, are wholly dependent upon their railroad-retirement benefits, have not received increases in benefits comparable to the increased cost of living.

Another of my bills, H. R. 857, will repeal the prohibition against the payment of dual benefits to widows of deceased railroad employees who are entitled to receive both a pension as a surviving widow in addition to any benefits she may have earned in her own right as a retired employee of an industry covered by the Social Security Act. In other words, the widow would be entitled to both security security and railroad-retirement benefits.

I have also introduced H. R. 2443, for the purpose of removing from the Railroad Retirement Act a discriminating provision which requires a railroad employee, before retiring, to sever his connections with any other employment outside of the railroad industry in which he may be engaged at the time of his retirement. This bill, if enacted, will

permit retired railroad employees to continue work outside of the railroad industry in which they were engaged at the time of retirement without forfeiting any railroad retirement benefits to which they are entitled. This bill is designed primarily to protect retired employees who, at the time of retirement, were forced to give up such positions as secretaries to fraternal and civic organizations, organists for local churches, and other minor positions for which the compensation received was of an insignificant amount.

Complying with the request of many currently employed railroaders, I introduced H. R. 856 and H. R. 858, both of which are designed to improve the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act by permitting retirement at the age of 60 or after 30 or 35 years of service with the annuity to be computed, based on the 5 years of highest earnings. Both of these bills, which I had pending in previous Congresses and which were rejected by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during the 83d Congress, in my opinion are entitled to further consideration at this time.

Mr. Speaker, as I said in the beginning of my statement, the retired and active railroad population of my Congressional District as well as throughout the Nation, are anxious for congressional action on pending amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act and, especially, those provisions which I have outlined.

According to my good friend and colleague, the Honorable J. PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, it is his hope that the so-called Harris subcommittee will begin a series of hearings on railroad-retirement legislation as soon as the full committee has finished action on amendments to the Natural Gas Act and completes its study on Federal control of the Salk vaccine. I am sure that Chairman PRIEST's announcement of the coming hearings will be received with great pleasure by the railroad population throughout the Nation.

The Late Judge Charles Brents Kennamer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of Judge Charles Brents Kennamer, of Montgomery, Ala., one of the Nation's outstanding United States district judges, was the cause of great sorrow in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. Judge Kennamer was a native of Marshall County, Ala., and in the soil of his beloved Kennamer's Cove he was laid to rest.

Judge Charlie Kennamer, as he was known in our section of Alabama, was not of my political faith. He was a rugged, regular Republican. He loved the GOP, and was always true to its tenents.

As a judge, he was fair, industrious, and impartial. He was loved and admired by Democrats and Republicans alike. He was truly a man of the people. There are many of his relatives scattered throughout my section of Alabama, for his is one of the largest families in the State. It will be interesting to the Members of the House of Representatives to know that Tom Kennamer, former Doorkeeper of the House, is one of his nephews.

Geoffrey Birt, staff writer of the Montgomery Examiner, has written the following beautiful tribute to Judge Kennamer, Until the Last Trumpet Blows, which I include with my remarks:

UNTIL THE LAST TRUMPET BLOWS
(By Geoffrey Birt)

They buried Judge Charles Brents Kennamer yesterday in his native soil near Kennamers' Cove, up in Marshall County. And there the squire of the Kennamer clan will lie, with the winds from the lakes of the Tennessee Valley blowing across his grave, until the last trumpet blows. A gentleman and a scholar lies at rest. Let me tell you something about Judge Kennamer:

He was born up there on Sand Mountain in 1874. Those were rugged days. The Guntersville area then was frontier-type country. Disputes were quite regularly settled simply—with the gun. Born in quite humble circumstances—later, he never forgot his early hardships—he studied law, mostly the hard way, and at 29 hung up his first shingle. The judge could recall the time the Marshal circuit courtroom was filled with unsmiling men who mostly had their guns in their pockets and young lawyer Kennamer tried that case with a pistol on both hips.

They talk about the growth of the Republican Party in Alabama today. Well—perhaps so. But back in 1919–20 Republican Attorney Kennamer ran for Congress from the old so-called "bloody" seventh district; almost got assassinated, and was defeated by the narrowest of margins. Candidate Kennamer carried every county in the old seventh district, save Etowah—and in the end, it was the Gadsden vote which beat him.

En route to St. Clair County to speak, word reached him that a hostile crowd awaited his arrival. At least eggs—perhaps worse—would be thrown at him. Neither then, nor till the moment he died, did Judge Kennamer fear any man or sidestep any situation. He prepared to keep his appointment. Drawing into Boaz the day before the St. Clair speech, he asked some able-bodied supporters to accompany him.

While talking with Boaz supporters on the highway, a Boaz policeman came forward. The man said he meant to search the candidate because he had heard he was carrying a pistol. Kennamer hold him, "I have no pistol, I assure you," and asked, "Have you a search warrant?" The man said, "No; but I'm going to search you." With that he suddenly flashed a gun and pressed it against Kennamer's ribs. A friend threw his arms around the policeman and his finger miraculously went behind the trigger just as the cop pressed it. But for that, Judge Kennamer would have died of an assassin's bullet 36 years ago.

Judge Kennamer never owed any man anything. He paid cash. He was scrupulous. His children remember they sat on cane-bottom chairs until father could pay cash for better ones. It was many years before he bought a car, and then he paid cash for it. He had not owned a home, for the same reason, until quite late in life.

There can be few, if any, more devoted families than the Kennamer family. Every Sunday, year in and year out, the family gathered at the modest home on South Perry Street for Sunday dinner. Only Dr. Samuel Kennamer, a heart specialist with a growing national reputation, lived far away, and he lives in California. The judge kept a good table of the old homey variety—big joints of meat, honest-to-goodness vegetables. The family, home from church, said grace and ate an old-fashioned family dinner. The judge, as head of the whole large Kennamer clan, from the Tennessee Valley to the gulf, presided. Each year he went back to Kennamers Cove to preside at the Kennamer reunion, and men from the mountain who are no kin would visit him and the family.

There comes none finer the wide world over than Charles Brents Kennamer. Alabama mourns the passing of a great citizen. Another link with a dying era has snapped. I bid the judge farewell.

Equal Pay for Equal Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to express my interest in and sympathy for H. R. 6503, which was introduced by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN]. An identical bill was introduced in the Senate by my colleague the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The purpose of these bills, as I understand it, is simply to guarantee that the 18.5 million women workers, or at least that group engaged in industry affecting interstate commerce, receive equal pay rates for equal work, that they shall not be underpaid merely because they are women.

Here in Congress we have recognized both in the Classification Act of 1923 and the Classification Act of 1949 that women workers in Government were entitled to equal pay for equal work. There is no discrimination in the Federal Government against women workers merely because they are women.

Equal pay in private employment is important to all workers. It is important to men because their own pay standards may be undermined if employers find themselves able to hire women workers at lower wages to do the same work. It is important to the women who are deprived of equitable wages for work they do as skillfully as men.

We already have Federal laws protecting workers in interstate commerce in the field of minimum pay and in work on Government contracts. We have a law protecting workers in their right to organize freely and bargain collectively. The principle of equal pay for equal work is a sound one, on which the Congress has a right to legislate.

Sixteen States already have equal-pay laws governing workers in local industry, and I am happy that my own State of Illinois is among them. But the standards vary all over the country, there are 32 States that have no equal-pay laws at all, and none of the State

laws protects workers in industries affecting interstate commerce.

We had House committee hearings several years ago on an equal-pay bill, and I hope it will be possible for the House Committee on Education and Labor to revive those hearings and to report out a bill that the committee considers sound and equitable.

Communistic Influences Upon Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Dr. Lyle G. Phillip's radio talk over station KHON, Monday, May 16, 1955, as part of the anti-Communist program of the Hawaii Residents' Association. The Hawaii Residents' Association is also known as IMUA.

The radio talk follows:

Before discussing the subject we have in mind tonight, may we make these emphatic declarations to eliminate any possibility of misunderstanding:

First, IMUA is not anti-labor nor anti-union.

Second. IMUA is nonpartisan politically.

Third. IMUA is not antistatehood.

Fourth, IMUA is anti-Communist.

As a patriotic organization, and as a foe of communism, IMUA is interested in labor unions, in politics, and in statehood only to the degree that communism and other subversive influences are involved in labor unions, in politics, and in the statehood issue.

And now, having made that clear, may we pass on to a subject which has been uppermost in the minds of many people in Hawaii these past few days, namely, communism as related to the statehood issue.

The Communist conspiracy in Hawaii has come to be intimately connected with the statehood issue; and it is apparent to all save those who will not see that many votes were cast against statehood in the House of Representatives in Washington last week, because Congress is now well informed of the Communist influence and success here in our islands. Communism, it now becomes clear, is one of the real obstacles in the path of statehood.

Undertaking to cover up or gloss over the shameful facts about Communist infiltration and Communist influence has, we believe, won no friends for statehood in Washington or here at home. Facts are facts—and when facts have been as clearly presented by reputable agencies, as have the facts about communism in Hawaii they speak for themselves, and carry weight. They spoke for themselves in Washington last week, and many Congressmen were convinced.

Now, IMUA believes, is the time when all good citizens should quit kidding themselves—and trying to kid others—and get down to the job which concerns us all, the elimination of Communist conspiracy from Hawaii.

The Communist conspiracy is inextricably tied up with Hawaiian labor, Hawaiian politics, and the Hawaiian statehood issue. It has played, and is playing, a major role in determining the fates of all three.

It has been interesting to listen to, and attempt to evaluate, some of the reactions here in Hawaii to defeat the statehood legislation which was pending in Congress.

In our legislature, Senator Ben Dillingham has been openly charged with having helped to bring about statehood's defeat. Yet Senator Dillingham appears to have done no more than to state, in the senate chamber, what certainly appears to be self-evident and irrefutable fact.

In the House of Representatives in Washington, Congressman PILLION, of New York, made statements which are credited with having influenced many of his colleagues to vote against the Hawaii-Alaska statehood bill. Those statements were, we understand, a recital of cold, hard documented facts about Communists and the Communist influence in Hawaii.

IMUA is ready to listen to, and weigh, any evidence that anything said by Senator Dillingham or Representative PILLION was false. It is our conviction, based on what we have read, that they spoke the plain, unvarnished truth.

We have listened to and read much abuse of both of these gentlemen for what they said. But it was not their words, but the facts behind those words, which are significant; and it was the facts reflected in their words which undoubtedly played a major role in the defeat of Hawaii's statehood efforts.

The answer, IMUA believes, does not lie in berating Mr. Dillingham and Mr. PILLION. The answer, it seems to us, lies in facing those facts and doing something about it.

We have said, and we will say again, confident that we are not exaggerating:

There is no community in the United States where members of the Communist conspiracy have gone so far in attaining their primary aims as in Hawaii—and those primary aims, in case you don't know, are, first, the control of a major segment of labor, and, second, political infiltration, and through political infiltration, influence over government.

In Hawaii, Communist leaders do control a major segment of labor. "But," say the quibblers, "the Communist-led unions, the ILWU and the UPW, have only about 25,000 members all told, and that is less than an eighth of Hawaii's labor force." That is true, but the ILWU leaders control our vital industries and activities—the sugar and pineapple industries and the waterfront. The UPW has a couple of thousand government workers in its ranks. These two Communist-led unions, in absolute fact, control a major segment of Hawaiian labor—major, in respect to power and strategic position. And that power has grown even since seven Communist leaders, including ILWU Regional Director Jack Hall, were convicted in Federal court of conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of our Government by force and violence.

IMUA is not alone in its conviction that known Communists play far too large a role in Hawaiian politics, and that their influence in the present legislature is far greater, and more effective, than Communist influence in any State legislature on the mainland. It has been all too painfully apparent that, to the obvious distaste of many fine members of the Democratic party, that party has been chosen as their "chosen instrument" by our island Communists.

As a matter of fact, there is good reason to believe that our island Communists were directed to make that choice, and that in so doing they were faithfully following directions coming to them from the Communist Party, United States of America. If you doubt that statement, listen to this:

In August 1954 the national election conference of the Communist Party, United States of America, unanimously ratified the program of the party; and on page 26 of the pamphlet announcing this program, the following paragraph appears:

"To unite a new political party for 1954 and 1956 requires recognition that the two-party system is still the form through which the overwhelming majority of the American people now express themselves in politics. Except in special local and State situations, there is no immediate prospect that large masses will break away from the existing two-party structure. Under these circumstances, the decisive sections of organized labor, without which a third party is impossible are first attempting to fight out issues within the ranks of the Democratic Party."

That was the Communist Party, United States of America, speaking. From which it appears, our local Communists have just been carrying out party orders.

A few years ago when this same group of local Communists effected a coup d'etat and placed Communists and known Communist sympathizers in control of 80 percent of Oahu's Democratic precinct organizations, good, loyal Democrats rebelled and walked out of the party's territorial convention rather than be seated with known Communist and fellow-traveler delegates.

The whole Territory has been waiting for some similar action since it became apparent that the Communists have regained what they lost at that time by using a different strategy—a strategy so effective that Communist leaders have, many are convinced, come to wield a whip hand in the territorial legislature.

If you don't believe they wield a whip hand, what other explanation can you offer for the fact that the house of representatives voted, by a comfortable majority, to override the Governor's veto of the bill exempting the ILWU Memorial Clubhouse from taxes, even after the Governor gave as one of his reasons for veto the fact that the board of directors of the ILWU Memorial Association is heavily loaded with known Communists, including one who has been convicted of Communist conspiracy?

Or how do you explain the fact that the legislature ignored the excellent recommendations of the Territorial Commission on Subversive Activities—recommendations which could have injured no one but Communists and would have given the Territory some measure of protection against their subversive activities.

Those things didn't just happen.

We have cited the courageous action taken by local Democrats in walking out of a party convention a few years ago rather than sit with Communists.

We have also been hearing a lot about what some of our local Democrats have done in the past against communism.

Charley Kauhane, speaker of the house of representatives, signed the resolution which brough the commission on subversive activities into being several years ago.

Senator Herbert Lee announced in the senate last week that it was on his motion that the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities was requested to conduct its investigation of communism in Hawaii.

To which, we say, most commendable—both of these acts.

We would also say to these gentlemen, "What you did a few years ago was fine; but, Charley and Herbert, what have you done lately?"

What the people of Hawaii are particularly interested in is not past history, but the situation as it exists today. They sense that there has been a change, and they are waiting for someone to say it isn't so, and to back up that declaration with convincing action.

And now let's get back to statehood and communism.

There can be little doubt that the facts about communism influenced the votes of many Representatives in Congress.

It seems to IMUA that the reasonable thing for advocates of statehood to do is to take another look at the situation and, perhaps, to decide that this particular obstacle, communism, can be removed from the path of statehood if every loyal citizen gets behind a drive to eliminate the Communist conspiracy from Hawaii. It should be obvious by now that playing down the issue of communism in Hawaii—sweeping known facts under the rug, if you will—not only doesn't win for statehood but helps the Communists.

To IMUA it seems incomprehensive that the combined forces of the Federal and Territorial Governments, backed up by a well-informed and determined citizenry, cannot put an end to the Communist conspiracy in Hawaii in short order, or, at least, to render it innocuous.

Certainly it can't be done with influential portions of the community closing their eyes to facts which have been amply substantiated by Federal and Territorial investigative agencies, by a jury in the Smith Act trial of the Hawaii seven, and which are even blatantly and insolently paraded around the legislative halls of Iolani Palace.

No wonder that the commission on subversive activities found our people beridden with apathy and indifference toward the Communist issue.

We believe that some of that apathy and indifference to which the commission referred has disappeared during the past few weeks.

We hope the realization that the Congress' knowledge of facts about communism in Hawaii contributed to the defeat of statehood may further awaken Hawaii's people to the fact that a concerted drive is essential to cure the Red evil.

Politics and Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein a statement appearing in the Washington News of Saturday, June 11, 1955, entitled "High Politics on the Highways."

For the first time in the many years which I have served in Congress, politics seems to have invaded the subject of roads and highways. Never before has this been a political subject and it is with extreme regret that it now appears that such is the case. The Committee on Public Works of the House has been holding extensive hearings on the Clay committee report for improving the highways of the United States, and especially the interstate system. The Clay report consists of the best judgment of a nonpolitical committee made up of members of both the Democratic and the Republican Parties. The report is the result of 4 months of intensive study and consideration of our highway problem. Legislation has been introduced to carry out the suggestions made in that report. Both parties are aware of the necessity for improving the highway system of the United States. It is my hope that roads will not become a political subject.

The article follows:

HIGH POLITICS ON THE HIGHWAYS

House Democrats will trump President Eisenhower's highway ace soon.

They'll report a highway bill of their own, almost as big as his, from subcommittee. It will be a 10-to-12-year program; will cost $20 billion to $24 billion (twice as large as Gore bill passed by the Senate).

There will be this important difference: Democratic bill will not permit financing outside the budget, by means of corporation bonds.

Also, Democratic bill will put more emphasis on secondary roads, virtually ignored in GOP proposal, though it will include billions for interstate highway system.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN has put his foot down on corporation bond financing scheme. Aside from that, he's told Democrats on House Public Roads Subcommittee to put anything they want into the bill.

RAYBURN'S object: To give United States public what it wants in new roads, under Democratic sponsorship, but to leave problem of paying for them up to Republicans.

Democrats figure administration, if it wants roads, will be forced either to raise taxes or to increase national debt.

Democrats oppose Clay Commission plan (to let Government corporation issue and sell $21 billion in bonds outside the national debt) on these grounds:

They call it "phony financing" which boosts debt but doesn't say so.

They don't like idea that corporation—not Congress—would control spending of highway billions.

They remember GOP outcries when Democrats talked of revenue-bond financing, outside the budget, back in New Deal days.

There's talk at the White House of a veto if Democratic bill is passed. Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey bitterly opposes anything which would wreck his dream of balancing the budget.

But administration has counted on highway building to assure good economic conditions, high employment rates, in election year.

Showdown on financing must come soon. Temporary legislation raising national debt limit to $281 billion expires June 30. Administration must ask extension soon unless it's willing to live within old $275-billion limit.

Minimum Wage Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following statement prepared by Mr. Sidney Levingston, on behalf of the Delta Council of Mississippi, for submission to the House Committee on Education and Labor:

STATEMENT OF SIDNEY LEVINGSTON, RULEVILLE, MISS., CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR OF THE DELTA COUNCIL OF MISSISSIPPI, TO THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 10, 1955

Gentlemen, my name is Sidney Levingston. I am a farmer living at Ruleville, Miss. As chairman of the Committee on Labor of the Delta Council of Mississippi, and the member for the State of Mississippi of the Special Farm Labor Advisory Committee to the Secretary of Labor, I should be grateful to this committee for permission to file the following statement for inclusion in the record of hearings on the minimum wage bills now pending. I wish to do this on behalf not only of the Delta Council of Mississippi but also of the Mid-South Cotton Producers Committee. Members of both the Delta Council and of the Mid-South Committee are deeply concerned with the provisions of a number of these bills, and officials of the organizations other than the Delta Council that are associated in the Mid-South Cotton Producers Committee wish to be recorded as supporting this statement.

To make clear to the committee the nature of this interest, I should like to explain that the Delta Council is a public service organization representing the Yazoo-Mississippi Delta, the purpose of which is to promote the economic and civic development of the 18 alluvial counties comprising this area. Delta Council represents the common interests of the 650,000 people of this important agricultural section.

For more than 20 years the delta council has been a vital and constructive force in advancing the development of the delta area. It stands for the best in citizenship, and it takes justifiable pride in the progress of the last two decades.

The Mississippi Delta is essentially a cotton-producing area. Mississippi is the second largest cotton-producing State in the country, and delta farmers are producers of just about half of the State's cotton. Members of the delta council are therefore primarily dependent upon cotton for their livelihood.

The Mid-South Cotton Producers Committeee is an affiliation of the Delta Council of Mississippi with four similar organizations. These are the Delta Council of Louisiana, the Agricultural Council of Arkansas, the Tennessee Agricultural Council, and the Missouri Cotton Producers Association, all of them likewise active and progressive factors in the life of their States. Together these organizations cover an area that accounts for much more than half of the total cotton production of their five major cotton-producing States.

Understanding that it is the purpose of the Committee on Education and Labor to consider at this time only the minimum wage rate, I shall make my statement brief. Under the legislation as it stands today on the statute books, agriculture and first processors of agricultural products in the areas of production are of course exempt from minimum wage-and-hour requirements. Cotton producers, and cotton ginners in areas of production, would thus not be directly affected by a change in the minimum wage rate, so long as this exemption holds. They are anxiously concerned, however, that these exemptions not be removed or narrowed.

When fair labor standards legislation was in process of enactment in 1938, the Congress, after searching studies and mature deliberation, wisely concluded that because of the special conditions under which necessarily they are carried on, agriculture and its first processing industries in areas of production should be wholly exempt. Again, when the amendments of 1949 were under consideration, Congress, after similar careful analysis, arrived at the same conclusion.

These premises on which this decision was taken are no less valid today than before. In fact, they are more cogent. For the past several years farmers have found their income progressively squeezed between rising costs of production and declining prices for their products. Cotton producers in particular, faced with a rising tide of competition and an alarming falling away of export trade,

have submitted to increasingly severe curtailment of production with severe reductions of income. The process of acreage curtailment has now gone to a point beyond which it cannot go. Cotton producers have no alternative but to reduce costs of production, by all means possible. For many producers the imposition of a minimum wage requirement would jeopardize their survival.

On this account the Delta Council of Mississippi and the Mid-South Cotton Producers Committee would respectfully support and commend the decision of the Committee on Education and Labor to exclude from its consideration the matter of exempted enterprises. Should at any future time the question of extended coverage be taken up for consideration, these organizations would ask to be informed and to be afforded opportunity to present a more extensive statement with supporting documentation.

What Blocks Gas Price-Fixing Repeal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune of June 11, 1955:

WHAT BLOCKS GAS PRICE-FIXING REPEALER?

Washington reports say that there is less than a 50–50 chance that the House will vote to repeal the law requiring the Federal Power Commission to regulate prices on natural gas at the wellhead.

If the repealer fails, the reason for that will be no compliment to the House. It will mean, it seems to us, that in the House membership there is too much socialism masquerading as economic freedom; or that there is an overabundance of politicians who wish to cater to the unwarranted fears of gas consumers that some thousands of gas producers will combine to overcharge them; or that Members fear they are incapable of designing legislation to prevent collusion and preserve competition if ever better antitrust laws are needed.

When the original law was passed it was to regulate interstate pipeline rates, just as any public utility rates are regulated. It wasn't intended to have the Federal Power Commission fix producer prices. But the Supreme Court said the law calls for producer regulation.

Consumers distant from the producers in Louisiana, Texas, and Oklahoma are being led to believe the law as now written protects them. Tht is the irony in the situation becaus they will be the sufferers from the regulation in the long run. The FPC knows what a job it is being forced to tackle and the majority wants none of it. Conditions vary from field to field, from area to area, and they are always changing. The industry is convinced that the price fixing will discourage wildcatting and the search for new production. If so, that would tend to create a scarcity. On the other hand, if prices are fixed to sustain the most uneconomic producers the better-situated producers will make big profits. Either way, the customers of the interstate pipelines will pay for unwise regulation. Here in Louisiana, we are not much worried about the price fixing in itself. Gas produced for sale within the State does not come under the law. Even if discovery is hampered we'll have enough gas—and, we expect, at competitive prices. We can continue to bring in new industries to use it. But for the people of this State and all other States, the law and the trend it represents, is bad.

Some Congressmen who say they deplore collectivism and needless Government interference ought to be asked if they are not following, in this instance, a line they pretend to oppose. Some who say they want to reduce the high income tax should be asked how such professions fit with hiring hundreds of thousands of people to regulate what there is no excuse for regulating. If they say they are afraid of monopoly (ridiculous with 3,000 or 4,000 producers) or a conspiracy to overcharge the consumer, why don't they see that the antitrust laws are good enough to prevent any such thing. If they are for free competitive enterprise, why don't they try to preserve it instead of killing it?

On the gas repealer showdown let us hope there is less of this inconsistency in the House than the reports indicate there is.

Salute to the Commemoration of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege at this time to place in the RECORD the following resolution which was unanimously adopted at a mass meeting commemorating the 164th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, held at the Polish Home in Lackawanna, N. Y., on Sunday, May 1, 1955:

Whereas the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, was the most liberal and democratic document of its day proclaiming respect for the human rights and the lofty aspirations for freedom of the individual; and

Whereas within the past decade since the end of World War II, Communist Russia, as a result of fearful and shameful appeasement of western democracies, has seized a sector of Poland and subjugated Poland and other free nations under the yoke of communistic imprisonment; and

Whereas this unfortunate example of Polish imprisonment by Communist Russia should fully awaken our Government to fuller defenses against threatening evils on the part of Russia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, as Americans, wholeheartedly dedicated to the Four Freedoms, feel duty-bound in the name of justice and equality, to pledge loyalty and allegiance to our great and beloved United States of America, to be always on guard against communism; be it further

Resolved, That we, as American citizens of Polish descent, hereby repeat our pledge of loyalty and allegiance to our great and beloved United States of America; be it further

Resolved, That we appeal to our great Republic of the United States of America, which guarantees freedom and liberty to all, to do everything in its power to restore those blessings of liberty to millions of enslaved Poles who are now suffering political, religious, and economic persecution in their land; be it further

Resolved, That the now functioning pro-Communist government of Poland, illegally imposed upon the once-free people of Poland, be brought to an accounting before the world's tribunals of justice for the excesses and persecutions of the thousand-year-old established state religion, the Roman Catholic faith, together with its spiritual leaders, namely, His Eminence Stephen Cardinal Wyszynski, the primate of Poland, be denounced and punished according to the immensity of their crimes; be it further

Resolved, That the infamous articles of the Yalta conference pertaining to the betrayal of Poland and other subjugated nations be publicly denounced and repudiated by our Government; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Vice President, Richard M. Nixon, President of the Senate; to the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles; to the United States Senators, Irving M. Ives and Herbert H. Lehman; and to the United States Congressmen, John R. Pillion and Edmund F. Radwan.

RESOLUTION COMMITTEE,
WILLIAM M. STYPOWANY,
Chairman.
JOSEPH F. KIJ, M. D.
WALTER J. LOHR.
STEPHEN GUZ.
JULIA MOLENDA.
LOTTIE HARZYNSKI.
JOHN F. ASZKLER.

Dated May 1, 1955, Lackawanna, N. Y.

Noted Scientist Calls for Impartial Board To Decide Upper Colorado Project Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Paul B. Sears, president-elect of the Association for the Advancement of Science, sees the proposed multibillion-dollar upper Colorado River project as illustrating a serious defect in our national structure as far as the relation of science to public issues is concerned.

This view by one of the Nation's outstanding scientists and conservationists should be given thoughtful consideration.

It is Dr. Sears' belief that the remedy for this defect is the appointment of a disinterested board of scientists from various fields to study and report on such problems.

In a letter to Science Magazine, Dr. Sears says of the upper Colorado River project:

Costly and important as this whole issue may be, its greatest significance lies in illustrating a serious defect in our national structure as far as the relation of science to public issues is concerned.

Scientific knowledge and personnel are available to present the American public with factual, verifiable information, thus stripping the issues down to essential questions of national policy.

Dr. Sears, who also is chairman of the Yale University conservation program, feels very strongly that "public issues should not be clouded and confused by failure to get the basic scientific facts."

In his letter to the magazine, Dr. Sears recites many of the arguments advanced both for and against the upper

Colorado River project to point out the confusion and controversy the project has caused throughout the country.

It must become part of our habit of thought and a recognized procedure—

Dr. Sears declared—

to insist that, in matters of public policy where verifiable physical knowledge is involved, such aspects of major problems be referred to impersonal, disinterested, and competent boards of scientists.

We have in the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council, a proper and legal mechanism for such assignments.

These two closely interrelated groups have at their command the entire scientific talent of the Nation. For various reasons, however, they cannot inject themselves into controversial issues, unless the Government or the public demands that they do so.

Dr. Sears pointed out that one group of scientists has not shared this inhibition. It is the Engineers Joint Council.

The Engineers Joint Council—

He said—

has investigated and reported unfavorably upon the upper Colorado project. But the air would be greatly cleared and an important principle established if the services of bodies representing all phases of science were called upon to analyze this and similar issues.

It is Dr. Sears' contention that failure to use science as a source of perspective in our present stage of culture degrades its function and may in time be disastrous.

The fight over the upper Colorado River project is now raging in the House of Representatives. I believe it would be wise to seek the council of such leaders of science as Dr. Sears.

The issues in the upper Colorado River project involve verifiable physical knowledge, and, as Dr. Sears suggests, the Nation would benefit greatly if such issues were decided by the highest scientific authorities.

There is no substitute for honest and impersonal scientific findings. The public has a right to demand such service from scientists who are better qualified than any other persons to sit in judgment on such issues as those involved in the upper Colorado River project.

I believe that Congress might well take advantage of Dr. Sear's proposal.

Citation of Congressman Joseph W. Martin, Jr., in Connection With Award of Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws by Dartmouth College on Sunday, June 12, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, our beloved colleague, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws at the recent commencement at Dartmouth College, Sunday, June 12, 1955.

The citation that accompanied the award was most deserving and appropriate. I am certain my colleagues would like to read it. It is as follows:

Your native modesty and perhaps your political principles preclude your saying that your life was planned as an American political classic, but perhaps it can be said that had such a plan existed it would include being born and reared a smalltown boy, skilled as a shortstop, apprenticed as a newsboy, and then progressively reporter, publisher, State legislator, Congressman, leader of your party in the House of Representatives, and on two occasions as the Speaker of that House, the legislative leader of this land. One of America's foremost practitioners of the honorable art of politics, your example has taught two generations that in a republic where the great wheel of governing goes round and round, political parties are spokes dependent on each other's strength as well as on their own and as such must be honored at both the top and the bottom of the wheel's turning. Brother of two Dartmouth graduates whose education you helped provide, it is wonderfully right that this college should now be privileged to welcome you into its fellowship as doctor of laws.

The Military Reserve Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times:

THE MILITARY RESERVE BILL—AN ANALYSIS OF PRESENT OBJECTIONS TO DEFENSE MEASURE BEFORE HOUSE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The compulsory military reserve bill was the subject of intensive artificial respiration by the administration this week.

But the breath of legislative life appeared to have vanished, at least for this session, from a law that had been intended to be one of the cornerstones of the administration's new military policies.

The immediate causes of death were amendments barring segregation in the National Guard, but the bill was sick—almost to the point of death—even before these amendments caused it to be withdrawn from House consideration.

The reserve bill in the form in which it was presented to the House is a compromise, a hybrid, about which nobody, not even the Pentagon, was really happy. If it should prove to be dead for this session, the outcome need not be the "disaster" so freely predicted; the interval between now and next January can be used to draw up legislation more in keeping with the military realities of the atomic age.

There are many objections to the current legislation. One of them is the inherent hostility of many Americans to any form of universal military training. Representative DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, senior Republican on the House Armed Services Committee and a conscientious and enlightened legislator, voiced this objection in a speech opposing the current bill:

"This may not be UMT [universal military training]," he said, "but it is an attempt to get a foot in the door."

EQUITY OF SERVICE DOUBTED

Another objection to the current legislation is that it would not accomplish one of the purposes it was intended to accomplish—to provide equity of service for all.

The bill would permit, as amended, the voluntary enlistment of youths for 6 months' training, followed by 7½ years in the Reserve. No fewer than 100,000 annually nor more than 250,000 would be so enlisted.

At the same time, regular draft calls for 2 years' active service would continue and voluntary enlistments in the Regulars for various periods would be accepted, both to be followed by commitments to Reserve duty.

The manpower pool of the Nation is increasing steadily with increasing population. The induction age for draftees is steadily being pushed back into older age brackets as draft calls are reduced. The budget and active-duty manpower for the Regular services are being reduced.

There are elements of incompatibility in these facts that the Pentagon will not admit, but that make it certain that the new bill cannot provide equity of service. Indeed, the chances are that some able-bodied men may not have to serve at all.

The cost of the new program is another factor that has aroused misgivings.

By the fiscal year 1959 the proposed program would cost a minimum of more than $2 billion annually—more than double the cost of the present Reserve program. This increased Reserve cost would provide still another "squeeze" on the Regular forces, if the balanced-budget concept was retained. If the current Reserve plan should be adopted, our commitment to greatly increased Reserve costs would probably mean further cuts in the Regular services.

The greatest and most important objection to the Reserve plan is the emphasis it places on the militia concept in an age when military professionalism of the highest order is the primary requirement.

WEEKEND WARRIORS

The program would provide eventually a Ready Reserve of 2,900,000 men, with a standby Reserve of perhaps 2 million more. Undeniably this Reserve would be in a better state of organization and training than our Reserve today. But it would necessarily be a half-trained Reserve, an organization of weekend warriors. The bulk of it would still need an additional 3 months or so of active training after war started before commitment to battle.

And it would be organized and trained for what? World War II battlefields? Repulse of ground invasion? A force as large as this could not be transported overseas for many months after mobilization, if then.

Its primary use, therefore, at least in the initial stages of any war, would be to stiffen and strengthen our civil defense organization.

Yet there is to be no real training provided for this purpose, and the tactical organization of the new Reserve, strictly tailored to the battlefield, would not seem to fit civil defense needs.

We should take a leaf from Britain's book and specially train and specially organize Reserve components for civil defense duties.

But most important is to remember the preeminent role of the specialist, the highly trained soldier, sailor, and airman in the atomic age. Brig. Gen. Dale O. Smith, United States Air Force, in his provocative study, United States Military Doctrine, very rightly stresses professionalism as one of our fundamental necessities today. If any Reserve bill strengthens the Reserve at the expense of the regulars it is not worth the price.

Man Cannot Live Without Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, man cannot live without water, and while we often have too much of it in Louisiana, we are mindful that the entire Nation may ultimately face a water famine.

This is serious. It threatens our existence as a nation. The time for action is now.

Eminent demographists forecast that in less than 50 years our population will have doubled. Think of that. That means that 330 million souls along with a tremendously expanded agricultural-industrial plant will be seeking water. Will there be enough for them?

Man must have water.

Water rationing is necessary in many localities.

Experimentalists are trying to find an economical way to make saline waters fit for human consumption.

A nation cannot survive without an adequate water supply.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding our grave water shortages, billions of acre-feet of precious water flows unmolested and needlessly into the sea taking a heavy toll of human life and valuable property in their wake. Dr. Hugh Bennett, the world's very greatest authority on soil conservation, tells us that this water also carries a million acres of our irreplaceable topsoil into the sea each year.

There are serious water shortages.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection there is little wrong that engineering brains cannot correct. All we have to do is to put the engineers to work. Let us briefly consider the Mississippi-Missouri-Ohio River system from which Louisiana receives its flood waters. Man in his impatience has butchered the main watersheds supplying these trunk water lines; but, Mr. Speaker, each of these watersheds can be restored to their original purpose—made to perform the work that God intended they should do.

All along the main rivers there must be great storage basins to receive and hold the flood waters. These basins would reduce and eventually eliminate flood damage.

The engineers can do the job. We have the engineers and we have the necessary money. Then what are we waiting for?

Mr. Speaker, these storage basins would become a vital water source for scores of municipalities and for farm use. Indeed, it is said that it would be possible to divert the flood waters pouring down upon Louisiana westward into Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the Lord only knows just how many acre-feet of vital water are being deliberately polluted. Many once useful streams are now little less than open sewers—menaces to health and repulsive to human decency.

Man should not make war upon nature. He must not destroy God given resources. Polluted water is destructive of marine life. It is deadly to the waterfowl.

Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress will give serious attention to the water problem without further delay.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include a pertinent article by Joseph A. Fox, which appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star for June 12, 1955:

WATER, WATER EVERYWHERE—BUT UNITED STATES MAY BE FACING CATASTROPHIC SHORTAGE

(By Joseph A. Fox)

Is the United States headed toward a catastrophic water shortage?

That is more than a possibility, according to some experts. They point to spots on the water map where ever-growing needs already are creating supply problems—and litigation. They predict that the time will come when critical areas will be the rule rather than the exception, as population increases and industry expands.

Nothing of the sort is going to happen, according to another school of informed thought on the subject.

Conceding that the water stocks of the Nation are poorly distributed, and that there probably will be times and places in which severe shortages occur, at least temporarily, these experts insist that the country as a whole is safe.

The worst that could happen, they contend, is that water which now costs the average householder less than 5 cents a ton—250 gallons—could become a relatively expensive commodity in areas of scarcity, where elaborate pumping systems might be required to bring it in from the outside.

The two sets of forecasters agree on one point: The country has become so dependent on an adequate supply of water for so many things, that much more must be done by everybody concerned, in the way of research and planning to meet this need. Admittedly, not enough attention has been given the problem in the past. Water has been too much taken for granted.

The West always has been water-conscious, because of the demands of agriculture. More than half the water used in this country today goes to keep fields green in that region, once given over largely to sagebrush and rattlesnakes.

Nowadays, new advances in industry—the development of synthetic fibers, for example—call for more water all the time. Forty percent of all the water we use goes to industry. And so the industrial East also is awakening to the importance of the water factor in the economy.

With 90 percent of our useful water supply going to agriculture and industry, only a thin 10 percent remains for everyday living needs in city and countryside. Here again, our growing population adds to the squeeze each year.

Congress also is becoming more aware of the water problem. The House, which wants to set up water-supply projects in every State, only recently started the ball rolling by voting $4 million to continue experiments on methods for making salt and brackish water usable for everyday needs. The Senate upped this to $10 million and a conference committee is now working on an adjustment.

President Eisenhower has a Cabinet committee studying the problem.

To anyone trying to get a true perspective on the dimensions of this water problem, the figures compiled by the United States Geological Survey offer a hopeful key. The Survey experts, who live with the problem constantly, are not alarmist on the subject of our water supply. But neither are they complacent.

Even to a generation accustomed to thinking in astronomic terms, the statistics are staggering. They require a new dimension in numerical thinking.

CONSUMPTION MAY DOUBLE

There are 165 million people in the United States. They use, currently, 210 billion gallons of fresh water every day—more than 1,200 gallons a person. The experts expect this consumption rate to double within the next 25 years.

Where does this water come from?

Of the 210 billion gallons used daily, 175 billion are surface water from rivers and lakes. The remaining 35 billion are drawn from the ground in wells and springs.

How does the demand stack up against the supply?

The average daily rainfall across the country is 4.2 trillion gallons. This is 20 times the present daily demand. It represents an average annual rainfall of about 30 inches. The joker, however, is that only a fraction of this total water supply actually is available for use by man.

HOW IT BREAKS DOWN

Here is how the figures break down:

In the first place, more than 70 percent of the total precipitation—21.5 inches of it—is either evaporated or absorbed by nonuseful plants before man has a chance to get at it.

The remaining 30 percent—8.5 inches—becomes available to man in streams, lakes, or wells. Technically, this water is known as run-off. In theory, it can be used. Again, however, much of this water cannot under present circumstances be put to effective use. It comes in flood flow of such volume, that it is too hard to store. Or it may be needed to carry away sewage—or for navigation. Some 7 inches of rainfall goes into these channels.

NOT TOO FRIGHTENING

On its face, the picture is not too frightening. The water is there. Clearly, serious shortage will be averted if we can find ways of getting more use from the 30 percent potential run-off supply, and of salvaging some of that original 70 percent wastage.

Bad distribution is the foremost stumbling block to satisfactory use of rainfall. Too often, rain comes at the wrong place, at the wrong time, and in too much volume.

The 17 westernmost States—where the Government has its vast reclamation projects—constitute about 60 percent of the land area of the United States. But they get only about one-fourth of the overall water supply.

BATTLE OVER WATER RIGHTS

There also is great disparity within these regions.

For example, the Pacific Northwest has a 100-inch rainfall yearly; places like Utah and Nevada get 4. This is the sort of thing that starts the States battling over water rights.

In the East, New York's right to divert the flow of the Delaware River has been challenged by Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

As the pinch gets tighter in water-sensitive areas, more litigation can be expected.

Adequate legal standards for this issue still are to be devised, but controls that will safeguard the rights of all are looked on as an ultimate certainty.

More basic than the problem of how to divide up the water is the problem of how to get more water to divide. Here is where the planners are really getting busy.

They emphasize:

Overdevelopment; that is, taking more water out of a given area than nature puts back in the earth, must be eased. New sources of supply must be developed. And as a complementary proposition, no avenue of avoiding waste and promoting water conservation can be overlooked.

In trying to take greater advantage of available water supplies, hydrologists have been pursuing several lines of attack.

Where geological conditions are favorable, it has been possible to save stream water that would otherwise be wasted by sinking wells nearby and, in effect, siphoning the water through the ground to these subterranean depositories.

Another device is the artificial recharge of ground stores by spreading flood waters from mountain streams over land where soil structure will permit it to seep in.

Receiving much attention also is the destruction of the worthless water-loving plants—they're known as phreatophytes—which habitually grow where their roots can be sent down to the water table and which, through the process of transpiration, discharge relative large quantities of water vapor into the air.

The storage and reuse in small reservoirs and cooling towers of water that already has served some industrial purpose is another step being studied. More effective pollution control and less waste in irrigation also are recognized needs.

The most dramatic line of inquiry, however, is the desalting program. Here, of course, the effort is not aimed at salvaging presently available supplies—but rather at increasing the total supply of fresh water. Involved is not alone the matter of purifying salt sea water, but also of cleansing freshwater areas that have become impregnated with salt-water seepage—a problem of increasing importance in some west-coast areas.

Some work already has been done on this water-cleansing idea. But the ordinary processes still are too expensive to make the operation feasible in a program of any size. Right now, it costs between $400 and $500 an acre-foot—a 1-acre expanse of water 1 foot deep—to freshen up the salt water.

The Interior Department, which is directing the desalting project, seeks to reduce the cost for sea water to about $120 an acre-foot, and that for making brackish water suitable for irrigation to $40 an acre-foot. Scientists believe these goals are in sight.

Mr. Speaker, we must not underestimate the seriousness of this impending water shortage. As in so many other matters affecting man's survival, there are those in high places who would procrastinate; those who want to follow the rule of wait and see, and finally those who can never see the forest for the trees; and in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I submit that water conservation and distribution has no proper place in partisan politics. If the politicians cannot keep their heads above water, water must be kept above the politicians.

Postmaster General Summerfield Honors Capt. Benjamin B. Lipsner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, 1955, the committee on education for freedom of the American Legion, Department of Illinois, honored Comdr. Benjamin B. Lipsner, of Aviation Post, No. 651, who is liaison chairman of the education for freedom campaign. The committee officially noted and approved the tribute paid Commander Lipsner by Postmaster General Summerfield in commemorating the 36th anniversary of the founding of the United States airmail system.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement of Postmaster Arthur E. Summerfield:

The Post Office Department today observes the 36th anniversary of the founding by the United States on August 12, 1918, of the first permanent civilian airmail service in the world.

The date is also important as marking the beginnings of commercial aviation in the United States, Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield noted in an anniversary statement.

Early in 1918, Mr. Summerfield explained, Postmaster General Albert Burleson conferred with Secretary of War Newton Baker and others, and as a result set up an experimental airmail service between Washington, D. C., and New York, N. Y., with an intermediate stop at Philadelphia, Pa.

The first flights both ways were made on May 15, 1918.

The United States Army furnished planes and pilots and conducted flying and maintenance, and the Post Office Department handled the mail and all operations connected with it. It also printed the first 24-cent carmine rose and blue airmail stamp, with the picture of the early flying machine, the Jenny.

Incidentally, one sheet of these first airmail stamps with the Jenny printed upside down escaped the post office in Washington and gave philately one of its most dramatic moments. A fortunate mint-sheet buyer, so the legend goes, went to the Washington Post Office the day the stamp was first issued in 1918. A man ahead of him ordered a sheet of the stamps and then indignantly handed it back to the clerk because the clerk because the airplanes were upside down. The next man in line was given this sheet. Today a single stamp from this sheet, the only one of its kind ever released by the Post Office Department out of billions of sheets of stamps issued since July 1, 1847, is valued at $3,500.

Before 1918, Mr. Summerfield pointed out, no regularly organized airmail had been set up anywhere by any nation. All attempts had been of short duration, and on an experimental basis only. The United States Post Office Department itself had cooperated in such experimental flights in September 1911.

To organize the United States first scheduled experimental service, the Army assigned Capt. Benjamin B. Lipsner, who coordinated the efforts of the two Departments, and who became the Post Office Department's first Superintendent of Airmail Service when the Department took over the service.

The experimental service launched in May 1918 continued until August 10, 1918, when the last mail in the experiment was flown. On Monday, August 12, 1918, the Post Office Department, equipped with six custom-built 150-horsepower new aero-mail biplanes—advanced for their day—began the world's first regular permanent civilian airmail service.

Pioneer Pilot Max Miller (burned to death in September 1920 over Morristown, N. J., while carrying the mails) was at the controls of the first plane taking off that day with airmail from College Park, Md.

The plane left at 11:35 a. m., carrying about 220 pounds of mail; Pilot Maurice Newton took over at Philadelphia and landed at New York at 2:15 p. m. Two other pioneer pilots flew the southbound trip from New York to Washington in 3 hours, starting at noon. They were Pilots Robert Shank and Edward V. Gardner.

Aviation pioneers of those days hailed the "aero mail" as the first commercial use to which the airplane had been put, and recognized the Post Office Department's airmail service as the forerunner of today's tremendous air industry, Mr. Summerfield noted.

The Post Office Department, sensing the possibilities of airmail over longer routes as a vital need in the expanding American economy, moved ahead rapidly in enlarging the service. The next route started between New York and Chicago on September 5, 1918, and was permanently established on May 15, 1919.

New routes followed quickly—from Chicago to Omaha, St. Louis, Minneapolis, and San Francisco. The Post Office Department made its first transcontinental flight from New York to San Francisco on September 8, 1920, with the plane carrying 16,000 letters and averaging 80 miles an hour, Mr. Summerfield recalled.

Development of the airlanes by the Post Office Department continued, and, in 1926, Congress passed the Air Commerce Act, providing for commercial passenger flights and routes for private companies. When these ventures had been demonstrated successfully, the Post Office Department—having seen commercial aviation safely through its fledgling days—stepped out of the picture, and contracted for its airmail service with private carriers. Contracts for carrying the airmail were let in 1927.

The Post Office Department, however, has not lost its keen interest in the development of the aircraft industry, Mr. Summerfield noted. In line with President Eisenhower's mandate for better mail service at less cost, Mr. Summerfield pointed out that the Post Office Department on October 6, 1953, pioneered another major development in this field, launching a service for more rapid transmission of regular mail by air on a space-available basis.

This service, already operating experimentally between Chicago and Washington and New York, as well as between those three cities and Florida points and between various smaller cities, means that millions of pieces of mail are delivered everyday as much as a day earlier, Mr. Summerfield pointed out.

"However, equally important, today's anniversary of our establishment of the world's first regular civilian airmail reminds us in the Post Office Department that the American public demands a progressive spirit in its mail service, as it did even in 1918 and at other times when the Department has pioneered new service," he said.

"This progressive spirit is typical of our operations today. In addition to the transit of regular mail by air, we are speeding mail and saving money through use of functionally designed new vehicles, painted red, white, and blue in the spirit of new postal revolution.

"We are bringing administration of the mail service closer to the people through decentralization from Washington of many important postal operations. We have instituted longer hours of service to the public by keeping post offices open at hours to suit public convenience and by making later collections in most major cities.

"These and many other developments are evidence that we have recaptured—after a previous 30 years of decadence and deficit in the postal service—the constructive imagination that marked the start of the airmail service on August 12, 1918."

Authorizing Building of Museum of History and Technology

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, we have before us today a bill to provide $36 million for the construction of a new Museum of History and Technology to be a part of the Smithsonian Institution. This museum will house the Nation's outstanding present and evergrowing collection of historical items which are of great interest to our people.

That the need for such a building is great has been known for some time and, I think, we must now take into consideration the relative importance of this need.

This Smithsonian Institution is a most valuable part of the Nation's Capital. I do not mean to imply that its value is limited to one city. Rather it is a kind of national museum belonging to all of our people. It has provided a showplace for the pageant of our national progress for over a century despite its inadequate facilities. It is a center of knowledge and repository for its collection of priceless treasures. The Smithsonian has also become world famous as a scientific institution reflecting great credit to our country. Certainly an organization which serves us so well deserves a building sufficient to its needs.

The present building was constructed 75 years ago on a budget which was extremely limited even for the time. Consequently, there is not nearly enough floor space to provide for display and much that is worthwhile goes unseen by the tens of thousands of visitors each year. This portion of the collection must, of necessity, be hidden away in some storeroom. Due to the building's age and condition, any sort of reconstruction would be impossible. With this in mind the Regents of the Smithsonian have been working for some time to perfect plans for a new building.

They have wisely chosen a site which is directly in line with the National Gallery of Art so that these two buildings would form part of a path leading from the Capitol to the Washington Monument, an ideal location from the point of view of the visitor to Washington. The building would provide sufficient space not only for the present collection, but also for the many contributions now unavailable to the Smithsonian because of the lack of display area.

We must remember the importance of the Institution to the Nation. It is high up on the list of almost every visitor to the Capital, with 5 million persons visiting the museum every year. How much more meaningful an experience it would be for them with a background planned to display properly the impressiveness of this collection. Our visitors, young and old alike, would go away with a greater sense of pride in what America has accomplished and a greater enthusiasm to add to these accomplishments. Not only would the museum have more meaning for our own citizens, but it would be a clearer demonstration of our national progress for those coming from all points of the globe.

With the facilities proposed in this bill, the Smithsonian would better fill its present role and would also be able to attempt education on a nationwide scale. With expanded facilities it would be possible to originate radio and television programs from the museum itself, allowing many more millions across the country to enjoy some of the benefits our National Museum has to offer. Many people who would never be able to make the trip to Washington would have the opportunity of witnessing our Nation's greatness and of feeling the same stir of patriotism experienced by those who are fortunate enough to make the trip.

I wish to state my conviction that this bill, H. R. 6410, deserves our serious consideration and the support of all Members of Congress.

Foreign Aid and the American Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time, Members of Congress and the American people also should be interested in the subject of foreign aid and the American budget.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an address by Mr. George E. Stringfellow, senior vice president, Thomas A. Edison, Inc., West Orange, N. J., before the Rotary Club of Houston, Tex., on May 26.

The address follows:

FOREIGN AID AND THE AMERICAN BUDGET

Mr. President, honored guests and friends. I think I can safely say "friends" even though I am a Kiwanian admidst a gathering of Rotarians. The name of your organization may differ from that of mine, but I'm sure we are guided by the same principles and ideals in the conduct of our lives and in the fulfillment of our responsibilities.

Sharing the same reverence for our country and the same interest in its future, you will share my concern for the preservation of our liberty and our way of life. Let me show you how the misguided thinking of some of our Government officials and many of our citizens is bringing our country close to disaster through our unbalanced budget, a rising national debt and high taxes.

Following the usual custom of opening a serious discussion with a humorous story, I should like to quote campaign statements made by two successful candidates for the Presidency of our Republic.

In 1932 Franklin D. Roosevelt said, "Any government, like any family, can for a year or two spend a little more than it earns, but you and I know that a continuation of that habit means the poorhouse. * * * When I'm elected, I shall reduce the cost of Government 25 percent right across the board * * * and reduce the national debt."

The cost of Government then was less than $5 billion a year and our national debt was less than $20 billion. We all recall what happened to the Roosevelt promises.

In 1952 Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower promised to balance the national budget and reduce the national debt. Let's see what happened to the Eisenhower promises to date.

First, the national budget hasn't been balanced, and there seems to be little inclination on the part of the administration to balance it. Second, the national debt ceiling has been lifted, at his request, so that it could be increased.

FOREIGN AID

The foreign-aid program, to which I invite your attention today, helps keep our national budget unbalanced and pyramids our national debt. We embraced the foreign-aid program during World War I when we made large loans to several nations to finance their war efforts—loans totaling $22 billion. A moratorium on the payment of these loans and interest was declared 25 years ago, and for all practical purposes, they should be written off as a loss.

WORLD WAR II

Shortly after the outbreak of World War II Congress passed the so-called lend-lease act in March 1941. This act gave official status to the biggest giveaway of the American taxpayers' funds in history.

We were told that the funds of the democracies were exhausted and we must provide credit—to save democracy. We were told we must provide munitions—to save democracy. We were told we must transport those munitions through the submarine-infested seas—to save democracy. We were told we must send our boys across to fight the war—to save democracy.

We may not have saved democracy, but we certainly saved England. Of the $48 billion which we shelled out to 38 nations fighting to save democracy, England received $25 billion, or 52 percent.

The cessation of hostilities did not halt the request for funds. They merely shifted the emphasis from firearms to food.

Then the European nations convinced us that they were threatened with economic chaos. The Secretary of State, George Marshall, responded in a speech at Harvard University on June 5, 1947. His speech, while no sensation in this country, almost precipitated a stampede in Europe as nations rushed to qualify for American aid. Their militant natonalism temporarily forgotten, all non-Communist countries participated in the Committee of European Economic Cooperation which met in Paris 5 weeks later.

The so-called Marshall plan activated as ECA, was represented as an economic emergency measure, intended to help Europe's free institutions survive. The plan did not live out its 4-year program, as Congress found Communist aggression in Greece, Turkey, and finally in Korea to be a greater menace. The 3-year life of the Marshall plan cost the American taxpayers $12.5 billion.

After the Marshall plan came the Mutual Security Act. This was followed by Harold Stassen's free-wheeling Foreign Operations Act. By June 30 of this year, the total foreign aid will have reached $128 billion. Of that amount England received more than 39 percent, although 45 nations participated. This staggering amount is more than the total wealth of our Republic 50 years ago. The actual purpose of this aid was to strengthen our Allies to the end that we might jointly preserve democracy.

Soon after the Marshall plan was initiated, chalk scribblings appeared all over France urging Americans to get out and the English people appealed to their authorities to send American soldiers home. Because of this uncooperative attitude, we spent $20 million

of the taxpayers' money in publicity to sell the Europeans the idea that our intentions in giving them this aid, which they claimed was urgently needed, were honorable. More recently, the word "traitor" was painted across the London statue of Franklin D. Roosevelt to whom Winston Churchill had referred as "the greatest American friend Britain ever found."

In January 1952, a congressional committee invesigation revealed that France had collected $100 million in taxes from our construction of military installations and facilities in their country. This was approximately 20 percent of the total cost—practically the same percentage as France's share of the military project for her defense. In other words, she was getting her military installations at virtually no cost to her.

In addition, the investigation showed that France was charging us a landing fee of $6 for every American officer and $2 for every enlisted man we sent over to defend her. She said she considered these charges as fees for service rendered to us. What it amounted to was that we were rendering a service in defending her country and paying her for the privilege of doing it.

It has become apparent to many of us that other nations have voted us the exclusive privilege of defending their liberty and ours. For example, the population of Western Europe and the United States is 440 million, of which our population represents 37 percent of the total. Yet, more than 60 percent of the Armed Forces stationed in Western Europe today are American boys. Our divisions over there would bear the brunt of the fighting if East Europe unleashed a sneak attack—not against us, but against West Europe.

We have the expense of maintaining American air squadrons in Britain, but Britain has veto over their use. If the Communists should attack Britain, our American boys would of course be released immediately to strike back. On the other hand, if Russia were to attack Alaska, Seattle, or San Francisco, do you think Britain would permit the use of our American, British-based Air Force to attack Moscow?

We have a mutual-aid pact with Britain, France, and other NATO countries whereby we will go to their aid if they are attacked by Russia. There is no doubt in my mind that we would live up to the terms of that pact. But, would Britain, France, and other NATO countries live to the agreement, in the event we were attacked by Russia, or would they declare their neutrality and leave us to go it alone. Our experience in Korea is a good example of what might happen. There, we provided more than 90 percent of the foreign troops and most of the money to stem the tide of communism, while England called the shots.

"The British still operate on the maxim of one of their great statesmen that England has no friends, no enemies, only interests," said the Houston Chronicle editorially the early part of this month. "Would that this country had statesmen who possessed a similar regard for our own country," concluded the editorial.

Foreign aid and domestic extravagance have pyramided our public debt to $276 billion, or $1,685 per capita. "Unpublicized commitments," said the Honorable HARRY FLOOD BYRD, senior United States Senator from Virginia, one of the most courageous, one of the most able, and one of the wisest statesmen of our time, "would almost double that amount." England's per capita debt is $1,489, and that of Canada, $1,196.

The Secretary of Commerce predicts that 1955 will, in all probability, be the biggest business year in the history of our country. Yet, the administration is budgeting a deficit equal to the total cost of government when Franklin D. Roosevelt became President.

You can imagine what would happen to your business if, at the peak of its income, its outgo exceeded its income. You can also readily realize what would happen to you as an individual if, at the peak of your earnings, you spent more than you took in. The same thing will happen to government.

The value of our dollar has decreased to 52 cents in the last 10 years. Rising national debt, high taxes, and cheap money are the road to inflation, chaos, and dictatorship. It is this combination that produced Mussolini, Hitler and Stalin. If continued, it will produce a dictator in America.

How much of a factor, you ask, is foreign aid in our budget? It will cost us $4.7 billion this year. Without foreign aid in the fiscal year 1956, we could reduce personal income taxes 12 percent, corporate income taxes 22 percent—or we could balance the Federal budget and have a $1.1 billion surplus.

In 1954 England not only balanced her budget but had a surplus of $1,212 million, while we had a deficit of $3.1 billion. Britain plans to reduce her personal and corporate income taxes substantially this year and yet show a surplus of $515 million, while we anticipate a deficit of $4.5 billion. Our aid to Britain in 1954, when she had a surplus of $1,212 million and we had a deficit of $3.1 billion, provided 20 percent of Britain's 1954 surplus, and will provide 29 percent of her expected 1955 surplus.

"It is high time," the Chronicle editorial continued, "the United States quit throwing money and material around the world like a drunken sailor and settled on a foreign policy clearly consonant with our national interests first and foremost. We pile deficit on deficit until we threaten ourselves with bankruptcy."

The American taxpayers have underwritten the cost of placing many of the free nations on a stronger financial basis than we are today. Many of these foreign nations are using our subsidies not only to balance their budgets, but to reduce their national debts, while we continue an unbalanced budget, a pyramiding debt, and high taxes, all of which combined, reduce the buying power of our money.

I believe most of us agree with Senator BYRD who contends that the time has come when we should eliminate foreign aid, balance our budget, reduce the national debt, and return to fiscal sanity.

Instead of eliminating foreign aid, the Eisenhower administration is urging an increase in amount and perpetuity in the budget.

The Eisenhower administration must be made to understand that its commitment to balance our national budget and reduce our national debt has priority over any and all foreign aid. "We, the people" must play a more active part in our Government, if our way of life is to endure. Rome endured as long as there were Romans. America will endure as long as we remain American in spirit, in heart, and in thought.

"We, the people" can and should assert ourselves. We should tell our President, our Senators and our Representatives, in no uncertain terms that the national budget must be balanced and the national debt reduced. Our public servants are responsive to the people's will. Let them know your will through letters, telegrams, and personal contacts.

The Real Threat to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 12, the Baltic Committee of Washington, D. C., held a mass meeting commemorating the 14th anniversary of the forced deportation of over 50,000 Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians by the Russian Communists. June 14, 1941, will stand as one of the blackest marks on the long list of crimes against humanity by the Russian Communists. Because of the significance of this affair and the need for those of us who enjoy the blessings of individual liberty to be reminded that tyranny is on the march, under leave granted, I insert my address of June 12 before the Baltic Committee of Washington, D. C.:

THE REAL THREAT TO PEACE

(Address by Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN before the Baltic Committee of Washington)

It is a privilege for me to be able to join with you today in commemorating the sad events which took place in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on June 14, 1941. That day was, indeed, the darkest in all of history for those three small but free nations situated as they are on the shores of the Baltic Sea. It is our dedicated task to make certain that the infamous crimes committed on that day by the Russian Communists shall not fade from the memory of freemen. That is why we Americans have come to know June 14 of each year as Baltic States' Freedom Day.

As we look back to June 14, 1941, that date seems very distant and hardly belonging to the generation in which we live.

Fourteen years in the ordinary course of history reflects little more than a split second.

But the 14 years which have elapsed since that darkest of days are not judged now, nor will they be judged by the hard test of time as a split second, an hour, a day, or a year.

Generations of the future will surely regard that unhappy day as one of the earmarks of an era which threatened to extinguish all forms of civilization and all those things for which the common man has struggled since the beginning of time.

There can be no doubt but what the unbelievable events of these past 14 years together with those of equal evil which took place during the preceding 24 years, will hold that place in recorded history.

One cannot help but wonder what has happened to those more than 50,000 God-fearing, freedom-loving patriots who on June 14, 1941, were taken into custody by the Russian secret police and sent to the most dismal, far reaches of the current empire of Moscow. We know from sworn testimony by eyewitnesses of the cruel methods used by the Russian secret police to tear wife from husband and children from parents.

We know, too, the careful method and inhuman precision used by these agents of Satan to make certain that no members of the same family were put into the same boxcars for shipment to an alien, unknown destination.

The established record on this crime also reveals the clear intent of the Russian Communists to destroy the very soul of each of these three gallant nations by the process of selecting the leaders of religion, intellectual thought, national patriotism, business ingenuity and enterprise, education, and free labor for assignment to a life of ruthless exploitation and degradation.

No doubt now exists but that the Russians had a carefully worked-out plan reduced to writing and then placed in the hands of their secret police in order that a crime of this magnitude could be carried out so effectively.

It is only human for us to wonder where those heroic people might be tonight just as it is our duty to pray for them each day.

In the passing of 14 years there have been many happenings in the world which almost defy belief.

These events seem also to confound many of those who during that period were charged with the conduct of foreign rela-

tions on behalf of this and other still free nations.

Perhaps the outstanding event of that period is reflected in the fact that the civilization of which we are a part, having sunk so deep in a tryst with evil, has been able to survive at all.

The second most remarkable event, in my judgment, is reflected in the fact that when our leaders recognized the dangerous position into which we had been corraled, they were able, nevertheless, to rally the spark of freedom and human decency which has always burned steadily in the breasts of mankind.

That singular event is what launched us into what we have come to know as the "cold war"—which some people are today attempting to end because they believe it is possible to establish a modus vivendi with the Russian Communists.

We called it a cold war because of the absence of orthodox conflicts which history records all too frequently.

There were no great land armies engaged in battle with one another—modern weapons of destruction as we know them were employed to a very minimum—the classical type of economic blockade was not launched—and there seemed plenty of room for an attitude of business as usual.

"Cold war," therefore, seemed to be a good description of the conflict between the Russian Communists and the aspirations of all freemen—but what a terrible mistake we made in calling it a cold war.

The facts are that the warfare being used against civilization as we know it by the conspiracy of communism is hotter than any war ever known to mankind.

In this type of warfare more people have already been tortured, maimed, imprisoned, and killed than in any other war in recorded history.

You and I know full well how hot this war has been for the good people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

We are aware that for each and every one of those gallant freedom-loving people to barely live is a 24-hour-per-day struggle against the alien occupier.

The Russian Communists have given ample evidence of their determination that they will either break the spirit of all the people of the Baltic States or they shall exterminate them.

As we look upon the full record of the crimes against humanity made in the name of Russian communism, we see clearly the use of manmade famines, a device used to destroy millions of liberty-loving Ukrainians and Turkestanians.

We cannot help but see the vast network of prison camps which extend from one end to the other of the Communist empire, and in which are imprisoned patriots and fighters for individual liberty from each and every one of the non-Russian nations enslaved within the Russian Communist empire.

We are sadly reminded that the life span of those imprisoned in the slave labor camps rarely exceeds a period of several years.

Millions upon millions of people are suffering the same fate as the heroic Balts by being forcibly deported from their Communist-occupied homelands to the interior reaches of the imperial Russian Communist empire.

The evil practice, sadly recalled by the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians, of separating husband from wife and children from parents in the process of deportation to uninhabited and barren wastelands has been applied to all the nations now occupied by Communist tyranny.

The record also tells us that entire nations have been destroyed by this new type of warfare.

Against this background of criminal warfare being directed against all forms of civilization, the Kremlin recently called for peaceful coexistence between the still free world and the conspiracy of Russian communism.

The propaganda organs of the Russians then began to blast out statements to the effect that the time has come for a concentrated effort to ease world tensions.

The place for peaceful coexistence by the Russians was quickly followed up by a propaganda and diplomatic offensive on a worldwide basis.

The clear objective of that propaganda and diplomatic offensive is to split the political and military alliances of the free world, to neutralize Germany and Austria, thereby providing a neutral belt between the Communist empire and the free world and finally to isolate the United States and the Western Hemisphere.

In the face of this propaganda and diplomatic offensive engaged in by the Kremlin, the Congress of the United States, through the reports of the Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression, has attempted to alert the people of the United States to the true nature of communism and the meaning of its current propaganda drive for peaceful coexistence with the free world.

That committee, on which I had the honor to serve, recommended in January of this year, that to meet this new propaganda challenge by communism and to avert world war III, the Government of the United States engage in a bold, positive political offensive.

Such a political offensive would of course be launched against the conspiracy of communism and on behalf of the enslaved nations and people.

That basic recommendation was supported by 12 definitive recommendations which were in the nature of concrete steps that should be taken to initiate such a political offensive.

These recommendations were arrived at after hearing the direct testimony of over 300 eye witnesses who themselves had been the victims of communism, and after the study of thousands of sworn statements and all available documentary evidence.

Moreover, this was the work of a truly bipartisan committee attested to by the fact that all 27 of its reports were unanimous.

Since that time, many prominent Americans have come forward to urge the Government to take up a political offensive against the conspiracy of communism.

It is encouraging to see that there is an awakening to the fact that if we are to avert world war III and at the same time extend the cause of freedom and peace, bold and resolute action is required.

The record is clear that if we continue to engage in weak, half-hearted, fearful measures based upon a desire to placate the Russians, we are taking the course which inevitably leads to war and possibly slavery for our people.

One of the planks in the platform of the political offensive to prevent world war III is House Resolution 183, which has been reported favorably by the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

The purpose of that resolution is to cause the Secretary of State to formulate a resolution based upon the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the House Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, naming the U. S. S. R. as an aggressor against the nations enslaved by communism, and to have such a resolution placed on the agenda of the General Assembly of the United Nations for early action.

Identical resolutions to that end were introduced by my colleagues, Congressmen MADDEN, DODD, MACHROWICZ, BENTLEY, and HILLINGS.

I am proud to say I also introduced such a resolution.

On Tuesday next this resolution, House Resolution 183, will come up before the Rules Committee of the House.

I am confident that this resolution will be voted out of the Rules Committee and brought to the floor of the House where a general debate will take place and thereby the people of the United States can, through their representatives, voice their determination to use every method available to prevent world war III and to extend the cause of human freedom.

The continued military and political occupation of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia by the masters of the Kremlin is a major cause of the dangerous world tensions which now beset mankind and therefore constitutes a serious threat to peace.

We must take bold and determined action to remove that threat.

I hope and pray that we, as a nation, will not hesitate to meet this issue head on.

Address by Representative Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, at Joint Commissioning Ceremonies for Army, Navy, and Air Force ROTC Graduates at Dartmouth College, June 11, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD the text of the address by Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, at the joint commissioning ceremonies for Army, Navy, and Air Force ROTC graduates at Dartmouth College, June 11, 1955:

Mr. President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, if time could turn back the clock to the last century it might well pause at a day in American history when President Abraham Lincoln signed the law which made possible the commissioning ceremonies that we are honoring here today.

If Representative Justin Morrell of the Green Mountain State of Vermont could be here today he would be justly proud of his foresight—foresight which has contributed to the defense of the Nation in an incalculable manner.

It was Justin Morrell who fathered the law that provided grants of land, and eventually grants of money, for colleges that would offer military training, along with agricultural and mechanical arts. It was this act, in conjunction with land-grant colleges, which brought about that provision of the National Defense Act of 1916 which established the Reserve Officer Training Corps in various colleges and universities throughout the United States and its Territories.

Since 1916 the colleges and universities of this Nation have graduated and commissioned thousands upon thousands of young men who have acquired a firsthand knowledge of the basic principles of military and naval warfare. Later this program was expanded to the science of air power, so that today we have universities and colleges teaching the fundamental concepts of defense so indispensable to the security of our Nation.

You have all willingly sacrificed a portion of your college days to the somewhat unfortunate, but nevertheless necessary task of acquiring the elementary principles of the art of destruction and survival. But if we look upon this teaching as simply one which glorifies war and mayhem, then the liberal education that you have received at this great

college, and the liberal education that countless other young men have received at colleges and universities throughout the Nation, has been worthless.

What you have learned here is the precious, inestimable, value of freedom—and you have also learned some of the basic skills that you may be called upon to use to preserve that freedom.

Freedom in a world faced with the interminable conflict between communism and Christianity will survive only so long as freemen are willing to fight for that precious principle. In this hallowed ground of New England where the American Revolution had its beginning, the word "freedom" has a special significance. For it was from New England that the young farmers and tradesmen, the minutemen, and the sons of liberty, received that spontaneous spark that ignited the world in a crusade for establishing the dignity of man—a crusade that has grown until it is recognized as the zenith in the philosophy of governments throughout the world.

You have been taught the principles of squad, platoon, and company meneuvers, you have been taught the rudiments of discipline, the value of close order drill so that reaction to commands is automatic. You have been taught how to read maps and interpret aerial photographs. You have been taught the problems of distribution and supply, but above all, you have been taught at this great college the reason for your education in this somewhat incongruous field. You have learned that you live in a free nation composed of free men and women who are willing to sacrifice all they possess, as did their forefathers, to preserve the Christian principles of a free nation under God. You have learned the meaning of freedom and democracy.

Many of you, if not all of you, will go on from here to a new and thrilling experience—you will become members of the greatest defense team in the peacetime history of the United States. You will go on to the Air Force, or the Army, or the Navy, or the Marine Corps, where you will be further educated in the peculiar arts of your branch of the service. Thereafter, you will be asked to assume the basic purpose of your ROTC training; you will be asked to become a leader of men. Because you have demonstrated a capacity for learning, a desire for knowledge, an understanding of the problems of civilization; because you have demonstrated a willingness to cooperate and have satisfied your professors and instructors of your ability to retain the fundamentals of a liberal education, you have passed the first test of your qualification to be a leader of men. But you are not yet qualified, for there remains the supreme challenge of performance. Into your collective hands may be placed the lives of hundreds, perhaps thousands, of young men who have yet to wear a uniform in the service of their country. You may well be placed in command of those young men. Because of the faith and confidence that your college and your Government has in you, they are willing to place into your hands the responsibility for the security and safety of these young men and, even beyond that, the security of the Nation. For you, and thousands of others like you, will constitute a large portion of the commissioned officers of our Armed Forces.

As a matter of fact, 80 percent of the officers of the Army and Air Force, and approximately 50 percent of the officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, are reservists—a great number of whom have acquired their commission in the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force ROTC programs. The ROTC system is the greatest single source of offices in existence today. Without this system, it would be impossible for the Armed Forces to maintain the commissioned corps of the various branches of the service.

Of course, you have enjoyed a distinct privilege for 4 years, a privilege not granted to every young man in this Nation—the privilege of completing your formal education and the privilege of being offered a commission in the Armed Forces of the United States. You are assuming the lowest grade in the commissioned officer corps, but it also happens to be the most significant grade with respect to the men who will serve under you—for you will be closest to them. Your intelligence, your understanding, your ability to comprehend their problems, your judgment and your willingness to sacrifice personal comfort, will be the test of your success.

Many of you may well continue in the Armed Forces as career officers; it is possible that some among you may later become senior officers, even generals and admirals. But a great deal of your future will depend upon what you have acquired here in the past 4 years and what you do in the immediate period of active duty that lies before you.

You are entering into an era of military preparedness that is unique in American peacetime history. For the first time, our government has adopted a military program which envisions a stable strength—a stability which will permit orderly planning, orderly procurement, and a stability which can be tailored to the missions of the respective services.

I cannot tell you what the future holds, yet it is only through the preservation and maintenance of this stable force that we will be able to answer the challenge of communism insofar as armed might is concerned.

The plan in Congress to fortify our military strength as embodied in the military Reserve proposal is essential. This presents to the youth of the Nation an opportunity to share equitably and reasonably in the country's defense. It is a sensible alternative to a vast standing army the cost of which our economy could not stand over the long pull. The Reserve proposal is a voluntary program and maintains our military strength while, at the same time, causing the least possible dislocations in the lives of our young men.

While we work for peace by keeping strong, we must make sure that our economy is not endangered because of the heavy burdens of taxation.

We do not profess to match the Soviet Union in manpower, but I will put any man in this class against his counterpart in the Soviet Union when it comes to intellectual attainment, ingenuity, inventiveness, commonsense, perseverance, and patriotism. And we know that the fighting forces of every nation are limited by the number of men they can equip and maintain. We know, also, that no power on this earth can exceed the productive capacity of the United States. That is why we need not fear the vast population of any country. As long as we have the weapons and the hard core of men who will man those weapons should armed conflict be our ultimate destiny, we need not fear for the safety of this Nation.

Many of you are probably wondering just exactly what your education has done for you insofar as your military service ahead is concerned. You may be trying to figure out how a course in English literature, or a course in several foreign languages, chemistry, physics, or calculus, or sociology, or history, can possibly make you a better officer. Well, the answer to that question, if that is what is in your minds, is the very fact that you have asked the question, for it would indicate a seeking mind, a mind that is operating actively, wanting to know, asking questions, seeking information, a mind that reasons, a mind that calculates, a mind that has been exposed to a variety of subjects over a relatively short period of time to test if it is receptive and retentive to the extent necessary to go on to greater responsibilities in the life ahead. And to that, for you who are about to be commissioned, has been added the vagaries, and perhaps to some of you, the futilities of warfare. And I hope that you do feel that war is futile and unnecessary, and unreasonable for if that is your feeling you are merely demonstrating to the world that this Nation, the American people, have an inherent, an all-consuming desire for peace, but they also can subjugate that desire for peace to a determination to fight with all they possess should the very foundations of our civilization, freedom, and Christianity, be threatened.

I congratulate each and everyone of you as you go forth into a new venture; you carry with you a great deal of responsibility, much more than many of you may realize. You have enjoyed a privileged status while attending this great college, and I know that you will demonstrate to your family, your fellow students, and to the Nation that you appreciate the advantage that has been offered to you.

You who are members of the Army ROTC program will be commissioned in the Ordnance Corps. And you will meet with metal and men. You are entering into the age of atomic artillery; ordnance is playing a greater and greater role in the defense program. I know you will accept that challenge willingly.

You who are graduating as ensigns will enter the fleet in the age of atomic submarines, large carriers, and antisubmarine tactics. You will have the experience of traveling over the water, on the water, and under the water. You are entering into a new era of nuclear power, an era more significant to the world than the advent of the ironclad vessel and steam power.

You who are entering the Air Force are entering the era of the guided missile and supersonic speeds. Space and time will stand still. Your challenge is in the air and the stratosphere—that unlimited area which has in it the tremendous possibilities of the future or the potential threat of world annihilation.

And you who are entering the Marine Corps are entering into a force in being—a relatively small but hard-hitting force in readiness—second to none in the world. If you are not already convinced that you are joining the most elite fighting organization in the world, then I suggest that you merely wait a few minutes until you have an opportunity to talk with a marine who is 15 or 20 minutes senior to you.

These four services constitute a balanced force which make up the armed might of America. Each is dependent upon the other and each exists for the sole purpose of protecting the United States and our philosophy of freedom and a republican form of government. Each service has a mission to perform and each mission is of vital importance to the defense of the Nation. No single service is subjugated to a sister service, but each works separately in its assigned field, or jointly as the situation may demand, as part of a balanced team. Collectively, it is the greatest single answer to the threat of communism that exists in the world today. I am happy to be present here today as you receive your commissions as members of this great team. An honor is being bestowed upon you, but you are also assuming all of the responsibilities that are commensurate with that honor.

Gentlemen, I congratulate you all and wish you Godspeed.

The Army's Growing Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has not yet passed the proposed military budget for the coming fiscal year. For sometime now, it has been carefully evaluating it, item by item. Billions of dollars are involved, to be allocated on the basis of needs to each of the services. But the prime consideration in every case is what each item will contribute to the security of the United States. There is no place in the budget for any item, merely because the service wants it included. The requirements of each service must be balanced against the overwhelming requirement of adequate national defense.

Defense must not be purchased at the cost of the national economic well-being. Communism would be as happy to see this country ruined economically as to win an aggressive war against us. In fact, the undermining of our sound economic structure would be a cheaper victory for communism than any military attack. What we must have at all times is national defense that the country can afford.

Such national defense permits of no useless duplication.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, evidence of duplication in service requests is abundant. Consider, for example, the Army's air arm.

I do not mean the United States Air Force. That was established by Congress in 1947 as an independent, autonomous service, to be "organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained offensive and defensive air operations." I quote the language of the National Security Act of 1947 that established it. That act further specified that "the Air Force shall be responsible for the preparation of the air forces necessary for the effective prosecution or war."

Less than 6 months after the Air Force came into existence, decisions on the missions of all three services were reached by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in formulating their program for the future security of the United States. Those decisions, known as the Key West agreements, spelled out the intent of the National Security Act very specifically:

The United States Air Force includes air combat and service forces. It is organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat operations in the air. Of the three major services, the Air Force has primary interest in all operations in the air.

Notwithstanding the intent of Congress as reflected in the National Security Act of 1947, together with interpretive agreements reached among the Joint Chiefs of Staff, let us take a look at the status, aspirations, and intentions of the Army with respect to duplicating air facilities. The Army already has light and medium helicopters. It has liaison and light transport aircraft. Naturally, it has airfields, pilots, aircraft maintenance personnel, and facilities to take care of its rapidly growing air arm. Now the Army has jets.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take the time of my colleagues to discuss the history of air warfare, or the development of the concept of air power. Either is a big subject. I want merely to call the attention of my colleagues to the Army's order for jet aircraft, which the Army says will not duplicate Air Force aircraft. I think my colleagues should be in a position to decide for themselves. I do not know what the Army will ask for next, for its growing Air Force. I do know that the Army is violating the intent of the National Security Act. It is violating the spirit of the Key West agreements. And it is creating duplication that will cost the taxpayer a pretty penny.

For the edification of my colleagues who may have missed a very interesting and revealing article by that distinguished newsman, Jim Lucas, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I insert the following in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, from the Washington Daily News of June 6, 1955:

ORDERS HAVE BEEN PLACED FOR ARMY JETS

(By Jim G. Lucas)

The Army expects to start flying its own jets next year. Orders have been placed.

Army leaders foresee the day when planes and helicopters replace trucks and jeeps.

They're convinced that—once the reasons are understood—the public will go along.

"There's no more duplication in our using planes than in the Air Force's use of trucks," Maj. Gen. Paul Adams, Acting Chief of Staff for Operations, says. "It's a question of moving men and supplies as rapidly as you can."

It's all part of the Army's effort to streamline itself for Atomic war. Its entire battle doctrine is being reshaped. Time-honored concepts are being scrapped.

Back of it, too, is the Army's little-publicized dissatisfaction with the Air Force. Army men are careful to say the Air Force is doing a fine job with its intercontinental bombers, continental defense and research and development. But for that very reason, they say, the Air Force hasn't had time to consider the kind of airplanes the Army needs.

EMPHASIS ON SPEED

The thermonuclear age, General Adams says, dictates a return to the Army's "true cavalry role." The emphasis must be on speed and mobility. For that role, the Army needs:

Two-men helicopters for reconnaissance. They'd be able to land behind the lines, on hills and mountains for intelligence purposes. They could get in and out without fighting.

Medium helicopters, each carrying an Army squad with its recoilless antitank rifles, 51-millimeter machine guns and 81-millimeter mortars. They'd set up blocking positions and hold passes, defiles, and other advanced terrain. Supplied by helicopters, they probably could survive indefinitely. Small in size, they'd not be too attractive a target for atomic weapons.

Jet aircraft for low-level photographic reconnaissance. They'd be able to use emergency fields the Army bulldozes around its camps. Speedy enough to fly at tree-top level, they'd develop pictures in flight.

The first 2—the 2-man and medium choppers—are ready. They're being tested at Fort Bragg, N. C. Orders for the first Army jets are being placed through the Air Force—with Cessna, Beachcraft, and a foreign firm. As jets go, they're inexpensive—$40,000 to $50,000 each. They'll fly about 500 miles an hour.

TRAIN OWN FLYERS

The Army wants to train its own jet fliers so they will feel and think like other Army men rather than like Air Force men on loan.

General Adams says air transport is a must in the Army's new concept.

Indications are that battalions and regiments will be replaced by combat commands and combat groups. Instead of holding a single line, they'll hold sectors, or pockets. The enemy might infiltrate between these pockets—in what General Adams calls our killing ground—at will, and we theirs. To try to move truck convoys through these areas would be suicidal. The Army insists that hedgehopping planes are needed, and has ordered 80 Canadian-made DeHavilland Otters to do the job.

General Adams says the Otter isn't the final answer, however. He's looking for a plane that can handle what a 2½-ton truck would handle.

NOT MUSCLING IN

He insists the Army isn't muscling in on Air Force territory.

"Moving an Army division from this country to Europe would take big planes. You've never heard anyone in the Army suggest we go in for that. That's Air Force responsibility."

At the same time, the Army hopes the Air Force relaxes some of the restrictions it's placed on Army aviation.

For instance, General Adams says, "If we went to war, we'd have to kill tanks and keep on killing tanks in greater numbers than ever before."

The most efficient weapon, he believes, is a small, rocket-firing Army plane. Several years ago, such a weapon was developed and tested by the Army. General Adams says the results were spectacular.

"But," he smiled, "they were never used. We ran into a small obstacle. We weren't supposed to have planes that shoot."

Peaceable Alertness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I wish to call to your attention and to each of my colleagues the following text of an editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on June 6, 1955:

PEACEABLE ALERTNESS

The free peoples are moving into a period which will test their intelligence and steadfastness no less sharply than has the decade just past. In the first postwar years the prime problem was awakening to communism's aggressive purposes and building the unified strength required to resist them. In the period ahead the chief task will be to relax tensions without relaxing the posture of preparedness.

A no-war-no-peace situation poses real problems for democratic countries. Under conditions of open hostilities they rise to vigorous effort. But their normal reliance on methods of peace leads them to disarm when active fighting ceases. In Mein Kampf

Hitler compared them with a herd of horses which would form a circle when attacked by wolves but, soon forgetting, would disperse to become singly the easy prey of silent stalkers.

It is a picture the free peoples would do well to keep in thought as a constant warning. Yet at the same time they will find it necessary to respond to every move toward pacification. Indeed, they will be wise to take the initiative themselves in peaceful moves. President Eisenhower has, over the last year, given repeated evidences that this was his first concern.

It is much too early to judge whether these efforts will bring about any genuine change in Communist countries. But they have had definitely beneficial results in promoting Allied unity and in winning better understanding of American purposes among the so-called neutral nations. For among many peoples whose friendship is valuable to the United States unfortunate impressions had been created by belligerent attitudes engendered in the Korean war and by a seeming obsession with atomic weapons.

In arousing the free peoples to the necessity for rearming, considerable heat and animosity were generated. Can they now maintain their strength and alertness while giving warm support to peace-seeking negotiations? Can they now dismantle the bellicosity which spurred the building of essential defense without dismantling the defenses? We believe they can.

Indeed, we believe the basic position will be strengthened as peaceable alertness takes the place of alarmed hatred. Strength, not weakness, will result as the emphasis shifts somewhat from H-bombs to the defensive and offensive power of spiritual ideas—of freedom, justice, and equality of opportunity. The more clearly the free peoples recognize that the basis struggle is one of ideas the surer they are to resist being mentally disarmed. And the better prepared to wield the weapons which "are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds."

Moscow and Peking are showing an awareness that the free peoples now hold a preponderance of power. The craftiness of evil may endeavor to lull the defenders of freedom into apathy, but the stupidity of evil will probably continue to sound recurrent alarm bells. In the period ahead the stance of the free peoples may well be modeled on that of Nehemiah when rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem or of the early American settlers who plowed with their guns slung on their backs. They must keep armed and alert while pursuing peaceful purposes.

Signalmen for Global Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, acting under the authority granted me, I am very pleased to include with my remarks an article entitled "Signalmen for Global Defense" by Paul Thead, which appeared recently in the Newark Sunday News.

This article tells about the student soldiers who come from many lands all over the world studying at the Signal Corps installation at Fort Monmouth, N. J., so they may become instructors in the use of the military equipment which is made available to them under the mutual-defense-assistance program. Fort Monmouth is well equipped to teach these men, and I am sure they return to their native lands highly qualified to act in the capacity of instructors. The article follows:

SIGNALMEN FOR GLOBAL DEFENSE

(By Paul Thead)

FORT MONMOUTH.—East and West have met here, despite Kipling, along with North and South and many global points between. There are currently on the post 76 officers and 11 enlisted men from 21 countries besides the United States.

They come from Peru, from Norway, from the Republic of South Korea, the Philippines, Nationalist China, Japan, Thailand, Pakistan, and Indonesia; from Colombia, Brazil, Venezuela, and Cuba; from Turkey, Greece, Iran, Egypt, France, Ethiopia, Italy, and Great Britain.

The officers and men, whose presence makes this one of the most cosmopolitan gathering places outside the United Nations, are finding nothing remarkably strange about working and living together while adding to their knowledge of communications.

The primary mission is a military one, carried out in the Signal School. However, the United States Army and the guests believe that of parallel benefit are the opportunities to meet among themselves and with civilians of New Jersey and other States.

"Enrollment of these Allied students in the United States Signal Corps courses serves a dual purpose," says Col. William D. Hamlin, commandant of the Signal School. "They become acquainted with United States equipment, training procedures, and techniques. Through the various tours and visits, they learn a great deal of the American way of life and system of government."

This expresses the Army viewpoint that the program is a mutual proposition. There is a good deal of deference all around to the customs of the others, and while protocol is observed, there have been no "incidents" larger than a molehill.

A good many of the officers, concerned in soldierly fashion with food, cannot comprehend why so much of it, in restaurants as well as in the messes, is canned or processed rather than fresh. A combat-hardened Italian, whose country makes the world's fastest production-model autos, finds American driving a little fatiguing and sometimes harrowing. A lieutenant colonel from Pakistan, who likes most of what he has found, is baffled by some of the TV commercials.

Most of the student soldiers are studying under the mutual defense assistance program. Some are here through arrangements made by their military attachés. MDAP, so abbreviated in official circles, each year brings in large but undisclosed numbers of Allied personnel for specialized training in all branches of the Armed Forces at 124 posts.

After completion of their courses, most of which take about 6 months, most of the men return to their respective countries to teach in service schools the additional knowledge they have gained about military equipment and combat methods.

At the signal school, the courses include radar repair, radio and wire communications, still- and motion-picture photography. All the Allied commissioned personnel are enrolled in an advanced course for officers, drawn up to give them an overall view of the big picture in command.

The Allied students must have a working knowledge of English before they are named by their countries for the assignments. However, some have difficulties with language during the early days of their stay. They attend regular English classes on a sink-or-swim basis and usually end up swimming quite well, the Army says.

"We think it is an extremely important and successful program," says Lt. Col. William A. Glass, Jr., of Miami, Fla., who was in Iran from 1949 to 1952 as signal adviser to the Iranian Army, and now is S–3 for the Signal School, that is, staff officer charged with plans and training.

"Part of the general United States program," he continues, "is to help the armies of the free nations through the benefit of training in this country. We want the people—the officers and men—to know how our equipment works, to make the best use of materiel they might receive under the United States program."

Although classroom schedules have top priority, the visitors are assisted in their desire to find out more about the country. They are frequent guests in private homes, attend concerts, visit art and historical museums, are taken on tours of industrial plants, go to churches off the post, visit the plants of newspapers and press services, civic clubs and learn first hand about municipal, county, and State government. One recent high point was when the group was received in Trenton by Governor Meyner. The Army and Naval Academies at West Point and Annapolis are popular spots.

Lt. Col. Taj Mohammed, 35, the officer from Pakistan who closely watches TV, is undoubtedly one of the sharpest general observers of Americans and Americana since de Tocqueville sojourned in the country more than 100 years ago.

The handsome colonel, who speaks perfect English, has traveled in Europe and is now planning a tour of the United States in his recently acquired auto. He finished his course late last month.

He is able and willing to comment on virtually any subject, without the suggestion of direct questions.

American skyscrapers: "The most important thing is the people in them."

Television: "Some of the programs are good, but I was amazed when the details of an important news event were delayed for the details on toothpaste."

Religion: Colonel Mohammed is a devout Moslem. He has visited other churches, including the Presbyterian Church in Shrewsbury. "We (members of various denominations) believe in one God. There is a place for the spiritual part of life that is not to be ignored."

American women: Friendly and attractive—"the girls in the offices always smile, but some of them smile only with their mouths and not with their eyes." The colonel is married and has a child. His observation is detached when he states "Being from a Moslem country, I am impressed by the ladies in short dresses."

Americans in general: "I feel that the people are very friendly. You have a lot of technical know-how, but you also have something more lasting than material happiness. People who invite us to their homes show genuine human interest. I had heard a lot about America, both good and bad. Before coming here, I read one book by a man who had nothing good to say about this country. I realized after coming here that he was talking nonsense."

Maj. Pier Attilio Rosina, 40-year-old native of Merano, Italy, and father of four, is in the country for his second time. He has brought a 5-year-old auto and gets around but finds that congestion sometimes makes driving more of a chore than in Italy. "Lots of travelers see New York and think it is America, but it is not America, only a part," he observes.

Lt. Col. Rassoul Sodaify, 38, is from Iran. The Teheran resident, who has a son, 5, was here in 1950 for a basic officers' course. He

finds the country quite different from several standpoints, particularly in the degree of mechanization. "But it's a very good way of life, if you can get accustomed to it." Colonel Sodaify is at a loss, though, to understand why so much food is quick-frozen or canned in spite of fast transportation and distributive facilities. "You lose the flavor of everything."

Maj. Pedro Schneider, 37, from Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, is one of the few Allied officers accompanied by his family—his wife, Dolores, and their two children, Pedro Leon, 3, and Claudia, 18 months. The South American has noted nothing fundamentally different between the two continents of the Western Hemisphere, but he also is puzzled by all that canned and processed food.

Staff Sgt. Se Yerl Lee, 24, who is taking a repeater and carrier course in the Enlisted Department of the Signal School, was impressed by the sweep of the Great Plains as he rolled eastward in his Pullman roomette after arriving in San Francisco from the Republic of South Korea.

The sergeant, who is a booster of American railroads because of the excellent service he received, was not a complete stranger since he mingled with American soldiers during the fighting in Korea. The soldier also is agricultural minded, the son of an official in the Ministry of Agriculture in Seoul. A former member of the 4–H Club in Korea, he is studying the organization and farming methods during his spare time. He sends reports to his father.

Sgt. Michel Thieffine of Paris meets many of the popular American requirements for a Frenchman. The 25-year-old veteran of Indochina fighting is handsome, unmarried, speaks English with a continental flair and is a violinist. His versatility is attested by the fact that he is studying microwave radio relay, one of the Signal School's most difficult courses.

Sergeant Thieffine has made a flying trip to the west coast since arrival here last September—"California, it's wonderful." He smiles when he states he does not particularly care for dancing but would rather talk to people or listen to music.

He confides that he has, of course, met American girls but, strictly speaking, has not taken them out on dates.

"Too busy."

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*____
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*__6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*_____4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*___
Albert, Carl, *Okla*_____
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*__
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*_____
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*___
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*_____University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*___4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*_
Andrews, George W., *Ala*___3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*____
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*_____4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*___
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*___
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*__Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*_113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*___
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*___
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*_
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*___
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*_
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*__2737 Devonshire Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*____
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*_____
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*_____
Bates, William H., *Mass*____
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*_
Beamer, John V., *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*_____1727 Mass. Ave.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*_____
Bell, John J., *Tex*_____
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*___1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*____7304 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*___
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*_____2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*____
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*____
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*__
Boggs, Hale, *La*_____
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*___
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*_____3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*___2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*____
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*__The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*_____
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*_____4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*_____
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*_____The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*_____
Bray, William G., *Ind*_____
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*_____
Brooks, Overton, *La*_____4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*__Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*_____Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*_
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*_____
Buchanan, Vera, *Pa*_____
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*__
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*___
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*__
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*_____2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*____
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*_____
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*____
Byrne, James A., *Pa*_____
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*_____1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*_____
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*_____
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*_____The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*____
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*_____
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*_
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*_____The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*___Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*_
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*_____
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*_
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*__1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*_____
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*_____
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*_____The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*____1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*__
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*____The Dorchester
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*_____
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*_____The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*_____
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*____
Cramer, William C., *Fla*___4454 Tindall St.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*__
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*__
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*____3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*_____
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*_____
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*___
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*_____4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*_____2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*_____
Dawson, William A., *Utah*__
Dawson, William L., *Ill*___
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*____
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*____
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*__2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*__
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*_
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*_
Dies, Martin, *Tex*_____
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*_The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*____
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*_
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*____
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*____
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*____3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*__The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*_
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*__
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*_____
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*____
Dowdy, John, *Tex*_____
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*_____3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*_____The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*_3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*_____
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*_____
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*____4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*_____3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*_____5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*_____
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*_____
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*_
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*_____3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*__200 C St. SE.
Fine, Sidney A., *N. Y*_____
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*_____
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*_____Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*_____
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*_____The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*_____
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*_____3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*_____4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*__514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*_____
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*_____The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*__Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*____
Fulton, James G., *Pa*_____
Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*____
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*___
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*_____
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*_____6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*_____
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*_____
George, Myron V., *Kans*___3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*____
Granahan, William T., *Pa*__
Grant, George M., *Ala*_____4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*_____
Green, Edith, *Oreg*_____
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*__
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*_____2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*_
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*_____
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*___
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*____
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*_____
Hale, Robert, *Maine*_____2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*_____
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*___4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*_____
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*_____The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*_____
Harris, Oren, *Ark*_____1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*_____4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*__
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*_____314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*_____The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*_____
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*_____104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*__125 Marthas Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*_____
Heselton, John W., *Mass*___
Hess, William E., *Ohio*_____
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*__
Hill, William S., *Colo*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*__
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*_____
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*__2108 Suitland Terrace SE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*___Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*___
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*_____
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*_____
Holt, Joe, *Calif*_____
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*____
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*____3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*_____
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*_____
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*_____
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*_____
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*_____
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*__
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*____200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*_____
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*__The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*_____
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*_____The Washington House
Johansen, August E., *Mich*_
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*_____630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*____3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*_
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*_____3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*___
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*__
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*____3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*____
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*_____2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*_
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*_____Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*_1249 31st St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*_____
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*___
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*_____
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*____The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*_The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*_____3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*_____
King, Cecil R., *Calif*_____
King, Karl C., *Pa*_____
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*__
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*_____
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*___
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*_____
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*_____
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*_____The Coronet

Appendix

Address by Dr. George M. Modlin at the 125th Anniversary Celebration of the University of Richmond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very outstanding address made by Dr. George M. Modlin, president of the University of Richmond, on the occasion of its 125th anniversary.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS

One hundred and twenty-five years ago, in the year 1830, momentous events were taking place, some of which were to shape the future of the world.

There had been a revolt in Paris, and the French had conquered Algiers. Holland and Belgium were separated into two countries, and Poland was torn by revolution. The United States signed a treaty of commerce and navigation with Turkey, opening the Black Sea to American ships.

This was the year that Americans were excited by news of the steam locomotive that had hauled passengers and traffic from Liverpool to London. In January the Petersburg (Va.) Railroad was incorporated, and February saw the beginning of canal transportation between Richmond and Lynchburg.

In 1830 there were 24 States in the Union and, according to the fifth census, the total population of the United States was 12,866,020. Virginia, with 1,044,054 inhabitants, ranked third, exceeded only by New York and Pennsylvania.

In presenting the Federal budget, President Andrew Jackson estimated total expenditures for that year at $23,755,526, of which $11,500,000—almost half—was for servicing the public debt. There was a deficit of three-quarters of a million dollars.

In Richmond, people were talking about the new State library which had just been established. The chief subject of interest, however, was the Virginia Constitutional Convention, among whose delegates were Madison, Monroe, Marshall, John Tyler, and John Randolph. Later in the year Virginian Henry Clay was to be nominated as a candidate for the presidency of the United States.

On June 8, 1830, a deeply significant event occurred here in Richmond. At 5 o'clock in the morning, a group of men attending the eighth session of the Baptist General Association of Virginia met in the basement of the Second Baptist Church, then located on 11th Street south of Main. After considerable discussion, according to the minutes, it was resolved "that the Baptists of this State form an education society for the improvement of the ministry." This meeting and this resolution constituted the beginning of the institution that today is the University of Richmond.

DUNLORA ACADEMY

As a result of this meeting the Virginia Baptist Education Society was formed and, until funds could be raised to organize an educational institution, the members of the society prevailed upon its vice president to accept into his home young men wishing to prepare for the ministry. The vice president, who had written the society's constitution, was the best-educated Baptist minister in Virginia, having earned the degrees of bachelor of arts and master of arts at Hampden-Sydney College. His name was Edward Baptist. In August 1830, the first student, William Allgood, arrived at Dunlora Plantation, in Powhatan County, where a building of 3 or 4 rooms provided by Elder Baptist became known as Dunlora Academy. Altogether nine students were enrolled that first year. (You will be interested to know that after a search of several years the grave of Founder Edward Baptist has recently been located, in central Alabama, and a commemorative headstone will be placed above it by the university this summer.)

VIRGINIA BAPTIST SEMINARY

After 2 years the education society, having secured some funds, purchased for $4,000 Spring Farm, about 5 miles north of Richmond near the present Bryan Park, on Hermitage Road. As Edward Baptist was unwilling to move to the new location, the presidency was offered to Elder Robert Ryland, a graduate of Columbian College, in Washington, then pastor of the Lynchburg Baptist Church. On July 1, 1834, the Virginia Baptist Seminary was opened and on July 4 instruction began for eight students, some of whom had attended Dunlora Academy. A total of 14 students were enrolled during the first session.

The courses of instruction included Latin, Greek, and mathematics; and a compulsory feature of the curriculum was manual labor. Students were required to work on the farm 3 hours a day, thus, in the words of President Ryland, "improving the health, diminishing the expenses, and perhaps guarding the humility of the young preachers." For a number of reasons this system of farming proved unprofitable and was abandoned after a few years.

With the enrollment of nonministerial pay students, registrations increased and additional instructors were employed. Conditions on the farm became increasingly unsatisfactory, causing the Education Society to seek a more desirable location for the seminary. The Haxall plantation, 2 or 3 miles nearer Richmond, with the mansion house, Columbia, and several other brick buildings, purchased in 1834, and the seminary began classes there on January 20, 1835. In the words of President Ryland, "This was really an onward stride to respectability and usefulness. * * * We left the plain farmhouse and the slab-covered log cabins that had been improvised as the students increased, and the unsightly barn that had served for a chapel and schoolrooms."

In its new location, with better facilities, the institution began to grow, the faculty was increased, and the need for additional funds became more and more urgent. As the Education Society was unincorporated and thus could not hold title to property or receive bequests, and as the Legislature of Virginia would not grant a charter to a theological school, the seminary was greatly handicapped. It was decided to apply for a charter for a liberal arts college under a new name, and on March 4, 1840, a charter was granted by the Virginia Legislature to the trustees of Richmond College. The property was turned over to the trustees by the Education Society, and on January 2, 1843, Richmond College opened its doors to students.

RICHMOND COLLEGE

At that time there were 68 students, 3 teachers, land and buildings valued at $20,000, a small endowment, and a library of 700 volumes. The total cost of room, board, and tuition was $120 for the session of 11 months. President Ryland and the 2 instructors received annual salaries of $900, $600, and $500. The president said in a later address, "What we lacked in pay we made up in work."

During the 10 years the Virginia Baptist Seminary was in operation there were enrolled 85 students for the ministry and 351 other students. That decade provided a sound foundation for the new institution and, under the wise and constructive leadership of President Ryland, Richmond College grew steadily in size and in strength until the beginning of the War Between the States. The college soon closed, as all the students and most of the faculty entered military service. Before the war there were 161 students, a faculty of 7, land and buildings that cost $60,000 and were valued at $100,000, an invested endowment of $77,000, and a library of several thousand volumes.

During the war the college buildings were used as a hospital and barracks, and the endowment was invested principally in Confederate bonds. After the evacuation of Richmond in April 1865, the buildings were occupied by a Federal regiment which destroyed or took away everything portable, including all the books in the library. At the close of the war the college was prostrate. Its buildings were deteriorated, the equipment and scientific apparatus were gone, the faculty was scattered, one-fifth of its graduates had been killed in battle, and the endowment was worthless. The future of the institution appeared hopeless.

AFTER THE CIVIL WAR

In June 1866, when the Virginia Baptist General Association met in Richmond, the education board reported that it had collected no funds, assisted no young men, transacted no business. Some prominent alumni made such earnest appeals before the association, however, that several thousand dollars were raised. The trustees met the next day, elected Dr. Tiberius Gracchus Jones as president, soon appointed four able men to the faculty, and on October 1, 1866, the college reopened. During the year 90 students enrolled.

After 2 years President Jones resigned and the operation of the institution was placed under a faculty chairman, a system then in operation at the University of Virginia. In 1870 the school of law was added to the several schools or departments already in the curriculum. Times were difficult for the college, however, as the people were impoverished and funds were hard to raise. It was decided to organize a campaign for $300,000 in connection with the celebration in 1873 of the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Baptist General Association of Virginia. Although the campaign was not fully successful, chiefly because of the onset of

the panic and depression of 1873, sufficient funds were raised to strengthen the college and, more important, the continued support of Virginia Baptists was secured.

PRESIDENT BOATWRIGHT

Late in 1894 a most significant event occurred when the trustees decided, not unanimously, to abandon the faculty-chairman system and elect a president to administer the increasingly complex affairs of the college. It was a wise move, and the choice of a president was most fortunate. Dr. Frederic William Boatwright, an alumnus of the class of 1888 and, at the age of 26, the youngest member of the faculty, was offered the presidency in December. Against the advice of many friends, as well as his father, he accepted the offer and assumd the duties in June 1895.

Immediately, under the aggressive and tireless leadership of President Boatwright, the college began to prosper. He led campaigns for funds to construct two greatly needed buildings, he strengthened the curriculum, added to the endowment, and in 1898 admitted young women under certain restrictions. The most notable single achievement of his long administration, however, was the removal of the institution to the spacious new campus in the western suburbs of the city.

During the first decade of this century the city of Richmond was rapidly expanding westward, surrounding the old campus of 13 acres. At the same time the college was growing and experiencing the restrictions of its limited campus. During these years there was a developing sentiment among Virginia Baptist leaders that a strong college for women should be established. It was eventually decided that all forces should cooperate in raising half a million dollars to construct on a 300-acre campus buildings for Richmond College and for a new woman's college, Westhampton. Aided by a generous grant from the General Education Board, the funds were raised, the buildings erected, and classes began on the new campus in September 1914. Twenty-six former co-eds in Richmond College formed the nucleus of the 82 women enrolled in Westhampton College that first session.

In that year, also, the property of the Woman's College of Richmond, a successor to Richmond Female Institute founded in 1854, was transferred to the trustees of Richmond College, and in 1916 the Woman's College was closed, with 15 of its students entering Westhampton.

When our country entered World War I, the campus was turned over to the United States Army for use as a hospital, and during the session of 1918–19, Richmond College, Westhampton College, and the law school moved back to the old campus and its environs. After 1 year Richmond College and Westhampton College returned to the new campus, and the law school remained in old Columbia Building at Grace and Lombardy Streets for 35 years until 1954.

UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND

The institution entered upon a new period of growth on its beautiful new campus, and in 1920 it was decided to amend the charter and change the name to University of Richmond. At that time there were 628 students, 46 faculty members, campus property valued at $1,398,685, endowment of $1,130,677, and total income of $201,402.

In 1920 the first summer session was conducted, and in 1921 the graduate school was established as a separate division, though the graduate degree of master of arts had been offered since 1861. In 1924 the evening school of business administration was organized to offer educational opportunities on a part-time basis to men and women employed in Richmond's offices, stores, and industries.

Having weathered with gratifying strength the difficult years during the serious depression of the 1930's, the university was prepared to make the sharp adjustments required by World War II. It operated for 2 years a Navy V–12 unit composed of approximately 1,000 college men preparing to become naval officers, conducted special training programs for air cadets, offered evening classes in engineering, science, and management war training, and expanded the enrollment in Westhampton College. Although most of the civilian men students and many of the faculty entered the armed services, the university tightened its belt and came through the war without incurring a deficit.

Having guided the institution safely through those trying years, Dr. Boatwright resigned in June 1946 and was elected chancellor of the university. A distinguished alumnus, Dr. Douglas Southall Freeman, who served as rector of the board of trustees for a quarter century, once said that everything Dr. Boatwright touched he multiplied by 10. A few comparative figures will show that even this estimate is faint praise for that noble and indefatigable man who served this institution as president for 51 years. When he became president in 1895, there were 183 students, a faculty of 9 professors, campus property valued at $300,000, an endowment of $400,000, a total income of $30,000, and no debt. In his final annual report he reported an enrollment of 2,174 students, a faculty of 112 members, campus property valued at $2,706,606, an endowment of $2,904,843, total assets of $7,188,181, income of $648,729, and no debt.

When the fourth president was elected in 1946, the university was crowded with returning war veterans, who carried the enrollment to a record peak of more than 4,700 in the 1948–49 session. Attendance declined gradually over several years to 3,452 last year, but this session there has been an increase in every division of the university, resulting in a total enrollment of 3,854.

At the close of this 125th year the value of the campus property is $4,536,820, endowment and trust funds amount to $6,189,222, the total assets are $11,496,547, and the income is $1,407,632. The university is the largest private institution in Virginia and one of the strongest church-related institutions in this part of the country. Assuredly we can say in all humility that the Lord has blessed this institution during these 125 years and that He continues to look with favor upon this university as it seeks to serve Him.

Size, facilities, and resources, however, do not make a great institution. Rather, it is the quality of its educational program; what it stands for in the educational world; and what it seeks to achieve. During the time remaining, let us consider briefly some characteristics and qualities of the University of Richmond.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE UNIVERSITY

Fortunate location: Among the factors, though not necessarily the most important, that have caused this institution to thrive is its location. In 1830 there were only four institutions of higher learning in Virginia, all located in hamlets or small towns. The wisest action taken by the Virginia Baptist Education Society was quickly to place the young school adjacent to the city of Richmond. When the Seminary was moved to Columbia plantation in 1834, President Ryland later stated that "It brought us nearer to market, nearer to the post office, nearer to medical aid, nearer to the bookstores, and nearer to spiritual privileges."

But it did more. Through the years the city of Richmond has afforded to our students cultural, literary, musical, artistic, and other opportunities for the uplift of the spirit and the cultivation of the finer things of life. For a century and a quarter the city and the university have developed and prospered together. The university has, in part, been molded by the city. In return the city has received from the university a steadily growing stream of graduates who have influenced every phase of its life. And through the years professors of this institution have made large contributions to the city in which they live. Both city and university have enjoyed happy benefits from this mutually fortunate union.

High standards: Since the early years high academic standards have been maintained by strong faculties. From Edward Baptist and Robert Ryland to the present distinguished group, this institution has been noted for the quality of its faculty. Through the years able men and women have dedicated their talents and their lives to this institution. This is attested by the long tenure of service of so many in each generation of teachers. Would that time permitted the naming of those who have labored here for a quarter century or longer.

An eminent rector of the university's board of trustees once stated that to be successful a teacher must love young people. Certainly the crucial point in education is the relationship between student and teacher. An inspiring teacher with a personal interest in his students will stimulate even the most reluctant mind. One of the primary objectives of our educational program is to maintain a close personal relationship between professor and individual student that will develop the largest potentialities of each young man or woman. Such a policy is a fundamental justification for a private, church-related institution like this.

During this century and a quarter the curriculum has been based on the classical and liberal arts. Few, if any, courses have been offered that were not in this tradition. Seldom have experimental courses or novel programs been introduced. One important exception was the establishment shortly after the Civil War of perhaps the first department of English in the country. Requirements for admission and for graduation have been maintained at a high level. In summary the curriculum has been sound, instruction superior, and standards high.

Integrity and honor: From the beginning integrity and honesty have marked the institution in its various relationships. For example, although founded in 1830 and chartered in 1840, the college did not award a degree until 1849, when it felt it was qualified to grant a sound degree.

In the first catalog of Richmond College there appeared this announcement, which was continued until degrees were awarded: "As the trustees are determined to avoid pecuniary embarrassment, they propose to conduct the college classes only so far as their resources may justify, taking care to have the students thoroughly taught as far as they shall go. It is not their purpose to confer degrees until they shall have afforded facilities for education equal to those of other chartered institutions." This statement represents the basic integrity of the institution.

Another illustration of this quality is the wise and conservative financial policy that has preserved every dollar placed in the endowment since the Civil War. Moreover, under this sound fiscal management, the institution has operated within its annual budget since 1895 without incurring a deficit. That is a record of which all friends of the university can be proud.

When the college reopened after the Civil War, among the new rules was this: "Discipline is to be maintained not so much by minute regulations as by cultivating among the students the sentiment of personal honor and responsibility." This placing of greater

reliance on the integrity of students was the beginning of the honor system in which we have such pride.

Integrity and honor have given character to this institution through the years.

The spirit of the university: In June 1890 Dr. Robert Ryland, at the age of 85, returned to the college to deliver the alumni address. Discussing the early years of the institution, he said: "It is a Baptist college in no narrow, bigoted sense. Pupils of every creed and of no creed have been, and will be, received on the same terms, and treated with equal justice and consideration. Even professors have been, and will be, chosen without prejudice on account of variant religious affinities. We have founded the college primarily for the elevation of our own ministry and people, and secondarily for the improvement of the whole country." It may also be added that similarly non-Baptists as well as Baptists through the years have served as members of the board of trustees. There has never been a narrow spirit of intolerance at this institution, social, religious, or economic.

Faculty and students have never been restricted here in their search for truth. Everyone has been free to follow the inquiries of his mind and the dictates of his conscience without fear of interference or recrimination. On this campus there have been breadth of opinion and freedom of expression to a degree that is rare in a church-related institution.

From the beginning there has existed at this school a democratic spirit that is remarkable. There has been little of social caste or cliques in our student body. Whether resident or nonresident, employed or not employed, fraternity or nonfraternity, ministerial or nonministerial, on scholarship or not, everyone is appraised on his or her merits. Opportunities, student offices, recognition, achievements are open alike to all. From those early years of manual labor, work has been respected on this campus. Through the years a large proportion of our students have labored, often at menial tasks, to secure the means of financing their education. Our urban location and the spirit of our school have made this possible. This respect for work is one of the foundations on which the university has been built. We have come far from the slab-covered log cabins of Spring Farm to the Gothic buildings on this beautiful campus, but may we never lose the spirit that places high esteem on honest toil.

One other word about the spirit of our university. With each succeeding generation the students have enjoyed a larger degree of self-government. We are proud of the effective student government organizations and the extent to which our students assume the responsibilities of self-regulation and self-discipline. In this important way the young men and women here have developed a maturity that prepares them well for positions of leadership in the years ahead.

The spirit of our university is marked by tolerance, freedom, democracy, and self-discipline.

Spiritual emphasis: Founded by Virginia Baptists to improve their ministry, and enlarged to provide a liberal education with emphasis on the moral and spiritual values of life, the university has remained close to the principles of its founders. A primary objective has been the development of character in its students. It has sought their full development in heart and spirit as well as in mind and body to become mature men and women. This emphasis on Christian education has been a distinguishing characteristic that justifies its service as a church-related institution.

The Baptists of Virginia have given strong support to the University through the years. At various times when the need was greatest—after the Civil War, in 1873, in 1910–14, in more recent years—whenever the call for assistance has gone out, the denomination has responded generously to the appeal. In return the university has produced a continuing flow of leaders, ministerial and lay, men and women, to carry forward the work of the denomination at home and abroad. The university, moreover, has maintained on its campus an atmosphere and a program that give students every opportunity and encouragement to develop their spiritual lives. The denomination and the university have come a long way together since that early morning 125 years ago this week, and the growth of each has strengthened the other as both have sought to advance the kingdom of God on this earth.

CONCLUSION

As we look back over those years it is with an overwhelming sense of gratitude to the host of men and women whose vision, heroic sacrifices, faith, and tireless labor have given us the institution that we call the University of Richmond. Their achievements place us—trustees and officers, faculty, alumni, and students—under a heavy obligation to enrich this noble heritage and make it even more serviceable to the generations yet to come. If we adhere faithfully to the policies and principles of the past, if we remain true to the traditions and spirit of the university, if we accept the challenge of the vast opportunities that lie before us, we can face the future with every assurance that, with divine guidance, there will be a much greater University of Richmond during the next 125 years.

Truman on the U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on April 20, I obtained permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Truman on the U. N.," which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of that date. Apparently the editorial became misplaced, so I now renew the request.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN ON THE U. N.

Former President Truman talked with restraint and good sense about the role of the United Nations in the present world situation and about the problem of revising the U. N. Charter. He took note of the many weaknesses and imperfections in the charter and expressed the wish that the United Nations could be a much stronger instrument than it is for putting down aggression and maintaining peace. But this did not blur his appreciation of what the U. N., with its limited powers, has been able to accomplish.

The complaint most often heard against the United Nations is that it has been rendered powerless by the Soviet veto in the Security Council. Consequently, there is much demand for abolition of the big-power veto. Mr. Truman was realistic in saying that the U. N. would never have come into being without the veto. Neither Russia nor the United States would have accepted a charter without the reserve power the veto provision gives. It follows that talk of abolishing the veto is so much wasted breath. Mr. Truman pointed out that it would be more difficult to secure agreement on the charter today than it was in 1945. We do not think there is a chance that the Senate would agree to an amendment that would permit the Security Council to order military action against an aggressor without specific acquiescence of this Government.

However, the veto ought to be eliminated in regard to the admission of new members, and that should not be impossible of attainment. Also numerous improvements in the U. N. can be made by strengthening the capacity of the General Assembly to act against threats of aggression when the Security Council is moribund, as at present. The fact that the Assembly has to act through recommendations and consent of a majority of its members is not an insurmountable handicap, as the experience in Korea proved. If there is a will among the law-abiding nations to act against aggression, they can do so through the Assembly under the uniting for peace resolution. This line of development within the U. N. ought to have every encouragement.

While moving toward improvements of this sort, Mr. Truman cautions us "not to throw away the good and great instrument we have in search for something better." This is sound advice. And the best means of upholding and strengthening the United Nations is to make it a positive force for peace and to invoke its powers as effectively as possible whenever there is a threat of coercion by armed force.

The Olympic Games

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I delivered on June 10, 1955, before a combined meeting of all civic and service clubs of Anne Arundel County, Md. These comments relate to certain aspects of the 1956 Olympic games which would seem to warrant the attention of all Americans.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER BEFORE THE INTERCOUNTY MEETING OF ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY CIVIC CLUBS, FRIENDSHIP INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, MARYLAND, JUNE 9, 1955

It is, indeed, a pleasure to be with you—the members of all of the fine civic and service clubs of Anne Arundel County—and I am honored by your invitation. This evening, I should like to discuss with you an aspect of our contemporary life which reaches all of us in some way or another. I speak of sports—and more particularly—the Olympic games.

If God grant the world peace, the 1956 Olympic games will be held in Melbourne, Australia. We are delighted that this great international classic is to be held in the home of our great friends in the South Pacific. We have met the Australians often on the fields of sport. Their great spirit of sportsmanship makes them very desirable hosts for the 60 or more nations expected to take part in these international games.

The United States tried without success to have these historic games take place here in 1956. It is almost 25 years since we had the honor to be the host nation at Los Angeles in 1932. Although the great city of Detroit pressed its claims vigorously, the

International Olympic Committee decided in favor of Melbourne. We hope we will be more successful in 1960. The United States Olympic Committee, representing the chief amateur athletic associations in the United States, will seek to obtain the honor for Detroit. Senator POTTER, of Michigan, has introduced Senate Joint Resolution 14 in the present session to request the Government of the United States to join in the effort to bring the games here.

All the world knows the spirit of these games.

It is the spirit of amateur sportsmanship itself: the spirit that encourages observance of moral laws; the spirit that engenders a wholesome respect for ethical standards; the spirit that is the nourishment of man's inner growth.

It is the ultimate expression of that innate sense of honesty, integrity, and fair play that can be found and cultivated in the heart of every man—regardless of race, creed, political conviction, or social standing.

Under our free system in the United States that spirit has found fertile soil in which to blossom to fruition. It is known instinctively by everyone from the freckle-faced kid playing scrub ball in the little leagues to those fine, upstanding American youngsters who participate in the Olympic games and, win or lose, do great honor to our way of life.

Since the revival of the Olympic games in Athens, Greece, in 1896, Olympic committees of every nation have recognized the fact that the true spirit of sportsmanship rules out even the slightest taint of professionalism or commercialism.

They have realized that an athletic endeavor which is subsidized is subject to the control and domination of the sponsoring agent whether it be private interest or National Government.

It is for this reason that a strict amateur status of participants is insisted upon; it is for this reason that personal achievement—as distinguished from national achievement—is emphasized in the Olympic games.

Any other course of action would be a gross violation of true sportsmanship. Acquiescence to any other standard would be tantamount to wanton perversion of the underlying principle of the Olympic games.

The question on my mind today and which I want to post to the American people is this:

Are we in the United States—where our record of excellence in the field of amateur sportsmanship is a byproduct of our unique system of government—allowing the Soviet Union to pollute the Olympic games; to us, with diabolic deceit, the spirit of sportsmanship itself as a velvet-gloved iron fist to ruthlessly hammer out their godless propaganda?

Disturbing evidence of the Soviet Union's designs of the 1956 Olympic games prompts me to speak out on this all-important matter.

The Soviets' only goal in the forthcoming Olympics is to win by whatever means they deem expedient.

This attitude was quite bluntly expressed by Vladimir Kuchmenko at the Henley Regatta in England early in 1954.

Kuchmenko, head of the Department of Aquatic Sports in the Committee of Physical Education and Sports of the Soviet Council of Ministers said to the British observers:

"This is sport to you, but we are over here to win."

The record is replete with Soviet violations not only of the basic principles of sportsmanship involved, but of the self-imposed rules and regulations governing the conduct of participants in the Olympic Games.

It should be clearly evident to those with eyes to see that the Communists—who will subvert everything from the Deity to the invention of the sewing machine, to serve their cause—have their sinister eyes fixed upon the 1956 Olympic Games. And their ulterior motive is to advance not the cause of fair play and sportsmanship, but international Communist domination.

In the first place, the Soviet athlete is not an amateur; he is a paid propaganda agent of the U. S. S. R.

He is just one more slave in the hideous chain gang of brain-washed individuals slavishly advancing the Communist cause.

He is not willing to accept the rigid discipline of defeat which ofttimes is the finest hour of a truly great sports figure.

The Soviet athlete is as much a pawn in the vast Soviet mechanism as any other segment of the total Soviet proletariat.

He is not an individual.

He has no independence.

He is anything but a free agent.

His only right is the right to obey.

And his duty is simple and absolute.

He must win.

He must win or suffer the devilish ostracism of a police state; a liquidation so cruel as to defy description.

He must win not for the indulgence of his understandable human desire to excel but to enhance the prestige of that vast, sprawling Soviet slave state which is unalterably committed to the ultimate extinction of every principle which the Olympic Games attempt to promote.

As such he has no right whatsoever to participate in the Olympic Games.

The least we can do is to bar the Soviet Union and its satellites until such time as they show some respect for the cardinal rules of the games.

Lest the impression be created that my fears are unjustified and are based on the natural distrust of the Soviet prevalent in this country today, I should like to quote from a recent article appearing in the Saturday Evening Post.

It was written by Mr. Avery Brundage, a famous American sportsman and president of the International Olympic Committee. Mr. Brundage reported what he saw inside the Soviet Union during an inspection tour of the Russian athletic program.

I quote: "In Moscow, at the annual sports parade, I watched 34,000 boys and girls put on a series of magnificent displays of physical training, athletic competition, and gymnastics. These demonstrations proceeded with almost mechanical precision for 5 solid hours. I was told there were 800,000 trained gymnasts in Russia.

"In Gori * * * I witnessed a volleyball tournament. It was only a district tournament, but 900 teams took part. The courts were hewn out of the forestlands by the players themselves. I saw volleyball courts even on hospital grounds.

"At Kiev, the capital of the Ukraine, they told me there were 60,000 soccer-football teams in the Ukraine alone, 5,000 of them good quality. Also at Kiev, on a hill adjoining a large stadium in the center of the city, there was a ski jump. There was one in Moscow, too, the first one I had ever seen in the heart of a city.

"Thousands of soccer-football fields are spotted throughout the country. Kroutchev Stadium in Kiev seats 70,000. Kirov Stadium in Leningrad has space for 100,000 and is about to be enlarged. Primitive running tracks are found even in small hamlets on the steppes.

"Once, during an informal conversation with a group of Soviet sport officials, I asked how many track-and-field athletes Russia had in training. 'Four million,' was the reply. I thought the question had been misunderstood, so I repeated it to the interpreter, saying that I meant track-and-field athletes alone. 'That's right,' the official repeated blandly. 'Four million.' "

These 4 million, mind you, are only the track-and-field athletes. There are millions more. In fact, it has been estimated that Russia has a reservoir of 12 million athletes.

Acquainted as we are with the Soviet tactic in every phase of man's existence behind the Iron Curtain, what further evidence do we need that the Soviet Union is a highly organized, mass training ground for 12 million professional athlets?

This deplorable situation can be better appreciated, perhaps by citing an example.

Suppose that universal military training was enacted into law in the United States.

Imagine, if you can, millions of American boys drafted into the service and the huskiest and strongest of them being subjected to an unremitting rigorous training program in specialized athletics to the exclusion of military training.

Picture the best of these boys being sent to the Olympic games like so many pawns of the Government with strict orders to win for the greater glory of the Republican or Democratic Party, or suffer dishonorable discharges and exile to the barren wastelands of Alaska.

I ask you, would such a practice be even remotely in keeping with the honored traditions of the Olympic games?

Would not such a practice, in fact, be equal to barefaced ridicule of everything that we hold sacred and honorable?

Would not such an eventuality, in fact, be tantamount to a national insult to every honestly motivated athlete participating?

And yet, this is only a mild example of the extent to which the Russians have gone in their mad drive to dominate the 1956 Olympic games.

What further evidence do we need that the atheistic masters of the Kremlin are flagrantly violating the principle of the Olympic games when we consider that these 12 million athletes are trained from childhood to adolescence, like performers for a circus, and to young manhood and womanhood?

The Government of the Soviet Union, through its All Union Committee on Physical Culture and Sports, which is a cabinet ministry, selects its topflight contestants for the Olympic games from these automatons trained from the cradle.

Let me review the process step by step:

The Government of the Soviet Union moves with a fine-tooth comb through the teen-age youth of the land, extracting the best 12-year-olds for some 400 children's sports schools. At 17 the best of these are graduated to youth sports schools. I doubt whether we have anything comparable to it even in our professional system. From these advanced institutions come the Soviet athletic stars. There is a Soviet humor magazine called Krokodil. It is almost the only instance I have ever known where the Communists kid the Communists. This periodical takes a jibe at the fact that Soviet athletes, who are supposed to have what the humor magazine laughingly calls jobs, actually spend all their time practicing up on their sports specialty. Their training remains uninterrupted through the winter months when, like well-cared-for Soviet animal stock, they are shipped south. In the spring they may be seen on the beaches of the Russian Black Sea resort of Sochi. The training is unremitting, severe, under constant surveillance, endlessly repeated, to the point of fingertip perfection. The hand of Government possession, direction, compulsion is everywhere.

This is clearly in violation of Olympic rules.

Since World War II the Soviet Union has intensified its athletic program by direct command from the Central Committee of the Communit Party. Against the policy of abusing losers it has the balancing policy of glorifying winners. The champions are honored, privileged, envied. They have a title:

"Honored Master of Sports." The Soviet of Ministers of the U. S. S. R. on July 2, 1947, issued a decree providing for gold, silver, and bronze medals. By January 1, 1954, more than 10,000 medals had been awarded. Of these 1,529 were gold and 3,494 were silver. The point I make is that athletics in the Soviet Union is a tight Government-controlled institution and that every facet of it seems to me to be a denial of the principle of amateur athletics, and on the contrary, characteristic of established professionalism. A Russian athlete who goes through the Soviet screening process for admission to international contests is by any standard you wish to set up a professional in the most absolute sense.

In all of this unrelaxed, hard-hitting, wickedly single-purpose drive for professional flawlessness, at what are the Soviet leaders in the Kremlin aiming?

They are aiming at the 1956 Olympics.

They are committed by their literature, by their Marxist ideology, by their passion for world domination—domination in athletics today, domination in world conquest tomorrow, to win. To win by fair means or foul.

Make no mistake about it, the Soviets are not interested in games.

They are not interested in sports.

The principles of fair play and honest, competitive endeavor are completely alien to the Communist ideology.

Tolerance by the free world—and, more particularly, by the United States to which the free world looks for leadership—of such violations of the basic theory of the Olympic games constitutes abject negation of the principles and purposes of these great international classics.

Our problem, as I see it, is twofold.

It calls not for mass moaning, but a hard-hitting, realistic, and constructive approach.

In the first place, we must insist that the Soviets respect the rules of the Olympic games.

We must insist on our freedom from being defrauded once again by the Soviet.

We must do it now.

To wait until after 1956 will be too late.

For, if their push-botton athletes run away with all the honors in 1956 and we then start complaining that they have not abided by the rules, we will be providing them with a razor-sharp, double-edged propaganda sword with which to run us through.

The winning Russian athlete will be flaunted as a symbol of strength, clean living, fun, and fair play; the end result of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The complaining Americans will be ruthlessly propagandized as inferior products of a decadent, capitalistic system, incapable of winning over the Russian athlete and a poor loser to boot.

I repeat: We must seize the initiative. We must lay open for all the world to see, what was referred to in an article in the U. S. News & World Report as a "big, grim, production line business, run from grade school to Olympic track, by that supercoach, the (Russian) state."

Mr. Avery Brundage, in honestly and ably reporting what he found behind the Iron Curtain, has rendered a significant service not only to the cause of sportsmanship, but the cause of peace.

We in Government, and lay people in all walks of American life—if we are to remain true to our athletes—must back him up in exposing this gigantic Russian fraud.

We must do it now while there is yet time.

By so doing, and because we have right on our side, we can make this huge propaganda effort of the Soviets serve our purpose instead of theirs.

They can be made to look ridiculous in the eyes of the world.

Let us not forget that Americans chalked up an amazing record of performance at the 1952 Olympic games, held at Helsinki, Finland, because our free system of Government and vast network of higher education paves the way to athletic excellence.

The Russians have had to organize shock-troops numbering 12 million and to violate every rule of the game to even get into our league.

I am supremely confident that the good sense of the American people and the peoples of the free world, if these facts are adequately publicized, will prevail, and that they will see this diabolically conceived hoax for what it is.

The second problem, as I see it, which faces us today, is the decline of interest in this Nation for participation in amateur athletics.

Mr. Brundage, in the aforementioned article, said:

"As I watched those thousands of husky, healthy Soviet boys and girls performing in Moscow last July, I thought of the 42-percent draft rejections back in the United States. I thought of American youth enjoying the superior advantages and the greater privileges offered by the country with the most freedom and the highest standard of living in the world, and at the same time subject to all the temptations to grow soft and flabby from too easy living, too much amusement, too many automobiles and television sets. I thought of their need for sound guidance and wise leadership, and I wondered what was going to happen in the games of the XVI Olympiad, at Melbourne."

Mr. Brundage has wisely sounded the warning.

I call upon everyone—the press, radio, Government, educators, and lay people in general, who are interested in the great principles engendered by amateur athletics, to act now to expose the deceit of the Soviet Union and emphasize our own deficiencies in amateur athletics.

We will be helping to develop initiative, resourcefulness, self reliance, tolerance, good judgment, self-discipline, a sense of responsibility, and a broader viewpoint in the youth of the world.

These are the principles which will form the foundation for world peace and we will, therefore, immeasurably aid that great cause.

Remember, the Russians are out to win in 1956.

They are out to win not only the Olympic games, but a great propaganda battle.

Whether or not they do is entirely up to us.

To fail in this duty which devolves equally upon each of us will be to fail our youth and the future which is theirs.

Address by Hon. Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, at Big Seven Regional Meeting of the American Bar Association

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine address delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] before the American Bar Association's Big Seven regional meeting in Cincinnati, Ohio, on last Friday evening, June 10, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. STROM THURMOND TO THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION'S BIG SEVEN REGIONAL MEETING AT THE NETHERLAND PLAZA HOTEL IN CINCINNATI, OHIO, JUNE 10, 1955

Optimism is a general characteristic of the American people. This is true of the individual American and it has been true also of America as a nation.

I am glad we have retained this optimism, in spite of our experiences which have proved that we must be strong militarily. Optimism is good, but it must be tempered by experience.

Our experience in the realm of international affairs has, or should have, taught us that preparedness is a prime requisite for dealing with nations that are apparently less concerned with peace than we are.

As our President plans to meet with the Prime Ministers of England, France, and Russia we should temper our optimism with the salt of past experience.

We should not, and must not, expect all our difficulties with other nations to be resolved by this meeting. Rather, we should expect little and be grateful for any small successes attained.

Winston Churchill was realistic regarding England's relations with Russia in 1941, even as he joined hands with Stalin to fight Hitler as a common enemy. When Hitler disregarded their treaty of 2 years and invaded Russia, this is what Churchill told Britain:

"No one has been a more consistent opponent of communism than I have been for the last 25 years. I will unsay no word that I have spoken about it." But, he continued, "Any man or state who fights on against nazidom will have our aid."

President Eisenhower also knows the Russian by experience. He has expressed a realistic view of the proposed meeting of the Big Four.

On May 11, the President told his news conference:

"Trying to reach a clarification of issues, if such a thing is possible, is so important that you can't stand on any other principle except to do your utmost as you preserve your own strength of position, as long as you are not sacrificing, as long as you are not expecting too much."

That is realistic. The United States and a world that desires lasting peace would gain nothing if we go into the Big Four meeting expecting too much, and, consequently, concede too much, in an effort to arrive at an agreement which in the end might be worse than no agreement at all.

Our people should be united behind our President in his efforts for world peace. Partisan politics must be kept out. World peace is more important than any political party.

As we discuss this search for peace, let us review our relations with Russia.

Russia's Bolsheviks chose the height of World War I to seize the Government. This permitted the Germans to withdraw troops from the eastern front in November 1917 and to intensify her attacks on the West.

But on January 9, 1918, when President Wilson announced his 14 points as a basis for peace, he included Russia. His sixth point provided for the "evacuation of Russian territory and the independent determination by Russia of her own political development and national policy."

Outside interference has not prevented Russian self-determination. But the Communists have never been willing for other peoples to have the same right.

In the 15 years between the end of World War I and diplomatic recognition of Russia

in 1933, the Soviets transformed a weak government, born in revolution, into a strong and aggressive dictatorship under Stalin. Even then the Communists had infiltrated other nations of the world.

But in the agreement under which the United States extended diplomatic recognition, Russia agreed to "restrain all persons * * * under its direct or indirect control * * * from any agitation or propaganda having as an aim * * * the bringing about by force of a change in the political or social order of the United States."

Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, soon reported "evidence of violations" and such evidence has continued even to this date. Such bad faith on the part of Russia is the cause of continuing world tension.

All of us recall the disbelief and horror with which we heard in 1939 of the Soviet invasion of Poland and Finland. However, at that time the actions of the Soviets were somewhat subordinated by Hitler's invasions of Poland, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, and France. To us the greater danger at that time was the madman in Germany.

When Hitler attacked his ally, Russia, in 1941, we thought the Soviets would soon fold up as the Czar's army had in 1917. But, as the war progressed, we realized that Hitler had taken on a tough and ruthless foe.

On August 14, 1941, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill signed the Atlantic Charter. It embodied what came to be known as the four freedoms: Freedom of speech and religion and freedom from want and fear. The United States and Great Britain pledged themselves to fight for those rights for all peoples, and to seek the establishment of peace on that basis. Territorial rights and self-determination were guaranteed to all nations.

The Atlantic Charter stood as a beacon of hope to all subjugated peoples, and Russia subscribed to the principles of the charter in a joint declaration on January 1, 1942, of the United Nations fighting against Germany.

Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin met in Teheran in November and December 1943. They issued a statement on December 6 which declared:

"The Governments of the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom are at one with the Government of Iran in the desire for the maintenance of the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Iran."

Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin met next at Yalta, and following that conference, issued a report on February 12, 1945, which said in part:

"Our meeting here in the Crimea has reaffirmed our common determination to maintain and strengthen in the peace to come that unity of purpose and of action which has made victory possible and certain for the United Nations in this war. We believe that this is a sacred obligation which our governments owe to our peoples and to all the peoples of the world."

At Yalta, Stalin also joined in a reaffirmation of the principles stated in the Atlantic Charter.

On July 17, 1945, after the defeat of Germany, President Truman, and Prime Ministers Stalin and Churchill met in Potsdam. After the British elections, Mr. Attlee, who had accompanied Churchill, replaced him. Also present were Foreign Secretaries Byrnes, Eden, and Molotov.

Again stating their unanimity of purpose, the Big Three issued a report saying:

"* * * It is the intention of the Allies that the German people be given the opportunity to prepare for the eventual reconstruction of their life on a democratic and peaceful basis. If their own efforts are steadily directed to this end, it will be possible for them in due course to take their place among the free and peaceful peoples of the world."

This agreement pledged that "all democratic political parties with rights of assembly and of public discussion shall be allowed and encouraged throughout Germany." A Council of Foreign Ministers was established for the purpose of doing the necessary preparatory work for the peace settlements with Germany and her allies.

The conference took up many other important questions: unification of Austria, the Polish frontier, reparations, the desirability of concluding peace treaties with Italy, Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary and Rumania, the withdrawal of troops from Iran, etc.

On July 26, 1945, during the Potsdam Conference, the Big Three issued a proclamation calling on Japan to surrender and setting forth the terms. The meeting ended on August 2, and the Soviets declared war on Japan 6 days later. That was 2 days after the first atomic bomb had been dropped on Japan.

Russia, in her declaration of war on Japan, became a party to the terms of surrender which had stated the determination of the Allies to carry out the terms of the Cairo Agreement. The Cairo Agreement had been entered into by Roosevelt, Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek in November 1943. It said in part:

"The United States, Great Britain, and China are fighting this war to restrain and punish the aggression of Japan. * * * It is their purpose that Japan shall be stripped of all the islands in the Pacific which she has seized or occupied since the beginning of the first World War in 1914, and that all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China. * * * The aforesaid three great powers, minful of the enslavement of the people of Korea, are determined that in due course Korea shall become free and independent."

In December 1945, Secretary of State Byrnes and Foreign Ministers Bevin of Great Britain and Molotov of Russia met in Moscow. At this first meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers, they reached agreement on the preparation of peace treaties with Italy, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Finland.

They also agreed on the establishment of a Far Eastern Commission and Allied Council for Japan. The principal function of this Commission was to "formulate the policies, principles, and standards in conformity with which the fulfillment by Japan of its obligations under the terms of surrender" might be accomplished.

Korea was specifically provided for by the establishment of a Joint Commission "with a view to the reestablishment of Korea as an independent state, the creation of conditions for developing the country on democratic principles, and the earliest possible liquidation of the disastrous results of the protracted Japanese domination in Korea, there shall be set up a provisional Korean democratic government * * *." The Commission was charged with "assisting * * * the establishment of the national independence of Korea."

On China, the Foreign Ministers agreed "as to the need for a unified and democratic China under the National Government * * *. They reaffirmed their adherence to the policy of noninterference in the internal affairs of China."

In that same report of December 27, 1945, Foreign Secretaries Byrnes, Bevin, and Molotov recommended that the United Nations General Assembly establish a Commission "to deal with the problems raised by the discovery of atomic energy and other related matters." Specified in this proposal was the establishment of "effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means to protect complying states against the hazards of violations and evasions."

At the London meeting of the United Nations General Assembly in January 1946, the resolution for the establishment of a U. N. Commission on control of atomic energy was adopted unanimously—Russia included.

But even while the Soviets were making agreements, they were in the process of breaking them.

In spite of her pledge in 1943 to respect the territorial integrity of Iran and in spite of a treaty of 1927 between Iran and Russia, the Soviets violated their pledges by refusing to withdraw troops from Iran at the end of World War II. The Soviets would not respond to reminders and persuasion. Secretary of State Byrnes, speaking for the United States in the United Nations Security Council in January 1946, denounced the failure of Russia to comply with her agreement.

Only then, under pressure and possible fear of direct action, did Russia remove her troops. But, the Soviets continued to broadcast vicious attacks on the Iranian Government in support of the Azerbaijan sepratists and the illegal Tudeh party.

In Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania, Russia has violated directly and indirectly many agreements and provisions of the Balkan Treaties, which were ratified September 15, 1947. The Soviets have in many instances condoned, and in others abetted, violations of the treaties and the Moscow Agreement. Russia has made these countries her satellites.

In Poland, the situation has been much the same. The Polish election of 1947 fully bore out the fears our observers had expressed prior to the voting. Of the 444 deputies elected to the Parliament, only 28 places were secured by the Polish Peasant Party, which is believed to represent a majority of the people.

The Communists also have tried to subvert larger governments, like Italy and France, since the end of World War II.

What happened in Korea is too recent and too sorry a story to require details. Soviet support of the so-called Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea above the 38th parallel cost the lives of thousands of American fighting men in the war launched under Soviet sponsorship in 1950. Russia has completely disregarded her obligations of the Cairo and Moscow agreements to permit the Koreans unity and self-government.

Russia has refused to comply with many obligations in the Far East including those toward Japan. So, in 1951 the United States concluded a separate peace treaty with Japan. Only in recent days has Russia been courting Japanese favor in conferences in London. The Japanese should demand full explanation of what happened to the 369,000 prisoners taken by Russia.

Russia left substantial military supplies to the Communists in Manchuria after the short period in which she participated in the Pacific war. Nationalist China, therefore, owes no thanks to Russia for the aid which helped the Reds take over the government. Apparently Russia's pledge in the 1945 declaration from Potsdam to restore the Pescadores and Formosa to the Nationalist Government means nothing to the Soviets in view of recent threats by the Red Chinese to seize these islands.

Developments in Europe also are of vital concern to us as we look toward the Big Four meeting on July 18.

In Germany we tried for nearly 10 years to have Russia agree to establish a unified nation under a democratic government. They refused every plea. They tried to force us out of Berlin and failed only because of the success of the airlift in 1948. The conclusion of a peace treaty with West Germany by the United States and France

has awakened the Soviets. Chancellor Adenauer has been invited to Moscow to discuss "normalization of relations" between Germany and Russia. The invitation also indicates the Soviets are now willing to consider the unification of Germany.

We can only conclude that our treaty with West Germany spurred the Soviets to action in an effort to neutralize all of Germany. Our treaty with Germany also was the probable cause of Russia's willingness to sign an Austrian Treaty.

Previously Russia resisted for nearly 10 years all efforts of the United States and the United Nations to end the occupation of Austria by conclusion of a peace treaty. Again the evident purpose of her sudden agreement was to create a neutral state and prevent our making a separate treaty with Austria.

Only 2 weeks ago Russian Communist Party Chief Khrushchev and Premier Bulganin flew to Yugoslavia to mend relations with the independent Communist state. At the end of the visit there was little to comfort the United States in the official statements issued from Belgrade. Certainly the gap between Russia and Yugoslavia was narrowed and not widened by the bowing and scraping of the top Communists to Tito.

We have provided nearly a billion dollars in aid to Tito since 1948. There is no justification for us to continue to supply the military machine of any Communist dictator unless he pledges himself as an ally. Spenders of our funds must also be defenders of our position in world affairs.

An effort has been made to lull us into optimism during the past 10 days by the release of the American airmen who had been held in Red China. We owe no gratitude to the Red Chinese for "trying and expelling" these men. Red China slaughtered thousands of Americans in Korea who would have lived had not the Reds supplied North Korea and sent troops to help our foe.

In view of the violations I have cited and many others by the Soviets, what course must we follow at the Big Four meeting?

1. We must not be led into making concessions which might be construed to violate any of the agreements or treaties to which we are a party.

2. We must not consent to any new agreements which have any possibility of being labeled as appeasement.

3. We should not consider the admission of Red China to membership in the United Nations. The Chinese Communists seized China by force and have denied self-determination to the Chinese. The Reds could not have done this without outside assistance. Russia should be reminded of her obligations under the Cairo and Potsdam agreements that Formosa and the Pescadores belong to Nationalist China.

4. We must again call upon Russia to join us in restoring unity and political self-determination to Germany, Korea, and the satellite nations.

5. We must exercise the utmost care in dealing with the Soviets on the subject of atomic energy. On December 27, 1945, Secretaries Byrnes, Bevin, and Molotov issued their report from the Second Moscow Conference recommending the establishment of a United Nations Commission for international control of atomic energy. The following January, in London, the U. N. established the Commission.

Then, on June 14, 1946, Mr. Bernard Baruch presented the proposal of the United States to create an International Development Authority, which would control the development of atomic energy by a system of inspection.

Through 6 months and 70 meetings, the U. N. Commission and its committees sought the cooperation of the Soviets. Finally, the plan was presented to the Security Council, in spite of the lack of cooperation. The vote was 10 to 0 in favor of the Baruch plan with Russia and Poland abstaining.

Because of Soviet noncooperation, we are as far from agreement with the Russians on international control and development of atomic energy as we were 9 years ago.

We must be sure that any plan the Soviets might propose on this subject now is not a trap. Only through the right of international inspection of the facilities of all nations could we hope to have real control of atomic energy. We must emphasize this point over and over to the world.

6. The United States should insist that the meetings at the Conference of the Big Four be open to representatives of all news media. The peoples of the world whose fate is at stake have the right to know all the Big Four does.

We cannot prevent the Soviets from breaking the agreements they make with us and other nations. But we can and must establish safeguards around the Conference, to make certain the world knows just what is agreed to at the meeting, or why no decision is reached, if none is.

We have gained nothing by secrecy in dealing with other nations. I believe we have lost prestige. Little nations have suspected and accused the large nations of having no interest except self-interest. We still argue over the results of some such conferences.

Open meetings would protect our representatives against charges based on lack of knowledge of what happened at the Conference.

When Woodrow Wilson announced his 14 points, he called first for "open covenants, openly arrived at."

History should have taught us that had we always followed this policy, we would not have been so vulnerable to the propaganda attacks of our enemies. Military security is the one justification for secrecy. Military security is not a consideration at the Big Four meetings. Russia will know all that is said and done. The world should know. If Russia dooms the Conference to failure, the world should have no doubt as to where the responsibility lies.

We do not know how much time is left to us to attain a basis for world peace or, failing, face atomic war. The United States must always be willing to negotiate for peace and a better world. There is no doubt this is the objective of the President as he approaches the Big Four Conference. If any step can be taken on the road to enduring peace, I am confident that he will lead us on that road, in spite of the barriers which have been erected by the Communists since our alliance with them in World War II.

Commencement Day Address by American Legion National Commander Seaborn P. Collins at FBI National Academy Graduation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address delivered by National Commander Seaborn P. Collins, of the American Legion, at the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy graduation exercises, in Washington, D. C., on June 10, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY NATIONAL COMMANDER SEABORN P. COLLINS OF THE AMERICAN LEGION BEFORE THE FBI NATIONAL ACADEMY GRADUATION, DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AUDITORIUM, WASHINGTON, D. C., JUNE 10, 1955

I am very proud and grateful to have a part in these graduation exercises marking the end of another chapter in the history of the FBI Academy.

The privilege of addressing you graduates of the Academy is a great personal honor, which I deeply appreciate. Fundamentally, however, it is a tribute to the American Legion, and to the active interest which our organization has traditionally demonstrated in law enforcement.

When he invited me to speak to you this morning, the distinguished Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation was, in fact, inviting the American Legion to this program. His generosity and courtesy reciprocate the pride and the interest of every American legionnaire in the FBI.

I want to extend to each of you graduates the sincere congratulations of the American Legion. The fact that you were selected to attend the Academy is in itself recognition of the fine service you have already rendered your communities. More important, perhaps, it indicates the confidence and esteem in which you are held by your superiors and by the people whom you serve.

Now you have completed a difficult training course, and you are even better qualified to do your jobs back home. You and your families have every reason to be proud of this latest achievement, for the instruction you have received here and the use you make of it will benefit not so much you as individuals or the FBI but every citizen of the United States who looks to you and your colleagues for protection under the law.

Yours is an honored profession. There was a time, you know, when many Americans foolishly regarded police work as a necessary evil. Today, most of us have a clearer and more sensible appreciation of your work. We see it as a necessary good, a public service which requires and deserves the support of all the people. Most of us also recognize that the lion's share of credit for this change of attitude goes to you and to the FBI who have developed improved techniques of crime detection and a thoroughly responsible approach to its problems.

Here in America we have government of laws. But they are laws created by men and women dedicated to protecting the dignity of the individual and his God-given inalienable rights which form the cornerstone of our freedoms.

You in turn are dedicating your lives to enforcing and upholding these laws. The importance of your mission is clearly expressed in these words of Mr. Hoover's introduction to "The Story of the FBI National Academy."

"The badge of a law enforcement officer is a sacred trust which must be guarded with his whole mind and his whole body, for it is his to hold only while he lives a life beyond all reproach and censure.

"The law enforcement officer is the guardian of civil rights, the protector of the weak, and the defender of the innocent."

He is the living symbol of the FBI's motto: "Fidelity, Bravery, Integrity."

Few of us in the American Legion have had the opportunity to share your firsthand knowledge of the FBI: its organization, operations, duties, and activities. Nor do we know from personal experience how your own police organizations operate. Yet, we feel that we are your partner and the partner of the FBI. Not just a silent partner, but an active, interested, cooperating force in

your efforts to make law enforcement in America ever more effective and efficient.

This morning, I'd like to report to you on the manner in which the American Legion is carrying out its responsibilities as a partner of a nationwide law enforcement system. I'd like you to know what legionnaires are doing and will try to do to help you, the FBI and all of the men and women who, together, make up the country's law enforcement system.

The security of our Nation is threatened today by subversion from within as well as by aggression from without. This threat is not new. Communism has been a cancer in the bloodstream of America since the end of World War I.

From our very beginning as an organization of citizen-soldiers pledged to the service of God and country, the American Legion has recognized the insidious evil that is communism. Long before our fellow citizens awoke to the danger, the American Legion learned that this conspiracy would stop at nothing, not even murder, to achieve its purposes.

On November 11, 1919, in Centralia, Wash., the American Legion was participating in an Armistice Day parade when a group of radicals, known as the Industrial Workers of the World, fired from ambush into the ranks of marching Legionnaires. Four men were killed. This unprovoked, cowardly attack unquestionably was prompted by the knowledge that the Legion stood for those things which the IWW detested—patriotism and loyalty to country.

This was our baptism of fire in the fight against communism. This was the first challenge to the American Legion's fidelity, bravery, and integrity—to those qualities which compelled us to pledge in the preamble of our Constitution "to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America" and "to foster and perpetuate a 100-percent Americanism."

The Communist challenge has become bolder and more constant since that time. So has the American Legion's defiant, dedicated opposition to communism and to everything for which it stands.

Our position has not always been a popular one. Even today, apparently, in some other free countries it is not considered politically expedient to speak out against communism.

We have endeavored to function as a helpful ally of the FBI in this fight against subversion. Mr. Hoover has been gracious enough to publicly acknowledge the voluntary assistance which his agency has received from thousands of American Legion posts.

This service took a very practical form prior to and during World War II, when enemy agents operated a sizable fifth column dealing in sabotage and other disloyal acts.

Legion posts, particularly during the early war years, served as listening posts, relaying information which helped the FBI round up and isolate subversives—in every case before damage was done. Since World War II our people have continued to work closely with the FBI.

We do this because we believe it is our duty as citizens to report to proper authorities information which might facilitate their assigned work of guarding the internal security of the country. We do it, not because we imagine ourselves to be vigilantes or self-appointed security officers but because we believe subversion is everybody's concern.

The first responsibility for combating un-American activities rests, of course, with the courts and the Congress, with the FBI and State and local law-enforcement officers. The Communist agents in this country are professional traitors, trained in the science of infiltration and propaganda. On our side professionals trained to cope with them must bear the heavy burden.

What too many people still do not realize, however, is that the Red firing line is everywhere—that the real danger comes not entirely from the "hard core" of 20,000 or 30,000 party members but, as Director Hoover recently pointed out, from the 200,000 to 300,000 Americans ready to do the party's work.

These individuals and their influence are active in our schools and churches, our places of business and entertainment * * * through literature and other media, even in our homes. The prize they are after is not a system called capitalism, but your freedom and mine * * * and if we want to keep our liberty, then we must take a personal interest and a personal responsibility for its defense.

We of the American Legion pass judgment on no man except as his record invites judgment. We submit that when an individual joins a string of organizations which the Attorney General of the United States has declared to be subversive, when he contributes his money to Communist programs, and permits his name to be used in Communist propaganda, then the facts should be made public and the people can arrive at their own conclusions as to where and how he stands in American society.

That's why we support the right of congressional committees to investigate subversive activities. That's why we support the FBI's magnificent work in this field. God forbid that a majority of the American people ever should become so confused or indifferent as to seriously hamper the investigative work of either the Congress or the FBI.

There is another American Legion program which I think bears directly on your difficult task. That is our "back to God" program.

Respect for law, for the rights of others, and for the God-given, sublime dignity of man cannot exist where there is no respect for and love of God. We must first recognize our dependence upon God and our obligation to obey His laws before we will subordinate our lives to the good of our fellow citizens and to the laws of man.

The American Legion's "back to God" program recognizes this. It reflects, too, our realization that the power and providence of Almighty God are inseparably related to the prosperity and security of America. As a nation and as individuals we must acknowledge our dependence upon God and realize that such acknowledgment is essential to the preservation of our liberties and our civilization.

Our program is intended to keep America close to God * * * to insure that we shall always have the wisdom and the fortitude and the ability to keep America a nation under God.

What too many people still do not realize, however, is that the Red firing line is everywhere—that the real danger comes not entirely from the hard core of twenty or thirty thousand Party members but, as Director Hoover recently pointed out, from the two hundred to three hundred thousand Americans ready to do the party's work.

These individuals and their influence are active in our schools and churches, our places of business and entertainment, through literature and other media, even in our homes. The prize they are after is not a system called capitalism, but your freedom and mine, and if we want to keep our liberty, then we must take a personal interest and a personal responsibility for its defense.

We of the American Legion pass judgment on no man except as his record invites judgment. We submit that when an individual joins a string of organizations which the Attorney General of the United States has declared to be subversive, when he contributes his money to Communist programs and permits his name to be used in Communist propaganda, then the facts should be made public and the people can arrive at their own conclusions as to where and how he stands in American society.

That's way we support the right of congressional committees to investigate subversive activities. That's why we support the FBI's magnificent work in this field. God forbid that a majority of the American people ever should become so confused or indifferent as to seriously hamper the investigative work of either the Congress or the FBI.

There is another American Legion program which I think bears directly on your difficult task. That is our "back to God" program.

Respect for law, for the rights of others, and for the God-given, sublime dignity of man cannot exist where there is no respect for and love of God. We must first recognize our dependence upon God and our obligation to obey His laws before we will subordinate our lives to the good of our fellow citizens and to the laws of man.

The American Legion's "back to God" program recognizes this. It reflects, too, our realization that the power and providence of Almighty God are inseparably related to the prosperity and security of America. As a nation and as individuals we must acknowledge our dependence upon God and realize that such acknowledgment is essential to the preservation of our liberties and our civilization.

Our program is intended to keep America close to God, to insure that we shall always have the wisdom and the fortitude and the ability to keep America a nation under God.

Recently I had the opportunity of discussing with Mr. Hoover some of the big, current problems involved in law enforcement. He emphasized on that occasion his personal concern with the still-growing problem of crime among the youngsters of the Nation * * * and the great importance of countering this trend in every possible way.

The American Legion also has a sharp awareness of the situation. That's why we devote so much of our time and energy to positive youth opportunity programs that encourage boys and girls to develop a sense of fairness and justice and individual responsibility to their society. Through programs like American Legion junior baseball, oratorical contests, boys' state, and school-achievement awards, our Legion posts seek to give youngsters an appreciation of citizenship and a chance to spend their free time in wholesome and healthy activities. More than a million and a half teen-agers are participating in these programs during 1955. We only regret that we have not yet been able to expand them to the point where every boy and girl can take part.

You and I know that in many cases the trouble starts long before a youngster reaches teen-age. There is no substitute for good home training which teaches children to respect authority and submit to discipline. For that reason, we are placing more and more stress in our child welfare activities, on the responsibility of parents and the community's obligation to provide guidance and help for children whose home life is not adequate.

During the past 12 weeks you have covered a great many subjects. During the past 12 minutes or more, I've covered quite a few. I'm not trying to establish any record, but there is one more important subject which I would like to touch on this morning.

The security of your community is your job. It's also the concern of the American Legion. America will never be really secure * * * no matter how well you do your job * * * no matter how effective the FBI * * * until our Armed Forces and our foreign policy are strong enough and dynamic enough to meet the Communist threat on these fronts.

In a matter of weeks, our strength will be tested at "the summit." The American Legion has no illusions as to the outcome

of the Big Four conference. We agree that no honorable opportunity to resolve the critical problems of the cold war at the conference table should be overlooked. At the same time, however, we feel that the forthcoming conference can serve our interests only if President Eisenhower is permitted to deal from a position of maximum strength. At worst, it could blueprint for the Kremlin the weaknesses and lack of resolve among the leaders of the free world.

I'm sure that no group of citizens is more interested in this conference and its outcome than are you. No group knows better than you that at this game, the stakes are going to be high and no one is going to be able to stay in the game by bluffing.

President Eisenhower has some pretty good cards already lined up. But he needs more. It's up to Congress to give him the cards he needs, particularly in the area of national defense. I believe that unless Congress approves the national security training-military reserve program, which only this week was strongly urged by the President himself, President Eisenhower is going to carry into the game at the summit, a deck of cards that is short on aces.

Make no mistake, the leaders of the Kremlin will know exactly the cards in every hand. They will respect strength—not words. I hope the Congress will recognize this fact and act promptly to give us an effective peacetime military reserve.

I have enjoyed more than I can say the privilege of addressing these graduation ceremonies. Now may I extend to each of you the American Legion's heartiest congratulations on the completion of a very exacting but a very wonderful course. Good luck as you go back to your organizations. I know that you will fulfill the highest expectations of those who chose you to come here, of those who trained you, and of those who will benefit from your knowledge and experience as graduates of the FBI National Academy.

What Is an American?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, June 14 has been proclaimed by our President to be Flag Day. On this particular day we pay special honor to our flag, which symbolizes the history, the ideals, and the strength of America.

Every day should be Flag Day for a patriotic citizen, but it has become the accepted pattern to set aside certain days as periods of special commemoration. Flag Day reminds us Americans of our responsibilities as American citizens.

Recently there was brought to my attention a splendid article entitled "What Is an American?", written by the Reverend Harold W. Ruopp, of the Minnesota Council of Churches, and published in the Christian Advocate of July 1, 1954. The article is a beautiful definition of Americanism and a splendid definition of what it means to be an American.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS AN AMERICAN
(By Harold W. Ruopp)

An American is one who believes in the right of men and women—of whatever creed, class, color, or ancestry—to live as human beings with the dignity becoming the children of God.

An American is one who believes in the right to be free; free not only from crushing coercions and dictatorships and regimentation, but free for that way of life where men may think and speak as they choose and worship God as they see fit.

An American is one who believes in the right to vote, the right to work, the right to learn, the right to live, and—what is equally important—the right to be different; for he knows that if we ever lose our right to be different, we lose our right to be free.

An American is one who believes in democracy, not only for himself, but for all his fellow-Americans, and by democracy he means not simply the rule of the majority, but the rights of minorities—and those minorities have rights not because they are minorities, but because they are human beings.

An American is one who believes in the responsibility of privilege. What he asks for himself, he is willing to grant to others; what he demands from others, he is willing to give himself. His creed is not alone, "Live and let live," but, "Live and help live."

An American is one who acts from faith in others, not fear of others; from understanding, not prejudice; from good will, not hatred. To bigotry he gives no sanction; to intolerance, no support.

The only question the true American ever asks is not, "Are you a Protestant or Catholic, gentile or Jew, white or colored?" but, "Are you an American? If you are, then give me your hand for I am an American too."

Ideas Leap Frontiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on June 6 of this year, Sir Leslie Munroe, Ambassador from New Zealand to this country, delivered the commencement address at the University of Omaha, in my home city. The address was very well received. Sir Leslie's visit there was likewise productive of a great deal of friendly feeling and better understanding on the part of our folks there toward the country which is represented by Sir Leslie. We were fortunate and highly privileged by reason of his visit. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address which he delivered on that occasion, which is entitled, "Ideas Leap Frontiers."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IDEAS LEAP FRONTIERS

One rather unusual characteristic which is shared by Nebraska and New Zealand is that we both have unicameral legislatures. We have, however, a great deal more in common, for we are both sprung from European stock and in our separate frontier societies we have largely maintained (though not without modification) European ideas of justice and liberty.

There should be nothing surprising, therefore, to a Nebraskan or New Zealander in the assertion that ideas spread from country to country.

The 17th Century colonists brought to this land principles of representative government which were already of sturdy growth in England. Whether they came to escape the repressions of the King, Parliament, or Church, or simply to carve their fortunes in the New World, they were for the most part determined that in their colonies these principles should be accepted. The Atlantic proved no barrier to the spread of ideas from Britain and the continent. On the contrary, those who crossed it became only the more determined to curb an executive appointed by the Crown and its advisers in London.

A century later those convictions were expressed in the Revolutionary War—at least the slogan "no taxation without representation" expressed one aspect of the war. As you know, the French contributed troops to the force which surrounded Cornwallis at Yorktown, and so they played an important part in winning your independence. Louis XVI eventually regretted the intervention. Indeed, M. de Vergennes, Louis XVI's Minister, had previously profound misgivings about the wisdom of intervention, and had written with prophetic anxiety:

"Far from seeking to profit by the embarrassment in which England finds herself on account of affairs in America, we should rather desire to extricate her. The spirit of revolt, in whatever spot it breaks out, is always of dangerous precedent; it is with moral as with physical diseases, both may become contagious. This consideration should induce us to take care that the spirit of independence, which is causing so terrible an explosion in North America, has no power to communicate itself to points interesting to us in this hemisphere."

Probably de Vergennes lived to regret that he had succumbed to the temptation to twist the lion's tail, for many historians believe that the triumph of the American colonists had a profound effect on the course of French history and that the ideas espoused by Washington and his colleagues, spread to France and played their part in the immense upheaval of the French Revolution.

In the 19th century, of course, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand obtained from a not too unwilling government in England first representative and then responsible government; by the end of the century they had achieved what we call dominion status. This, I would remind you, was remarkably like a suggestion put forward by Benjamin Franklin, Wilson, and John Adams before the War of Independence, that the colonies (of the American seaboard) should have separate parliaments but should be united by a tie of common allegiance to the Crown. This forerunner of the present conception of the British Commonwealth of Nations was thus born in your country before the Declaration of Independence and has lived to flourish mightily.

But I should like to return for a moment to that quotation from de Vergennes. You will remember that he said: "The spirit of revolt * * * is always of dangerous precedent; it is with moral as with physical diseases, both may become contagious." The moral disease we have to combat today is communism, which can and will spread across frontiers only too easily if we are not on our guard against it. Bad ideas will spread just as readily as good ideas if they are not checked, that is, if we do not all insist on testing and retesting every idea that comes our way—"test every axiom" as Einstein said—and throwing out immediately the false, the spurious. Moreover, bad ideas have a habit of taking root in a suitable soil; poverty is a breeding ground.

Before I develop the theme of the spread of bad ideas, let me discuss for a moment

longer the manner in which good ideas leap frontiers. Let us, for example, examine the interchange of ideas within the United States.

It occurred to me as I was traveling out here from Washington that I was covering about a thousand miles. In Europe, traveling that same distance, I might have passed through a dozen different countries, but here it was all through the one United States. This led me to reflect on the sharp differences in character that had existed between the first Thirteen Colonies and subsequently between the States of the Union and on the manner in which these had been softened. Of course commerce and communication had a great deal to do with it, common problems, but you will not disagree with me, I am sure, that ideas played a most important if not the most important role. It was the idea of the Constitution, of the American notion of democracy and liberty as set forth in the glowing words of such people as Thomas Jefferson that bound together the American States. So today as one travels through them, though the differences, the special characteristics due to their geography, the origins of their people, their history in a word, are not far to seek, the real Americanness of them all is what first strikes a foreign observer.

The fact that even in this country the boundaries between the States (which are often as big as nations in Europe) do have some meaning to my mind points up the problem of all land frontiers, that they are clearly artificial, although they do mark off people with substantial differences. The likenesses between the groups are more important; but the differences are significant.

For example, Americans, members of the British Commonwealth, and Europeans more or less share a Western European culture in which ideas have moved backward and forward since Greek and Roman times. You are, of course, aware of the travels of medieval scholars, you know how the Renaissance spread through Europe, you know about the 18th century enlightenment, the 19th century romantic revival; you must realize how, in the things of the mind, we do have a great deal in common.

It seems to me, therefore, theat there are, to some extent, two systems, one of ideas and the other of politics. In the first we share and in the second mankind has a tendency to be narrow, parochial and unfriendly. Your own political system illustrates one method of attempting to overcome this parochialism—a method of federation probably best adapted for a large continent. I should like today to suggest to you that there is another method perhaps better suited to other geographical circumstances—and that is the system of the British Commonwealth of Nations, comprising as it does, European and Asian nations spread all over the world.

One of the ideas which you and we have shared is the idea of freedom, a noble idea or ideal, although it has been the source of many misunderstandings—some of which of course are due to difficuties of language.

However, you can trace the idea of freedom if you like from the emigrants who left England and came to this country in the 17th century, through your revolution against the British Crown to the French Revolution, and so perhaps to nationalist movements in Eastern Europe in the late 19th century and, more recently, in Asia. (This freedom was generally equated with the idea of "nationalism," which as you know is a very difficult word to use at all accurately.)

In your search for freedom one particular relationship between you and Great Britain became intolerable, yet you never really broke off all connection. On the other hand, we New Zealanders, together with such other former colonies as Canada, Australia and South Africa, remained in a rather closer relationship but over the years every drastically altered the nature of it. And now today we are all—we Britishers and Americans—very closely allied together. Indeed the Commonwealth-American alliance is the very foundation of the strength of the Western world, and the strong bulwark of our ideals of political democracy.

The result is that, in practical terms, there is far less difference between New Zealand's relationship with Great Britain and your own than is generally realized. I do not mean to describe the processes of day-to-day consultation and cooperation between the respective governments, but I should like to try and make my point by describing in a few words the nature of the Commonwealth in this year of grace.

Actually, I should confess that it was once put to me that I would have fulfilled my role in this country as ambassador if I could but persuade the majority of Americans that New Zealand no longer pays taxes to the British Parliament. Perhaps this is my opportunity to persuade you.

In 1926 it was correct to describe the members of the Commonwealth as "autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the Crown and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations." Such is the famous Balfour Declaration.

Since 1947, when India, Pakistan, and Ceylon became wholly independent—and India became a republic, though within the Commonwealth—the nature of the "Commonwealth" has undergone considerable change. But, although we would probably agree that the Balfour Declaration is not an exact description of the present-day Commonwealth, I am doubtful whether we could easily produce any form of words that would better it.

Three or four characteristics of the Commonwealth can be readily agreed on: its members are freely associated together; its members have autonomy; their association, apart from the strength of the causes from which it springs, is maintained by consultation and cooperation in respect of particular issues as they arise; and they recognize the queen as the symbol of their free association and, as such, head of the Commonwealth.

No member of this association of nations makes a solemn profession of intentions or enters into binding obligations in respect of its membership of the Commonwealth. Each member decides for itself whether to stay in or out of the Commonwealth. In carrying out their business, the members rely on their political experience of working together rather than on appeals to the chapter and verse of a charter.

Whilst allegiance to the throne is a potent force binding together many members of the Commonwealth, it does not bind everyone. The common loyalty together is a loyalty by all to the ideals for which the throne stands in the minds of some. The crown today is separately advised on all matters, even the declaration of war, by its advisers in the various nations of the Commonwealth.

Whatever happens to the future membership—and it must be remembered that whereas the Central African Federation, the West Indian Federation, and perhaps the Gold Coast and Nigeria may shortly qualify for membership, it is not impossible that a member may withdraw from the Commonwealth—it seems certain that the new Commonwealth will be one in which the national aspirations of the various members will be stronger, and their autonomy more jealously guarded, and their equality more often exerted. We shall no longer be discussing the problems of how 4 or 5 self-governing dominions with European traditions and outlook and a common allegiance can work together, but the way in which various groupings of people of different racial background—European, Asian, and probably African—can find a common interest and contribute to the advancement of that common interest.

We shall have indeed a grouping of independent nations with a tradition of cooperation and tolerance, a tradition of law, and, to some extent, of ideals, and an interest in maintaining a working coalition. The Commonwealth is already a living embodiment of the fact that ideas leap frontiers. Indeed, among Britain's greatest achievements is the planting in the great Republic of India of the British ideas of parliamentary government and the rule of law.

This Commonwealth of Nations to which my country belongs, together with the great Asian members, may not seem to you to be tightly enough knit; it is merely, you will say, a loose grouping of nations constantly changing with no real binding interests and no written rules. Yet I say to you that it already is and will be a working example of the way in which people of different races and of very different development can achieve a modus vivendi; it is and will indeed be an object lesson in the way in which East and West can live together, bound at any rate by a common tradition of government and of law, born of that mother of democratic institutions, Great Britain.

The idea of freedom in unity which we are trying to express in the Commonwealth is slightly different from what you are trying to express in this country, because of our historical and geographical circumstances. The freedom you fought for in 1776 was a national freedom; the freedom we are practising in the Commonwealth is international freedom. It seems to us an important concept which we hope will be of great influence in the world of the future.

However, the traffic in ideas is not only one way. The Communists are busy spreading their's. I need not remind you of the shattering speed with which the ideas of communism have spread from Russia into eastern Europe, China, and parts of southeast Asia. But while ideas can easily leap the frontiers of the democracies, it is unfortunately true that they do not so readily surmount the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

I firmly believe that insofar as the Communist leaders protect their people from the ideas that are abroad in the world, they are weakening their own societies—they are condemning them to intellectual stagnation.

How then shall we, for our part, combat Communist ideas, when history shows that they will cross democratic frontiers? They can be combated only by better ideas and by the creation of better conditions among the depressed peoples as a foundation for the principles of democraacy. We have entered upon a contest of ideas, which education in such colleges as yours equips us to win.

You cannot confidently assume that all other people's ideas are wrong nor can you confidently assume that all your own are right. Judge Learned Hand has been fond of quoting from Cromwell's letter to the Scots before the Battle of Dunbar in which he wrote: "I beseech ye in the bowels of Christ, think that ye may be mistaken." Indeed he once said, "I should like to have that written over the portals of every church, every school, and every courthouse, and, may I say, of every legislative body in the United States."

This is the challenge to all of us, and especially to you young people with your advantages of education. You must welcome the give-and-take, the free interchange of ideas, the rough-and-tumble of debate. You must test and reexamine your own ideas and those that are presented to you by others. You must learn to accept what is good, and to reject what is bad and false. You must

learn to remodel, to compromise, to improve and to understand and sympathize with others. Only in this way will you retain your position in the world—by the validity, the honesty, the vigor of your own thinking, and the truth of the ideas that you support and spread.

The American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, from time to time I have endeavored to emphasize the importance of the American merchant marine to our peacetime economy and as our fourth arm of defense. I should like to believe that these efforts have had some impact. However, frequently the same voices of dissent are still heard. To aid further in enlightening these persons, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Red Shadow on the Sea," which appeared in the June 12, 1955, issue of the Baltimore Sunday American.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED SHADOW ON THE SEA

WHY UNCLE SAM'S MISSING THE BOATS

(How the privately owned United States-flag merchant fleet is deteriorating is dramatically pointed up in this questionnaire compiled by the authoritative American Merchant Marine Institute:)

Question. What is the present tonnage of the United States merchant fleet?

Answer. As of May 1, the dead-weight tonnage was 13,933,000. This compares with 15,244,000 on July 1, 1954, and 15,439,000 the year before.

Question. How much of our export-import cargo is being carried on United States-flag ships?

Answer. Right after the war they carried 65 percent. By the first of this year this was reduced to 24.9 percent. Foreign ships are carrying the balance, at a tremendous loss to owners of United States ships.

Question. What is the explanation?

Answer. A great many United States-owned oceangoing ships, dry cargo and tanker, have been transferred to foreign-flag registry, principally Panama, Liberia, and Honduras. During the past year our merchant marine lost 1 out of every 10 ships to foreign flags.

Matter of dollars

Question. Why do owners do this?

Answer. For economy. Operation costs under United States registry are vastly higher than foreign merchant marine. Labor, seagoing costs, maintenance—everything it takes to run a ship—have gone up with the United States cost of living. Comparative monthly labor cost figures on ships of the same tonnage are: American-flag, $23,600; British, $5,600; Italian, $4,500.

Question. How are ships transferred to foreign flags; why is it permitted?

Answer. All cargo ships now in the merchant fleet are former war-built Liberty ships sold to private owners by the Government. Any owner of 2 is permitted to apply for the transfer of 1 under Maritime Administration regulations. He must transfer to a friendly power, and he is bound to return the ship to the United States flag in the event of an emergency. The Government permits such transfers in recognition of cost hardships to the owner.

Question. Can American owners under foreign registry hire native crews?

Answer. Yes. They are then out of the jurisdiction of United States maritime unions.

Question. How about passenger ships?

Answer. This will startle you. For every 3 passenger ships we had in 1939, there now is only 1. Of course, transocean air travel has cut in on the industry, but the curtailment is still acute.

Question. What about domestic and coastwise shipping? Is it hurt?

Answer. It has been virtually wiped out.

Question. Isn't private industry building ships?

Answer. Not a single dry-cargo ship is now under construction. A few tankers are being built, but 85 percent of our tanker fleet needs replacing. Most were built during the war and now face obsolescence. Average life of a ship is 20 years.

United States jobs lost

Question. Hasn't this affected employment of Americans?

Answer. Yes. Between January 1953 and October 1954, as owners transferred to foreign registries, 1 out of every 4 United States seaman lost his job. Because there was less than one-third as much tonnage under construction at the beginning of 1955 as in 1954, 1 out of every 5 shipyard workers lost his job in that period.

Question. If it costs so much to run American-flag ships, why do we try to keep a United States merchant marine?

Answer. For defense. Military men call the merchant marine their fourth arm.

Question. What can be done to make United States ship operations financially feasible?

Answer. We already have the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the basic maritime legislation which provides for subsidy payments for both building and operating ships. In reality, they are parity payments to offset the competitive disadvantages under which Americans have to operate. Construction subsidies run around 40 percent of cost. Operating subsidies vary, based on individual contracts and costs.

Question. Is anything being done under that law to keep our shipping up to date and up to strength?

Answer. Yes; but by no means enough. Four major passenger lines are building new ships to replace obsolete ones as required under the law. These are subsidized.

Question. Does the subsidy cover all United States-flag ships?

Answer. No. Only lines plying between fixed points on foreign-trade routes declared essential by the United States.

Question. What can be done for other lines?

Answer. Last year Congress passed the so-called 50–50 law. This requires that half of certain types of cargoes must be carried in United States-flag ships. Foreign aid, Government stockpiles, and cargoes owned or financed by our Government are specified. Also, the Hoover Commission recommends that the Government get out of the shipping business.

Question. Are subsidies a giveaway to ship owners?

Answer. Ship subsidies are the only United States subsidies recapturable. If an operator makes a net profit in excess of 10 percent a year he has to repay one-half of the excess to the United States, up to the subsidy amount.

Question. What is the general outlook?

Answer. There are strong indications that Congress is now alert and sympathetic to the problem. And President Eisenhower has recommended substantial appropriations. Drawback is the indifference of 80 percent of the public, suspicious of somebody getting something for nothing. The problem is to make them understand that if we are to have a merchant marine, it means making up shipowners' losses.

SOVIET'S MERCHANT MARINE EXPANDS AS OURS SHRINKS

Rapid expansion of Russia's merchant marine—with the obvious aim of dominating shipping lanes of the high seas—is disturbing the free world.

The Soviets are using non-Communist countries' desire for East-West trade as a device to make Russia a great mercantile sea power to supplement its fighting naval forces.

Hearst newspapers foreign correspondents have unearthed this ominous situation at a time when a study reveals the United States merchant marine is undergoing a steady and alarming shrinkage.

The Soviet shipbuilding program is being carired on in four strategic areas—the Pacific, North Atlantic, the Baltic, and the Mediterranean.

Conservative estimates are that the Russians are increasing their merchant fleet by 500,000 tons a year while United States tonnage is decreasing at a similar rate.

From Paris, International News Service European general manager Kingsbury Smith cables:

"Never has Western Europe had so many Russian shipbuilding orders. Every trade agreement Russia has made since 1953 with continental European countries which have shipbuilding yards—France, the Netherlands, Finland, Denmark, West Germany, and Sweden—has included orders for ships of different types."

An arm of navy

Smith notes the Soviets are concentrating on heavy cargo ships, refrigerator ships, and powerful icebreakers, concluding that apparently Moscow's new high priority objective is a mighty navy.

From Rome, INS correspondent Michael Chinigo reports that Italian shipyards, which dominate the Mediterranean, have accepted an undisclosed number of Rusisan contracts.

In Japan, the Russians have swamped shipbuilders with construction and repair orders.

It's a new phase of the cold war which the West appears to have disregarded.

The sea-ing eyes

It's known as Operation Red Eye by security officials in the free world.

Russian seagoing spies are using Soviet merchant ships as floating bases for snooping on allied defense plans. And there isn't much that can be done about it.

Uninvited, Red ships turn up almost anywhere, fish near allied maneuvers, tie up for repairs at key Western ports, make cargo stops where crews can spy on United States arms in Europe and the Far East.

Italian ports that serve as the southern anchor of NATO are pet spots for Red sea spies. An example:

The Soviet freighter *Andreev* put into Naples for engine repairs, remained for 17 months surveying the United States 6th Fleet.

Attorney General's National Committee To Study Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the report of the Attorney General's National Committee to study the antitrust laws has provoked considerable interest

and comment by a number of retail associations throughout the Nation. From time to time here in the Senate I have spoken on this matter, because it is the subject of very careful study at the present time before the Select Committee on Small Business, particularly before our Subcommittee on Retail Trades and Distribution.

In the May issue of the Minnesota Food Guide, the lead article, entitled "'Masked Attempt To Repeal Robinson-Patman Act' charges NARGUS" represents one of the many expressions of protest which have been registered concerning the Attorney General's committee report and recommendations.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MASKED ATTEMPT TO REPEAL ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT," CHARGES NARGUS

The National Association of Retail Grocers said recently that if Congress follows the recommendations on the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act made by a majority of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws, it might just as well repeal the act entirely.

Expressing shock and dismay at the proposals for changing the Robinson-Patman Act, Mrs. Marie Kiefer, secretary-manager of the association, said at the association's national headquarters: "The majority report of this commitee on 'antitrust policy in distribution' is a masked attempt to repeal the Robinson-Patman Act. One member of the committee, who refused to go along, characterized the report by saying the majority appears to act 'in unseeming haste in urging Congress to repeal a law that small-business men regard as important protection against price discrimination.' We believe the recommendation of the majority would gut the Robinson-Patman Act and make it a legislative monstrosity without any usefulness at all.

"The suggestions contained in the report for what it terms a more 'liberal interpretation' would undermine the act and stifle its enforcement. It proposes to read into the law vague and complicated standards for justifying discriminations, thus making evasion of the act easier and enforcement more difficult. Not content with this, the majority report adds new defenses permitting bogus brokerage and advertising allowances, so that price discriminations in either of these forms could be practiced by large mass buyers against their smaller competitors without fear or hindrance.

"Independent grocers would have had more respect for the forthrightness of the committee majority if it openly advocated repeal of the Robinson-Patman Act instead of recommending changes wholly at variance with its basic purpose. In many instances, the report advocates weakening the act by judicial interpretations which distort its meaning, thereby evading the legislative processes for accomplishing this result.

"The committee majority seems to favor price discrimination on the erroneous grounds that price favors go only to the efficient, whereas experience shows that it is the superior economic power of large mass buyers that governs the receipt of such favors. It assumes that price discrimination is a form of competition, ignoring the fact that only a few large mass distributors receive price cuts when they are given on a discriminatory basis. This provides an unfair advantage for large mass buyers and deprives their competitors, victimized by this practice, of equal opportunity to compete with them on even terms.

"Throughout this entire report, the committee majority did not advocate one single change to strengthen enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act. Yet hardly a provision of the law is left untouched by some suggestions for weakening it. Many of the suggestions would enmesh the Federal Trade Commission and the courts in long, complex economic investigation.

"We regard this report as giving biased and distorted views of public policy that is served by the Robinson-Patman Act. This policy has kept the field of retail food distribution open for independent grocers to compete successfully with the largest of their competitors. Price discriminations destroy this equality of opportunity, and eventually lead to monopoly and higher prices at the grocery stores. Consumers benefit most when efficiency and not size or financial power determines a retailer's success. For this reason, the section of the report dealing with price discrimination deserves to be completely repudiated and we think it will be."

Red Loses Citizenship—Concealed Party Ties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present the news item as printed in the Huntington Park Daily Signal, Huntington Park, Los Angeles County, Calif. This splendid news channel is one of those giving the fullest factual coverage and dissemination of news in my native State of California.

The item follows:

RED LOSES CITIZENSHIP—CONCEALED PARTY TIES

An alien naturalized in 1941 and who concealed his membership in the Communist Party yesterday lost his citizenship because of fraud.

In a far-reaching opinion, Federal Judge Leon R. Yankwich ruled in the case of Sam Title, Los Angeles businessman, that while membership in the Communist Party itself was not grounds for denaturalizing him, Title's testimony that he was not affiliated with any organization teaching disobedience to organized government was not true.

Thus, Title's citizenship, granted in 1941, was revoked.

Judge Yankwich said evidence revealed that Title has been, since 1936, first a member of the Young Communist League, and then a full-fledged member of the Communist Party.

This concealment of fact, and his oath to the contrary, "showed that he was guilty of fraud and not attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States," Judge Yankwich said.

Judge Yankwich pointed out that, in the test case, Title, at a revocation trial "declined to answer questions relating to his membership in the Communist Party, or to identify his signature on a card showing membership in 1937 on grounds that his answers might incriminate him."

The court also observed:

"I have made a detailed analysis of literature dealing with the aims of communism. That includes the first volume of Marx's 'Capital,' and two volumes of Lenin's writings, introduced by the defendant himself.

"This court reaches the conclusion that during the period between 1936 to 1941, the American Communist Party adhered to the program of the Russian Communist Party and the Third International, and advocates force and violence as the means of achieving the aims of the party."

June—A Tragic Month for the Baltic Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, a decade and a half ago this month tragedy struck the Baltic nations. In June of 1940 the Red armies swarmed into the three small Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and extinguished their freedom. Since then the sufferings of the peoples of these three countries have been intense—the Communist invaders have despoiled them, enslaved them, murdered them and deported them by the thousands. The monstrous crime the Soviet Union has committed in the Baltic countries is one that demands remedial action, particularly at this time when the great powers are planning a meeting "at the summit" to discuss world tensions.

When the Bolsheviks invaded the Baltic countries on June 15, 16, and 17, 1940, they announced that their occupation would guarantee peace and protection from war. The falsity of this propaganda was quickly realized by the Baltic peoples, for their countries were quickly straitjacketed in the Communist despotism and the hand of Red persecution fell brutally upon them.

Posts in government and public administration both in central and local governments were occupied by Communists or their sympathizers. The police force was taken over by the NKVD and its function became mainly the liquidation of the so-called political unreliables. Private property was expropriated, and the personnel was changed in the courts where instructions from the Soviet Union now governed decisions handed down. Farcical elections were held resulting in Communist-controlled parliaments and in August 1940, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were incorporated into the Soviet Union.

The destruction of the Baltic nations' liberty and independence was accompanied by many acts of violence against the innocent. Among these perhaps none was more horrible than the deportations, especially those of June 1941. Preparations for these deportations were made as early as 1939 in the infamous NKVD Serov order No. 001223. The plans of deportation were designed to accomplish a three-fold objective: First, to remove all active and patriotic elements from the local population; second, to break the will of resistance by ex-

posing examples of what results when one does not conform with Soviet requirements; third, to weaken the Baltic nations physically.

The cruelty of the deportations was unspeakable. For instance, according to the Serov order, the operation was to take place at daybreak with the head of the operating group seeing that nothing in excess of 100 kilograms in weight was taken by those deported. This included clothing, cooking utensils, 1 month's supply of food, money of the locality—no foreign currencies—and a haversack. Male members—heads— of families were to pack their personal articles separately from the others and were not to be told of the separation of members of the families at the place of embarkation.

Thousands suffered this inhuman treatment in all three countries. In Lithuania, an operational staff of the People's Commissar for State Security of the Lithuanian SSR was formed in May 1941 for the purpose of "directing, preparing, and executing the operation of purging of the Lithuanian SSR from the hostile, criminal, and socially dangerous element." From June 14 to June 21, 1941, the number of Lithuanians deported to remote areas of Siberia and the arctic totaled 34,260.

In Estonia on the night of June 14, 1941, approximately 10,000 men, women, and children were deported by cattle cars to Siberia and northern Russia.

Records found in Riga, the capital of Latvia, which the Communists failed to destroy when retreating from the Germans in the latter part of June 1941, disclosed lists of deportees in June 1941. These names included: farmers, engineers, factory owners, transport, automobile, railway, and other workers and operators; defense and police forces—in which 1,085 missing or murdered army officers were included; government officials; intellectuals; pensioners; houseowners; students and schoolchildren; housewives; and others of unknown occupations. This totaled about 34,000. Of these, 23,016 were men; 7,218 women; and 4,016 children. Transportation records disclosed 824 railway coaches and freight cars were used in deporting Latvians to Soviet Russia between June 13–17, 1941.

The savage, inhumane treatment suffered by these Baltic States deportees is almost unbelievable. These atrocities are in the same category with the infamous death march of Bataan and the Nazi concentration camp horrors of Dachau and Buchenwald. Only God knows the harsh fate of all those unfortunate Batlic States deportees of 1940, 1941, and the years since.

The Big Four plan to meet sometime next month to discuss world problems. I recommend that the talks include the forceful takeover of the Baltic States and their incorporation into the U. S. S. R. Thousands of innocent people are still suffering under the Communist yoke not only in the Baltic States but in many other countries. Certainly the enslavement of millions by the Communists is one of the major causes of tension in the world today and should be included in any negotiations designed to relieve such tension. The United States has never recognized the forced incorporation of the independent nations of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia into the U. S. S. R. We still maintain diplomatic relations with the free governments of the Baltic nations, although their homelands have been swallowed up by the Communist conspiracy.

We must bring the international crime committed by the Communists in the Baltic countries to the attention of those now preparing to discuss world problems. We can not let it be forgotten while these victim nations are still enslaved. If we persist in our endeavors, I have complete confidence that freedom and independence can eventually be restored to the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Private Versus Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Private Versus Public Power," which was published in the Florence (Ala.) Herald, of May 12, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE VERSUS PUBLIC POWER

The failure of private utilities to curb their insatiable greed for profit is the primary reason the public should bend every effort to promote the continuance of public power, for regardless of all the socialistic implications heaped upon Federal power producing agencies, these agencies alone are based upon a recognition of the importance of electricity in the homes and communities of the areas they serve.

On the other hand the private utilities have failed to show that they are not in business for the sole purpose of establishing a monopoly over power regardless of how it is generated, steam, hydropower or atomic energy.

Today there is not a man, woman, or child whose everyday existence is not profoundly affected by electricity. This is the age of electricity, it is motivating force of everything from the electric toaster at breakfast to the giant factories producing our clothing, building materials, home furnishings, food, and drugs, and practically all of the necessities of life. Today electricity is indispensable in the home and on the farm.

The fight for control of this indispensable commodity was begun in the twenties and it continues today. Private power monopolists are out to destroy municipal systems, rural electric cooperatives, and public utility districts. They are against Federal power agencies owned by the people and operated for the people because they have had to scale their own profits down in order to compete.

In spite of this they (the private utilities) have amassed billions of dollars from the sale of power since the TVA was built and at lower rates than were charged before TVA. And strange as it may seem, public power distribution systems buying power from the TVA have not only shown healthy profits but in practically every instance have amortized their physical holdings far in advance of deadline while at the same time undertaking large expansion programs of their own.

The latest move to hamper TVA and other Federal agencies is the "power squeeze." There is no consideration given the taxpayer who will have to pay the Atomic Energy Commission's power bills if electrical energy is supplied by Dixon-Yates at higher rates than TVA would charge. Furthermore the taxpayers' money will be used to build the Dixon-Yates plant which Dixon-Yates will own after 30 years.

The power monopoly is out to destroy the "yardstick" that brought the price of electricity within reach of the low income groups. They tell us the "yardstick" is bad.

What, we ask, is bad about it?

Disarmament, Population Control: Overriding Problems of Years to Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate an address delivered at Hamline University on June 6, 1955, by Mr. John Cowles, president of the Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co. I commend to the attention of my colleagues this thoughtful and inspiring message. I truly agree with Mr. Cowles that the "attainment of universal, enforcible disarmament is the most pressing problem of the second half of the 20th century." Every effort and all our talent and ability must be directed toward the solution of this problem. We Americans must become the peacemakers for the world, seeking a peace with honor, peace with justice, and peace with freedom and security. These objectives are not beyond realization. In fact, to fail is to court disaster. To succeed is to merit greatness.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISARMAMENT, POPULATION CONTROL: OVERRIDING PROBLEMS OF YEARS TO COME

(By John Cowles)

When I received the invitation from Hamline to make this year's commencement address I felt deeply flattered by the honor being paid me, for Hamline is the oldest college in Minnesota, with a record of public service to liberal education extending for over a century.

Speaking to a graduating class here is obviously a high and exacting privilege, so I began reflecting on what I might say that would be worthy of the significance of the occasion, something that conceivably a few of the class would remember throughout their lives.

The old anecdote concerning Samuel Butler occurred to me. As some of you may recall, Butler was once asked to speak to a distinguished audience on the subject of How To Make the Most Out of Life. Butler stood up and said, "I don't even know

how to make the most out of the next 15 minutes."

At that stage in my reflections it dawned on me that not only could I not remember a single thing that any of the commencement speakers had said when I was graduated from Harvard more than a third of a century ago, but I couldn't even remember who any of those speakers were.

So, after further thought, in the humbling realization that thirty-odd years from now your memory of your commencement speaker or of his ideas probably won't be any better than my memory is of mine, I adjusted myself to following the accepted path, on these academic occasions, of prophecy followed by exhortation.

Now one does somehow think of prophets as being old, but just why it should be assumed by all college boards of trustees that any aging member of the bifocal generation, like me, who is rapidly approaching the trifocal lens stage, should be able to be clairvoyant about what is going to happen in the next 50 years is beyond me.

Before I attempt any prophesying, I must say a word of caution. As a newspaperman all my adult life, I have been particularly interested in the forecasts or prophecies of the political columnists and commentators. Occasionally I will go into our editorial library, or "morgue" as it is called in newspaper parlance, and reread from the files the prophecies these columnists made a few months or years ago. This has proved enlightening to me, because it has convinced me that even the best informed men are frequently, if not usually, in error in forecasting the shape of things to come.

You will all recall that almost all of the political experts were proved wrong in their predictions of a Dewey landslide in the 1948 presidential campaign. You will recall the predictions made by many foreign affairs experts when Hitler's Panzer divisions attacked Russia in the summer of 1941 that Russian resistance would last only a few months at most. You will recall the economic prophets who, following the end of World War II, predicted that Great Britain was finished as an important nation and could never stage an economic comeback.

But since it seems to be expected that a commencement speaker will do some prophesying, with this warning that I have given you to be skeptical, I will tell you what I see when I gaze into my private crystal ball.

You may have noted that I selected as the subject of my talk "A Forecast to the Year 2000." I did this because the next 45 years will cover the most active and effective years of your lives. You will all play roles, some of you I hope highly important roles, in determining what the shape of things will be when the 21st century rolls around. I hope you will all be active in a political party, join some foreign policy or current affairs discussion group, be a member of the League of Women Voters or the Junior Chamber of Commerce, or whatever the organization may be in the community where you live, and so help determine what our national policies will be.

I'm not going to talk at length about the new mechanical gadgets or even the scientific advances that will undoubtedly come in the next 45 years that will change your lives. I accept, for example, but without particular enthusiasm, the idea that most people will probably wear a second wrist watch, which will be a miniature walkie-talkie radio receiver-transmitter, part of the telephone system.

Probably a person will be able to fly from New York to California in an hour or so, or across the Atlantic in 2 or 3 hours in a luxury air liner. Probably helicopters will become the accepted mode of travel in congested metropolitan areas.

NEW LIVING STANDARDS

Due to automation, our productivity—our output per man hour—will be steadily increased. Probably before the end of this century our average standard of living will be double or triple what it is now, even though the average workweek is reduced to 30 hours, with a minimum of a month's annual vacation.

Leisure time, and what one does with it, will be much more important than it is today. Through the blessings of atomic energy, if wisely used, we may have the opportunity for the first time of eliminating poverty throughout the globe.

Undoubtedly within a few years we shall have small artificial satellites revolving around the earth, and probably before many years there will be space ships carrying human beings to other planets. These and many other such ideas are pretty familiar to all of us.

Undoubtedly the advances of medical science will be enormous, and the average length of life will be significantly increased. Half the hospital beds in the country are now occupied by mental cases. I would guess that we will make great progress in developing better techniques and new drugs for treating the mentally ill. Surely ways will be found to prevent a high proportion of the deaths that now result from certain types of heart disease and cancer.

I don't want to stretch your credulity too far, but perhaps the scientists will even discover ways to grow hair on bald heads.

FERTILITY PROBLEMS

I hope and believe that the scientists will find ways to increase human fertility and enable more couples that want children to have them. I similarly hope and believe that before many years the scientists will have discovered a simple, harmless, inexpensive, antifertility pill, which will stop fertility for a known period of time but which will not affect a woman's future ability to have a child when she wants one. Then families could be planned, children properly spaced, and each baby born would be a wanted child.

We desperately need such an antifertility pill because the current rapid increase in population throughout the world, coupled with a steady exhaustion of many of our important natural resources, is alarming in its implications.

In the past half century medical science has reduced infant mortality and lengthened the life span with the result that total population everywhere on the globe is increasing at an unprecedented and accelerating rate.

The estimated population of the world a century ago was about 1 billion people. Today it is about 2½ billion. Experts estimate that by 1980—only 25 years from now—it will be 3½ billion or even 4 billion.

Recently Dr. E. C. Stakman, a professor emeritus at the University of Minnesota, who is one of the world's most distinguished plant pathologists, said—and I quote—"Man is menacing himself with two tremendous powers: the power of atomic energy, and the power of human reproduction. The population of the world is exploding in our faces."

Of course, it is possible that the scientists will some day develop relatively inexpensive ways of taking the salt out of sea water on the one hand, and of using the oceans to grow food on the other. It is also possible that economically feasible ways will be found to extract, through grinding and processing, many—but not all—of the minerals that we need from ordinary, common rock.

If, however, the current world trend toward industrialization continues, if the relatively underdeveloped areas are developed so that the peoples of Asia and Africa and Latin America begin to consume minerals at even a small fraction of the per capita consumption of the United States, we will rapidly face global shortages of minerals that we now assume are abundant.

Or let's consider for a moment such a simple natural resource as water. If any of you in the graduating class has as one of your material goals in life your eventually moving to the sunny climes of Arizona or southern California so you can have a private swimming pool surrounded by green lawn and flower gardens, I venture to suggest that before many years that may prove impossible.

Population is growing rapidly in the West and Southwest, and the amount of water available per capita is steadily declining. I suspect that it will not be many years before private swimming pools in Phoenix or Denver or Los Angeles will be forbidden, in order to save the water that they would otherwise consume.

I suspect that the watering of lawns will be made illegal in many communities, due to the growing water shortage in relation to the expanding population. Perhaps the lawns of the future in the West and Southwest will be of asphalt, painted green, or gravel dyed whatever shade is the most becoming to the housewife.

These are, of course, trivial examples of the effects of skyrocketing population on the one hand and static or dwindling natural resources on the other, but in all seriousness I suggest that the world population problem in all its ramifications ranks second in importance only to that of avoiding another world war and maintaining our basic freedoms.

NO VICTORS

Of course the issues of war and peace overshadow all others in importance.

The disastrous consequences of a global war fought with atomic and hydrogen bombs stagger the imagination. Neither side could win such a war in the traditional meaning of the word "win." One side might be completely exterminated and the other side only partly. That would be victory in a sense, but it is also possible that in such a war not only what we call civilization but even most of human life itself might be wiped out.

Some people are still gripped by the old delusion that war can make peace. War can only destroy, and the extent of the destruction that another global war would produce is almost beyond anyone's power of comprehension.

The Atomic Energy Commission reported that the hydrogen bomb exploded in the Bikini test polluted an area of 7,000 square miles. A leading nuclear physicist has stated that lethal doses of radioactivity would cover 2,100 square miles of that area for at least a week, and that humans spending any extended period of time in the area even 2 or 3 weeks after the explosion would probably die.

We now have guided missiles with ranges up to 5,000 miles, designed to carry an atomic warhead. Although all the technical difficulties have not yet been solved, the statement has been published that the United States hopes within 2 or 3 years to have intercontinental ballistics missiles which will have at least 20 times the speed of sound, or a speed of some 15,000 miles an hour, which could not be intercepted or diverted from their target.

It would be foolhardy for us to assume that the Russians may not be equally advanced in their development of comparable weapons. These intercontinental missiles, carrying hydrogen bombs, would constitute pushbutton warfare of a kind potentially capable of destroying, in a few hours, most human life over a whole continent.

A BETTER COURSE

So long as the danger of war exists we obviously must do everything within our power to keep ahead of Russia, in military preparedness in being, so that Russia knows that we have the means to strike instantaneously a retaliatory blow so deadly to her that any attack on us, however crippling it might be, would mean her near or total extinction.

But there is, I believe, a better course than a continuance at an accelerated rate of this

arms race, with increasing tensions and the possibility at any time of a holocaust. That better course is universal disarmament under effective, continuous, unqualified international inspection and control.

Universal disarmament, not onesided or partial, but complete, is the paramount need of the second half of the 20th century. The mutual fears and tensions produced by nuclear weapons and intercontinental missiles are such that there cannot possibly be real peace until there has been universal disarmament, right down to the level of lightly armed and strictly limited forces for internal order only, with continuous and effective international inspection and control.

We will have to discard a lot of our outworn political ideas and prejudices before we will be willing to do those things that are essential if we are to have complete and enforceable world disarmament, even if Russia and the other major powers were willing.

I do not minimize the difficulties. Many people would object to what they would call "the sacrificing of our sovereignty" to the extent of permitting international inspection teams to examine our military establishment as we would want to examine Russia's.

Some intelligent people say that the very idea of universal disarmament under international inspection and control, desirable as it might be, is so utopian and so impossible of realization as not to be worthy of serious discussion. I say to such people, "What is the alternative?"

So far I have received no satisfying reply other than the expression of the wishful hope that Russia might break up through internal dissension, and the threat of a catastrophic world war thereby be eliminated.

Is it possible that Russia is now willing to make an overall settlement, on a basis that the free world could accept? I doubt if anyone knows. My own guess is that it is extremely unlikely but conceivable. In any event, I think our position should be that we are willing to negotiate, to talk and to listen, at any time.

TEST FOR SOVIETS

I suspect that Russia wants to use the forthcoming conference at the summit for propaganda purposes to convince the neutralists that the United States and not Russia is the nation blocking the road to peace, and to prevent if possible Western Germany's rearmament as part of NATO.

It seems to me that if instead of getting into a sterile dispute with the Russian delegates over limitations on certain types of weapons, or on the evacuation of military or air bases on foreign territory, the United States would unequivocally advocate total universal disarmament, perhaps done in stages over a 10-year period, with continuous international inspection and control, the whole non-Communist world would applaud.

I hope that President Eisenhower, for whom I have deep admiration, will take that bold step.

Russia's reaction to that proposal, and her subsequent conduct in the meetings called to formulate the mechanisms for international inspection and control would quickly reveal her intentions and her sincerity or lack of it. Conceivably agreement could be reached, although the problems of implementation would be extremely difficult, and if so, the threat of a hydrogen war destroying civilization might be eliminated.

I hope that those of you who share my belief that the attainment of universal, enforceable disarmament is the most pressing problem of the second half of the 20th century will spread the doctrine with missionary zeal. I hope that those of you who are not convinced will continue to study and ponder the problem, always keeping in mind the alternatives.

I am an optimist. I instinctively believe that man has the innate wisdom and resourcefulness to turn aside the threat of war before it culminates in his destruction.

I am confident, in short, that the human race will meet the life-or-death challenge by choosing to survive, and that the dawn of the 21st century will be bright.

A Bill to Amend the Political Broadcast Section of the Communications Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill designed to exempt from the equal time provision—contained in the political broadcast section of the Federal Communications Act—appearances of candidates on news programs, panel discussions, or similar programs controlled by broadcasting stations or networks.

The request for the introduction of this amendment has come to me from the Columbia Broadcasting System. CBS believes an amendment of this kind to be in the public interest, and I feel that an amendment of this nature should be given careful consideration by the Congress.

The question of amending the political broadcast section of the Federal Communications Act has been considered at some length by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in connection with the so-called McFarland amendments to that act. On that occasion, the liability of broadcasters for libelous statements made by political candidates appeared to be the primary concern of the broadcasting industry. I have been informed that this problem is being solved successfully through State legislation.

The exemption proposed to be made by this bill would leave intact the equal-time principle embodied in section 315 of the Communications Act. It would, however, give leeway to broadcasters and networks with regard to the appearance of political candidates on news, news interviews, news documentary, panel discussion, debate, or similar type program where the format and production of the program and the participants therein are determined by the broadcasting station, or by the network in the case of a network program.

Broadcasters, of course, would be called upon to justify the exercise of their discretion under this amendment in connection with renewal proceedings before the Federal Communications Commission at the time their licenses are up for renewal. A broadcaster might have to show to the satisfaction of the Commission that in the exercise of this discretion he acted fairly and thus served the public interest.

Under the provisions of the amendment recommended by CBS, the exemption would also apply with regard to network-controlled programs of this nature. Networks are not licensed and, therefore, there would be no occasion to review their performance when their licenses come up for renewal. However, a question might arise whether the Commission should not be granted power to review the performance of networks with regard to their performance under the proposed amendment.

Finally, the amendment raises a question, at least by indirection, whether the basic provisions of political broadcast section of the Federal Communications Act meet the present-day needs of broadcasters, networks, political candidates, and the electorate in view of the still-increasing importance of the broadcast medium in the political arena.

Section 315 (a), as proposed to be amended by the bill, reads as follows—italics indicate the new language which would be added to the present provisions of section 315 (a) of the Federal Communications Act:

SEC. 315. (a) If any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station, he shall afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station: *Provided*, That such licensee shall have no power of censorship over the material broadcast under the provisions of this section. No obligation is hereby imposed upon any licensee to allow the use of its station by any such candidate. *Appearance by a legally qualified candidate on any news, news interview, news documentary, panel discussion, debate or similar type program where the format and production of the program and the participants therein are determined by the broadcasting station, or by the network in the case of a network program, shall not be deemed to be use of a broadcasting station within the meaning of this subsection.*

In this connection, I want to call to the attention of the House an editorial in the Washington Post for Monday, June 13, 1955, entitled "Television for Candidates." This editorial comments on the amendment suggested by Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System:

Obviously there would be need for great care in amending the regulations so as to preserve the principle of impartiality. In this respect the specific amendment proposed by Dr. Stanton is deficient, for it would raise the possibility of favoritism for one candidate through repeated appearances on panel discussions or other public-affairs type programs at the discretion of the networks. The aim ought to be to preserve the equal-time principle for serious contenders while affording greater flexibility in format.

The editorial concludes by calling for a reexamination of the political broadcast provisions of the Communications Act for the purpose of "bringing television and radio regulations up to date with political realities." The editorial in its entirety reads as follows:

TELEVISION FOR CANDIDATES

Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, has raised a highly significant question about the regulations governing the use of television in national political campaigns. CBS will give free television time to presidential candidates of the two major parties in 1956 for a series of Lincoln-Douglas type debates—provided that there is a modification of the requirement of equivalent free time for all

other candidates. Such an offer, if it was made feasible by proper amendment of the law, undoubtedly would be repeated by the other networks. While the availability of some free time would by no means eliminate the need for paid political programs on television and radio, it certainly would help reduce to more manageable proportions costs that keep both the Republican and Democratic National Committees begging for funds.

The key point, of course, is to retain essential safeguards while modifying section 315 of the Federal Communications Act, which stipulates that if a network or station gives free time to one candidate it must extend the same privilege to all other candidates for the office. Section 315 was adopted for a reason of fundamental importance—to prevent rank political favoritism on federally regulated airways. It has prevented this favoritism, however, by freezing out much of the national political discussion that otherwise would take place on radio and television. Because it obviously would be impossible to extend free time to each of the 18 candidates for the Presidency in 1952, most of whom polled a mere handful of votes, there was for practical purposes no free television and radio time on the national level.

Obviously there would be need for great care in amending the regulations so as to preserve the principle of impartiality. In this respect the specific amendment proposed by Dr. Stanton is deficient, for it would raise the possibility of favoritism for one candidate through repeated appearances on panel discussions or other public-affairs type programs at the discretion of the networks. The aim ought to be to preserve the equal-time principle for serious contenders while affording greater flexibility in format.

What could reasonably be done, it seems to us, would be for Congress to amend the Federal Communications Act to recognize that the country has two major parties. Certainly the law should not discriminate against the possible rise of new parties on a national basis. But Congress could fairly provide that the free-time principle on the presidential level would extend only to parties that polled, say 1 million votes each in the last presidential election or that could muster 200,000 or 300,000 signatures on a petition. In this way the public interest in equal free time for parties with a national following could be met without placing the vegetarians or prohibitionists on a par with the Democrats and Republicans.

As this newspaper views it, three broad avenues are open for reform in controlling campaign expenditures. The first is in more realistic limits on political outlays and more rigorous reporting of contributions, as provided in the Hennings bill in the Senate. The second is in greater public participation in campaign financing through much more widespread individual contributions. An important third is in bringing television and radio regulations up to date with political realities.

The Organized Reserve Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Organized Reserve program is very little understood and appreciated.

There was conducted recently in Boston a top-secret mobilization of one of its units—the 305th Military Government Group, the first of its kind in the Nation for an Organized Reserve unit.

It was felt by Army officers it would not be successful—in any event, nowhere near the success that it was.

The news item which I include in my remarks and which appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe of June 5, 1955, shows that the alert operation was an outstanding success.

In commending the officers and enlisted men of this unit for the successful operation, knowledge of its success to other Organized Reserve units will prompt them to try and emulate the record established by Col. John L. Donovan and the members of his group.

The article follows:

ALERT FINDS 305TH READY BUT IN ODD TOGS FOR JOB

A top secret mobilization order—the first of its kind for an Organized Reserve unit in the Nation—was sounded yesterday for the 305th Military Government Group at the Army base yesterday.

The order, a highly guarded secret known only to the unit commander, brought members scurrying to Boston from Worcester, Salem, Lowell, Lawrence, and New Bedford.

Col. John L. Donovan of Quincy, commanding the group, sounded the alert call at 6:30 a. m.

Four hours later, 93 percent of the unit's 100 members had reached the Army base and were ready for duty.

The surprise alert caused temporary confusion and changed Saturday morning plans for many men and women members of the unit.

An east Boston man showed up in a morning suit, a young Brookline woman quickly climbed out of her mountain climbing outfit, a Boston businessman made and then immediately canceled a plane reservation, and a former assistant attorney general reported for duty after leaving his child at a hospital for an emergency operation.

Colonel Donovan, former Harvard football coach and chairman of the Massachusetts Hospital School trustees, termed the test a "fine job well done."

The unit was recently given the annual plaque of the Military Order of the World Wars as the best Army Reserve unit in Massachusetts.

SCULLIN CAUGHT AT AIRPORT

Colonel Donovan issued the mobilization order by placing a telephone call from his office at the Army base to the home of Sgt. Matthew P. Scullin, Jr., of Prides Crossing, his personal aid.

Scullin, vice president of the American Oil Products Co., of Somerville, happened to be en route to Logan Airport where he was scheduled to enplane for New York.

His brother telephoned the American Airlines reservation desk and on arrival at Logan, Scullin was advised of the unit's alert. He immediately canceled his reservation and left for the Army base.

"I always carry my uniform in the car, so I didn't have to go back home for it," he said.

Sergeant Scullin joined the Military Government Group during his undergraduate days at Harvard.

Meanwhile, Colonel Donovan, through a prearranged plan, notified other key members of the unit by telephone.

The group had no knowledge that a mobilization order was to be sounded yesterday, but they prepared for the surprise alert long ago.

STANDS UP MOUNTAIN

It was a quick change for WAC M/Sgt. Elvea Bowker, of Brookline, secretary to Attorney Eugene Carver, Brookline selectman. At 6:30 she had planned to leave for Dog Town Commons, Rockport, with the Appalachian Mountain Club, on a picture-taking expedition. She was all togged out in her mountain climbing costume when call came from Maj. William O'Connor of Melrose to report for duty. In a quick shift she changed to her uniform. Miss Bowker served in the WAC's during World War II.

Maj. Henry J. Chiarini, Boston High School of Commerce football coach, was preparing to be an usher at the wedding of his sister, Cecelia, of 50 Andrew Road, East Boston, who was married to Norman Regan of 52 St. Andrew Road, East Boston, at St. Lazarus Church.

He reported for duty with a morning suit over his arm at 6:45 a. m., completed his assigned duties, then left to attend the wedding.

Three members of the unit were pleasantly surprised. They found they had passed stiff examinations and were advanced in rank. Major Chiarini was advanced from the rank of captain. He served during World War II in the European theater of operations and was a prisoner of war in Germany. He lives at 821 American Legion Highway, Roslindale.

M. Sgt. Gerald Leaver, a high-school teacher in Stoughton, had his first lieutenant's bars pinned on his shoulder straps by Colonel Donovan. He likewise served in the European theater of operations during World War II. M. Sgt. David J. McAuliffe, of 149 Florence Street, Melrose, was advanced to warrant officer (jg). He is a graduate of Dartmouth College and a veteran of World War II.

It was a busy morning for Maj. Lenehan O'Connell, of Jamaica Plain, a former assistant attorney general. He is a son of the late Congressman Joseph O'Connell and a nephew of Superior Court Justice Daniel O'Connell. Informed of the alert, he couldn't leave right away because of an emergency appendectomy on his son. After leaving his son at Carney Hospital he reported for duty in civvies and was excused by Colonel Donovan. He returned to the hospital where he learned the operation was successful and his son out of danger.

CAUGHT BETWEEN TWO FIRES

Capt. Alfred Sudhalter, a lieutenant on a Boston fireboat moored at Battery Wharf, was between two fires when he received the call. He had to get permission from his acting chief before he could leave one important post for another. He was on duty for 2 hours, the minimum time required by Army regulations, before he was relieved.

New duties were experienced by Sgt. Arthur L. Schwartz, of Scarsdale, N. Y., and Edward Glich, of Worcester, both juniors at Harvard. Assigned to checking identification, they even held up civilian plumbers and steamfitters reporting for work in another section until they were cleared.

WAC Sgt. Mildred Smith had no telephone in her apartment on Commonwealth Avenue. Maj. Reginald Murphy and Capt. William Bergen surprised her at 6 a. m. Describing the early-morning visit Sergeant Smith said: "They gave me time only to get into my uniform. No time for a cup of coffee."

There was not even a catnap for Pfc. Thomas J. Gallagher of 12 Meredith Street, West Roxbury, who works at the Newton exchange at the telephone company. He worked all day yesterday and all night returning to his home at 12 Meredith Street, West Roxbury, shortly before 8 to learn of the alert. He reported at once.

Capt. Justin V. McGuirk, medical department, got also very little sleep. Last night he attended routine cases and performed an emergency appendectomy at 1 a. m. After spending the night at the hospital, he hurried to the Army base to take command of his medical team.

One member of the group couldn't make it for a good reason. Capt. Laurence Eisener, of Lynn, last night was admitted to the Saugus General Hospital for treatment.

The final check, Colonel Donovan told the Globe, was 48 officers and 51 enlisted men regarded as an excellent record. The group boarded Army buses at the base and went to Ft. Banks, Winthrop. After lunch there, they went to the NIKE site in Squantum where they inspected the construction.

Two school teachers in the WAC section reported early and assisted Colonel Donovan in checking plants for the alert. They are Maj. Lillian C. Crowley, teacher in the T. N. Hart School, South Boston, highest ranking WAC officer in New England, and Capt. Kathleen M. Trainor, a teacher in the Sarah J. Baker School, Roxbury.

The 305th Military Government Group is the only unit of its kind in New England. Its mission is to handle military government in occupied territory overseas. Most of its officer personnel have had experience in World War II and in the Far East running local governments. Colonel Donovan served on the staff of Gen. Omar Bradley with the 12th Army group in Europe during World War II.

First completed subunit to report for duty was the 1st platoon, commanded by Maj. Joseph C. Forte, a Winchester school principal. He was detailed by Colonel Donovan to take charge of movement of the group.

Commencement Address of Hon. John W. McCormack, Majority Leader, United States House of Representatives, at Stonehill College, North Easton, Mass., June 5, 1955—Awarded Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a commencement address made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] on the occasion of the commencement exercises of Stonehill College, North Easton, Mass., on June 5, 1955, on which occasion the gentleman from Massachusetts received the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

The address follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK, MAJORITY LEADER, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AT STONEHILL COLLEGE, NORTH EASTON, MASS., JUNE 5, 1955—AWARDED HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS

Your excellency, Most Rev. Bishop Brady, very reverend father president, right reverend and very reverend monsignori, reverend Fathers, reverend Brothers and Sisters, distinguished and invited guests, fellow members of the class of 1955, friends of Stonehill College.

It is at once a high privilege and a great pleasure to be with you here today at the commencement exercises of Stonehill College, a pioneer institution of its type and quality in southeastern Massachusetts and in the diocese of Fall River.

I am aware, in view of the presence of my distinguished and honored colleague from the 14th District of Massachusetts, former Speaker MARTIN, that it may also now be accused of being the conscious promoter and abetter of what our free press is wont to call the American bipartisan policy.

I am sure, however, that my honored friend from the Attleboros, as people hereabouts call his home territory, despite any partisan differences, will agree with me today that we are on neutral and somewhat hallowed ground, and that all of us are humbly proud that, in common kinship we are permitted to participate today in these impressive ceremonies which mark the progress and advancement of Stonehill College along another academic milestone.

I glory in the background, ideals, and aspirations of your college, to which I wholeheartedly ascribe.

I am here, and happily so, and as all commencement speakers, I am here in the unenviable position of not merely having to justify my presence, but, at the same time, I am charged with the task of conveying to my fellow graduates of the class of 1955 some message which will more than justify my inclusion within its intellectual ranks.

I trust you will believe me when I say, more out of a sense of inadequacy than simulated humility, that I realize how little qualified one of my generation is to speak with authority to those of you who, with your contemporaries, will shape the destiny of the generation to come.

You graduate today into what is fearfully described as the "atomic age." In past centuries, when descriptive terminology has been ascribed to an era or a period of time, it has generally been couched in words expressive of progressive, constructive, or even spiritual connotations.

For example, we have all learned in our history books of the Golden Ages of Greece and Rome, the Age of the Apostles, the Period of the Crusades, the Age of the Renaissance, the Age of Invention, and the Era of Good Will. True, we have also learned of wars and plagues, but these descriptive periods such as the Thirty Years War and the Time of the Bubonic Plague, have always been limited in concept and duration.

It has remained for this generation to come forth, unfortunately, with an historical description for its time which primarily connotes destruction and annihilation.

The ugly and shuddering fact is that today man can destroy in seconds what it took his fellow man centuries of toil and struggle to build.

In the past, when man has plumbed the depths of the elements, or harnessed the forces of nature, or invented mechanical contraptions, it has mostly been to achieve good ends. Control of fire, harnessing of steam, invention of gunpowder, conquest of the air by flight, undersea travel by submarine—all these were principally for peaceful purposes and constructive ends. True, indeed, some of them have been perverted to destructive uses—but it remains that the atom bomb was conceived and constructed to destroy, and its enormous peaceful potentialities are still the subject of our search and exploration.

This tremendous fact—the fact of atomic power—produced as the terminating agent of the most horrible and devastating war in history, is at once the fear and the hope of the age it characterizes.

It will continue to be a "fearful thing" if it is viewed only as a physical discovery and a mechanistic device with merely materialistic implications.

On the other hand, I submit that it may be the "hope of our future," if the secrets which it unlocks and the marvelous wonders of nature which it unfolds, can, as they already have in great measure, undermine the religious skepticism and philosophical materialism of modern science.

As I see it, it is young men and young women like you who graduate today, fortified with rightly formed consciences and the armor of Christian education, who can bring about the ultimate choice of the second, and far more desirable, alternative.

Out of the welter of destruction it has wrought, out of the sense of awfulness which it inspires, nuclear knowledge and its cosmic implication may finally bring modern man to the realization that the periodic tables of the elements and the molecular and atomic theories are merely a human discovery of a very small and very finite portion of the infinite intellect of Almighty God.

Such realization will undoubtedly mark the greatest forward step in the true education of this and succeeding generations.

You who leave these learned precincts today are already blessed with this realization. You will discover, however, that the majority of your contemporaries are ignorant of it.

As so eloquently expressed in the statement of the American hierarchy last year—a statement, incidentally, to which our classmate Bishop Brady was signatory—you will find that—

"It is not that the existence of God is expressly or generally denied; it is rather that so many men ignore Him and His law in their absorption with the material world which he created. There is not yet a deliberate turning away from God, but there is an excessive preoccupation with creatures."

It is this preoccupation with creatures which the bishops have summed up in the one word which characterizes our secular age. That word is materialism, and the ironic fact is that everything represented by that one word can be blasted into infinity by the atom bomb.

It is this latter terrible realization which should cause modern man to reexamine the bases of his education and his philosophy, and so reform them that, by the light of faith and grace, he may come to that more renign realization that God also created the atom, that as His creation it is basically good, and that its evil lies only in the perversity of its use by man himself.

Once man realizes these elemental facts, the terrors of the atomic age can be dissipated; and if he will then devote as much time and energy to the science of God as he now lavishes on the science of God's creation, perhaps harmony and balance shall be restored to the will and intellect which constitute his soul.

Unless this harmony and balance are achieved, the new age will be one of finite knowledge without faith, human yearning without hope, and mere civility without charity.

For, in the final analysis, it is these three great fundamental, theological virtues which are the crying need of the world today.

They need to be inculcated in the schools and colleges, they need to be practiced in government, politics, business, the professions, and in the home. Taken together, their needs must be permeated throughout our society to save our western civilization and its Judeo-Christian foundations.

You members of the class of 1955 at Stonehill College have been thoroughly grounded in the wisdom and necessity of these virtues. They are the cornerstone of your education, the firm foundation of your secular knowledge, the distinguishing mark of your character.

Without them, you would leave here informed but not educated; trained but not disciplined; mentally alert but spiritually unarmed.

Sincere belief in these virtues and diligence in their practice will convince you of what modern man is now sadly coming to realize, and that is, that he cannot live by his own standards alone.

He needs, rather, the inspiration of the standards set forth in the canons of Ten Commandments, in the sublime pattern provided by the life of the God—man, Jesus

Christ, on earth, and in the sound teaching of holy mother church for over 19 centuries.

You here today, with the deposit of learning imparted by your dedicated teachers, and by the example you can give as truly educated citizens, can help enormously in furnishing such inspiration.

If you will but do it, and if the rest of your generation is wise enough to respond to it, the deadly fears of the atomic age will vanish in a revitalized era of true Christian concord built upon God's ordering in faith, hope, and charity.

To each and every one of the graduating class, I offer my sincere congratulations and best wishes. Yours is an accomplishment of which you may well be proud. You have studied and prepared yourselves for the journey through life. Let each of you be true to yourself, your college, your country, and to God.

I salute you and wish you Godspeed.

Shackling TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Shackling TVA," which was published in the Florence (Ala.) Times, and was reprinted from the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHACKLING TVA

For years the private power industry has been making an expensive campaign to say the Tennessee Valley Authority power business is unable to pay its own way.

So the TVA directors prepared plans to demonstrate more clearly that it can be financially independent of the Federal Treasury and pay its own bills, if the Budget Bureau and Congress will let it. TVA offered to stand on its own feet without increasing the price of electricity.

The Budget Bureau has now turned thumbs down on the TVA proposal and demanded changes which will force the price of power upward.

The heart of the Budget Bureau method is a requirement that TVA retire its debt and pay full interest at the same time. TVA has been retiring the debt, which privately owned utilities rarely do. The private investment method is to refinance old bonds. But TVA has had an advantage in interest by use of the Treasury.

The Budget Bureau makes the unusual specification that the TVA power business carry at the same time the TVA method of retiring the debt and the private power method of interest payment.

The result of the Budget Bureau method would be higher priced electricity, while what TVA wanted to do was to prove financial soundness of its present prices.

Further, after more than 20 years of sound management by TVA, the Budget Bureau is determined to get shackles on that management. The Budget Bureau is opposed to letting the TVA management decide what bonds it needs to sell. The Budget Bureau wants to move that power of decision to the distant hands of the Secretary of the Treasury, a member of the Presidential Cabinet; the Budget Bureau itself, a presidential agency; and Congress.

The Budget Bureau further wants to tell TVA how it uses its money and have the say-so every 3 months.

Details of what the Budget Bureau wants to do to TVA could be recited at length. But it would be pointless, for they all add up to the Budget Bureau requirement that TVA give up its low prices for electricity—the most painful fact of TVA methods to the private power industry.

What Did Jesus Believe About Wealth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by the Reverend Irving E. Howard, which appeared in Human Events, the great Washington newsletter, of June 4, 1955, says many things that have needed to be said for a long time.

People in the modern world have allowed themselves to be bamboozled into thinking of Jesus as the original do-gooder, and a rather soft one at that. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Jesus believed in the law, and the law is not soft; it is just. Jesus believed in property rights. It was He who said, with approbation: "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with my own?" This is a far cry from today's fuzzy thinking.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Howard's article will perhaps surprise some, but it is true and we cannot have enough of such truth.

The article is as follows:

WHAT DID JESUS BELIEVE ABOUT WEALTH?

(By Rev. Irving E. Howard)

Someone has observed that no generation of Americans has thought more about freedom than ours and none has shown a greater readiness to abandon it. This is especially true in the realm of economics. The crux of the problem of economic freedom is the nature of wealth and man's right to it.

In view of this, it is important to consider what Jesus thought about wealth. Since He was concerned with life and since economics is involved in the whole of life, we should expect to find economic implications in the teachings of Jesus. This expectation is not disappointed.

Consider Jesus' parable of the laborers in the vineyard (Matthew 20: 1–6). Here is the story of an employer who hired a series of laborers at different hours of the day and at the end of the day paid them all alike. When those who had worked the longest complained because they had not been paid more than those who worked for an hour, the employer answered, "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with my own?"

Whatever theological meaning this parable may have, it clearly assumes that a man has a right to his property. This is not a surprising assumption for Jesus to have made, for it was a central idea in the Ten Commandments and was a part of the Judaism of Jesus' time. Much so-called social legislation is in conflict with the teachings of Jesus on the question of property, for this kind of legislation is usually founded upon the assumption that a man's property or wealth belongs to the community, and that the community has a right to determine how it should be used. Jesus had a different idea, namely, that ultimately all property belongs to God. More about that later.

Jesus also had a more constructive thought about the nature of wealth than "share the wealth." "Tax the rich" legislation assumes that there is a fixed amount of wealth which must be more evenly distributed throughout the economy if we are to have a just social order. Our Marxian graduated income tax operates upon that principle.

Jesus' theory of the nature of wealth corresponds to that of the classical economists. Both were expounding something that is written into the nature of things and is therefore unchangeable.

The classical economists taught that there are four ways to get property or wealth. It may be created by the sweat of one's brow or the use of one's talents. It may be traded for, received as a gift, or taken by force. In simpler days, when people were so naive as to believe the Ten Commandments, taking property by force was called stealing. In more recent times, however, we have been led to think that what may be wrong for the individual is right for government. According to this philosophy, if by majority rule the government takes property by force, the fact that the majority voted for it makes it not an act of theft but an expression of "social consciousness."

No one who is serious about the teaching of Jesus can ever be happy with this socialistic teaching. Not only did Jesus not believe in stealing; he did not believe that wealth was static. Study the parable of the 10 pounds. Here Jesus told the story of a nobleman who gave his 10 servants 1 pound each before he left for the far country. Upon his return, he called them to account. All but one had invested and increased his pound. This servant had hoarded his in fear that he might lose even that 1 pound. His lack of enterprise was condemned (Luke 19: 11–28).

Thus, from Jesus' point of view, if one man has less wealth than another, he may get more, not by robbing the man who has more but by creating some for himself. The only limitation upon the amount of wealth in existence is in man's ingenuity for creation. In this parable the more the servants made on their investment, the more they were applauded and there is no suggestion that there was anything immoral in their creation of wealth. Only sloth, fear, and hoarding were condemned.

In The Religious Foundations of Economic Progress, published in the Harvard Business Review of May 1952, Kenneth Boulding, economist, commented upon the gospel of self-help which has been largely lost from modern Protestantism. "Part of the cause," he wrote, "lies in sheer misunderstanding, stemming from failure to appreciate the ethical significance of economic progress, and a resultant economic ethic based on static assumptions, in which undue stress is laid on distributing a fixed sum of wealth fairly rather than on increasing the total to be distributed." We might add: "distributed by the method of the free market."

To be sure, Jesus' concept of wealth was in the framework of the Old Testament doctrine of the sovereignty of God: "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof." Thus, man is a steward over his wealth and is obligated to use it to the glory of God. Man has an account to render.

However, he renders his account to God. If man is responsible to society, as suggested by the World Council of Churches, the door is opened to totalitarianism. Society can become demonic. Our Founding Fathers

were aware of the danger of a despotism of the majority growing up among us, and therefore tried to construct a government of checks and balances which would restrain majorities by a concept of justice. They saw something beyond society as the source of man's freedom, dignity, and responsibility.

In addition to His idea of stewardship, Jesus' attitude toward wealth was conditioned by another worldliness. He was not primarily interested in this present world but in a world to come.

Therefore, when a man came to Jesus saying, "Master, speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me," Jesus rebuked the man and refused to be an equalizer of wealth. He continued by warning the man against covetousness.

Jesus had not heard about the social gospel, so his response to this challenge did not reveal an "enlightened social consciousness." It is odd that the covetousness Jesus warned against so frequently has been turned into a virtue by the social gospel and social action movement in the modern church.

Jesus followed his warning against covetousness with the parable of the rich fool who built ever larger barns only to die suddenly unprepared for eternity (Luke 12: 13–21). To Jesus, wealth was a threat to the soul of the possessor, not a problem to be solved by social engineering. His focal point was always upon the individual rather than the group. While what he said to the individual had wide social consequences, he always started with the individual. So how to use wealth was a problem for the individual to solve with a sense of stewardship to God.

Consider the Rich Young Ruler who asked Jesus what he should do to inherit eternal life. Jesus recited the Ten Commandments to which the Rich Young Ruler replied: "I have kept these from my youth up." To prove that he had not understood the full implication of them, particularly of the first, Jesus replied: "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, give to the poor * * * and follow me." Note that the point of emphasis in this incident was not upon the welfare of the poor, but upon the welfare of the Rich Young Ruler's soul. He had made a god of wealth (Matthew 19: 16–26).

Jesus was for neither the poor nor the rich. He was for all men as individuals. Most of all, he was for their spiritual development and commanded charity as a means to that development.

In Jesus' hands, the Old Testament doctrine of the sovereignty of God became a warm, personal faith in the providence of God. While expounding upon God's willingness to care for those who trust Him, Jesus enunciated one of the greatest truths of the New Testament: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you" (Matthew 6: 33).

The order of this verse is exceedingly important. Seeking the fulfillment of one's economic needs is not evil, but it must be secondary. When God is kept first, Jesus promises that man's economic needs will be met. Many historians have observed that at the root of the amazing economic development of western civilization have been deep-seated religious convictions about God, man and the universe, especially the conviction that man is a morally responsible individual accountable to God and who therefore should be free to make choices and suffer the consequences. Thus, the futility of trying to transplant western know-how to lands which have not accepted the western know-why. When such countries master western know-how without the religious world view which inspired it, those countries have invariably become a frankenstein of political despotism. All forms of coercive socialism, which put materialistic, economic considerations first and spiritual considerations last, invite disaster.

Man's accountability to God in the use of his wealth obligates him to practice charity which was the point of the story of Dives and Lazarus. The rich man in this story was punished, not because he was wealthy, but because he did not have compassion upon the beggar at his gate. Nevertheless, there is no suggestion in this story that Lazarus had any claim upon the rich man's wealth (Luke 16: 19–31).

Emil Brunner has stated it well in Justice and the Social Order: "(Man) is obliged, not by justice, but by compassion to give to those who are in need out of what is entirely his property, but those in need have no right to it. * * *"

The best known example of Jesus' insistence upon charity is the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10: 25–37). A close examination of this story reveals that while it was given in answer to the lawyer's question—"Who is my neighbor?", it answered an unasked question—"Who is it that acts neighborly?" In The Peril of Modernizing Jesus, Dr. Henry Joel Cadbury made the point that Jesus shifted the emphasis from the recipient to the doer of the deed, but Jesus actually went beyond that. Jesus emphasized the motivation of the doer of the deed. The spirit of compassion was more important to Jesus than the act of getting a wounded man taken care of on the Jericho road.

These distinctions are vital. Too frequently we have made the mistake of thinking that Christian ethics is concerned only with the objective deed, the consequences, rather than with the subjective motivation.

Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, secretary of the World Council of Churches, has criticized our American tendency in this regard: "When the objective deed is valued in the social result rather than in its motivation, it becomes possible to interpret a number of manifestations of social life as Christian (because of their apparent social value) that in the conception of ethics which stakes everything upon the inner attitude would never deserve the name."

"The greatest treason," said Thomas à Becket in Murder in the Cathedral, "is to do the right thing for the wrong reason." Much social welfare legislation provides us with examples of both wrong things and wrong reasons.

It used to be the fashion to complain that the church had ignored the social implications of the teachings of Jesus. The complainers then proceeded to demonstrate that Jesus' teachings implied socialism. Now that many people are taking a second look at those teachings, they are finding that they do imply a social message, but that message is one of individual responsibility, freedom and right to private property.

With a cry of alarm, ecclesiastical experts now warn that we must never seek to identify the ethic of Jesus with any civilization. Indeed. Is it permissible to discover that Christianity produced the healthy and admirable values in our society?

If the teachings of Jesus are not relevant to the problems of life in any age, then Christianity is indeed bankrupt. But Christianity is not bankrupt. It is socialism that is bankrupt for new ideas. The teachings of Jesus are still relevant and contain the truth that makes men free. Man is a spiritual being, not a materialistic mechanism. Man is responsible to God beyond all other authorities. As such, man has inalienable rights to life, liberty and property, which rights no government can give and no government should take away. This is the true Social Gospel.

Neutralism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a well considered and properly warning editorial appearing in the June 10, 1955, issue of the Catholic Standard, of Washington, D. C., entitled "Neutralism."

It was not so long ago when the false prophets of the Kremlin tried to deceive the free world by the deceitful movement of "peaceful existence," and failed. Their intentions were quickly perceived and understood. They are now following the policy and the appeal of "neutralism."

I am fearful that some of the leaders of our country and of other free countries are falling into their trap.

The editorial is as follows:

"NEUTRALISM"

As a movement worthy of notice in the present crisis, neutralism began in France and in its inception was the idea of some political thinkers; Gilson and Mauriac were among them. The idea was that there was no necessity for choosing sides in the struggle between Russian communism and the Western bloc headed by the United States. A third course, a course of neutralism, was advocated.

The idea of neutralism meant that a nation could simply absent itself in a struggle involving a moral decision. Of course, some of the philosophers developed the theme that a large enough bloc of neutralists would in effect create a peace or a truce.

Somewhat similar in appearance to this idea of neutralism, but vastly different in concept, is the demilitarization of internationalization of a certain zone to settle conflicting claims. An example of this was the establishment of the free port of Danzig and the demilitarization of a certain part of the Rhineland after World War I (later taken by the Nazis). Generally in such arrangements, the will of the citizens in the territory is not considered of paramount importance because the claims or frictions of the surrounding peoples are controlling. This demilitarization and internationalization has no application in this crisis since there is no question of the claim of the German Government to govern all of Germany.

Neutralism in the world situation today is totally unacceptable as a philosophical idea. It is a refusal to judge in a moral issue that is vitally pertinent to all. Regardless of the complexity of interests in the struggle between the Reds and the free peoples there is a massive, underlying principle of belief in God and the moral law involved that cannot be neglected. Communism is essentially atheistic and destructive of the foundation of our form of government. Even if an adverse military situation demanded that we tolerate communism, we still could not be neutral, we still would be opposed to its error.

Actually, there are further and weighty errors involved in neutralism. To strip such mighty nations as Germany, Poland, and others of their right to defend themselves is to strip them of their autonomy and right-

ful independence. There is no such thing as real independence and lack of the right of defense. An integral right of an independent nation is its right and duty to defend its borders and its citizens. This has always been recognized in the field of law and is recognized today by the U. N. For the United States to be a party to such a lawless despoliation of the rights of other nations would be a national disgrace.

Furthermore, to create an inviting vacuum so close to the Reds in Russia is tantamount to ceding the territory to the Reds. Never in the history of the world has there been such a situation which did not end in disaster. The neutralizing of a vast part of Central Europe would set off an onslaught of aggression.

The wisdom of following the course of justice and granting to Germany its sovereignty and right to rearm is apparent in the reversal of attitude by the Reds. If they do not acknowledge right, the Reds at least acknowledge might and their recognition of the claims of Austria and Germany coincided with the rearming of Germany. More progress in granting right to the throttled nations has been made in the few months since Germany was given independence than in 10 years of talking with the Reds. Neutralism would simply put us back to talking with the Reds and would give her an unimpeded opportunity to rape the rest of Europe.

Subtle "Book Burning"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Subtle 'Book Burning,'" which was published in the Science News Letter.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBTLE BOOK BURNING

There is a subtle book burning underway in Washington. Informative and inexpensive books, published by the Government for the public, are being withdrawn from further publication, or being reedited.

Principal targets are the how-to-do-it books. A few have already been discarded and more can be expected to disappear from Federal book stores. They can be expected, however, to turn up again at the book stores of private publishers, at higher prices.

One of the Government Printing Office's how-to-do-it books, a best seller for 24 years, is now in its death throes. "Care and Repair of the House," which had a profitable and record-breaking sales in 1954 of 33,500 copies, will not be reprinted.

The book is being discarded because it seems to be competitive with privately published books, and because it deals with a subject that is now considered "hardly appropriate with the fields of the Department of Commerce," Donald R. Burgess, director of the Department's office of publications management, told Science Service.

The Department of Commerce has the final say on what material written by its staff is to be published by the GPO.

Mr. Burgess explained that the do-it-yourself market has expanded in recent years and there are many good privately published books available. He said that there is a trend to take the Government out of competition with private industry, where private firms are doing the job.

Until 1950, when the 204-page, 60-cent do-it-yourself guide was completely revised, it had sold 175,000 copies. Since its revision, it has sold more than 114,600 copies. Its sales have steadily increased since it was first published in 1931.

But Care and Repair of the House will not be lost to the public. McGraw-Hill, New York publishers, are planning to publish a completely revised, lengthened, and heavily illustrated edition of it to sell for $3.95 or more.

Steve Gibson Scheaffer, a technical book editor at McGraw-Hill who is responsible for the revision of the book, told Science Service that it was being reedited under contract by the late Mrs. Louise D. C. Nobel, a former employee of the National Bureau of Standards who died on March 11, 1955. Mrs. Nobel had helped revise the 1931 Government edition in 1950. Mr. Scheaffer said that three-fourths of the Government book had been reworked, and that the New York publishers were "certainly interested in publishing it if there is a possibility for completing it."

The book was originally written by Vincent B. Phelan, a former National Bureau of Standards employee, who is now retired and living in Santa Barbara, Calif. When Mr. Phelan was notified by Science Service that his work was being discarded, he said that "the public deserves a better break than this."

"There is nothing like it on the market," the author stated. "Its reprinting should not be stopped. The book's sales record speaks for itself and there is certainly a continued demand for it here in the West."

Mr. Phelan said that it was still "up-to-date" and that it had been revised with the help of the Bureau's experts and with the addition of many new illustrations.

At present, only several hundred copies of the book are left in Government stock. When they run out, the plates will be put in storage and, unless the Department of Commerce requests the GPO to reissue the book within 2 years, the plates will be destroyed.

Opinion of the United States Supreme Court in the Peters Loyalty Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on June 10, there appeared in the Topeka Daily Capital, of my State, an article entitled "United States Supreme Court Shakes Confidence by Opinion in Peters Loyalty Case." The article was written by the distinguished columnist, David Lawrence. Because of the thoughtful approach of this great columnist has given to the Supreme Court's decision, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY IN WASHINGTON—UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT SHAKES CONFIDENCE BY OPINION IN PETERS LOYALTY CASE

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Returning from Europe to a National Capital largely preoccupied with domestic problems, the saddest event that meets the eye is the manifestation this week by the Supreme Court of the United States of a political affliction that cannot but hurt the institution itself. For, when the highest Court in the land abandons its judicial objectivity and indulges in the evasions and ambiguities so characteristic of partisan politics nowadays, the Court is bound to lose the respect of many thoughtful citizens.

The average man will not dig into the legal phrases of the case of Professor Peters, of Yale, and read the lengthy opinions, as did this correspondent. Most people will read only that an alleged Communist fired by the Government was ruled, on the basis of a technicality, to have been improperly dismissed. For the Court refused to decide whether he merited dismissal.

The Supreme Court majority also dodged the constitutional issue which had been raised in trial court—namely, whether informants in loyalty cases inside the Government shall be subject to cross-examination even though this ruins the detective work of the FBI and makes detection of other suspects difficult, if not impossible.

But the six judges who ruled that the Loyalty Review Board exceeded its authority in recommending the dismissal of Dr. Peters did far more than evade the constitutional question. They really challenged the right of the President of the United States and the executive agencies of the Government to dismiss anyone on any grounds they wish to cite. The only exceptions hitherto recognized have been the instances where Congress by law specifically stipulates the causes on which removal must be based.

The Supreme Court thus, in effect, has reversed or placed in doubt for future guidance one of the most important decisions it had made in previous years, when it upheld in the famous Myers case the right of the President to dismiss employees on the ground of inefficiency or unsuitability.

The six Justices went even further. They said, in effect, that the President and his Cabinet officers may not accept the advice or recommendations of advisory boards set up by the executive branch itself without running the risk of a court review.

This unprecedented ursurpation of judicial power over the inner workings of the executive branch may turn out to be the most startling deviation from custom in the whole history of the Supreme Court.

It is to the credit of Justices Reed and Burton that they refused to join in the misrepresentation of the facts of procedure. The opinion written by Justice Reed said in part:

"The executive branch is traditionally free to handle its internal problems of administration its own way * * *.

"Nowhere in the majority opinion does it appear that Secretary Hobby or the Department she heads, and for whom Dr. Peters worked, ever took any action in regard to the review board's recommendation."

Thus, Justices Reed and Burton flatly contradict the other Justices, who try to make it appear that the review board actually ordered the dismissal of Dr. Peters, as the final order of separation really came from an executive department official.

If the justices had been inclined to do a little research, too, they would have found that Loyalty Review Board recommendations were at times ignored by both Secretaries of State Acheson and Dulles, who disposed of cases of alleged lack of loyalty either by special panels of their own or by permitting resignations.

If the Supreme Court of the United States can undertake to appraise the quality of advice given by advisory boards and commissions and can rule that they do not have authority to give advice if it leads to dismissal of an employee, then the administrative machinery of Government is in for some perplexing interferences by the courts.

Even Justice Douglas, who wanted to tackle the constitutional issue about informants, says in his opinion discussing the Executive order under which the Loyalty Review Board was set up:

"The question of construction of the Executive order was so well settled that neither the Government nor Dr. Peters suggested the absence of authority in the Review Board to take jurisdiction of this case on its own motion. I agree that it had such authority. It, therefore, becomes necessary for me to reach the constitutional issue."

Chief Justice Warren, in the majority opinion, conceded that the dismissal of Dr. Peters was taken up by the high Court "because the case appeared to present the same constitutional question left unresolved by this Court's action in Bailey v. Richardson."

But in the latter case the justices voted 4 to 4 and the tie was not resolved due to the fact that one justice disqualified himself. So, after having taken the Peters case because of constitutional issues, the Supreme Court then backed away. It will be a long time before the prestige lost by the Supreme Court in the Peters case will be recovered.

A Grain of Sand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address delivered by Mr. Gilbert B. Dickey, Jr., president, Tennessee Oil Men's Association, at Gatlinburg, Tenn., May 16, 1955. These are the thoughts of a practical and substantial businessman who is head of a strong and growing organization in Tennessee. The thoughts expressed upon beneficial cooperation in getting things done are well worth consideration.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GRAIN OF SAND

(An address by Gilbert B. Dickey, Jr., president, Tennessee Oil Men's Association, at Gatlinburg, Tenn., May 16, 1955)

A very learned man not long ago said that lack of communication was the greatest problem in the way of world peace—for surely when man learns to communicate with his fellowman all over the world—understanding must surely follow, and with understanding comes peace.

This lesson was learned early in the oil industry. Out of the depression days came the birth of many jobbers, and of many large oil companies, major and independent. Then the days of World War II when this communication proved the mettle of the oil industry, a grateful nation and, yes, a grateful world said, "Thanks." Thanks for showing that as successfully as you battle it out in a peaceful competitive world, you can just as quickly join together and drink from the same cup to preserve our world. This could only have been possible because of such groups as this existing at different levels all over these United States.

Then to the days after World War II, when all of the high-powered crystal gazers goofed, like the Hooper survey that elected Dewey, we found ourselves in seller's market. Again this association reminded those of us who got too hungry for a dollar that every right carried an equal responsibility. There was a right way to allocate, and in spite of some companies who chose to be greedy, around a common table, these men found a solution of fairness. Here in this lush market which had been pentup for a period of nearly 6 years, each was enjoying his prosperity to such an extent that TOMA degenerated into a country club of back slappers. Sure we went through the motions of a meeting, but each one of us "had the world in a jug, Lord—and the stopper in our hand."

Man was too busy to worry about communication—he was too busy building to take care of all these people with all these cars—stations, bulk plants, refineries, oil wells, pipelines, tankers, barges, millions and millions—who the hell cares—it was like the Florida boom but this one will never burst, not this one.

Then something happened. The figure jugglers in the ivory towers had goofed again. There were the cars and the people that everyone said there would be, but each one of us had counted them all for his own. Somehow, we thought they would all trade with us. But look what competition had done—they had felt the same way. Well, let's get the business anyway. Those damn refineries won't quit throbbing gasoline—"Move it," become the order of the day. Build more stations. Take a quick shot at cost. Move 5 million more gallons this month. Our tanks are running over. Dump it. That station that was turned in to us to do 40,000 gallons is doing 18,000. Change operators. Make him give a discount. Cut the price. Put in premiums. Do anything, but move this damned gasoline.

Well, here we are, in 1955—bleary-eyed, ulcer-ated, money-poor (and I don't just mean jobbers)—crying, "Somebody do something." Let's get the Government to protect us. What happened to the oil industry public relations program? How come they want to start controlling the oil industry? Somebody guarantee me a living. How can we survive?"

Gentlemen, the oil industry has been a bad boy—and I mean from the producers in their coupe de Ville Cadillacs, who are not content to ride from their high-priced homes to their oil wells in the cool and chrome elegance of their air-conditioned cars, but who are now proposing to air-condition Texas—brought about because of the 27-percent depletion allowance, and gigging municipalities for natural gas which they used to flare off as waste—and now cry, "Why does the Government put my business under Federal regulation," to the major oil companies who hide their 27-percent windfall in trick financial statements of fast writeoffs, and their employees, jobbers, and agents, who spend silly money to make a station do 40,000 when it should do 20,000 or maybe should never have been built at all—who sell commercial accounts 3 to 4 cents below what they sell their own dealers—who, by their very way of doing business, are asking for all the punishment due this bad boy. Yet, surely, with limping and crawling, reddened face, and downcast eyes it finds itself today back at the council table of the trade association asking mutual forgiveness.

As a kindly father would, must not our council bring forth a resolve to do good, and go out and sin no more. Cannot we—and there is not an innocent party at this table today—show the world that we are big men and can settle our problems without courts—without regulation—but in that law of decency that should prevail among us. Nor do I mean to preserve the weak, the inefficient, or the lazy laggards in our industry. These are properly the fatalities of a buyer's market. Are not the confines of this table more conclusive to a more peaceful industry, than in the hands of those who do not understand or appreciate our problems?

Gentlemen, I would suggest to you that the word, voluntary, sounds better to my ears than compulsory. What a bloody game football would be without a set of ground rules. How much more conducive to a good game of football are those rules made by coaches of football than those that could be made by the PTA. Cannot we in Tennessee set ourselves up as a model for the rest of the groping Nation, and lay down our own ground rules of fair play? This, I would like for you to discuss with your management and yourselves. I shall attempt between now and the next convention, with your help, to publish these rules of the game. Nor need you fear that watchdog of our practices—the Federal Trade Commission—for I am sure that they would prefer to see the little live with the big for the good of the American people than to spend the money and the time to prosecute the evil that exists among us today.

Practicing Diplomats by the Thousand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Practicing Diplomats by the Thousand," by Mr. Norman Adams.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRACTICING DIPLOMATS BY THE THOUSAND

(By Norman Adams)

Our Government will sponsor the exchange of over 8,000 persons between the United States and 70 other nations this year. It will also encourage and assist, in other than financial ways, some 570 private businesses, institutions, and foreign governments in the interchange of over 7,500 more persons, which will increase the number of countries involved in these programs to well over 80.

These people comprise part of the very successful postwar educational exchange arrangements which are sending thousands of people to other countries for foreign study, training, teaching, lecturing, on-the-spot research, and observing and consulting with other countries' experts.

The United States Government programs have shown a definite increase in the quality as well as in the volume of personnel involved, and a well-diversified field of study approach is kept constantly in mind. The State Department's competently organized International Information Administration, which administers most of the grants, is wisely considering each recipient as a "junior diplomat" and the selection of the exchange personnel is carefully studied. The IIA's annual pamphlet, "International Exchange Opportunities," expresses this point of view very clearly.

The exchange program is one of the vital elements in the United States Government's

"Campaign of Truth." Not only is it an effective way of breaking down barriers of misunderstanding about the United States, but it also harvests for this country a rich crop of knowledge about the problems and values of other countries, essential if we are to live up to our present position of leadership among the nations of the free world.

"The benefits of the exchanges are not limited to the participating individual alone. They reach far beyond when these people take part in a variety of extracurricular activities—as they usually do. Then, upon returning to their home countries, they disseminate the information they have acquired to countless others. Consequently, one of the guiding principles in the selection of participants is that they possess those personal characteristics which will enable them to develop understanding of the people in the country they visit and communicate an honest expression of this experience to their fellow citizens upon their return."

Congress in at least 11 instances has authorized various international educational plans. This explains the noticeable increase from 913 grants in 1946 to over 16,500 Federal grants in 1952, in programs conducted by the Department of State, the Army, and the Mutual Security Agency.

This reciprocal type of educational exchange program had its inception in 1938 with a plan incorporating some of the nations in the Western Hemisphere. It was unimpressive in both size and flexibility and was never actually given much of a chance to function, as the war's approach terminated the fluidity of movement between countries. With the war successfully concluded, the United States found that it had enormous real estate holdings in foreign areas. But when we sold our surplus material to the foreign countries we realized that they couldn't pay for them in dollars, as their negative trade balances with us had exhausted most of their dollar holdings. Their currency was of negligible value to us as we had no trade payments that would utilize all those funds; and so a unique pecuniary problem arose.

But in 1946, Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat from Arkansas, who was a Rhodes scholar in England in his student days, introduced the now famous Fulbright Act by which the State Department can use a limited amount of the blocked currencies, procured through the sale of our real estate abroad, to finance the international educational exchange of persons plan. The debtor nations transfer to our Fulbright commissions, located in each of the participating countries, the money which they owe us. This will be used to pay the expenses of the Americans coming to that country. It usually includes travel, living costs, and an incidental expense allowance.

The foreign currency is also used to pay for the travel of foreign nationals to the United States. As the currency is blocked, i. e., not convertible into United States dollars, the foreigner must obtain some dollar aid to pay for his expenses while here. If he is a visiting lecturer or graduate research student, etc., he can usually obtain a salary from the American university with which he affiliates. If a student, he generally will apply for any one of the tens of thousands of scholarships offered by individual trust funds, businesses, and colleges. Also, oftentimes both governments will financially assist a visiting expert or consultant in order to allow him to travel abroad.

This Fulbright Act was amended by the passage of the Mutual Security Act of 1952. This provided for the use of foreign currencies held or available for expenditure by the United States or any agency thereof which might have been procured by any one of many ways—not just through the sale of our foreign assets. Obviously, this enhanced the program's financial stability and widened its scope enormously.

In 1948 only Burma, China, the Philippines, and New Zealand were included in this program, with fewer than 65 American professors, research scholars, teachers, and students being exchanged with 36 foreign professors and students. The Americans, coming from 28 different States, studied 23 various fields of interest. The following year saw the addition of 8 new countries and an increase from the 100 "Fulbrighters" in 1948 to over 1,800 American and foreign nationals in 1949. Representation came from 46 States plus the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Alaska. The State Department pursued its intelligent policy of a wide flexible academic field which saw over 45 different subjects being studied.

Since 1949 the program has enlarged unbelievably. About 1,200 Americans, from every State and each United States territory, were awarded grants in 1950 (from 12,593 applicants) to travel and study in 15 nations of their choice. Over 1,300 foreigners were recipients and were sent to 45 different States and studied at least 50 different academic topics.

Two years ago 3,452 people were involved in this mass Fulbright exchange movement. Today, an even greater number are utilizing the facilities of the 27 nations now currently participating in the international Fulbright program. The act is not only a marvelous opportunity for interested scholars, but more: it is a means of seeing and understanding each other. It allows governments to send their specialists to help others, their leaders in industry and agriculture to learn newer methods, and students to study their subjects at first hand. It has logically and potentially far-reaching possibilities which should prove most conducive to international progress and a stronger union between the nations of the free world.

For example, James Coleman, from Utah, is interested in colonial development, and is studying in Nigeria. Walter Deshler is in Uganda living with the Mbulu people of the northern province of Tanganyika, also studying colonial development. Bryn Mawr graduate Reba Benedict has always been interested in geology and is now in Scotland pursuing her topic, A General Study of the Geological Structure of Scottish Highlands and Lowlands. Indiana-born Kurt Kaufman, a student bacteriologist, is enrolled at Oxford University in England, following in the footsteps of Dr. Fleming, the discoverer of penicillin.

The Taxonomy of Orchids and Ferns is the botanical specialty of Gordon De Wolf from Arizona (where there certainly aren't many orchids or ferns) so he is at the University of Malaya in Singapore. Lois McDonnell is enrolled in Manchester University in England in one of the very few schools stressing education for preschool and hard-of-hearing children.

Besides this gigantic Fulbright program, our Government is also actively engaged in the following:

(1) The Buenos Aires Convention, which provides for the annual exchange of graduate students between the United States and 16 South American countries.

(2) The program established by the Smith-Mundt Act, which puts the educational exchange program into our national policy and assists financially the interchange of persons between America and the entire Western Hemisphere, the Fulbright countries, and more than 20 other nations in the eastern areas of the world.

(3) The Maritime Commission program, which authorizes a 4-year instruction course for 12 citizens of other American republics at the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

(4) The Finnish agreement which puts aside part of the annual payment on Finland's World War I debt to the United States to be used for educational exchange between the two countries.

(5) The program of the Foreign Economic Assistance Act, which allows Chinese and Korean scholars, stranded in America, to continue their studies here.

(6) The Iranian Trust, received by the State Department, which is used for the education of Iranian students in the United States.

(7) The program set up by the annual appropriations act, which expends money through the Department of State to bring students, educators, and businessmen from Austria and Germany to the United States.

The thousands of American exchange students study art in Paris and Rome; music in Milan and Vienna; city planning in Venezuela and Australia; agriculture in the Netherlands and Pakistan; anthropology in Greece and Peru; economic nationalization in Great Britain and Agentina; mining in the Union of South Africa and Chile; classical literature in Athens or in the shadows of the Vatican; history in Turkey or Western Germany; and business techniques in Belgium and Austria.

The foreign students coming to our universities study mostly agriculture, chemistry, engineering, medicine, physics, economics, public administration, and secondary education. The foreign instructors are spread evenly throughout 46 of our States, while we send most of our educators to the United Kingdom, Burma, the Philippines, Thailand (Siam), Greece, New Zealand, and Pakistan.

Our point 4 program and Foreign Operations Administration, combined with numerous civic-spirited private businesses and organizations, have been pushing an ambitious exchange plan with special emphasis on bringing foreign executives and government officials to the United States. Foreign journalists may come here and work for 4 months on a newspaper staff. Labor leaders will be guided through American unions and industries. Foreign government officers, educators, scientists, and others will study, observe, and comment on the political, economic, and cultural aspects of their impressions with American colleagues in their respective fields. A member of parliament from southeast Asia remarked, when returning to his homeland, "I wanted to learn about American life because it was only possible in the United States for me to see the difference between democracy and communism. I have definitely accomplished this."

In 1951 over 200 grants to Americans taking part in specialized assignments were given for their assistance in 25 countries. Typical of these was the appointment of a dentist to Thailand, a labor specialist to Trieste, a monetary economist to Israel, and a radio electrician to Greece. The impact of these awards has already been felt. For example, the dentist, who is the dean of an American medical school, assisted in the organization of a Thailand school of dentistry; through professional contacts he was able to stock it with new medical textbooks; and upon his return to America he arranged for private scholarships for Thai students for their graduate study in American dental schools. These exchanges often have a dynamic effect on a wide and varied group of people. A Howard University scholar, doing graduate research on French political problems, spoke to a large audience on the progress made by the American Negro in attaining first-class citizenship. Included in the group listening to him were colonial governors, members of parliament, and leaders in important organizations interested in federation of the French union. This is certainly another example of our American exchange students' acceptance of their role to present our country honestly and objectively to the entire world.

In addition to these types of awards, the State Department also has continued to provide in-service training for foreign nationals interested in political science. For example, Australia and the United States concluded an agreement (Smith-Mundt Act provisions) which allowed the United States Bureau of Reclamation to train 12 Australian engineers a year for the next several years in the Bureau's installations at Denver. The Bureau has agreed to design some of the works to be undertaken by the Australian Snowy Mountain Hydroelectric Authority. Every service and facility, including tuition for the Australian trainees, will be paid for by the Snowy Mountain Authority.

But certainly all of these educational sponsorships are not done solely by our Government. The development of the American exchange program is due in large measure to the enthusiasm of private organizations and foundations. For instance, in 1951–52, of the 31,000 foreign students here, over two-thirds were receiving monetary assistance from private sources. The approaching years will show an even greater private impetus given this movement when the Ford and Cordell Hull Foundations begin their exchange plans. Typical examples of these private exchange actions were: (1) The American Chemical Society enabled over 250 young European and Southeast Asian chemists and chemical engineers to attend the International Chemical Conclave in New York, and to observe and study at firsthand the scientific, industrial, and educational advances which have been made in this country; (2) the Trans-World Airlines sponsored newspapermen from 14 nations for a 2-week tour of the United States; and (3) private donors granted outstanding young American musicians financial travel awards to the annual musical competition in Brussels (during last year's competition, at which no prominent American artist appeared, the highest awards were given to Soviet pianists).

The United Nations' annual report, "Study Abroad," delineates many of the Government and private scholarships available to peoples from almost every country. It shows that fewer than 15,000 grants were available in 1948, while today more than 40,000 are awarded. This great evolutionary movement is attempting—and successfully so—to unite the free world by mutual understanding and appreciation of one another's customs, beliefs, and habits.

We, as Americans, can be justly proud that our Government is undertaking this program in an enthusiastic and competent manner. It is a wise investment for future peace and progress.

Social Security Exemptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill for the purpose of amending existing legislation in order to provide an exemption from participation in the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program for individuals who are opposed to participation in such a program on grounds of conscience or religious belief.

Overtures leading to the introduction of this bill were received from representatives of the Amish sects, residing in my congressional district as well as from those residing in other sections of the country; notably, Maryland, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa.

The spokesmen for these fine people emphasized that it is contrary to their religious beliefs that they or their children should depend in any way upon government for support or aid in any form, and that it is distressing to them to think that their children should ever rely on other than Divine Providence for their economic needs. They also pointed out that it has been traditional with them to avoid insurance in any form, and it is well known that they "take care of their own", whether it be to replace a barn or dwelling destroyed by fire or to care for those of their faith who may find themselves in financial straits.

The precedent for exemption on grounds of conscience is well-established, and we have traditionally recognized that a citizen can claim relief from military duty on the ground that it is contrary to his religious beliefs. The exercise of this right is particularly prevalent in Pennsylvania where the founding fathers were Quakers who opposed the bearing of arms as violative of their pacifistic philosophy. Also inherent in our legal processes is the right to exemption from sitting on a murder jury because of opposition to capital punishment. It would seem then to be equally logical that the Government should grant exemptions from a program which is designed primarily to provide economic benefits to individuals—as distinguished from the public welfare or defense—when such individuals are prepared to renounce irrevocably all claims on the Government for either themselves or their heirs. In short, Uncle Sam collects nothing and pays nothing out, while those thus exempted continue to provide for themselves as they have been doing for over two centuries.

The exemptions from the operation of the Social Security Act presently enjoyed by doctors, lawyers, and clergymen is a further precedent for favorable action on my bill, and I feel that the fact that there still exists in our midst a group of people to whom governmental largess and handouts are repugnant should command wholehearted support for this legislation.

The Supreme Court and Its Political Decision in the School Segregation Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the political decision of the Supreme Court, recently, in the school segregation case has caused no little attention in this Nation. This decision, rendered without the benefit of what we in the legal profession call "stare decisis," has disturbed the minds of constitutional lawyers throughout the Nation. They recognize the fact that, if this trend is to continue, neither law books nor former decisions of this Court can be relied on when cases come before this body on appeal.

It will be noted that the original decision, rendered some time ago, was manufactured when not a single iota of evidence could be found in the records coming from the lower courts to justify the original decision in the first place.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding legal minds of the United States is William Mason Smith, member of the New York bar, and in a letter to the News and Courier, Charleston, S. C., he has referred to the instant decision.

I include his letter with my remarks. In addition to this, Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial on the same date, from this outstanding daily newspaper, the oldest daily in the South, which aptly reflects on this decision:

WHO CAN CORRECT THE COURT?

To the NEWS AND COURIER:

It is gratifying to note that the United States Supreme Court by its decree in the segregation cases is endeavoring to alleviate the evil threatened by its unconstitutional usurpation of legislative power.

From the beginning of our country, it has been recognized that the administrative power was vested in the President, the legislative power in Congress and only the judicial power in the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court has been given or has acquired the right to say when the actions of the President are unconstitutional and therefore void, when the laws passed by Congress are unconstitutional and therefore void, but who is empowered to say when the actions of the Supreme Court are unconstitutional? Only the Supreme Court itself.

One of its learned former justices has been frequently quoted as having said, "The Constitution is what the Supreme Court says it is." This anomalous situation makes it vitally important that the Supreme Court should be scrupulous not to arrogate to itself powers not given to it. When it undertakes to declare unlawful a procedure that for 85 years has been recognized by the country and by the Supreme Court itself as lawful, it overlooks the constitutional limitations on its own power.

But who is to correct that error? Preferably the Supreme Court itself. It should reconsider and overrule its basic decision in the segregation cases. The opportunity might be given to it by the lower Federal courts, since it is their duty as well as the duty of the Supreme Court to enforce the Constitution. If one of them should have the courage to hold in an appropriate case that the segregation decision was not binding as a true statement of the law, because it was legislative and not judicial and therefore beyond the Supreme Court's power, that Court, on appeal, could reconsider the whole question, with attention directed to the question of whether their own action was not ultra vires, unconstitutional, and therefore void.

It is no new thing for the Supreme Court to reverse itself, nor is it contumacious or improper for an attorney to contend in that Court that a previous decision on a question of law is wrong and should be set aside. The assumption that the last decision of the Supreme Court on a legal question which it has decided in 2 contradictory ways must be the right 1 seems to be based on precedent but not on reason.

It would seem to be a patriotic act to give that court the opportunity to correct its action in having strayed outside of its constitutional boundaries and taken over the legislative functions constitutionally vested in

Congress. If the Supreme Court's action in changing the law be deemed a controlling precedent, then that Court has become more powerful by its own act that the Russian Politburo, and our constitutional security is gone.

As Senator EASTLAND has been quoted in the newspapers as saying—and the late John W. Davis and others ably contend in the Court itself—the decision was not a judicial one. Being legislative, it should be unenforceable unless supported by an act of Congress approved by the President.

WM. MASON SMITH.

(A Charlestonian who has been practicing law in New York for more than half a century.)

NEW YORK.

JUDICIAL ERROR

Elsewhere on this page today appears a letter from Mr. William Mason Smith, a native Charlestonian who has been practicing law in New York City nearly 60 years. Mr. Smith is associated with one of the most prominent law firms of the metropolis. His opinions on constitutional matters carry weight.

What he has to say about the Supreme Court's decision in the public-school cases merits attention not only in the South but everywhere in the country. He has touched on a matter of vital concern to all Americans. It is the power of one branch of Government to encroach on others.

In this case the Supreme Court has taken action on matters which are in the province of the legislative branch. Moreover, the legislative branch has refused to do what the Court has done with regard to race. By its action the Court has upset orderly representative government.

Who is to correct the errors of the Court? Mr. Smith's discussion of this subject, we believe, is a valuable contribution, to which we invite the attention of our readers.

Niagara Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include a resolution received from the Young Men's Republican Club of Erie County, Inc., Buffalo, N. Y., in favor of legislation I have introduced to authorize the immediate construction of certain works of improvement on the Niagara River for power purposes.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Governments of the United States and the State of New York and private power interests have shown a willingness and a desire in developing the power potential of the Niagara River;

Whereas it appears that it will be some time before a decision will be made as to which authority will be given the right to develop said project;

Whereas this delay is detrimental to the citizens of the Niagara frontier and is annually depriving them of millions of dollars in potential electric power;

Whereas the Dominion of Canada has virtually completed construction of its own power project;

Whereas Representative EDMUND RADWAN has introduced legislation in the House of Representatives authorizing the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to commence immediate construction of a power project on the American side of the international boundary comparable to the project now under construction in Canada;

Whereas said legislation would permit construction to begin without further delay while a determination as to the proper authority to assume operation and control of said project upon its completion is made: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Young Republican Club of Erie County go on record in favor of and urging the passage of said legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Congressmen RADWAN, PILLION, and MILLER, and Senator IRVING IVES.

Promotion Needed in Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an article from the March 26 issue of Pennsylvania Farmer, written by John A. Smith, a Cumberland County dairyman, who is farm editor of radio station WCMB, Harrisburg, and one of the most knowledgeable agricultural experts in Pennsylvania.

Since June is Dairy Month, Mr. Smith's article is quite pertinent:

LOOKING BOTH WAYS AT THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

(By John A. Smith)

Pennsylvania dairymen are running into trouble again. Increased production brings more efficient management but, sadly, no increased profits. Farmers are learning that efficient production is not the whole answer to our milk problems. We must also learn to sell our products.

According to a Cornell marketing report the per capita consumption of milk in New York State has declined 17 percent in the past 10 years. On the other hand highly advertised competitors have increased consumption by leaps and bounds.

United States tea consumption has risen by 20 million pounds in 5 years. Coffee increased 17 percent in a 10-year period. The consumption of soft drinks has made a spectacular rise of 170 percent and in the case of highly advertised beer the American people are now consuming an average of 67 quarts annually.

"Advertising," said one milk-marketing expert, "has helped to fill the human stomach with cake, pop, orange juice, and beer until there's practically no room left for milk."

START AT HOME FIRST

Farmers, themselves, need to appraise their attitude toward the use of their own products. Dairy farmers who use margarine have created a poor case for themselves. Vegetable shortening and synthetic detergents have made serious inroads into the fat market and are now challenging the loyalty of farm women to their own home product.

On a local level farm women are purchasing ice cream from the local peddler or roadside custard stand and forgetting the loyalty they owe to their own milk distributor who finds it necessary to sell his lower classifications of milk on the open market. Why? Because his demands for ice cream fall short of his supply of milk during the flush season.

Wisconsin ice-cream mix competes with Pennsylvania ice-cream mix on the very farms of our State. No, we can't build a stone wall around our milkshed, but we can be loyal to our market outlet.

If adults and the younger Americans would drink three glasses of milk a day, as recommended by the American Dairy Association and nutrition experts, instead of three cups of a competitor, we would consume close to 44 billion quarts of fluid milk a year. This amounts to more than 94 billion pounds a year—easily enough along with milk used in other dairy products to keep pace with production and to wipe out our surplus. If every American would drink one-half glass of milk a day above his present level of consumption we would have no surplus of dairy products.

WISCONSIN PROMOTION

I was in Fort Atkinson, Wis., the morning that State launched the big milk butter and cheese campaign of 1953. I used one of our 4-H Dairy Demonstration team members, Annette Curtis of Columbus, Pa., as a model to translate the Wisconsin campaign to meet our Pennsylvania demands. In the picture, she held a banner that appeared in all Wisconsin restaurants. But I was appalled as we drove through the great dairy State of Wisconsin on our way to the National Dairy Cattle Congress at Waterloo, Iowa, to find dairy farmers willing to sell choice advertising space on silos to a favorite brand of beer. One small compensating factor may have had some influence—the large add contained in small print a postscript, "with Wisconsin cheese."

Unless farmers are willing to place the marketing of their product in top position on their farms, on their trucks and above all in their minds we are headed for trouble right here in Pennsylvania. We have competitors in our markets. We cannot be complacent. We cannot refuse to use the weapons they use to defeat us in securing a fair share of the consumer's good will as well as his dollar. It is not enough for us to be content with 42 cents when the people who advertise get the 58 cents from his dollar.

A few timid souls in the dairy industry tell us that milk and milk products are priced out of the market. None of our competitors have any such delusions—even with much less to sell, nutritionally, economically and flavorwise.

Lower-priced milk has been the theme of most attempts to destroy a favorable market for milk products in this great center of organized labor. People who favor minimum wage laws balk at the thought of minimum price laws for farmers.

On the other hand, billboards as seen from Pittsburgh hotel windows quite often keep one awake nights blazing forth the virtues of a big competitor very much priced out of the market valuewise but commanding a leading role in the beverage field. Price to these competitors is not a factor. They bid for the consumer's favor and get it.

MILK A GOOD BUY AT PRESENT PRICES

Twenty years ago when the milk control law was written 1 hour of industrial wages bought 4.8 quarts of milk. Today the ratio is much more favorable. One hour of industrial wages buys 7.2 quarts of milk.

Milk must be sold at a price that will give a farmer a chance to pay interest on mortgages, operating expenses, a fair standard of living for his family and a chance to send his children to college, maintain churches and schools and improve community life. Better standards of value must be established than merely producing and selling a product for a price that people are willing to pay. No commercial commodity is thus sold and no marketer of such commodities apologizes for the fact that his product must represent cost of production plus a reasonable profit. When a quart of milk has a value of 50 cents

worth of steak nutritionally or 75 cents worth of codfish—why should we hide behind a priced-out-of-the-market phobia and resign ourselves to a take-what-the-market-offers formula?

I am very happy indeed that so many people have taken the position that the State milk control law "should be retained without amendment" because I take it as a personal vindication of a conviction of 20 years standing. I likewise considered the bipartisan support the milk-control law received in the House of Representatives as a vindication of fair dealing and sound thinking. Only 23 members opposed its final passage in the House. Except for minor amendments in 1937 when the Commission was made permanent the law is virtually the same as when passed April 16, 1935.

TEST OF TIME

The basic functions of the milk control law have been subjected to the test of time and the interpretations of the courts. Dirt farmers wrote it. Except for the able hand of John H. Fertig, director of the Legislative Reference Bureau, who guided the hand of the writer in matters of constitutionality of its many provisions, we did not have an expert on our team. In fact most experts refused to participate in our hearings and deliberations.

To this law and its regulations I owe much. It has enabled me to pay off the mortgage on our farm and send our children through college as well as establish a well-equipped modern farm. I am sure many farmers will acknowledge the same debt of gratitude.

Accessory to the establishment of the Pennsylvania milk-control law were the milk marketing committees established by the evangelistic spirit of a country preacher. The Church of the Brethren produces many lay ministers who become valuable preachers as well as excellent farmers. One of these was Rev. Robert Cocklin of Cumberland County. He was given the job of setting up committees of three in the milk marketing areas of the State, financed jointly by the dealers and producers on a share-the-cost basis.

LOCAL COMMITTEES

During the war years when we produced much less milk and dairy products than we needed for our civilian population and Armed Forces as well as friendly allies, the job of marketing was of little importance. We have passed that period now. We need, on the local level, the same type of marketing committee and we need to support them to the hilt. Yes, we should support the $5 million program of American Dairy Association on a national scale, but we should support them through these marketing committees.

Our first duty is to our local marketing problems. Then with the details of local marketing well handled, part of the funds collected by the share-the-cost authority should go to the national program, now operating throughout the Nation through magazine advertising, network radio programs and the Bob Hope, Bob Crosby, and Walt Disney TV appeal to consumers. If we now profit by the experience of those marketing committees set up as accessory to the new milk control law we can have a very clear view of where we may be going in this difficult year of 1955.

STRATEGIC MOMENT

Dr. John H. Davis, director, Moffett Program in Agriculture and Business, Harvard University, addressing the National Grange in November said in part:

"The present is a strategic moment for the American farmer in terms of deciding his future. While he has suffered some serious economic setbacks in the past 4 years, he still is in a good position to participate as a full partner in the economic growth toward a national annual product of $500 billion. However, if wrong decisions are made now and in the years ahead, or if we follow a policy of indecision, then gradually agriculture will begin to lag behind farther and farther in the march of progress."

In conclusion the former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture said, "The 25 percent drop in farm net income during the past 4 years should make us pause and think. We cannot afford to permit agriculture to move backward while the balance of the country moves forward to new levels of prosperity. The philosophy that the entire agricultural economy must be depressed economically as a means of forcing adjustments is unsound—it does not fit the enlightened era of the 1950's. In general it is wiser and usually more successful to implement economic adjustments by the incentives method than by the punishment method."

Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech delivered in New York City, June 9, 1955, by a distinguished constituent and friend, Col. Harold Riegelman, a leading lawyer, former postmaster of New York, former Republican candidate for mayor of New York, and counsel for the citizens budget commission. His thinking on this difficult and controversial subject is constructive and merits serious consideration.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS OF COL. HAROLD RIEGELMAN AT CARNEGIE HALL RALLY FOR A FAIR IMMIGRATION LAW, JUNE 9, 1955

This is a meeting of protest, of vigorous protest against laws that are inconsistent with American tradition—inconsistent with traditional policies that have made America great. That greatness is not only material but, more important, spiritual. The complex of immigration which has brought about this greatness has also enriched the pattern of American life. Every culture in the world has found its place in that pattern—every national inheritance from every corner and part of the world.

There is no one within the sound of my voice who does not owe to a historically liberal, nondiscriminatory immigration policy the fact that he is an American.

The reason we are gathered here tonight is because America has turned its back upon that very policy to which we owe the blessing that we are Americans. We recognize the need for keeping the number of newcomers within the numerical limits of our capacity to offer them full, productive lives. But we have blocked the stream. We have imposed tests and conditions upon those few who trickle through which are directly contrary to our own basic concepts of human dignity and human rights.

There are two points I wish to make. The first is that there is nothing new or partisan in the repulsive idea of exclusion. Long before we were a nation voices were raised against the newcomer. Three hundred years ago the people of Providence, R. I., the very cradle of religious tolerance in our country, proposed to stop immigration by dividing up among themselves the land in Providence reserved for immigrants—land without which immigrants could not feed or clothe themselves. It was on that occasion that Roger Williams made his moving plea—a plea that still rings down through the ages and is as timely in these days as it was 3 centuries ago:

"I have one only motion and petition which I earnestly pray the town to lay to heart, as even they look for a blessing from God on the town, on your families, your corn and cattle, and your children after you; it is this, that after you have got over the black brook of some soul bondage yourselves, you tear not down the bridge after you by leaving no small pittance for distressed souls that may come after you."

Down through the centuries there have always been those whose ears have been deaf to this immortal plea. Having themselves cross the black brook of soul bondage, they have sought to burn down the bridge behind them. They sought to keep out the Germans in the forties and fifties, later the Poles, and in turn Russians, Italians, Greeks, and the Jews, regardless of where they came from. Some would even prevent our fellow citizens from our insular possessions from coming here. McCarran and Walter did not invent restrictive or discriminatory limitations upon immigration. They have been merely the modern disciples of a restrictive and discriminatory philosophy. And unsettled and confused times brought them sufficient support to write provincialism and bigotry into the law of the land. Meanwhile, the voices which might have neutralized that support were silent, or at least not sufficiently vigorous to be effective.

Today these voices have awakened to the full significance of failure to marshal their forces to maintain the integrity of traditional American principles.

And in this awakening, they have the backing of a great leader. On seven occasions in the fall of 1952, the President pleaded for a rewriting of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, as he said, "to get the bigotry out of it." In 1954, he told the Congress: "It is well for us * * * to remind ourselves occasionally * * * we are, one and all, immigrants or sons and daughters of immigrants. Existing legislation contains injustices. It does, in fact, discriminate. I am, therefore, requesting Congress to review this legislation and to enact a statute that will at one and the same time guard our national interests and be faithful to our basic ideas of freedom and fairness to all."

In 1955, he repeated his plea to Congress to amend provisions which "have the effect of compelling action in respect to aliens which are inequitable in some instances and discriminatory in others."

These views, I think, fairly represent our views. They cut across party lines. Beware of any man in public life who claims some partisan benefit or advantage in the issue of an equitable, liberal immigration policy. The McCarran-Walter Act was conceived and sponsored by two Democrats. But it would not have become law without bipartisan support. The Refugee Act was passed in response to a Republican President's plea, but its purposes were torpedoed by the same forces which favored the McCarran-Walter Act. What is needed is support for the men in both parties who stand for fair play; and vigorous, unrelenting opposition against those of both parties who are against fair play. This is not a battle of personalities or parties, but of principles. Personalities are important only to the extent that they stand for or against sound principles. That is the first point to remember.

A second point is the administration, as distinguished from the substance, of our immigration laws—both the McCarran-Walter Act and the Refugee Act. We have no patience with prejudiced, harsh, and extreme interpretation of these or any statutes which affect and may well ruin the lives of human beings. Nevertheless, in our anger against these immigration laws, let us be slow to

condemn those who are responsible only for administration of those laws. They cannot, consistently with their oath of office, decently and humanely administer a law which is neither decent nor humane. They cannot consistently with that oath make an effective Refugee Act out of one whose provisions are self-defeating. Let us not fritter away our indignation by fruitless and sometimes unfair recriminations.

We should know what we want and demand it and fight for it.

We want the McCarran-Walter Act rewritten. When it is rewritten, we shall no longer have to pass special laws for Basque sheepherders or other emergency situations.

We do not favor unlimited immigration, but the national origins quota system imbedded in the McCarran-Walter Act is racist, demagogic, and does outrageous violence to the first American principle that all men are created equal. Even if that pernicious system were to be continued, common fairness demands that it be based on accurate 1950 census figures and not the obsolete and distorted figures of 1920. That basis was not chosen by accident. It was aimed primarily at Italians, Greeks, and other southern and eastern Europeans. The humiliating treatment of Asiatics is less subtle and indefensibly severe.

The exclusion of active, voluntary Communists from entry as immigrants is commendable, but the fact that the same security provisions are not applied to Nazis or Fascists cannot be defended or excused.

The preference within 50 percent of quotas, given to persons of special skills determined by the Attorney General to be needed here, discourages the immigration of teachers and desirable young men and women who have not yet mastered special skills. The accent is shifted from moral character which is the backbone of our Nation, to technical ability which is an acquired competence. It may never be used here. In any case it has nothing to do with fitness to be a useful American.

And the broad discretion given subordinate officials has encouraged abuses for which there is no assured remedy by appeal. The act makes second-class citizens for life of aliens who become citizens. As second-class citizens they are exposed to deportation on grounds which did not exist when they arrived and on grounds which may be as trifling as failure to report a change of residence within 10 days after the change. These new exposures as to many of which there is no statute of limitations in turn make them vulnerable to forms of oppression and extortion to which no American citizen, by birth or naturalization, should be subjected.

This enumeration of abuses by no means exhausts the iniquities of the McCarran-Walter Act. But they do serve to emphasize the racist, biased, unreasonable, and anti-American quality of that disgraceful statute.

As for the Refugee Act, that, too, requires drastic changes. It needs to be amended to permit the unused quotas in some categories to enlarge the inadequate quotas in other categories.

The term "refugee" should include uprooted people whose character and ability have enabled them to adjust themselves to their new temporary environment abroad, and who for that very reason are ineligible as refugees under the law to come here, and who are also ineligible because they have found temporary homes in the same countries where their permanent homes have been destroyed.

The illegality of original entry to this country should not, after years of law-abiding, useful residence, deprive a man of all protection against deportation and persecution, slavery, or death.

The requirement of a passport as a condition to entry under the Refugee Act is the ultimate cynicism in those many cases where the lack of a passport is the very hallmark of a man's character, courage, and resistance against oppression. The same consideration applies to the harsh requirement of a complete 2-year personal history of the petitioner for admission. We do not require this of quota immigrants under the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. Why ask it of the refugee?

We want organization sponsorship to be accepted as an equivalent of individual sponsorship. Organization sponsorship is frequently more responsible and less difficult to secure.

And finally, we see no virtue, kindness, or necessity in excluding an entire family because one member is ill from a disease which in no way endangers our community.

These abuses have been very specifically enumerated and their correction demanded by President Eisenhower. We cannot but endorse his demand that they be corrected. But let us not get bogged down in detail.

It is a change of heart and mind we require and not merely verbal changes. And while we are concerned about the deficiencies of the Refugee Act, we are even more concerned about the callous and narrow philosophy of the McCarran-Walter Act.

By all means let the State Department do what it lawfully can to give these laws as humane an interpretation as their language permits. But let our target be the language and spirit of those laws and those men inside and outside of the Congress who are content to let the blot of those barbaric, bigoted, and reactionary provisions remain on the statute books and the conscience of America.

How Airlines Have Brought South American Countries Closer Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the RECORD a speech delivered by Mr. Emil F. Klein, of Pan American World Airways System, at the University of Maryland before the Rotary Club Committee on International Service. The speech follows:

HOW AIRLINES HAVE BROUGHT SOUTH AMERICAN COUNTRIES CLOSER TOGETHER

I cannot be so presumptious as to ask that you believe that I know all about International Air Transportation. I am not one of those men who knows all there is to know about the business he is engaged in.

I, like all of you, have opinions. I have beliefs in the airline industry, in the company I represent, and in the service that it sells.

It is one of these beliefs that I wish to speak of tonight. I cannot help but believe that the International Airlines have done more to bring the countries of South America closer to each other and to the United States—yes, and to the other nations of the World, than any other single means of transportation. Why do I believe this? Because I see the International Airline performing a threefold task. Acting as an ambassador—providing a means for the exporter and importer alike to profitably market their goods. I see it extending the bonds of friendship between peoples by providing a safe, comfortable and economical system of travel to countries and cities never before made possible.

All of us realize the destructive force of the military airplane. Few realize the peace power of that same flying machine. I do not believe that the visions that Orville and Wilbur Wright had for their machine were anything but adventure, the promoting of goodwill and the developing of commerce by air between the people of all nations.

In doing the job of bringing countries closer together, let us consider that obstacles—political, economical, and social had to be overcome. The International Air Carrier does in hours and days what other forms of transportation take weeks and months to accomplish. The speed that is necessary for the representatives of the governments to get together to discuss and settle peaceably their grievances is one of the contributions of air transportation.

In March of 1954 in Caracas, Venezuela, there was held the 10th International Conference of the American States—it's purpose—to make sure of the independence of the Americas. In November, in Brazil, the Rio Economic Conference—it's purpose—the strengthening of the bonds of friendship and cooperation between the countries of South America and the United States, which will produce benefits to all.

The airlines have done much to prevent economic stagnation in the countries of South America by providing a means of transportation, where—because of geographical conditions—other systems have been made difficult, if not impracticable to facilitate trade between manufacturer and consumer, exporter and importer.

Pan American Airways has in service to the countries of Central and South America huge 4-engine Douglas 6 A's—the most modern air-cargo carrier available. To supplement these, Pan American developed, and has in service, the station wagons—DC-4 type Clippers that can be quickly converted to handle cargo or passengers, or a combination of both, with no sacrifice to passenger comfort.

Fully aware that what is good business for our customers is good business for our company, the sales representatives of the company in 411 offices in the world's busiest centers are constantly looking for possibilities of moving merchandise from manufacturers and distributors in one country to retail and wholesale outlets in another. In 1932 Pan American carried 13,700 pounds of cargo to South America. In 1953, it carried 43,374,000 pounds of cargo to South America. This is the effort of one international carrier.

Today, only 51 years after that first historic flight at Kitty Hawk and, only 25 years after Pan American World Airways and its affiliate, Panagra, were encircling South America with their combined service, there are 24 other international airlines operating in South America.

In 1954 air transportation replaced the surface transport as the principal carrier for overseas travel. These airlines have helped incease the number of South American visitors between those countries and between the United States. Agricultural improvements and industrial developments will follow.

The value of travel as a part of education is becoming more and more recognized. A survey of colleges and universities in all 48 States showed that 11.3 percent of the 1,209 institutions responding to the questionnaire granted academic credit for travel. Ninety institutions offered professional recognition in addition to academic credit, and 257 offered professional credit alone.

These airlines offer to the traveling public of North and South America alike:

Their equipment—the most modern available.

Their routes—frequent schedules to most all places.

Their service—the kind of service that makes for the best in comfort and dependability.

Their experience—the kind of experience that goes in an unequaled record of 47,000 transatlantic flights, 30,000 transpacific flights, 37,000 equator crossings, 2,000 round-the-world trips and the winning of more safety awards while carrying more than 13 million passengers over a billion miles in safety and comfort.

Rare Engineering Feat Accomplished as D. M. Bare Paper Mill, Roaring Spring, Pa., Is Converted Into a Modern Plant While Precision Manufacturing Processes Continued Uninterrupted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the interesting story of how one of the Nation's oldest paper mills located in my congressional district was converted into a modern plant valued at over $6 million was revealed to the public when the Altoona, Pa., television staton WFBG–TV, recently dramatized the feat of effecting the transformation without interrupting the work schedules of the plant.

The story of the miracle of reconstruction is told in the following article which appeared in the June 9, 1955, issue of the Morrisons Cove Herald published in Martinsburg, Pa. It is a well-deserved tribute to the officials of the D. M. Bare Paper Co., of Roaring Spring, Pa., a firm that has added greatly to the economic life of the Morrison Cove area in Blair County, which is one of the richest agricultural areas in the world.

The story follows:

D. M. BARE PAPER CO. MILL, ONE OF NATION'S OLDEST, NOW ONE OF MOST MODERN

One of the Nation's oldest paper mills has been transformed into one of the most modern—a $6 million vote of confidence in the future of Roaring Spring and Morrisons Cove.

This week Cove stockholders of the Combined Locks Paper Co., parent company of the D. M. Bare Paper Co. of Roaring Spring, read that the new facilities of the Cove mill were in operation.

Between the lines of the president's brief report to stockholders lies a dramatic story of a rare engineering feat—construction of a new factory over an old one, while precise manufacturing operations continued.

While residents of Roaring Spring saw the steel skeleton of new building rise, and then saw it covered, few knew of the engineering problems that were faced and overcome inside those walls.

Some of this drama was revealed recently in a television salute to the industry by WFBG-TV.

Two articles in the Paper Trade Journal told the same story to papermakers of the Nation.

John C. Evans, editor of the Journal, wrote:

"Roaring Spring is a very advantageous location for a paper mill. Coal mines are within trucking distance (15 miles) of the mill; it draws its chief raw material, wood, from the nearby area and it is particularly fortunate in its water supply.

"Insofar as markets are concerned, it is located near the center of the largest paper market in the world—New York City and area, Philadelphia, Washington, Pittsburgh, and Cleveland."

When the Combined Locks Paper Co. bought the D. M. Bare Paper Co. in 1946, a long-range program of improvement and rebuilding was started.

Fate, however, changed both plans and schedules radically. A serious explosion in the soda pulp mill in 1951 forced a shutdown of that part of the mill. The improvement program was put into top speed and the erection of an entirely new pulp mill was started.

This was during the Korean war, so that mechanical problems were multiplied by shortages of critical material.

Now the reconstruction is complete. The new pulp mill in operation, as well as a new paper machine—larger and faster than any previously erected in the mill.

In a salute to the D. M. Bare Paper Co. by the Altoona Chamber of Commerce, televised over WFBG–TV, company officials revealed that the plant now has 340 employees with an annual payroll of about $1,300,000.

Employees enjoy benefits of hospitalization insurance and a retirement fund. Last September, they established a chapter of a Federal credit union which now has $10,000 in the till and has loaned $14,000 to members. In a year's time, the mill purchases 35,000 cords of paper wood for about $600,000. Another $125,000 is spent for electricity and $200,000 for coal each year.

In his article, How One of the Oldest Pulp Mills Has Been Rebuit and Modernized, Mr. Evans wrote:

"This is the story of the rejuvenation of one of the oldest pulp and paper mills in the country, that of D. M. Bare Paper Co., of Roaring Spring, Pa., 15 miles south of Altoona.

"The mill first started operations in 1866, pulping straw and gunny sacks and producing paper from these. Through the years, the mill's production progressed to finer grades, such as book, envelope, writing, and mimeograph.

"The D. M. Bare Paper Co. is a subsidiary of Combined Locks Paper Co., of Combined Locks, Wis. The parent company was acquired in 1946 by John F. Cuneo, of Chicago, one of the Nation's largest printing firms.

"With the completion of a new kraft pulp mill, the D. M. Bare Paper Co. will have completed by far the greatest single construction program in its 88 years of existence."

In the television program, Vice President J. B. Porter, who is in charge of sales, said that the largest customer was also the nearest. The Roaring Spring Blank Book Co. purchases about 20 percent of the mill's production.

Paper from Roaring Spring is shipped around the world. Much of it is used in the largest national magazines, books, writing paper, and for publishing the Bible.

Harold S. Vanderhei, vice president and general manager of the D. M. Bare Paper Co., who was chief engineer of the Combined Locks Paper Co. at the time of the building project, headed the engineering staff for the reconstruction.

D. M. Bare men who played important roles in the project included W. Rodowski, pulp mill superintendent; W. Stephenson, technical director; Bernard Brown, construction superintendent, and J. Manifold, master mechanic.

Mr. Evans continued:

"Streamlining of straight-line operation was of prime importance. Space has been provided within the present buildings to add future equipment, without additional building alterations. Duplicate pumping units have been installed in many cases to insure smooth uninterrupted operations. Gravity flows predominate throughout the entire pulp mill."

An unusual layout allowed the elimination of pumps in the handling of white liquor. A 12-foot trucking aisle has been provided on the operating floor level extending from one end of the mill to the other. This aisleway ties in with one railroad siding facilitating the ease of handling materials.

On the third floor a similar 12-foot trucking aisle extends the full length of mill and ties in with another railway siding at this higher elevation. At a later date an 8-foot by 15-foot electric freight elevator is to be installed to serve all floors and both railroad sidings.

Raw materials such as liquid alum, caustic, and size are unloaded from tank car by gravity. Bag lime is used for liquor making. Bulk lime for causticizing department. Airveyor system is used for the unloading and storing of salt cake for use with the recovery boiler.

Among the interesting engineering problems solved were: Location of the woodyard and arrangement of the woodroom, design of the bleach plant building, wrapping the whole pulp operation around and through existing buildings and expansion of the paper mill, whereby a new and larger building has been built surrounding the existing paper mill building which has since been removed.

Carl Martin, assistant treasurer, commented: "All of this took place while we continued manufacturing paper. The new building grew over the old, then the old was removed. Work went ahead without any shutdown, except on weekends."

Mr. Vanderhei, of the D. M. Bare Co., and John J. Bowman, of the Combined Locks Paper Co., wrote in the Paper Trade Journal of April 4, 1955:

"The project was a complicated one, as it involved moving and rebuilding the stock preparation system, replacing a small paper machine with a larger one in the same location and building a new finishing room. Nature of the mill yard made it necessary to accomplish this on the existing site so that a new paper mill building had to be built around the existing building, which was later demolished."

By coordinating erection, construction, and production of existing machinery, the plant continued to turn out paper while growing a new shell and new interior.

The giant, new paper machine is designed to turn out paper 110 inches wide at 1,000 feet per minute, although it is not operated at full capacity at the present time.

It is now producing offset paper. If, however, the demand falls for this type paper the same machine can be used to manufacture coated stock. Whatever, the demand, the new D. M. Bare mill is equipped to meet it, company officials said.

At the same time, two smaller machines make paper from pulp produced in the mill. The No. 2 machine turns out high-quality paper, 76 inches wide at a speed of 330 feet per minute, while machine No. 3 makes paper 70 inches wide at 350 feet per minute.

Working at full capacity, the old D. M. Bare mill produced about 40 tons of pulp daily. Now it produces 70 tons.

The old mill produced, about 45 tons of finished paper. Today, the output is 75 tons per day.

One of the oldest paper mills in the Nation is now one of the newest.

As long as Roaring Spring continues pouring out its cascade of 7 million gallons of water a day, the future of the D. M. Bare Paper Co., and the community, looks good.

And the Roaring Spring never falters.

National Policy on Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on June 10 I was granted permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech entitled National Policy on Coal, delivered by Mr. James D. Francis, of Huntington, W. Va., at the 39th annual meeting of the National Industrial Conference Board, in New York. At that time I did not know that the Francis speech would fill 2½ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or one-half page more than a Member is authorized to have printed without first presenting to the Senate an estimate. On June 13 the Government Printing Office returned the manuscript to me with this statement:

This manuscript is estimated to make approximately 2½ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, for a number of years it has been my privilege to know Mr. James D. Francis, of Huntington, W. Va., former president of Island Creek Coal Co. and, since reaching the retirement age of 65, president of a new company he formed, called the Powellton Coal Co.

Mr. Francis received his law degree from the University of Virginia, and entered the legal division of a large coal company in West Virginia; but his interests and talents lay more in the production field than in the legal field, and it was not too long before he was first general manager, and then president, of one of the large coal companies of West Virginia. For the past 22 years I have had many contacts with Mr. Francis, concerning the problems of the coal industry, but more especially with respect to its tax problems. It was a subject in which I was much interested because of large deposits of high-grade bituminous coal in the southwestern section of Virginia.

Because of his great familiarity with the subject of a national policy on coal and my great confidence in his sound judgment, it gives me pleasure to offer for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD the address Mr. Francis delivered on May 20 at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in New York City.

In a period of unprecedented peacetime prosperity the coal industry is the most depressed industry in our Nation. Everyone knows that coal is not only our basic fuel, but our most abundant fuel, and the preservation of that industry in a healthy, economic condition, is essential to the national welfare. The suggestions of Mr. Francis, one of the ablest and most experienced coal producers of the Nation on how the coal industry can, and should be, helped, are so pertinent at this time that I renew my request for permission to publish his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated that they will fill 2½ pages of the Appendix and cost $200.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL POLICY ON COAL

(Speech by James D. Francis, president, the Powellton Coal Co., before a roundtable on Managing Our Natural Resources, concerning the findings of the Hoover Commission at the National Industrial Conference Board's 39th annual meeting held May 19 and 20, 1955, in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel)

A national policy on coal is essential for the welfare of our Nation as much as it is for the coal industry.

Our great growth as a nation has been based on the use of heat, power, and energy produced from coal and the use of horsepower rather than manpower.

The known and available supply of coal is adequate to provide heat, power, and energy for our Nation for at least 2,500 years. Nine-tenths of our known mineral energy is coal. Water power, petroleum, and natural gas combined is less than 10 percent. Even if we have atomic and hydrogen power, coal in abundance is necessary.

The coal industry is desirous of helping to bring about a national policy which will make it possible for this enormous supply of coal to be available to our Nation, the public, and our coal users and consumers in adequate quantities at reasonable prices at all times.

To do this it is necessary to remove several artificial handicaps under which coal is now operating.

The real beginning of the demand for coal in quantity started with the Civil War in 1860, and in that year production was only 6½ million tons. Production doubled by the end of the Civil War.

The development of our coal-burning locomotives, powerplants, steel industry, and later the electric industry speeded this growth. By 1890 it was 111 million tons, in 1900 it was 212 million tons, and in 1914, the beginning of World War I, production was over 422 million tons. Under the impetus of the war demand, it mounted to 580 million tons in 1918, a production not reached again until 1947, when production was 630 million tons.

Under the impetus of World War II production rose from 395 million tons in 1939 to 620 million tons in 1944. In that period coal took on 80 percent of the extra energy load for the Nation's defense, while petroleum, natural gas, and water power assumed only 20 percent of the additional energy load.

According to the statistics of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the coal industry operated at an average loss of $24 million per year from 1929 to 1939. Even in the period of the Second World War, including the postwar period from 1940 to 1952 inclusive, the industry only earned $113 million a year, or approximately 15 cents a ton on each of the 7 billion tons of coal produced in that period.

From 1929 to 1952 inclusive, when 12 billion tons of coal were produced, the earnings of the coal producers amounted to approximately 10 cents a ton, or less than 2 percent on the value of the investments in the industry devoted to this service.

While the figures for 1953 and 1954 are not available the best information indicates that the industry operated at an average loss in both of these years.

Some of the more favorable situated and efficient coal companies have made profits during a great many of these years, but the great majority have not. The Nation, to have a strong coal industry capable of supplying not only our own country's needs but the needs of our friends in Canada and overseas, must make profits to justify it in building and maintaining an adequate capacity using the latest and most efficient machinery and equipment that will keep the coal industry up-to-date in production, sales, and distribution.

Of the approximately 5,000 companies operating 9,000 mines in 1948, less than 6,000 are now in production or partial production, and of the 442,000 miners employed in 1948 only 214,000 are now employed or partially employed. It is obvious that this industry should be restored to a healthier situation at the earliest time possible.

The coal industry is operating in an efficient manner. It has for many years produced 5 to 6 times as many tons of coal per man-day as is produced by any other coal-producing nation in the world. Coal miners averaged $92.01 a week in December of last year, not including vacations with pay, welfare funds, and other fringe benefits. The average wage in all manufacturing industries was $74.12 and the average for the British miner was $39.20. American coal is sold at the mines for less than similar coal is sold for in Great Britain and Western Europe. Consumers of coal are getting the advantage of these prices.

After the end of the Second World War in 1945, when tankers could operate freely and the Big Inch line was made a natural gas line, competition with petroleum products and natural gas increased rapidly. In the years since 1948 the increase in cheap natural gas and foreign residual oil for steam boiler use and the loss of coal for railroad fuel to diesel locomotive has substantially decreased the production and use of coal. The loss from 1947 to 1954 amounted to 238 million tons, making the production in 1954 about 392 million tons. From 1940 to 1954 the increase in natural gas marketed, not including gas used for carbon black and other field uses, amounted to the equivalent of 248 million tons of coal. Reverse this coal demand from 1939 to 1947 due to war or other emergency and we will have a disastrous shortage of fuels that can seriously cripple our Nation.

The United States is using up its short-lived fuels, petroleum and natural gas, at a rapid rate while the United Kingdom and Western Europe, which are now rapidly developing their oil and gas reserves, still depend upon coal for their heat, power and energy. The United Kingdom used in 1952 as a source of heat, power, and energy approximately 92 percent coal; Western Germany 92 percent; France 72 percent; and Europe, as a whole, 81 percent. In 1953 our country's use of coal had dropped to 44.4 percent and we were using 24.5 percent natural gas (not including gas used for carbon black and field use), 25.3 percent oil (not including truck and motor fuels, lubricating oils and similar products), and 5.8 percent hydroelectric power. Even with that decline the United States uses 50 times as much coal per capita as South America.

One of our most important problems in this country is this. Shall we burn up our natural gas and petroleum products as rapidly as we are doing today in order to make quick profits? Shall we do this when we know that probably within 20 to 25 years, and maybe in a shorter period, we shall have to attempt to make gas and liquid fuels from coal at a cost that will be from 3 to 5 times more than natural gas is selling for today? The coal industry does not think so, and the Cabinet Committee's report to the President of February 26, 1955, indicates that the members of that committee do not think so.

We in the coal industry are not alone in believing that this capacity is essential, that oil from domestic and foreign sources will not be adequate for all demands, and that natural gas is more likely to decline than to increase.

Former President Herbert Hoover, in a letter to the National Coal Association published in 1953 Bituminous Coal Annual, said: "There is no engineer who believes this Na-

tion can do without huge supplies of coal. Despite the encroachment of waterpower, oil, gas, and the possible atomic power, the Nation will need increasing coal production. There is in sight no ample substitute for much of our steam, a large part of household coal, supplies for metallurgical use, production of chemical materials, and other use."

Our friend, Mr. Clarence Francis, is quoted in the same publication as saying: "The contribution of coal to the welfare of this country is great, has been great, and will continue to be vital. Not only is coal important as a power producer, but scientific research will develop more and more uses for this vital product. Its use will be broadened and its contribution to our standard of living enlarged."

Mr. Eugene Ayres, economist and technical adviser to the Gulf (Oil) Research & Development Co., in a letter addressed to the president of the National Coal Association a little more than a year ago, said: "All signs now seem to point toward an almost explosive expansion in United States consumption of coal." He states: "I believe that demand should be about 600 million tons in 1958 and 1.2 billion tons in 1970." He further states: "By 1970 we shall want to import 4.5 billion barrels of oil, while the world shortage will be nearly 4 billion barrels."

These statements are supported by the Paley reports and cannot be taken lightly.

The national policy on coal is based on the belief that it is not only in the public interest but it is a public necessity that the coal industry operate from 500 to 600 million tons per annum and maintain a standby mine and manpower capacity that will allow it to increase its production in any emergency quickly by 25 to 50 percent.

For many years, but especially for the past 2 years, the coal industry has been presenting its problems to the legislative and the executive departments of our Government. We now have a report dated February 26, 1955, from the Cabinet Committee to the President recommending a balanced fuel and energy program which, among other things, recommends lower freight rates on coal, fairer buying practices by the Government, promotion of coal exports, some limits on importation of crude and residual oil, new consideration of tax incentives, and revision of the present Natural Gas Act. I shall quote or describe what the Cabinet Committee's report has to say on these points, and comment on some of them.

Freight rates: "In order to maintain coal's vitality as an instrument of national defense by improving currently its ability to compete with other fuels, the railroads, by voluntary action, and, in the absence thereof, the Interstate Commerce Commission, by compulsory order, should adjust freight rates to the extent necessary to remove the excessive and disproportionate contribution that coal rates are making to meet the cost of other unprofitable services of the railroad industry."

Usually about one-third to one-half of industry's cost for coal is represented by freight charges from the mine to the point of consumption. Many of these rates are too high both actually and relatively. The coal industry has been protesting these rates and charges for many years and is now asking the Interstate Commerce Commission to take off the general increases made in 1952 and subsequent raises under ex parte docket 175. The coal industry feels that a substantial reduction should be made on the present freight rates on coal. Such a reduction would give coal a better opportunity to meet the competition of petroleum products and natural gas in competitive markets.

This is most important to the railroads as well as to the coal industry and the public. The railroads operating in the important coal-consuming area in the northeastern part of the country originated 251 million tons of coal and coke traffic in 1954, and this represented 47.1 percent of their total carload freight tonnage.

Coal pays a transportation charge much higher than many heavy commodities. Coal in many cases pays about 50 percent more per ton than iron ore moving in the same cars over the same rails for an equivalent distance. Coal and railroads both are also meeting unfair competition from natural gas transportation companies that operate under another Government bureau very similar in makeup to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Fair-purchasing practices: The Government, its agencies or contractors, should use fair practice in buying coal in order to work out a more consistent and equitable coal-purchasing policy. (The Government and its agencies, like the TVA, have been buying coal under cost while buying zinc, lead, and many other minerals for storage in order to help these industries maintain a fair market price.)

Foreign restrictions—Coal: "The Government should urge foreign governments to reduce unreasonable discriminatory restrictions against imports of United States coal." (Such discrimination has been practiced in favor of Polish coal, vessel rates, and in many other ways.)

Oil imports: In regard to crude and residual fuel oil imports, the committee made the following recommendations:

"An expanding domestic oil industry, plus a healthy oil industry in friendly countries which help to supply the United States market, constitute basically important elements in the kind of industrial strength which contributes most to a strong national defense. Other energy industries, especially coal, must also maintain a level of operation which will make possible rapid expansion in output should that become necessary."

"That if the imports of crude and residual oils should exceed significantly the respective proportions that these imports of oils bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954, the domestic fuels situation could be so impaired as to endanger the orderly industrial growth which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense."

"That if in the future the imports of crude oil and residual fuel oils exceed significantly the respective proportions that such imported oils bore to domestic production of crude oil in 1954, appropriate action should be taken."

Tax incentives: On the matter of tax incentives, the committee report makes the following recommendation:

"Present tax provisions on coal, oil, and gas production have been an important factor in encouraging development of energy sources at a pace about in keeping with demand. Further analysis and study by the appropriate branches of the Government should from time to time be made to review the amount and method of making such allowances to maintain proper relationships with continuing changes in other features of the tax law. Any changes which may be proposed in the future must be analyzed in terms of their probable effect on development of domestic resources needed for economic progress and national defense as well as the fiscal and tax policies of the Government."

Congress has long recognized the hazards of finding petroleum products and natural gas and has, in my opinion, properly encouraged this finding by giving them the most liberal tax rates given to any of our natural resource industries and includes a percentage depletion of 27½ percent and the right to charge off to cost their intangible drilling expense. In doing this it is proper to assume that Congress expected reasonable and proper conservation of petroleum products and natural gas and that the benefits of this tax treatment should not be used to help anyone to quickly exploit and waste these products that we all know are not only convenient but are necessary to our present economy and mode of life. Congress probably never intended that the natural gas transportation lines, which are government-permitted monopolies subject to some regulation by the Federal Power Commission, to quickly exploit and use up these valuable reserves in competition with coal and fuel oil. These gas lines are allowed a fair and reasonable return and a more generous return than the American railroads with whom they are in competition.

While coal has a percentage depletion of 10 percent as compared to 27½ percent for natural gas and oil products, the majority of the coal companies under present conditions get very little benefit because this credit is limited to not more than one-half of the net profits. Where there are no profits on coal there is no percentage depletion, and where their profits are small the percentage depletion allowance is much less percentagewise than it would be allowed if the industry were making earnings on its investment at the same rate as is being made by other industries. If the coal industry could get the full benefit of percentage depletion, it would go a long way toward providing funds to restore old plants and install new plants and facilities.

Revision of Natural Gas Act: The Cabinet Committee's recommendations on the subject of natural gas are long and there is considerable difference of opinion as to whether or not they will be carried out by Congress and still protect a free competitive enterprise system. Among other things they recommend:

"The basic principle regarding the regulation of natural gas and the use of alternative energy sources should be as far as possible that of free choice by the consumer and free and fair competition among suppliers. But sales either for resale or direct consumption below actual cost plus a fair proportion of fixed charges which drive out competing fuels constitute unfair competition and are inimical to a sound fuels economy.

"The committee recommends, therefore, that appropriate action be taken that will prohibit sales by interstate pipelines either for resale or for direct consumption, which drive out competing fuels because the charges are below actual cost plus a fair proportion of fixed charges."

Several bills have been introduced into Congress to amend the Natural Gas Act of 1938. Among them are the Harris, Staggers, Fulbright, and the Magnuson bills. The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has completed hearings on these various bills, and the Senate is holding hearings on these and other bills at the present time.

The evidence presented to the committees to date has been highly controversial, but the testimony in these hearings points up the necessity of conserving natural gas. Gas is the principal fuel in Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi and adjoining southwestern States. Great quantities of gas are being shipped to the large coal-consuming territory in the north and northeastern parts of the country as well as to the Pacific coast in competition with coal and/or fuel oil. About one-third of the gas coming into the coal-consuming territory along the Atlantic Ocean, the Great Lakes territory, and the central part of our country is used for home-heating and approximately two-thirds for commercial use and boiler fuel. The latter is being sold in these markets for prices below its value in competition with coal and fuel oil.

In his reported testimony on May 10, 1955, before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on gas legislation, the committee was told by John W. Boatwright,

an economist with the Standard Oil Company of Indiana, that natural gas would be a bargain if its producers got for it twice as much as they now do.

As an illustration of why natural gas has displaced so much coal and fuel oil, you will be interested in the relative delivered cost of boiler fuel to the utility plants which are typical of major industrial use as compared with coal and fuel oil. The figures I am using are for 1952 and show the delivered cost for various regions as follows:

Region	Cost per million B. t. u.		
	Coal	Oil	Gas
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*
United States	27.1	33.8	15.3
New England	37.3	35.9	36.9
Middle Atlantic	28.9	35.5	26.5
East North Central	25.7	70.5	19.3
West North Central	28.4	47.5	19.0
South Atlantic	27.2	33.6	18.8
West South Central	18.9	44.3	8.9
Rocky Mountain	21.1	26.6	16.6
Pacific	12.4	28.7	23.1

Seventy-three percent of our gas is produced in the east south-central region. Under the present gas act, transportation companies have bought gas under old long-time contracts and from small and medium-sized independent producers at a price varying from 2 cents per thousand cubic feet up to a present price of 16–20 cents a thousand or more; but enough is bought below the average to put the large and current contracts of 20 cents a thousand in the average at 8.9 cents a thousand. Generally gas in the Allegheny regions is currently bringing at the well 16–30 cents or more a thousand. Even in the large gas-producing States of Texas and Louisiana, gas cannot be produced at the current average price received by the producer at the well according to Mr. Hines H. Baker, president of Humble Oil & Refining Co., in an address before the Investment Bankers Association of America at Hollywood Beach, Fla., on December 1, 1954. His statement is as follows:

"The producer's price for gas in the field is about 10 percent of the retail price to the residential consumer. The average field price, I am convinced from our studies, is below the cost of production under any accurate accounting which fairly allocates or divides the costs of exploration and production between oil and gas, which are jointly explored for and produced."

He also reported that the average price per thousand cubic feet received by producers at the well in 1953 was 9.2 cents per thousand and that the average transmission and distribution service charge was 77.3 cents a thousand.

Gas wells are expensive to operate and maintain as well as to find; and it is generally recognized that the wildcat independent drillers, who discover 75 percent of the gas and oil fields, have 8 dry holes out of each 9 holes drilled. Mr. Baker further states that the average well completed in the last 3 years cost more than 4 times as much as those drilled immediately prior to the war.

Mr. K. S. Adams, chairman of the Phillips Petroleum Co., in a talk before the American Gas Association on October 12, 1954, illustrated this as follows:

"In Milwaukee the average residential user paid $1.21 per thousand cubic feet for gas which cost the distributor 31.8 cents and for which the pipeline paid the producer only 8.7 cents." He further stated: "The New York customer might be astonished to know that according to latest available figures only about 3 percent of his gas cost goes back to producers as payment for their costs and financial risks in supplying him gas."

Mr. Paul Kayser, president of the El Paso Natural Gas Co., in a talk made at St. Petersburg, Fla., on February 3, 1955, in speaking of oil and gas, made the following statement:

"The apparent 13 years of supply could not possibly be produced in the 13 years but would require nearer 40 years. So, if exploration and discovery were halted, we would feel a severe pinch in 2 years and our whole economy would be slowed down to a snail's pace in 5 years. The same situation exists in gas as in oil except the relationship between annual production and proven reserves has steadily declined from approximately 30 years' indicated supply in 1947 to approximately 23 years' indicated supply in 1953.

"If these vital supplies were going to last only these indicated years, we are obviously living in a fool's paradise to depend upon them for 63.8 percent of all our energy resources and 100 percent for our defense.

"And yet the only thing that stands between us and this inevitable disaster is intelligent, aggressive exploration for new supplies of both oil and gas."

I am quoting these gentlemen at length as among the best informed men in the oil and gas industry because I believe their statements are correct. Since they are correct, I don't think it is wise for the American people to bet on their ability always to find new gas reserves. In 1954 the use of gas was such that there was nothing of consequence left to add to reserves. The drop in reserves from 40 years to 22 years indicates that it is necessary at this time for the American public to see that it is not wise for the coal industry to liquidate. More than ever in our history, we need a good, strong, well-financed coal industry. If the Cabinet committee's recommendations in regard to rail transportation, Government purchases, protection of export markets for coal, a reasonable limitation on imports of residual oil, and a study of the tax incentives are carried out and utilized; and if Congress, after careful study, passes a natural-gas act that will protect the producer and will prevent and possibly take away from the gas-transportation lines the power and authority to dump gas in the market, we can have and maintain a strong coal industry, and can do so without imposing any substantial burdens on the consuming public.

Mr. Edwards, economist for the National Coal Association, in his testimony on the natural-gas situation before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on April 20, 1955, shows that out of 26 utility companies burning 117 billion cubic feet of gas as boiler fuel in 1953, the Mid-Atlantic and Northeastern Central States would have had an increase in cost of 5.2 percent if they had substituted coal for gas, but this would only have increased the cost of electricity about 1 percent—not, it seems to me, a high price to pay for national safety and security.

The coal industry is not only mindful of its own interest and the interest of its customers and consumers, but it is and I am seriously interested in the welfare of the 225,000 men who have been directly dropped out of employment since 1940 in the coal industry and the thousands of railroad employees who are idle because of lack of movement of trains. Also, I am interested in the great coal-producing communities built up on the demand for coal and the hundreds of thousands of people who are directly and indirectly dependent upon the coal industry for employment and a livelihood. There is today relatively more unemployment in the West Virginia coalfields than there was in 1932 and 1933 and these hundreds of thousands of coal miners, railroad employees, and people whose employment depends upon their employment are scattered throughout the 28 States producing coal. I don't believe that coal is going out like the buggy. I think it is essential to the welfare of our country and that in case of emergency within 15 to 25 years we may need 1 billion tons of coal per annum or 2½ times our present production, and we can't wait for the need to arise before we are prepared for it. World conditions being what they are now requires that we make this preparation today.

My life has been largely spent in the coal business and my major investments are in the coal business; but I have from my standpoint, substantial investments in petroleum, and natural gas, and gas transportation lines. I have studied their situation for years from both a competitive and an investment standpoint, and I do not think the suggestions I am making or the recommendations the Cabinet Committee has made will in the long run be detrimental but will actually be of great constructive benefit to the petroleum, the natural gas, and the pipeline transmission industries.

Address by Hon. Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy, at the United States Naval Academy, June 3, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to include in the RECORD an address by the Honorable Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy, delivered on the occasion of the graduation of the class of 1955 at the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., on Friday, June 3, 1955. The address follows:

IN THE SHADOWS OF TOMORROW

(Address by Hon. Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy, on the occasion of the graduation of the class of 1955, U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., June 3, 1955)

Admiral Boone, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, midshipmen of the graduating class of 1955, to speak at any graduation ceremony to a group of young people commencing a new life is a formidable task. But to address a Naval Academy graduating class at this important time in our history is a challenging opportunity—to try and say something helpful, something you perhaps may remember, and yet to say it briefly.

On these occasions, it is traditional that a graduation speaker talk about the future—and I shall not shatter precedent, for there is little about the Navy's past or present that you gentlemen do not know as well or better than I. In fact, as we peer into the shadows of tomorrow, you perhaps are in a better position to objectively analyze the future than those of us whose experience goes back two, three or four decades. Certainly your vision is not obstructed either by crowded memories of the past or the obsessive problems of the present.

Regarding your future therefore, I ask you to pay special attention to these words:

"As you look forward, you see the foundations of old theories crumbling every day. Old tactics, old strategies, old theories of naval warfare which have stood unchallenged as almost axiomatic since the triremes of Carthage and Rome grappled together in the Mediterranean, are disappearing overnight. New and terrible instruments of destruction have appeared under and over the seas * * * every day some new

thing in naval warfare arises. The old things are passing away; new things must be devised. With what weapons, by what strategy shall we meet the terror of the submarine and the still unrevealed possibilities of the airship?

"Who shall say that before you become captains, naval warfare will not undergo a revolution as great as the one that followed the construction of the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac*? * * * The appeal * * * is to fearlessly discard the worship of things that are old and to adopt courageously anything that is new the moment that some new development convinces that the old way is no longer the right way, or that the new way points to the path of victory * * * keep an open mind; investigate new methods * * * there never was a ship that could not be improved, and it will be your duty to find the way. * * *

"A noble lineage is yours."

What I have just read you is from a graduation address delivered in this very same hall, 39 years and 1 day ago, by the then Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels, to the departing class of 1916. These words of Secretary Daniels read with as much freshness today and with as much prophetic meaning for the future as they undoubtedly did in 1916. The President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, was sitting here in Dahlgren Hall waiting to award the diplomas and to shake the graduates' hands. Out in the audience where Midshipman Pirie is now seated, sat Midshipman First Class Arthur W. Radford. Where Midshipman DeGroff is now seated, sat Midshipman First Class Robert B. Carney. Where Midshipman Blair is now seated sat Midshipman First Class William M. Fechteler; where Midshipman Waitley is now seated, sat Midshipman First Class C. Turner Joy—39 years and 1 day ago.

"Old things are passing away" * * * "new and terrible instruments of destruction have appeared over and under the seas" * * * "fearlessly discard the worship of things that are old." * * * "Keep an open mind" * * * "a noble lineage is yours." The sound waves of these admonitions may still be echoing in the rafters above your head; certainly, they are as apt today as they were then, and no better example could be given how changeless and yet ever-changing the service is, and how traditions and inspiration of the past passes to the youth of the future.

What sort of a Navy was it that Midshipmen Radford, Carney, Fechteler, and Joy were about to join as they listened to these words? What was the 1916 Navy like?

Vastly different, you might think. There were no aircraft carriers, no guided missile cruisers, no radar, no electronics. There were no jet engines, no turbo-props, no atomic power, no H-bombs. There were no snorkeling submarines, no assault helicopters, no homing torpedoes, no degaussing, no pressure or acoustic mines. Midshipman Radford had not been required to absorb the electrical mysteries of a Combat Information Center, Midshipman Carney had not struggled with the hydraulic and electronic brains of a beam-riding missile. And neither of them were tormented by such things as the "extinction potential of a thyratron," "the irreversible adiabatic diffusion of atmospheric air in a turbojet engine," "up doppler," or "thermo-cline."

It is a different age and a different Navy today even to the uniforms. But is our present Navy really different? The changes are physical, I think, and the inventions and innovations which 40 short years have brought with such bewildering rapidity are more surface than substance. That which has not changed far exceeds that which has.

In many respects, the 1955 Navy is not really different from the 1916 Navy. Even then, there were submarines, there was a primitive form of sonar, there were aircraft, mines, and torpedoes. Now, as then, the Navy is ships, it is officers, it is men, it is tradition. This was true in 1916; indeed it was true in the time of John Paul Jones, Decatur, Truxton, Farragut, and Dewey; and it will still be true when you gentlemen are running the Navy, making graduation speeches, and charged with the protection of our country.

For while the Navy is always evolutionary and ever changing, while the parade of progress intensifies and accelerates with every passing year, three key factors so important in your future years have not and will not change.

The first is our country's dependence on the seas. In this atomic age, when the elements of time and space have been so drastically compressed, our country is more dependent on the seas than ever before. The seas are still the supply routes to our overseas sources of raw materials. The seas are still the links which bind the free world together. The seas are still the means by which we supply our far-flung, transoceanic bases. And, most important, the seas are the highroads for carrying the battle to the aggressor's territory. If we are a great Nation, if we are the world's leader, seapower has made us so and seapower will keep us so.

Secondly, our naval traditions have not changed. The high standards of devotion to duty, loyalty, sacrifice, and integrity will always be upheld.

But the most changeless factor of all is the human one. With all the achievements of science, with all the technology of modern war, with all the surface changes the Navy has undergone, its success in battle is ever dependent on leadership; and, inexorably, you are the Navy's future leaders. No machine, no invention, no process of automation can ever replace foresighted, courageous, personal leadership.

This fundamental is sometimes forgotten in our haste and in our preoccupation with the automatic, almost-human hardware of our modern armed services. As your life in the service passes, no matter how mechanical, automatic, and untouched by human hands our Navy, Air Force, Army, and Marine Corps become, the need for leadership is and will always be paramount. Good leadership in a military organization is even more important than operational readiness, high material standards, or engineering efficiency.

I now have a few words for each of the groups represented here today—parents and families, faculty and staff, the midshipmen who remain behind, and finally the graduates themselves.

First to the parents and relatives and sweethearts. This is an exceedingly happy and proud moment for each of you, rightfully so, and I congratulate every one of you for the important role you have played in sending and keeping your young man here. Today, you see him embarked on a challenging, important, and exciting career. In passing time, your young man may be tomorrow's Radford or Carney, Twining or Shepherd. Even if he does not attain national fame, his career is certain to be useful and productive to his country.

To the staff and faculty: The importance of this naval citadel of inspiration, education, and service to the Nation has never been greater. It is not too much to say that you are molding the men upon whom the future and safety of our country depends. Your vision, your enthusiasm, your competence is indelibly transmitted to these young men. Make certain that your counsel is wise, your teaching sound, and your example creditable.

To the midshipmen who remain behind: You young gentlemen also stand in the shadows of tomorrow. Those shadows obscure and make indistinct the events of the future, but it is possible to discern that the days ahead for our Navy will be as momentous and memorable as those of the past. Never in our history has the future of the Navy been brighter. Never have its opportunities been greater. Never has the challenge of naval service been so provocative. The events which lie in shadows of tomorrow will certainly challenge your foresight, your ingenuity, and your imagination.

And finally, to the graduates: Whether your commission is in the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Air Force, if you carry away from these 4 years nothing else, let it be this: the knowledge of your primary responsibility as a leader. Your life at Annapolis commenced with the theme of good leadership ringing in your ears. Let them end that way. In this age of increasing specialization, when emphasis tends to drift to the technical, sound leadership is more important than ever. Always remember that the stress you give your leadership duties must greatly exceed your technical responsibilities.

Take a genuine interest in your men; recognize and commend their good work; treat them firmly, impartially, fairly, and with respect; keep them informed; be accessible to them; give them authority and responsibility.

And most important, accept eagerly the responsibility given you, and exercise it diligently. For the exercise of responsibility is the prime tool of your trade, and its discharge is the catalyst of leadership.

I wish each of you good luck, a fair wind, and Godspeed.

Joint Resolution Requesting Congress To Extend the Benefits of the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Old-Age Assistance Programs

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of No. R–47 of the acts and resolves of 1955 of the State of Vermont entitled "Joint resolution requesting Congress to extend the benefits of the old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance programs."

This resolution directs the attention of Congress to the plight of many of our senior citizens who desire to work in order to supplement social-security benefits received only to find that under existing law their industry is rewarded by a curtailment of these benefits if they earn more than $1,200 a year.

The resolution follows:

Resolution R–47

Joint resolution requesting Congress to extend the benefits of the old-age and survivors' insurance and old-age assistance programs.

Whereas a person under 72 years of age who is otherwise entitled to receive monthly benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program is not entitled to receive the maximum benefits otherwise allowable if he earns more than $1,200 in a year; and

Whereas such provision tends to encourage idleness of persons, to lower the level of subsistence and to discriminate against per-

sons within that group who do not have income from sources other than earnings; and

Whereas many of the persons 65 years of age and older whose property and income are so limited as to entitle them to benefits under the old-age assistance program do not receive sufficient payments thereunder to subsist at a healthful level, and some are destitute: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to extend the old-age and survivors' insurance benefits to allow beneficiaries thereunder to earn up to $2,400 a year without curtailment of payments, and to extend the benefits of the old-age assistance program to allow recipients to earn reasonable amounts regularly to supplement the payments received and to enable maintaining themselves at a healthful level; and that the Secretary of State be directed to transmit duly attested copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, and to our congressional delegation.

Approved May 19, 1955.

Exemption From Social-Security Program on Religious Grounds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide exemptions from participation in the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program for individuals who are opposed to participation in such program on grounds of conscience or religious belief.

I have introduced this bill in response to a plea from leaders of the Old Order Amish Mennonite Church, made on behalf of approximately 13,000 Amish Christians in Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, New York, Tennessee, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, and Oregon.

It recently was my privilege to assist in arranging a conference on this problem in Washington between leaders of this church, Members of Congress, and a representative of the Social Security Administration. The bill I have introduced stemmed from this conference.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a letter from Bishop Henry N. Miller, of Middlebury, Ind., outlining the views of Amish Christians on this issue and a petition signed by bishops and elders of the church on behalf of their congregations:

MIDDLEBURY, IND., *April 1, 1955.*

The Honorable SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER,
House of Representatives,
Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CRUMPACKER: Late in 1954 our Amish Church group became aware of the new provisions of the social security laws, which brought all farmers under its coverage. We immediately realized that our Amish heritage was in conflict with this attempt by the United States Government to arrange for the care of our aged, infirmed, or needy people. It has been our Christian concern from the birth of our church group in the 15th century to supply those of our group who have a need financial or otherwise. We feel this is our religious obligation to our own people and any others whom we can reach with our resources. Our faith has always been sufficient to meet the needs as they came about, and we feel the present law is an infringement on our responsibilities as a church.

In bringing this problem to a head, so to speak, we asked and were granted audience with Mr. Gerald Kelver, local social security administrator, who was kind enough to bring along a Mr. Schneider, area supervisor for several States. These men spoke to our group of local bishops, who are the governing or advisory body of our church group. We were instructed as to the details of getting a social security number, paying the taxes due, and receiving benefits as set up in the present law. These men were most helpful in setting out exactly the position taken by our Government.

Later, we as bishops met to discuss what our position should be in light of our beliefs. From this meeting we brought forth the plea to our Government as you see it in printed form enclosed. Approximately 90 percent of the Amish bishops in the entire United States have signed this plea, and we have their signatures on record. They have also designated the number of members in their churches who have approved this plea.

The end result of this effort represents the concerted wish or plea of approximately 13,000 Amish Christians throughout the entire United States. States represented are Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, New York, Tennessee, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, and Oregon.

We have been advised to organize a group of not more than six leaders of the above movement, who would be willing to come to Washington, D. C., and discuss personally with those of our Government who could hear our plea and consider the possibility of working out a plan by which our church heritage may be preserved and at the same time the Government needs be met. We think it is entirely possible that a plan of this sort may be worked out.

You, as our local Government representative, are the logical person for us to turn to in this time of need. Would it be possible for you to arrange a meeting of the above-mentioned six-man group with the Government officials in the best position to discuss this plea and who have the authority to arrive at a compromise, if possible, which is mutually agreeable?

Our communion service will be held between May 1 and May 15. We would appreciate your arranging a date any time following May 18 for the above proposed meeting. We also request your presence at said meeting and would appreciate it if you would act as adviser in the procedure in Washington. As you know, we are country farmers and not acquainted with the problems of the city, let alone governmental procedure.

We humbly await your reaction to our above mentioned proposals and hope to hear that it has been possible for you to arrange for us to talk personally with the proper members of the Federal Security Administration on or near the suggested date.

Very truly yours,

HENRY N. MILLER.

"I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty." (I Timothy 2: 1, 2.)

In regard to the social-security law of 1954, which includes all farmers, but does exempt certain classes, such as doctors, lawyers, and ministers, because of their being sufficiently insured otherwise:

(1) We, as members of the Old Order Amish Mennonite Church, do herein express our deep appreciation, and with grateful hearts do we recount the favors and consideration accorded our forefathers in the past. As in the days of William Penn, our forefathers accepted his invitation to immigrate to this land where they might enjoy freedom of conscience in religion, and exemption from military service. These benefits were later confirmed to them by the Constitution of the United States and the State constitutions. We rejoice that freedom of conscience is thus recognized by the laws of our land.

(2) Our standard has been, and now is, for us to provide for our needy members, for our aged and disabled, for our widows and orphans; also to help bear the burdens of our less fortunate brethren in fire losses, storm damage, sickness, etc., as has been handed down by our forefathers as being both Scriptural and practical. (Matthew 25: 34–40, Mark 14: 7, I Timothy 5: 8, Philippians 2: 4, Galatians 6: 10.)

(3) So now comes the social-security law and includes us as farmers to also supply and partake of offered benefits, which is not in accord with our religion and beliefs.

(4) May we in a humble and prayerful, Godfearing way, appeal to you as officials of our Government, ask you to prayerfully consider and reconsider an exemption for us from the social-security law?

(5) We, the representatives as bishops and elders of said church, are appealing to you to prayerfully consider and reconsider this favor. We ask for the various congregations within the United States of America.

In God we trust

Signed: Bishops and elders, Old Order Amish Mennonite Church.

Irresponsible Smears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, columnists and commentators who have wide reader or listener acceptance, have definite and very important responsibility. One of these is for accuracy and truthfulness.

Vice President NIXON has been the object of irresponsible smears at various times. I quote from the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 11, 1955, a letter from Ancher Nelson, Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration, in his laudable effort to correct the irresponsible columnist printed in the Post of June 5. Dr. Nelson's high integrity is beyond reproach. I think we may rely upon his statement as being 100 percent truthful:

NIXON AND REA

I wish to correct the statements in Drew Pearson's June 5 item about Vice President NIXON, which are inaccurate to my personal knowledge.

First of all, Mr. NIXON did not "drop around unexpectedly" at REA's 20th anniversary observance. We invited him; he accepted and was listed on the printed program.

In fairness to both the Vice President and to the REA employees who comprised his audience, I want to say that nobody at all walked out. As a matter of fact, there was an overflow crowd throughout, with people standing at the rear of the auditorium and in the hall outside. His remarks complimenting our employees on the good work they have been doing to advance the REA program over the years were well presented and well received.

We regret seeing one of our 20th anniversary guests made the victim of such faulty reporting.

ANCHER NELSON,
Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration.

New Kind of Partnership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I have here an editorial from the Sun, published at Naches, Wash., dated May 26, 1955. The question as to whether or not partnership between Government and local enterprise in electric power development is feasible and desirable is answered very clearly by this writer, and I would like each of my constituents to have the benefit of reading this. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I insert this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NEW KIND OF PARTNERSHIP

Is partnership between Government and local enterprise in electric power development feasible and desirable?

A current case may help answer that. A bill has been introduced in the House proposing a $310 million multipurpose project in Oregon, to be built by the Army Engineers. What makes this unusual is that the taxpayers would pay only the $37 million required for nonreimbursable features such as navigation and flood control. All the rest—$273 million—would be paid in advance by local interests for power to be generated in the future.

And that isn't the end of the story. Three business-managed, taxpaying utility companies in the region have offered to supply the entire $273 million. Investors have already been found. If other local enterprises, such as municipal systems and cooperatives, wish to participate, they would share in the power on the basis of their part in the financing.

It is said that this bill will be opposed by the public power bloc in Congress. That has been true of other types of partnership proposals—just as it has been true of anything and everything involving taxpaying private power development as against tax-free, tax-subsidized, socialized Federal monopolies. The result is that huge needed projects on the Niagara River in New York, the Snake in Idaho, and elsewhere have been subjected to interminable, unnecessary, and indefensible delay. The public power bloc is a minority bloc. It makes up in political finagling what it lacks in public support. And we are going to have to decide before long if the present situation is to continue. In sum, will this country risk critical lack of power in the near future because of the desires of Socialist-minded groups that black normal power development while crying power shortage?

Nod to a Portland Builder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, maintenance of shipyard facilities along our Pacific seaboard and keeping these yards staffed with training machinists and other workers are essential links in our national defense program. Because of the decline in ship construction since World War II, operation of these vital facilities has been difficult.

However, in recent weeks, a Portland, Oreg., shipbuilding concern—Willamette Iron & Steel Co.—has been making an outstanding effort to obtain a reconversion contract from a Federal agency, so that its yard and workers can be kept busy. Disregarding sectionalism and partisanship, representatives from groups throughout the Pacific region have given their support and assistance to the Portland shipbuilder in an effort to bring the west coast this important project. People from Oregon who have been assisting the company in the presentation of its case are gratified by the amount of cooperation and support which has been forthcoming from other parts of the Pacific coast.

This unity has been sufficiently noteworthy to evoke editorial comment from the major Pacific coast shipping weekly, Pacific Shipper. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the issue of May 30, 1955, regarding the community support given the Portland shipbuilding concern.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOD TO A PORTLAND BUILDER

The valiant attempt of the Willamette Iron & Steel Co., of Portland, to win the giant reconversion contract on two liners for Matson-Oceanic has captured the admiration of the Pacific coast, including many persons who never heard of Willamette Iron & Steel before and some who possibly were not even aware that the Willamette River is the great southerly branch of the mighty Columbia upon which the city of Portland is situated. And more to the point, the effort, whether successful or not (and this is not known at this writing) has done something for the unity of the Pacific coast shipping range and for its shipbuilding future.

Willamette Iron & Steel has had a fairly long and checkered career as an engine manufacturer, mainly, before it became much of a shipyard. In latterly years it has been quietly building up to the point where both the Maritime Administration and the Oceanic Steamship Co. (wholly owned subsidiary of Matson Navigation Co.) were willing, after rigid examinations, to acknowledge that it was qualified to tackle the $25 million job of making two mariner-type freighters over into luxurious passenger and freight carriers. The very audacity of this yard, not large even by Pacific coast standards of shipyard size, caught the public fancy, especially when it turned out that Willamette was the lowest bidder, after the congressional allowance of a 6-percent handicap in favor of the Pacific coast, and the second lowest bidder, absolutely; in competition, of course, with the best and the largest on both coasts.

A wave of warm approval greeted the declaration of Governor Knight, of California, that he thought that Willamette ought to get the contract. This diminished somewhat when it was discovered that Willamette is controlled by a San Francisco company.

And yet this kind of intercommunity interlocking is very common and in itself illustrates the community of interest which should be held superior to interport rivalries. No port, no city, no State on the North Pacific coast, including British Columbia, has a monopoly of controlling financial interests or of manufacturing sites, of stock ownership or of terminals. None is lacking in either type of asset. Offhand, we think of a Portland shipping house, States Steamship Co., that controls one of California's finest steamship lines. Examples might be cited ad infinitum.

The bidding on the reconversion work also appears to have established the adequacy of the Pacific coast's 6-percent differential, providing the shipyards have the energy to go after the business. In support of this thesis there is not only the Willamette bid, as against the absolute low bidder on Chesapeake Bay, but also the Bethlehem-San Francisco tender, which, after the allowance, beat the Bethlehem-Maryland bid and virtually tied the Bethlehem-New York bid.

But it remained for Willamette, smallest of the pack, to show the way.

Meeting at the Summit and Coexistence Originated With the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, 24 years ago Dimetry A. Manuilsky, speaking at the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow, said:

War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down we shall smash them with our clenched fists.

This is the same Manuilsky who presided over the United Nations Security Council in 1949. The Reds sure know what they are doing. They play the tune and we dance to their music.

Commencement Day Address by Hon. Harold E. Talbott at Federal Bureau of Investigation Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on June 10 the Federal Bureau of Investigation Academy, which operates at Quantico, Va., held its annual graduating exercises in Washington, D. C. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the program of the graduating exercises, including a list of those who have previously graduated and now hold various offices, as well as the names of the graduating class, together with an admirable address delivered on that occasion by Hon. Harold E. Talbott, Secretary of the Air Force.

There being no objection, the program and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE

To the Members of the Fifty-fifth Session:

This closing ceremony terminates the brief period of our immediate relationship. You are now graduates of the FBI National Academy and will, henceforth, be the standard by which the institution is judge.

These weeks of voluntary effort devoted to the common objective of proficiency in police work yield invaluable byproducts. The friendships engendered here, the respect developed out of mutual effort, and the understanding born of knowledge of our common problems do not lend themselves to measure but they do serve as most favorable omens for the future. Reciprocal voluntary cooperation is vital to proper enforcement of the law.

We have welcomed this opportunity to afford you training at the FBI National Academy and are pleased to place the services of the FBI at your disposal. We offer our hearty congratulations and wish you godspeed.

J. EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

PROGRAM

Musical program: The United States Marine Band.

Call to order: Assistant Director Rolf T. Harbo, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Invocation: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Maurice S. Sheehy, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Address: Mr. C. J. Hyde, Louisville, Ky., president of the graduating class.

Address: Hon. Seaborn P. Collins, national commander, the American Legion, Washington, D. C.

Address: Hon. Harold E. Talbott, Secretary of the Air Force, Washington, D. C.

Introduction of distinguished guests: Director John Edgar Hoover, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The presentation of diplomas: Deputy Attorney General William P. Rogers and the Director.

Benediction: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Maurice S. Sheehy.

The National Anthem: The United States Marine Band.

THE GRADUATING CLASS

William J. Allison, Galesburg, Ill., police department.
James H. Avant, Corpus Christi, Tex., police department.
Robert D. Brown, Muscogee County, Ga., police department.
Joseph R. Carten, Stratford, Conn., police department.
George M. Craig, Santa Fe, N. Mex., police department.
James A. Cretecos, Massachusetts State Police.
T. K. Devitt, Plaquemines Parish, La., sheriff's office.
Sam Alexander Dews, Jr., Nashville, Tenn., police department.
Howard R. Eide, Des Moines, Iowa, police department.
Edward C. Erickson, Chicago, Ill., police department.
Jack P. Foster, Michigan State Police.
Albert Gernert, Hasbrouck Heights, N. J., police department.
Elmer F. Hagner, Jr., Anne Arundel County, Md., police department.
William M. Hambrecht, New York City Police Department.
Paul M. Hamilton, Talladega, Ala., police department.
Harry M. Harrison, Howard County, Md., police department.
Glenister A. Hunt., Fresno County, Calif., sheriff's office.
C. J. Hyde, Louisville, Ky., police department.
Roy E. Isgrigg, Joplin, Mo., police department.
Leroy C. Jenkins, Racine, Wis., police department.
John F. Karst, Jersey City, N. J., police department.
Stanley L. Kentner, Danville, Ill., police department.
William G. Kording, Brentwood, Pa., police department.
Ralph G. Kortz, Long Beach, Calif., police department.
Arnold R. Kramer, Milwaukee, Wis., police department.
Theodore J. Kramer, Cudahy, Wis., police department.
A. A. Kretchmar, Seattle, Wash., police department.
Robert La Mettry, Richfield, Minn., police department.
Nolan H. Lasiter, Jr., Lubbock, Tex., police department.
Gerald W. Livingston, North Kansas City, Mo,. police department.
Landon Mc D. Louthian, Jr., Charleston County, S. C., police department.
Wilbur C. Lovette, Lumberton, N. C., police department.
William Anderson Magee, Jr., Harlingen, Tex., police department.
John T. McCrate, Ohio State highway patrol.
Martin C. McDonnell, San Mateo, Calif., police department.
Paul J. McKinney, Chester, Pa., police department.
William S. McKinney, North Carolina State highway patrol.
Robert C. Messett, Warren, Ohio., police department.
E. P. Moomau, Kansas State highway patrol.
Elmer W. Morehouse, Paso Robles, Calif., police department.
Michael F. Moylan, Stamford, Conn., police department.
James F. Murphy, Lewiston, Maine, police department.
A. J. Palazzetti, Bradford, Pa., police department.
James R. Peva, Indiana State police.
Neil E. Pfost, Branch County, Mich., sheriff's department.
Leland W. Pierce, Canandaigua, N. Y., police department.
Donald D. Pomerleau, United States Marine Corps.
Charles M. Powell, Meridian, Miss., police department.
Robert S. Quaid, Detroit, Mich., police department.
Denis J. Quilligan, St. Petersburg, Fla., police department.
Percy V. Richardson, Federal Bureau of Investigation.
Spencer H. Robb, Federal Bureau of Investigation.
A. C. Roberts, Atlanta, Ga., police department.
Louis F. Rossiter, Whitpain Township, Pa., police department.
Henry Richmond Salmans, Sr., Salina, Kans., police department.
Thomas I. Sanders, Tangipahoa Parish, La., sheriff's office.
Paul J. Schirmer, Cincinnati, Ohio, police department.
Raymond Joseph Schmit, Buffalo, N. Y., police department.
Edwin S. Schriver, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa., police department.
Wilmer Bryan Schroeder, Scott County, Minn., sheriff's office.
Daniel Edward Shelley, San Francisco, Calif., police department.
Emil Paul Smith, Tacoma, Wash., police department.
Howard P. Smith, Spartanburg, S. C., police department.
George A. Stephens, Mecklenburg County, N. C., police department.
Walter E. Stone, Providence, R. I. police department.
John S. Stuper, Illinois State highway police.
Albert W. Swanson, Evanston, Ill., police department.
Theodore E. Swoveland, Claremont, Calif., police department.
Albert J. Theriault, Rumford, Maine, police department.
William G. Tothill, Alexandria, Va., police department.
Harry Traver, Mount Vernon, N. Y., police department.
Jose A. Vazquez Sanchez, Puerto Rico Police Department.
John James Viarengo, Turlock, Calif., police department.
Tom G. Waldrop, Cullman County, Ala., sheriff's office.
L. Olin Watkins, Kershaw County, S. C., sheriff's office.
Richard P. Weiler, Grand Traverse County, Mich., sheriff's office.
William K. Whitehurst, Jr., Tennessee Bureau of Investigation.
William W. Wilkinson, Memphis, Tenn., police department.
John Charles Wilson, Dallas, Tex., police department.
Walter L. Wiski, Duluth, Minn., police department.
Jesse G. Workman, Charleston, W. Va., municipal police department.
Roderick Roy Wright, Billings, Mont., police department.

PRESIDENTS, FIRST 55 CLASSES, FBI NATIONAL ACADEMY

1. James T. Sheehan, Boston, Mass.
2. Joseph T. Owens, Rome, N. Y.
3. E. G. Christensen, Wichita, Kans.
4. Bryan E. Ford, Rochester, N. Y.
5. Howard M. Travis, Hornell, N. Y.
6. Clifford E. Peterson, Sacramento, Calif.
7. William G. Rogers, Austin, Tex.
8. F. L. Matteson, Missoula, Mont.
9. Lawrence M. Taylor, Springfield, Ill.
10. John F. Woods, Norfolk, Va.
11. James F. Ingoldsby, Roanoke, Va.

12. James O. Barker, Miami, Fla.
13. Charles W. Woodson, Jr., Richmond, Va.
14. Charles O. Deaner, Lynchburg, Va.
15. Albert E. DuBois, Philadelphia, Pa.
16. Vernon Rasmussen, Glendale, Calif.
17. Leroy E. Wike, Endicott, N. Y.
18. Robert M. Pugmire, Pocatello, Idaho.
19. Harry W. Grossglaus, Canton, Ohio.
20. Richard R. Foster, Richmond, Va.
21 Arthur A. Weller, Newark, N. J.
22 John A. Engler, San Francisco, Calif.
23. Carl J. Sanders, Lincoln, Nebr.
24. Earl J. Daniels, Binghamton, N. Y.
25. W. C. Thomas, Richmond, Va.
26. Cyrille Leblanc, Gardner, Mass.
27. Robert Marx, Augusta, Maine.
28. J. Carroll Hamlin, Utica, N. Y.
29. Ray M. Barger, Fort Collins, Colo.
30. Henry F. Whaley, Berkeley, Calif.
31. Joseph P. Mahoney, Brookline, Mass.
32. John W. Rycroft, Lexington, Mass.
33. Andrew T. Aylward, St. Louis, Mo.
34. John E. Fondahl, Washington, D. C.
35. Howard O. Hunter, Indianapolis, Ind.
36. Melvin C. Hoover, Charlotte, N. C.
37. Jeter L. Williamson, Jo., Greensboro, N. C.
38. Delbert E. Berry, Norfolk, Va.
39. John Claussen, Napa, Calif.
40. John B. Sheehan, Mineola, N. Y.
41. Bernard Lewis Garmire, Eau Claire, Wis.
42. Bruns McKie McCarroll, Memphis, Tenn.
43. Lester H. Eisenhut, Fort Wayne, Ind.
44. D. W. Snyder, Walthall, Miss.
45. Robert Ernest Goodwin, Raleigh, N. C.
46. Paul Harvey Ashenhust, Dallas, Tex.
47. James W. Traeger, Gary, Ind.
48. Rogers D. Kennon, Nashville, Tenn.
49. William Walton Pleasants, Durham, N. C.
50. Charles E. Martin, Cincinnati, Ohio.
51. Gene S. Muehleisen, San Diego, Calif.
52. Earl B. Whitmore, Redwood City, Calif.
53. I. Byrd Parnell, Sumter, S. C.
54. Francis Michael Sullivan, New York, N. Y.
55. C. J. Hyde, Louisville, N. Y.

ADDRESS BY HON. HAROLD E. TALBOTT, SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, AT THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION ACADEMY, JUNE 10, 1955

It is a privilege to appear before you this morning. I am particularly glad to talk with you because you and the Air Force share a common task—that of providing security for our great country.

First, I want to acknowledge a debt of gratitude, not only for the Air Force but on behalf of this Nation. The Air Force is deeply grateful to Mr. Hoover and the men of the FBI for their tremendous support in building up the internal security activities of the Air Force. The FBI has assisted us by training personnel, providing qualified personnel for staffing, and by lending us continued support since the inception of our Office of Special Investigations.

Even today we are still dependent upon the FBI for background investigations of Air Force personnel, which as you know has a uniform strength of almost a million, and employs approximately 300,000 civilians.

In a broader sense, all of us in this Nation should be thankful to the FBI for creating higher uniform standards of law enforcement and prevention throughout our Nation. The medium of the FBI Academy in which you gentlemen participated has been the principal instrument of doing this. While we in a democratic country are never suspicious of our neighbor, we know that the insidious forces of communism will stoop to any level to attain their espionage objectives in this country. The ever-present vigilance of the FBI coordinated with our nationwide law enforcement agencies is a comforting thing.

I am particularly happy, also, to talk with you men who come from communities throughout the United States. Many of you have military and air bases adjacent to your town. To you, as representatives of local law enforcement agencies, I want to give thanks for your cooperation and assistance in taking care of our men in uniform.

When I speak of taking care of our men in uniform, I would like to tell you of one of the great problems that faces the Air Force today. As you well know, the efficiency and effectiveness of any organization in measured to a large extent by the ability of the men who make up the organization. The Air Force is no exception to this general rule.

The men in uniform in the Air Force are all voluntary enlistees—men who have come to the Air Force for a minimum of 4 years. During these 4 years they gain valuable training and experience. One of our great problems is that on completion of their first 4 years of service in the Air Force, too few choose to continue their careers with the Air Force. Let me give you some figures. During the last 12 months, we have had 275,000 men whose enlistments have expired. Seventy-five thousand of these airmen for one reason or another were not eligible to reenlist. However, of the 200,000 whom we need badly and want to keep, less than 25 percent have decided to reenlist. The loss to the Government in money that has been spent in training and maintaining these men (about $2 billion) in addition to the drop in efficiency of our operational units by the departure of these trained men, makes it mandatory that we do something about this problem.

In our surveys to find out why men fail to continue with the Air Force, I find that the attitude of the local civilian communities and the treatment that they are accorded in these communities many times contribute to the decision of our men to leave the service. Now, I need not tell the seriousness of our country's position in the world today. Never in the history of our country has it been more important that our Armed Forces be maintained at the peak of efficiency. These men in uniform who come to your communities are the best young men from many other communities. The fact that they wear uniforms does not change them one iota. So, I would ask you today to look upon these men as you would any visitor to town, guide them, assist them, and make them welcome. Urge your churches, civic organizations, and other activities to accord them the respect which they, because of the importance of their day-to-day duties, so deserve. I am sure that were a young man serving in his own community he would be accorded the best treatment. I only ask you to treat a stranger in your community as your own. You will be amply repaid.

I have another problem I might discuss with you today. You have all, I am sure, noted the conflict in opinion from responsible officials, public figures, and news media concerning very important day-to-day issues in our country. Some of these issues are of a military nature. The facts concerning these issues can come only from highly qualified experts—men who devote their full time and effort to the detailed study of intelligence. You men are experienced, trained, law-enforcement officers. You know the tedious detail and the endless hours that must be spent in tracing clues in your law-enforcement work.

Military intelligence falls into the same category of detail as your basic detective work. The association of facts derived from reading a remote scientist's autobiography with a news release on a recent development may fit together to give clarification or meaning to some unexplained enemy development.

You all understand that much information on military matters cannot be revealed without providing our enemies real assistance. However, we strive from day to day to provide the American public as much information to keep them fully informed on how we are doing, what money is being used for, how the security of our Nation stands as we possibly can. This I think, we owe to our people.

You know the old adage "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," really applies to all our jobs these days. Commonsense calls for you to devote much of your time and efforts to crime prevention. It is reassuring to see the good lights in our city streets, the well-organized police patrols, the police boys club activities—all efforts designed to prevent crime. You in the law enforcement world have, of course, many of the same problems in doing your day-to-day job that the Armed Forces have. All of these are brought about because of our way of life. We have guaranteed to our people basic liberties and it is just alien to our way of life to violate them. The Communist world has no such inhibitions. The MVD or the Russian armed forces are free to exercise their initiative at any time and without regard to the basic rights of others. It is because of this difference in the way of life in the free and the Communist world that we must be continually on our guard. Our guard must be up both against infiltration from within and surprise attack from without. I know that you men feel confident that our Nation is secure from within. May I give you my opinion of our external position.

As your Secretary of the Air Force, I am primarily responsible for the efficiency and effectiveness of the Air Force. We annually spend in the Air Force some $15 billion of the taxpayer's money. With that money we have over the last few years built up the mightiest military force that man has ever seen. It is a force that is more than airplanes and bombs. It is a force of highly skilled men to fly and maintain the aircraft and other intricate equipment so necessary to modern warfare, of a worldwide logistics, communications, and base system all tied into a single operating unit. Your Air Force is the principal strength standing between the free world and global war. It is a force truly dedicated to peace. Our hope is that as long as we remain strong—so strong that no government will dare attack us without inviting its own suicide—that we will be able to prevent a war from happening. The weapons, the strategy, and the size of the force must be constantly changing to meet the threat of an enemy. But, gentlemen, let me assure you here today that the Air Force is dedicated, and determined to do everything in its power to insure that we do retain our superiority over any possible aggressor.

I want to wish all of you success in the tasks that lie ahead of you. I want to thank Mr. Hoover again for the help and assistance that he gives the citizens of our country by affording such training as he has provided for each of you graduating today. The training and skills of the men of the Federal Bureau of Investigation are of great value to the Air Force, and a great pillar of security for the Nation.

Federal Communications Commission Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I feel strongly that the failure of President

Eisenhower to reappoint Miss Frieda Hennock to the Federal Communications Commission, a post in which she has served with distinction, was a most unfortunate act on his part.

Miss Hennock has fought valiantly for the public interest. She will be sorely missed—by the public, at least.

On May 29, 1955, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch published an editorial on this matter. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with an article from Labor, the fine publication of the railroad brotherhoods, dealing also with Miss Hennock, and paying a well-deserved tribute to her.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 29, 1955]

UNDERMINING THE FCC

President Eisenhower has now made his 4th appointment to the 7-member Federal Communications Commission.

The latest nominee is Richard A. Mack, a Florida Democrat and officer of the National Association of Railroad and Utility Commissioners. Little seems to be known of Mr. Mack nationally. But it is not so much his nomination which is bad as the rejection of Commissioner Frieda B. Hennock for a second term.

Miss Hennock, despite occasional criticism, gave the FCC a spark of imagination and independence which has seemed sadly lacking in that agency regulating radio, television, and other interstate communications. Nobody could question her devotion to the public interest.

In fact, the Nation would not now have a system of educational television if it had not been for Miss Hennock. She fought commercial television interests and official colleagues to get TV channels set aside and made safe for education.

In spite of that remarkable record, the administration has rejected her. The White House offers no explanation.

Before replacing this thoroughly independent member of the FCC, the administration brought these men into it: Chairman George C. McConnaughey, an attorney for Ohio telephone companies whose interstate business is regulated by FCC; John C. Doerfer, a protege of Senator MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, and Robert E. Lee, another MCCARTHY friend who participated in the unsavory smear campaign which defeated former Senator Millard Tydings, of Maryland.

These three nominations, plus the rejection of Commissioner Hennock, make up probably the worst series of appointments which the President has made to any one regulatory agency.

[From Labor of June 4, 1955]

FCC'S LONE CHAMPION OF PEOPLE FIRED

Labor recently predicted that President Eisenhower would fire the only remaining Federal Communications Commission member who stands up for the public interest. That prediction came true this week.

The White House disclosed that the President will not reappoint Frieda B. Hennock to the FCC when her present term expires a month from now. To replace her, Ike has picked Richard A. Mack, former chairman of the Florida Public Utilities Commission, and now vice president of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, known as NARUC.

Miss Hennock is a Democrat and, by law, the President had to put a Democrat in her place, so political party had nothing to do with the choice. Why wasn't she reappointed? The answer is suggested by her record.

She was the only commissioner who opposed an $80 million rate boost for the Bell Telephone trust. She fought for and won for educational institutions 257 television channels which were wanted by private profit TV interests. She defended small and independent radio and TV stations against big network monopolists.

REFUSED TO BOW

She crusaded against the crime and horror television programs which make big money for advertising sponsors but are charged with causing juvenile delinquency.

Also Miss Hennock recently urged that some way be found to make radio and television equally available to candidates of both political parties, to end the growing advantage of the party which gets the most money from rich men who "buy" elections—particularly the tax-free Texas oil magnates who fatten GOP campaign funds.

In other ways, too, Miss Hennock refused to bow to powerful special interests. So she is ousted, like other courageous regulators in recent years.

Not much is known about her successor, Mack, except his close connection with NARUC, the national organization of State regulatory commissions. Of the latter, almost all are under the thumbs of the power trust, gas trust and telephone trust. Also, the organization has taken an antilabor stand on various occasions.

The 10 Years of the U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article written by Walter Lippmann, and published in today's Washington Post and Times Herald, dealing with the 10 years of the U. N. and what it means to American security, and to peace in the world.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—THE 10 YEARS OF THE U. N.

There would be no such celebration as the world will be seeing next week in San Francisco, if in these 10 years the United Nations had not proved themselves to be a universal and indispensable institution. Nothing that can be said by the statesmen who will be there is so eloquent as the fact that these statesmen are there—that no government has wished, that no government would have dared, to refuse to come. There are still many governments waiting, hoping, and working to be admitted into the United Nations. There is none that would like to resign.

Among those who follow these things there are, to be sure, few in any country who are not critical of this or that in the organization or in the specific acts of the United Nations. There are, likewise, few Americans who agree with all the policies and actions of the American Government. But those who would like to leave the United Nations, or wish to see the society dissolved, are no more than an eccentric minority.

No member has threatened to resign if it could not prevail. And none has been threatened with expulsion if it did not conform to the views of the others. This reflects, I believe, something new in human history, and something of great significance: namely, the presence throughout mankind of a will that the sovereign governments shall preserve the universal society.

This sentiment, so imponderable and yet so compelling, is not due to the triumphs of the United Nations in the specific and hard questions that have been put to them. The United Nations have not solved all their problems; not by any means. The general human will to maintain the United Nations is due to the feeling, almost one might say to the instinct of the great masses of mankind that beyond and above the cold war, the ideological war, the armaments race, and the revolutions, there is a supreme and universal human interest. This supreme and universal human interest is that issues must never be let reach a point where conflict is irreparable and inexpiable. For humanity has rights that mankind must compel all governments to respect and to defend.

That the United Nations have come through the past 10 years, and that membership is now prized in every nation, is—if one stands off and looks at it—extraordinary. These have been 10 dangerous years. The world is rent by the cold war—which is perhaps the deepest, widest, and bitterest schism within the peoples of the world since the long struggle between Islam and Christendom. And with this cold war, alongside of it, as part of it, and at times overriding it, we have been living amidst the epoch-making rise of the peoples of Africa and Asia, and their emergence as new sovereign powers among the powers of the world.

In the whole of our recorded history there have been few periods, perhaps no period, when so many peoples have been involved in such deep changes in the ways of their life, or engaged in such a diversity of conflicts. It is astounding, therefore, that the universal society of the United Nations survives, and that it is, if anything, more deeply rooted, more tenaciously adhered to, than it was 10 years ago.

In human experience this is not the first enormous ideological schism when men were prepared to kill and be killed, nor is this the first period of widespread revolution. But this is the first time when in such an age of troubles there has been a truly universal society to which all the antagonists have adhered, or have wished to adhere. That is something without precedent. It is something that is not to be taken for granted, but is to be regarded with wonder and with hope.

This is, I believe, the great conclusion to be drawn on the 10th anniversary of the United Nations. But, of course, these 10 years have put many ideas, principles, and institutions of the United Nations to many different practical tests. In another article I shall venture to put down some of the things which I believe experience has taught us.

Reuther's Victory for All Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks, I include herewith an editorial from the New Era, official publication of the Pennsylvania Conference of Central Labor Unions (AFL):

REUTHER'S VICTORY FOR ALL WORKERS

No matter what his critics say, Walter Reuther has written his name in indelible ink in the economic history book of America and to the everlasting credit of working men and women who will benefit from the guaranteed wage established in principle in the new UAW-Ford contract.

The Wall Street Journal, chewing on sour grapes, termed the settlement "a throwback to a dark age of labor relations."

The National Association of Manufacturers, in a full-page advertisement in the Journal, rapped the annual wage as a "bad means to achieve an obviously good end—steadier work and pay."

This gloom-doom fraternity issued the same kind of statements when the principle of industry-paid pensions was established by the coal miners. They also said the 40-hour week would be the ruination of our free enterprise system.

These calamity howlers, who, incidentally, today are enjoying some of the highest profits in history (even after taxes), fought every social reform over the last two decades.

There is no reason why sound insurance principles cannot be applied equally to the guaranteed wage as they are to other cost items. Industry pension plans eventually were integrated into the pattern of doing business and so will the guaranteed wage.

What Walter Reuther and the automobile workers did was to end this hill-and-valley cycle of take-home pay—a good wage while production soars, and less-than-subsistence compensation benefits during weeks and months of unemployment.

Many times in the past some of the dyed-in-the-wool reactionaries declared that a little unemployment is a good thing for the economy. What they really meant was that they should have the right to shirk social responsibility and merely hire and fire according to some cold, cost-accounting system without regard to human needs.

Reuther has put human beings ahead of company dollar signs by forcing the guaranteed-wage principle into the Ford contract. We can expect that other unions now will press for a similar pattern in other basic mass-production industries.

In the long run the guaranteed wage can only strengthen us in the global war on communism. For here in America the working people can boast of security and purchasing power without any loss of freedom and without fear of depression.

Federal Aid for School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the New York Times of June 2 published a letter to the editor written by Mr. Shad Polier, chairman of the executive committee of the American Jewish Congress, having to do with legislation for Federal aid for school construction, and commenting on the significance of the recent Supreme Court decision with regard to this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the copy of Mr. Polier's letter to the Times be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTRUCTION OF SCHOOLS—PROGRAM OFFERED TO SPUR BUILDING NOW WITH FEDERAL AID

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The May 31 decision of the Supreme Court in the public-school segregation cases underlines the importance of a related issue now before the Congress. Both parties and a clear majority of both Senate and House support Federal aid for public school construction. But bills to grant such aid have been held up in committee by disagreement over the inclusion of an antisegregation provision.

Even those who oppose Jim Crow are divided. Some hold that Congress should keep hands off altogether since the Supreme Court has taken responsibility for the desegregation process. Others urge that Congress has an equal duty in the struggle for full equality to see that Federal aid is not given to any State which may attempt to retain segregated schools. Until these approaches are reconciled the legislative process seems likely to remain stymied. There is, I would suggest, an available middle course.

THOSE AFFECTED

When Congress enters the school picture by appropriating funds, it cannot shrug off the segregation issue or expect the courts to correct its omissions. It has the obligation to make plain that it regards segregation as wrong and that it refuses to subsidize wrongdoing. But congressional control need extend no further than to the schools directly affected by its appropriation of Federal funds.

As many had anticipated, the May 31 decisions of the Supreme Court allows some period for the alteration of established practices in existing schools. Congress can complement the court's action by adding an antisegregation provision applicable only to schools which will be built or improved with Federal funds. Under such a provision communities electing to receive such aid would have to agree that those assisted facilities will be open to all on an unsegregated basis.

Such action would not be open to challenge as improper interference with State's rights. It is traditional for Congress to insure proper disbursal of the funds it appropriates. Moreover, it has express power to enforce the requirements of the fourteenth amendment, requirements that have been given clear content by the Supreme Court in its two decisions in the public school segregation cases. Leaving existing schools alone, Congress would be telling State officials that, while the timetable for desegregation of those schools is a matter lying between them and the courts, they may not take advantage of the Federal program to finance further violations of the Constitution.

ADVANTAGES OF PLAN

In addition to its sound base in constitutional principle and tradition, this moderate approach has several practical advantages:

First, the prospect of receiving Federal funds would encourage and assist those citizens in the South, and especially in border areas, who want to see their communities move ahead on the racial issue.

Second, if a school board practiced segregation in violation of its certification, the courts could be expected to order immediate compliance. For, in such a case, there would be no basis to urge delay or the need of gradual transition. The original certification of intention to operate without segregation would bar any claim that prompt integration in the particular school building was not possible.

Third, suits to obtain such compliance could be brought by the Federal Government, to which certification would be made. This would give needed relief to the Negro community which now faces the prospect of bringing a separate action against each of the school districts of the South.

The need for Federal school aid is imperative and demands prompt disposition of any issues that may impede it. Bills should be brought to the floor of the Senate and House, with an effective antisegregation provision if possible—without one if necessary—so that the full Senate and House Membership can vote on the two questions of aid and segregation. We owe this both to the millions of school children now deprived of adequate schools and to the millions who continue to suffer the shame of racial oppression.

SHAD POLIER,
Chairman, Executive Committee,
American Jewish Congress.

Taxpayer Fleeced in Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a very interesting and illuminating article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of yesterday, under the byline of Constantine Brown, entitled "Taxpayer Fleeced in Foreign Aid."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXPAYER FLEECED IN FOREIGN AID—FIGURES IN BILLS TELL SMALL PART OF STORY; HANDOUTS ABROAD OBSCURED BY BUREAUCRATS

The extent to which foreign aid has fleeced the American taxpayer since World War II has never been fully realized. The figures in the headlines when a foreign-aid bill is up for consideration on Capitol Hill tell only a small part of the story. Indeed, it would be a practical impossibility to present any definite figure as an accurate grand total for the foreign-aid bill to date.

The reasons, of course, for such necessary vagueness lie in the nature of the effort the United States has made to put the war-torn free world back on its feet and to create a worldwide pump-primer operation hazily described as of vital importance to American prosperity and defense.

The nature of the effort can best be described in a single word as diversity. The lavishness of American handouts has been obscured to the taxpayer by the bureaucratic device of spreading the largesse among many different Santa Clauses. Thus the right hand never knew, or questioned, what the left was doing. Both hands were kept busy, handing out to countless other hands which also refrained from any serious effort to know what was really going on.

While the official foreign-aid organizations were busily performing their gracious bestowal of the resources of America on Zambezi and Timbuctu, a dozen other American Government agencies were also eagerly employed in like enterprises. Many times 2 or 3 agencies found themselves doing the same thing, and usually resolved the duplication or triplification quite readily by a new series of gobbledygook language designed to obscure the facts, as Government talk usually does.

Thus, while the Marshall plan was going strong, the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the State Department, the Information Agency, and several more obscure but no less generous outfits were competing vigorously to "obligate" their fat appropriations.

Foreign aid itself never consisted alone of handouts. There were lots of "do-it-yourself" projects, in which ostensibly the foreign governments concerned were doing a job, such as building a power plant or a railroad station or a dam. But guess who was footing the bills?

Then there was the matter of lend-lease accounts. When the figures were added up at the expiration of the lend-lease arrangement, "careless" was hardly the word for the procedure. Millions upon millions were signed away or ignored—all levies on the sad United States taxpayer and all gone if not forgotten.

When NATO came along for a fact, Uncle Sugar was happily cast in his accustomed role. While our brave and dependable allies praised the "mutual" effort for the common defense, Uncle dug deep into our collective pockets to pick up the tab.

Military assistance was supposed to be a separate category, and to an extent it was. But not to a very far extent. Under so-called military assistance, hundreds of projects were paid for which were of dubiously indirect military significance. At the same time, the armed services themselves were financially engaged in a host of projects having not the remotest connection with military matters, except of course under the well-stretched excuses that the "stability" of our gallant allies was a direct military contribution to defense of the free world.

And despite the existence of the murderous cold war, even the Soviet Union and the Iron Curtain satellites have been the eager recipients of United States material aid, both directly and indirectly through various stratagems.

The whole foreign aid extravaganza has been right out of Alice in Wonderland.

Britain's "Socialistic" Conservatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an article by the Public Affairs Institute, published in current issue of the New Era, official organ of the Eastern Pennsylvania Conference of Central Labor Unions, AFL:

BRITAIN'S SOCIALISTIC CONSERVATIVES

The victory of Great Britain's Conservative Party in the recent general election has been hailed widely by American conservatives as a bitter blow to liberalism.

Presumably the British people had turned their backs on the kind of welfare state that the Labor Party had introduced during its term of office and wanted a continuance of good old-fashioned conservatism.

Politicians in Washington, applying the British results to the United States, were not above interpreting them as a boost for conservative Republican policies and a blow for liberal Democratic policies.

Actually, the blunt fact is that many parts of the platform on which the Conservatives ran would give the United States Chamber of Commerce the cold shivers.

Like most platforms, the Conservative platform of 1955 was divided into boasts about past accomplishments and promises for future good things for the electorate.

Here are some of the Conservative boasts:

"The Conservative Government has now become the first in the world to launch a program of nuclear power stations on a commercial scale.

"Our party's pledge to build 300,000 houses a year was derided by opponents as impossible to fulfill. In fact, nearly 350,000 were built last year. * * * Already under Conservative Government a million new homes have been provided." (This refers to public low-rent housing.)

"Under Conservative Government a record number of new schools has been completed and a record number of teachers recruited."

"In its first year of office the Conservative Government increased virtually all social service payments. This year it has again raised pensions and benefits."

"As part of our policy for maintaining full employment, we aim to attract (in Scotland) the widest variety of new industrial enterprise."

Here are the promises for the future:

"We intend to increase capital investment in new pits and major construction schemes (in the nationalized coal mines) to four times what it was when we took over in 1951."

"By support prices, deficiency payments, and other means, we shall uphold the principle of the 1947 Agricultural Act * * * Three out of every four farm cottages will be linked to a main electricity supply on the completion of a major 5-year program which we have initiated. We have doubled the amount paid annually in grants for rural water supplies and sewerage; this progress will be kept up, and further funds made available.

"In the next 5 years we shall provide at least another million new school places, mostly in secondary schools."

"We accept the case that family allowances should be paid as long as a child is at school."

"New hospital building was completely neglected by the Socialist Government. Plans have been announced and will be carried out over the next few years for the building of new hospitals * * * and for the extension and modernization of many existing hospitals."

"We welcome the increase in the provision of dental treatment. * * * We are anxious to provide the best national health service the country can afford."

All of this would indicate that the British Conservative Party knows pretty well what the British people want in the way of social services and that it is willing to give it to them.

Meditations From a Jail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article by Ralph McGill, which appeared in the Atlanta Constitution for Saturday, June 11, entitled "Meditations From a Jail."

It seems to me that this article is most important right at this time when we are inclined to find fault with Nehru, India's Prime Minister, because of apparently hostile statements he makes from time to time. At least it seems to me that we should weigh the facts set forth in Mr. McGill's column as we consider our foreign-aid program currently before the House.

The article follows:

MEDITATIONS FROM A JAIL

(By Ralph McGill)

A few years ago Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru visited the United States. Everyone now admits the job was "bungled." We made a seemingly typical error of allowing him to meet, almost exclusively, our important men. We briefed none of those men about Nehru or India.

The result was that at luncheons and dinners Nehru was forced to listen to some of the most important men in American industry and business talk what was almost nonsense. There questions about India and about his own career were both naive and ignorant.

Nehru left America feeling that he had had no contact with our intellectual life, our culture, or with the real people of our country. One of the things which stuck most in his craw, and which to him illustrated a materialistic attitude, occurred at one of these dinners with important men. In talking with friends when he returned to India, Nehru said that his host sought to impress him by saying, "Mr. Nehru, I would like for you to know that the men gathered together at this table represent several billions of dollars."

A REAL POINT

Nehru said that it made him sad that he did not learn anything about their families, their interests, their culture, their activities as human beings, but only that the faces he saw before him represented many billions of powerful dollars.

Nehru, of course, is extremely sensitive. All new nationalisms, and leaders of them, almost invariably are unreasonably sensitive, but Nehru did have a real point. And to an Asian whose religion teaches the theory of renunciation, the America visit was one which made us seem crassly materialistic, which, as a matter of fact, we are not.

The Russians are not making this mistake. One notes from reading the reports of Nehru's visit to Moscow that they are going in heavily for the common culture of the Russian and the Asian peoples and are presenting to him their poets, musicians, philosophers, and so on.

This will appeal to Nehru, but it is important to know that it will not necessarily make him turn to the Russians. He did not like his visit to America, but he did not turn against us. He basically is an Indian. It is important to remember that from about mid-1919 until 1947 there was hardly a year that one or more members of the Nehru family were not in British jails in India on political charges.

IN PRISON

In Nehru's admirable book, "The Discovery of India," written while he was in prison in Ahmadnagar Fort during the last war, he says:

"Time seems to change its nature in prison. The present hardly exists, for there is an absence of feeling and sensation which might separate it from the dead past. * * * The outer objective time ceases to be, the inner and subjective sense remains, but at a lower level, except when thought pulls it out of the present and experiences a kind of reality in the past or in the future. We live, as Auguste Comte said, dead men's lives, encased in our pasts, but this is especially so in prison where we try to find some sustenance for our starved and locked-up emotions in memory of the past or fancies of the future.

"* * * so I made voyages of discovery into the past, ever seeking a clue in it, if any such

existed, to the understanding of the present. The domination of the present never left me even when I lost myself in musings of past events and of persons far away and long ago, forgetting where or what I was. If I felt occasionally that I belonged to the past, I felt also that the whole of the past belonged to me in the present. * * *"

This helps explain Nehru. It also assists us to understand other Indian leaders and the intensity of their nationalism. Whatever they can create in India, they want it to be Indian and neither Russian, Chinese, nor American.

The Late Senator Robert M. La Follette, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, today, June 14, 1955, marks the birthday and the 100th anniversary of one of America's great and most devoted public servants, who through his long years of service, first in his own State of Wisconsin, but likewise during the long tenure of office in the Congress of this United States, I refer of course to that great humanitarian and staunch friend of the many, the late Senator Robert M. La Follette, Sr., of Wisconsin.

I wish today to join with thousands of my fellow Minnesotans, and all Americans, who like myself wish to pay our respects and tribute and refresh our memories of a great American who blazed the trail here in the Congress for social reforms and legislation that had for its purpose a better tomorrow for the many, not only the few.

I include the following editorial:

[From the Machinist of June 9, 1955]

FIGHTING BOB LA FOLLETTE'S CENTENNIAL

Brother A. E. Drescher, retired member of I. A. M. Lodge 266, is living spryly in Jacksonville, Ark. Like so many machinists, Brother Drescher has been 49 years in good standing in his union. And, like so many machinists, Brother Drescher has a long memory for those who have helped (and opposed) the union cause.

Last month Brother Drescher wrote a letter to headquarters in Washington. Here's what he had to say:

"Years ago when the unions were looked down upon, and I mean down, there were only a few in Washington who would listen to our pleas for the improvement of human rights.

"Robert Marion La Follette was the Senator we could talk to, write to, and who would espouse our cause. June 14, 1955, will be the 100th anniversary of his birth. On June 18 he will have been dead 30 years."

CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE

Brother Drescher suggested that something ought to be done to observe this centennial of the birth of one of the greatest champions labor and the family farmers ever had—not just in his own home State of Wisconsin but of the entire Nation.

For those of us who are too young, Fighting Bob La Follette's name will evoke no memories. But for the oldtimers among us, like Brother Drescher, La Follette's name stands for everything that was clean and good about government—both Federal and State—for more than a quater of a century.

As Congressman, as Governor, and as Senator from Wisconsin, Fighting Bob La Follette was a man the people trusted. A Republican, he rebelled against boss rule and the corruption of so many public officials of his time. He fought special privilege, uncovered the Teapot Dome scandal—the biggest steal of public resources up to that time. He battled the giveaway of forest land and other public property. He sponsored such useful legislation as the Federal Employers Liability Act, the Seamen's Act, the railroad 16-hour law, woman's hours of service law, and championed the graduated income and inheritance taxes, fought for the direct election of our Senators, women's suffrage, and child-labor legislation—to name a few of his efforts.

No greater proof of La Follete's stature can be offered than to remind IAM members that he was the first and, until 1936, the only man ever endorsed by the International Association of Machinists for the high office of President of the United States.

PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

La Follette capped a long career in 1924 when he ran for President on a third party ticket. Like all third parties, La Follette's was preordained for defeat. Nevertheless, his effort was enough to convince at least the Democratic Party that it could never win with an arch-conservative candidate. It has never tried again.

Back in 1925, at the time of La Follette's death, Fred Hewitt, then editor of the Machinists Monthly Journal, wrote of him:

"We share the view of many who believe La Follette was the greatest champion of the right of the people to govern themselves since Lincoln."

At this century mark, we salute the memory of Fighting Bob La Follette. His fight helped to make our life easier. Brother Drescher and thousands of union men like him have not forgotten.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution signed by 81 public-spirited citizens in the Fifth Congressional District of Connecticut.

The current congressional investigations into the juvenile delinquency problem have uncovered the increasing use of alcohol by teen-agers. This is to be deplored and it is my sincere hope that my colleagues will join me in finding ways and means of enacting legislation that will curb the growth in delinquency among the youth of our Nation.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION TO OUR REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS

Since alcoholism, delinquency, and mental illness have become serious health problems, we, your constituents of Connecticut, earnestly emplore you to use the powers of Congress to get alcoholic beverage advertising off the air, and out of the channels of interstate commerce, and thus protect our people and the rights of States to prevent advertising of commodities which have been declared unlawful by the rights of local option granted them under State law.

Arthur C. Newport, Evelyn M. Case, F. L. Braman, D. E. Dayton, A. E. Dayton, Philip M. Dow, Mrs. C. F. Allyn, Jr., Velma Olson, Edna Fiedorowiez, Elsie Nettleton, Doris Roberge, Mildred C. Scoville, Hattie R. Siegel, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest Mayell, Mrs. G. S. Everett, Mrs. Willis C. Moore, Mrs. Nellie Rebmann, Mrs. Rose Sanford, Mrs. Herbert W. Atwood, Mrs. Kirsten Hestad, Rev. A. C. Allen, William J. Monroe, Alice M. Cass, Joan L. Monroe, Walter H. Wells, Ruth M. Monroe, Lillian F. Peck, Michael Galitello, John A. Conklin, Charles H. Connell, Aloysius A. Rebman, Hubert R. Monroe, Bernard L. Estes, Raymond Rebmann, Sarah Logue, Elizabeth Tehan, Alice L. Skilton, Edith M. Skilton, Elizabeth Tortorici, Margaret Marland, Rev. R. C. Hewitt, Raymond G. Cook, Lorraine Cook, Lela Holbrook, Edwin L. Mix, Angela M. Roberts, Walter Roberts, Harriet R. Bunnell, Harold M. Bunnell, Rhoda S. Salisbury, Mabel M. Anderson, Eva Roberts, Eileen S. Jones, Hattie B. Freter, Ellen M. Hewitt, Elizabeth Richards, Cora Roberts, Mrs. Cassie Dowd, Mrs. Lillian Bronson, Mrs. Henry Preusser, Mrs. Gertrude M. Byran, Mrs. Mabel Kelley, Mrs. Cora M. Scott, Mrs. J. M. E. Johnson, Mrs. Ruth Oldroyd, Mrs. C. B. Seaver, Emma L. Messenger, Mrs. Sarah Poushee, Mrs. Louis Venter, Mrs. Charles Townsend, Mrs. Edith P. Candee, Mr. Frank A. Hall, Mrs. Christina B. Hall, Mrs. Thelma D. Fowler, C. B. Fowler, Mrs. Ruth Stanwich, Mrs. Golda Young, Frederick H. Salisbury.

Yale University NROTC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at New Haven I had the privilege of watching some 100 fine young men take the oath of office as ensigns in the United States Navy. It was an impressive ceremony, and of particular importance to me because my own son, Joseph W. Bow, was one of the young graduates of the Yale University NROTC program who accepted this grave responsibility for the defense of our country.

The oath they swore was impressive in itself. It reads:

I solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same, that I take this obligation freely and without mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter.

Mr. Speaker, as these young men stood and repeated that oath, I could not help but reflect that they may soon find themselves on active duty in other nations of the world, and that the Constitution they have sworn to uphold and defend will not defend them there.

The constitutional guaranties which are their birthright will be denied them when in defense of that Constitution, they find themselves assigned to duty on foreign soil.

It is shocking that such a situation should exist, but it does exist under the terms of article VII of the Status of Forces Treaty and other similar agreements affecting our men in some 40 nations of the globe. Any infraction of unfamiliar foreign law may find them incarcerated in foreign prison without the constitutional guaranties of every freeborn American—because we bartered them away.

This experience has served to increase my determination with regard to H. J. Res. 309, calling upon the President to renegotiate or denounce article VII. I sincerely hope that we may have hearings on the resolution at an early date.

He Designed Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include an article by James Poling reviewing the life and work of gallant Captain Reid, who designed our flag. Captain Reid was born in the district which I am honored to represent. He is more than merely a local hero. His is a name of great honor and fame:

HE DESIGNED OUR FLAG

(By James Poling)

When we pause this coming Tuesday to observe Flag Day we can be reasonably certain that in all of the day's spate of commemorative oratory the name of Capt. Samuel Chester Reid will never be heard, even though he was the man who designed the flag we honor. And if it is strange that this hero should be forgotten, it is equally strange that, in 1816, the Congress of the United States should have chosen a young, Down East sea captain, with no artistic talent or training, as our flag's ultimate designer.

In 1777, it is true, Congress already had approved a flag—based on the coat of arms of the Washington family—which consisted of 13 stars and 13 stripes. Then, in 1795, after 2 new States had been admitted to the Union, 2 additional stars and stripes were added. In 1816, however, with more new States in or seeking admission, it became apparent that the flag would soon become an unwieldy monstrosity if we continued to recognize each State by adding another star and stripe.

It was then that Congress turned to Sam Reid. He had just staged one of the most heroic defenses of the flag's honor in our history, and Congress chose to pay tribute to him by thus placing the flag's future in his hands.

As the War of 1812 was drawing to its close 31-year-old Captain Reid—his men said, "There's one was born with salt in his nose"—had taken the small, 246-ton privateer *General Armstrong*, carrying 7 guns and 90 men, into the neutral port of Fayal, Portuguese Azores, for fresh water.

Only hours later a British squadron—a brig, a frigate, and a ship of the line—carrying 2,000 men and 130 guns, put into the same port. The British commander, Commodore Robert Lloyd, ran up a flag signal ordering the Yankee to surrender.

Reid signaled back, "Come and get me."

The Portuguese Governor of Fayal protested that the American brig was immune to attack in this neutral port, according to the law of nations, but Lloyd threatened to destroy the town, too, if the Governor interfered. And so, as a full moon rose, the island's natives took ringside seats on the shore and on the walls of the harbor's castle.

In the beginning the British underestimated their opponent. Reid and his men met the first English boarding party with musket, cutlass, and boarding ax, and repulsed it quickly and viciously. As a result, when Commodore Lloyd made his second attack at midnight he sent in 560 men in long boats armed with carronades and swivel guns. As these boats closed on the *General Armstrong* their commander, Lieutenant Matterface, ordered, "Up and board, men, and no quarter." No quarter was exactly what the 90 grim men on the little brig gave them.

Reid, leading the after-division, fought with both hands as the main British attack sought to storm his quarterdeck. Naturally left-handed, he wielded a saber with that hand while, with his right hand, he fired the pistols his powder boy constantly reloaded and handed to him. He personally disposed of Lieutenant Matterface in a cutlass duel, disdaining to shoot him down, and then led the attack that finally drove the British back over the quarterdeck taffrail.

At this point, a messenger reached him with news that the situation on the forecastle was desperate. The *General Armstrong's* two other officers were wounded, ammunition was running short and the enemy had gained the bowsprit and was pressing into the ship.

With a rallying cry, "Close quarters and quick work, lads," Reid led the after-division forward. He put a ball between a British lieutenant's eyes, hurled his empty pistol in the face of a lunging marine, cut a second down with a sidearm slash and plunged into the main line of the advancing British. For a time the line held, then it sagged and broke. The British were routed in only 40 minutes of fighting and the splash of bodies plunging into the sea could be heard as they fled the furious mopping-up action of Reid and his crew.

The British count was 120 killed and 130 wounded. Sam Reid lost 2 of his 90 men and had 7 wounded. As a British ensign said afterward, "God deliver us from our enemies if this is the way Americans fight."

At daybreak, the British brig *Carnation* moved in to finish at artillery range what couldn't be accomplished in hand-to-hand combat. Ten minutes later she was in full retreat—her guns silenced, her masts toppled, and her hull badly holed by the deadly American fire.

And then the 74-gun *Plantagenet* and the 44-gun *Rota* got underway. Knowing it would be impossible to defeat the full squadron, Reid refused to sacrifice his exhausted men in a hopeless cause. While he and a small band held the squadron off in a long-range artillery duel that crippled the rigging of the British ships, the rest of his crew rowed to safety ashore. Then Reid fired his "Long Tom" through the bottom of his badly damaged little brig, took down his bullet-torn flag and went shore himself.

There Commodore Lloyd sent him word that he was sending an armed force to take the crew captive. Reid led his men to an abandoned convent, raised his flag, and sent Lloyd the laconic message, "We're waiting."

The British commander gave up.

The following day Reid was invited to call at the British consulate. As he approached the building, wary of a trap, he was met by a group of officers from the enemy squadron, who lifted their caps and cheered him heartily. Then they took him inside the consulate and toasted him—a tribute unique in military history and, in its way, as remarkable as the one Congress later paid him.

It took 3 weeks to bury the British dead and rerig their battered ships—which were carrying the artillery intended for use in the British attack on New Orleans. As a result, the expedition awaiting the artillery in Jamaica was also delayed 3 weeks—and this gave Andrew Jackson the time he needed to move his Tennessee riflemen south, organize Jean Lafitte and his pirates, and set himself to give the British their final, culminating defeat of the War of 1812.

Captain Reid had fought better than he knew.

He returned from Fayal to be showered with honors. Congress asked him to produce a lasting, workable design for our flag. He had his wife make a model of the ensign he had in mind—13 stripes for the Original Thirteen States, and a blue field to which a star for each new State could be added. Congress approved and President Monroe signed an act making this flag official on April 4, 1818. On April 13 Mrs. Reid, in her husband's presence, handed the flag she had made to the President—and the American flag, as we now know it, was for the first time hoisted over our Capitol.

Today, of course, it still flies there—but the memory of Captain Reid has faded. I have a letter before me from his great-grandson, Sam C. Reid IV. He served in the New Guinea campaign of World War II on the U. S. S. *Reid*, third destroyer to be named for Sam Reid (she was sunk in the Leyte invasion in December 1944). He writes:

"Capt. Sam C. Reid has been forgotten by the United States of America, for which he did so much, for he lies in an unmarked grave in Green-Wood Cemetery, Brooklyn."

Forgotten? Well, not quite. Representative FRANCIS E. DORN, of Brooklyn, N. Y., has a bill in Congress to provide a fitting memorial for his grave; and the Associated Granite Craftsmen's Guild has offered to erect a monument.

Perhaps the time is not far off when America will recall this gallant seaman who gave us our flag.

House Resolution 183, "Counterproductive" Propaganda—Minority Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the minority views on House Resolution 183, requesting the Secretary of State to formulate a resolution naming the U. S. S. R. as an aggressor and to take immediate steps to place such resolution on the agenda of the U. N. assembly:

MINORITY VIEWS ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 183

We are in favor of a positive bipartisan political offensive against world communism.

We believe this resolution will have a negative, not a positive, result in such an offensive. Therefore, we are opposed to House Resolution 183. As Secretary Dulles says, it would be "counterproductive."

General Sarnoff, in his program for a political offensive against world communism, says:

Page 28—"The objective must aim to achieve dramatic victories as swiftly as possible, as a token of the changed state of affairs. Propaganda, for maximum effect, must not be an end in itself. Words that are not backed up by deeds, that do not generate deeds, lose their impact. The test is whether they build the morale of friends and undermine the morale of foes."

Applying these tests to this proposal to have the U. N. condemn the U. S. S. R. as an aggressor, what are the chances for a swift dramatic victory? What will be the impact of a failure of this effort on the morale of our friends, both inside and outside the Iron Curtain? The answers are obvious, and demonstrate why this resolution should go no further.

The diplomatic, the military implications of the action proposed by this resolution are far reaching, but the Committee on Foreign Affairs refused to hear any State or Defense Department witnesses before acting on this resolution. The only witnesses in the brief hearings were members of the select committee. The committee report on this resolution does not contain or even refer to the adverse report from the State Department which we have included at the end of our statement.

Our President, our two living ex-Presidents, our Secretary of State, our military leaders, are all opposed to the course of action this resolution would have the House request. We believe that any effective political offensive against communism requires a little teamwork. The House no doubt has a right to request executive action. In past years the House has teamed up with the Executive in passing "sense" resolutions opposing entry of the Red Chinese into the United Nations and seeking a United Nations embargo against Red China. As a propaganda project, however, it is counterproductive to have the House formally and officially request action against communism when it knows in advance the adverse views of the executive branch, which has the responsibility of implementing the action.

How will this, as General Sarnoff says, "build the morale of friends and undermine the morale of foes"?

Our country is now launched on a vast, complicated, risky political offensive against world communism, leading up to and away from the Four Power meeting at the summit. Our ultimate goal is no secret—just peace, and freedom for all mankind. The plays we make in driving toward that goal are not all announced in advance. We must not deliberately call openly for losing plays. We cannot have too many quarterbacks. In warfare, hot or cold, in political campaigns, as in football, teamwork and timing are needed. For the House to approve House Resolution 183 would be bad timing and poor teamwork.

We attach hereto correspondence of the State Department on House Resolution 183 and statements of ex-Presidents Hoover and Truman on Russia and the United Nations.

While we have not taken time to secure additional names on this minority report, other members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Republicans and Democrats, are opposed to House action on House Resolution 183.

JOHN M. VORYS.
FRANCES P. BOLTON.
DONALD L. JACKSON.
KARL M. LECOMPTE.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1955.

The Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RICHARDS: Reference is made to your letter of March 23, acknowledged March 25, requesting comments on House Resolution 183. The resolution refers to the report of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression and requests the Secretary of State to instruct the United States representative to the United Nations to transmit copies of these reports to each member of the United Nations. It further requests the Secretary of State to instruct the United States representative to the United Nations to formulate a resolution based upon the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the committee's report "naming the U. S. S. R. as an aggressor against the nations enslaved by communism" and "to take immediate steps to place such resolution on the agenda of the General Assembly for early action."

The Department of State shares the concern expressed in the resolution with respect to the serious implications for the maintenance of world peace resulting from the aggressive policies of the U. S. S. R. The work of the select committee is most valuable in exposing the details of Soviet policies and techniques in connection with the establishment of Communist regimes in a number of satellite countries.

We agree that it is desirable to give wide circulation to the reports of the select committee. The United States representative to the United Nations, on instructions from the Department of State, has already transmitted copies of the select committee's reports to all members of the United Nations. The only part of the report of the select committee which was not circulated was the section entitled "Summary Report," which contains the committee's recommendations to the executive branch. It was not considered appropriate to bring recommendations from the legislative branch to the attention of foreign governents. Thus, the first action proposed in House Resolution 183 has substantially been taken.

With respect to the request that a resolution "naming the U. S. S. R. as an aggressor against the nations enslaved by communism" be prepared and placed on the agenda of the General Assembly for early action, it is the view of the Department of State that such action would not bring about the desired result, a clear indictment of the U. S. S. R. for its policies of aggression and subversion.

In the first place, many of the events which were studied by the Select Committee occurred a number of years ago, in many cases before the establishment of the United Nations and in some instances long before World War II. Many members would seriously question the wisdom and even the authority of the United Nations to embark upon an inquiry into such matters. It is doubtful whether opposition based upon this position could be overcome, particularly to the extent necessary to make decisive United Nations action possible.

In the second place, any effort by the United Nations to investigate and judge the conditions by which constituents parts of the U. S. S. R. were incorporated into that country, regardless of how this incorporation occurred, might be looked upon by some members as an invasion of the domestic jurisdiction of the U. S. S. R. and consequently contrary to article 2 (7) of the United Nations Charter which forbids the organization to intervene in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any member. The basis for this constitutional objection would be the fear of these members that such action might eventually become a precedent that would be used to support international action in other cases involving the way in which states extended their jurisdiction over contiguous areas in the process of national growth. In this connection, members would also be influenced by the fact that at the time the United Nations was established, all the constituent republics studied by the select committee were known to be under Soviet control.

Third, notwithstanding what the facts may actually reveal, such countries as Albania, Bulgaria, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, which the select committee studied, would strongly contend that they are independent states, that their Communist governments were freely chosen, and that their association with the U. S. S. R. is simply one of friendly alliance characterized by mutual respect for each other's independence. A vigorous assertion that no aggression ever occurred, made by the alleged victims, would make it difficult to convince delegations less knowledgeable in Communist strategy and tactics than ourselves of the need for assembly action.

Fourth, many members oppose consideration of so-called "cold war" issues in the United Nations because they believe it increases international tensions without producing constructive results. An effort to indict the U. S. S. R. for aggression would be so regarded.

In these circumstances it is unlikely that a resolution naming the U. S. S. R. as an aggressor against the nations enslaved by communism could obtain majority support. Moreover, if such action were nevertheless undertaken and a resolution subsequently adopted by a small majority, possibly with its language weakened for the sake of obtaining necessary support, the work of the select committee would be depreciated, and the Assembly's action would be far less decisive than the situation studied by the select committee actually warrants. The Communists could also be expected to capitalize upon the apparent breach in free-world unity. It is even conceivable that the Assembly would not adopt any resolution whatsoever. Such a failure to obtain action could adversely affect the present positive propaganda value of the select committee's work.

Our experience indicates that the United States can most effectively expose the aggressive threat of Soviet communism by taking advantage of specific cases arising out of current situations, most of which involve facts about which all members have firsthand knowledge. For example, during the Ninth General Assembly, in the discussion of the items introduced by the Soviet bloc accusing the United States of aggression in the Far East and of violation of freedom of the seas, our delegation successfully demonstrated that the real aggressors were the Chinese Communists, supported by the Soviet Union. In this way the United States continues to expose before the United Nations the machinations of the Communist conspiracy.

In combating Soviet propaganda offensives, we have found it extremely useful to incorporate selections from such material as that prepared by the select committee in official speeches to illustrate the long-continued flouting of international obligations and standards of conduct by the U. S. S. R. At the Assembly next fall, as in the past, our delegation will exploit every appropriate opportunity to expose aggressive communism, and in this process the select committee's reports will be most valuable. Their use in the United Nations will complement efforts already underway in our overseas information program to publicize the committee's findings. We also hope that other members, all of whom received copies of the committee's reports, will make good use of them in their own speeches.

In light of the above observations, it is the view of the Department of State that adoption of the proposed resolution would be counter-productive in our mutual efforts to expose aggressive Soviet communism, in the United Nations and elsewhere.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

JUNE 9, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I request your comments on House Resolution 183, "Requesting the Secretary of State to take action to carry out certain recommendations of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, contained in its report made at the close of the 83d Congress."

This resolution was introduced on March 22, 1955 and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In response to a letter from the chairman requesting comments, Assistant Secretary of State Thruston B. Morton wrote the chairman on April 18, 1955 commenting on the resolution and concluding, "it is the view of the Department of State that adoption of the proposed resolution would be counterproductive in our mutual efforts to expose aggressive Soviet communism, in the United Nations and elsewhere."

When House Resolution 183 came before the committee for consideration, I requested that, in view of the adverse report, witnesses from the Department of State be heard before the committee acted on the resolution. On May 12 the Committee on Foreign Affairs, by a divided vote, reported out the resolution without hearing witnesses other than Members of Congress. The resolution was reported to the House today. I have not seen a copy of the report accompanying the resolution.

I have felt that this resolution was most untimely. In view of the present situation and immediate future developments, I would like to have your views on the resolution as promptly as possible for my own benefit and for consideration by other Members of the House.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. VORYS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 10, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN M. VORYS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR JOHN: I hasten to reply to your letter of June 9, 1955, requesting my views concerning House Resolution 183. This resolution refers to the report of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression and requests the Secretary of State to instruct the United States representative to the United Nations to transmit copies of the report to each member of the United Nations and to formulate and place on the agenda of the General Assembly a resolution "naming the U. S. S. R. as an aggressor against the nations enslaved by communism."

As you know, the Department's views on this resolution were submitted by Mr. Morton to Representative RICHARDS in a letter of April 18, 1955. As Mr. Morton indicated, Ambassador Lodge has already transmitted copies of the select committee's report, except for the section containing the committee's recommendations to the executive branch, to all members of the United Nations. The letter pointed out, however, that the action proposed by the committee, namely, a clear indictment of the U. S. S. R. for its policies of aggression and subversion, is not likely to succeed and that, in the view of the Department, to attempt it would be counterproductive. Mr. Morton enumerated the serious obstacles in the way of attaining the committee's objective in the General Assembly. I have no reason to believe that recent developments have in any way lessened these difficulties. It is indeed likely that the prospective 4-power meeting this summer will increase the reluctance of a number of countries to support such action and they would not consider it useful now to place the matter on the agenda.

Much as I value the committee's illuminating exposure of Soviet policies and techniques in the establishment of Communist government in the satellite states, I am compelled to express my deep concern that the adoption of the proposed resolution would hinder rather than assist our mutual efforts to combat these Soviet practices. Moreover, its passage at this time would be widely interpreted as an effort to prejudice the forthcoming Four Power negotiations.

Needless to say, the Department of State will continue to take advantage of every opportunity in the United Nations and elsewhere to expose the aggressive threat of Soviet communism. In this continuing effort, we shall of course rely heavily on the valuable information contained in the committee's report.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY OF PRESIDENTS HARRY S. TRUMAN AND HERBERT HOOVER BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. Truman (April 18, 1955):

"ADVANTAGE OF SOVIET MEMBERSHIP IN THE U. N.

"We knew at the time the United Nations was created that we were having difficulties with the Soviet leaders and that our difficulties might increase. We were determined, nevertheless, to go ahead with the creation of the United Nations and to get the Soviet Union into it, committed to the principles of international peace which are expressed in the charter. Without such a commitment on their part, we believed that the United Nations would not be successful. Looking back now, I think this was the correct course. We were striving to prevent the East-West split which has now become known as the cold war. We were striving to set up an organization which would bridge the split. Of course, no charter, no constitution can wipe out a power conflict. We must not blame the United Nations for all the bad things that have happened outside the United Nations and in violation of its principles. Soviet membership in the United Nations has been an advantage to the cause of peace, because the peoples of the world have been able to compare the Soviet's conduct to the standards of international peace laid down in the charter and to see that the Soviets have violated the basic ideals of mankind."

Mr. Hoover (April 21, 1955, answering a question by Senator SMITH):

"Senator, at one time I made a suggestion that either the Russians be asked to retire in order to give free entry to 14 nations which they have excluded, and in order that we might have a more unified front among free nations, and I suggested that if it was not possible to get them out of the United Nations we might consider a new organism to include only the free nations. I don't think at the present moment in view of conflicts which have developed among free nations that either course would be workable. My own conclusion is that we have to go on and worry with the Russians and with the hope that things may be better sometime. In any event, we have the opportunity of exposing them in five languages all at once."

A Toast to the Flag, by John Jay Daly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that proper credit was not given to the author of the poem I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of June 8, in connection with an article from the National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes, I wish to request unanimous consent to make the following insertion giving proper credit to Mr. John Jay Daly, the writer who was inspired to compose the powerful stanzas and its correct title "A Toast to the Flag":

"Here's to the red of it; there's not a thread of it
In all the spread of it from foot to head,
But heroes bled for it, faced steel and lead for it,
Slept with the dead for it, bathing it red.

"Here's to the white of it; who knows the might of it
But thrills at the sight of it through day and night,
Womanhood's care for it made manhood dare for it;
Purity's prayer for it kept it so white.

"Here's to the blue of it; heavenly hue of it
Star spangled view of it, constant and true;
And here's to the whole of it, stars, stripes, and pole of it,
Here's to the soul of it—red, white, and blue."

Scrambled Pay-Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as TV shows are viewed by millions of people throughout the country, the fate of television programing is affected with a special public interest. In this connection, I would like to include the following statement on pay television made by Dr. Frank Stanton, president of Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., at the annual conference of the primary affiliated stations of the CBS Television Network and CBS, which was held in New York on May 19, 1955:

CBS opposes pay television because it would hijack the American public into paying for the privilege of looking at its own television sets. This is a betrayal of the 34 million families who have already spent $13.5 billion for their sets in the expectation that they would be able to use them as much as they wanted without paying for the prerogative of watching.

Under pay television, stations which are now broadcasting free programs would scramble the pictures and sound so that the set owner could not receive them unless he paid for each program. Such programs could be unscrambled only when a costly gadget, attached to the home receiver, is fed a coin or slug, a key or card for which the viewer pays. Since a station cannot televise two programs at once, any station broadcasting a scrambled-pay program would necessarily have to eliminate its free program during that time period. Pay television would black out the best of free television. In essence, this is a booby trap, a scheme to render the television owner blind, and then rent him a seeing-eye dog at so much per mile—to restore to him, only very partially, what he had previously enjoyed as a natural right.

Pay-television promoters say they would be satisfied if they got $100 a year from the average family. On this basis, today's tele-

vision audience would pay some $3.5 billion a year—more than it pays for shoes or doctors or electricity—for viewing far fewer programs than it now watches without charge. This is three times the amount now being paid by the public for all spectator admissions.

Under the present system of American television, no set owner is deprived of a program because he is not as prosperous as his neighbor. But, once the turnstile of pay television is placed in the living room, the families who rely most on television for their entertainment and information would be hit the hardest because they would be the ones who, for economic reasons, would have to restrict their viewing most severely. Television would no longer belong to all the people all the time.

One of the arguments made by the promoters of pay television is that its introduction would hurt nobody. Try it out in the market place, they say. Surely this is in the American tradition. There would, they claim, be free television for those who want what they are now getting and there would be pay television for those who want the unusual, the sort of entertainment and culture which free television cannot afford currently. But this is a specious claim, unsupported by the economic facts of life. It is the sheerest kind of sophistry and it is intellectual quicksand.

It is probably that pay television would deliver an occasional heavyweight championship fight, and possibly such special entertainment as a multi-million-dollar first-run movie, which the economics of present television cannot reach, at least as of today. On the other hand, the bulk of any programing for which pay television would bid is bound to be the very kind of entertainment which already has found such high favor in present day free television. The result of this is that the public would be victimized into paying out billions of dollars a year for a programing service which they are now getting free.

If this scheme is authorized and becomes generally established, pay television would be able to bid away from free television every kind of program which the public now enjoys. For example: For viewing the World Series at home, a tribute of some $6 million per game would be levied on the public if each family watched the series in 1954 were forced to put up the modest sounding sum of 50 cents for each game. Thus the people would pay 15 to 25 times as much as is now being paid by the sponsors who bring them the games free.

If only 5 percent of the families who now watch Ed Sullivan's Toast of the Town would pay only 50 cents each to see the show, they would spend $375,000—two and one-half times as much as the sponsor now pays to bring it to the public free. The other 95 percent would then have the "free choice" that pay television promoters want to give them: the free choice of not watching Toast of the Town or paying to see it. It's the old story of letting the camel get his nose into the tent. Once this happens, the channel on which Toast of the Town is broadcast would be scrambled out for everyone who doesn't pay.

What is true of these two examples is true of every one of the public's favorite programs. If pay television is authorized, nobody could blame the owners of popular attractions for putting them where they could produce the most income. No one can be so naive as to believe that popular programs would be broadcast free if they could be charged for.

Thus television could not long remain half free and half fee. Either television programs belong to the public free or they belong to the highest bidder. During the hours when most people watch television, coexistence would be unlikely; it would be an economic improbability.

It is claimed that under pay television there would be more cultural programs appealing to small minorities. We believe the reverse to be the fact. If, as the pay-television promoters say, installing a minimum service in a single major city will cost tens of millions of dollars, installing it throughout the total area now served by television will cost billions of dollars. People who make such an investment will have to get it back by putting on the type of shows which will attract the largest audiences. If a million families were willing to pay $1 each to see a movie and 100,000 people would pay $2 each to see a ballet, there would be no ballet.

It is difficult to believe that the Federal Communications Commission would authorize a scheme which seems to be so clearly contrary to the public interest. However, if pay television should become established, economic necessity will force CBS to participate. Unlike theater owners, we have no economic axe to grind. We could expect to operate profitably under a system of pay television. With our programing know-how, facilities and experience, we regard it as more than probable that we would earn our share of the billions of pay-television dollars. But this is not where CBS believes its best interests lie.

We are proud of the progress the broadcasting industry has made in establishing a nationwide free television service. The pay television promoters have continuously predicted the failure of free television at every point of its development; that it could never support itself without direct tribute from the public. They made these false prophecies 25 years ago and, as recently as 1946, the president of Zenith Radio Corp. flatly stated "the advertisers haven't sufficient money to pay for the type of continuous programs that will be necessary to make the public buy television receivers by the millions." Today there are 36 million television sets in daily use. Unlike these false prophets, we set no limits to the increased and continually increasing service to the public of free television.

During the past 7 years, and at the cost of a refrigerator, the average family has been able to convert its home into a center of information and entertainment not even the wealthiest could have enjoyed 10 short years ago. The finest talents of Broadway and Hollywood, the significant events of Washington, faces of Presidents and legislators, the art of museums and advances of science have become as familiar to televsion set owners as their neighbors down the street. And past advances are only a prelude to future accomplishments. We are unwilling to see the present system, under which everybody watches television as much he wants, destroyed and a great and unifying medium of communication disrupted, with attendant dangers to our entire economy. The cost to the public in dollars and in the loss of free television far outweighs the potential gains of the pay-television scheme.

We believe, therefore, that the public's best interests and our best interests as well, lie in the continuing expansion of free television; that television channels now dedicated to all the public should not be used for the introduction of a system whose benefits to each viewer would be limited by his ability to pay.

Because the pay-television scheme would impose an unnecessary burden of billions of dollars on the American public; because it would charge the public for the popular programs it now enjoys free; because it would become a discriminatory service, available in large part to only those who could afford to pay; because it would endanger the scope and qualify of nationwide news and public service programing, we shall oppose it before the Federal Communications Commission.

A Sorry Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VERA BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of June 12, 1955, entitled, "Report on Polio."

The editorial deals with the sorry mess that has resulted from the complete abdication of leadership and responsibility in the handling of the Dr. Salk antipolio vaccine program. It calls attention to the tragic bungling of this program by the administration as compared with the brilliant record of Canada in the production and distribution of the vaccine there.

The editorial follows:

REPORT ON POLIO

Surg. Gen. Leonard A. Scheele's letter to Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby and the paper that he read last week at the Atlantic City meeting of the American Medical Association are his most explicit statements on the mishaps that followed the inoculation of schoolchildren with Dr. Salk's antipolio vaccine—yet not explicit enough for Mr. Basil O'Connor, who protests on behalf of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis that only the Public Health Service's version of our experience with the vaccine has been presented.

Mr. O'Connor is clearly right. Beyond the fact that live virus had contaminated some supposedly killed vaccine we know little of what happened in the factory. It may be that the full report of Dr. Scheele gives the information that is lacking. The mystery deepens in the light of the brilliant record of Canada. There over 500,000 children have been vaccinated, so far without any mishap. Yet the procedure followed by Canada is essentially the same as that laid down by Dr. Salk and originally followed in this country—supposedly. Possibly Dr. Salk will clarify the mystery. The Public Health Service maintains that his methods work well on a small scale but not when it comes to factory production and testing for safety. But why should the Salk technique succeed in Canada and prove inadequate here? A partial explanation may be found in the method of production. Originally we licensed six pharmaceutical houses and left to them the interpretation of the rules formulated by the National Health Institutes laboratories; in Canada all vaccine has been produced in the Connaught Medical Laboratories of the University of Toronto under the strict control of the Ministry of Health and its Federal Laboratory of Hygiene.

Was the virus used in last year's field trials better than that distributed and inoculated this year? It may have been, but there is no certainty. It is probable that it contained some live virus and that some of the failures tabulated in the Francis report are thus to be accounted for. If so, it would be unwise to rely too much on the statistics of that report.

On the whole, Dr. Scheele's two statements support those public health authorities who contend that the Public Health Service, instead of rushing into mass production this year, should have continued the field trials of last year on a national scale. Had that policy been followed, the public would have accepted the mishaps that have occurred as inevitable incidents in a great experiment, just as it accepted those listed in the Francis

report. Neither Dr. Scheele's letter to Secretary Hobby nor the paper that he read before the American Medical Association at Atlantic City absolves the Public Health Service of responsibility for the bungling that has attended the production and testing of the Salk vaccine.

Westward Movement of Center of Population of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as it appears that the center of population of the United States will remain within the boundaries of the State of Illinois for approximately the next 100 years, it would appear to me to be extremely wise to make some effort to distribute the Federal Government workload into the State of Illinois, so it would be more accessible to the majority of the people of our country, many of whom are today living 3,000 miles from our National Capital.

The history of the center of population indicates that at the time the site for the National Capital was selected the city of Washington was almost the center of population of our country. In 1790 the center of population was 23 miles east of Baltimore, Md., and in 1800 the center of population was still on the east side of Washington, D. C., which made Washington not only near the geographical center but also near the center of population as well.

According to the 1950 Bureau of the Census report—nearly 160 years later—the geographical center is some 1,500 miles to the west of the Capital City, and the center of population is in Denver Township, Richland County, Ill., which is 8 miles north-northwest of Olney, Ill.—a distance of approximately 1,000 miles west of our Capital City.

The following report shows the westward movement of the center of population of the United States between 1790 and 1950:

Year	North latitude			West longitude			Approximate location
	°	′	″	°	′	″	
1790	39	16	30	76	11	12	23 miles east of Baltimore, Md.
1800	39	16	6	76	56	30	18 miles west of Baltimore, Md.
1810	39	11	30	77	37	12	40 miles northwest by west of Washington, D. C. (in Virginia).
1820	39	5	42	78	33	0	16 miles east of Moorefield, W. Va.
1830	38	57	54	79	16	54	19 miles west-southwest of Moorefield, W. Va.
1840	39	2	0	80	18	0	16 miles south of Clarksburg, W. Va.
1850	38	59	0	81	19	0	23 miles southeast of Parkersburg, W. Va.
1860	39	0	24	82	48	48	20 miles south by east of Chillicothe, Ohio.
1870	39	12	0	83	35	42	48 miles east by north of Cincinnati, Ohio.
1880	39	4	8	84	39	40	8 miles west by south of Cincinnati, Ohio (in Kentucky).
1890	39	11	56	85	32	53	20 miles east of Columbus, Ind.
1900	39	9	36	85	48	54	6 miles southeast of Columbus, Ind.
1910	39	10	12	86	32	20	In the city of Bloomington, Ind.
1920	39	10	21	86	43	15	8 miles south-southeast of Spencer, Owen County, Ind.
1930	39	3	45	87	8	6	3 miles northeast of Linton, Greene County, Ind.
1940	38	56	54	87	22	35	2 miles southeast by east of Carlisle, Haddon Township, Sullivan County, Ind.
1950	38	50	21	88	9	33	8 miles north-northwest of Olney, Richland County, Ill.

Stability in the Lead and Zinc Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the Oil Workers International Union and the United Chemical Workers Union, CIO, met in joint convention in Cleveland, Ohio, the week of February 28, 1955. This was the last convention for each of these unions and the first convention for the great new union that was there formed as a result of a merger. The new organization is known as the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union, CIO.

Among the resolutions adopted at this important meeting was a clear and straightforward formulation of a program for stability in the lead and zinc industry. The statement of the legislation needed and the steps necessary to bring about the rehabilitation of the lead and zinc industry as set forth in the following resolution merits the thoughtful consideration of every Member of Congress:

WE NEED STABILITY IN THE LEAD AND ZINC INDUSTRY

Whereas the lead and zinc industry, smelters, mills, and mines have been passing through a period of economic distress, curtailment of operations, and substantial unemployment; and

Whereas this curtailment of operations occurs at a time when consumption and unemployment within the United States continues at a high level and at the same time it occurs in this industry they have faced unemployment and part-time employment.

To meet these needs United Gas, Coke, and Chemical Workers of America established a lead and zinc council, which has sought to meet the problems facing the industry. After consultation with all groups and agencies in the Government, organized labor, and the industry, a three-point program was adopted to provide aid and assistance to the workers as well as the producers in this industry, as follows:

1. An immediate purchase program by the Federal Government of lead and zinc under fixed floor price contracts which are authorized by section 303 of the Defense Production Act.

2. Enactment of legislation similar in principle to that introduced by Senator MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, and Congresswoman PFOST, Democrat, of Idaho. This legislation would permit the adoption of an incentive payment plan combined with Government purchase of materials.

3. Enactment of Federal legislation that would grant aid and assistance to workers, plants, mines, companies, and communities affected by imports.

I. TO WORKERS

A. Supplemental unemployment payments to affected workers.

B. Retraining opportunities.

C. Necessary transportation assistance in moving when shifted from community to community.

II. TO COMPANIES, MINES, AND PLANTS

A. Loans and assistance to enable them to improve their efficiency and become more competitive.

B. Loans to enable them to shift their production to other items (not applicable to lead, zinc, and copper).

III. TO COMMUNITIES BY GIVING

A. Assistance to the communities in determining alternative types of production and employment opportunities.

B. Aid in the determination of research, marketing, and employment opportunities.

C. Assistance in attracting new and diversified industries.

A purchase program under point No. 1 is now in effect with intention of purchasing domestic lead and zinc at prevailing prices to a total of 300,000 tons for stockpile purposes. This program has given some relief to this stricken industry.

Point 2. The Congress should enact legislation for premium-price plan contained in the bills introduced by Senator MURRAY and Congresswoman PFOST in the 83d Congress.

To implement the third point of the above plan we urge approval of the Trade Adjustment Act as introduced in the 83d Congress by Senator JOHN KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, and Congressmen WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, and EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania.

This bill, if enacted, would provide aid to workers, industrial enterprise, and communities affected by foreign-trade policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union, CIO, endorses the three-point program approved by the lead and zinc council including the request to the Congress to enact incentive payment plan as introduced by Senator MURRAY and Congresswoman PFOST and the Trade Adjustment Act as introduced by Senator KENNEDY and Congressmen WILLIAMS and EBERHARTER.

Television for Candidates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of realistic legislation to control campaign expenditures in connection with Federal elections is one of the important tasks which confronts this Congress. The Hennings bill for that purpose, S. 636, will be considered by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate tomorrow morning, I am advised. A companion bill, H. R. 3139, is at present before the Subcom-

mittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Monday, June 13, which clearly demonstrates the importance of these bills, and shows their relationship to other issues of concern to all Members of Congress and to the country as a whole:

TELEVISION FOR CANDIDATES

Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, has raised a highly significant question about the regulations governing the use of television in national political campaigns. CBS will give free television time to presidential candidates of the two major parties in 1956 for a series of Lincoln-Douglas type debates—provided that there is a modification of the requirement of equivalent free time for all other candidates. Such an offer, if it was made feasible by proper amendment of the law, undoubtedly would be repeated by the other networks. While the availability of some free time would by no means eliminate the need for paid political programs on television and radio, it certainly would help reduce to more manageable proportions costs that keep both the Republican and Democratic National Committees begging for funds.

The key point, of course, is to retain essential safeguards while modifying section 315 of the Federal Communications Act, which stipulates that if a network or station gives free time to one candidate it must extend the same privilege to all other candidates for the office. Section 315 was adopted for a reason of fundamental importance—to prevent rank political favoritism on federally regulated airwaves. It has prevented this favoritism, however, by freezing out much of the national political discussion that otherwise would take place on radio and television. Because it obviously would be impossible to extend free time to each of the 18 candidates for the Presidency in 1952, most of whom polled a mere handful of votes, there was for practical purposes no free television and radio time on the national level.

Obviously there would be need for great care in amending the regulations so as to preserve the principle of impartiality. In this respect the specific amendment proposed by Dr. Stanton is deficient, for it would raise the possibility of favoritism for one candidate through repeated appearances on panel discussions or other public-affairs type programs at the discretion of the networks. The aim ought to be to preserve the equal-time principle for serious contenders while affording greater flexibility in format.

What could reasonably be done, it seems to us, would be for Congress to amend the Federal Communications Act to recognize that the country has two major parties. Certainly the law should not discriminate against the possible rise of new parties on a national basis. But Congress could fairly provide that the free-time principle on the presidential level would extend only to parties that polled, say, 1 million votes each in the last presidential election or that could muster 200,000 or 300,000 signatures on a petition. In this way the public interest in equal free time for parties with a national following could be met without placing the Vegetarians or Prohibitionists on a par with the Democrats and Republicans.

As this newspaper views it, three broad avenues are open for reform in controlling campaign expenditures. The first is in more realistic limits on political outlays and more rigorous reporting of contributions, as provided in the Hennings bill in the Senate. The second is in greater public participation in campaign financing through much more widespread individual contributions. An important third is in bringing television and radio regulations up to date with political realities.

Contributions for Political Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Shop Talk at Thirty," written by Robert U. Brown, and published in the June 4, 1955, issue of the magazine Editor & Publisher. The article, in which I think all Members of Congress will be interested, suggests a rather unique method of raising campaign funds. I believe it has a great deal of merit.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOP TALK AT THIRTY

(By Robert U. Brown)

Public service advertising has become a useful and vital social tool in the 12 years since the organization of the Advertising Council. It has aided a hundred causes among which have been the savings bond program, forest fire prevention, traffic accident prevention, blood banks, get-out-the-vote, etc.

Philip L. Graham, publisher of the Washington Post and Times Herald, suggest public service advertising be applied to the major problem:

"That is, how can we raise enough honest, untainted money to permit our politicians to run for office without becoming obligated to corrupt or selfish forces? And in doing this, how can we help to create a higher regard for the importance of politics in the American future?"

Speaking at the annual dinner of the School of Business, University of Chicago, June 1, Mr. Graham stated that we, as a Nation, face problems that involve life and death for all of us; yet we insist on having the lowest sort of opinion of the very people we entrust with those problems; and we force them to operate under conditions which do everything to repel decent men.

Who are these people who bear this great responsibility, and whom we treat so stupidly? They are, of course, the politicians. They include Dwight D. Eisenhower, Adlai Stevenson, 96 Senators, 435 Congressmen, 48 Governors, the 750,000 other elective officials, and the Cabinet officers and tens of thousands of appointive officials and political workers who must live under our existing system of politics.

"These are the people whose day-by-day actions will very largely determine the greatest conflict in the history of the world. Yet how do we tell them we regard them? We tell them that we consider them just a little above outlaws. Thus, this spring in a nationwide Gallup poll, 7 out of 10 people with an opinion stated that they would not like to see their children enter politics as a life's work."

The root of the problem is money, our habits regarding contributions for political campaigns, Mr. Graham says. We not only rank politicians close to skunks in the popularity polls, but we force them to live in a system which goes a long way toward depriving them of self-respect.

First, we maintain a boldface, official lie about the cost of political campaigns and the amounts of political contributions.

Second, we almost universally fail to respond to, or even to recognize, the duties of the individual citizen in a free society.

Third, we consequently force politicians to live in close connection with the filthy power of gangsters and the acquisitive power of special interest groups and favor seekers.

Citing the Federal law limiting campaign expenditures by a candidate for Congress to $5,000, by a candidate for the Senate to $25,000, and by a national political committee to $3 million, Mr. Graham says this forces a man entering politics to launch his career with an initial act of blatant hypocrisy. Also citing actual expenditures—$17,500,000 by the national committees in the 1952 campaign, "and there are counties in this country where even a sheriff's race costs from 10 to 20 times more than $25,000"—Mr. Graham called this a "monumentally deceitful system of laws and reporting."

Examining the default of the citizenry, he noted that after the 1954 congressional elections the Gallup Poll asked people whether they had made a political contribution. This showed that only 1 family out of 20 had made any political contribution and would mean that only about 2 out of every 100 citizens made any contribution.

Rushing to fill this vacuum are the sums raised by the underworld, funds contributed by special-interest groups at home and abroad, and the contributions by "the hopefuls" who expect to receive high public office as a reward.

"The high cost of politics is a direct result of a high population and an expanding right of suffrage," Mr. Graham said. "And superficial attempts to solve the problem by having politicians pass rules as to what other politicians can get free TV time are only going to create new problems. Even stronger language can be employed against the suggestion, now 50 years old but constantly revived, that the Government should appropriate funds for this purpose."

He commended the step toward reform now being studied by the Senate committee under Senator HENNINGS of Missouri—the 60th congressional committee to review this subject in the last 50 years—but added that hearings so far indicate the new limits will still invite evasions by being unrealistically low.

Therefore, the problem will still be with us, he added.

"The problem is how to convince millions of Americans of an obvious fact—that good citizenship requires political contributions by each individual to the party or candidates of his choice," Mr. Graham stated. "Good citizenship requires this just as much as it requires contributions to one's church, one's community fund, the Red Cross, or other causes."

Here's where public service advertising could be used to advantage, he suggests. Others, including some members of the Advertising Council, may disagree with Mr. Graham on this point. But it seems to us he has made a good case, and one worth listening to in its conclusion:

"One does not have to be an Einstein to see how great a function public service advertising could perform in helping to build a new and decent foundation under our system of political finance. Through television, magazines, radio, newspapers, billboards, car cards—even match boxes—the average decent American could be reminded and reminded again of the importance of good government. Of how good government depends on each citizen's supporting, as he can, the party or candidate of his choice. And by doing this we can gain the larger objective of giving public recognition to the fact that

there should be no more noble calling in a free society than that of public life.

"A complete, well-coordinated campaign of public service advertising can create proper citizen support for political campaigns. It can do so quickly. By doing so it can, as I have said, create the most important political reform of the century.

"What is needed to make this happen? What is needed to make it work? Nothing more than the support of you and other decent citizens like yourselves.

"This country has in the Avertising Council a nonprofit, nonpartisan, public service group that annually administers $100 million worth of public service advertising donated by American business. The Advertising Council could provide a practical means for conducting such an educational campaign. It can be a campaign to further good government by reminding every citizen of his duty to support the party and candidates of his choice.

"For my part I hope it is done. For your part, I hope you join in making it a success.

"For our part, for the common concern of this country, we must end the fantastic system under which we treat our politicians as unsavory characters while at the same time we charge them with preserving our very civilization."

Libraries for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 1955, there appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald an editorial entitled, "Libraries for All." Under unanimous consent, I am inserting this editorial in the RECORD:

LIBRARIES FOR ALL

The public library, like the public school, has been dangerously neglected in the United States. A bulwark of the democratic process—more important than ever in the heightened complexity of the contemporary world—the public library has not kept abreast of the country's spreading population. Especially in rural areas and farming communities, library service of any sort is sadly lacking. Over 26 million Americans are today without access to modern libraries; more than 400 counties—roughly 1 out of every 6 in the Nation—have no public libraries at all.

The conditions is the more shameful since it can be so readily remedied. Improvement of library services is less difficult and less costly than improvement of the country's ailing public school system. It entails no controversial racial or religious issues and no bugbear of Federal control. And under the terms of a bill on which the House recently held hearings, the cost of the proposed program would be no more than $7½ million a year for 5 years in the form of Federal grants-in-aid to the States—about one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the total Federal budget, or 5 cents per capita.

The library services bill has 15 bipartisan Senate sponsors in addition to LISTER HILL who introduced it. In the House, 27 identical bills to the same purpose have been introduced. Senator HILL, who also introduced one of the principal aids to education bills, remarked that "library service complements and supplements the work of our schools by carrying the school into the home." It is, indeed, an indispensable means toward the attainment of an informed and enlightened citizenry.

Resolution of Baltic Committee of Washington, D. C., Concerning House Resolution 183

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 12, I had the honor to speak before the Baltic Committee of Washington, D. C. I was happy to hear taken up and passed unanimously a resolution having to do with the threat to peace caused by the continued Russian Communist occupation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania This resolution was particularly pertinent not only because June 14 of each year commemorates the mass deportation of more than 50,000 people from the Baltic States into Soviet Russia, but this year it had particular significance because pending before the House Rules Committee is House Resolution 183, requesting the Secretary of State to do the following:

First. To instruct the United States Representative to the United Nations to transmit to each member nation of the United Nations copies of the summary report of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression—House Report No. 2684, part 16, 83d Congress—as well as copies of all other reports submitted to the House by such select committee.

Second. To formulate a resolution based upon the findings, conclusions, and recommendations contained in such House Report No. 2684, part 16, 83d Congress, naming the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as an aggressor against the nations enslaved by communism; and

Third. To instruct the United States Representative to the United Nations to take immediate steps to place such resolution on the agenda of the General Assembly for early action.

In view of the relationship the resolution of the Baltic Committee of Washington, D. C., has to do with House Resolution 183, under unanimous consent, I ask to have this resolution inserted in the RECORD:

Whereas the investigations of the special select committee, which was created in 1953 by the House of Representatives, have established that "Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were forcibly occupied and illegally annexed by the U. S. S. R." and that "the continuing military and political occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the U. S. S. R. is a major cause of the dangerous world tensions which now beset mankind and therefore constitutes a serious threat to peace"; and

Whereas on March 22, 1955, identical resolutions were introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressmen THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut; ALVIN M. BENTLEY, of Michigan; MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Ohio; PATRICK J. HILLINGS, of California; THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, of Michigan; and RAY J. MADDEN, of Indiana, asking the Secretary of State to formulate a resolution "naming the Soviet Union as an aggressor against nations enslaved by communism" and to take immediate steps to place such resolution on the agenda of the General Assembly of the United Nations for early action; and

Whereas the date of June 14, 1941, marks the beginning of Soviet mass deportations of citizens from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to slave labor in remote Asian parts of the Soviet Union, presently being continued under the disguise of the plan for cultivation of virgin lands; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has refused to recognize the incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union and is steadfastly continuing recognition of their lawful diplomatic representatives in this country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we here assembled in prayerful mourning for the victims of Soviet aggression and genocide in the Baltic countries vigorously protest against the continuous practice of genocide and enslavement of the Baltic peoples by the Soviet regime; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully request the Congress and the Government of the United States to initiate an investigation of Soviet violations of international treaties and human rights in the Baltic States by the General Assembly of the United Nations, with the aim of achieving the withdrawal of Soviet occupation forces from their territories; and be it finally

Resolved, That we express our sincerest gratitude to the people, the Congress, and the Government of the United States for their resolute support and encouragement of the Baltic nations' struggle for regaining their liberty, and that we pledge our unequivocal support to America's leadership in the fateful fight of the free world against totalitarian Communist aggression.

The Neighborly Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

THE NEIGHBORLY WAY

(By Congressman JOHN M. VORYS, Franklin University Commencement, June 5, 1955, Columbus, Ohio)

Graduates of 1955, I congratulate you on winning your diplomas the hard way. You have had no easy, secluded campus life. To paraphrase Longfellow:

"For you, while your companions slept,
Were toiling upward in the night."

This is the commencement season. You may have missed some of the trimmings that make college days so dear in memory to thousands who are leaving our colleges and universities this month; the wooded campus, the ivy-covered halls, the games, the extracurricular activities. You have gained through your hard work an appreciation of the value of learning that may be missing among many who are graduating elsewhere this June.

It is most appropriate that your studies should be crowned by the ritual and pageantry of this ceremony today. The very words, commencement, bachelor, or baccalaureate, diploma, the caps and gowns, all carry on the traditions of the medieval sanctity sur-

rounding study and scholarship. The fundamental concept is that this is both an ending and a beginning. Your degree gives you rights, dignities, privileges, and equally, responsibilities, among your fellowmen.

For while you have earned your degree by spending time, money, and effort, you have only partially paid for your education. Your opportunity was given you, not by a tax-supported institution, not by a vast endowment of a private university, but as a service of the YMCA. You will be indebted to the YMCA spirit as long as you live.

What is this YMCA spirit?

There are many things that could be said about it. Today I shall touch on one view of it.

In 1934 the Columbus YMCA owed nearly a million dollars. I was talked into heading a drive to start cleaning up that debt in the depths of the depression. I tried to think of a phrase, an idea, that would describe my concept of the Y in a community. It was something like this: Being neighborly in a modern city.

In earlier times boys played in neighbor's woods, swam in their creeks, were kept straight by neighbors who knew them. Young men studied law, "read" law, in the offices of neighboring lawyers. What people did for each other was not charity; it was just being neighborly.

In a modern city that is all changed. People in apartment houses are usually not neighbors; they just live near each other. Boys who want to play and swim; boys who come to town to work and want a homey place to live; ambitious young people who want to study with older people at night, must look to the Y to organize and provide these neighborly facilities.

Now, of course, there are many neighborly people in our cities, and there are other neighborly agencies beside the Y. And, of course, not all neighbors are good neighbors, and neighborhood fights and feuds are the source of much comedy—and tragedy. But I think we all feel the nearness and friendliness involved in neighboring, in neighborliness, the getting along with those around us, being understanding and tolerant and helpful—the neighborly way.

That is the spirit of the Y. It requires among other things, considerable imagination to be neighborly in a big city, a big country, a shrinking world. I recommend the neighborly way to you, however, as a way of life, from now on.

I think you are all familiar with the problems that unneighborly living creates in a big city, the slums and other areas that breed juvenile delinquency either because people are too poor to care or are too rich to care; the cleavage between industrial and residence areas, city and suburbs, segregation due to race, color, creed, or wealth. I am proud of the way our own community, here in Columbus, grapples with these local problems. We have successful neighborly institutions because we are neighborly folks.

How about the national picture?

Now we all realize this is the age of intensive specialization for individuals and business and each group, each segment, needs to organize to promote and protect its own interests. This is necessary, and can be extremely helpful to members of the groups, to Congress, and to the country.

But in my work in Congress I also see how such activities can result in pressure groups that develop class and group consciousness and set neighbor against neighbor back home. Now everyone has a right to bring pressure on his Congressman, and there is nothing wrong with joining a pressure group. But when I see groups that put their selfish interests above those of other citizens, who finally, come to identify their own interests with the public interest, without regard to the effect on others, then I see the need for the neighborly way in national life. Certain farm groups have demanded continuing rigid price supports from the public, regardless of mounting Government agricultural surpluses and mounting deficits in the Treasury. Certain industries have demanded increased tariff protection against imports, regardless of the retaliatory effect on our exports. Certain importers have demanded decreased tariffs regardless of the effect on our domestic industries.

Certain retail groups who oppose minimum wages for their employees want minimum prices for the wares they sell. Certain labor unions want increased minimum wages but oppose the so-called fair trade minimum pricing laws. There is one man who writes me many times each year to cut down expenditures and balance the budget—and then writes me demanding increased appropriations for a Federal project that will help his business. Within the Federal Government certain employees demand special treatment on salaries, and certain groups within such groups demand additional preferred treatment. People who would not think of taking something from a neighbor's garden or his clothesline or automobile will ask me for a tax preference that necessarily takes more taxes from a neighbor.

Now all of these are actual cases that come to a Congressman although, obviously I cannot give names and addresses. In each instance the persons, the groups involved, could rightfully say that I have not explained fully the background of their demands. I might reply that perhaps they have not considered fully the results of their demands, not on me, but on their neighbors. I am not complaining about my part in all this. It is my job to be pressured, to respond to just demands, to resist unjust ones. I am merely pointing out that all of us would get along better and be more helpful and happy if we practiced more the neighborly way in our national life, and realized that the man next door and also the people in Maine and California, are involved in our demands on Washington; that government is not "they," but "we."

As neighbors we have a right to call on other neighbors to help in doing things that can be done better working together than each for himself. We ought to remember, however, that whenever we ask more than our fair share of benefits for ourselves, our business, our union, our group, from our national Government, we are sponging on our neighbors.

What about our international relations?

In a world growing smaller as means of communication improve and growing more dangerous as means of mass destruction improve we need the neighborly way as possibly the only alternative to annihilation. Our country has a neighborly policy that should make us all proud. The most powerful country on earth in all history seeks no teritory, no control or domination over other countries. We have poured out our wealth with a generosity unprecedented in human history for relief, rehabilitation and recovery of war-torn nations, for the support of nations that are ready to fight to remain free. We have a vast program for sharing with the world our knowledge, the skills and techniques that have built our power. We are using our development of atomic energy as a deterrent to aggression, not to dominate, and are offering the world our "atoms for peace" program. In commerce we have unconditional most-favored-nation treaties with 33 other nations. This mouth-filling phrase merely means that we treat all our neighbors alike when it comes to trade concessions. Our good neighbor policy toward Latin America has replaced dollar diplomacy. In the United Nations we agree to the sovereign equality of all 60 nations, large or small, not asking preferred treatment even though we pay one-third of all the bills.

Now note this; during the very period we have been following these unparalleled policies of generosity, friendship, and humanity, we have arrived at a period of unparalleled prosperity, and the policies preceded the prosperity. Is this a coincidence, or could it be that the neighborly way pays off, in dollars and cents?

We face constantly the grim and deadly threat of godless, ruthless communism. They deny and defy the simple fundamentals of the neighborly way, at home and abroad. Nothing ruins any neighborhood quicker than tattling and gossip, but this is a duty forced upon people behind the Iron Curtain and in Russia by their Communist rulers. Even members of a family are forced to spy on each other. Abroad the Communist diplomats use the laws of international hospitality as a shield for espionage, infiltration, and subversion in carrying out their plans to take over their neighbors by aggression or by revolution.

Outside the Soviet orbit, there are relics of unneighborly imperialism. The British Empire was built, not as neighborhoods grow, but on the basis of holding strategic spots all over the world. British and French colonialism, based on exploiting backward countries, is a constant hindrance and embarrassment to the spread of our good-neighbor policy. We have in this country advocates of plans such as Atlantic Union, urging us to join more closely with those who speak our language, or have governments we like. Some of these plans involve strange geographic patterns. Our policy has not been in that direction. Instead, we have been urging that neighbors, countries that live next to each other, should get together, just as our 13 States did. We have promoted regional groups such as the Organization of American States; Western European Union; the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. We are helping temporarily with each group, but we do not expect to join them as they move toward the military, economic, and political unification we urge.

Our President has agreed to meet this summer with the heads of the governments of some countries that have pursued differing policies from ours, with the hope of relieving the tension between communism and the free world and seeking steps toward peace. We are closer in our ties to some of these countries than others, but none of them practice the neighborly way as we do. Perhaps we had to agree to such a meeting. It is unneighborly to refuse to speak to people. On the other hand, we will be meeting with some people who don't practice neighboring. We had better not expect too much from such talks, but it is possible they may do some good. I have great confidence in our President, his vast experience in war and peace, his commonsense, his humility, his friendly, forceful personality, his fine spirit. In his state of the Union message he said:

"It is of the utmost importance, then, that each of us understand the true nature of the world struggle now taking place.

"It is not a struggle merely of economic theories, or forms of government, or of military power. The issue is the true nature of man. Either man is the creature whom the psalmist described as a 'little lower than the angels,' crowned with glory and honor, holding 'dominion over the works' of his Creator; or, man is a soulless animated machine to be enslaved, used and consumed by the state for its own glorification.

"It is, therefore, a struggle which goes to the roots of the human spirit, and its shadow falls across the long sweep of man's destiny."

If the President can make a start toward winning that struggle in the sessions at the summit, then good can come from the meeting.

I told you of how I used this neighborly idea in a Y campaign in 1934. It was not original with me. It was "written in the law" a long time ago, "love thy neighbor as thyself." This law was quoted by a certain lawyer, who then asked, "And who is my neighbor?" The answer from the Master Teacher was the story of the Good Samaritan. The neighborly way is a very old law of life and a very good one.

Prince Edward Rests Its Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, we have in Southside Virginia an outstanding biweekly newspaper, the Farmville Herald. It has rendered long and distinguished service to the people of that area of Virginia. I am proud of its editor and publisher, Mr. J. Barrye Wall, who for many, many years has exerted great influence for good among our people. He is a statesman who has on all occasions assumed his duties and obligations as a citizen of the Commonwealth of Virginia and this great country of ours. His county, Prince Edward, has recently been placed in a unique position. Its citizens are faced with making a momentous decision. Barrye Wall is in the forefront of the fight to save our way of life and to help our people chart a course that will preserve for all of our people those things that we hold near and dear. I commend him for his calm judgment and sound thinking amidst this great crisis.

So that the people of this country might know the problems confronting our section, I incorporate as a part of my remarks an editorial by Mr. Wall published in the Farmville Herald on Friday, June 10, 1955, and commend him for the forthright manner in which he has, in plain language, stated the situation confronting the people of Prince Edward County, Va.

The editorial follows:

PRINCE EDWARD RESTS ITS CASE

The people of Prince Edward County spoke unequivocally Tuesday evening in a public meeting at which the matter of public education in Prince Edward County for the immediate future was discussed in a serious, calm, logical manner. Several shades of opinion were expressed and sincerely supported by advocates. Jarman Hall, with seating capacity of over 1,300, was filled, despite inclement weather. By a show of hands we judge that easily 70 percent of the audience were white school patrons. The almost unanimous action (not more than 25 contrary votes) in effect reaffirmed the position of about 300 patrons and citizens who appeared before the board of supervisors on May 31 and requested that the school budget for Prince Edward County be not approved. The supervisors disapproved the budget, and appropriated the minimum (50 cents per $100 valuation) for public schools as required by Virginia statute, which means that public schools in Prince Edward County cannot be operated in the next school session.

Because of this action, the school board is without funds to employ teachers. Recognizing the irreparable damage to the school system if the teaching staff were dissipated, a group of interested citizens and patrons of the several white schools advocated the underwriting of a sum of approximately $200,000 in voluntary subscriptions by which the teachers in these schools could have some assurance of continued employment during the emergency. The plan to organize a nonprofit corporation and begin solicitation of funds was overwhelmingly approved by the approximately 1,300 patrons and citizens present. This is now a direct obligation of our people. It is the largest goal that Prince Edward citizens have voluntarily taken upon themselves. That it will be accomplished we have no doubt, if the white citizens of the county share their proportionate responsibility.

The long series of events which forced the action might be reviewed.

Prince Edward County has long had an interest in public education, expressed in 1776 by the founding of Hampden-Sydney College; in 1873, when Farmville Methodists began a college, which was the basis for establishment in 1884 of Longwood College, the first State-owned institution for teacher training.

In elementary education semipublic schools were a legion, but those who studied under the celebrated C. C. Bass (1874–97) still praise his pedagogy. Dr. J. D. Eggleston, of Prince Edward County, gave his life to public education and was the first superintendent of public instruction in Virginia, serving during his career as president of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and later Hampden-Sydney College. To recite these facts is to show the educational consciousness of the county.

Buildings were inadequate from the beginning of free public schools and not until 1912 had a modern school been constructed for the white citizens. In 1926 the frame school building used by the Negroes since 1892 was replaced with a modern brick building. A second unit was added to the Farmville High School in 1927, and a second brick modern school building was constructed in 1939 for the Negroes. This indicates the effort which was being made to develop the physical property of the school system. Naturally, progress in the Negro plants followed that in the white plants, because an overwhelming majority of the taxes were paid by the white citizens.

Immediately after World War II there was an upsurge of Negro pupils in the county, and the consolidated school building at Farmville was incapable of accommodating them. With the purpose of meeting an emergency, temporary classrooms were built to provide instruction, with the understanding that they would be used for 10 years, to make the investment economically sound. At the end of that time permanent facilities would be provided. Nevertheless, Negro patrons became restless in their zeal for a permanent building. Possibly misunderstandings were interpreted as undue delay.

On April 23, 1951, without warning, the students of R. R. Moton High School walked out. The principal, an unusually able administrator, was absent from the school because of an anonymous telephone call, when the walkout occurred. The strike was reported to have for its purpose to focus attention upon conditions at the school and to obtain a permanent building. Racial integration of schools was not injected into the matter until NAACP lawyers were introduced upon the scene. It is our belief that the majority of the plaintiffs were under the impression that "a new school" was the sole issue. Certainly the survey by the Richmond Times-Dispatch on December 12, 1953, indicated that the majority of pupils interviewed in a cross section preferred their own school.

The long road through the district Federal court, an appeal to the United States Supreme Court, and months of study and myriads of legal facts and arguments, and the 1896 opinion of this Court, enunciating "equal but separate" philosophy, evidently had the Supreme Court divided upon the law. Death removed two of the most able Judges. President Eisenhower's appointee, Earl Warren, as Chief Justice, wrote an opinion, in an incredibly short time, based upon psychology and sociology, completely reversing the lower court, and the former decisions of the Supreme Court. Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi, has proposed an investigation of the sources upon which this decision was based and charges that the sources are the result of a Communist conspiracy.

The decision of May 17, 1954, declared that segregation in schools was unconstitutional under the 14th amendment, and the Court adjourned for vacation announcing that it would hear arguments later as to the form of a decree it should issue. In other words, the Court said in effect that it would not make its findings effective until later. Even though it was unconstitutional on May 17, 1954, it could remain unconstitutional until the Court got around to how and when it would demand it to become, in fact, unconstitutional. Of course, people confronted with a complete change in customs and mores, were pleased with the respite, but the fact remains we have acted unconstitutionally for an entire year. And now with an ax over our heads in the form of a decree to the district courts these unconstitutional acts continue. It appears to us that the Supreme Court and those who would integrate the schools, churches, and thus society, are depending upon gradualism, and indifference of many areas of people, to enforce integration leading, of course, to amalgamation of the races.

The people of Prince Edward have seen the effective work of the NAACP legal staff, and we believe, of the psychological brainwashing. Recent pronouncements of the NAACP are that the principle of integration will be pushed with vigor. As a defendant in the case and with the implementation directed only to this county in Virginia, we are not willing to choose integration of schools as an impending fact.

As a matter of principle, the people of the county believe that separate schools are in the best interest of the people, and for the best interests of education. The board of supervisors, supported by the white people, refused to appropriate funds for the school budget, which was in effect a choice between integrated schools or no public schools. Prince Edward occupies the place in court as the convicted prisoner on probation. The judge can act immediately without further proceedings. Other counties like Nottoway, might conceivably operate another year on the segreated basis given time to delay in court proceedings. That is the reason that Prince Edward has stood, on a principle, ready and willing to sacrifice for a time its public education. The calculated risk of integration is too uncertain.

Prince Edward has been careful not to set a State pattern for integration. It has done nothing except to comply with State law.

Whether or not section IX of the Virginia constitution has been abolished by the United States Supreme Court's ruling is a question yet to be determined. In our opinion it has been abolished.

Judge Leon Bazile's finding that bonds authorized prior to the decision of May 17 for construction of white and Negro schools in Hanover County would be invalid, raises a serious question by the same reason that the Virginia budget for public free schools is invalid.

Prince Edward County citizens have simply moved to retain intact its teaching forces, but they have not proposed private schools.

In short, the board of supervisors have taken a stand on a matter of principle. They are backed by the overwhelming opinion of the white people, and many Negroes. If it be argued that section 129 of the State constitution is valid, the maintenance of schools is a State responsibility.

Without prejudice, Prince Edward stands resolutely on the principle of separate schools for the races and passes the matter to the State of Virginia.

Prince Edward rests its case.

Address by Former President Harry S. Truman at Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner, Portland, Oreg., on June 11, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an address given by our former President of the United States, Harry S. Truman. This address was made at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Portland, Oreg., June 11:

I came here tonight on my own initiative. I asked to come to Oregon because I wanted to express my respect and admiration for one of the great men in public life, WAYNE MORSE. Senator MORSE is typical of the progressive West which is so rebellious against selfish interests and despoilers of the public domain. He is the shining example of political courage and independence which many men in public life might do well to follow.

It is no secret that I liked him when he was a Republican, and I like him all the more now that he has discovered that you cannot protect the public interests under present Republican management. It was easier to do so in the days of Teddy Roosevelt, George Norris, and Charles McNary, who fought against raids on public resources, for at that time WAYNE MORSE would have had powerful support in his own party. But where in the Republican ranks today can you find support for men who fight for the people's right to own and develop their common property.

Something evil is happening in this country today, and we had better put a stop to it before it is too late. Our people have been preoccupied by the movement of many events around the world where one false move may lead us to trouble. And let me say that I know nothing more vital than the wise conduct of our foreign affairs, and the administration would do well to continue the bipartisan policy initiated by us.

But in the shadow of these world events, while our minds have been somewhat distracted, selfish interests in this country have been scheming to take away from the people vast public resources. I am sorry to say that much has already been lost in the last 2 years, and I fear vastly more will be taken away.

One of the reasons why Oregon must keep WAYNE MORSE in Washington is to help put a stop to this. For Senator MORSE not only represents Oregon and the Nation with great credit, but his voice has stirred the country against those who would destroy one of our great American institutions, the public lands and the public power. From its very beginnings, this Nation has reserved for the common use of the people, rights in certain lands and resources as a permanent foundation for the well-being and future of our country. And succeeding generations have added to these lands and resources. This is part of the tradition of the American way of life.

In the past there have been raiders who sought to appropriate these resources. But up until recently we have been able to turn them back time and again. Many of those raiders called themselves rugged individualists and did not disguise their purpose. They said they did not like public ownership of anything and openly tried to help themselves to everything they could put their hands on. We could fight this sort of open attack.

But in the last 2 years the raider has been more subtle, and, for that reason, more dangerous. He says that he is not trying to grab anything for himself. He professes to be doing the public a service. He tells you he wants to save us from the terrible evil of the public being in business for itself in the management and conservation of its natural resources.

Pious in his pretentions and aided by experts in propaganda, the modern-day raider insists he is fighting for private enterprise, local rights, regional rights, and State rights.

But he always winds up by taking over the people's rights.

The last time I was out here was in 1952. There seem to be more Democratic voters here now. It appears that the Republican administration in Washington has been more persuasive than I was in convincing the people that their interests are best represented by the Democratic Party.

When I was at Kalispell in Montana in 1952, I advised the voters to take a good look at Hungry Horse Dam. I said that if a Republican President were elected, that was the last new dam they would see out here for a long time to come. Senator MORSE knew I was right.

WAYNE MORSE always had his heart set on the development of the water and power resources of the Northwest States. He knew that this was not just a local matter but that it concerned a large region, affecting many States.

As long ago as 1789 the founders of our country realized that man-made boundaries should not control the great rivers of this country. And they wrote a provision in the Constitution to place control over these rivers as channels of commerce in the hands of the Federal Government.

In the last 2 years, there has been an attempt to becloud the basic concept that our great rivers are a Federal responsibility. A number of people have been trying to make us believe that the Federal interest in our river systems is an encroachment on the rights of the States and local governments. There have been a lot of crocodile tears about how the Federal Government is setting up a power monopoly and breaking down States' rights—and how the time has come to get the Federal Government out of the river business.

The development of our rivers must be planned—it cannot be opened as a grabbag to private interests to pick off the best revenue-producing damsites at the expense of future generations.

If there is anything I am proud of in the record of the New Deal and the Fair Deal, it is the development of our river basins. In the Tennessee Valley and the Pacific Northwest, future generations can see what a truly representative government could accomplish for its people.

Of course, there was a lot of opposition to this at the time. I remember when the Grand Coulee project was proposed, its opponents said there was no justification for it—that there was nothing out in that country but jack rabbits and coyotes, and that a big dam there would be as useless as the pyramids. But Franklin Roosevelt had the vision to see it another way, and the courage to do something about it. So Bonneville was built, and Grand Coulee was built, and people began living and working where the jackrabbits used to be.

The Pacific Northwest grew and flourished; its population and its income increased by leaps and bounds; its magnificent water projects produced the current that made the aluminum that helped win World War II. Water was brought to hundreds of thousands of acres of thirsty land. Other dams were built, and we went forward—not only in the local interest but in the national interest as well.

And let me point out that with this public development private enterprise flourished too. Here as in the Tennessee Valley, public river development meant the growth of private industry and private business. Big dams and big projects, financed by the Government, mean far more private enterprise, in the long run, than little dams and inadequate projects financed by the utility companies.

The development of the water resources of this region was not a politically-inspired or a partisan affair. Of course, the national leadership of the Republican Party—the Old Guard—was opposed to this program. But, in those days there were some Republicans from these States who fought for this development—who went to Washington and worked for the future prosperity and welfare of their constituents. I sat with one of them in the Senate of the United States—his name was Charles McNary. He was the Republican leader in the Senate, and one of these great new dams is named after him, because he worked to get it built.

Yes, there used to be Republican Senators—there was even a Republican President—Teddy Roosevelt—who favored the maximum development of our rivers, by the Federal Government.

Those days are gone. In fact, you have to be almost as old as I am to remember them. The fact that they are gone is dramatically illustrated by the presence at this Democratic dinner of WAYNE MORSE, now a Democrat but hitherto a lifelong Republican. And I believe there are thousands of conscientious Republicans, throughout these States and the country, who are facing the same decision that confronted WAYNE MORSE, and they are facing it with troubled hearts. For I know what it is to be loyal to a political party, and I know that such loyalties are not easily changed. But what is an honest man to do, when his party ceases to stand for what he believes in? What is he to do when his own party tears down and destroys the very policies which mean future prosperity and progress?

What is happening today is that a Republican President is being used to cripple the program of river development that has brought prosperity to many regions of our land. In 1952 I tried to tell the people just what the Republicans would do. Unfortunately, it was hard for the people to imagine that any President could be used to halt and undo our public-power programs.

As WAYNE MORSE said the other day, you can always repeal a law, but you can't repeal a dam once it is built—and if it is the wrong dam, and it turns part of the people's resources over to a private monopoly, the people can never get them back.

By tricky and devious ways, private raiders on public power have been at work. They did not try to make a head-on assault against one of the most successful and most popular programs of the Federal Government. Their methods were more subtle. The first thing they sought was to stack the Federal agencies with enemies of public power. They had been encouraged by a Secretary of the Interior who openly opposes public power.

And, unfortunately, the new Chairman of TVA has had no experience with the issue of public power.

The second stage was even more effective. This is how it works. If you have a successful and going concern like the TVA, which needs to expand its services, then the plan is to get the President's policy advisers to cut its appropriations and, at the same time, subsidize private power companies to move into its territory. If you have an agency like the Southwestern Power Administration, selling power at low cost to rural cooperatives, the technique is to rewrite the contracts in such a way that the cooperatives will have to go out of business. If you have a new source of publicly financed power coming into being, like the St. Lawrence project, they try to give the power to the private companies to distribute without any guaranties in the public interest. If you have a great plan for an entire river basin, like the plan for the Columbia, which is only partly built, then the technique is for the Federal Government to give up the crucial dam sites and get the Federal Power Commission to turn them over to private power companies for piecemeal exploitation. This will block the future growth of the whole system, and prevent existing dams from turning out as much power as they could.

After a few years of this process of hamstringing, and obstruction, and doubletalk, it ought not to be too hard for the private power monopoly to prove that our Federal program of river development is a mess, and that the people's dams and transmission lines ought to be sold to the power trust.

Let us not be misled again by the strange assurances that keep coming from Washington. You know, the President, in his speeches and press conferences, keeps saying, after each new blow at the TVA, that the administration has no intention of destroying the TVA.

Nor should we be fooled, after each attempted giveaway of a high-dam site, by the explanation that what the administration is really after is a partnership between public and private interests. And what a strange partnership it is, with the people paying for the dam, and the private partners taking all the profit.

There is yet another deception, and that is to trot out, from time to time, some public project that cannot possibly be built for years and years and to say nice things about it. In this way, it may be possible to keep the people from discovering what is going on.

Let me make one point perfectly clear. I do not have the slightest doubt that the President honestly believes that the expansion of our program of Federal power development is wrong. I am sure that he thinks he is doing the right thing in curbing TVA and in permitting the giving away of Hells Canyon. But the facts and our national experience are against him. If the administration continues its present policies, the future development of our river resources will be irretrievably lost to us.

The future of this part of the country depends not only on having a Congress that is sympathetic to projects necessary to your economic growth but a sympathetic administration as well. You must have a President who believes in the public development of our rivers. For unless the executive power is on your side, there is nothing but frustration and delay in the way of the development on which your future depends.

The top leadership of the Republican Party is dominated by the special interests of big business. This is the fundamental reason for their attack on public power. You can also see the evidence of it in many other issues. You can see it in their haste to cut taxes for corporations and top incomes, even though the budget was unbalanced, and their refusal to give a small amount of tax relief to the little fellow. You can see it in their labor policies and their farm policies. You can see it in the vetoes of justified pay increases for Federal workers. You can see it in the giveaway of our publicly financed rubber factories and tidelands oil.

The fight to return the Government of the United States to the people of the United States in 1956 is already under way. I pledge you now that I will do my level best in that fight.

Extension of Social Security to Lawyers and Dentists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced H. R. 5944 and H. R. 6270 to extend social security to lawyers and dentists. The evidence is now overwhelming that these two professional groups desire coverage, and there appears to be no sound reason why such coverage should not be extended without further delay. The New York State Society of Dentists, at their meeting in mid-May unanimously approved OASI coverage, and has so advised the American Dental Association. The house of delegates of the Pennsylvania Dental Association has unanimously approved coverage. Illinois dentists have voted 6½ to 1 in favor of coverage. Among other State groups and regional groups which have voted overwhelmingly in favor of OASI are the dentists of Iowa, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Ohio, Oregon, Washington, Wisconsin, Vermont, the District of Columbia, and regional groups of dentists in New Jersey, Colorado and Indiana.

The demand for coverage of lawyers is equally strong. The American Bar Association has receded from its former opposition to coverage, and meanwhile, State bar associations including that of New York State, are going on record affirmatively in favor of OASI.

In the light of this trend, and in the absence of any persuasive reasons to the contrary, it is my hope that this Congress will act speedily and affirmatively to extend to these 2 groups the coverage now enjoyed by 9 out of 10 of the gainfully employed of our country.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a sample of the letters and excerpts from letters which have recently come to me, urging such action:

NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION,
Albany, N. Y., April 26, 1955.

Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OSTERTAG: At the annual meeting of the New York State Bar Association held in late January of this year a resolution was adpoted favoring inclusion of self-employed lawyers in social-security coverage. A copy of the report of the Committee on Social Security Legislation recommending such action is enclosed herewith.

You will note that the recommendation is based on a poll of local bar associations and we believe it reflects the sentiment of the great majority of lawyers of this State.

We solicit your effort on behalf of the necessary legislation.

Very truly yours,
MORRELL S. LOCKHART,
Chairman, Committee on Social Security Legislation.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *May 3, 1955.*

Congressman OSTERTAG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In the local newspaper, the Kansas City Star of yesterday evening, was the folowing item:

"COVERAGE OF LAWYERS

"WASHINGTON, May 2.—Social-security coverage would be extended to the Nation's self-employed lawyers under a bill which Representative OSTERTAG, Republican, of New York, said he would introduce in the House today."

This morning I have talked to a number of local lawyers; some of them had seen the article and some had not. I called the attention to the article of those who had not seen it and it was received with great praise, and we thank you sincerely for your efforts in this behalf.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN C. NIPP,
Former President, Kansas City Bar Association.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *May 6, 1955.*

Hon. Congressman OSTERTAG,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I read an article in a recent issue of the Philadelphia Bulletin that you introduced a bill to extend social-security coverage to self-employed lawyers. I think such a bill should be given approval and I believe the bar associations will be in favor of a bill, provided social security is payable after the age of 65, regardless of the amount of earnings. In other words, the age limit for males should be reduced from 72 to 65 years of age.

Trusting that you will give consideration to my suggestion in this matter, I am

Very truly yours,
J. RAYMOND LYNCH.

WEBB & HILL,
Pittsburg, Kans., May 4, 1955.

United States Representative OSTERTAG,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. OSTERTAG: I have read with interest your bill to bring lawyers within the provisions of the Social Security Act. I am the workmen's compensation examiner in the southeast district of Kansas, comprising 19 counties. I have talked with many lawyers over this entire district and have not found one who is contrary to your proposal.

Seemingly the only ones who are opposed to bringing lawyers under social security are a small group of wealthy men who are in positions of leadership in the American Bar Association.

Respectfully yours,
SIMEON WEBB.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., *May 27, 1955.*

Representative HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. OSTERTAG: I recently read that you had introduced a bill to extend social-security coverage to self-employed lawyers.

I wish to thank you for your efforts in preparing the bill and to advice you that I wholeheartedly support it. I sincerely trust that the House will pass the bill.

I am a member of two local bar associations, both of which have, by majority vote of the membership, approved social security for lawyers.

Very truly yours,
ROBERT J. SCHMORLEITZ.

DOYLE & MIDEY,
Seneca Falls, N. Y., May 10, 1955.
Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. OSTERTAG: I am very pleased to read in the papers that you are sponsoring social-security coverage for self-employed lawyers.

I have heretofore discussed this matter with many attorneys in central New York and they are unanimous in their feelings that attorneys should be given the privilege of coverage under social security and you may rest assured that your efforts on behalf of the legal profession will indeed be appreciated.

With many thanks for your interests and with kindest regards, I am

Very truly yours,

NICHOLAS V. MIDEY.

BURBANK, CALIF., *May 31, 1955.*
Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. OSTERTAG: I note by press reports that you have introduced a social security bill to cover self-employed lawyers.

I am very much interested in the success of some of these measures in behalf of the group of lawyers whom I represent.

I have been unable to find out when this measure would come before the House for action. As it is now June, there is not a great deal of time left.

Could you give me an idea about when the matter will come up for action?

Yours very truly,

PORTER C. BLACKBURN.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *May 9, 1955.*
Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I note from a recent press report in one of our local newspapers that you introduced a measure to amend the Federal social security act so as to extend the coverage to self-employed lawyers.

Trusting that you will meet with success in securing the enactment of such amendment, I am

Yours truly,

GEORGE L. SIEGEL.

EAST CHICAGO, IND., *May 5, 1955.*
Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I was happy to read in the press that you have introduced a bill to extend social security coverage to lawyers. I trust this bill passes without unnecessary delay and will take effect as soon as possible.

Since the House of Representatives, in the last session of Congress, approved such legislation, but the Senate disapproved of same by a voice vote, and as the American Bar Association is no longer antagonistic, favorable action should result.

If I can be of service, please so advise me.

Yours very truly,

DAVID T. ROSENTHAL.

MAY 12, 1955.
The Honorable HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I was glad to read that you had introduced a bill to extend social-security coverage to self-employed lawyers. I am sure you know that the American Bar Association is now favoring such extension and the bar associations of many States have taken similar action. I think it was most unfortunate that the American Bar Association took a neutral, and in some cases an opposing, view of such legislation up until February of this year. I think the delegates finally realized that the bar as a whole very much desired the opportunity to have such coverage. I hope such legislation can be enacted this year.

Sincerely yours,

HOMER H. HEWITT, Jr.

CONGRESS OF AMERICAN
DENTISTS FOR OASI,
Chicago, Ill., May 26, 1955.
Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Anything that you can do to include dentists under the old age and survivors insurance program will be greatly appreciated by all of the dentists of the United States.

Sincerely,

EARL S. ELMAN, *Secretary.*

BUFFALO, N. Y., *May 16, 1955.*
Representative OSTERTAG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It was with pleasure that I read a brief insert in the Buffalo Evening News to the effect that you have introduced a bill in favor of including dentists under the provisions of OASI.

The delegates to the American Dental Association from my district told me he voted against OASI; because he felt those in favor of it were not as well informed as himself, but that in view of the majority who have expressed themselves to be in favor of OASI, the delegate thought he might vote in favor of it this time. Words failed me at the time, and it was probably just as well.

Should you desire further information on recent polls, I suggest you contact Dr. Earl S. Elman, secretary, National Dental Committee for OASI, 6350 North Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.

Very truly yours,

H. L. BARCLAY, Jr., D. D. S.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *May 17, 1955.*
Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a member of the dental profession, I wish to thank you for your efforts to have our group included in social-security coverage. The sentiment in our area is very definitely in favor of OASI and has always been so.

I think by now the American Dental Association officers are realizing they were not representing the rank and file of the dentists of the country in opposing social-security inclusion of our profession.

Sincerely yours,

CARLOS D. CHASE.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *May 9, 1955.*
Congressman HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The coverage of dentists is a necessary thing in OASI. It is a terrible injustice that has been done to them. The polls taken indicate that they all want it. Please give it your full support.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES J. PIERCE.

Bananas on Pikes Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the Lyman irrigation project in Wyoming.

The Lyman project is a part of the proposed multibillion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The cost to the Nation's taxpayers of the Lyman project would be $1,400 an acre.

The project would grow agricultural products now supported by the taxpayers and in great surplus. Among these are grains and dairy products.

Address to Italian-American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address I delivered Saturday, June 11, 1955, before the Italian-American veterans group at Little Falls, N. Y.

My address was devoted to the contribution of Italian-Americans to the progress of our country and the problem of immigration. The address was as follows:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO BEFORE ITALIAN-AMERICAN VETERANS AT LITTLE FALLS, JUNE 11, 1955

I am indeed very happy to be here with you this evening. I consider it an honor and a privilege to have the opportunity to address this fine and patriotic organization of Italian-American War Veterans.

I am going to limit myself to two matters which are of great interest to me, and which, I believe, will be of utmost interest to you, too. One is the role of Italian-Americans in the progress of this great country of ours. The other is the need for revision of the McCarran-Walter immigration law.

For some 300 years, millions of people have come to this country in a steady stream—looking for a better and more dignified life, seeking freedom from want and oppression, building a community that is free from discrimination and injustice. They came to these friendly shores because they wanted the best possible chance to live a decent, orderly, and rewarding life, for themselves, and for their children.

Today, the United States is a nation of immigrants and descendants of immigrants. It owes its greatness to people who came here from other lands and gave of themselves unstintingly to their new homeland. These people, who stemmed from many national origins and different religious faiths, made valuable contributions toward the founding and the development of our great country, its way of life, and its culture and civilization.

Among those who contributed vastly to America's greatness are the sons and daughters of Italy, who, since the days of Columbus, have played a large and growing role in the history of the United States. In fact, our country's history is replete with numerous contributions made by men of Italian extraction, not only in the early period, but also in our own day.

In the very early period it is sufficient to mention names like Columbus; his contemporaries Giovanni Caboto (John Cabot) and his son Sebastian from Genoa, who discovered Greenland, Newfoundland, Labra-

dor, and the east coast of North America; Giovanni Verrazano, a Florentine, who discovered the harbor of New York and the mouth of the Hudson River 100 years before Henry Hudson; and Amerigo Vespucci after whom America has been named.

In the period of the 13 American Colonies, men of Italian origin made lasting contributions. Philip Mazzei, who settled in Virginia, was the first to introduce the culture of grapes in America. He was also an intimate friend of Thomas Jefferson and, according to historians, Mazzei's letters had a tremendous influence on Jefferson's political philosophy.

Then there was William Paca, who served as the third Governor of Maryland. He was a member of the First and Second Continental Congress, and was one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. He contributed much money to help Washington outfit the American troops during the Revolutionary War.

A merchant from Piedmont, Joseph Vigo, who came here and made a fortune in fur trading in New Orleans, helped finance the expedition led by George Rogers Clark into the Northwest Territory. In Indiana there is a county and a township named in honor of Vigo. The Venetian musician and composer, Philip Tragetta, a friend of Presidents James Madison and James Monroe, established the American Conservatorio in Philadelphia. The first collegiate institution on the Pacific coast, the College of Santa Clara, was created by Father Greg Mengarini, a Roman missionary and educator.

These are but a few of the more important names of early Italian-Americans. There are many, many more. Throughout the 19th century you will find many Americans of Italian descent in all phases of our national life, contributing their share in the various wars, in the growth of America's industry and agriculture, in the development of the sciences and the arts, and in the shaping of its national culture.

Let me mention briefly two military heroes of Italian extraction during the Civil War period. One was Bancroft Gherardi, who commanded several ships in the west gulf blockade and later became the Commander in Chief of the North Atlantic Squadron. Another was Luigi Cesnola, a major in the 11th New York Cavalry, who served with Sheridan in the Shenandoah Valley campaign, was wounded, taken prisoner, later awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, and appointed a consul by President Lincoln.

Of course, you must remember that the number of Italians in this country at that time was quite small. It was not until the last decades of the 19th and the first decades of the 20th centuries that Italian immigrants came over in large numbers. Some four and a half million immigrants from Italy entered this country between the 1880's and the early 1920's. These people gave of their brain and brawn, of their mind and muscle, to help build their adopted country to its present greatness.

In return, they found freedom in the New World to develop their talents to full fruition and to utilize the opportunities afforded them in every endeavor. It is no wonder that within the space of a single generation millions of Americans of Italian descent have not only adapted themselves and have become integrated into the general American community, but they have attained important positions of leadership in government, in politics, in business, in industry, in agriculture, in education, in labor, religion, science, the arts, the professions, sports, etc.

I shall not even attempt to list names, for they are so numerous that I would not know where to begin and where to end. You know them all anyhow, whether it is Tony Canzoneri or Rocky Marciano in boxing; Tony Lazzeri or Joe Di Maggio, in baseball; A. P. Giannini in banking; Caruso or Mario Lanza in music; or Perry Como and Liberace in the more popular type of music; or Mayor LaGuardia of New York and Mayor Rossi of San Francisco; or Senator JOHN PASTORE of Rhode Island; or Dr. Enrico Fermi, the Nobel Prize winner, who made the first atomic reactor back in 1942; or the numerous other scholars and scientists.

And how can I omit men like Gunnery Sgt. John Basilone, of the United States Marines, who gave his life at Iwo Jima for American democracy? He is one of that long and illustrious list of Americans of Italian descent who received the highest award bestowed by this Nation on its heroes, the Congressional Medal of Honor.

How can we forget the valiant contribution of the 550,000 American men of Italian origin who served in our Armed Forces during World War II on all fronts throughout the world? How can we, in particular, forget the invaluable role they played during the Italian campaign in 1943 when Italy was liberated from Fascist dictatorship and from the stranglehold of Nazi Germany?

When we review all these contributions and activities—and all I can do today in the limited space and time is give a brief review—we can truthfully say that yesterday's immigrants from Italy and their offspring in this country have become fully American in the best sense of the word. Americans of Italian descent have every right to feel justifiably proud of their services and their contributions to our American heritage over these many and long years. It is a constant and enduring contribution whose imprint on American life and culture is visible all over our land.

And this brings me to the second matter I want to discuss with you—the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act and the need for early revision of this discriminatory law. In view of the achievements and the contributions of Italian-Americans, which I enumerated a moment ago, why then such a discriminatory and inhumane immigration law on our statute books? Is this a suitable law for a Nation which prides itself in being the haven of the oppressed and the asylum of the persecuted? Is this the proper law for a country settled by immigrants and built to its present greatness by immigrants and their descendants?

At the end of this month it will be exactly 3 years since this harsh law was enacted. I recall vividly the struggle in Congress at that time. I was then serving my first term in Congress, and I fought and voted against the bill. President Truman vetoed it and denounced it in bitter terms as a racist and discriminatory measure. Unfortunately, Congress enacted it over his veto. but our experiences over these past 3 years with this dreadful and iniquitous law justify our opposition to it in 1952.

I am sure I need not dwell at length in explaining to this audience my objections to the McCarran-Walter Act. I merely want to state that the chief objection to this law is that it is based on a false doctrine, the so-called doctrine of national supremacy, which maintains that some nations are superior to others. Imagine telling a Sicilian that a Milanese or a Genoese is better than he is. It is worse when you write it into a law that an Englishman makes a better citizen than an Italian, a Greek, a Pole, or a Spaniard.

It's about time that we discard this stupid doctrine. It has long been established that there is no such thing as a superior race or a superior people. Why should the United States, the leader of the free world, still cling to such an outmoded and un-American theory in 1955? The McCarran-Walter Act was originally intended by Congress to be a codification of all previous immigration and naturalization laws. But what happened? Actually, it is a codification of all the discriminations and the prejudices against immigrants which were devised by narrow-minded men in the past few decades.

Take, for example, the quota system which was first enacted in the 1920's in an atmosphere of isolationism and hatred of foreigners. Do you realize that under this system three countries—Britain, Germany, and Ireland—are allotted more than 70 percent of all the visas? I have nothing against the people coming from these countries. I merely ask: Is this a fair and equitable distribution? To my mind, this is not only discrimination, it is an insult to decent people everywhere and to all the nations of the world.

In the 2½ years since the Eisenhower administration has come into power, it has done absolutely nothing to wipe out the inequities of the McCarran-Walter Act. During the 1952 election campaign Candidate Eisenhower pledged to support legislation to revise this act. In 1 or 2 instances he admitted that the law contained injustices which should be corrected. But it was all lip service. Not a finger was lifted by the present administration to revise the McCarran-Walter Act and to restore dignity and justice to our immigration system.

Recently, the President submitted to Congress several proposals to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. I do not want to minimize the action of the President. The point I wish to make is that, whether done deliberately or not, he is evading the main issue. The main problem is revision of the McCarran-Walter Act and the elimination of its injustices and discriminations. We are primarily interested that this country should follow a liberal immigration policy. Let's not get away from that point. The President's proposals merely becloud the issue. He continues to remain silent on the McCarran-Walter Act, and by his silence he hurts every effort to revise this infamous law.

Last fall, during my campaign for election to Congress, I promised the people of my district that my first task upon return to Congress would be to introduce a bill to rewrite the McCarran-Walter Act. That promise I kept. On January 5 of this year, the first day of the new session, I introduced my bill—a document of more than 200 pages long, on which I and my staff worked for many months. I do not want to burden you with details about this bill. Let me just mention in passing that it contains proposals to abolish the national origins quota system, to eliminate all discriminations, to admit 220,000 immigrants annually, to pool unused quotas among countries whose allotments are small, to take immigration out of the hands of the State Department, and to remove all distinctions between native-born and naturalized citizens.

On April 20, when I realized that the bill was making no headway because the administration is doing nothing to encourage revision of the McCarran-Walter Act, I initiated action on a discharge petition to bring my bill out on the floor for a vote. In order to accomplish this, we must obtain the signatures of a majority of the Members (218)—but we are still far from this goal.

As I see it, we must intensify our efforts to overhaul this law. The American public must insist that the Eisenhower administration make good its pledge to revise the McCarran-Walter Act. Noble sentiments voiced by the President are no substitute for effective leadership on his part. The American people must find a way to make it clear to the administration that it desires decent immigration laws decently administered. Our present immigration laws are un-American in concept. They are a hoax on the American public. They are a fraud and

a conspiracy against those who seek to enter this country, instead of being a help to them.

The McCarran-Walter Act is gradually weaving a red-tape curtain around our beloved country. Because of it, the good name of the United States has been besmirched. We must continue to maintain our tradition of being the asylum for the oppressed. We need an immigration law that will enhance the prestige of America. We need a law that will conform to American concepts of justice, fair play, and basic traditions. If we permit the discriminatory McCarran-Walter Act to remain unaltered and unrevised, then much which is precious to American ideals and traditions will be destroyed for good.

For the sake of our country and its future, for the sake of its greatness and its continued leadership in the world, I say the McCarran-Walter Act should be torn out of the pages of our law books—and with God's help we shall accomplish this.

Army Grabs 387 Square Miles in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the Tanana Valley Sportsmen's Association in Alaska has a house organ called Along the Trail. Recently Along the Trail published the following article about the seizure of 387 square miles set aside as wildlife refuges, by the Army. It is such action as is here described that points up the need for the enactment of legislation like H. R. 5306 to prohibit the abandonment or transfer of any of these refuges without obtaining the consent of Congress. The article follows:

ARMY GRABS 387 SQUARE MILES IN ALASKA

At a special meeting of your trustees on April 25, the recent withdrawals of public land by the Army was discussed. These withdrawals are in the Gerstle River-Granite Mountains-Jarvis Creek area, as follows:

1. Twenty thousand acres to be used for a chemical test site and decontamination station. This withdrawal has already been accomplished by Public Land Order No. 910, dated July 18, 1953, without public notice in the newspapers. A construction contract has been let and work begun at the site.

2. On March 18, 1955, the Army filed application for 2 additional sites in this area in the amounts of 120,000 and 17,000 acres. The serial number of this application is No. 012203 and it was filed by the district engineer's office in Anchorage.

It is the opinion of the trustees that these withdrawals are totally inconsistent with the public interest for the following reasons:

1. The area requested is one of our finest sheep, grizzly bear, moose, and caribou ranges as well as containing some of the last remaining unspoiled grayling streams in this locality.

2. Use of the area for chemical testing and research can easily lead to extensive stream pollution throughout the Gerstle River-Jarvis Creek and Tanana River drainage areas.

3. The Armed Forces have many hundreds of thousands of acres of already withdrawn land for such purposes in the Blair Lake-Mount Hayes bombing and gunnery range which is just as accessible and convenient for them to use.

In keeping with the long-established policy of the Tanana Valley Sportsmen's Association of protesting these excessive, unnecessary, and ill-advised land withdrawals by the Armed Forces, your trustees have taken positive and concerted action on these two withdrawals. A full report on the action taken and progress to date will be made at the May 9 meeting. You, as individuals, can register your protest of this action by writing the Bureau of Land Management, Box 110, Fairbanks, Alaska.

Each year we have watched with increasing irritation the insatiable land grabbing of our military. Naively assigning to their acts a measure of uncertain faith that their knowledge of the needs for defense preparedness would be wisely applied, that their acquisitions would reflect these needs and not those occasioned by opportunistic greed, that the precious heritage of virgin lands would not be unnecessarily desecrated or withheld from our children. Viewing the military record of wisdom evidenced in the past we cannot but find that our faith has been too often deceived.

The scores of withdrawals from the public domain for the exclusive use of the military have amply demonstrated that the acreage was vastly in excess of actual need. The excess area by no stretch of the imagination aids security of the installations. With a given number of troops security is improved by shrinking the perimeter. That which has been in excess has never been trimmed off and returned to public domain, indeed in most instances the excess has proved a detriment to the military themselves. It consumes time and effort to be a landlord; when the effort brings no return it's only good sense to slough off the excess.

Even more serious though is that these excess areas are for all practical purposes closed to every other potential development—homesteading, stock grazing, oil or gas exploration, mining, timbering, haying, trapping, hunting, fishing, or even plain bird watching. Little hope can be had that the military will voluntarily clean its own house.

In 1953 the Army secretly withdrew 20,000 acres of land along the Big Gerstle River near the Alaska Highway for a chemical warfare training and experimental station—this withdrawal was made despite the fact that Mount Hayes-Blair Lake withdrawal previously made is 90 percent unused and topographically and every other way would prove as good or better for the chemical warfare station. The Mount Hayes-Blair Lake area is tremendous; is very little used, is owned by the Air Force. Could it be that the integration of the Armed Forces is failing so seriously that the Army can't walk on Air Force ground? Or could it be that the Army would like to entertain VIP's on their own playground? The answer will never be known, no doubt the reason for the treacherous secrecy lies not entirely in some misguided notion of security.

Whatever the master military planners may be guilty of, they are certainly not guilty of inconsistency in their never-lagging efforts to set themselves up as land barons of a stature that makes the old landgrabbers of Europe look like pikers.

Like spoiled children they seem incapable of long remaining happy without new toys. Like children, too, they have eyes bigger than their stomachs. They seem also to believe that there is a Santa Claus near the North Pole. Unlike children, however, their antics are not lovable, cute, nor forgivable.

The time is long overdue for the Secretary of Defense to check up on his boys here and find out why they have found it great sport to use 10 square miles whenever they want to put a radio antenna or 50 square miles where they need 50 acres. It doesn't take a swami with a crystal ball to see why the Secretary's Alaska advisors are opposed to statehood.

Hearings Before House Antitrust Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in my statement on May 10 opening the hearings on emerging monopoly problems by the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I pointed out the six major reasons why our antitrust inquiry had been launched:

First. To probe deeply into the operation and enforcement of the antitrust laws at this time.

Second. To assess the dimensions of, and generating forces behind, the current merger movement.

Third. To study the adjustments in antitrust policy made necessary by new foreign economic policies here and abroad.

Fourth. To secure up-to-date information from political, industrial, agricultural, and labor leaders concerning the new monopoly problems which they now face because of the new forces now transmuting the economy.

Fifth. To provide a forum for the presentation, from all points of view, of recommendations concerning remedial measures whereby present antitrust laws might be flexibly adapted to preserve and promote strong, independent, growing, competitive enterprises .

Sixth. To take inventory of the political and social dangers now involved in concentration of decision-making in the hands of giant aggregates of economic power. As Shakespeare stated in Measure for Measure. It is excellent to have a giant's strength; but it is tyrannous to use it like a giant.

On all these points the Antitrust Subcommittee had the privilege of listening to antitrust experts from every walk of life inside and outside the Government. Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming; Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois; Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon; and Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas; Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin; and Congressman ABRAHAM MULTER, of New York, gave generously of their counsel and knowledge derived from their rich experience in the antitrust field.

The Antitrust Subcommittee was likewise most fortunate in eliciting highly thoughtful and detailed presentations and recommendations from several of the Nation's most eminent university specialists in antitrust matters, including such veterans of years of responsible service in the Antitrust Division and leading professors of law and economics as Prof. Louis B. Schwartz, of the Law School of the University of Pennsylvania; Prof. Leonard J. Emmerglick, of the School of Law of Georgetown University; Mr. Sigmund Timberg, for many

years Chief of the Judgments and Judgment Enforcement Section of the Antitrust Division; Prof. Milton Handler, of the Law School of Columbia University; Prof. Walter Adams, of Michigan State; and Prof. Eugene V. Rostow, of the Yale Law School.

Witnesses were heard representing the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the National Association of Manufacturers, important trade associations, leading farm and labor organizations, and many national retail and wholesale grocery, tire, petroleum, candy, and druggist associations.

On the first of the six matters mentioned above, that of enforcement of the antitrust laws, the Antitrust Subcommittee received testimony from several witnesses, including Assistant Attorney General Barnes, in charge of the Antitrust Division; Chairman Edward F. Howrey, of the Federal Trade Commission; and, among several others, Prof. S. Chesterfield Oppenheim, cochairman of the Attorney General's Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws, which in its report on March 31, 1955, made no less than 73 suggestions of general guides or recommendations to enforcement agencies and the courts. Practically all of these were bitterly attacked by associations representing small business, farm, labor, retail and wholesale organizations, university professors, lawyers for private plaintiffs in antitrust cases—in fact, by nearly every group except giant business organizations.

While more evidence and testimony is obviously necessary to determine which, if any, of these suggestions merit embodiment in actual policy, the hearings have already borne fruit: First, in apprising Government agencies that many of these suggestions may contravene the will and intent of the Congress, and, secondly, in evoking increased support for measures, two of which I have introduced that have now passed the House, and are presently awaiting action by the Senate. These are H. R. 3659, raising the maximum fine for violation of the antitrust laws from $5,000 to $50,000, and H. R. 4954, permitting the Government of the United States to recover as a party injured by antitrust violations and setting a uniform statute of limitation at 4 years in private antitrust cases. Senator SPARKMAN introduced a bill, S. 2075, that requires any corporation with assets over $1 million to give 90 days' notice to the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission before consummating or being a party to a merger. Congressman PATMAN has introduced a bill, H. R. 6748, that not only requires advance notification but suspends a merger if a complaint is filed by the enforcement agencies.

Other bills have also been dropped in the hopper such as mine, H. R. 6404, reversing the Glenshaw decision taxing the entire amount of a treble damage recovery, and Representative WALTER'S, H. R. 4958, on the problem of trible damages. As more evidence is accumulated and digested no doubt other bills will be drafted, debated, and passed.

The testimony relative to the current wave of mergers, item 2 above, was voluminous. The Federal Trade Commission, on May 20, 1955, brought out its Report on Corporate Mergers and Acquisitions, which documented such facts as that it is the large firms that are merging at present rather than the small; and that 2 out of 5 acquisitions consist of "additional capacity to supply a market already supplied by the acquirer." In addition, Mr. George F. Mooney, superintendent of banks for the State of New York, Mr. Gidney, comptroller of the currency, and others gave extensive statistical documentation of the present-day trend to mergers in the banking field.

Again there have been certain immediate results. In addition to the bills already mentioned strengthening the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act, there are several measures designed to apply the standards laid down in that act to the entire field of industry and finance, whether regulated by Government or not. Such as H. R. 2115, that originated with the Federal Reserve Board, and my bills, H. R. 6405 and 5948, the former amending the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, the latter the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act, both bringing bank mergers within the orbit of the Clayton Act policy of keeping whatever free, independent profitably competitive enterprises we have wherever it is working effectively. To let a vigorous, independent unit swallow another like unto it in strength and competitive vigor is to sanction an economic cannibalism destructive of the American system of free, competitive enterprise.

Perhaps in no area do our antitrust laws require greater strengthening and modernization than in the field of foreign trade and foreign economic policy. It is here that better economic weapons are urgently needed wherewith to win the cold war on the economic front.

The evidence presented by Prof. Leonard J. Emmerglick, Thorsten Kalijarvi, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Sigmund Timberg, and Eugene V. Rostov was most disturbing. In fact, the testimony with respect to the Iranian Oil Consortium and the operations of the alleged international oil cartel revealed such jeopardy to the national security interests of this country that I announced the intention of the antitrust subcommittee to hold soon a complete investigation in this field. Such extensive international commercial agreements in practical effect constitute private treaties between American companies and foreign governments, which are undertaken and consummated without adequate control or supervision by duly constituted authorities of the United States Government.

Numerous recommendations were made concerning antitrust policy in the foreign economic field. Mr. Timberg advocated repeal of the Webb-Pomerene Act since the position of American firms in export markets no longer resembles that of 1918. He also suggested legislation reducing or removing the tariff protection on commodities produced or sold by firms found guilty of violating the antitrust laws. He urged implementation of the Thye amendment and together with Professor Rostow castigated the action which on April 4, 1955, terminated United States membership in the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices. They pointed out that notions of extensive cartelism abroad are hangovers of the Fascist-Nazi period and completely ignore the extensive liberalization of trade that has taken place under the aegis of the Marshall plan. Removal of Fascist trade barriers and of war controls coupled with the inauguration of controls over cartels have created a new freedom of enterprise which has been an important factor bringing West Germany and Europe generally to an all-time high in prosperity.

The fourth item—current vexing monopoly problems—was dealt with by almost a score of witnesses from every field of commerce, industry, and labor. The gas-station owners, the tire dealers, the wholesale grocers, the retail druggists, the cooperatives, small-business men—all gave concrete and direct witness of their difficulties. In this connection Dr. Julian Caplan, of San Francisco, became the first expert to be heard in recent years whose practice covered representation of plaintiffs in private antitrust actions. From his decade of experience he gave the Antitrust Subcommittee extensive documentation concerning the plight of small west coast steel fabricators who compete with subsidiaries or operating departments of large integrated steel producers but are dependent upon "big steel" for sheet or other semifabricated materials. His evidence taken from court records of cases settled in favor of the plaintiff both in and out of court showed coercion, intimidation, obstructive and discriminatory tactics in delivery of materials and even as condition of settlement in one case the brazen and, in my judgment, clearly illegal requirement that plaintiff bind his lawyers not to take on a single additional antitrust case for a period of 5 year.

The evidence here became crystal clear that there are hundreds of thousands of small-business men and farmers who regard themselves as victims of monopoly practices. There seem to be a dozen or more areas here crying for intensive investigation. Senator WAYNE MORSE opened up a Pandora's box of monopoly problems in the field of electric power. Senator DOUGLAS highlighted the plight of the farmer squeezed between the upper millstone of higher prices for the things he buys, farm machinery, fertilizers and other finished goods—and the lower millstone of declining prices for the things he sells. Such monopolistic price spreads and huge accumulations of corporate profits brought on the depression of 1929, he warned. Senator KEFAUVER, Congressman PATMAN, and others called for intensive scrutiny of the impact of monopoloid enterprises and restrictive trade tactics upon retailers and wholesalers, notably of tires, gasoline, food, and drugs. Senator O'MAHONEY showed how, despite explicit congressional policy, no new entries had been certificated among the trunk airlines since 1938, the field being wholly preserved by the Civil Aero-

nautics Board for 16—due to mergers, now 13—"grandfather" carriers. Congressman REUSS suggested an exhaustive probe of the forces which manage to award some $30 billion of Government procurement contracts almost wholly to large firms despite heroic efforts and constant investigation by the Senate Small Business Committee and the Small Business Administration to get a fair share for small business. Congressman MULTER advocated further examination of bank mergers. And so on.

Equally diverse and numerous were the recommendations—point 5 above—tentatively offered for study and action. The witnesses can be readily counted on the fingers of one hand who testified with respect to the Attorney General's report that all of the 12 recommendations for legislation and the 73 suggestions for enforcement be endorsed. More than 9 out of 10 witnesses dissented to a lesser or greater extent, primarily on the grounds of their conviction that the antitrust laws should be strengthened rather than weakened.

Many thoughtful and important substitute proposals were made to the Antitrust Subcommittee. So numerous were they, in fact, that only a small sample can be accorded space in this preliminary report. The subcommittee was urged to look into the pros and cons of legislation, for example, which might prohibit companies of specified size from merging except upon advance approval based on a showing of technological necessity, or which might repeal the Reed-Bulwinkle bill, or repeal the McGuire Act, or amend the Motor Carrier Act to eliminate control of entry and rates for trucks and buses, or prohibit restrictive licensing of patents by large patentees. In addition, the Antitrust Subcommittee was urged, for example, to compile a list of the restraint of trade cases brought against the "100 largest" firms, thereby identifying habitual offenders; to examine carefully a few leading patent pools; to conduct pilot studies of a few of the very largest industrial giants with a view to drawing up tentative reorganization plans that might limit such enterprises to activities geared in kind and volume to minimum technological requirements; to compile a who's who of megalolatry, that is, of representatives and ideological fellow travelers of giant enterprises or their satellites who comprise the big-business network in Federal and State Governments; and others of this genre.

The sixth and last reason for probing antitrust and monopoly problems, the fear that concentration of power in industry, in labor, and in agriculture may generate concentration of power in government, ran like a connecting thread through the testimony of nearly all witnesses. They repeatedly stressed the urgent need for full investigation of monopolistic trends and abuses to protect the country against the threat of unlimited agglomerations of private power of such proportions as to be inconsistent with the survival of genuine private enterprise or the successful functioning of democracy itself.

A highly interesting development in the hearings on this point was the emphasis on the need for tightening incorporation laws, and especially the revival of a proposal long advocated by Senator O'MAHONEY that a national rule be established for national corporations. This proposal was made the subject of a special message by President Theodore Roosevelt, was endorsed by Presidents William Howard Taft and Woodrow Wilson, and has been urged by numerous experts on antitrust problems up to the present day. Of interest is the fact that the Twentieth Century Fund in its three-volume study of cartels and competition puts first and foremost a proposal for Federal incorporation.

Finally, the hearings of our Antitrust Subcommittee reemphasized that the basic goals of the American way of life are individual freedom first and foremost, then a system of justice establishing the zones of creative voluntarism within which a maximum of individual freedom can be obtained; and third, and least important, economic efficiency. It is not enough for big enterprise merely to be efficient. It must not limit freedom or generate injustice. Americans have repeatedly given heavily of their treasure to preserve their freedom. Vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws that preserves small business and other recruiting centers for managerial skill and free enterprise is necessary for the preservation of democracy.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*____
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*__6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*_____4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*___
Albert, Carl, *Okla*_____
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*__
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*_____
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*___
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*_____University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*___4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*_
Andrews, George W., *Ala*___3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*____
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*_____4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*___
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*___
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*__Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*_113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*___
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*___
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*_
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*___
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*_
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*__2737 Devonshire Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*____
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*_____
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*_____
Bates, William H., *Mass*____
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*_
Beamer, John V., *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*_____1727 Mass. Ave.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*_____
Bell, John J., *Tex*_____
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*___1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*____7304 Bradley Blvd. Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*___
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*_____2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*____
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*____
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*__
Boggs, Hale, *La*_____
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*___
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*_____3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*___2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*____
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*__The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*_____
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*_____4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*_____
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*_____The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*_____
Bray, William G., *Ind*_____
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*_____
Brooks, Overton, *La*_____4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*__Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*_____Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*_
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*_____
Buchanan, Vera, *Pa*_____
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*__
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*___
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*__
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*_____2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*____
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*_____
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*____
Byrne, James A., *Pa*_____
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*_____1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*_____
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*_____
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*_____The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*____
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*_____
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*_
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*_____The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*___Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*_
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*_____
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*_
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*__1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*_____
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*_____
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*_____The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*____1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*__
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*____The Dorchester
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*_____
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*_____The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*_____
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*____
Cramer, William C., *Fla*___4454 Tindall St.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*__
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind.*
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*__
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*____3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*_____
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*_____
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*___
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*_____4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*_____2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*_____
Dawson, William A., *Utah*__
Dawson, William L., *Ill*___
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*____
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*____
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*__2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*__
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*_
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*_
Dies, Martin, *Tex*_____
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*_The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*____
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*_
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*____
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*____
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*____3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*__The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*_
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*__
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*_____
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*____
Dowdy, John, *Tex*_____
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*_____3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*_____The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*_3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*_____
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*_____
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*____4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*_____3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*_____5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*_____
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*_____
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*_
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*_____3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*__200 C St. SE.
Fine, Sidney A., *N. Y*_____
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*_____
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*_____Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*_____
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*_____The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*_____
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*_____3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*_____4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*__514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*_____
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*_____The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*__Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*____
Fulton, James G., *Pa*_____
Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*____
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*___
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*_____
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*_____6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*_____
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*_____
George, Myron V., *Kans*___3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*____
Granahan, William T., *Pa*__
Grant, George M., *Ala*_____4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*_____
Green, Edith, *Oreg*_____
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*__
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*_____2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*_
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*_____
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*___
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*____
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*_____
Hale, Robert, *Maine*_____2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*_____
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*___4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*_____
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*_____The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*_____
Harris, Oren, *Ark*_____1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*_____4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*__
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*_____314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*_____The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*_____
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*_____104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*__125 Marthas Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*_____
Heselton, John W., *Mass*___
Hess, William E., *Ohio*____
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*__
Hill, William S., *Colo*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*__
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*_____
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*__2108 Suitland Terrace SE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*___Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*___
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*_____
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*_____
Holt, Joe, *Calif*_____
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*____
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*____3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*_____
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*_____
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*_____
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*_____
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*_____
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*__
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*____200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*_____
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*__The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*_____
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*_____The Washington House
Johansen, August E., *Mich*_
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*_____630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*____3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*_
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*_____3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*___
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*__
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*____3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*____
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*_____2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*_
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*_____Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*_1249 31st St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*_____
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*___
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*_____
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*____The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*_The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*_____3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*_____
King, Cecil R., *Calif*_____
King, Karl C., *Pa*_____
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*__
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*_____
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*___
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*_____
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*_____
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*_____The Coronet

Appendix

Agriculture and Industry—The Unbeatable American Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call to the attention of the House a notable address by my distinguished colleague, Mr. COOLEY, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, in which he introduced a positive public relations program for agriculture, together with a supplement prepared and presented by Mr. COOLEY.

The program to tell the truth about our farmers was presented on the occasion of the opening of the Research and Enginering Center of the Tractor and Implement Division, Ford Motor Co., Birmingham, Mich., on June 8, 1955.

Mr. COOLEY spoke on "Agriculture and Industry—The Unbeatable American Team," using this theme to point up the injustices that have been heaped upon our farmers and to plead for support of a program that will bring economic equality to agriculture and lay a solid foundation for our total economy.

Recently some Members of this House criticized the chairman of our Agriculture Committee for receiving the opinions of labor leaders on legislation relating to farm price supports. These critics especially should read the address I am inserting in the RECORD today. They then will understand that Mr. COOLEY is taking the farmers' case and cause to industry, to labor, to the great city consuming population—to all alike who will listen and to all who are willing to understand. The source of this criticism is such that it is the best evidence that Mr. COOLEY's position is sound and statesmanlike.

Mr. COOLEY's address follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am here to talk about a team. It is the team that, about 180 years ago, put on the road the greatest shown on earth. It is the team that has made America the envy of every other country on the face of the earth. This is "Agriculture and Industry—the Unbeatable American Team."

The game we are playing is free enterprise. Nobody has found a match for it, and I doubt if they ever will.

But today, gentlemen, your partner on this unbeatable team is in trouble—serious trouble. I want to discuss this with you. A little later in these remarks, I want to suggest something we have got to do.

First, however, I must commend a star player on industry's part of this team—the Ford Motor Co. This company has made a great contribution to American agriculture. You have worked for our farmers in good times and in bad. Some might well be content to rest on the record you have made. But not the Ford Motor Co. That was not the nature of Henry Ford, your founder, and it is not the nature of you people who have inherited and merited the responsibility of the Ford Motor Co.

To me this occasion is a demonstration of faith.

You are opening a great farm machinery research and engineering center. You are showing your faith in the Ford Motor Co. You are throwing your lot in with the farmers, as never before. You are proving your faith in the future of American agriculture.

I think this is both a time and a place—a proper setting—to examine some fundamentals.

In the manufacture of farm implements, the Ford Motor Co. is engaged in the oldest of all organized industries. The plow was its beginning. Indeed, the plow was the beginning of civilization. Of all ages, it is the greatest invention. It enabled mankind to quit wandering in search of food and to settle for the first time in permanent communities.

The plow was invented in the Valley of the Nile, or the Euphrates. Plows that were used two to four thousand years ago have been unearthed at the sites of old civilizations. The colonists introduced the plow to North America and established civilization here. From such a beginning, and on the solid foundation of any enterprising farm people and an abundant agriculture, the United States stands first among the nations today.

The economic structure of this Nation rests upon a productive and prosperous agriculture.

I am proud to be here today as a part of this ceremony marking a great occasion of our free enterprise system, in a demonstration of Ford Motor Co.'s devotion to that unbeatable team that constantly is improing the nutrition of our people, our health, our strength, our happiness, and our faith.

We cannot overemphasize the importance of the cause of progress you are advancing.

But still we must stress here that the design and manufacture of implements is not enough.

We can put tools in the hands of people. That is not enough. We can teach them to use the tools. That is not enough.

You must have willing hands. You must have the spirit of an enterprising people. You must have a society—an economic order—founded on just reward and in which the spirit of freedom springs eternal.

Look at the Communist world.

Machines and the science of agriculture are available to Russia. Yet in that unhappy land they want for food.

The world has witnessed a great upheaval in Russia. Late events show us that the Soviet's greatest weakness is her inability to match the productivity of America's farmers. In Russia, agriculture requires the labor of fully one-half the total population. One family on a farm hardly can feed itself and one other family in town. In America, each farm worker feeds 18 persons—16.4 in our own country and another 1½ abroad. Thus while half of Russia's total population works on farms, and still cannot meet the Communists' needs for food and fiber, in America the efficiency of our farmers—with the tools from our industry—releases over 86 percent of our population for other work—in factories, in mines, in shops, in transport, in all the other pursuits which—with the abundance of food and fiber from our farms—makes the United States standard of living the object of longing for peoples the world over.

I think it is time for America to realize where our fundamental strength lies. It is time we looked at the source of our strength.

My message right here, gentlemen, is this:

The responsibility of the Ford Motor Co., and the responsibility of all industry playing on this unbeatable American team, goes beyond the design and manufacture of implements. You have a responsibility to join our farmers in bringing economic equality to agriculture. You have a responsibility to help maintain a system of due reward and economic justice on the land, in which free and self-respecting men and women, with their brains and their hands—and with the tools you shape for them—can hope to earn a decent living for themselves and their families.

Let us be realistic.

Let us say a good word here for the profit motive.

In my mind, the free enterprise system has three prime motivations. They are:

1. Profit.

2. The hope of people working for wages, particularly those of younger ages, that with diligence and frugality some day they may own their own farm or their own business. This is an aspect of every man's desire to be his own boss.

3. The natural desire for achievement by a free people.

You produce good plows, good tractors, good harvesters—for the joy of it, to be sure. But you certainly produce these implements for the profit in it—because profit is important to the incentive and the good life for all of you who work for Ford Motor Co.

So it is with our farmers. There are many deep satisfactions in working with the soil. But there is no joy in poverty on the farm—as there is no joy among improverished people anywhere.

A fair profit in farming is essential to your industry. It is important to every man, woman, and child in this country.

Our farmers cannot do without the implements you provide for them. You cannot do without farmers who can earn money to pay for these implements. America cannot do without farmers who share in the blessings of our free enterprise system along with the rest of our people.

Let me say a word here also about the second motivating force of free enterprise—the hope of a man to have his own farm or his own business. There are disturbing developments, as this relates to farming. Every day or so you may read in the newspapers an account of a speech by somebody who should know better, telling the country that we have too many farmers; that, in effect, the little fellows are a burden on our economy and they should be plowed under. They tell us to send the little farmers to town to look for other jobs.

Gentlemen, it is my firm conviction that the more, the greater the number of family-size, economically operated farms we can maintain on the land, the greater will be the strength of our institutions and our free enterprise system, and greater will be the security of this Nation. Independent farm-

ers were the strength of this Nation when it was founded. They are among the most American of Americans. We cannot afford to have fewer of them.

So let me suggest and propose a special project for this great farm research and engineering center.

Adapt more of your tools, your implements, your machines to accommodate the convenience and the productivity of the family farm unit. I know that you already were well underway in this important work, without the benefit of this magnificent research center. But now you are in a position to prove for all of us that the family unit is "The Unbeatable American Unit," and you can put to shame those who want to send our small farmers into the city streets looking for jobs.

I think, gentlemen, we have come to a place in this discussion where we might well ask ourselves: Just how important is fair and just farm income—to you and to all of us?

Look back 25 years.

There are many among you who can remember the late 1920's when agriculture went into a devastating decline. Our farmers called for help. But the rest of the economy—much as today—was running high, wide, and handsome. The farmer's cries scarcely were heard.

Ultimately, the ruin of agriculture ran its inevitable course, and our whole economy tumbled into the great depression.

Shocked to our senses, this country belatedly came to a realization of the importance of the prosperity of agriculture to the strength and health of the whole economy. It took a near fatal catastrophe to bring this to pass.

This was when our farm program was born.

You know the story since that time. You know the great market that better farm income has created. You know that this has made jobs and has kept factory wheels turning in the cities. You know that the income of agriculture has multiplied 6, 7 or 8 fold, in the last 20 years. You know that rural people also have been able to buy the conveniences and comforts hitherto available only to homes in the cities and towns. You know how farmers have been financially able to mechanize their farms and apply the new sciences and more and improved plant food, to bring the blessings of abundance at low cost to this country. You know how farmers, with the means to do it, have devoted their resources and energies to the restoration and conservation of our most precious resource, the soil.

Take a look precisely on just what improved farm income has meant to the people in the business of supply farmers the things they need to produce their crops efficiently.

In 1932 there were 1,022,000 tractors on our farms. Today the number is almost 5 million. Our farmers owned 910,000 trucks then. They now own almost 3 million trucks. Grain combines on farms have increased from 60,000 in 1932 to 960,000 today; corn pickers from 50,000 to 660,000; milking machines from 100,000 to 740,000. Farmer expenditures for fertilizer and lime have jumped from $125 million in 1932 to $1,200,000,000 in 1954—and so on and on.

What has happened?

The output per farmer has increased by more than 50 percent.

Americans are getting more and better food today for a smaller part of their earnings than at any previous period in our history.

There has been a revolution on the farm. Secretary Benson himself recently gave figures showing that in 1940 it took 43 manhours to produce 100 bushels of wheat—now it takes only 26; that in 1954, notwithstanding a devastating drought in many areas, 18 percent fewer farm workers produced 14 percent more total output than in 1947—and he added: "In no other nation today do so comparatively few farmers produce food and fiber, to feed and clothe so many, at such a relatively low price."

This resolution has brought a bonanza for consumers. An hour's take-home pay bought 5½ loaves of bread in the 1920's—now it buys 10 loaves; then this pay bought 3⅓ quarts of milk—now it buys 7 quarts; then it bought 1½ pounds of chicken—now twice as much; it buys more eggs, more steaks, and more of everything in the food line.

Now, I want everyone here to ask himself: Why did this great efficiency in agriculture develop in so few years, and in these particular years?

I'll tell you why. This efficiency developed directly from the stablizing effects of our national farm program and from the good prices resulting from this program and the increased demands for food and fiber brought on by war. The increase in efficiency is the direct result of improved income that enabled farmers to buy good machinery, to apply new methods and to protect their soil.

The partnership of agriculture and industry, both enjoying the incentives of our free-enterprise system, has made this a land of abundance—the envy of the world.

But today, gentlemen, as I told you at the beginning of these remarks, your partner in the production of abundance, your partner on the unbeatable team, is in trouble—serious trouble.

The average of farm prices is down 22 percent since February 1951. Net farm income in 1954 was 28 percent below 1947. The income in the first 4 months of 1955 was 5 percent below the same period in 1954. Further declines are in prospect for 1955 and 1956. Farm debt is increasing, and farmers' purchasing power, in terms of 1935–39 dollars, is the lowest since 1940.

And this is not the worst of it.

There is a tragic thing happening in this country that relates in a much more disturbing way to the income of farmers and to profits and employment in the cities.

It is in the fact that no one segment of our economy ever has been singled out for such lambasting, such slander, and generally such cruel treatment as is now being administered to the farmers of America.

In news releases for the press, for radio, and for television, in speeches, and for magazines, thousands upon thousands of words have been beamed to city dwellers. With evil sounding overtones, such words as surpluses, controls, subsidies, waste, are drummed into city ears. Our customers in town are told that the farmer is pricing himself out of his markets, with a hint that he is living a high life on Government checks. The farmer is denounced, ridiculed, and vilified from one end of the land to the other. It even has been suggested that consumers rise and revolt, whatever that would mean, against farmers.

Moreover, a rather successful attempt has been made to divide farmers, to set one group or one region against another.

It all is a part of the fight on the farm program, and this brings me to the most urgent business, to the plea on behalf of agriculture—that I want to put before you today.

It is this:

I want you to join the farmers of America in telling America the truth about agriculture.

I believe the whole future of agriculture is imperiled by the prejudices against farmers that have been created throughout the country and, unless we find some way to put across the truth, our farmers will suffer, you people who work with the farmers will suffer, and ultimately this whole country will pay a woeful price for the folly of this prejudice.

It is time the farmer answered back.

The Nation is being told farmers are pricing themselves out of their markets. Secretary of Agriculutre Benson subscribes to this. Yet he admits that consumers are getting more and better food today for a smaller portion of their income than ever before.

It is hinted that farm people receive too much for their work and their products. The truth is that the per capita income on the farm is scarcely half the income of nonfarm people, and the farmers' share of the consumer food dollar has dropped from 53 cents in 1946 to 42 cents today. One-third of our farmers have incomes of less than $1,000 a year.

A great many citizens must have shared my own astonishment when Secretary Benson told our House Committee on Agriculture that 90 percent of parity—90 percent of a reasonable price—was a wartime measure for agriculture and price supports on basic crops should be reduced. This astonishment was aggravated by the fact that at the same time the Secretary of Labor was calling for an increase in the minimum wage.

And I ask you what you would think of the head of an automobile manufacturing concern that went around the country telling prospective customers that the price of his cars was too high, that his company was pricing itself out of its market?

The farmer is blamed for the so-called surpluses. The truth is that these abundant supplies resulted directly from the policy of our Government which, at the outbreak of the Korean conflict, suspended crop controls and called for all-out production.

Word is spread around that the present difficulty—the dangerous drop in farm income—was brought on by our farm progress. The fact is that our troubles stem from the huge supplies that were accumulated by Government policy in a dangerous world situation. The farm program is no more to blame for the present surpluses of food and fiber than it is for the great production of war materials—guns, planes, bombs—that have not been put on a battleline.

The real fact is that, without our farm program, agriculture this very day would be in the depths of a depression, and a great number of men in your implement plants would be looking for other employment.

City people are led to believe our farmers are living on Government bounty. The truth is that subsidies to agriculture add up to only a very small fraction of such payments that have been going to business and industry since the first year our Government began to function. Data prepared by a House Appropriations Subcommittee in 1954 indicated subsidies amounting to approximately $45 billion have been paid to business since World War II, a large part of this is business-reconversion payments. In contrast, the support of the basic crops through the Commodity Credit Corporation cost only $21 million over the first 21 years the program operated. The support program on the basic crops actually showed a profit of $13 million when Mr. Benson took office.

You are told that the farmer is losing his liberties, that he is being regimented and controlled from Washington—that, in reality, the whole farm program is some sort of socialistic scheme.

That is a lie on its face. So let us nail it down once and for all.

1. Is it regimentation, socialism, or something more evil when you people in industry regulate your production to fit your markets? That is just what the farm program does for farmers. If it is socialism, you people in industry have embraced it since your beginning, while it only recently has "corrupted" agriculture.

2. Is it regimentation, socialism, or something more evil when you people in industry take a voice in the price of the things you offer for sale? That is just what the farm program does for farmers. If it is social-

ism, you people in industry have always been neck deep in socialism and our farmers are just now getting their feet wet in it.

Agriculture, simply, if belatedly, has gotten around to employing the precise and profitable principles of free enterprise. And those who want to destroy the farm program would deny the rewards of free enterprise to the farmers of America.

I trust I have said enough to show you how the truth has been abused in the great assault upon our farmers.

Gentlemen, we do not want the Government to do things for agriculture that we should do for ourselves, and we shall not permit Government to preempt our freedoms. But we always must ask the Congress to do things that must be done.

Some people ask why agriculture should have any special treatment—a farm program—at all.

I want you to help us tell them why.

One answer, of course, is that this treatment is not special but is similar in principle to the minimum-wage and collective-bargaining laws that protect labor's income, the tariffs for industry, the Government ratemaking that assures profits for utilities, various fair-trade laws for business, and many other National, State, and local laws intended to modify or soften the hazards of working and doing business.

More explicitly, there are these hard facts why there must be a farm program:

1. Agriculture alone among the major elements of our total economy has no device, outside of the aid of Government, to pattern its production to market needs. A factory can be shut down in the middle of production, to adjust to a changing market, but farming cannot be stopped in the midst of a crop. Farmers have no way of measuring what should be their individual contributions to a balanced national supply of food and fiber, without Government help. And even with the help of a well-planned program their production is uncertain, being subject to the seasons—rain, hail, wind, pests, temperatures, and sunshine.

2. Agriculture—in the absence of a program—is the only industry that does not set its prices but goes into the market places and asks: "What will you give me?" It might be well to ask how long the free-enterprise system would survive if in industry, as in agriculture, the factories produced for a full year and in one brief period, as in agriculture's harvest season, put all their accumulated goods and wares at auction, not at prices fixed by management but at prices the customers would bid. How would your own company survive under such a system?

3. The needs of consumers and the safety of the country require huge agricultural supplies on hand beyond the food and fiber currently being consumed. But this very abundance—this safety margin against crop failures or other national or international emergencies—is known as "surplus" in the market places and will perpetually depress the farmers' prices, without a farm program to manage these supplies.

These are some of the reasons why the Government must provide the machinery for a farmer-controlled agriculture, in which our farmers, in their free elections, can set their production to fit their markets and in which farmers, as other businessmen, will have some voice in the prices of things they produce and sell.

But, gentlemen, we stand in danger of having no effective farm program at all.

The prejudice against farmers is firmly rooted.

It threatens to turn back the clock for a quarter of a century and deliver the farmer again to the mercies of unrestrained economic forces that pauperized agriculture in this country in the years ahead of the great depression, and which in other nations has fastened a peasant class on the land.

It, indeed, has become fashionable to mount a speaker's platform and call for a free agriculture, an agriculture free from any recourse to our Government.

That kind of freedom is not for me. I shall work to the limit for the real freedom of farmers and of all Americans, but I shall never brood on the farmers' loss of his freedom to go bankrupt and their freedom to become again the paupers in this Nation's economy.

Now that brings us to the $64 question: What shall we do?

At the opening of this discussion I told you I wanted to suggest something that I think we have got to do.

Now, on behalf of a small, representative group that has been devoting its thoughts and efforts to the problem, I propose immediate steps to establish a positive public-relations program for farmers—a program to plant the truth about agriculture wherever it cannot now be found—a program to bring all farmers together in common bond—a program to cultivate understanding between farmers and their customers in the cities.

The farmers' salvation will rest on our willingness and our effort to put across the truth.

Were you ever told the truth about the profits and losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation price supports for the basic crops—wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts? Are you told that up to the end of the last fiscal year the CCC cotton program showed a profit over a 21-year period of $266,422,709 and that the tobacco price-support operations had a profit of $685,443? Are you told that the sugar program for 17 years up to June 30, 1954, had a profit of $290 million and the figure now is higher? While there have been losses in wheat, corn, rice, and peanuts, are you told that the CCC firm supports on the basic crops, combined with the firm support on sugar, showed a loss of only $8 million through the entire period of these operations?

There have been other programs and some costs, but I am telling you about the direct price supports on basic crops operated by the Commodity Credit Corporation and under the Sugar Act.

Most of us here are wearing cotton shirts—costing each in the neighborhood, say of $3.95. Has anyone told you there is only 25 cents worth of cotton in your shirt, that if the farmer's price is cut from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent it would reflect a saving of only 4½ cents in the price of the shirt, but would mean a loss of income of $265 million a year to cotton farmers?

Now take a loaf of bread. It sells for the average of 17 cents. There's only about 2.7 worth of wheat in the loaf. A cut in the wheat price from 90 to 75 percent of parity would reflect only a fraction of a cent in price of the loaf of bread. Yet it would mean a loss of $320 million a year to wheat growers. Does all this surprise you? Nobody is telling the people these things.

Before I close let me emphasize that industries serving farmers have a vital stake in public relations program for farmers—in telling the truth about agriculture.

I have attached a supplement to my remarks making some rather detailed suggestions for this program. I hope many of you will have an opportunity to study them.

Let me point out specifically that farmers, as your customers, have not told the story of their increasing efficiency—efficiency that you helped them to achieve. They cannot tell their story without giving credit to the Ford Motor Co. for a considerable measure of their success. In helping them to tell story you will be helping yourselves.

This is true of other industries having farmers as their customers—the plant food industry—the petroleum industry—the various branches of the agricultural chemical industry—and I could name many more.

We must get on with this program.

We must suppress the prejudice against our farmers.

We must cultivate understanding.

We must let farmers' friends in the cities know that it is because food is so cheap that American families have three-fourths of their income to invest in their homes, in their institutions, and in the comforts and conveniences that make up this American way of life.

We must remind America that in many nations of the world today the people are hungry because their farmers have been neglected and ill-treated, that many governments are weak and unstable where food is scarce, that some are dictatorships where freedom is lost.

We must tell the world the truth about agriculture, that inseparable partner of industry, on this unbeatable American team.

A Positive Public Relations Program for Farmers

(Presented by Hon. Harold D. Cooley, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, on the occasion of the opening of the Farm Machinery Research and Engineering Center, Birmingham, Mich., June 8, 1955)

On behalf of a small, representative group that has been devoting its thought and efforts to the problem, I propose immediate steps to establish a positive public relations program for farmers, a program to plant the truth about agriculture wherever it cannot now be found, a program to bring all farmers together in a common bond, a program to cultivate understanding between farmers and their customers in the cities.

The farmers' salvation will rest on our willingness and our effort to put across the truth.

We propose the development and growth of this program in two parts:

1. By creation of an interim committee to—

(a) Enlist the aid and counsel of everyone interested in improving public understanding of agriculture;

(b) Study the size of agriculture's public relations problems, and its possible solutions—to serve as agriculture's research laboratory for this important, untouched farm problem; and

(c) Try out, on a small, pilot-plant scale, a limited number of specific projects designed to improve agriculture's relations with all other aspects of our national community of enterprise and aspirations.

2. To use the experience and work of this interim committee for the establishment of a permanent public relations organization, adequately staffed, to create understanding of the problems of farmers and the importance of agriculture to the well-being of the total economy and also to promote food—to convince America that food is the best thing that money can buy.

The program must be supported financially by all of agriculture—by individual farmers, farm organizations and industries serving agriculture—or it should not be started at all.

It should hew to these basic principles:

1. It would be based on facts. It could never deal with half-truths or evasions. Fortunately, our self-interests and the public interests are the same. The truth about agriculture is the best public relations it could have.

2. It would never deal with political matters.

3. It would attempt to unite agriculture, and give all agricultural groups something to be for. We now are in the very dangerous

position where it is difficult to find two organized farm groups working for a common goal. If, through a public relations effort, farm organizations can find common ground for united action, we shall have rendered agriculture a very great service.

4. It would explain the essentiality of agriculture. The security of abundance has never been put across to our people. Housewives are happy to have their pantry shelves filled, but they have been taught there is something evil about having abundant food in our warehouses. "Surpluses" actually represent only about 5 percent more food than our people will clear from the market places at present prices. We should see that America gives thanks for the fact that we are 5 percent over our goals, instead of 5 or 15 or 20 percent under—as is the case over most of the world.

5. It would explain the efficiency of farmers and what this means in better food and reasonable prices, and it would show the science, the flavor, and romance of food.

6. It would show what farm products will do for people, for health, and in terms of a good life for every American family and each member of it.

To accomplish this, we have only to use well-tested public relations tools. Here are some of the things we can do:

1. We should be supplying facts—the truth—to the important writers, magazines, and newspapers, of the United States. We have allowed a vacuum to come into being. The result is many people seldom hear of agriculture except in connection with unpleasant—or seemingly pleasant—events. I feel that the great newspapers of the country will be friendly to us, when we are able to put the facts before their editors.

2. We should have a speakers bureau, with well qualified persons ready to present, primarily for city audiences, the true story about agriculture. Moreover, farmers or local farm organization folks often are invited to speak before their fellow citizens. But farm people have little time to write speeches. We should aid these people by giving them fact sheets for use in such public discussions.

3. We should arrange tours of food growing and processing areas by editors and other urban leaders. Much of our agricultural public relations problem is due to the fact that most editors of large-circulation city magazines and newspapers have little opportunity to see agriculture at work. Thus, they have little appreciation of our problems, and do not personally know anyone to whom they can turn to explain agricultural questions as they arise. Industry for many years has used the group tour method to acquaint people with its personnel and its processes. Agriculture should do the same.

4. We should be quick to capitalize on current news, to explain our operations and the importance of our products. Every major industry and trade association in the country does that. For instance, when the Soviet regime was seriously embarrassed by its failure to provide enough food for its people, we did nothing to assure American consumers as to their own supply of food, and the continued ability of American farmers to produce that supply.

5. We should point up agriculture's importance, its problems and its dreams, in staged events. We should have a National Farmers Week. I already have introduced a bill in Congress for national recognition of such a week. Moreover a Farmers Week now is being planned for this fall by a group of agriculturally-interested organizations. We should give more attention and more promotion to the county fair. These, by and large, have been allowed to drift away from a portrayal of the agriculture of the area and, instead, we have allowed horse races, stock car races, and a succession of third-rate carnival acts to come in and make use of the funds which in most cases are still appropriated by the county for an agricultural fair.

6. We should promote the idea of farm summer scholarships for city school children. A number of city boys and girls could be selected by their school authorities to spend a month or two actually working for pay on farms. They would more than earn their way and could go back to their city classrooms in the fall to share with their fellow students an understanding or present-day farming and farm people.

7. We should encourage the teaching of agriculture in grade schools, high schools, and universities.

8. We should acquaint farmers with the importance of joining wholeheartedly in their local civic groups and activities. Other businessmen in our small towns and villages know it is important for them, both in a social and busines way, to be acquainted with their fellow businessmen and to identified with community improvement. We, too, are substantial businessmen in our communities, and must accept these community responsibilities.

9. We should rescue food from its present "residual expense" category. By and large, Americans buy food with the money they have left over after making the payment on the mortgage, the car, the television set, the gas company, and the tax man. There may be ways to end this situation, and we should explore them.

10. We should enlist the aid of industry public relations staffs. Many huge American industries sell a substantial portion of their products to American farmers. Yet many of those same industries do little to help the farmer with his public relations problem. We should show these folks how they can be of aid to agriculture. After all, their customers' problem is their problem, and farmers are their customers.

11. Eventually, agriculture should find some means of financing adequate institutional advertising to tell the agricultural stories which it will not be able to tell in any other way. Too, such an operation would give agriculture one more importan point of contact and liaison with America's mass media.

12. There is more than a possibility that agriculture could develop a very worthwhile continued television program, which would be of interest to farm and city people alike. One of the outstanding examples of such a program is the Johns Hopkins Science Review. Agriculture, too, has much to tell in the way of science. We would do well to investigate this method of telling it.

These are some of the things we can do in an effective public relations program for agriculture—in an effective program to tell the farmers' story.

Everyone who is truly interested in agriculture can join in this program. It is not a political proposition. It is not a 90 percent of parity, or a 75 percent, proposition.

It is a program to undo the damage that has been done. It places no blame. It will be born in the hope that all of us in agriculture, and those others whose wellbeing depends upon agriculture, henceforward can sit down together, resolve our differences, work out our problems, promote the prosperity of our pursuits, contribute to the strength and stability of our total economy, and all together enjoy the fruits of understanding and friendship among all our people.

The importance of telling the farmers' story first was impressed upon our House Committee on Agriculture 2 years ago during its grassroots tour, under the chairmanship of Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas. Our committee traveled 20,000 miles and everywhere it went farmers would tell the members that agriculture had the worst public relations of any segment of our economy—in fact, hardly any program at all to get the truth across to farmers' friends in the cities.

Back in February a few of us got together in a little informal meeting, to discuss what could be done. Among those present were Mr. Hope; Hon. W. R. Poage, of Texas; Mr. Jim Roe, managing editor of Successful Farming, published at Des Moines; Louis Wilson, secretary and director of information for the American Plant Food Council; Dana Bennett of the Foundation for American Agriculture; and Hollis Seavey, of the Clear Channel Broadcasting Service. We explored every means of getting the farmers' story told. Then we asked Jim Roe, who is very able at putting thoughts and words together, to draw up a plan embracing the things we had discussed.

That is the positive program of public relations for agriculture I have brought here and presented to you.

While this program puts major emphasis on suppression of prejudice and cultivation of understanding, it goes beyond that. It also is designed to promote the farmers' products—food, fiber, and the many raw materials that go into industrial production.

We cannot overemphasize this second major aspect of promotion.

We have failed to put over the story to housewives—that good food will make her family healthier and happier, and that good food is the best buy a dollar can find. We should be carrying to every household a message on the joy of good food, how cheap it is in relation to other things, and how we are blessed by abundance of food.

Our failure to push the farmers' product may explain why people complain at paying 22 to 24 cents for a quart of milk, and then cheerfully pay twice as much for a quart of beer. And this may explain why people spend more for beer than for milk. In 1953, the last figures available, America's beer bill was $5,035,000,000—its milk bill, $4,800,000,000.

There is a great merchandising job to be done for agriculture.

There is a great job that must be done through a positive public relations program for farmers.

Notable Address by the Ambassador of Brazil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION, JR.
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on April 23, 1955, there was formally unveiled in Bryant Park, at the corner of 42d Street and the Avenue of the Americas, in New York City, a statue of Jose Bonifacio de Andrada e Silva, father of Brazilian independence. Attendant speakers declared the event as being symbolic of Brazilian-United States amity.

Mayor Wagner expressed the city's gratitude and said that the statue would be "a lasting reminder of the aspirations and ideals common to both nations." Cardinal Spellman delivered the invocation. Other speakers were Parks Commissioner Robert Moses; Hulan E. Jack, Manhattan Borough President, and Edward J. Sparks, deputy assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. The musical program included Brazilian and United States national anthems, and was furnished by the department of sanitation band.

The main address was delivered by the Brazilian Ambassador to the United States, Hon. Jao Carlos Muniz. It was graphic and illuminating in its treatment of the evolutionary processes by which this great, friendly neighbor of ours in the southern hemisphere was wrought, into a free nation.

By the address there was again brought to public attention in our own land the value and wisdom of cultivating the ties between the United States and the Latin American countries; and in doing everything possible to make closer and ever closer the bonds of amity and good will which cultural and economic processes may fashion. We need products from these neighbor countries to the southward—products which are peculiar to their respective regions; and they in turn need and require our own productions—chiefly of the manufactured type.

Moreover, our constitutional bases are similar and in our general ideals we face in the same direction. No opportunity should be neglected on the part of ourselves or the peoples of Latin American lands to keep in constant mind and application these policies and ideals.

As a Nation we have ever been deeply interested in the welfare of all these neighbor countries and in the years in which their independence was achieved, as a Nation, we did much to lend inspiration and aid in their great struggles for freedom.

The address of the Brazilian Ambassador traces at length the effective struggle for independence in his country and constitutes a distinctive contribution to the subject discussed.

Under leave accorded, I am very glad to make the address a part of these remarks:

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR JOAO CARLOS MUNIZ AT THE UNVEILING OF THE STATUTE OF JOSE BONIFACIO, THE PATRIARCH OF BRAZILIAN INDEPENDENCE, NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 22, 1955

On September 7, 1822—nearly 133 years ago—Brazil severed her political ties with Portugal and became an idependent nation. The idea of independence had spread throughout the country, impelled by exasperation at the narrow-mindedness and lack of understanding of the Portuguese Government. The movement was in tune with the proud temperament of the Brazilians, who felt that their country, by the vastness of its territory, by the variety and wealth of its natural resources, by its geographical position, and by the will of the people, was fated to achieve high destinies. The sojourn of the King, Dom Joao the Sixth, in Brazil during 12 years following the invasion of Portugal by the armies of Napoleon, contributed to deepen the sentiment of independence in the popular mind. The flight of the Portuguese Court to Rio de Janeiro in 1808 had resulted in a situation unique in history, in that the overseas dominion became the metropolis, while the European mother country was relegated to a secondary place during the stay of the sovereign abroad. There is no doubt that this was an important element in the process of independence without bloodshed. Retreat was no longer possible. The country was dominated by a single aspiration and electrified by an irrepressible desire for freedom. The agitation for autonomy became a connecting link between the various provinces. A national conscience came into being, joining all Brazilian in a common destiny. This newborn unity was the first manifestation of a truly national spirit. In fact, unity is not an inherent property of things. It is a creation of the spirit rather than the result of physical conditions. Colonial Brazil, devoid of geographical unity, without means of communication capable of creating a circulation of live interests between the various regions, received then a starting impulse for national integration through convergence of the will of the people in the desire for political freedom. It was a miracle of the spirit, that gave life and meaning to a geographical conglomeration, and a soul to a reality that was until then merely material. The yearning for liberty thus provided the inspiration and sustaining power for the long march then begun, and which still goes on, toward the achievement of an ever ampler freedom through material and spiritual progress, and the realization of the Nation's manifold possibilities.

The independence of Brazil was thus the work and achievement of nameless thousands whose will converged toward that single objective at a particular moment in history. It was not a gift from a sovereign, nor was it the accomplishment of the plans of a statesman or of the exploits of a liberator. It was created by the people itself, which had attained majority and was conscious of its ability to fulfill its own destinies.

Brazilian venerate José Bonifácio as the patriarch of their independence. José Bonifácio was not a revolutionary. Rather, by the formation and tendencies of his spirit, he was a conservative. There were many other statesmen of his day who played a more outstanding role in popular meetings and in the political propaganda which culminated in independence. Popular imagination sees, nevertheless, and rightly so, in José Bonifácio the major figure of the political movement of those times, the patriarch of Brazilian independence. Without him, independence would have been processed with turbulence and bloodshed, leaving in its wake bitterness and internal rifts, and engendering still greater difficulties in the work of political consolidation.

The great man in history is characterized by his capacity for directing events and shaping their course so as to reap all possible advantages toward the achievement of high objectives. Such a man often is marked by Providence to carry out some great task, then sink back when that mission is accomplished. His formation, the strong traits of his character, the concentration of will power on a single objective—all these reveal predestination. No man is indispensable, says the time-worn adage. Yet a man can make himself indispensable at some particular moment in history, and respond thereby to destiny's call to greatness.

José Bonifácio was a man of that stamp. His figure towered over those of the other members of the Ministry of January 1822 which lay the groundwork for independence. The brilliance of his mind, his broad scientific, philosophic and literary culture, and the high prestige which he enjoyed because of his many other accomplishments, enabled him to exercise a predominant influence over the politicians of the time, over public opinion, and especially over the young Prince Dom Pedro, who had been left in charge of the Government of Brazil, as Regent, by his father, the departing King João VI. José Bonifácio became thus the guide and mentor of the movement for independence and the principal formulator of the political pact which held sway over Brazil for the next 67 years until the proclamation of the Republic in 1889. The history of the movement for separation from Portugal reveals the truly providential character of José Bonifácio's intervention. Extreme agitation and excitement were rife throughout the land. It was almost impossible, amidst so many contradictions and conflicts of ideas and of opinion, to make prevail a national consensus, a common denominator capable of achieving unity for all Brazilians. Influential politicians formed an ultra liberal faction, whose preferences were frankly republican. However, José Bonifácio's sagaciousness and political vision led him to realize that the republican form was not the most suitable one for the essential purpose of achieving national unity. As the monarchial sentiment was still very deeply rooted, the abrupt implantation of a Republic at that confused stage in the evolution of the national spirit might result in fragmentation of the country.

The Republic would come later. Circumstances would demand it; but it would have to wait until the political institutions were properly consolidated. José Bonifácio nourished in his spirit a further and most powerful argument for conservation of the monarchical form. The continuation of Dom Pedro as head of the independent Brazilian Government would serve to conciliate the inevitable conflict between the new nationality and the Portuguese Court. With this idea in mind, the Patriarch, with extreme sagacity and political discernment, shaped his action so as to lend prestige to the prince, Dom Pedro, by flattering his vanity and letting him believe that he was directing the events, when in fact he was being carried along by them. Untiring in his ceaseless activities, emboldening the fainthearted, moderating the overbold, he succeeded where success was thought to be impossible. A chaos of opinions, passions, and impulses was transformed into balanced action, the product of cold and objective reasoning. Elements otherwise dissimilar and incongruous were channeled toward the desired objective, the achievement of independence while insuring the future stability of the institutions.

No one, therefore, in view of the historical record, could deny him the title of maximum artificer of Brazilian independence. The choice which José Bonifácio made amongst the alternatives that were offered to the spirit of the times, in deciding for continuance of the monarchic regime, gave proof of his political genius and exercised a salutary influence over the evolution of the Nation. The monarchy was, in fact, the best school which the Brazilian people could have at that initial stage of autonomy, for the formation of character, for discipline in political life and for the education of public men. It succeeded in obviating sterile conflicts capable of provoking separatist movements. It deepened the sense of nationality, and, principally, thanks to the democratic spirit of the second Emperor, it consolidated the free institutions, transmitting to succeeding generations a tradition of government, a political culture, and the sentiment of democracy. No matter what vicissitudes the nation may encounter, it can seek always in this heritage a vivifying example and a source of strength that will enable it to persevere in the spirit of freedom. This is the true role of the great man in history: to implant the seed of the institutions, and to transform fruitful ideas into action, endowing the political reality with possibilities of development in the course of time. Such was the work which José Bonifácio was destined to perform.

In the handsome bronze statue which we are unveiling here today, the talent of the Brazilian sculptor Corrêa Lima has sought to portray the figure of José Bonifácio as he is known to history; the proud countenance of the statesman and man of the world, the questing look of the scientist accustomed to probe the secrets of nature, the lofty brow, furrowed as if under the burden of deep meditation. The artist has succeeded well in rendering through the plastic medium the outward manifestations of his subject's traits of character, such as the predominance of intellectual and volitional faculties, and a cold temperament that was capable, however, of erupting into passion-

ate outbursts at any opposition to his set ideas.

José Bonifácia was a man of thought and ponderation, yet he was possessed of a relentless driving power. Action and thought apparently impressed him as being two poles of the same reality. In fact, pure reflection often tends toward utopianism. Action, on the other hand, when not controlled by thought, becomes erratic and finally destroys itself.

José Bonifácio de Andrada e Silva was born in Santos, in the province of São Paulo, in 1763. Like most other men who are tapped by fate, he underwent, in his formative years, a long preparation for the role which he was to play later in his native land. His early youth was spent in Portugal, where he studied law and physical sciences at the University of Coimbra. Immediately after concluding his studies, he was appointed professor of mineralogy at that seat of learning. Led by his aptitude for experimental science, and desirous of broadening his knowledge in that field, he traveled extensively in Europe and attended courses under the most notable sages and learned men on the Continent. In Germany, he studied under Alexander von Humboldt. In Paris, he took lessons from Chaptal and Foulcroix, successors to Lavoisier. In Pavia, he studied under the direction of Volta, the inventor of the electric battery. He extended his knowledge of mathematics. Always eager to combine theory with practice, he conducted geological and mineralogical expeditions to Styria and the Tyrol in Austria, and in the Euganean Hills in Italy. He then went on to England, where he discussed chemistry with Priestley. At the suggestion of the naturalist Torbern Bergman, one of the founders of mineralogy, he investigated the geology of Sweden and discovered several varieties of minerals, which were named after him.

Young as he was, José Bonifácio personified at that stage the ideal of the enlightenment: the search for independent knowledge through experimentation and a comprehensive rational analysis. A contemporary of Goethe, he surpassed him in the depth and extent of the scientific knowledge which he had acquired under the teachings of the great European masters, while Goethe, in matters pertaining to science, was no more than a genial improviser. There is a resemblance between the young Brazilian savant and your Benjamin Franklin in their capacity for observation and keenness of inventive power. A parallel could easily be traced also between him and Thomas Jefferson, in the concern over the social conditions of the times and in the creative political genius which was common to both.

In 1790, after 10 years of pilgrimage in the cultural centers of Europe, José Bonifácio returned to Portgual, the possessor of an immense accumulated stock of pure science, and impatient, due to the natural tendencies of his pragmatical mind, to give practical application to his theoretical knowledge. Appointed superintendent of mines and metals for the Kingdom, he entered into a phase of intense action over a period of 29 years (1790–1819), during which he carried out important engineering works on the Mondego River, founded the chairs of chemistry and mineralogy at Lisbon and of metallurgy at Coimbra, and published monographies and papers on varied subjects in the great scientific journals and periodicals of Europe. His activity and spiritual curiosity were inexhaustible. Amidst so many tasks, he still found time to give expression to his interest in political and social questions and in the cultivation of literature and poetry. His patriotic spirit impelled him to join the forces which resisted the invasion of Portugal by the French armies.

In 1819, at the age of 52, he declined several proposals to continue in public office, and he returned to Brazil with the intention of taking a rest in his homeland. Providence, however, decreed otherwise. Another mission, the most important one of his life, was in store for him. It might be said that all preceding action and meditation, the sum total of the tasks he had performed, were but the groundwork and prelude of the role which he was to play in the liberation of Brazil and which marked his real entrance into world history.

Soon after his arrival in Brazil, the rhythm of events began to quicken, imparting to him an awareness of his forthcoming mission. National unity, to be attained through the creation of a great American empire, became the object of his meditations. "Immense Brazil," he wrote, "situated in the world's mildest and most temperate climate, endowed with wondrous natural fertility, rich in native products and capable of bringing forth many others easily acclimated there, away from Europe's winters and from the heat of Africa or of India, can be and must be cultivated and civilized without excessive labor or fatigue." Even before the nationality took shape, he pointed out the true solution for the problem of national unity, which could be achieved only through a close solidarity of the manifold racial components, without enmity or discrimination. "It is of the greatest necessity," said he, "to put an end to so many physical and civil disparities; let us make it our business right away to adjust wisely the many discordant and contrary elements and to fuse together so many diverse metals, so as to produce a compact and homogeneous structure."

In 1821, José Bonifácio was appointed vice president of the Governmental Junta of São Paulo. It was he who wrote the manifesto in which the people pleaded with the Prince Regent not to obey the orders of the court recalling him to Portugal. This act of rebellion was already a show of independence.

As head of the Cabinet of January 16, 1822, the Patriarch took the first step toward the establishment of the Empire of Brazil with the convocation of the Constitutional Assembly. The manifest directed on that occasion by Dom Pedro to the other powers was the work of José Bonifácio. The document was already an act of sovereignty, announcing the foundation of the empire and its intention to continue political and trade relations with the other peoples of the world.

Through a succession of acts, all of which were inspired by José Bonifácio, the idea of independence thus arose gradually in the national conscience as an irrevocable attitude. There was lacking only the final magic word which would trigger the emotions of the people and ultimate the political transformation. That came to pass on September 7, 1822, on the banks of the Ipirange, close by the city of São Paulo, when Dom Pedro, angered by dispatches which he had received from Portugal, uttered the cry of "Independence or death."

On May 28, 1824, the United States of America recognized the independence of Brazil.

This was the first act of acceptance of the new-born empire as a member of the family of nations. It was destined to produce favorable repercussion throughout the entire course of the relations then begun. Brazil, on the other hand, was the first to give recognition to the Monroe Doctrine upon its formulation by the American President. The Brazilian Government proposed at that time to the United States that a treaty of alliance be concluded under the principles of that doctrine. Brazil revealed thus, at the very dawn of her life as an independent nation, the continental vocation which has never ceased to inspire her foreign policy. It was our preoccupation to preserve the continent as the habitat of a new civilization, free from the rivalries and from the struggles for domination which were prevalent in Europe. In obedience to the same exigency of its spirit, Brazil has always opposed the totalitarian tendencies arisen in our times.

One hundred and thirty-one years have elapsed since the beginning of the relationship between the United States and Brazil. Throughout all vicissitudes and crises, our two peoples have stood side by side in defense of the same values of civilization. This friendship and mutual understanding has been the major factor of balance and harmony in inter-American relations. It springs not only from the fact that we are occupants of the same continent, nor from the complementary nature of our economies, but mainly from a kinship in character, in the love of freedom and the fidelity to the democratic way of life, and in a preference for methods of free consultation, communication, and cooperation, both at home and in our international dealings. May the present and future generations, in both our countries, be wise enough to preserve and deepen this heritage of friendship, which is becoming more valuable and necessary each day in face of the growing threat to free institutions throughout the world.

Mr. Mayor, in the name of the Government of Brazil, I have the honor to make official presentation to your excellency, for the city of New York, of this statue of José Bonifácio, the patriarch of Brazilian independence. It is my hope and that of my fellow countrymen that this monument will please the people of this great city, while serving to symbolize the indestructible friendship which unites our two countries.

In thanking your excellency for the high cooperation which has made this event possible, it gives me much pleasure to render at this time a tribute of appreciation for the good will and efficient assistance extended in the matter by your commissioner of parks, Mr. Robert Moses. Our sincere thanks go also to Ambassador Spruille Braden, president of the Pan American Society; Mr. James Carson, president of the Avenue of the Americas Association; Mr. Robert De Forest Boomer, president of the American Brazilian Association; Mr. J. T. Wilson, chairman of the José Bonifácio statue committee; to our former consul general in New York, Mr. J. B. Berenguer Cesar, now Ambassador to Uruguay, who promoted the idea of this dedication; and to our present consul general, Mr. Hugo Gouthier. The untiring and devoted efforts of these personalities and those of the many others who collaborated in this work have produced a result of which all of us may well be proud.

Here, then, in the heart of New York, this monument to the Brazilian statesman, scientist, and man of letters will rest in a setting that corresponds to the many facets of José Bonifácio's character. The park which surrounds it was named after one of your country's great poets, while the fronting thoroughfare, fittingly called the Avenue of the Americas, is a living tribute to the family of free nations on our continent. As the architect of the independence of one of those nations and because of the high ideals which he helped to fashion into reality, José Bonifácio belongs not to Brazil alone but to all of us.

Young Man on His Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the Virginia Record, an independent magazine published monthly at Richmond, Va., recently printed a most interesting article concerning our colleague, RICHARD H. POFF. The story is entitled "Young Man

on His Way." It is the story of a typical American youth who has come up the hard way through his own diligence and devotion to duty, and whose career, though brief, has been marked by exceptional service to his country and his people both in war and peace. It can be confidently expected that DICK POFF's notable achievements in the past are merely the forerunner of a future bright with the promise of great accomplishments in the years ahead.

Under unanimous consent, I extend my remarks in the RECORD to include this very fine article:

YOUNG MAN ON HIS WAY

(By Julia Gwin)

"Nothing I've ever received or that has ever happened to me means more than this award. Truly this is the humblest day of my life."

With these words, RICHARD POFF accepted the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce Distinguished Service Award at its annual convention in Norfolk, February 19, 1955.

"Virginia's Outstanding Young Man for 1954" was so surprised that he was a bit wobbly at the time. Gilbert Feinman, Lynchburg Jaycee president, related that the Congressman was asked to say a few words following the presentation and POFF was concerned about what to say, not knowing about whom he would speak. Feinman, a Democrat, was kidding about politics, more to keep him from asking hard-to-answer questions than for any other reason. Radford and Lynchburg Jaycees had the job of getting POFF to the Norfolk meeting without "letting the cat out of the bag." As Mr. Feinman explained it:

"When DICK's name was announced he shook all over and looked stunned. He had no idea he was the winner. We almost had to carry him up to receive the award. It couldn't have happened to a nicer guy."

The junior chamber of commerce gives its distinguished service award annually to a carefully chosen young citizen. There's no partisanship in these awards by the junior chamber, which is composed of young businessmen of all political parties. Representative POFF has every right to be proud of this honor that has come to him, an honor all the more valuable because it was unsolicited.

POFF was cited for his activities in helping to obtain from the 83d Congress larger Federal appropriations for the vocational-educational program and supplemental appropriations under the Hill-Burton Act for hospitals in his district. He was also cited for removing appointments to the military academies from the realm of politics by allowing candidates to compete in open competitive examinations and for the manner in which he keeps his constituency informed on congressional issues. POFF voiced his belief in the examination method to Bob Burruss, his eastern campaign manager for Lynchburg, Campbell and Bedford Counties, and vice chairman for both the Lynchburg and the Sixth District because "supervision and command of our Nation's defenses are in the hands of graduates of the military academies and we need the ablest men we can get, regardless of political label."

The achievements which won the Congressman the Jaycee award are mostly extrapolitical. His citizenship record as a member of his own community played a substantial part in the selection. He has been consistently active in the work of his church, in fraternal and civic organizations, and in many other endeavors which mark the good citizen.

BORN IN 1923

RICHARD POFF was born in Montgomery County, October 19, 1923. He was four when his family moved to Christianburg, about the same time that Dr. R. L. Kinnaird became pastor of the Christiansburg Presbyterian Church. One of the new pastor's first acts was rounding up children for Sunday school. RICHARD was one of the recruits. This faith, born in childhood, has been, according to his mother, Mrs. B. D. Poff, "both the cornerstone and anchor of his life." She recalls the night he returned from World War II service.

"His father and I met him at the train at about 11:30 p. m. On the way home he asked us to drive by the church. When we stopped he got out and went into the darkened sanctuary alone. When he returned to the car he said, simply: 'Now I know I'm home'."

His wife, the former Jo Ann Topper, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John J. Topper, of Christiansburg, says that RICHARD's religion is one of the most important things in his life. He is a trustee, a deacon, and a Sunday-school teacher in the Tyler Memorial Church, Radford. Away from home, he attends the Church of the Pilgrims, the Southern Presbyterian Church in Washington, where he also teaches a class.

RICHARD has worked hard for his place in the sun. Strangely, he always dreamed of one day being a Congressman. He started working at the age of 13. After school, on Saturdays, and during summer vacations he took any job that came his way * * * store clerk, laborer, farm hand, truckdriver, carpenter's helper—anything to finance his education.

For RICHARD's family have never been rich and he knew he'd have to earn an education or do without. His thirst for knowledge is matched only by his ability to acquire and retain it.

Charles J. Smith, alumni director of Roanoke College, was president when RICHARD attended there. He states that RICHARD's grades were mostly A's with a small sprinkling of B's and that he was a high honor student throughout his college career. Quoting Dr. Smith:

"My memory of DICK is quite clear as to his general campus attitudes. Although very light for a lineman, he was considered one of the best football guards ever to play at Roanoke College. He made up for his lack of weight by that fighting spirit of aggressiveness which has marked his career. In addition to his athletic and scholastic achievements he was outstanding in character among his fellow students. Never seeking the limelight and always humble in spirit he stood for the best values in campus leadership. From the first day that I met him, he has had my continued admiration and growing respect.

"I have watched his political career with the deepest interest, because I believe wholeheartedly in the sincerity of the man. DICK is bound to grow in usefulness to his constituents and to the Nation. Men of his integrity and devotion to the high principles of government are not easy to find. It is my considered opinion that though belonging to a minority party in Virginia, DICK should be continued in Congress until his seniority makes him still more valuable to his constituents. His intelligence, training, energy, and patriotism are qualities which, through the coming years, should make him a real statesman in the old Virginia tradition."

Bentley Hite, of Christiansburg, Republican chairman of the Sixth District, said much the same thing about RICHARD.

"He has accomplished what he has by constant application and unhesitating honesty," said Hite. "I lived in the same house as his schoolteacher in high school. This teacher considered him one of his smartest boys, though his straight A's were mostly won by hard work."

David P. Thornton, editor of the Salem (Va.) Times-Register, has to say:

"My recollections of DICK POFF at Roanoke College, where we both entered as freshmen, in the fall of 1941, pretty much discounts any theory that his current reputation for vigorous work came overnight. Like all of us potential soldiers, he plunged into his classwork with the idea of getting as much out of college as he could while there was still time. DICK was one of those rarities—a combination student and athlete. He would push himself to the limit on the athletic field every afternoon and still come away from class with the best grades. In fact, before he left Roanoke, he had earned both a letter in football and a membership in the Phi Society, campus honorary scholastic society. Whether or not those A's came easily, I don't know. But even though he came to college from a small high school, he ranked right up at the top with the best from all over the East. And unlike most college freshmen, he knew what he wanted to do and where he wanted to go. Now that I think of it, his upset victory in the 1952 congressional election is not at all surprising. Just as he wanted to excel in class and on the football team, he wanted to go to Congress. And, by gosh, there he is."

INSPIRES ENTHUSIASM EVERYWHERE

This enthusiasm for POFF isn't an occasional thing—it's everywhere. You find it in the strangest places. The manager of a Radford cab company, a wounded World War II veteran, was having trouble getting Government benefits. His wife wrote Congressman POFF and explained the situation. Four days later POFF had straightened the matter out and informed them they would shortly receive all back payments and regularly thereafter. "And we have," this man told me. "RICHARD POFF really gets things done. Being a poor man himself he understands our viewpoint and knows what such things mean to us."

Seventeen-year-old Ann Elizabeth Goodwin of Radford needed material for a paper on reciprocal trade. She wrote and asked POFF to send her something. She thought she'd probably hear from someone in his office. Almost immediately a stack of printed matter arrived with a personal note from POFF saying he hoped this would help. About 10 days later came additional material and a short note: "Dear Ann: Just found this and am forwarding it to you. It might help with your paper." No second-hand contacts for RICHARD, always the direct approach.

Montgomery County's Commonwealth's Attorney, Julius Goodman is another who's watched RICHARD grow with interest. He feels POFF typifies real American youth.

"It is a healthy feeling," he said, "to have a man in politics who places right, honesty, decency and morality far and beyond national, State and local politics. His character is untarnished and unblemished. He never thought of anything except the right thing to do."

You see what I mean when I say that everyone speaks highly of this young Congressman? No matter their personal politics they applaud RICHARD POFF for the things he stands for, the things he is doing.

A DEMOCRAT BOLTS

As for Mrs. Roland T. Hammer, of Lynchburg, she felt so strongly about his record that she made headlines throughout the State of Virginia when she resigned from the Democratic city committee of which she had been a member since 1945, to work for POFF. She told me of the large crowds at neighborhood parties held to further his campaign; of a woman who said she enjoyed his speech so much she wished he'd talk forever; of a workman on a city truck who told her, "at last I've met an honest politician"; of how enthusiastic supporters flocked around him whenever he appeared in Lynchburg.

"It was one of the easiest campaigns," she said. "He set the stage from his first day in Congress through service, and he had a fine record to run on."

This is not a political article. It is an effort to let you meet the man behind the Congressman and so, there'll be no report on his congressional activities or his voting record. It is enough that he has satisfied his constituents and that he was reelected last year with 62.3 percent of the vote from a predominantly Democratic district because of this. The way a man's neighbors feel about him are his yardstick of success or failure.

RICHARD POFF had just been elected president of the Radford Junior Chamber of Commerce when his law partner, Senator Ted Dalton, nominated him as a candidate to the United States House of Representatives from the Sixth District. RICHARD asked Leo A. Lorek, then internal vice president, to serve as president while he was campaigning. Neither knew the other too well. POFF had only been out of law school since 1948 and Lorek was also new to the community.

"There were a lot of people who didn't expect him to win," said Lorek. "The Republican Party wanted a candidate and he was the best man available. But RICHARD refused to be a token candidate. He plunged in with the drive and energy so characteristic of him and * * * well, you know what happened." Yes; and so does everyone else.

LOVES HUNTING

The Poff family is a happy one. RICHARD is the oldest of two boys. His mother tells of how restless he gets when he's idle. It is all the family can do to make him take a vacation. What spare time he has is spent reading and hunting. Senator Dalton spoke of his love of quail and grouse hunting. Last year they went hunting on an island in the New River.

"RICHARD'S legs are short," Dalton recalled. "He had to wade through such deep water he claimed I'd freeze him to death. I have a bird dog named Chief who follows RICHARD around as though he belonged to him. Last fall he took his father, his brother Beecher, and Lawrence Legg, of Roanoke, grouse hunting in the mountains for a few days. The Poffs like to eat so well they hardly had room for Chief for all the extra food."

RICHARD started dating Jo Ann in high school. They met in a junior year school play in which Jo Ann played grandma and RICHARD played grandpa. They were engaged when he entered the service.

POFF was a B–24 bomber pilot serving in the European theater of operations under Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. Stationed with the 8th Air Force in England Lieutenant POFF made 35 successful missions over Europe. For his gallantry, he was decorated with the Distinguished Flying Cross, and his unit was awarded a special Presidential citation. Ten years later he is again serving with the same commander.

After the war, DICK POFF entered law school at the University of Virginia. While a student there he was elected to his first public office—mayor of Copeley Hill, a development maintained by the university for student war veterans and their families.

RICHARD and Jo Ann had been married on his return from service and their first home was in Charlottesville on Jefferson Park Circle where RICHARD collected rents on other apartments to help pay for his own. Mrs. Poff also worked as assistant laboratory technician at the university hospital to help pay expenses. Getting an education was mostly hard work but, as his mother says—"work to him is not a burden but a joy." He has always had good health and a fine sense of humor, prerequisites to success no matter what you do. His tastes are simple and genuine as is his absorbing interest in people. He prefers home cooking and still calls his evening meal "supper."

RICHARD TEACHES COOKING

Along this line, Jo Ann claims RICHARD taught her to cook. An only child, she couldn't, as the saying goes, "boil water." She tried, but results were ghastly in the first months. Once she decided to surprise RICHARD with fried chicken. The chicken was bad enough but she used a whole cup of flour to make the gravy—and what a mess she had. She was in tears when RICHARD arrived. With patience and sympathy he smoothed things over, donned an apron, and cooked supper himself. Jo Ann says he cooked most of their meals in those days, teaching her all the things she should have known but had never learned.

I asked 7-year-old Becky what she thought of her daddy and she replied quite seriously:

"He's a good Congressman and a good daddy. He let me join the Brownies and he's going to let me learn to ride a horse. He helps me read and he's teaching me proper glamour (grammar) like adults use."

Things aren't as simple as they were before he went to Washington. His phone rings all hours of the day and night, but he still finds time to read Becky stories and to help with her home work. She looks like him and is she proud of that.

PASSED BAR IN 1947

RICHARD passed his bar examinations in 1947 before his graduation from the University of Virginia in 1948. By 1952 he had become prominent as a young attorney and civic leader. It was in that year that his fellow Republicans, notwithstanding his youth, chose him to make the apparently hopeless race for Congress from the Sixth District. Senator Dalton thought he had the stuff good public servants are made of. As his law partner he had found him a person of great capability and energy and he had no hesitancy recommending him.

"When he ran for reelection," he said, "I was glad to appear with him on TV after his fine 2-year record and say I felt he had fulfilled his obligations to his people. He has marked intelligence for seeking the facts and becoming fully informed then thinking it through. He never makes snap judgments."

His old friend and adviser, Dr. Kinnaird, urged him to run for Congress and it was he who introduced him to his audience when the first campaign was launched. At RICHARD'S request, this same man opened a session of the House of Representatives with a prayer after that first election.

Dr. Kinnaird painted a vivid picture of a boy and man who had held fast to the dream of serving his people. They used to lie in the grass and talk for hours. Once his party jumped RICHARD because he had failed to vote with them. He told them:

"You wouldn't want me to do something I didn't feel was right, would you?" When he told this to Dr. Kinnaird, the older man put his arm across POFF'S shoulders and replied:

"That's what I've tried to teach you, RICHARD. He was against the salary raise," the doctor went on. "I explained the necessity but RICHARD said stubbornly, 'I knew what I'd get when I agreed to run and it isn't right for me to vote now for an increase.' And he voted against it. RICHARD is the people's representative—not just those who voted for him, not just Republicans. 'I couldn't have been elected if everyone hadn't stood behind me,' he told me. 'My party label had nothing to do with it. Without the Democrats and Independents in my district I wouldn't have made it and I'm humbly grateful.' "

Dr. Kinnaird, who knows RICHARD as well as anyone and better than most, looked out the window across at the home of RICHARD'S parents next door, then he smiled and continued.

"If we can get men in Congress like RICHARD POFF the country will be all right. I'm an old man, I won't likely see much of it happen but just remember I said this to you—if the people of his district and his State stand behind him, RICHARD POFF will be one of the really great men of Virginia—he's a man with a mission. I've tried throughout the years to put fine things into this boy, by prayer, by hope, by faith. I've counseled—be humble, don't let anything people say make you lose your balance. He won't, you can be sure. You may think I'm rather extreme in my admiration. I couldn't love him more if he were my own son and I'm tremendously proud of him. He played in my backyard, was in and out of my house, I baptised him, married him, and when my little sweetheart, Becky, was born, I baptised her. I've seen him through a lot of rough places. That boy had good stuff in him. Yes; I'm strong for him."

In Congress he has served on the Government Operations and Judiciary Committees, the latter having jurisdiction over about half of all bills introduced. One of the significant pieces of legislation enacted by the 83d Congress was the Poff Act, designed to prevent bail-jumping by Communists (such as Gerhard Eisler and others). In addition to antisubversive legislation, POFF sponsored measures to assist railroad workers and, for the first time, inaugurated a policy of regular reporting to his constituents by newsletter, radio, and TV. His district is composed of the cities of Clifton Forge, Covington, Lynchburg, Radford, and Roanoke, the counties of Montgomery, Alleghany, Bedford, Botetourt, Campbell, Craig, Floyd, and Roanoke.

A Needed Amendment to Copyright Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. MURRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a serious injustice being caused by our composers and artists as a result of an antiquated provision of our copyright law.

Our present copyright law exempts from the application of its terms the reproduction of rendition of a musical composition by or upon coin-operated machines, unless a fee is charged for admission to the place where such reproduction or rendition occurs.

To my mind the effect of this provision of the copyright law violates the spirit, if not the constitutional guaranty, of equal protection of the law since it grants to one group of individuals a preference not enjoyed by others.

There exists at the present day no reasonable grounds for granting to the operators of coin-operated machines this preferred status under the law.

I have introduced bill H. R. 6654 which will amend the copyright law by striking this unfair exemption. The effect of my amendment will be to place the song publishers, and the operators of juke boxes, in a status quo insofar as the law is concerned.

An excellent article disclosing the effect of the present copyright law upon

the composers of our country was written by Columnist James O'Neill, Jr., and published in the Washington News recently. Although I do not concur in all of Mr. O'Neill's statements, the article does show the unfair result of the present exemption. Mr. O'Neill's article follows:

An archaic law of 1909 provides legal means for cheating—yes, cheating—music composers out of millions of dollars in royalties each year.

Those who profit by the composers' loss are the jukebox operators, whose annual take is more than $450 million, of which only an infinitesimal percentage is returned to the composers in royalties.

A bill before Congress would amend the Copyright Act of 1909 and pave the way for some remuneration to the composers. You ought to hear the sad, sad stories, the heartrending pleas of poverty, offered by the juke owners and operators.

In fact, the juke box operators are so horrified at the very thought of having to pay royalties to the composers they can't even discuss the matter with those who promote legislation to pay the composers a small fee for whatever talent they possess.

FOUR HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND OF THEM

According to trade sheets there are more than 450,000 jukeboxes in the country, owned and operated by only 7,500 businessmen. Average ownership is 60 per man, with some big operators owning as many as 300. While there are no official statistics, it is reasonably estimated that there are more than 9,500,000,000 jukebox plays a year, which, at a rate of only a nickel per play, would gross the owners $450 million a year. Of course many machines have been converted to a dime per play, or three for two bits, so the gross shoots up.

Under the Copyright Act of 1909 recordings played in coin-operated music machines at public places, where no admission is charged, is not deemed a public performance.

The exemption was granted back in 1909 because coin-operated music boxes were strictly a scientific dodge, with earphones and scratchy recordings.

HUGE INDUSTRY

With the advent of the painted monstrosities in every saloon, pool hall, drug store and gas station in the land, recorded music via the coin-slot became a huge industry.

All the operator of the jukebox had to do was buy a record, which gave the composer a couple of cents, and play it forever. The old records would last for about 70 plays. The new ones, made of Vinylite, will play from 700 to 2,000 times. And then they're sold as secondhands for up to 18 cents each.

Under the legislation proposed by Representatives JAMES C. MURRAY, Democrat, Illinois, the jukebox operators would turn over a fixed fee on each machine owned to organizations or individuals who would get the royalties into the hands of the men who wrote the music. Something like $30 per machine has been mentioned.

School Problems of Prince Edward County, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert as part of my remarks an editorial of the Farmville Herald, Farmville, Va., in its issue of Tuesday, June 14, 1955, in further reference to the school problems of Prince Edward County, Va. This editorial points our clearly the pressing problem facing the citizens of Prince Edward County. This is a real and immediate problem. The people of Prince Edward County are entitled to the help of all Virginians. The problem is not one for them to solve alone but the officials of the Commonwealth of Virginia, as well as all the citizens, have a duty, obligation and an interest in the solution of the problem, and I call upon them to assume their rightful role in this crisis.

The editorial follows:

PRINCE EDWARD, STAND STEADY

The interim report of the Governor's school study commission and statements issued by the Governor released on Friday afternoon offer little of consolation to the people of Prince Edward County who are deeply interested in maintaining public schools in the county. Understandably, this commission of 32 members of the general assembly has momentous and complex problems to be threshed out before it can make a full statement. In addition, legislation carrying out such a policy must be drafted before any session of the general assembly could act with intelligence or dispatch.

About all stated was that in the opinion of the commission it may be possible for the counties in the State to operate public schools on a separate basis for the coming session, and the Governor and the State board of education were asked to declare this policy for the coming year, due to the necessity of setting up the school system now. It is expected that the Governor and the State board of education will consider the recommendation and act on it about June 23. For what it may be worth we trust that this action will be taken as a measure which may protect the counties in the State with the exception of Prince Edward.

Prince Edward County occupies a position which is vastly different from the other 98 counties of Virginia. The implementation by the Supreme Court on May 31 was directed to Prince Edward County in Virginia and only those counties in other States from which suits had been heard. Therefore, Prince Edward County, through its school board, occupies an entirely different status. The Prince Edward case has been heard, a decision rendered, and the implementation remanded the case to the District Federal Court for execution. The school board is immediately answerable to the judge of the district Federal court, who has certain duties to perform. While cases must be brought in each of the other Virginia counties and delays made possible in court precedures, the Prince Edward case is now settled. The county faces integration with "deliberate speed," whatever that means, or no public free schools until State policy has been settled. The white people, and we believe the majority of the Negro people, do not favor integration. Certainly the white people expressed themselves resolutely last Tuesday evening.

Governor Stanley is quoted by the press as saying to the direct question involving Prince Edward County, that it was a legal question as to whether the county could operate next session on the broad principle which may be enunciated.

Until some authority, and in our opinion that authority should be the district Federal court, determines that Prince Edward County can operate on the basis of separate schools for the races for another year, we must stand steady.

Let there be no mistake, the people of Prince Edward are deeply concerned about the education of the children in this county, and this State. Nowhere will one find a person who would advocate abolition of education. But they are as resolute in their position of separate schools. The fate of the Negro schools is as much a concern as is the fate of the white schools, but at the moment the white people are unable to take any steps (except those of integration) to operate the school system on a normal basis. This they will not do. This is not defying the Supreme Court, nor trying to create an emergency in Virginia. The people of Prince Edward are standing simply where they have always stood, and that is for separate schools, for which they have good and sufficient reasons.

It must be remembered that the NAACP in its Atlanta statement on last Monday was determined to force the execution of the Court's decree without delay. Local branches were directed—

1. File a petition with each school board, requesting prompt formulation of plans of integration.

2. Follow up these petitions to press for action.

3. Keep the national office of NAACP informed of all developments of a positive or negative character.

4. Prepare for filing lawsuits "if no plans are announced or no steps taken by the time school begins this fall."

A meeting of Virginia groups in Petersburg on Sunday, we presume, will follow the national directive. The one purpose of the NAACP now appears to be immediate pressures to begin integration regardless of its immediate effects on education. That this policy meets with the approval of the majority of the Negro citizens of this county we have our serious doubts, but it is a fact that even if there was a contrary-minded majority, they have yet to show power to stop what is being done.

The white people of Prince Edward have spoken in no unmistakable terms; the Prince Edward School Board occupies a position not comparable to any other county in Virginia; there is no assurance that public schools in this county can be operated normally another year; the NAACP is pressing for immediate integration, and the State of Virginia is bending its efforts to establish a State policy. In the face of these facts Prince Edward will stand steady.

OUR OBLIGATION

The school patrons and citizens of Prince Edward County have only one immediate major problem, namely, to underwrite a sum of $220,000 to maintain a force of loyal, efficient teachers. This obligation was taken when about 1,300 people voted it last Tuesday night.

Let's address ourselves to this task, which admittedly is the largest sum for a community purpose ever assumed voluntarily by the citizens of the county. That is our first order of the day.

Flag Day Ceremony, Marietta, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of June 14, 1955, I attended the annual Flag Day services of Marietta lodge No. 477 of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks in Marietta, Ohio. The services were held in the park on the east bank of the Muskingum River at 8 o'clock in the evening. Colors were ap-

propriately provided by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion. Also participating was the Marietta High School band.

The members of that band very recently visited Washington and had an opportunity to observe the House of Representatives and other branches of Government in operation. I feel that their wholehearted cooperation and splendid attendance at this Flag Day ceremony was, in part, caused by the patriotic interest aroused through their visit here. It was my pleasure to assist in this Flag Day ceremony by furnishing the address of the evening. My remarks in part are as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 157, which the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON has introduced and called up for immediate consideration, is one which should have the support of every Member of Congress. It is an expression of fervent hope for peace by the greatest legislative body in modern civilization. Not only is it an expression of hope for peace, but it is also a statement that this legislative body is dedicated to peaceful purposes, determined to legislation in the interest of peace, and that in its further deliberations and actions, the prevailing question will ever be, Will this particular policy or legislative measure help to further the interests of peace?

Our dangers are real enough and the world is close enough to a fighting war that we must often subordinate political and personal views and theories for the salvation of America.

Friends, I am most happy to have the opportunity of being in Marietta tonight and speaking to this audience on this memorable Flag Day in 1955. I want to compliment the Elks Club of Marietta for arranging this observance. It is doing a very worthwhile thing in having as one of its important projects, the patriotic celebration of Flag Day. It seems to me that this one day has, in the minds of many, lost its full significance and it is indeed the performance of an act of a truly civic organization in bringing about a revival of a genuine appreciation of Flag Day. But this organization has a background of activities and principles which have ever been focused upon the desire for a better community and a stronger America.

We are inclined to take our American flag for granted. It flew over the Nation's Capital yesterday, it is flying there today and undoubtedly, it will be flying there tomorrow. We who enjoy the comforts of peace and the benefits of prosperity are inclined to forget that this symbol represents generations of men who fought in battlefields the world over, who drove back the frontiers of our Nation, who harnessed the power of our mighty streams, and opened the door to our storehouse of unlimited natural resources. We forget that there were lean and hungry days and years; anxiety that the noble experiment in the wilderness of the Western Hemisphere might fail. Let us remember as we observe this Flag Day of 1955 here in Marietta, that it is the symbol of a great Nation. It represents the progress of civilization down through the entire period of recorded history which has culminated in today's concept of a nation of free men and women, protected in their enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

There is one thing about this flag of ours that is different from the flags of the other nations of the world. The American flag today represents the same principles of freedom that it did in 1776, while the other flags of the world represented one concept in the 18th century and if they exist at all today, represent an entirely different concept. Many years ago in England, an American sailor happened to be standing near an African queen during a review of the naval forces of the world and as each flag crossed the bow of the inspecting vessel, the American sailor pointed out the salient features of the ship and the colors it bore. As ship of the British Navy passed in review, he stated, "There is the flag of the King of England," and as a Dutch vessel passed, he explained, "There is the flag of the Queen of the Netherlands," and as a Spanish ship passed he remarked, "There is the flag of his royal highness, the King of Spain." And so it went with the flags of the monarchs of the world. Then, proudly flowing in the breeze, came the Stars and Stripes of America and the sailor's statement was, "and that is my flag."

No monarchy owned that symbol of American freedom. No dictator, no committee, no President nor Congress owns that flag. It is the flag of the people and it stands for them. I have been in countries of the world, and so have many who are here tonight, where the people were not proud of their flag. They were ashamed of their country. Their thoughts were upon another day, another generation when their emblem was a symbol of strength, of freedom, of hope. Today it was instead a symbol of decadence and decline. But here at home the Stars and Stripes fly proudly and because of it we are proud. Down through the pages of history, since it first was created, other forces have worked to replace it by symbols of their own. In 1812 the British sought to return their emblem which we renounced in 1776. The Kaiser sought to replace it in 1917. A man named Hitler wanted to substitute a swastika in 1941 and even today there are forces who would replace it with a hammer and sickle. But still it flies proudly on, telling the story of toleration and of good will, of a Nation of free education, where the citizens of tomorrow can learn the truth about yesterday and today. It is the symbol of a Nation of industry which has become a home for millions from foreign shores who saw in it so many of the fredoms and privileges which could not have been theirs in their native land. It represents a Nation of equal opportunity where a boy from the slums of New York or a tenant farm in Georgia can rise to a position of prestige and power along with the boy who is born with a silver spoon in his mouth.

This flag of ours is constantly beset by danger. There are many menaces to the future of Old Glory. One is the menace of power-hungry nations who look with envy upon the great geographical expanse and the storehouse of natural resources which are ours. There are also menaces from within. For instance, the menace of corruption in government which would weaken its fiber. Another is the menace of inflation which would destroy its wealth. Another is the menace of overcentralization in which too much power is being handed to a few. But so long as we govern ourselves; so long as we, as individuals, maintain our own voice in government, we have little to fear from what happens in the Marietta Courthouse, in the Ohio Capitol, and on the hill in Washington. However, when we freely permit our welfare, our comforts, and our bread and butter to be administered and allocated to us from the District of Columbia, we are losing control of our destiny.

Our flag is one among the flags of the nations of the world. It is not the only symbol of power today. But we like to think that it is head and shoulders above the rest. We are anxious always that we can live with other nations on a free, cooperative, and democratic basis. We have assisted in establishing the United Nations to help our Nation to be free from the danger of international conflict and warfare. We know that it is necessary to give and take a little, in order to reach agreements with other nations, and this we have done willingly. But if we are to maintain our freedoms in a world in which full half of the nations scoff at those same freedoms, we cannot permit the principles of the stars and stripes to be supplanted by the symbol of an international organization. We know that we must deal with other nations and make agreements with them, both for our mutual protection and for our economic benefit. But, in so doing, we should not so bind ourselves that through the ordinary procedures of our constitutional form of government, we cannot protect our basic sovereignty and our basic industries, our small, independent industries here in southeastern Ohio, which for a generation have suffered from increasingly unrestricted competition from abroad. We must not destroy our industries nor the initiative which created them.

This flag of ours is one which serves to instill pride in our country. We are proud of its historic past and of the growth that our Nation has displayed. We know that in the field of battle, the inspiration of the Stars and Stripes has brought forth the best sense of patriotism and devotion to duty on the part of our soldiers, and we know too, that in a time of world crisis, the Stars and Stripes and its principles have brought out the best in us. But if we are to continue to have the rights and privileges and protection which it exemplifies, we must remember that there are also duties which we must perform in exchange.

We are inclined so often to demand justice for ourselves and point at the flag and say it guarantees justice. At the same time, we are the ones who would like to evade jury duty. We complain about the condition of our schools and point to the flag and say that it guarantees our children a fine education and yet, at the same time, we resist additional requests for taxes to maintain the schools. We insist that our Government do for us the things we cannot perform and point to the flag and say that it guarantees to us a Government which will protect the little fellow and help home industry and a dozen other things and yet, when election day comes around, we are among those who fail to vote.

We are proud of our flag and we want to keep it a symbol of a strong Nation. I am sure that that would be the wish of our Revolutionary fathers who battled valiantly to keep it aloft. And I am sure it would be the wish of our heroic dead who gave their full measure of devotion that it would still be flying when the smoke of battle cleared, and I am sure that it is the wish of the tortured souls behind the curtains of the heathen nations, who dream of the day when the principles that it represents will save them from the empty tomorrow of a nation under the iron fist of communistic dictatorship and I am sure that it is the wish, although unexpressed, of our children as they uninhibitedly express delight in the beauty and symmetry of our Stars and Stripes.

Presidential Veto of the Trade Agreements Escape Clause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the follow-

ing statement by Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy.

The article follows:

PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ESCAPE CLAUSE

(By O. R. Strackbein)

The escape clause of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 reads in its substantive part as follows:

"SEC. 6. (a) No reduction in any rate of duty, or binding of any existing customs or excise treatment, or other concession hereafter proclaimed under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall be permitted to continue in effect when the product on which the concession has been granted is, as a result, * * * being imported into the United States in such increased quantities * * * as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products."

This is a clear statement of the congressional intent. No duty reduction or similar concession is to be continued in effect if it leads to certain results, namely, to serious injury or threat of such injury to the domestic industry concerned.

No trade agreement, in other words, was to be allowed to operate to the damage of a domestic industry.

The only question that could remain was one of fact. The determination of this question was placed upon the Tariff Commission. This represented a delegation of power to a factfinding body created by Congress as an agency of Congress. Certain criteria were laid down to guide the Commission in making its determination, among them a downward trend of production, employment, prices, profits, or wages in the domestic industry concerned.

The Tariff Commission was directed to hold public hearings as a means of obtaining the necessary facts on which to base its determination.

From the section quoted in part above, i. e., from the substantive law, it would appear that if the Tariff Commission found the specified degree of injury or threat of injury to exist, the particular reduction in duty or similar concession which had been found to cause the injury, "in whole or in part," could no longer be permitted to remain in effect.

Yet, such has not been the result. In the vast majority of the escape clause cases the reduced tariff has on the contrary been left undisturbed regardless of the finding of the Tariff Commission that it had resulted in the condition specified by the law as calling for withdrawal of the concession.

How has such a result, so contrary to the clear wording of the substantive law, come about?

It came about because the Tariff Commission under section 7 (a), or the procedural provisions of the law, is directed to recommend to the President "the withdrawal or modification of the concession." The President, in turn, is left completely free to carry out or to reject the Commission's recommendation.

The accepted rule under which a delegation of authority is made did not, under the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, carry beyond the Tariff Commission. The criteria furnished the Commission for its guidance ended with that body. From there on there is not one further word of guidance: the President has only, after his act of rejection, to supply Congress with his reasons. These reasons may be of any variety of his choosing; and the Executive's reasons have indeed varied widely in actual practice, from 1951 to the present time.

Under this procedure, power is actually delegated without limit. The proper limitations on the Tariff Commission itself do not as they should, carry through the second step, i. e., through the Presidential or final action. They are therefore without actual force or effect in determining the final disposition of the constitutional congressional authority.

However this defect came about, its effect has been to set up the executive power as the supreme and unlimited arbiter of the law's enforcement. Whereas the law says certain concessions are not to be permitted to continue in effect under certain specified conditions, we find 4 years later that in 10 cases of 15 such concessions have in fact been permitted to continue in effect even though the Tariff Commission found the conditions precedent specified in the law to be present.

The obvious conclusion is that as the limitations that should guide a delegation of power broke down, Congress lost control. The freedom with which the Executive exercised his unfettered powers may be judged from two excerpts from his explanation to Congress in the justification of his rejection of Tariff Commission recommendations:

"Because of the dangerous precedent which would be involved in accepting this share doctrine as the determinant of serious injury, I should like to emphasize its far-reaching implications. Serious injury, by any definition, means a loss to someone. * * * But the share doctrine goes much further. In fact, it finds that serious injury exists when the domestic industry fails to gain something it never had." (Harry S. Truman, to the chairmen, respectively, of the Committee on Finance and the House Committee on Ways and Means, August 14, 1952, upon rejection of the Tariff Commission recommendation concerning the increase in the tariff on watches, watch parts, etc.)

This was how the President in August 1952 dealt with one of the criteria laid down in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951. "A decline in the proportion of the domestic market supplied by domestic producers" was one of the criteria of injury spelled out by Congress to guide the Tariff Commission. The President evidently did not like the law and therefore did not choose to carry it into effect.

On November 22, 1954, the President, in rejecting the Tariff Commission's recommendation to impose a quota on the importation of spring clothespins, wrote to the two chairmen of congressional committees, in part:

"Even if some restrictive action were warranted in this case, I should be particularly hesitant to impose an absolute quota on imports in a case of this kind. We have been very concerned that sales abroad of many American export products have been seriously hurt during recent years by quantitative limitations imposed by various foreign countries, thus curtailing the play of competition even when our product and its price are better."

Here again it is obvious that the President does not like the particular provision of the law that authorizes the imposition of an import quota as a remedy against injury, under the escape clause. The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 provides that the Tariff Commission shall recommend to the President "the withdrawal * * * of the concession * * * or the establishment of import quotas, to the extent and for the time necessary to prevent or remedy the injury."

However, acting under his limitless discretion the President is free to indulge his predilection in the regulation of our foreign commerce. When he says, "We have been very concerned that sales abroad of many American products have been seriously hurt," the President is addressing himself to the regulation of foreign commerce. Even though this is a function of Congress, the President finds himself in a position to do as he likes toward execution of the law which says that "no reduction in any rate of duty * * * shall be permitted to continue in effect * * *" if it has caused or threatened serious injury to a domestic industry.

Thus the defect of the legislation is obvious. The procedural provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 do not carry out the substantive part of the law. This should be remedied and can be done by limiting the President's discretion to the field of his special competence as Commander in Chief. However, all that pertains to the economic aspects of the regulation of our foreign commerce should be kept in the hands of Congress and its agency, the Tariff Commission.

The President has not limited himself in his rejection of Tariff Commission recommendations, to mere disagreement with and dislike of certain provisions of the law. He has reflected a deep lack of confidence in the findings of the Tariff Commission. In a number of cases he has introduced new and ex parte evidence, gathered from somewhere and not subjected to the hearings process. Such evidence makes its first appearance in the letters of rejection to the two congressional committees that he must write when he does not accept the Tariff Commission recommendation.

In his letter of rejection of the garlic case the President, July 21, 1951, said in part:

"In this case, it seems to me that the burden of proof has not been sustained. The evidence is tenuous and unpersuasive. The claim that the American producers of garlic have been seriously injured by imports is mere assertion."

Such comments do not reflect much confidence in the Tariff Commission.

On May 11, 1954, the President in rejecting the scissors and shears recommendation of the Commission, commented:

"It is questionable whether such audited financial statements requested by the Tariff Commission as were finally submitted, by firms accounting for little over one-third of the domestic production, constitute a representative sample. * * *

"The Commission, consistent with the terms of the law, made its decision on the basis of a threat of serious injury, rather than present injury resulting from a trade-agreement concession. * * * I believe that the evidence brought forth to substantiate the judgment of threat must be of such a character as to leave no doubt that actual injury is imminent. In the present instance, I am not persuaded that the evidence is of such a character."

These comments, too, show little confidence in the competence and judgment of the Commission.

On September 9, 1954, the President exhibited a third type of refusal to apply the law. He said, in rejecting the handblown glassware recommendations:

"Added tariff protection offers no comparable real benefit in my opinion. It might offer some short-term relief. That relief would, however, cloud the issues as to the industry's long-run needs."

In this case the President passed on the economics of the recommended action and disagreed with the recommended remedy—this time a tariff increase, not an import quota.

Further evidence of such delving into the economics of our industry and imports is found in the President's rejection of the briarwood pipe case, November 10, 1953. He said:

"In the present case, the primary cause of the domestic industry's difficulty appears to be a shift in consumer preference. * * * In other words, in recent years there has been a clear and sharp decrease in pipe smoking in this country.

"In view of the foregoing facts, I am not persuaded that the industry's difficulty is due primarily to increased imports under the

existing trade agreements rates nor that the application of the Tariff Commission's recommendations * * * would remedy such deterioration as has taken place in the domestic industry."

In this case, beside the excursions into economics, there is exhibited a clear disregard of the law which says that the injury complained of may be the result in "whole or in part" of a trade-agreement concession. Therefore the observation that the duty reduction was not the primary cause of the industry's difficulty was irrelevant and evasive.

Further evidence of disinclination to put the escape clause into effect for economic reasons was shown in the groundfish fillet case. On July 2, 1954, the President wrote to Congress:

"I am firmly convinced that it would be a disservice to the long-run interests of the entire groundfish industry to limit the imports. * * * It would hamper and limit the development of the market."

A review of the many Presidential rejections shows that on one pretext or another the President has explained his reasons for overriding the recommendations of the Tariff Commission. If the Commission is as incompetent (1) in gathering and judging the facts and (2) in proposing a remedy as the President's comments indicate, it should be dismissed and reconstituted. No allegations of incompetence have been made.

The Commission's findings with respect to the facts and injury should be final. If these are of questionable validity, again, the make-up of the Commission should be examined and corrected. Otherwise the President's judgment replaces that of Congress in the regulation of our foreign commerce.

To the end that congressional control is maintained in this field, the recommendations of the Tariff Commission should be sent to Congress. The President's veto power should be limited to instances in which the proclamation of the Commission's recommendation would in his judgment imperil the national defense. He would then be acting in the field of his authority.

The limitation on the delegated powers would then extend beyond the Tariff Commission through the second and final step of execution. There would no longer be a wide-open and unchartered field for exercise of unwarranted executive discretion as exists today in the administration of the escape clause.

Poorest in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of June 9, 1955:

POOREST IN UNITED STATES

Everyone in these parts will agree with Earl A. Barnhart, eastern district post office manager for Michigan, when he says that "Adrian has the poorest post office building in the United States for a town of its size." Residents of the Adrian community have suspected it for 15 to 20 years. Mr. Barnhart, in his position as district post office manager, now makes it official. Our post office building just simply can't be any worse than the poorest in the United States for a town of its size.

Since long before the last war Adrian has been trying to do something about its inadequate and undersized post office. The chamber of commerce has tried to do something. Postmasters have tried to do something. City officials have given their support to efforts for a new post office. And then in 1940 the Federal Government stopped appropriations for most Federal buildings. So Adrian's old post-office building, built in 1905 to serve a community half this big, now stands as the poorest in the United States for a town of its size.

Our post office really must be in pretty bad shape. Building and maintenance officials with the Post Office Department recently estimated that it would cost $40,000 to do the repainting, repointing, and reconditioning that was necessary on the old building. To avoid pouring money down a rat hole, Representative GEORGE MEADER, of the Second District, announced recently that he would make a new effort to get the community a new building. He has tried before, of course, as former Representative Earl C. Michener did before him.

The best chance seems to be a new Federal law under which private capital erects Federal buildings and then leases them to the Government over a period of years, the Government eventually taking title to the property. Because we have the poorest postoffice building in the United States for a town of our size, then we should be among the very first to get relief under the new law.

There are numerous sites available in the vicinity of the downtown area. One site that might be considered is the old Emma L. Bixby Hospital location. We're going to begin work before long on a completely new and modern hospital. The old hospital building and the site will be available for another project. The size of the old hospital site seems large enough for a post office and the necessary parking area. It is only two short blocks removed from the present post office building. The hospital board might find it advantageous to sell the site for a new post office.

The present buildings probably could not be adapted to post office use. But regardless of how the property is used in the future the buildings will have little value except for hospital or institutional use. It's just something to think about as we try to get rid of the poorest post office building in the United States for a town of this size.

Dr. Thaddeus Szewczyk: Discoverer of the Cause of Blindness Among Premature Babies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the young doctor who discovered the cause of blindness among premature babies is Dr. Thaddeus Szewczyk, of East St. Louis, in my home district in Illinois.

Physicians had become aware of the fact that in many cases of premature birth the babies were born blind. But they did not know the reason. Dr. Szewczyk, who did much work at the Christian Welfare Hospital in East St. Louis, first established in 1951 the fact that an overuse of oxygen was the cause of the type of infant blindness called retrolental fibroplasia. To prevent the unnecessary blinding of premature infants, he suggested, it was desirable to use a minimum of oxygen in the centers that specialize in premature births. This doctrine is now widely respected and followed.

An article in a national magazine discusses what used to be the mystery of blindness in premature babies. The public discussion of the subject no doubt will inform many parents and physicians that there is no longer any mystery and that premature babies do not have to suffer blindness. It is a pity, I think, that in the article the contributions of Dr. Szewczyk were not recognized.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the following article from the East St. Louis Journal of June 12, 1955:

Friends of Dr. Thaddeus Szewczyk in general and officials of Christian Welfare Hospital in particular are disappointed in a current article in the Saturday Evening Post.

"Disappointed" is an understatement. The article, Mystery of the Blinded Babies, by Steven M. Spencer, goes on for 2,000 words or more to discuss retrolental fibroplasia, the medical term for blindness that develops in the cases of hundreds of babies given oxygen in modern hospital premature baby centers.

Dr. Szewczyk is ignored in the article. His name is not mentioned. Yet he is the man who in 1951 here discovered the cause of retrolental fibroplasia—and he has led modern ophthalmologists and pediatricians on the now-accepted way to prevent the unnecessary blinding of thousands of premature babies.

Dr. George H. Van Dusen, administrator of Christian Welfare Hospital and ex-president of the Illinois Hospital Association, plans to inform the magazine by letter of the omitted facts in the Spencer article published under date of June 11.

Dr. Theodore Terry, who died in 1946, is credited with discovering and diagnosing retrolental fibroplasia at Boston in 1941. According to the SEP article, however, the cause of retrolental fibroplasia was not discovered until 1953.

Dr. V. Everett Kinsey of Detroit is featured in the Saturday Evening Post article. Dr. Kinsey at Chicago in June 1952, took exception to Dr. Szewczyk's findings as reported before the Pedriatrics Society of the American Medical Association. Now, however, Dr. Kinsey recommends nonuse or minimum use of oxygen to prevent blindness in premature babies.

Dr. Szewczyk made his discovery here in the fall of 1951, in the case of premature twins, as reported 3 years ago in the journal His first article on his findings was published in the American Journal of Ophthalmology in December 1951—18 months before the Saturday Evening Post article says the cause of retrolental fibroplasia was discovered, by doctors at Boston and Detroit.

Dr. Szewzyck's second article on the subject was published by the American Journal of Ophthalmology in March 1952, the same month he presented his findings to the Central Illinois Society of Ophthalmology at Springfield.

Dr. Szewzyck, who specializes in diseases and treatment of the eyes, was only 36 and only 3 years in practice when he discovered the major cause of blindness in "preemies" in modern baby centers and how to prevent it.

He credits a woman, Dr. Clare Campbell, of Melbourne, Australia, with sharing his conclusion in 1951 that oxygen in modern "preemie" centers probably caused retolental fibroplasia. The disease peculiarly had a high incidence in areas served by modern prema-

ture baby centers equipped with incubators and oxygen.

But Dr. Szewzyck is the man who discovered that overuse of oxygen causes the blindness, and that nonuse or minimum use of oxygen prevents development of the disease. The Saturday Evening Post article doubtless will bring the discovery to parents and doctors generally, and save thousands of babies from blindness.

The East St. Louis doctor's friends and associates for months have resented the lack of national recognition given Dr. Szewzyck by the medical profession, but medical ethics prevent the airing of intersociety stress in public.

Meanwhile, he has received scores of requests from England, Europe, Scandinavia, Australia, and New Zealand for reprints of his papers in the AJO.

Statement on Minimum Wages Before the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee, on Behalf of the New England Governors' Committee on the Textile Industry, Seymour E. Harris, Chairman of the Committee—Hearings on the Amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT ON MINIMUM WAGES BEFORE THE SENATE LABOR AND WELFARE COMMITTEE, ON BEHALF OF THE NEW ENGLAND GOVERNORS' COMMITTEE ON THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY, BY SEYMOUR E. HARRIS, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE—HEARINGS ON THE AMENDMENTS TO THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

APPROPRIATE RATE

Under the Fair Labor Standards Act a minimum wage of 40 cents was set as of 1941; In 1949 this was increased to 75 cents; and in 1955, the President proposes a minimum of 90 cents. But this is the time to raise the minimum wage from 75 cents to a figure substantially above the 90 cents asked by the President.

Perhaps a comparison of gross hourly earnings might give some indication of the proper rate on the assumption that the 40-cent rate in 1941 was justified. (Clearly in terms of effects on the economy it certainly did not seem to be too high.) On this basis it would seem that the appropriate rate would be more than $1—and especially when allowance is made for the greater rise in low-paying employments. Thus, in the years 1938–51, the rise of wages in low-wage industries subject to the minimum wage was 171 percent as against a rise of 121 percent in high-wage industries subject to minimum rate.

A rough estimate of annual wages obtained by dividing compensation of employees by the numbers employed and in the military service gives an index of 240 in 1949 and 274 in 1958 (1941=100). Again a minimum in excess of $1 is suggested. This figure takes into account the phenomenal growth of fringe benefits. It should be noted that since 1929 supplements to wages have increased 4 times as much as employee compensation; and even from 1949 to 1953, supplements to wages rose almost 1½ times as much as other employee compensation.

It seems to me that a rate substantially in excess of 90 cents can be justified in that if allowance is made for the rise in the cost of living, of productivity for the years 1949 to 1955, and for continued gains of prices and wages at least to 1958 (since legislation is so infrequent). As we shall see, other considerations also point to a higher minimum.

According to Secretary Mitchell a 90-cent rate would involve an increase for 1.3 million, or 5 percent of the workers covered. Below, I indicate the effect of a new minimum on factory workers (wages as of April 1954). Thus a 90-cents minimum would involve increases for 6.5 percent of factory workers and $1 an increase for 10.2 percent.

Percent of production workers in manufacturing industries earning less than designated amount

Wage	United States	Northeast	South	Middle West	Far West
$0.75	0.2	0.1	0.7	0.05	0.05
$0.90	6.5	4.1	20.2	2.3	1.1
$1.00	10.2	8.0	28.2	4.1	1.8
$1.10	15.3	13.2	38.6	6.9	3.4
$1.25	22.4	21.4	50.0	11.5	6.3

Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics: Wage Distribution for Factory Workers April 1954, 1955, p. 5.

MINIMUM WAGES AND A DECENT STANDARD OF LIVING

Behind minimum wage theory lies the view that employers should not profit by exploiting workers and especially those who are unorganized and paid low wages.

MINIMUM WAGES AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

In 1938, when the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed, the country was in the midst of a recession and undoubtedly a fear prevailed that in the absence of a floor under wages a wage-price deflation might be started.

In 1949, again the country was suffering from a recession and hence care had to be taken lest a rise in the minimum wage have a unfortunate effect on employment.

But in 1955, we are once more in the midst of a great boom, and with the high level of military outlays a substantial decline is most unlikely. Here is an opportunity to use the minimum wage as a weapon to direct labor into more productive employments where the peculiar composition of resources, capital and labor in this country yield a high return. The resultant flow of labor in the face of excess demand is likely to result in a minimum of unemployment.

THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT AND OTHER LABOR LEGISLATION

The case for a higher minimum gains strength at present because of the fact that the Walsh-Healey Act has bogged down under the handicap of the Fulbright amendment of 1952 which makes the wage determination by industries subject to the Administrative Procedures Act. In textiles, the result has been that a determination for cotton textiles and synthetics at $1.05 and for woolens of $1.25 have been voided by the courts. Under the Fulbright amendment the courts have interpreted a minimum wage fixed at a national level as countrary to the requirements that wages be set on a local basis.

It is unfortunate that northern interests allowed the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to obtain jurisdiction of wages under Government contracts and also that they did not prevent the passage of the Fulbright amendment. At any rate the present status of the Walsh-Healey increases the need of a higher minimum under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Another reason for treatment under the Fair Labor Standards Act is to be found in the effects of the Taft-Hartley Act and the recent surge of right-to-work laws. Prior to the Taft-Hartley Act and the spread of right-to-work laws, which especially prevail in Southern States, the gap between Northern and Southern wages tended to narrow. For example, in textiles an excess of textile wages of about 67 percent in the North in 1890 had been narrowed to less than 10 percent by 1950. (Even as late as 1924 there seems to have been a differential of about 50 percent.) But there has been no further improvement since 1950, and there probably has been a rise in the differential.

In April 1954, overall, the hourly wage for factory workers was as follows:

	Hourly wage	Relative to United States average (percent)
United States	$1.68	
New England	1.67	−1
South	1.36	−19
Middle West	1.80	+7
Far West	1.94	+15

Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Wage Distribution for Factory Workers, April 1954, 1955, p. 5.

LEGISLATION AND WAGE DIFFERENTIAL: CONCLUSION

The relevance of the new labor legislation is that it has tended to freeze a wage differential between North and South. Labor unionization in the South has been delayed by the new legislation, and hence the gap between northern and southern wages has tended to be stabilized or even widened. All the more reason, therefore, for a generous increase in the minimum wage.

WAGES AND MONEY FLOWS: THE SOUTH GAINS MONEY, BUT WAGES DO NOT RESPOND

In some respects it is surprising that wage differentials have remained as large as they are, for the money flow has tended to favor the Southern States. As the competitive position of Southern States has improved, as under Government guidance prices of agricultural products rose, as in response to more favorable economic conditions capital flowed in, and as the Federal Government poured money in to these States, the supply of money in the Southern States rose disproportionately. This inflow, evident in the deposits of member banks in the Reserve banks—the basis of monetary creation—helped sustain the rise of output but would also increase pressure to raise prices and wages.

DEPRESSION OF STANDARDS IN THE SOUTH

In recent years there has been an intense interstate struggle for business. Newer industrial regions, with large supplies of labor, resources, and proximity to markets, have tended to gain, in part, at the expense of the older regions. Much of their gains can be justified by favorable costs and prices related to important natural advantages and a determination to move ahead. But, in part, the gains are to be ascribed to all kinds of artificially induced gains. These regions obtain much more cash from the Federal Treasury than they pay in; they attract industries by reducing standards of social security, by depressing wage rates, and by introducing tax structures in State finance which on the whole favor competitive industries; and they put a greater burden on noncompetitive industries and directly on consumers. With interregional trade many times as important as international trade, little attempt is made to protect against depression of standards through restrictions on trade—though the case is stronger here than in international relations.

THE FLOW OF TAXES AND FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

In a recent year (1951) the amount of Federal taxes paid (by paid I mean allowing for the incidence of taxes, that is where the burden falls) in relation to income payments was as follows:

New England (Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut)	1.21
New York	1.24
Illinois and Michigan	1.04
Five Southern States (North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, Georgia, Tennessee)	.74

Hence the proportions of payments relative to income were as follows:

New England to South	1.64
New York to South	1.68
Illinois and Michigan to South	1.41

Of course, the net transfers are much greater than suggested by these figures because the Northern States with much larger incomes pay more relatively. The above figures merely indicate how much more they pay in relation to their incomes.

For a comparison of all New England States, the Middle East, and the Southeast, we find that the Federal tax incidence (allowing for incidence of business taxes) as a percentage of adjusted-income payments was as follows:

[U. S.=100]

New England	113
Middle East	111
Southeast	83
New England to Southeast	136
Middle East to Southeast	134

In the years 1934–51, the 3 large New England States received $2,529 million from Federal disbursements, and 5 major Southern States (Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee) received $5,841 million from the Federal Government. Thus the Southern States received two-times as much as the 3 New England States which account for about 85 percent of the area's income. But it should be noted that the 3 New England States paid in Federal taxes (allowing for passing on of taxes) $3,276 million, and the 5 Southern States paid in only $2,534 million. If we apply the percentage of Federal taxes paid by each group of States in 1951 (6.75 and 5.23) to the total Federal tax receipts in 1934–51, then we obtain the following figures:

	Billion
Taxes paid by 3 New England States	$31.9
Taxes paid by 5 Southern States	24.7

Whereas the three large New England States paid 29 percent more into the Federal coffers, they received back only 44 percent as much. In other words, on a pay-versus-obtain basis the New England States vis-a-vis the South received only 34 percent as much back for every dollar paid into the Federal Treasury: 34 equals $^{44}/_{129}$.

SOCIAL SECURITY STANDARDS

On the issue of depression of standards, I have said much in the Report on the New England Textile Industry for the New England Governors. Here I add just a few items. Thus, in 1951, for the 12 States with highest per capita income (exclusively Northern States), the average old-age assistance payment was $55 per month, or 34.2 percent of the per capita income; but for the 12 States with the lowest per capita income (all Southern States) the assistance was but $23, or 21 percent of the per capita income. Over a period of 18 years the 12 wealthy States paid out 7 times as much in old-age assistance as in general assistance—the former is paid in part by the Federal Government. But the 12 poor (Southern States) paid out 35 times as much in old-age assistance as in general assistance.

In each of the years 1952 and 1953, the 2 major textile States in New England levied taxes of 2.7 percent of payrolls on employers to finance unemployment compensation; but the 3 major southern textile States had average rates of 1.32 and 1.29 percent in these years. In the years 1946 to 1950, the ratio of benefits to taxable wages was 2.7 percent in Massachusetts and Rhode Island; and but 0.9 percent in the Carolinas and Georgia. The average weekly benefits for the 5 most important manufacturing States in the North in 1953 was $25.82; in the 5 major States in the South $19.60, or an excess of 31 percent for the North. The unemployment-compensation program, though it was justified in part as a program which would not result in competition among States to reduce taxes and benefits, has as a result of experience rating become just that.

EFFECTS OF PREVIOUS MINIMUM WAGES

Clearly the increases of 1938–41 and 1950 are not reflected in any deterioration of economic conditions in the South where the effects were greatest.

GAINS OF THE SOUTH AND OTHER REGIONS, 1939 TO 1953

Despite minimum wages especially significant for the South, since wages are lowest there, the South has been gaining economic strength at a spectacular rate both absolutely and relatively. This is especially evident in the figures from 1939 to 1953, where rises of income exceed that of all regions but the Far West and more significant, the rise of southern per capita income greatly exceeded all and even the Far West. In the years 1950–53, despite the large relative losses suffered by agriculture, the South maintained its relative position.

GAINS IN INDUSTRIALIZATION

How much the South is being industrialized as suggested by the following figures.

Percent rise of population, United States and Regions, 1940–50

	Urban	Rural
United States	18.7	7.4
New England	7.3	17.4
Southeast	32.7	1.9
Southwest	51.8	10.7
Central	14.1	6.6
Far West	42.2	57.5

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Regional Trends in the United States Economy, 1951, p. 110.

Finally, let us note recent trends in manufacturing. The gains of the South before the war were especially striking in textiles. But this is no longer true. Even from 1939 to 1947, textiles became relatively less important. From 1947 to 1953, the gains in textiles (employment) were but 8.1 percent in the South Atlantic States, with percentage gains exceeding those in textiles in all 20 census industries but stone, clay, and glass products (figures for tobacco manufactures not available). The largest relative gains were in transportation equipment (68.6 percent and 44,000 jobs), electrical machinery (59 percent and 12,000 jobs), miscellaneous (53 percent and 10,000 jobs), and apparel (46 percent and 45,000 jobs). In textiles, the gains were 8 percent and 39,000 jobs. Of great significance is the fact that the rate of expansion was much greater in the South than in New England in virtually all 20 census industries and even in the more productive and more rapidly growing industries. In lumber and products New England's rise was greater; in leather and leather products, New England increased its jobs, whereas the South Atlantic States experienced a decline. In the highly productive and growing industries, only in transportation equipment was New England's rise in excess of the South Atlantic States—79.5 and 68.6 percent, respectively. In total employment also, for these same years, 1947 to 1953, the South's rise of employment was substantially greater than that for New England, the Middle Atlantic States, and manufacturing employment in the three southern regions exceeded that for the Nation.

These figures support the point that the South is gradually moving into high-wage industries and hence the restrictiveness of minimum wages is likely to be relatively limited.

An examination of percentage changes in value added per production worker by industries also supports this general position. Thus, for the 10 industries for which figures are available, the percentage rise of value added per worker is greater for the South Atlantic industries than for New England for exactly one-half of the industries—both for 1939–53 and 1947–53. This is a remarkable record for a newly industrialized area.

The Technology of Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the vital question of automation and its effects on the lives of every American is one to which we must give increasing thought and consideration. I respectfully call the attention of the Congress to an excellent speech on the subject by Mr. Ted Silvey of the CIO which was given at a conference on automation sponsored by the Union County Industrial Council of Linden, N. J., last month:

THE TECHNOLOGY OF AUTOMATION

(By Ted F. Silvey)

Manufacturing and business spokesmen assert that the new technology being called automation is really nothing very much, it's just more of what we've had, and there needn't be any concern about overproduction, about losing one's job, about extensive unemployment. While this idea is repeated too much, the statement could be true if we were automatically intelligent enough in our social organization properly to apply our new science and technology for human betterment.

Actually there are some substantially new and different things impacting on us rather rapidly at this time. So the approach I want to make is that the word "automation" does stand for new things in our technology in two ways.

1. The intensification and speeding up of processes with which we have been more or less familiar, and

2. The electronic applications which are quite new and which are making quite substantial differences in our mass production industry.

When changes occur at great speed even with familiar things, the rapid change makes the old things actually new. All the new things affect the trade-union movement—the impact of this whole new technology on our membership and the challenge of it to us in our collective bargaining and public responsibilities.

When we use this word "technology," we mean the combination and operation of four things in an efficient organization:

1. Human effort and intelligence called labor;

2. Energy resources in addition to human and animal muscle power;

3. Machinery and instruments; and

4. Organization and management of extraction and production in high volume—all applied to the basic resources in the earth provided by a beneficent Creator.

UNIONS STIMULATE TECHNOLOGY

Historically, the working people of the United States have themselves been very inventive; a great many of the things that we have in our mass production industry came from the work bench, devised from the worker's own mind. In addition, trade unions as organized forces in society have required employers to pay more nearly adequate wages. When employers have had to pay higher wages they quickly sought ways to eliminate waste and to reduce costs. Under pressure of the labor movement that more decent wages should be paid, employers have had to hump themselves because they wouldn't both allow waste in their factories and pay high wages. As long as wages were low, they could make the workers pay for the waste, but when wages got to be high the additional costs came out of their pockets. This has forced employers to accept new technology and develop ways of reducing costs and increasing output to reduce the unit cost of direct labor.

Automation is being called a second industrial revolution. The word "revolution" means a change so sudden and violent that it upsets and disorganizes stable or orderly society. CIO unions can help control automation and its applications so it will make progress possible without disastrous results to workers, in fact be for the benefit of workers and all of society.

The CIO can view this big new technology without panic because it is a strong labor movement. In past times when workers tried to destroy machinery for fear the machinery would destroy their jobs, the action came because there was no labor movement or a weak and ineffective one. Because we now have a labor movement which can have some voice in the decisions that are made about these matters, we don't need to get panicky or hysterical. We can sit down and work out these things together with other elements in the society. We do not look with disapproval upon the new technology, but we say—because its impact is going to be considerable—we intend to go down the road and meet this new thing, take it by the hand, and help lead it in the direction that will be useful for all of society.

PRESIDENT REUTHER'S STATEMENTS

In his strong and forthright letter of last March 11 to Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks our CIO President Walter Reuther wrote:

"Automation must be met sanely and constructively so that the miracle of mass production—and the ever greater economic abundance made possible by automation—can find expression in the lives of people through improved economic security and a fuller share of happiness and human dignity.

"Sensibly, rationally, scientifically we intend to harness this radical new force in our lives, using its potential to produce an era in which well-being, justice, and peace will be the universal possession of all mankind. * * * Economic abundance is now within our grasp if we but have the good sense to use our resources and technology, fully and effectively, within a framework of economic policies that are morally right and socially responsible."

And in a newspaper article President Reuther revealed additionally the CIO breadth of view that the new technology in application must be of benefit for more than the few:

"It is my belief, and that of my colleagues in the CIO, that we must initiate effective action to guarantee a constant increase in mass purchasing power. Pay increases, higher pensions, and social security benefits, a rise in minimum wages, efforts to make certain that the farmers receive fair incomes, a distribution of tax burdens on a more equitable basis—all these steps will help to assure a stabilized reservoir of purchasing power during the transition years that lie ahead."

So unlike the situation when French workers threw their wooden shoes—their sabots—into the new looms to keep them from operating, we are not interested in sabotage. There is great promise in this new thing—with a strong labor movement to share in seeing that automation's promise of widespread abundance is made a reality for the benefit of people.

Traditionally labor unions have been concerned with in-plant, on-the-job problems of workers as producers. Now, in addition to this, unions even more will have to extend their activities to the concern of workers as consumers and citizens—not only with respect to their wage income but also their leisure time and a great many public and community questions.

ABUNDANCE, BUT NOT ENOUGH WISDOM

We are approaching the time when it can quite literally and truly be said that no one in the world need be short of the things that are necessary to make a good life. Those of you who know this special edition of Saturday Review magazine, issue of last January 22—a copy of which is included in the Elizabeth Public Library display on the table back there—will find this paragraph in the editorial:

"There is now scientific knowledge and experience which could within a short time be made to feed every human being on earth and supply the raw energy needed to work his machines. * * * An age of plenty for the living is now technologically possible and feasible. The only thing lacking to bring it about is wisdom."

We in the labor movement still have as our main concern the question of universal full employment, and this question of full employment continues to be primary under the new technology when workers can and will be displaced from their traditional jobs more rapidly and in greater numbers than may have been true before. Therefore the questions facing the labor movement and society in the application of the new technology are phrased very aptly by an automation expert, a computer scientist named Edmund Berkeley, who in his book, Giant Brains, says:

"Two questions hang like swords over a great many people these days. The first one is for any employee: What shall I do when a robot machine renders worthless all the skill I have spent years in developing? The second question is for any businessman: How shall I sell what I make if half the people to whom I sell lose their jobs to robot machines?"

I often say, especially in talks I give before businessmen's groups: The machines can do everything except buy what they make; it takes money in people's pockets in good volume all the year through to ring cash registers. And, of course, to businessmen there is no more beautiful symphony than constantly ringing cash registers. It means that goods are moving off the shelves into the homes and lives of the people to create a standard of living, that orders are being placed with jobbers and wholesalers, who in turn are placing orders with factories, which then hire labor, buy material, use transportation and other services, to create what we in the CIO call a full-employment pattern with a healthy economic circulation.

AUTOMATION DEFINED

But I cannot indulge myself more in the social and economic consequences of the new technology. The afternoon program will present questions and discussion about collective bargaining problems, the guaranteed annual wage, the shorter work week, and other relevant questions. My assignment is to tell what the new technology is. In doing this, I must use some unfamiliar words, some new words not yet in the dictionary, but which are appearing in many of the technical magazine articles and books, and which we need to know as we advance through automation to the new technological future.

There are a number of quite good definitions of automation but the shortest and the most complete one I know is by Prof. H. W. Wilson, of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. I quote it:

"Automation is the accomplishment of a work task by an integrated, power-driven mechanism entirely without the direct application of human energy, skill, intelligence, or control."

I think that's a very good definition. There are some longer ones. You will find a longer one in the CIO booklet, Automation, a copy of which is in your packet.

Now, the word "cybernetics." This is a Greek word meaning "steersman," revived in 1948 and given a special modern meaning by Prof. Norbert Wiener, of Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Beyond the idea of merely guiding a boat, the word embraces a whole new concept called the theory of communication. Once we understand this concept of conveying information by mathematical methods, we can go on to talk about the way machines are controlled without human beings running them.

Dr. Wiener writes in his book, The Human Use of Human Beings:

"We ordinarily think of communication and of language as being directed from person to person. However, it is quite possible for a person to talk to a machine, a machine to a person, and a machine to a machine."

To comprehend the basic idea of automation, it is necessary to understand cybernetics, the theory of communication or the ways by which to convey information. To illustrate that idea, let me put it in terms with which we in the shop are familiar.

FROM DESIGN TO PRODUCT

Every factory worker knows that in a production system, a mechanic follows a blueprint. A blueprint contains the information that needs to be transferred to raw material. The original design or concept in the designer's mind is drawn in lines and diagrams on a blueprint. The mechanic, the worker, then reads the lines, the information, on the blueprint, passes it through his mind and through his nervous system, applying his muscles and his body skill on tools and machinery to translate the information from the blueprint onto the piece of material which he is working. This operation is the transfer or conveying of information from a designer to a piece of material through an hourly rated worker in a production system. A factory is a place where this operation is repeated over and over again; each time it is performed the hourly rated worker adds to his earnings.

The new technology, instead of putting the information on a blueprint for a worker repetitively to process, puts it, for example, by punched holes in a tape and then feeds that tape into a servo-mechanism, which makes the machine perform in exactly the same way that a skilled human worker would make the machine perform—that is, put the information on the blueprint into cuts and dimensions on a piece of material. (Servo is from the Latin "servus" meaning slave, hence slave-mechanism.)

The information in the mind of a designer or engineer is put on a punched tape (or it may be put on a punched card, magnetic tape, film, or other carrier) and fed through a servo-mechanism into a producing machine. The machine can perform over and over and over again. It is true that human beings are needed to make the design, to lay out the production program, and to cut the holes in the tape according to the pattern that's needed. Once that is done, however,

the tape can be fed through again and again and again, continually, to produce the article many, many thousands of times, doing it steadily and accurately, without mistakes and at high speed.

The difference between this process and the worker making a part is that the worker has to do it repetitively, hour by hour, over and over again. But with a servo-mechanism, human beings are needed only once, and after that the operation is constantly repetitive as long as the power is on. Does this make clear that cybernetics is the theory of communication or the conveying of information and that automation becomes the performance of "a work task * * * without the direct application of human energy, skill, intelligence, or control"?

PICTURE OF MATHEMATICS

We need to think about this only a couple of seconds to realize that the hourly rated worker isn't needed constantly to repeat an operation over and over again, once the basic tape cutting or programing has set up the instructions to run through the servo-mechanism to the machine.

All this is accomplished by mathematics. This mathematics is difficult and complicated, which I will not attempt to explain except to make one simple illustration. I'm sure all of you are familiar with charts and graphs. A vertical line stands for one bit of information, a bottom connecting horizontal line stands for another bit of information. Then a variable line shows still other information as it is read up or down in relation to the vertical line, and backward or forward in relation to the horizontal line. So when we look at such a chart, we really are looking at a picture of mathematical information.

If I were to draw you a chart right here, I'd make a straight vertical line, and call it daily birth rate. Then I'd draw a horizontal line and call it year 1955. For each day of the year I'd place a figure to show how many thousands of babies are born, raising or lowering the column (on a scale so as not to go through the ceiling). When we have those figures correctly listed on the vertical scale for each day's births of babies in America, we then draw a line across the top of the columns of figures which would show the curve of births for the year. A constantly increasing birthrate, as we have now, would show the line going up. If there were some periods in the year when the number of babies born were fewer, then for that period the line would go down. This is a mathematical computation translated into a picture, which is a chart. We do this for wage rates, for hours of work, for cost of living, for exposure of camera film, we do it for 10,000 different things, and we are familiar with it.

But I make this explanation even of a familiar thing to show you that it's a picture of mathematical information and that the same thing is done to change information into mathematics to teach a machine how to perform production operations. An example of this applied in a production line is the Ford Motor Co.'s body painting operations in its new plant at Milpitas, Calif., near the southern tip of San Francisco Bay. A normal operation for painting a car body is for a workman with a spray gun in his hand to move about, holding the spray gun 6 or 7 inches away from the car body as he follows the contours and lines and curves, always making sure that the amount of paint that gets on the body is correct, according to the way he holds his spray gun.

In this new automobile plant at Milpitas ("Automation is extended further here than in any other assembly plant," says the plant engineer) they've worked out this operation mathematically so that the spray gun can be mechanically held and be directed to move to follow the pattern of the contours and lines and curves of the car body without the need of an hourly rated worker to perform the job. This is the application of a tool to a mathematical pattern. The movement of the mechanically held spray guns follows the mathematical pattern in multiple movement which is the shape of an automobile body, like the line on the chart I described is the shape of the birthrate.

The human worker is thus displaced. In some of the older automobile plants, adaptation of methods for paint spraying of fenders or parts of bodies permits 1 man to operate 6 spray guns to paint 6 automobile fenders at the same time, but paint each one a different color. That's the reason why it has been possible to get these mustard yellow and carnation pink combinations of car colors that are on the market today.

CHANGE AND SOCIAL LAG

Now I want to talk a little bit about the history of production, so we may get ourselves located. One of the phenomena of our lifetime is the rate of speed with which we can travel. Do you realize that for unnumbered milleniums men traveled at 4 miles an hour?—the speed at which a person can walk. And then, in the early days of this century we progressed in just a very short time from moving 4 miles an hour to about 40 miles an hour. Since then we have succeeded in traveling at a speed that breaks the sound barrier—faster than sound itself can travel through the air.

In the presence of such phenomenal technology, society is called upon, and we as individuals in society are called upon, to make changes to adapt our lives to the new technology. Our failure, our unwillingness, our holding back, to make the social and economic changes that are forced upon us by everything that's in this new technology is cultural lag. Our problem is this unwillingness to change our patterns of government, of industrial relations, of education, of the whole business of living, to bring up to date the patterns of social institutions to meet the impact and the consequences of this technology in many ways, quite aside from transportation.

Our struggle, our fight in the labor movement, our devotion to seeing that this thing that's new is for the benefit of mankind, is to help make the adjustments and the changes that the new technology is bringing. I just want to throw in this thought because it's the whole point of this conference, and of our whole work in these new matters. That's the reason why collective bargaining sessions, workers' education programs, political action committees, become highly important to those of us who are active in the labor movement.

TREMENDOUS ENERGY RESOURCES

In talking about the evolution of technology, we have to start with energy. The first energy that man had is the energy that God created him with, muscle power. Man's power physically was the muscle power of himself and of animals. During many centuries man has learned to harness water power, wind power, by burning coal to make steam power, by distilling petroleum to get oil and gasoline, by harnessing steam and falling water to make electric power, and finally in our day to release atomic power. During thousands of years we have progressed so that we have great new energy forces.

Man originally had only his bare hands to use his muscle. So he made simple tools. He made weapons. He used a lever as an early tool to raise an object. He invented a wheel. He devised the hitch so that an animal could be tied to a burden to move it beyond man's capacity. Then of course he made the simple hand tools like hoe and sickle, chisel and saw, drill and plane. But eventually, in the development of technology, men made machines, which are tools more complicated than one you hold in your hand. We called them "labor-saving" devices.

So we inherited machines like the loom and the flour mill and the printing press and the screw machine, and many, many others. All these are tools, all of them extend man's muscle power. We can say a tool is an extension of a man's hand, and a machine is a complex tool. But tools and machines must have energy other than muscle power. A giant forging press is a tool; no man is strong enough to put the needed power into that fist which is the head of the forge, so we do it with electric power.

AFTER MACHINES, INSTRUMENTS

After tools and machines to extend man's muscle power we devised instruments to extend man's perceptive senses—extend and take the place of his judgment. We have the simple instruments like a thermometer and a light meter. The instrument, in many complex applications, does for man's perceptive senses what the tool, the machine, do for his muscular ability. Men now are able to do things that they've never been able to do within the limitations of their senses.

For example, a man in charge of an aluminum continuous strip mill has the ability to do something that is physically impossible—look in front of him and look behind him, both at the same time, because he's got to see the strip coming toward and going from his high cage over the strip. If anything goes wrong he has to be able to control the situation through instruments under his fingers. How can a man see in front of him and behind him at the same time? By a camera and televisionscope—a combination of instruments!

For years men have gone through railroad yards to check the names and numbers of boxcars. It's a nasty job, out in all weather, at night and by day, and in winter a man has to write with cold fingers. But now, with closed circuit television it's possible for the camera to scan the cars as they move through the freight yard. The man can sit in a warm office and as the cars go past the camera, he can write down the names and the numbers. But the man himself can be replaced by taking pictures of the names and numbers on film for distribution of the cars to the various departing trains.

Instruments increase man's sensory abilities and his perceptive judgment. I could give you many illustrations of this, and you can think of a lot of them yourselves, so it's not necessary for me to elaborate. I do though, like to tell you one, which you will remember from reading the comic strip, Dick Tracy. In the February panels Dick Tracy was having a time with a guy named Rughead, who had been wounded, but escaped only to trap himself inside of a sewer that had an iron grating over the exit. The sewer curved away from the entrance. Tracy and his cops weren't sure whether Rughead was dead or alive, and it was too much of a risk for the detectives to go in after him because he might be alive and shoot them. So they devised a small wooden raft which they controlled with two lines. They mounted a television camera on it with one of those lenses that takes pictures in the dark, and then they safely remained outside the sewer entrance as they floated the television camera right up to Rughead's face and saw he was dead. So it was safe to go in after him.

This illustrates that instruments make it possible for men to do what is physically impossible to do through use of their own limited sensory perceptions. There are thousands of applications of this kind of thing. Some men used to read heat in steel mills, foundries, pottery kinls, etc. Now instruments replace that skill, and are much more accurate.

What I'm explaining is that by putting together machines and instruments technol-

ogy is marrying man's muscle power and his perceptive senses, putting them together in equipment to make counterpart of a human worker and giving that equipment all the skill that the human worker has. Even more skill than the human worker has, because the instruments and the machines can always perform without distractions, and they don't vary or make mistakes. They can break down, but as long as they're operating they do the work exactly right. The instruments and machines are without human relations, and they have no feelings; they don't complain and bring up grievances, they don't want coffee breaks, they don't even have to go to the john. One plant manager has been quoted as saying: "The only trouble with a factory is the people."

PRIO-PERCEPTION IN A MACHINE

Now I'd like to move you to a still further item of the new technology. This is something that comes under a word the psychologists use—prio-perception. Prio-perception means the ability of a human being to make judgments about what's going to happen in a situation and then adjust himself to meet what's going to happen even before it takes place. I can illustrate that best by a man playing baseball. There's a centerfielder out on the ball diamond. A batter sends a long fly toward centerfield. The centerfielder looks constantly at the ball, estimates its height, calculates its speed, determines where it's going to fall, and adjusts the movements of his body by running, twisting, jumping, so that he'll be under that ball when it falls. This is prio-perception in a man.

Now, what is prio-perception in a piece of manufacturing equipment? The situation is that the machine must be able to know what's going to happen next. The early development of this type of equipment came during World War II, worked out by Dr. Norbert Wiener and some of his mathematical colleagues at MIT and Harvard. The device was a mechanism for an antiaircraft gun. An enemy plane was in the air. We had a gun on the ground. Radar transmitted information back from the plane to the gun. The gun had a computing instrument within it that would instruct it to be ready for what the airplane was going to do next and be on target to shoot accurately. So a mechanism took information by radar from the airplane in the air, fed it to the gun on the ground, and calculated the aim instantly by electronics, enabling the gun to stay on target. Prio-perception was given to a machine.

This process now has been translated or transferred into production machinery. There is a complicated machine, but at a certain point the drills are going to break or the milling cutters are going to be too dull. Something's going to happen. The machine's got to know in advance of its happening. And so the information about what's going to happen next is able to be transmitted by the machine to itself, just like a human operator can tell by heat or color of metal or something else what's going to happen and make the correction in time to prevent a breakdown. One way of doing this is by electronics. There are other ways, but I want to dwell on the electronic method because that's the one that is most significant for automation.

FLOW—CUT AND FIT

Now I've got to explain, in order to make this fully clear, the two kinds of industries in America. One is the continuous process or flow industry, and the other is the cut-and-fit industry.

The continuous process or flow industry is an industry generally built up around things that a worker can't hold in his hand. Gases, liquids, and so forth. Oil refining, chemical operations, sugar extraction from cane or beets, flour milling, starch making, paper manufacturing, baking and candy-making—these are manufacturing processes which handle fluids, gases, sludges, liquids, powders, and so forth. A system of pipes and valves and pumps operate to handle and control what is being worked on.

At every point along the line instruments advise what is happening to the material in process. An array of different instruments is located in the process as the work goes along, to tell whether it's of the right viscosity, of the right temperature, of the right speed, of the right level, and many other things. When each bit of information is sent back to the control board, if there's anything wrong, correction is made at once, either by an observing operator, or automatically, depending on the degree of automation. Thus the great variety of products are obtained from petroleum, and high speed and accurate processing is possible in the chemical industries, in sugar refining, in paper making, and so forth.

This continuous process replaced the original batch method, the taking of a raw lot of petroleum, heating it and by distillation obtaining ether and chloroform, various grades of gasoline, kerosene, greases, paraffin, and waxes, down to the residue, out of which was made a variety of products. Now, with continuous process or flow, the batch method is completely out of date. Through instruments, control and correction occurs in rapid sequence, eleminating the time lag between taking a sample from the batch, carrying it to the laboratory, testing it, and making manual correction.

This means that these flow industries have been and are constantly increasing their output with a diminishing number of working people, or with an insignificantly small increase of workers.

The other type of industry is the one I call the cut-and-fit method. This is the one that uses materials the worker can hold in his hand. Wood, metal, rubber, leather, fabric, and so forth. Each operation of cutting and fitting is a trivial thing. But the combination of all the trivial things makes possible the finished article.

INDIVIDUAL OPERATIONS TRIVIAL

Prof. Adam Abruzzi, at Stevens Institute of Technology, has set forth that the last half century of more and more assembly line production and industrial rationalization has reduced factory operations to trivial tasks, which makes automation possible in the cut-and-fit industries.

Dr. Abruzzi states:

"Rationalized production methods, rationalized materials handling techniques, and rationalized production plans and schedules, is precisely what makes automation possible. It is mass-production techniques that give production processes the required flow characteristics, not machines. * * * What might have been crafts at one time are simply not crafts any longer. Looking back from the present, these activities are seen to be a simple sum of trivial tasks."

Here I am, standing before a nice, new lectern. It has apparently been recently made because the wood is still bright and new, and unpainted. The carpenter who made it took the lumber and by a series of trivial operations in proper sequence completed the job.

The mass-production system in America over the last 60 years has reduced cut-and-fit operations to the smallest units, and put them on machines. That's the reason why a worker on an assembly line performs repetitive operations, over and over and over. This method of work is dull, deadening, uninteresting, altogether an uninspiring kind of way to spend one's daily work life. But the system of thus breaking down the operations has made it possible for the cut-and-fit industries to be transformed and changed into continuous flow industry. Thus, anything in the manufacturing process that can be performed in a groove operation—by that I mean doing it over and over again the same way—can be given to an automatic machine to do and displace a worker.

This is a good thing because a human being is a very wonderful piece of mechanism, and a worker deserves to spend the good hours of his life doing something more interesting, more constructive, more useful than dropping a pin in a hole, pushing two pieces of metal together and inserting a bolt, turning on a nut, and doing it all day long. But the economic and social question is: What happens to the worker when the machine does what he used to do? Even though the work was dull and uninteresting, he got paid wages for doing it. Automation equipment makes him a displacee from his former job, and the new problem comes into focus. How shall he continue to be a useful member of society and earn an income which will enable him to purchase the products of automation?

TRANSFER MACHINE—DETROIT AUTOMATION

Detroit automation is that part of the new technology which involves the use of the transfer machine. Developed in the automobile industry, the best-advertised transfer machine is the huge one in the Brooks Park engine plant of the Ford Motor Co. near Cleveland, which does all the machining operations on an engine block. A UAW–CIO steward in that plant is reported to have said:

"Under manual production 400 workers turn out a finished engine block in 40 minutes. * * * Under automation 48 workers turn out a finished engine block in 18 minutes."

This reduction in direct labor cost comes from use of the transfer machine.

Heretofore, and currently in most factories, individual machines and operators perform individual operations on a piece of stock—stamping, shearing, sawing, drilling, tapping, milling, planing, champfering, countersinking, honing, and so forth, moving work in process manually in tote boxes, on pallets or rigs, in carts and tubs, sometimes on overhead or lateral conveyers. Chips, shavings, and scrap fall at each machine and are cleared away periodically.

The transfer machine telescopes all the machining operations in a continuous flow with the transfer of the work in process being accomplished by the machine itself. The raw stock is locked on a pallet which is part of the machine. Until it is unlocked and moved to assembly operation it will move through 15 to 50 operating stations—in some of the more spectacular large machines, through hundreds of stations. One transfer machine is described to be "as long as a football field * * * performs 540 machining operations * * * run by one man; present methods require 35 to 75 workers for a similar production pace." The same article describes a bigger-than-a-house tool that machines the housing for a jet turbine in 10 minutes under one man's control. Conventionally, this job takes 5 men 2½ hours.

Once work is locked on a pallet, the machine carries it through the stations, at each of which a different operation is performed. The first station may drill holes, the second station may start a tap, third station will finish the tap (some operations have to be broken down to a timing sequence) and so forth. When all the pallet-locked pieces come into position for a particular operation, there is something called indexing. Every one of the pallets is locked into perfect position—"precise placement" is the term—so that the mechanisms can move up to perform the job to be done on the piece at the station. And when they all lock into position, if there are say 42 stations on the machine, then 42 tools move in—many of them multiple headed so that

2 to 6 spindles work at once on 1 tool. These multiple-head spindles and other tools move in, perform the functions in perfect register (i. e., relation to every other function) so that the holes are going to line up, slots and grooves will match, screws will all go in properly, and so forth.

Any piece of work that goes through a transfer machine can have a maximum of 6 faces—a top and a bottom, a front and a back, and 2 ends. The transfer machine can turn and rotate the work as it goes through by means of dials and trunnions. In turning it around and turning it over no human being has to place the work in relation to the cutting tool because it's always perfectly done, automatically. So the work makes the whole rotation, through and around the line, and comes out finished. An operator has locked it on, the same operator takes it off and throws it onto the belt to carry it to the assembly. But the operator also can be displaced, part of automation is self-handling, and self-inspection at the time the work is done.

Remember the chips and shavings that had to be gathered up periodically and carried away? The transfer machine has its own disposal mechanism which carries away these bits and in the process washes or cleans the coolant and sends it back for use again.

RELATIONSHIP OF ELECTRONICS

Things happen to a machine like this when it's in operation. Drills get dull, tools are liable to break, cutting faces will have a fault. First of all it's necessary to engineer tools as nearly perfect as possible, then assign them a life span of work, but there must be immediate warning when anything goes wrong. So there is a control board; a message about the condition of the tool is sent back electronically to the control board for the information of the operator. The notifying system built into the transfer machine makes a judgment about the work, exercising perceptive senses just as a skilled worker would do.

Some of the larger transfer machines have banking systems, so when one station is down for tool change, all the other stations continue to operate, the work accumulates into a "bank" in front of the station that is down, and picks up work in the "bank" after the station that is down.

Now I must explain what electronics is and how it functions in Automation, and then I'm going on to say something about computers.

The April 8 issue of the New York Times carries a piece by its able labor reporter A. H. Raskin. He opens his article:

"The electron is doing more to revolutionize American industry than atomic energy. Automation—the harnessing of electronic brains to mechanical muscle—is making normal concepts of mass production obsolete."

An adding machine is a mechanical operation. Almost everybody knows how an adding machine works. There is a keyboard with figures on it; there are gears which carry figures, arranged on edge on an axle. Press figures on the keyboard, pull the handle and gears rotate in sequence. Answers show up on the dial face. * * * This is also the mechanism of a speedometer dial on an automobile dashboard, actuated by a flexible shaft from the front wheel. The first gear runs the second, the second the third, and so forth. This is mechanics, which operates quite slowly.

Electronics replaces mechanics by doing the calculations that the gears do but doing it with tremendous speed—in millionths of a second, a speed almost impossible for us to comprehend.

Electronics is an energy. Electrons are made by heating a wire with electricity. Off such a heated wire electrons fly in all directions, of no use to anybody. The vacuum tube is a control for electrons. In England, they call a radio tube a valve—a truer word for the function. Inside a radio tube, a vacuum tube, or electronic valve, are wires (they have special names) and a grid. The direction and use of electrons is controlled by the various kinds of tubes. They do many things—detect or select, amplify, rectify, operate as a relay to open and close circuits, and many things. The special item to note is the tremendous speed of operation. A series of tubes in proper sequence enables an instrument to do something which is the counterpart of the human brain in operation. It can make decisions. * * * This is important, but just hold that point for a minute while I talk about something called open loop and the closed loop systems.

"OPEN LOOP" * * * "CLOSED LOOP"

The open loop system is a manual system. We decide that it's too dark in this room, so we pull the switch that turns on the light. That's open loop because there has been an open space in the conveying of information, which was filled by a person pulling the switch. A closed loop system is the kind where one doesn't have to pull the switch manually. It's a self-controlling system. It takes the result of an operation or the "output" and gages or judges it and then sends a feedback to the "input" and makes a correction by itself, eliminating the need for a man.

This also can be illustrated again by a human function, this time driving an automobile along the highway. You're in your car, driving down the road. You come to a curve, you see the curve, and what your eyes tell your brain is to instruct your hand to turn the wheel. But you can't turn the wheel perfectly to match the curve. You always either overturn or underturn. If you overturn and stay overturned you're going to be off the side of the road into the ditch. If you underturn and stay that way you're going to go across the white line into the approaching traffic lane. So, as soon as you have turned the wheel and discern that you have overturned or underturned, you make a self-correction—automatically, you don't even think about it. You turn slightly back or slightly forward. This is self-correction or feedback.

Now when that quality is given to a machine, and it's done now by electronics, it is possible for the machine to make a judgment about the work it did, the output, and decide whether it's right or wrong and if it's wrong, feed back information to the input and correct it instantly. That's what goes on in the petroleum refinery, that's what goes on in a transfer machine, that's what goes on by the new technology in application to production. Taking the manual, muscle skills of a person, adding to them the perceptive senses, putting them together in a mechanism and replacing the skills of a man thereby. This is automation.

BRAIN THEORY AND COMPUTERS

Now I must speak of the computer. A great new instrument of the new technology is called a computer. Here I have to talk a moment about the theory of how the brain works. When I visited Dr. Wiener at Cambridge over 10 years ago, he told me about this feedback mechanism in its earlier stages of development, including something I never forgot. The human brain, he said, is thought to function by saying "Yes" and "No" constantly, and saying it with lightning speed. So that really everything we do includes these multitude of decisions of our brain—saying "Yes" or "No," "Yes" or "No," "Yes" or "No." I decide to wave my finger back and forth. My brain is functioning on this operation, so I say don't do it and I stop. You change your weight in a chair—anything you do, your brain says "Yes" or "No." There's a lot of brain theory research going on and I can't carry the point any further than this.

If, then, an instrument can be made to say "Yes" or "No" it can act like the decision functions of the brain, it being necessary only for a human first to set up the possibilities on which decisions are required for the mechanical operations to be carried out. Thus, the computer is given a choice of possible alternatives. A mechanical calculator is too slow, it cannot operate rapidly enough to be useful in programing machine production. Gears, cams, shafts, pulleys, wheels—these are all mechanical, they are too slow.

The Weather Bureau technicians have all the information they need to know what the weather is going to be on an early future date but it's no good for a man in the Weather Bureau to sit down with a mechanical calculator and calculate all those factors about next Wednesday, and in 1959 finally complete all the calculations to discover that May 4 is going to be a cold, cloudy, rainy day. The calculation took him too many years; it's of no use.

Now with an electronic computer all the essential information can be quickly fed in; once all the factors are provided, the electronic computer can work the complex mathematical problems in seconds and minutes. Years and years of mechanical calculation of mathematical problems can be telescoped into a few minutes of electronic computation, and the answers can be known right away.

The new electronic computer the Weather Bureau just installed is going to help perform weather forecasting in new and wonderful ways. This new calculation will be of great economic value; department stores will not run ads for sales on days when it's going to rain cats and dogs and the women won't come downtown to buy. A union picnic can be scheduled on a pleasant day. But most of the impact of more complete and more precise weather forecasting will be in agricultural production, already an area in which technology has produced surpluses.

COMPUTERS FAST WITH INFORMATION

Computers are called analog computers and digital computers, they are made to measure and to count. By counting I mean adding, subtracting, dividing, and multiplying. An IBM machine can do over 16,000 additions and subtractions in 1 second—in 1 second, through a series of electron tubes or valves. Current technology is developing the replacement of the tubes with transistors, not much bigger than the eraser on a wooden lead pencil, which performs the same functions with a small fraction of the electric current used by a tube so they do not get hot; consequently do not require elaborate cooling devices.

How do engineers know how heavy to make the frame of an airplane, a big DC–6, so when a pilot banks it in the air the frame isn't going to fracture and the whole thing crash to the earth? They have to calculate all this mathematically. There have to be literally millions and millions of problems worked out to find right answers. So with production problems, including servomechanisms on factory machines, there are millions of calculations to make. They can be done miraculously fast with an electronic computer.

The functioning of the electronic computers makes possible quickly to be done things which heretofore men could not live long enough to do. Human judgment is replaced in its routine performances, mathematical information is accelerated in transmission to machines, which can do alone what formerly they needed a human operator to guide them in doing. Just let me mention the telephone dial system because we have some CWA people here.

The telephone dial system is an electronic digital computer on a nationwide scale. Every subscriber eventually will get 2 letters and 5 figures for a telephone number. With 2 letters and 5 figures one can dial or program a telephone; a human being is

not needed to carry out the instructions. For example, if your number is ORegon 3–4774 in New York, and you want to phone TRiangle 4–7765 in Arizona, you now place a call manually with an operator who gets a trunk and puts it through. Under the universal digital computer operation, when every telephone in America has the 2 letters and the 5 figures, anybody who wants to make a phone call will just dial and the electronic searching system will find that telephone wherever it is on the continent. It will not only ring the bell, thus saying "Yes" to that instrument, but it will say "No" to every other telephone in America. That's how the electronic computer works.

Not only will a telephone ring the number dialed, but also it will compute everything about the telephone call. It will record the date of the call, the hour of the day the call was made, the number the call started from, the number the call was received by, how many minutes the call lasted, whether it was day, or night, and Sunday rate, and what the cost is for the total amount of time talked. And then it'll stamp it all on your bill and a bookkeeper won't even need to figure it. It'll come in the mail to you and you pay.

OFFICE WORK AUTOMATED ALSO

Many of the things that can be done with the electronic computer in this new technology are clerical work of all kinds. One of these elaborate computations that takes lots of man-hours in a factory is production scheduling. At 10 o'clock in the morning on a certain future date, the plant is going to run out of material or a part. If that material or part is not on hand, the whole assembly line will have to shutdown. So a very elaborate system of computation exists to know that always the material, components, and parts needed are on hand to keep the assembly line running. They must be ordered, allowance made for lead time, consideration taken whether they're being delivered from Idaho or Alabama or Massachusetts. They've got to be on hand in sufficient quantity to keep production going. This is a terribly elaborate mathematical problem to work out, and thousands of people work on production scheduling. The machines will do this for them.

Warehouse and department store inventories can be kept without so many people doing the paper work. Department stores do all kinds of elaborate calculations to keep inventory of goods in proper condition, hundreds and thousands of items. The machine will do it quickly. In fact, the National Cash Register Corp. has developed such a machine; when an article is sold, the sales clerk rings up not only her number and the amount, but also rings up the information about the article from coded information on the tag, which feeds right into the computer. Then the computer tells the buyer he has to buy this item now because the stocks is low.

Also involved is the whole question of insurance work—thousands of insurance workers now engage in actuarial calculations, premium billing and collection, agents commissions, claims settlement. These people can be replaced by electronic computers. Also railroad car work and freight billing, payroll work, utility customer billing. The Commonwealth Edison Co. in Chicago is renting an IBM computer for $29,000 a month which will replace 200 people. The workers there call it "the Monster." Beginning in July it will calculate 45,000 bills a day, without making mistakes. In this instance, the 200 people will get other job assignments in the company, but obviously new hiring will be reduced.

The electronic computer is not really a brain, but rather like a spinal cord. A human being must tell it what to do. After this programing is completed, the computer continues to handle the regular problems with tremendous speed. Payroll work is another example. A plant with more than 8,000 workers with an electronic computer does all payroll calculation and writes all payroll checks in about 2 hours a week.

So the impact of automation will be substantial on white collar workers as well as factory workers. Some of these jobs also are onerous, and will be a relief for people not to have to do them, providing they can obtain other employment.

There are great changes to be faced in collective bargaining, in work scheduling, in re-training of displaced workers, in new job classifications and wage rates. Then all the larger issues have to be considered and the problems solved—the guaranteed annual wage, the shorter work week, full employment and the growth rate of the economy, distribution of the tremendous volume of products unemployment compensation and earlier retirement, the new occupations. The speakers this afternoon will address you on some of these questions.

WEALTH AVAILABLE FOR ADJUSTMENTS

I wish I had time to explain the cost reduction and new wealth formation that automation will accomplish. While it is true many of the technological changes require large capital outlay for engineering and equipment, the cost reduction and increased output make rapid amortization possible. So the investment capital is cheaper, and the new equipment is quickly paid for. Then more and more production can flow at low cost. With reduced costs and increased output there will be vast amounts of new wealth to pay for the adjustments for displaced workers and for the whole society which will be necessary if this great technology is to serve human needs.

Our responsibility is continuing consideration of the impact and the challenge that this new technology brings to us. Relatively fewer production workers in factories will be needed, but they will produce a great deal more than production workers have ever produced before. The employment patterns of society will change. More people will have employment in nonprofit and public enterprise jobs. People who will not work in factories will have to find work in all kinds of other occupations, and factory workers whose jobs have been destroyed, whose skills have been replaced, will have to find new work. The use and enjoyment of leisure time will raise new questions and problems.

I spoke of cultural lag. I said that cultural lag was the inability or unwillingness of society to make the institutional changes in the process of living together that technology forces on us. Therefore many stresses and strains are set up. The problems that come and the ways of solving them will, I assure you, make life very interesting for the next 10 years. And the CIO, I can also assure you, will be right in there working on these things, not only through collective bargaining, but through political action, through legislative work, through education, through community organization, and all the other areas of relationship of members of CIO Unions to the society of which we are a democratic part.

Mr. Pierce Gerety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon Mr. Pierce Gerety was sworn in as Deputy Administrator for the Refugee Relief Program.

Mr. Gerety is a resident of Connecticut and is a member of the Connecticut bar.

I have had the pleasure of knowing Pierce Gerety for several years and as a result, I am well aware of his great mental ability and his outstanding good character.

Pierce Gerety will do a good job in his new assignment as he has done with respect to every task which he has undertaken.

It should not be expected that overnight Mr. Gerety can quiet all the complaints about the administration of the Refugee Relief Act, for it is clear that the act itself needs revision and improvement.

The important thing right now for the American people is that the administration of this important law is in good hands.

Pierce Gerety is the kind of man who gets along well with other human beings, and as Deputy to Mr. Scott McLeod, we can expect that both of these men will work in harmony to fulfill the objectives of the law.

The following editorial appeared recently in the Bridgeport Post, and I include it as a tribute from that great newspaper to Pierce Gerety, of Fairfield, Conn.:

WE ALSO WISH HIM WELL

After the big row in Washington which resulted in the ouster of Edward J. Corsi, of New York, from the administration of the 1953 Refugee Relief Act, Secretary Dulles looked carefully for a man who could handle the controversial job to the satisfaction of the administration and Congress.

The Secretary of State selected Pierce J. Gerety, of Fairfield, who had been general counsel of the Civil Service Commission. Previously he headed the International Organization Employees Loyalty Board, which inquired into the loyalty of Americans employed by the United Nations and other international organizations.

Mr. Gerety was credited generally with having done a good job, without fanfare, accusations, investigations, or recriminations. This in itself was unusual in a job as sensitive as one dealing with the loyalty of citizens.

It must have been for this reason that Secretary Dulles asked Pierce Gerety to take on a tougher assignment, one of the most difficult this administration has to offer. Immigration has been a stormy subject ever since Congress passed the Alien Act of 1798 and it is a stormy subject today.

The law popularly known as the McCarran-Walter Act, for its sponsors, the late Senator Pat McCarran, Nevada, Democrat, and Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat of Pennsylvania, has been subject to heated controversy ever since it was first proposed, and even now there is a battle raging in Congress over it, headed by New York Democrats, Senator LEHMAN and Congressman CELLER, who propose an entirely different method for determining what types of immigrants and how many may enter the United States for permanent residence.

Scott McLeod heads the program of refugee relief and Mr. Gerety will be his deputy with complete authority in the handling of the program. It was because of a personal feud between Mr. McLeod and Mr. Corsi over the entry of refugees that the latter was ousted by Secretary Dulles.

The present program is set up to bring into the United States by the end of next

year 209,000 refugees and relatives of immigrants already here.

The program was authorized in August 1953, and up to June 3, this year, visas had been issued for only 32,842 persons, and of these only 9,140 were refugees. Extreme care must be exercised in the admission of these people because of the peril of admitting subversives and Communist plants. Such a task is difficult and the Administrator is open to sharp criticism by those who are not in accord with the present quotas.

Mr. Gerety is a former member of the Post staff and we are interested in his career. If he carries on in future as he has in the past, we are confident that his appointment by Secretary Dulles will be fully justified. President Eisenhower, who has urged liberalization of the law to speed the flow of worthy refugees, advised Mr. Gerety that he wanted a good job done and the Fairfield lawyer said he was determined to make the program succeed.

This is something of the situation, and the background of the difficult job that Mr. Gerety is taking over. There is nothing glamorous about it. It takes a man with a lot of courage, and plenty of commonsense to handle one of these "hot potatoes," and we believe the administration has found a man with both.

Panama-United States Treaty—A Giveaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by a United States citizen who outlines his objections to the Panama-United States treaty provisions. Also, a newspaper article on the same subject from the Star and Herald in Panama, dated June 8, 1955:

CRISTOBAL, CANAL ZONE, *June 9, 1955.*
Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I am enclosing a clipping from today's Star and Herald, and thought that you should be enlightened on some facts concerning the Panama-United States Treaty.

First of all, permit me to introduce myself, a retired United States Government employee, and have lived down here for 47 years, and am very well acquainted with the Latin people, speaking the language fluently.

It seems almost impossible to believe, that whenever the American representatives to any treaty meet with those of other nations, ours invariably get hooked severely and have not the slightest conception of what they are doing. In all of the treaties to which our Nation is a part, we have, as you say, "given away" unsolicited, unbelievable grants, both financial and territorial, making it, as you would call it, a financial drain on the American taxpayers.

Here are our American representatives to this Panamanian treaty, none of whom, have lived 1 month down here, practically giving away, $35 million worth of American Government property, without one cent compensation. That is a terrible scandal. Mr. Dulles is giving away anything and everything, to appease a class of people, who have no use for the Americans. Their government accepts everything the United States Government gives them, but they, in turn, never give us anything outright. It is always with strings attached. For example, the road to Madden Dam. We needed it badly, to build the dam, and Panama was gracious enough, to "lend" it to us, providing we concreted it; which we did at a cost of $3 million. The road never belonged to us, but they sandbagged us into getting a new road because they knew we had to get to the dam. Our Government built the road and then returned it to the Panamanians. We are helping them with point 4, more than any other Latin country, and we get rebuff after rebuff, when we ask for something that is necessary for the defense of the canal. They have given us the use of Rio Hato, in the new treaty, but the American Government has to keep in repair the concrete highway that goes from the Pacific end of the canal, to Rio Hato, a distance of 130 miles. That is unjust, when you consider, that their traffic is considerable, while the United States Army flies most everything to Rio Hato.

I can enumerate endless incidents. Take this new treaty. Besides getting the railroad yards and terminals in both ends of the canal, they want all of New Cristobal, a residential section, that the American Government built at a cost of $7 million. This section also includes Fort DeLesseps, built by the Army, and consisting of 14 concrete dwellings (including a beautiful general's quarters) and 1 large (130 feet) office concrete building. Among other buildings that the Panamanians want, is the $2 million Cristobal High School, which the United States Government built in 1931, and is a beautiful concrete structure. Then there is the Colon Hospital, estimated at between $1 million and $1½ million. Also the Cristobal Elementary School Building. Besides these concrete structures, there are some 50 dwellings, built by the Panama Canal for its employees. All of these buildings and structures total some $35 million. Oh, yes, the Panamanians will also get the famous Washington Hotel, a $1 million structure, plus the swimming pool attached to it.

Honorable sir, this giveaway is a terrific shame, and we Americans down here feel it deeply, knowing that the Secretary of State has absolutely no idea of what these people think of us, never having been here; therefore will give away anything and everything, just for the asking. Those of us, who have labored down here all of our lives, to make this place what it is, feel that someone should prevent the treaty from being ratified by a soft-going Congress. A thorough investigation should be made by Congressmen and Senators on the spot. Talk to the men who have lived all of their lives down here, and get the firsthand information, and not take the word of the President of Panama, or Dulles, or anyone else.

Hoping that you will see your way clear, in making Panama pay something for this loot, I remain,

——— ———.

[From the Panama Star and Herald of June 8, 1955]

UNITED STATES ECONOMIC COUNCIL TERMS NEW RP TREATY A GIVEAWAY

WASHINGTON, June 8.—A proposed new treaty with Panama is a giveaway treaty, a National Economic Council official says.

The remarks of Earl Wilson, vice president of the Council, a privately supported organization, appear in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They were ordered inserted by Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

Wilson said the treaty demands the attention of citizens and Congress. He objected particularly to the following provisions:

1. An increase in the United States annuity payment from $430,000 to $1,930,000. This, he said, means either increased tolls, or increased drain on American taxpayers.

2. The granting to Panama of waterfront and other properties, including the Panama Railroad's yards and terminals at Colon and Panama. He said the value of these properties has been estimated at $30 million.

3. An agreement to ask Congress to authorize and appropriate money for a bridge to replace an existing ferry. He said preposterously high Panamanian cost estimates are $27 million for the bridge.

4. Other provisions designed to restrict American and to extend Panamanian rights in respect to commissary privileges, trade advantages, wage differential, etc.

"Ordinary American prudence demands," he concluded, "that ratification of the pending giveaway treaty be at least deferred until the impartial commission provided for in the Martin Thompson bills can make its investigation and report its conclusions to Congress.

The treaty, signed January 25, now is awaiting Senate ratification.

Guaranteed Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks I would like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from the Washington Economist, edited by J. Donald Browne, of Washington, D. C., in the issue of June 14, 1955.

Mr. Brown gives some facts about the recent guaranteed wage contract with the big motor companies:

GUARANTEED WAGES

Who guarantees the wage? It is not quite true:

1. That the CIO United Automobile Workers have entered into an agreement recently with the Ford Motor Co., and by this time, possibly with General Motors, whereby the companies all by themselves will provide a guaranteed annual wage.

2. That the United States Government did not consent to the agreements.

3. That the public and the Government have no interest in the agreements since they were entered into legally and voluntarily by the unions and the companies through collective bargaining.

The fact is that you and I, and every other taxpayer and consumer, willy-nilly, are unnamed parties to the Ford-UAW agreement, and every other agreement that may follow the Ford pattern. We are guaranteeing the union against layoffs, and we will pay the union tap in higher prices.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING PROMOTED

Both political parties are committed to prevent recessions, and if consumers should rebel against the high tax guaranteed wage agreements put on commodities, Congress will be compelled to appropriate money to stem any recession that might be triggered by these agreements.

The threat of higher inflation and other adverse economic effects, by these agreements that constitute discriminatory private economic legislation through their pattern setting qualities, have been consented to by the Government through inaction.

Whether the guaranteed wage, obtained through nationwide bargaining that pre-

tends to be company by company bargaining, is socially desirable or not, or economically feasible for any except the most prosperous industries, begs the main question. Equally indifferent in importance is the amount of money that the union extracted from the companies, or that it might have taken the form of a 10-cent-an-hour wage rise.

The main question to be decided by Congress is this:

Are you willing for union heads and the presidents of a few large companies in the automobile, steel, electrical, etc., industries to make such vital political and economic decisions that determine the future of America?

Admitting their good will and competency within their own spheres, is it good or wise for America, to let Walter Reuther and Henry Ford, or their counterparts elsewhere, to be more powerful than the Federal Government in their actions? There is a system of checks and balances in Government, elected officials, and subject to the will of constituents. Provided they act legally, Reuther and Ford are only responsible to their own organizations.

PUBLIC INTEREST DISREGARDED

Since the days of World War II, Government has fostered, and even sometimes participated in the decisions of the so-called power centers of collective bargaining in the steel and other industries year after year, with no part of the public interest represented. There never has been any effort by Congress and the Executive to determine the public interest and the economic safety of reposing so much power in private organizations.

A good case can be made out for the discriminatory character of the recent agreements. The majority of workers are not in industries or occupations where a guaranteed wage can be afforded; and some workers are not well enough organized to compel their companies to give this benefit to them. The great mass of unorganized workers, and others, will have to look to Congress for greater unemployment compensation benefits. People with fixed incomes coming from investments or pensions have no hedge against rising prices, and no Reuther to go to bat for them to increase their income.

This supplements my remarks made on this subject Thursday, June 9, 1955, on the floor of the House.

I predict this subject will be discussed by many economists, business organizations, and writers and that the Congress will ultimately have to give serious consideration to the problem to protect the public interest.

Repayments to Treasury by TVA Running Ahead of Schedule—Procurement Benefits Every State in the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, it is never possible to completely and effectively refute false propaganda—especially where it has been disseminated by experts, such as the private utilities lobby. But at this time I want to make an effort to counter some of the effects of this propaganda by pointing out a few truths regarding the TVA's repayments into the United States Treasury and the benefits which are apparent in all 48 States from the TVA procurement program. The other benefits are incalculable.

Under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks in the RECORD the following two tables which are part of the record of the hearings on the TVA appropriations. One is the record of TVA repayments into the Treasury and the other statistics as to TVA procurement in all 48 States:

TVA procurement sources, 1934–54

	1954	Total (1934–54)
Valley States:		
Alabama	$9,913,413	$109,393,458
Georgia	2,012,599	25,982,613
Kentucky	15,401,255	121,538,153
Mississippi	951,062	7,993,689
North Carolina	507,111	13,250,231
Tennessee	50,289,053	335,593,202
Virginia	214,893	7,783,988
Total valley States	79,289,386	621,535,334
Other States:		
Arizona	44,035	115,353
Arkansas	128,425	1,154,504
California	646,381	9,294,073
Colorado	137,585	1,068,353
Connecticut	652,306	6,699,773
Delaware	3,032,628	17,924,456
District of Columbia	49,661	2,388,155
Florida	827,274	6,616,527
Idaho	407	2,302,060
Illinois	4,846,403	92,233,522
Indiana	$719,257	$18,885,906
Iowa	154,212	1,454,127
Kansas	94,085	554,499
Louisiana	958,868	8,831,276
Maine	264,067	479,021
Maryland	352,394	5,980,969
Massachusetts	1,731,321	38,060,756
Michigan	1,307,734	18,009,066
Minnesota	489,235	7,675,479
Missouri	1,904,724	25,303,027
Montana	1,431	165,813
Nebraska	20,752	480,430
Nevada	823	136,461
New Hampshire	142,024	1,580,722
New Jersey	1,905,522	37,953,165
New Mexico	4,151	46,091
New York	10,792,256	140,027,452
North Dakota	24	54,009
Ohio	9,959,076	119,071,865
Oklahoma	534,273	2,782,616
Oregon	130,861	1,514,263
Pennsylvania	19,647,931	288,156,583
Rhode Island	165,972	1,973,808
South Carolina	207,448	1,840,364
South Dakota	10,641	707,091
Texas	1,039,090	5,239,519
Utah	17,399	2,804,728
Vermont	37,483	174,124
Washington	7,563	1,209,331
West Virginia	165,099	3,414,226
Wisconsin	3,953,344	58,552,668
Wyoming	56	28,937
Total other States	67,084,221	932,951,258
Foreign	10,887	523,233
Total	146,384,494	1,555,009,825

Repayment of investment in power program under provisions of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948

Fiscal year	Minimum repayments required under 1948 law		¼₀ of plant investment at end of previous year		Actual and budgeted payments [1]	
	Year	Total period	Year	Total period	Year	Total period
1948	$10,500,000	$10,500,000			$10,500,000	$10,500,000
1949	2,500,000	13,000,000	$8,705,981	$8,705,981	5,500,000	16,000,000
1950	2,500,000	15,500,000	8,705,981	17,411,962	5,500,000	21,500,000
1951	2,500,000	18,000,000	9,149,627	26,561,589	9,000,000	30,500,000
1952	2,500,000	20,500,000	9,733,970	36,295,559	12,000,000	42,500,000
1953	2,500,000	23,000,000	12,256,316	48,551,875	15,000,000	57,500,000
1954	2,500,000	25,500,000	17,482,476	66,034,351	20,000,000	77,500,000
1955	2,500,000	28,000,000	21,592,868	87,627,219	[2] 50,000,000	[2] 127,500,000
1956	2,500,000	30,500,000	[2] 31,424,781	[2] 119,052,000	[2] 59,000,000	[2] 186,500,000
1958		87,059,810				
1968		174,119,620				
1978		261,179,430				
1988		348,239,240				
1990		365,985,080				
1991		389,358,811				
1992		490,252,655				
1993		699,299,057				
1994		863,714,733				
1955		[1] 1,257,000,000				
1996		[2] 1,451,400,000				
1997		[2] 1,462,496,000				
1998		[2] 1,472,346,000				

[1] In addition to repayments under the provisions of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948, bond redemptions of $8,572,500 and other repayments of $15,059,019 were made prior to fiscal year 1948.
[2] Estimated.

The President's Emergency Fund and the 1956 Olympic Games—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in the American Legion magazine for June, 1955, Arthur Daley has an important article entitled "Will the Soviet Union Sweep the Olympics." He writes that—

The Russians will knock the ears off the Americans in the 1956 Olympic games at Melbourne, Australia, next year. It isn't a pretty fact but it's virtually an inescapable one. The worst of it is that we can't borrow the light-hearted English approach and give it the jolly-well-done-old-boy treatment. The Red brothers will scream to the world that this is merely one more proof of how decadent the capitalistic system really is.

Mr. Daley points out that unsparing of time, money, or effort, the Russians have been improving phenomenally in all forms of athletics as part of a concerted drive to capture a new but irresistible propaganda medium—sports. Meanwhile, America marks time, either unaware of the danger to our traditional worldwide supremacy in athletics or indifferent to it.

Athletics in the United States, says Mr. Daley, are a haphazard affair. The Government has nothing whatsoever to

do with sports in any capacity. Our Olympic team consists of volunteers. Our Olympic committee consists of a group of volunteer amateurs. Our Olympic financing comes from volunteer contributions and it is usually a frantic scramble to get enough funds to send a team to the Olympics. The athletes, naturally enough, get free trips. So do coaches and managers of each team. But all the other Olympic officials, the greatly maligned badge-wearers or badgers pay their own way.

During the past quarter century, Avery Brundage, of Chicago, has been all over the world many times as president of the United States Olympic Committee and later as president of the International Olympic Committee. He has never asked for one thin dime for expenses although these jaunts probably have cost him upward of a quarter million dollars.

The Subcommittee on State, Justice, Judiciary, and related agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives is considering, among other things, an appropriation to continue the President's Emergency Fund.

Some of the best salesmen for the United States way of life have been American athletes sent abroad by the Amateur Athletic Union in cooperation with the State Department under the President's Emergency Fund.

Among them are two great Negro track stars, Mal Whitfield and Harrison Dillard, both two-time Olympic champions, who got tumultuous receptions in tours of Africa and South America.

Olympic diving champion, Maj. Sammy Lee, an Army doctor of Korean parentage, was similarly hailed when he performed in the land of his ancestors. Still another good-will athlete is the Rev. Robert Richards, the preacher who won the Olympic pole valut title in 1952.

The President's Emergency Fund would be of great assistance, I am convinced, in American participation in the 1956 Olympics. I include here my testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee in support of the Fund, and the timely article by Arthur Daley in the June 1955, American Legion magazine:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE FRANK THOMPSON, JR., BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE, JUSTICE, JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S EMERGENCY FUND, JUNE 14, 1955

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, with funds supplied by the President's Emergency Fund, the United States is fighting the cold war on two new fronts. Both are important. And on both the Communists have a head start on us.

The head start, however, need not discourage us. These are both fields in which the United States has no need to worry if we exert ourselves. The only danger is that we may let victory go to the Communists by default.

Let us take a look at the facts. In the 5 years prior to 1955, the Soviet bloc exhibited at 122 trade fairs at which the United States was not represented. Their first shock was at Damascus last year where they had a $500,000 exhibition. Awakening in time to what was happening, the United States was a last-minute entry, presenting as one of its official exhibits the film Cinerama. The picture was the hit of the fair. It stole the entire show. The Communists protested violently, and when they heard the United States was planning a repeat performance at Bangkok they withdrew entirely. They couldn't take the competition.

Since that date the U. S. S. R. has withdrawn from at least five other fairs in which it was announced that the United States would exhibit, the Lyons International Fair, and the Milan Sample Fair in April of this year, the Paris International Fair and the Tokyo International Fair in May, and the Canadian International Trade Fair in Toronto this month.

Under the program made possible during the current year by the President's $5 million emergency fund, the United States will have been represented at 15 fairs by July 1, 1955.

These fairs have given us opportunity to refute Communist sneers at the myth of the American way of life. The Frankfurt Fair, March 6–10, is a good example. Commenting, a Frankfurt English-language newspaper said * * * "the exhibition marked the first time that Uncle Sam has actually raised his window shades in Europe in an attempt to dispel myths and give substantial facts about how Americans live."

At Frankfurt, United States producers displayed over 300 products commonly used in the average American home. The exhibit entitled, "America at Home," featured a completely furnished full-scale five-room modern American home with actors impersonating an American family. Brand names that are household words in the United States were displayed * * * Dupont, General Electric, Singer Sewing Machine, Congoleum-Nairn, Revere Ware, and a host of others. Over 65 firms exhibited. The products told a significant story of a nation's economy dedicated to production for peace and abundance. Over 70,000 visitors saw that exhibit.

The Trade Information Center, manned by United States industry specialists and Department of Commerce representatives, gave over 275 personal interviews and answered inquiries by the thousands. Inquiries came in so fast that three receptionists were unable to take care of them.

The major responsibility for the exhibits in these fairs rests, of course, upon the exhibitors. The United States Government contribution is only "seed" money. But without that encouragement the participation of American business would be uncertain. And, in this cold war, we cannot afford uncertainties.

No less significant have been the results achieved under the cultural presentation program and for this, too, the President's Emergency Fund provides the "seed" money. It does not pay all expenses, but it assures American artists going overseas against too heavy losses.

That Americans are uncultured, crass, material-minded barbarians is a favorite Communist propaganda line. On the other hand, they try to present themselves as devoted to the arts, to the better things of life. For years troupes of artists from the U. S. S. R., and more recently from Communist China, have been sent abroad by their Governments to make friends and influence people for communism. That the Russian ballet, admittedly among the best in the world, has its roots in Czarist Russia is ignored. The ballet is communist, they say. It is a potent argument for the Marxian line. Music, art, sports—all are grist for the Communist mills. They exploit their artists and sportsmen as they exploit everything else, and they have been doing it effectively, make no mistake about that.

These statements are borne out by no less a personality than William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor-in-chief of the Hearst newspapers. During his recent visit to Soviet Russia Mr. Hearst had ample opportunity to observe the steps being taken by the Communists to gain support for their ideology in fields other than the military. As a result, he came back to the United States determined that the United States should not be caught off base in this particular phase of the struggle. In a speech before the National Press Club he pointed out that "the western program for building armed strength should be widened into a more flexible and imaginative strategy for competitive coexistence with Communism in every field and on every front." He went on to draw on some of his own observations saying, "While I was in Moscow I gained the impression that communism was moving ahead in many fields which the present western strategy overlooks. * * * By inviting to Moscow picked delegations from the satellite countries and wavering neutrals like India they strive to convey the impression that Soviet customs are superior to those of the West.* * * (Therefore) we should seek to convey to the world—to our allies, to the uncommitted countries especially, and to the Russians if possible—the idea that America is not only proud of its motor cars, its bathtubs, and other material benefits, but also of its cultural achievements." The legislation under consideration here today would do much in the future to convince other peoples of our interest in cultural affairs as it has done in the past.

Under the President's program, policies and procedures for the United States cultural offensive are now fully established and in active operation. As of May 19, I am informed, 23 projects are underway. I do not propose to discuss each of these projects in detail, but will touch upon several by way of illustration.

Those of you who have listened to the NBC Symphony of the Air will not be surprised at the success of its present tour of the Far East. At its stop in Manila, the Filipino newspaper, Sunday Chronicle, made mention of the Communist charge that the tour was a propaganda move. Said the writer: "If this is so, then we can afford to have more of it * * * this is propaganda we would go out of our way to welcome * * * it is propaganda that will really sell the United States anywhere, be it Europe or Asia."

The orchestra's 21-day stop in Japan was a smash hit. The New York Times quotes a review in the English language edition of Osaka Mainichi: "As the symphony was brought to the grande finale, the crowd who sat in an ecstasy of tonal splendor, knew no end of jolly."

A "Salute" to France is one of the big projects under way this year under this program. The chief financial burden has been assumed by private sponsors but the "seed" money from the fund is extending its scope throughout Europe and the Near East. The Salute now under way includes both music and the drama as well as paintings.

The Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra, conducted by Eugene Ormandy, opened the festival on May 19. Reviews in the French press used such expressions as "great music making," "exquisite," iridescent," "ravishing."

Last week, the New York City Ballet followed upon the orchestra's heels. Still to come on the Salute schedule is Oklahoma, and later, in conjunction with a Dramatic Arts Festival, performances of Medea and the The Skin of Our Teeth.

The 9 weeks' tour of the Balkans and Mediterranean area of Porgy and Bess has been another cultural triumph for the United States. On the opening night in Zagreb, the company received 14 curtain calls, and on closing night there was a half-hour ovation.

Not only in Yugoslavia, but elsewhere, this was, for many people, the first time they had seen Negroes. Having heard so much Communist propaganda, they were astounded to learn that most of the cast are college gradu-

ates. These are not the Negroes of Communist propaganda. Each individual member of the cast has been an ambassador for this country. Plied everywhere with questions, they are handling the situation with a dignity and intelligence of which every American can be proud.

In the sports field, the program includes tours by stars in the Pan-American games. Three such teams have already gone out. Their success has been on the level of those I have just listed.

All of the projects undertaken in this program have been planned with the specific interests in mind of the areas to which the traveling artists and athletes are sent. The projects, handled in this country by the State Department, are publicized overseas by the United States Information Agency. In all cases, the events are being used by all Agency posts in the various countries as the nucleus of a public information campaign to create recognition and appreciation of the cultural achievements of the United States.

In my own opinion, trade fairs and cultural activities are areas of the cold war which the United States cannot neglect. And, as I have said, both are fields in which we can have full confidence of success. It is only a question of taking advantage of the opportunities afforded us.

Communist goods exhibited at trade fairs have often been of inferior quality—but how are other peoples to know that if there are no United States exhibits to make the contrast clear? In the absence of first-rate Western participation, the Communists have been winning by default.

In the cultural field it is, again, only a question of giving these other peoples an opportunity to see, listen, and judge. Here, again, we have the goods. The best rebuttal of Communist charges is to produce them. In closing, may I refer once more to Mr. Hearst. In the speech from which I quoted earlier he spoke words of great import to all of us here today: "One side or the other is going to win the battle of coexistence. It hade better be our side. Everyone and everything we love and cherish is at stake."

I urge the committee to support these tremendously important activities and to grant the funds necessary to carry on and expand them during the coming fiscal year.

The President's Emergency Fund and the 1956 Olympic Games—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article by Arthur Daley which appeared in the June 1955 issue of the American Legion magazine, as well as an article by David Sentner, head of the Washington bureau of the Hearst newspapers, which appeared in the Boston American recently:

[From the American Legion magazine of June 1955]

WILL THE SOVIET UNION SWEEP THE OLYMPICS?

(By Arthur Daley)

The Russians will knock the ears off the Americans in the 1956 Olympic games at Melbourne, Australia, next year. It isn't a pretty fact, but it's virtually an inescapable one. The worst of it is that we can't borrow the light-hearted English approach and give it the jolly-well-done-old-boy treatment. The Red brothers will scream to the world that this is merely one more proof of how decadent the capitalistic system really is.

Why will the Soviet outscore the United States in the next Olympics? It's a reasonable question. There are two main answers.

1. Unsparing of time, money, or effort, the Russians have been improving phenomenally in all forms of athletics as part of a concerted drive to capture a new but irresistible propaganda medium—sports. Meanwhile America marks time, either unaware of the danger to our traditional worldwide supremacy in athletics or indifferent to it.

2. The 1956 Olympics could not be held at a worse time of the year from the standpoint of the United States. The land down under has upside-down weather, and the Olympic dates in late November and early December are in the Australian spring, a few weeks before summer officially begins. But this will be smack dab in the middle of United States college semesters. Hence college athletes, the backbone of every American Olympic team, will find it either difficult or impossible to compete. This will not be our best or strongest team. However, the Russians will be loaded.

Don't go preening in smug satisfaction, though, and clutch at the straw of this ready-made alibi. There's no guaranty that our best team could outscore the comrades anyway. A decade or so ago the U. S. S. R. was in the middle ages, athletically speaking. Now it's in the atomic age and it didn't have to steal anything to get there.

If you need a few examples, here are some which should open your eyes. This is what the Soviet athletes did in various world championships last year:

Speed skating: Swept all 5 men's championships and took 4 out of 5 women's titles.

Skiing: Won 2 men's and 2 women's championships, thus muscling in on the Scandinavian monopoly for the first time.

Gymnastics: Won 5 of 7 men's championships and 3 of 6 women's. Won both men's and women's team titles.

Wrestling: Won 3 of 8 championships, more than any other nation.

Rowing: Won the Grand Challenge Cup at Britain's Henrey Regatta.

Weight-lifting: Won 4 of 7 championships and took the team title.

Shooting: Won 7 of 9 team championships and 6 of 9 individual championships.

The closest thing to a world championship in track and field was the European title games. The Russians won them.

The comrades also set world records for the 3 mile run, for the 5,000 meters, for the 400-meter hurdles and for the hammer throw while their amazons set 9 more world records. Their male swimmers set 2.

And if all those statistics don't give you a chill, it's worth mentioning that there isn't a Russian track and field record—except the high jump—for the 19 standard Olympic events that's older than 4 years. Ten of them were made in 1954. At this rate there will be another batch this season.

If you wish to make comparisons, it's worth noting that the United States turned out only 12 of its 19 records within the past 4 years. Significant are the ages of the 7 missing marks which were made in 1948, 1942, 1941, 1936, 1935, 1934, and 1932. That could be considered a rather normal rate of progress even though it can't quite match the Soviet high-compression speedup.

Before we get any deeper into the subject, it might be wise to go off on a slight side trip in order to get a better understanding of our surroundings. And we even gain a sharper appreciation of the situation if we first make a brief detour to postwar Berlin for a look into that mysterious labyrinth, the Russian mind. It's just a peek, but it is a very illuminating one.

When the hard-boiled Frank Howley was commandant of the American sector of Berlin, he happened to mention to his Russian opposite number that he (Howley) planned to enter an equestrian competition over the weekend.

"You'll win, of course?" asked the Russian.

"I haven't a chance," said Howley with a laugh. "I'm competing just for the fun of it."

The Russian walked away, shaking his head. He just couldn't comprehend how anyone—particularly anyone in authority—would voluntarily compete without having the cards stacked in his favor. Thus endeth the Berlin detour. Now for the background side trip itself.

When the Russians made their first cautious step in athletics beyond the Iron Curtain in 1946, they did so because they were convinced the deck was stacked and that they held all the aces. They entered the world weight-lifting championships in Paris. They knew beyond doubt that they'd win.

At the last moment, however, the United States hastily recruited a makeshift team and flew it to Paris. It wasn't a full team such as the Russians had, but it had sufficient balance even though it had no depth. And the American won.

Monumental was the embarrassment of the red-faced Reds. This was something they'd never expected. Since the officials had promised to bring back the trophy, they did the next best thing. They bought a duplicate trophy and carted it back to Moscow with them. Pravda greeted the returning "heroes" with a couple of lines acclaiming the noble Russian "victory" and that's the last anyone heard of the subject.

But the shock of that setback kept the comrades out of international tournaments until 1950, when the Soviets entered the European track championships in Brussels.

They won, but only by a thin red whisker, and it was the scoring of the amazons from the steppes which gave them the biggest block of points. It's worth noting that the Russians refused to compete in the rerun of a relay when the meet officials ordered it. They first had to clear with the Kremlin; then they reran the race.

One year later the U. S. S. R. entered the European boxing championships at Milan. After they arrived, the commissar in charge looked over the opposition and decided he'd rather live in Moscow than in Siberia. So he withdrew his entry and Russia's boxing team sat in stony-faced silence in the stands while the tournament was held.

[From the Boston American of April 29, 1955]

SOLON BACKS HEARST CULTURE, SPORTS BID

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON.—Representative THOMPSON, Democrat, of New Jersey, urged consideration of congressional measures to promote American culture and sports events in line with the program for competitive coexistence with Red Russia advocated by W. R. Hearst, Jr.

Concurrently, the House District Committee favorably reported out THOMPSON's first bill on the subject, providing for creation of a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium. The latter would include an inaugural hall of Presidents and a music, drama, fine arts and mass communications center.

THOMPSON asked the House to heed warnings by the editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers and Olympics committee president, Avery Brundage, that this country is in danger of losing its supremacy at the international games.

THOMPSON said his legislation is specifically designed to put into effect the proposals made by Hearst upon his return from behind the Iron Curtain where he interviewed the four top leaders of Communist Russia.

DEVELOP STATE PROGRAM

The measures would create a national advisory committee under the Welfare Secretary to develop a program with the States that would make the public more sports and culture conscious.

Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Hobby has approved a bill, introduced by Representative WAINWRIGHT, Republican, of New York, for establishment of a Federal Commission on the Arts and for other purposes.

However, Representative THOMPSON and his Democratic colleagues do not think this administration bill goes far enough in activating a dynamic competitive coexistence blueprint.

THOMPSON called attention of Congress to both the warning of Hearst and Brundage on the sports challenge from the Soviet Union.

BRUNDAGE WARNING

He referred to a current magazine article by Brundage warning that Russia is building the greatest mass army of athletes the world has ever known.

"The huge Russian sports program is based on a broad and comprehensive system of physical training for everyone in the U. S. S. R. regardless of age or sex," Thompson said.

"Undoubtedly one of the results of this system which was started more than 20 years ago was a very substantial contribution to the success of the Soviet armies during World War II. No country is stronger than its people.

QUOTES HEARST

"In his recent speech at Washington's National Press Club, William Randolph Hearst Jr., after his Russian trip, said that sports are a front on which the commissars are moving ahead full speed.

"America, he said, has dominated the Olympic games since their inception. It has been a source of prestige throughout the world especially with sport-conscious young people.

"Mr. Hearst asked: 'How will the youth of the world feel, especially in doubtful areas, if the Russian team ends America's long sway at Melbourne in 1956?'

"Mr. Hearst advocates the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence with Communists."

The President's Emergency Fund and the 1956 Olympic Games—No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include herewith the concluding portion of the fine article by Arthur Daley entitled "Will the Soviet Union Sweep the Olympics," from the June 1955 issue of the American Legion magazine:

And now we've reached the key point in the chronology, the 1952 Olympic games at Helsinki in Finland.

We can skip over the fact that the suspicious Russians refused to let their athletes be quartered at the Olympic Village with the other athletes from all over the world. They insisted on a private Olympic Village, apart from the other and surrounded by barbed wire. The main thing was that they were competing before the eyes of the world at last. They'd reached the put-up-or-shut-up stage.

There is no official team championship in the Olympics. But points are traditionally awarded unofficially on a basis of 10 for first place, 5 for second, and then 4, 3, 2, and finally 1 for 6th place. In most Olympics the United States has been so far in front all the way that the "unofficial team championship" was of little importance and of less interest.

On the first day at Helsinki, however, Russia outscored America, 23 to 15. One day later headlines over here proclaimed that "the United States wrests back lead from the U. S. S. R." The count then was 72 to 40. But on the third day the Red women gymnasts, registering 60½ points to none for us, gave the Commies a lead of 137½ to 115.

The so-called team championship suddenly became the most important news to come out of Helsinki, even though the International Olympic Committee pleaded that this phase of the gigantic show be ignored because it didn't exist. No one paid attention to the IOC.

With the Soviet leading on the fourth day, 266½ to 202, the Red brothers cautiously let leak to Pravda, Izvestia, and the other papers back home that the decadent capitalists from America were on the run before the valiant onslaught of the heroes from the people's republic.

On the ninth day a gigantic scoreboard suddenly bloomed into being behind the barbed wire in the Russian private Olympic village. They even rigged up an even more advantageous scoring system to make their lead all the more impressive.

After the 10th day the Reds were cocky to the point of arrogance. They formally petitioned the international authorities to make all team totals official. The plea was denied but the Russians surely were feeling their oats.

On the 12th day radio Moscow blatantly shouted, "We will win." The point total then was 523½ for the U. S. S. R. and 463 for the United States. By the 14th day the lead had shrunk infinitesimally to 533½ to 499 but the Americans were rapidly running out of time. Unofficial though these team totals were, even the State Department back in Washington was starting to get nervous.

Suddenly it happened. On the 15th or next-to-last day the Yankee Doodle Dandies hit the jackpot. They scored 111 points with 5 boxing championships, 2 swimming championships, and the basketball championship, plus stray points elsewhere. But whom did the United States have to beat to win the basketball crown? You guessed it—Russia. For the first time in fortnight, however, America was ahead.

Curious American reporters peeked into the Soviet's private Olympic village that evening. They discovered that the giant scoreboard was blank. The numbers, which once had been so proudly put in place, were gone.

"I do not have the score with me," said Nikolai Romanov, president of the Soviet Olympic Committee, as he edged toward the nearest exit. "I do not know how we stand."

In the equestrian events on the final day, we picked up 4 extra points to make the final totals, 614 to 553½. However, Pravda still hailed the world superiority of the Russian athletes and proudly asserted they had won more medals than anyone else. They offered no figures or substantiation.

Two more days of frantic juggling in Moscow, an arithmetical juggle which continued until satisfactory figures could be obtained, brought an official admission. The U. S. S. R. and the United States had finished in an absolute tie at 494 points apiece—which was pretty damn generous of them.

Perhaps it is a salve to our pride for us to say that the United States had won everything in the major leagues while the Russians were sweeping the minor leagues. But that's whistling through the graveyard. In gymnastics alone they outscored us, 248½ to 0.

Their ignorance of proper techniques was astonishing. Their sprinters, for instance, didn't even know how to burst out of their starting holes.

Their oarsmen didn't know how to row. They did what they did on brute strength. But their eight-oared crew still finished second to the great Navy shell and ahead of such nations as Australia, Britain, and Germany, all traditional powers with the sweeps. The Reds weren't even aware of the fact that losing oarsmen always are supposed to peel off their shirts and offer them to the winners.

When the medium-sized Russian basketball players squared off against the elongated giants from the States, the Soviet officials grumbled that they'd left their goons at home. Playing a crafty possession game, however, the Russkies made it tough before bowing in the Olympic final by the startlingly low score of 36–25. The Soviet will have its seven-footers ready at Melbourne.

In fact, the Russians will be ready in every Olympic sport for the simple reason that the huge Communist apparatus is behind the movement to make the Soviet the world's most invincible sports power. Worse still, it's a highly organized operation down to its last fiendish detail.

Athletics in the United States are a haphazard affair. The Government has nothing whatsoever to do with sports in any capacity. Our Olympic team consists of volunteers. Our Olympic committee consists of a group of volunteer amateurs. Our Olympic financing comes from volunteer contributions and it's usually a frantic scramble to get enough funds to send a team to the Olympics. The athletes, naturally enough, get free trips. So do coaches and managers of each team. But all the other Olympic officials, the greatly maligned badge wearers, or "badgers," pay their own way.

During the past quarter century, Avery Brundage, of Chicago, has been all over the world many times as president of the United States Olympic committee and later as president of the international Olympic committee. He's never asked for one thin dime for expenses although these jaunts probably have cost him upward of a quarter million dollars. Fortunately for him, he can afford it.

Brundage is an idealist. Back in 1936, he refused to concede that Hitler was prostituting Olympic sports as a means of proving that the Germans were truly the master race. The Reich had so organized sports—and the Germans are marvelous organizers—that they would outscore all nations in the Berlin Olympics. They did.

Almost 20 years later, Brundage still is an idealist. He was taken on a carefully prepared tour of the Soviet Union last summer and reported that everything was hotsy-totsy in the Red paradise. Every Russian athlete was as pure an amateur as Coroebus of Ellis, the guy who started this business by winning the first Olympic chamionship in 776 B. C. What's that again, Avery?

"Russia has risen rapidly in the world of sport," he said, "because it has tremendous interest in all sport. One reason is that the Russians have a tremendous vacuum to fill because they have no place to go in their spare time. They have few automobiles, radios, television sets or roads. Workers have a month's vacation and most of them spend that time engaging in athletics in their hometowns and villages."

He cited the fact that there were 60,000 soccer teams in the Ukraine alone and that 1 small community drew 900 volleyball teams for a tournament. But he brought back no statistics on the Olympic events.

His hosts obviously didn't want to give him such ammunition. One doesn't need too strong an imagination to figure it out, though.

Romanov, the president of the Soviet Olympic committee (he's the guy who misplaced his scoreboard at Helsinki) has cabinet status in the government as head of the department of physical culture. That's almost a tipoff in itself as to the importance of sports in the Red scheme of things.

The Kremlin finances every phase of the athletic program. Romanov heatedly denied to Brundage that the Kremlin also financed the athletes. That's a dirty capitalistic lie, he implied. Russian athletes, he piously stated, must place their education and their jobs ahead of sports. Oh, yeah?

When Vladimir Kuc, a sailor with the Baltic fleet, beat the supposedly invincible Emil Zatopek, of Czechoslovakia and set a world record for 5,000 meters, he was made a master of sports. No one on this side of the Iron Curtain knows exactly what that means. But scientists, writers, and others who become master academicians or the like get cash prizes and cushy jobs. It would seem safe to assume that master of sports is more than just an empty title which offers no financial return.

Perhaps the Red athletes place their education and jobs ahead of sports but Marguerite Higgins reported from Russia that athletes are able to practice at least 3 hours a day.

"We are well paid," one amateur athlete told her. He's probably in Siberia by now, learning to keep his mouth shut.

One Polish athlete, fleeing from behind the Iron Curtain, said that Soviet amateurism was a fraud. That same refugee added, "Only athletes and Communist dignitaries are well off in Poland. I had everything I wanted but I knew it was because I was an athlete." The most persistent report to seep from that section of the world is that athletes receive a full day's pay for a half day's work. The other half day is spent in practicing sports.

Branch Rickey invented baseball's farm system. But the Mahatma was a piker compared to the Russians. As soon as any athlete shows the slightest sign of promise, he's absorbed by the equivalent of a class D team. As he progresses he gets promoted until he's in the big leagues.

It's a disturbing situation and there's virtually no way in which professionalism can be proved. The Kremlin has such complete control of the lives of everyone in Russia that each citizen merely does as he's told, whether that assignment be digging in a salt mine, working on a collective farm or throwing a discus.

One day last winter, Roger Bannister, of Great Britain, announced his retirement from foot racing. The world's first 4-minute miler regretfully declared that he'd be too busy interning and practicing medicine to have time for track. No one in Parliament arose to denounce him. In England, as in America, a man is permitted to do as he pleases.

But if Dr. Bannister were a Russian, do you believe for one moment that he'd be permitted to retire? Not a bit of it. He'd probably be appointed surgeon general of the Red army, given a medical sinecure somewhere near a cinder track and ordered to practice constantly for the 1,500-meter race, the Olympic mile, at Melbourne. Bannister, a free citizen of a free country, won't even compete in Australia unless he himself changes his mind.

The comrades have made such magnificent progress in athletics that they've even reached the luxury of their famous self-criticism.

A petulant article recently appeared in the magazine Soviet Sports. It attacked the Red sprinters for not training hard enough to gain world dash supremacy. This merely emphasizes the ignorance of the Reds as far as the facts of life—athletic division—are concerned. Although distance runners and weight throwers can be manufactured, sprinters have to be born. But they'll find them yet. Not all of Russia's 200 million people necessarily have lead in their britches.

This will be a mighty Olympic team that the Soviet will assemble, hand-picked all the way. What's more, it will be taken in October of 1956 to a special training camp near Afghanistan where the weather resembles that of Australia. This is something new and special, a month of acclimitization in advance.

But the Red brothers can do this and the United States can't. In the first place we don't even know who will be on our Olympic team. That team, by the way, is a microcosm, a little world in itself. It's a democracy within a democracy whereas the Russian team reflects the dictatorship from which it springs.

The wearers of the United States of America shield are selected only by means of final Olympic tryouts. Should Wes Santee fail to finish among the first 3 men in the 1,500-meter tryout, he won't make the American team in that event, even though he may rank by that time as the greatest miler who ever lived. He could stumble and miss out through no fault of his own. But he still couldn't make the team.

There was such an occurence in 1948. Harrison Dillard was acknowledged to be the world's greatest hurdler, unbeaten in sixty-odd races and the holder of world records. But he stumbled and didn't make the team—as a hurdler.

By an ironic twist of fate, however, he qualified as a sprinter. Then he won the 100-meter dash in the Olympics, a major upset. Four years later he returned to use his raincheck. He qualified this time as a hurdler and won the timber-topping title at Helsinki.

This qualifying system is the democratic way of operating even though it doesn't insure our picking our best possible team. Much more alarming than that for the Australian show next year, however, is the time element. The calendar is against us.

Something happened last March which could have been a straw in the wind. The final Olympic basketball tryouts normally bring together the best teams from the colleges and the Amateur Athletic Union. The same system would hold true for the Pan-American games. But they were scheduled this year for Mexico City in mid-March, which is smack in the middle of the collegiate tournament season. So the colleges withdrew and handed the Pan-American assignment to the AAU.

If this is a symptom, it's an alarming one. The 1956 Olympics will open on November 22. Let's stop for a minute and orient ourselves. The college year ends in June and by mid-summer there's virtually no more competition in this country in track, swimming, or rowing. Late autumn is when basketball, boxing, wrestling, gymnastics, weightlifting, and fencing begin.

Hence the international show catches us completely between seasons. How do we adjust to it? It's quite a problem and no ready solution is forthcoming. In other Olympic games, American athletes are coaxed along to a natural peak by the end of July when the big show ordinarily begins.

Whatever we do will be both unnatural and unseasonable. Admittedly, the Russians are in the same north of the equator situation we are. But they're a dictator nation and their athletes are government controlled. They also have none of our deep traditions of every sport in its proper season. They can arrange their sports seasons by Kremlin ukase. We're helpless. We're stuck.

Under these awkward circumstances, it's impossible to conceive of any way we can assemble our best possible Olympic team for Australia. A bad situation also may be aggravated by the fact that the trip to Melbourne will be the longest and most expensive of all Olympic tours. If we don't get contributions in the million-plus brackets, we'll start lopping off lesser sports teams and may have skeleton or token representation in some of the others.

But the comrades will be on the scene loaded to the gunwales with their very best. They have no intention of missing out on a propaganda vehicle as monumental as this one. Maybe it's just as well that they didn't wise up earlier to the value of sports.

They've almost reached a degree of impudence in their new and confident approach to athletics. Last summer they began asking questions about Wimbledon and also began encouraging tennis on a major scale. The next thing we know they'll be playing polo and sailing yachts, the last bastions of decadent capitalism.

The embarrassing part of it all is that the United States might not be able to outscore the Russians even with our best. The Reds came uncomfortably close in their first try at Helsinski when they didn't even know what it all was about. They've improved so tremendously since that there may be no containing them.

Brace yourselves, boys, and accept an unhappy fact. When the 1956 Olympics games are ended, the Soviet scoreboard will not be blank. It will be heralding its news to the world in letters and in figures of red.

If We Are To Have an Investigation of Cost of Natural Gas to Consumers Then Let us Have a Full Investigation of All Phases of the Natural Gas Industry Affecting Price of Natural Gas to Consumers

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to supplement the resolution recently introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain matters related to the transportation and distribution of natural gas as affecting the price thereof to consumers.

I am in favor of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], as far as it goes, but unfortunately it does not go far enough. The best interests of consumers requires that in addition to an investigation of the transportation and distribution of natural gas, as elements in the cost to the consumers there must be an investigation also of production costs. Without this there would not be a complete picture of the entire matter. Because of the failure to include this important element of cost in the Harris resolution, I have introduced a resolution similar to it except that there is added to it authority to investigate the subject of

production as well as transportation and distribution of natural gas. I have also added authority and direction to the Federal Power Commission to give its assistance to the investigation by supplying factual data to the committee.

In the press release of March 2, 1955, when my colleague, Mr. HARRIS, introduced H. R. 4560, to amend the Natural Gas Act, two references were made to his desire to protect the consumers of natural gas. In Mr. HARRIS' press release of June 9, 1955, when he introduced a resolution to investigate the price of natural gas to consumers, he again referred in several instances to his desire to protect the consumers' interest. With this objective I wholeheartedly agree.

I was a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce when the Natural Gas Act was passed in 1938. This act was passed principally to protect the consumer, as we considered this a matter of great public interest, and so stated in section I of the Natural Gas Act.

In the present 84th Congress the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I am a member, has held hearings almost continuously since March 22, 1955, and the record alone of these hearings comes to 1,930 pages. In spite of the length and comprehensiveness of these hearings, Congress does not yet have all of the facts and information on the basis of which it can proceed with needed remedial legislation. Congressman HARRIS himself, who introduced a bill, H. R. 6645, ordered reported by a committee vote of 16 to 15, stated last week "that before this situation is cleared up in the interests of the industry as well as the consumer, other factors are going to have to be considered." Congressman HARRIS also stated that "in the interest of the consumer there must be Federal regulation of prices which the consumer would pay, of not only future contracts but existing contracts between pipelines and producers."

With all these conclusions I agree. However, the resolution which Mr. HARRIS introduced on June 9, House Resolution 267, provides for an investigation to be made by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce only of intercorporate controls of natural gas pipeline companies and natural gas distributing companies and it provides only for the investigation of the transportation and distribution of natural gas. Singularly, the production of natural gas has been omitted. I am in full sympathy with the objectives of Congressman HARRIS' resolution but believe that it is vitally important that the terms of this investigation be broadened in scope to include production as well as transportation and distribution. In short, it is for that reason that I am today introducing a special resolution which would authorize and direct the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the cost of production and transportation in interstate commerce and distribution of natural gas to the consumers of America. In other words, practically all that I have done is to add to Mr. HARRIS' resolution, investigation of the production segment of the natural gas industry. In addition to this, I also thought it well to include a special section calling upon the services of the Federal Power Commission to aid and assist our committee in getting at the facts.

This is a matter which has been before the Congress for a number of years; in fact, the same issue has been before the courts and Congress since 1947, culminating in the now famous Phillips Petroleum Co. decision of the United States Supreme Court announced June 7, 1954. The Congress will remember that this same subject matter was before them in H. R. 1758, also introduced by my colleague, Congressman HARRIS. This bill, you will remember, was approved by 4 votes in the Senate and 2 votes in the House of Representatives and was later vetoed by President Truman on April 15, 1950. President Truman so well summarized this entire matter that I feel it appropriate at this time to ask for a complete insertion of his veto message as part of my remarks at this point:

PRESIDENT VETOES BILL TO EXEMPT GAS PRODUCERS AND GATHERERS FROM FPC REGULATION

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1758, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended.

This bill would preclude the Federal Power Commission from regulating sales of natural gas to interstate pipeline companies, for resale in interstate commerce, by producers and gatherers who are not affiliated with the buyers. After careful analysis and full consideration, I believe that such an action would not be in the national interest.

I believe that authority to regulate such sales is necessary in the public interest because of the inherent characteristics of the process of moving gas from field to the consumer. Unlike purchasers of coal and oil, purchasers of natural gas cannot easily move from one producer to another in search of lower prices. Natural gas is transported to consumers by pipelines, and is distributed in a given consuming market by a single company. The pipeline companies, and in turn the consumers of natural gas, are bound to the producers and gatherers in a given field by the physical location of their pipelines, which represent large investments of funds, and cannot readily be moved to other fields in search of a better price.

These characteristics of the natural-gas business impose natural limitations upon effective competition among sellers. Competition is further limited by the degree of concentration of ownership of natural-gas reserves. While there are a large number of producers and gatherers, a relatively small number of them own a substantial majority of the gas reserves. Furthermore, the demand for natural gas has been growing phenomenally in recent years, and its natural advantages as a fuel, coupled with its present price advantage, indicate that demand may soon be pressing hard upon total supplies.

Under these circumstances, there is a clear possibility that competition will not be effective, at least in some cases, in holding prices to reasonable levels. Accordingly, to remove the authority to regulate, as this bill would do, does not seem to me to be wise public policy.

It is argued that regulation of sales of natural gas to pipeline companies would discourage producers and gatherers from selling their gas in interstate commerce, and would discourage exploration and development of new wells. This claim rests primarily on the assumption that the Federal Power Commission would apply standards of regulation which did not take account of the peculiar circumstances of natural-gas production—such as the cost of exploration and development, including the drilling of dry holes. I do not believe this assumption is well founded. On the contrary, I am confident that the Commission will apply standards properly suited to the special risks and circumstances of independent natural-gas producers and gatherers.

My confidence in this outcome is supported by the fact that, until recently, the Commission has not found it necessary to undertake to regulate the prices charged by independent gas producers and gatherers, although those prices have been advancing. It is only natural that prices have risen, since the interstate lines built during and since the war have offered a far wider market than existed previously and have resulted in more competition among buyers. This process of price adjustment will probably continue, and it is right that it should if held within reasonable limits.

Accordingly, producers and gatherers are finding, and I am sure will continue to find, strong incentives to search out new sources of natural gas and to sell their gas in interstate commerce. I believe the production and sale of natural gas will continue to grow rapidly, to the benefit of consumers and of all the businessmen concerned with serving them. I see no danger to that growth in the continuance of the authority of the Federal Power Commission to regulate sales of gas to interstate pipelines.

The continuance of that authority will adequately protect the public interest by permitting the Commission to prevent unreasonable and excessive prices, which would give large windfall profits to gas producers, at the expense of consumers, with no benefit to the Nation in terms of additional exploration and production. Such cases are few, if any, at the present time, but the authority to deal with them in the future clearly should not be dissipated.

Experience may demonstrate that some improvement of the existing statute may be desirable. I have no doubt that the Commission will operate reasonably and in the public interest in carrying out the present law, but I would have no objection to reasonable amendments if they are found to be needed.

To withdraw entirely from this field of regulation, however, impelled only by imaginary fears, and in the face of a record of accomplishment under the present law which is successful from the standpoint of consumer, distributor, carrier and producer alike, would not be in the public interest. Accordingly, I am compelled to return this bill without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 15, 1950.*

I call particular attention to the language used by President Truman in his veto message, in which he said:

The pipeline companies, and in turn the consumers of natural gas, are bound to the producers and gatherers in a given field by the physical location of their pipelines, which represent large investments of funds and cannot readily be moved to other fields in search of a better price.

These characteristics of the natural-gas business impose natural limitations upon effective competition among sellers. Competition is further limited by the degree of concentration of ownership of natural-gas reserves. While there are a large number of producers and gatherers, a relatively small number of them own a substantial majority of the gas reserves.

H. R. 6645, the bill under present consideration, was designed primarily to ex-

empt producers from Federal regulation. It is rather significant, Mr. Speaker, that to my knowledge not a single producer appeared before our committee to offer any testimony whatever and as far as I can learn no producer appeared before the Senate committee, who closed their hearings on this matter last week. Accordingly, the only way that the Congress will be in the possession of the facts concerning producer ownership and control and producer costs will be through proceedings with the investigation along the lines indicated by my resolution.

Summarizing my statement, Mr. Speaker, I feel exactly like President Truman when he stated, in his veto message:

To withdraw entirely from this field of regulation, however, impelled only by imaginary fears, and in the fact of a record of accomplishment under the present law which is successful from the standpoint of consumer, distributor, carrier, and producer alike, would not be in the public interest.

Address by Representative James C. Murray, Third District of Illinois, Before a Group of Latvians and Americans of Latvian Descent at Austin Town Hall in Chicago, Ill., Saturday, June 11, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech delivered by Representative JAMES C. MURRAY, Third District of Illinois, before a group of Latvians and Americans of Latvian descent, at Austin Town Hall in Chicago, Ill., on Saturday, June 11, 1955. Congressman MURRAY made a stirring and eloquent plea for Latvia and those other unfortunate countries which have perished behind the Iron Curtain. His speech is a ringing cry for freedom for all persecuted peoples everywhere. The address is as follows:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES C. MURRAY, THIRD DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, BEFORE A GROUP OF LATVIANS AND AMERICANS OF LATVIAN DESCENT, AT AUSTIN TOWN HALL IN CHICAGO, ILL., SATURDAY, JUNE 11, 1955

Honorable Chairman Bumanis, my fellow countrymen of Latvian nativity, the nameless graves of uncounted thousands of your countrymen conquered in treachery and murdered with savagery bespeak to us who have always known the blessings of liberty today to stand before you in all humility.

It is in that spirit that I have come here to you. My purpose, my pledge, is to rededicate myself to freedom—freedom everywhere—freedom in Latvia and among your oppressed neighbors. Latvia, like Lithuania, Estonia, like Poland and many other countries has been forced to fight for freedom since antiquity. Overrun many times but never completely conquered; purged and scourged but never completely exterminated; enslaved and enchained but never completely subjugated; Latvia stands as a great and eloquent testimonial of man's determination forever to be free.

We who take our liberties for granted can never fully appreciate the trials and struggles of your brave and unquenchable peoples.

The occasion we observe today is one of the blackest chapters of all of human history. On June 17, 1940—let that date be remembered—the Communist purge began in Latvia; the slaying of more than 1,300 of political leaders, educators, journalists, public officers, hundreds of ordinary men and women in whom the fire of personal political liberty burned brightly.

I need not recite the many battles that Latvia has fought for freedom since early history; her trials and struggles after the revolutions of 1905 and 1917; her final achievement of freedom on January 26, 1921; nor the foul aggression of Communist Russia which in 1940 seized upon her at a time of international melancholy, once more to load her down with servitude and chains.

Thank heaven that our Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower have always signified to the entire world that this country will never acquiesce in this treacherous aggression.

I deeply, personally regret that undue hopes have been built by talk of liberation or other slogans.

This is not the way to liberty, not when we are unprepared and lack the plans and firmness. Anyone who has read the reports of the House Select Committee on Communist Aggression, 83d Congress, knows well the full depths of Communist treachery and the assault upon your free people. I am not here to open up old wounds or to raise up false hopes by slogans or unjustified promises.

This I say: The Democratic administrations met communism and stopped it in its tracks in Greece, in Turkey, in Germany, in Korea. Our own great Democratic Senator PAUL DOUGLAS last year proposed to carry the cold war to the fear-ridden, tottering, and uncertain satellites. His bills, all six of them, were stronger pressure than the Department of State would permit. I was for those bills then; I am for them now.

Uncertainty, suspicion, defection, despair stalk the Communist regimes everywhere; I hope we will work with foresight and courage to increase those tensions and to undermine those tyrannies.

I have one thought that I would bring to you, my friends, on this sad but determined memorial day; there never was a midnight so deep, a night so black, it was not followed by the dawn. Already we find heartening and cheerful evidence that communism is wracked and torn in depth by internal fears and failures and stresses. Beria is liquidated; Malenkov is drenched with deep disgrace; Kruschev goes hat in hand to Tito and gets a cool reception.

The Marshall plan successes rebuild Europe and NATO, another Democratic program, builds strength and arms and a strong wall against communism. The economic and political successes of the West undermine the faltering political futilities of the East.

One day your country and other countries will be free. Latvia will be free. Lithuania free. Poland will be free. Estonia free. And so will the other nations that now are held in communistic chains. For freedom is the power that knows no peer, stronger even than the atom, it has no half-life—its half-life lives forever. Even now the daylight breaks. We read retreat and hysteria in communistic diplomacy. I believe the moment is almost here when at "the summit conference" we may strike our strongest blows at chains and brighten hope of freedom everywhere. With this thought in mind I have addressed the following plea to the President.

Here is the text of my telegram:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT. Believing in ultimate freedom as you do, I urge you to raise immediately at the summit conference, if held, the question of freedom in Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, and other enslaved countries. The Soviet treachery against the Baltic Republics in 1940 is equalled only by Communist treacheries against other free peoples since World War II. I urge and beg that you approach this conference with firmness and determination and that you raise at once the question of freedom in these countries, free elections, and make this the test of Soviet sincerity. Let communism match its professions of peace with self-determination of peoples, with free elections supervised by a world committee of the United Nations Assembly. This should be the first test of their sincerity. If you will raise these questions you will earn the gratitude of these and other peoples. I pledge you my earnest support in these endeavors."

Believing in liberty as I do, detesting communism in its entirety, distrustful of its every motive and pledge, I could do no less. I hope my suggestions will be accepted, conditions raised, and communism put to the test of its sincerity.

At the same time that we demand of communism conditions of sincerity on its part, we ought to give a demonstration of sincerity on our part. We can do this by immediately passing legislation to eliminate the ghastly immigration restrictions that have been placed against countries like Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Estonia; and second, by passing at once legislation that will make the Refugee Relief Act an act to admit refugees instead of raising up legalistic bars against them.

The President was absolutely right in demanding a revision of the Refugee Act, and I will support its revision. I wish he had gone further and demanded that the inhuman restrictions of the immigration laws against your free peoples be removed. We ought to give Russia a one-two punch: first, by revising our Refugee Act, and, second, by putting conditions of sincerity to her at the Summit Conference.

Liberty never sleeps. We who believe in liberty must never rest or sleep while in great nations and among good peoples it is held in chains. The day will come when tyranny will find itself defied at every hand as it has been in your great country.

I close with this humble thought—let us keep faith with liberty forever.

Thank you.

Book Banning Versus Book Burning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a little more than a year ago ripples of controversy in this country grew into great cascades of caustic criticism because of the practice of book burning. Critics grew so frantic in their discussion of book burning that they even condemned aa committee of Congress which, after careful investigation, discovered that a number of pro-Communist books and books written by Communists had found their way to the shelves of the American Information Libraries overseas. However, because of the diligence of the congressional committee and the cooperation of the Director of USIF, those Communist-tainted books were removed from the overseas libraries.

However, it appears from a recent article that book burning has been car-

ried to its *n*th degree, and that there is developing in this country the practice of book banning or book burning, whereby books are prevented from being circulated, even to the extent that people are unable to determine whether they want to place a given book on the library table in the sitting room, or burn it in the furnace in the basement. I think Congress will be interested in this new twist of book burning.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the subject, Book Banning Versus Book Burning, together with an article entitled "Book Burning: How the Librarians Do It," written by Victor Lasky and published in the current issue of Human Events.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOOK BANNING VERSUS BOOK BURNING

(Statement by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota)

For the careful consideration of the Congress and the country, I desire to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an unusually challenging and disturbing article appearing in the June 11 issue of Human Events and written by an outstanding American man of letters—Victor Lasky, author of several books, and a former editor of the American Legion Reader.

The title of the attached article is "Book Burning—How the Librarians Do It." It provides challenging reading for anybody seriously interested in preserving the first amendment and complete freedom of press and information.

Obviously, if certain books are banned by the personal prejudice of biased librarians or if they are condemned by a chorus of book reviewers with preconceived opinions about what Americans should read, the odious practice of book burning has been carried to the *n*th degree by eliminating books from reading rooms even before critics can pounce upon them, and carry them to a greedy fire.

Mr. Lasky raises some soul-searching questions to be answered objectively by those opposed to censorship whether it be by Government edict or by individual bias.

Is it true, that pro-Communist books usually receive favorable book reviews while anti-Communist books are given the brush-off or a black eye?

Is it true that books favorable to Formosa or to the free Chinese are condemned and discouraged whereas books favorable to Communist China and critical of Chiang Kai-shek are applauded and recommended for library purchase?

Is it true that books which are supercritical of congressional investigating committees and the FBI are encouraged and their perusal advocated whereas caustic criticism and condemnatory comments are directed at books which defend congressional investigating committees and support the FBI?

Is it true that the Library Journal published by Virginia Kirkus has become a "tip sheet" for unsuspecting librarians through which ideological predilections toward the left are espoused and by which books supporting our private enterprise concepts and the constitutional practices of this Republic are excoriated?

Is it true that book reviewers for the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Saturday Review have become a claque of critics chorusing sharp criticism of such ancient and honorable American virtues as patriotism, loyalty, private ownership, and the rights of States and individuals as against the Central Government? Is Boston's chief librarian, John M. Carroll, correct in his warnings about the Library Journal and its tendency to present to librarians a biased and a prejudiced picture?

Busy Senators find little time to read book reviews and less time to review books. Therefore, I raise these questions for others to answer. However, Mr. Lasky's reputation is great enough to at least justify an effort to find honest answers to the questions growing out of his stimulating article. Surely, America wants no more of book banning than it does of book burning.

Individual librarians, library boards, book selection committees, and the publishers of America's great newspapers and book review sections would do well to reexamine their procedures to make certain there are straightforward and correct answers to the questions raised by Mr. Lasky. Book readers, generally, and those who are inclined to rely on book reviewers to determine their reading diets would do well to give personal study to what they see in book reviews compared with what they read in books in order to make sure that those who publish, review, and recommend books contribute to the enlightenment of the public rather than engage in propaganda thinly concealed behind a facade of respectability.

BOOK BURNING—HOW THE LIBRARIANS DO IT

(By Victor Lasky)

Diverse, indeed, are the ways of the book-burners.

In Milton, Mass., for example, the town librarian refused to buy Eugene W. Castle's book Billions, Blunders, and Baloney. She explained that it was "a sporadic attack with inaccuracies and written with assumption."

Castle's assumption, based on several years of personal observations abroad, was that United States foreign aid and overseas propaganda do us more harm than good.

Admittedly, that is a controversial assumption.

But so is Elmer Davis' But We Were Born Free, which can be found in the Milton library. Apparently, the librarian accepts its basic assumption—that American freedoms are rapidly disappearing under the whiplash of McCarthyism.

But there are those in Milton, whose taxes support the library, who would disagree. Yet, no one questions the librarian's right to purchase the Elmer Davis book.

Or, for that matter, the recent penny dreadful by the brothers Alsop, denouncing Admiral Strauss as the villain in the Oppenheimer case, which was criticized even by the physicist himself for intemperateness.

The librarian's charge of inaccuracies hardly holds water since only recently the Milton library obtained a copy of Justice William O. Douglas' highly inaccurate Almanac of Democracy. In it, Douglas said 58,000 court-approved wiretaps had taken place in New York; the correct figure was under 800.

Yet, despite her aversion to inaccuracies, the Milton librarian has not consigned the Douglas book to the furnace.

In itself, Milton's ban on the Castle book is not too important. Whether or not the book is good or bad, accurate or inaccurate, is of no importance, either.

The real issue is whether librarians should be permitted to purchase books solely on the basis of their personal opinions. Are they entitled to ban books not conforming with their ideological predilections?

If they are, then the American Library Association was absolutely right when, in 1943, it endorsed a statement proclaiming that "the freedom to read is in danger."

The proclamation denounced attempts to list books and authors as objectionable or controversial and efforts to remove books from sale, to censor textbooks.

Noble sentiments indeed. But they overlook the fact that, quite often, librarians themselves "burn" books. As at Milton, they just don't buy books they don't like.

Sometimes the librarians can't help themselves. For example, in Teaneck, N. J., the chief librarian had decided against purchasing the Castle book since the reviews, she claimed, were bad.

But, as she told a librarians' conference, she had a painful problem: What should she do about the unusual number of requests for the Castle book?

To the untutored, the answer would appear obvious. Give the public what it wants. Or, at least, the librarian should have read the book giving her such pain. But she had not. She told Mr. Castle her opinion of it was based solely on the reviews.

Eventually, her painful dilemma was resolved. She ordered the Castle book.

It should be emphasized that, as in Teaneck, many librarians may be unaware that, by refusing to purchase a book because of certain reviews, they're unwitting accessories in the crime of bookburning.

More than 12,000 books are published annually. Obviously, few librarians can read more than a handful. Obviously, too, few libraries can purchase every book.

Most librarians, therefore, rely on certain publications for guidance on what to purchase.

Rarely do they decide on the basis of public demand. The Castle book, for example, stirred up extraordinarily large requests in the Nation's libraries, to judge from a sampling. Yet, as Boston's chief librarian admits, such demand is no determining influence.

Neither, the Bostonian said, is the fact that a book, such as Castle's, hit national best-seller lists of both the New York Times and the Herald Tribune.

What is important are the reviews appearing in the Times Sunday Book Sections and such trade sources as the Library Journal and the Virginia Kirkus tip sheet.

Miss Kirkus' ideological predilections can be seen in her attack on the new Ralph de Toledano anti-Communist novel for failing to contribute to international understanding. Apparently this means that anti-Red manuscripts should be submitted to the Kremlin for approval.

Books like Billions, Blunders, and Baloney rarely meet with Miss Kirkus' acceptance. In the Times, the Castle book was subjected to a hatchet job, more vindictive than usual. The Libray Journal also denounced the book.

The Journal, since it caters specifically to librarians, has an enormous say over what Americans find in their libraries. Unfortunately, its recommendations generally are questionable.

John Caldwell, a writer on the Far East, studied the Journal's choices in his field. Invariably, he told a Senate committee last year, books critical of the Chinese Nationalists are touted. Anti-Communist books, he said, such as Geraldine Fitch's Formosa Beachhead, either are condemned or ignored. Books sympathetic with congressional probes, such as Burnham's Web of Subversion, are rarely recommended. Unsurprisingly, therefore, the Journal described the Castle book as "an intemperate attack, often bordering on the hysterical * * * unfortunate * * * noisy manner of presentation * * *."

Librarians were advised to "await demand," meaning they should keep Castle out of their libraries unless the demand was overwhelming.

By giving such advice, the Journal has arrogated for itself the powers of a censor. If anyone else presumed to tell librarians

what not to buy, the Journal undoubtedly would accuse him of book-burning.

The Journal's influence is enormous, according to Boston's chief librarian, John M. Carroll. In order to accommodate local tastes, Boston's library system supplements the trade papers with its own reading system.

This consists of "five representative branch librarians, advised by ministers and other community leaders," Mr. Carroll said. The committee decides on a book's merit—or lack of them—on the basis of trade reviews, as well as one submitted by a local reader. The committee's analysis then is sent to the various branch libraries.

Here's what was sent out on Billions, Blunders, and Baloney.

"This book is subtitled 'The fantastic story of how Uncle Sam is squandering your money overseas.' It might be well to note that the emphasis in this statement should be on the word 'fantastic.' If Mr. Castle had been a bit less fantastic and a bit more factual his book would have carried greater weight. In this sound and fury treatment he pulls no punches and is impartial in his criticism from the President down.

"Before deciding to buy this item, it might be well to read the following reviews: New York Times Book Review, February 13, page 22; New York Herald Tribune Book Review, February 20, page 5; Saturday Review, February 26, page 14.

"An important subject not too adroitly handled. Undoubtedly there will be calls for this title; in fact there have already been many calls, but buy with caution. Not for replacement."

Mr. Carroll frankly admitted this comment was "not designed to encourage purchase of the book." He said it was not unusual to cite reviews appearing in the two New York newspapers.

Mr. Carroll was unaware that New England's best-known newsman, the Boston Herald's Bill Cunningham, had devoted a Sunday column of some 4,000 words to high praise of the Castle book. Or that both the Boston Globe and Boston Post had warmly recommended the book.

"Local newspaper appraisals generally are not profound," Mr. Carroll explained. "Moreover, we seek guidance in noncommercial sources."

The fact that, as reported by the library itself, "there have already been many calls" for the Castle book was unimportant.

"This occurs from time to time," he said. "A newspaper will refer to a book, or Walter Winchell might mention it, and there is phenomenal interest. Which is what happened in the case of Castle. Librarians know what the public wants to read. We seek to avoid deadwood, books not likely to have permanent value."

Mr. Carroll voiced bewilderment in the interest shown in the circular carrying comment on the Castle book. "After all," he said, "we can't read everything."

That, of course, is not the issue.

The issue concerns the objectivity of those empowered to recommend books. In Boston, at least, that objectivity is questionable. Consider the Boston analysis of Emily Hahn's sympathetic biography of Chiang Kai-shek. This recent book was described as "designed for the China lobby appeal. * * * Not all readers will agree with her interpretation. * * * There will be a demand, but it is not a first choice. * * * A more unbiased interpretation may be forthcoming."

The clichéd phraseology clearly reveals the leftward thinking of those who have a lot to say about what is purchased by Boston libraries.

Obviously the hoped-for "more unbiased interpretation" of Chiang's life would be the traditional one picturing the Gismo as a scoundrel. However, Edwin O. Reischauer's Wanted—An Asian Policy was recommended. In urging eventual recognition of Red China, this book takes the Lattimore line.

As stated, the merits of these books are not the issue.

The real issue is whether librarians should be permitted to put their own form of "thought control" over on the American people.

And, whether those in high places, from the White House down, will take cognizance of this form of insidious "book-burning," as they did so forthrightly when a Wisconsin Senator sought to remove Communist books from United States overseas propaganda libraries.

The United States Overseas Information Program—Comments by United States Ambassadors

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a Senate-House conference committee will shortly complete action on the next fiscal year's appropriations for the United States Information Agency.

As I have previously stated on the Senate floor, I believe that the funds wisely restored by the Senate should be retained in the final conference report.

Evidence throughout the world fully confirms the advisability of continuing the information program.

In particular, the men and women who serve as our Chiefs of Missions, representing the Government and the people of the United States in foreign lands, have consistently commended this agency for its indispensable role in interpreting the people and news of the United States to the world.

Certainly, the judgment of our ambassadors should be given due heed by the Congress of the United States, for it is our ambassadors who are on the scene, who are in day-to-day contact with governments and peoples, and whose judgment is, therefore, most expert in this field.

I am very pleased that the distinguished chairman of the National Committee for an Adequate Overseas Information Program—which I have been pleased to commend previously on the Senate floor—Mr. Edward L. Bernays, saw fit to invite the reactions of United States Chiefs of Missions to our overseas information program. The responses have been most heartwarming to this national committee of civic-minded private citizens, and to all friends of the Information Services.

I am pleased to say that these ambasadorial responses—including several from our most honored Foreign Service officers and from other well-honored Americans from private life—have received extensive coverage in the United States press. I am glad now to ask that they have the further attention in our country by inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that the responses received by Mr. Bernays be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and that they be preceded by a list of the able membership of the National Committee for an Adequate Overseas Information Program.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COMMITTE FOR AN ADEQUATE OVERSEAS UNITED STATES INFORMATION PROGRAM

Edward L. Bernays, chairman; Edward W. Barrett, S. R. Bernstein, Hodding Carter, Leo M. Cherne, J. R. Cominsky, Fleur Cowles, Nate L. Crabtree, Elmer Davis, George Gallup, Palmer Hoyt, Charles M. Hulten, Robert L. Johnson, C. B. Larrabee, Harold D. Lasswell, James A. Linen, Ed Lipscomb, Harlan Logan, Louis M. Lyons, Ralph McGill, Charles F. Moore, Jr., Wallace H. Moore, Theodore S. Repplier, O. W. Riegel, Jean Wade Rindlaub, Howland H. Sargeant, Paul C. Smith, Mark Starr, Ordway Tead, W. W. Waymack, E. S. Whitman.

COMMENTS OF UNITED STATES AMBASSADORS

Winthrop W. Aldrich, American Ambassador, London, England: "Serving in Britain as the representative of the United States Government, I have been impressed more than ever with the importance to Anglo-American unity of a clearer understanding at all times between our two countries. It is essential that there be the greatest possible flow of information between Britain and the United States to strengthen and foster that understanding. In this process the United States information program plays a most significant part. I have seen for myself the valuable contribution which the United States Information Service makes to the proper understanding and appreciation abroad of the American people and American foreign policy. I am convinced that this program deserves fullest support not only in the national interest but in the interest also of the whole free world."

John Davis Lodge, American Ambassador, Madrid, Spain: "I welcome the opportunity to make a statement for your committee on the vital importance of an adequate United States information program overseas.

"I have long been on record for support of an adequate United States information program, both when I was in Congress and subsequently as Governor of the State of Connecticut. Indeed, I was a member of the subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee which drafted the legislation creating the United States Information Service.

"Not only must we fight the insidious spread of communism with the truth, but we must also constantly explain our motives and our intentions to our friends so that there can be no doubt of their understanding of the path we are following in world affairs.

"I wish you and your committee great success in your valid undertaking.

"I shall be glad to have you use this statement for publication."

James B. Conant, American Ambassador, Bonn/Bad Godesberg, Germany:

"The purpose of your letter, and indeed the aims of your committee, encourage me to reply enthusiastically. I have found the United States information program of invaluable assistance to the United States mission to Germany.

"Wherever communication media exist, the air is likely to be charged with opinions, sometimes clearly labeled, sometimes expressed as fact. Through it all, however, people must carefully pick their way to find the truth. The United States information program, I believe, makes their job easier. The United States role in world affairs is better understood abroad if the truth, as

well as our policies which depend upon it, is widely known.

"A major objective of our information program abroad is to counter the persistent efforts of the Communists to weaken confidence in American leadership and to distort and defame the aims and policies of our country. Facts concerning the strength, unity, and determination of the free world also bring hope for the future to millions of people. Such a program demands public support in America, for its content is not simply governmental, in essence, but American in the generic sense of the word."

Clare Boothe Luce, American Ambassador, Rome, Italy:

"I most heartily agree with you and with the distinguished members of your committee on the need for an adequate overseas information program, and for all the reasons set forth by the President and Secretary of State."

Douglas Dillon, American Ambassador, Paris, France:

"In France I have found an increasing thirst for information about the United States across the widest possible range of society. This interest in the American way of life, in our policies and our actions, is reflected in the many questions asked by French men and women and in a constant stream of letters to the Embassy. It is in large part due, I believe, to the predominant role the United States has increasingly played in world affairs and also to the realization here that United States actions, both at home and abroad, have a correspondingly greater importance to France.

"Our USIS libraries, our film showings, and our exhibits in France are hardly able to meet the great demand for information about the United States. Interest runs high not only in the political field but also in such diverse activities as American agriculture, industrial development, our educational system, and the conservation and use of our natural resources.

"Since the key to our foreign policy lies in united effort with our friends throughout the free world, I believe it essential that we maintain an adequate overseas information program to keep these foreign friends fully informed of our purposes and of our achievements."

L. Corrin Strong, American Ambassador, Oslo, Norway:

"The United States is trying to be a good neighbor in a modern world. Our good intentions, however, sometimes are suspected by those who incorrectly fear that we have hidden motives. Americans who are in Europe—and I am one of them—cannot but be aware that even among people who are basically friendly to us there exists fears of United States power, criticism of United States practices. Much of it is based on misconception. The United States Overseas Information Program is doing much and can do much more in helping to improve an understanding of our common interests with our European neighbors and thus to obtain firm working partners in the family of free nations."

Cavendish W. Cannon, American Ambassador, Athens, Greece:

"I would have thought that the time was past when it was necessary to explain and defend the overseas-information program. In the years since the war ended it has become an essential instrument in the conduct of foreign policy. As the President has emphasized, our relationship with our allies is increasingly one of partnership. No partnership can endure without full understanding and sympathy among the partners, and USIS, through its libraries, its press service, its radio programs, its exhibits, its concerts and lectures, its motion pictures, and its innumerable day-to-day man-to-man contacts, has contributed immensely to that understanding. In the four posts where I have served as Chief of Mission I have tried to utilize USIS to the fullest, and I should have felt sadly handicapped without it.

"I am glad also to report my observation that USIS is each year responding more effectively to the requirements placed on it as an instrument of our foreign policy; this in spite of hard times due to insufficient public confidence and underestimation of its achievements.

"I wish your committee every success in its campaign to assure a truly effective overseas-information program."

Arthur Gardner, American Ambassador, Habana, Cuba:

"Viewed in action overseas, the informational and cultural work performed by the United States Information Agency is, to my mind, an essential weapon in our ideological struggle with international communism. I feel that we must devote unflagging efforts to convince other peoples, particularly those hundreds of millions who have not yet made up their minds, that the United States stands for peace, freedom, progress, and the dignity of man.

"Every dollar that goes into this campaign is well spent. The USIA is a highly specialized organization manned by capable professionals. It should not be crippled by unjustified criticism or insufficient funds. It should be given every encouragement and the proper tools to do its job."

Sheldon T. Mills, American Ambassador, Quito, Ecuador: "During my recent tours of duty abroad, I have been increasingly made aware of the importance of the United States overseas information program which functions as an adjunct to our foreign policy.

"I feel that even the best and strongest foreign policy is likely to be limited in its effectiveness if the peoples at home and in the rest of the world are not informed concerning it.

"It is axiomatic that we who are engaged in a struggle to determine whether democracy or communism will rule men's minds have the duty to present the truth and soundness of our way of life to men of all nations."

Avra M. Warren, American Ambassador, Ankara. Turkey: "A decade has now passed since the guns of the Second World War fell silent. How well we all remember the feeling of hopefulness for the future that then prevailed; a universal hope of peace and good will. Yet in the 10 short years that have since elapsed we have seen the transition to a world of disillusionment and frequently of despair.

"What is the reason for this tragic development? No doubt there are many contributing factors, all of which will be duly listed and identified by the historians of the future. Yet, when the definitive history of this era is finally written, I am convinced that one thing will be singled out as primarily responsible for the sorry pass in which the world now finds itself—and that is the success with which the Kremlin has spread the Communist gospel throughout almost all the world. This is the insidious force, the false faith, which has penetrated among great masses of people in many lands and it, far more than the use or threat of military force, has made possible the advance of communism up to now.

"Surely it must now be evident that the basic struggle is one of ideas. It is a fight for the minds and hearts of men, in which we must recognize that concern for security or material well-being are not the only or necessarily controlling factors. It is still true that 'man does not live by bread alone.' We must meet and defeat the ideological appeal of communism on its own ground, that is, with a better and finer appeal to the minds and hearts of men. We must oppose the false faith of international communism with the true faith, based on that respect for human rights and the freedom of the individual which is at the basis of our democratic society.

"It is thus essential that our message be brought to all the world, and in this task the United States Information Agency is our principal instrument. To the extent that the American people understand and support the vital nature of this task, its success will be assured."

Fletcher Warren, American Ambassador, Caracas, Venezuela: "During my 33-year career with our Foreign Service, I have observed throughout the world great and constant need for strong moral leadership. I believe that no other nation has so great a responsibility to furnish that leadership as the United States. Our capacity to act morally and with determination is a decisive factor in rallying the free peoples of the world to our side. One of the best ways to make that leadership effective is through a vigorous United States information program. Therefore, I highly commend your committee for its efforts toward strengthening the United States information program overseas."

The Genius of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, recently the Fifth Washington Pilgrimage concluded its meetings in the auditorium of the National Archives Building. For the occasion, Dr. Lynn Harold Hough delivered a thoughtful address entitled "The Genius of Democracy." Dr. Hough is one of our most distinguished theologians and a leading writer on religious subjects. He has spent 26 years as a pastor, and has been dean of Drew Theological Seminary.

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GENIUS OF DEMOCRACY

(By Lynn Harold Hough)

The theory and the practice of democracy are based upon a sense of the significance of the individuals. Something like 600 years before the coming of the Christian era the principle was announced dramatically by tne two Old Testament prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The people felt that they were caught in the evil coming down from their ancestors. They said bitterly "The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge." This attitude was sharply condemned by the prophets. As Ezekiel put it: "This proverb shall no more be used by you in Israel. Behold all souls are mine, the soul of the father as well as the soul of the son is mine; the soul that sins shall die." Every individual soul has its own standing before God because all belong to Him. A man is never lost in the bundle of life. Here we have the religious basis for democracy—to use terms belonging to a far later time. In the declaration that every individual soul belongs to God you have the charter of democracy.

In the fifth century B. C. you have an expression of what may be called the secular conception of the value of the individual.

The philosopher Protagoras declared that the individual man is the measure of all things. Truth must be approached through the individual. He sets the standard. Not because of what he is to God but because of what he is to himself he is important. But here a problem emerges. If the individual is the standard of truth there will be as many kinds of truth as there are individuals. And that means anarchy. In fact this is just what Proudhon the founder of philosophical anarchy—who was born in the year of the birth of Abraham Lincoln and died in the same year as the death of Lincoln—declared. The danger of the position of Protagoras was clearly seen by Socrates who made the class rather than the individual standard. Mankind rather than the individual became the standard. And Plato put this conception at the very heart of his conception of the eternal ideas. The two conceptions have been fighting ever since. In the Middle Ages the State was considered more real than the individual citizen, the church was more real than the individual Christian. In fact the individual was only real as a part of something greater than himself. When the great door of history swung on its hinges the individual was seen in the sharper fashion. So the battles between the absolute state and the individual claiming his rights began. Each principle had something important and true in it. The one alone meant tyranny. The other alone meant lawlessness. The two must be brought together. So democracy began to be seen as involving these larger relationships. We may illustrate the result by a consideration of the circle and the ellipse. Democracy is not a circle with the state at the center. It cannot make terms with tyranny. Democracy is not a circle with the individual at the center. It cannot allow itself to be reduced to anarchy. It is an ellipse with two foci. One focus is the individual. The other focus is the state. They are in equal emphasis. The individual is given all the freedom he can receive without interfering with the common good. The state is given all the power it can exercise without crushing the individual. The legitimate rights of the individual must be maintained.

In America the Declaration of Independence was a great document in the name of individual rights and freedom. The Constitution of the United States is a great document relating to the rights of the individual to those of the Federal Government. The two political parties have built themselves about the two principles. One has emphasized the individual man and the individual State. The other has represented the doctrine of central and Federal authority. But it must be observed that when in power, the party of the individual usually exercises far reaching central control. And whichever party is out of power becomes the watchful critic of Federal exercise of power. Both principles are needed. And together they make a great Federal Republic which duly recognizes the rights of the individual man and the individual State. On this side of the Atlantic there was a situation where only property owners could vote. There was a situation where only church members could vote. And of course there was the long period when only men could vote. The full recognition of the rights of the individual human being came slowly.

Industrial democracy brings up all the complicated problems of the employer and the employed. Collective bargaining is an attempt to take account of the rights of each. But there is a third factor in the matter of industrial democracy. This involves the consideration of the rights of the general public. Really democratic bargaining would include not merely a struggle between the employer and the employed but it would bring in a representative of the public. This would bring about a more definite approach to justice. Democracy does not mean life lived on a dead level where everybody is comfortable. It takes account of mountains. But it does away with artificial barriers. Anybody who will pay the price of self-discipline and industry is allowed to climb.

Intellectual democracy recognizes differences in the mental capacities of men. But it does mean the right of every man to make the most of the powers of his mind. It seeks out the poor inglorious Miltons and it makes it possible for them to enter into their intellectual heritage.

Spiritual democracy means that no man has a right to obstruct the path of another man to God. Every man has a right to unblocked access to the source of spiritual reality.

In all these things democracy means for every individual that the essentials of a good life, mental, and moral, and spiritual, and physical are brought within reach. Human beings must not be asked to live on an inhuman level.

In every individual the possession of certain possibilities and powers leads to the possession of certain rights. And the deeper basis of these rights lies in the fact that as Paul said in his great sermon at Athens, "men are the offspring of God. As God's children they are God's sons in the making." Of course any man can say "no" to God. And here is the deepest tragedy of human life. And he can say "yes" to God. And here is the greatest glory of humanity. The divine word "All souls are mine," gives infinite promise to every individual who will receive the grace of God and set about following the divine will. God's care for every human being is not only the basis of democracy, it is the transfiguration of democracy. The dignity of man is the glory of God.

The Soviet Subsidized Athletic Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on professionalism in Soviet athletics, written by John Washburn, of Hanover, N. H. The most recent issue of Life magazine contained a very fine article on this subject, and Mr. Washburn's story, I believe, points up the real intent of Moscow in furthering its subsidized athletic program.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Concord Daily Monitor and N. H. Patriot of April 12, 1955]

PROFESSIONALISM IN SOVIET ATHLETICS SCORED BY FORMER DARTMOUTH INSTRUCTOR—NEW HAMPSHIRE MAN SAYS BRUNDAGE DUPED BY HOSTS ON VISIT TO RUSSIA—WASHBURN DECLARES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE PRESIDENT WAS PLAYED FOR A SUCKER, ASSERTS TRAINING CAMPS SET UP FOR YOUNG RUSSIAN ATHLETES

(By John N. Washburn)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Today's lead sports article, indicting Russia for double talk about its alleged amateurism in sports, was written exclusively for the Concord Monitor by John Washburn, former Dartmouth College instructor.

(The Hanover man, who served in the Army in Korea in 1945 and 1946 as a Russian interpreter, is now a sportswriter for World Tennis and the author of several articles on tennis behind the Iron Curtain.

(One-time New Hampshire junior tennis champion, and the son of Prof. H. E. Washburn, of the Dartmouth faculty, John will begin law studies at the University of Michigan in June. He leaves Friday for a 6 weeks' tour of Europe and the Near East.

(Recently he has been engaged in free lance writing on Soviet propaganda in drama and literature as well as in sports. From 1950 to 1953 he was instructor in Russian at Dartmouth.)

Avery Brundage, International Olympic Committee persident, was quoted by the Associated Press last month as saying: "The Russians insisted when I was in Moscow last summer that they are conducting athletics on a pure amateur basis and are not operating athletic camps." How naive can one be?

If while in Moscow Mr. Brundage had bothered to look at volume XIV of the new edition of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia, or to leaf through the old numbers of the newspaper Red Sport, he would have discovered that the Russians were playing him for a sucker.

The Great Soviet Encyclopedia in its entry on Dynamo, the oldest and most powerful Soviet athletic organization now in existence, confirms the fact that training camps for young Russian athletes do exist by its statement: "For the training of young cadres of athletes from the youth of Dynamo, the Young Dynamovite (Yuni Dinamovets) which has raised many champions and U. S. S. R. record-holders, was created."

It ought to be noted, in passing, that Dynamo is the athletic organization of the secret police and organs of state security.

There is considerable material to prove that all top Soviet athletes are professionals, by any definition except the Communist-approved definition.

ANTIPOV STATED POSITION

The official Soviet Government position on professionalism in athletics was stated in detail by N. K. Antipov back on October 7, 1934, at a meeting of the Presidium of the All-Union Soviet of Physical Culture, and, since no other official viewpoint has been publicly expressed, we can assume that it is still the official one.

Said Antipov:

"Our instructor, by bourgeois concepts, is, of course, a professional. We have thousands of such people, and we shall have even more. How can there even be a question about allowing our instructors to enter competitions? In our country an instructor is just as much an athlete as anybody else."

The Soviet position, as Antipov indicates, is that if an athlete is engaged in actual coaching work, he thereby maintains his nonprofessional standing and is free to engage in competition even against those whom he has coached. In fact, in order to qualify for the title of "master of sport," according to the so-called single all-Union athletic classification which went into effect on January 1, 1933, top Russian athletes must serve as coaches "directing public activity in a physical culture collective and transmitting their experience and knowledge to young people."

PAID BY STATE

Do these Soviet athlete-coaches get paid by the state for their services? Yes, indeed. A former Soviet athlete now in this country told me he used to draw a salary of 1,000 rubles monthly (not subject to any Soviet withholding taxes), a salary far in excess of what a top engineer was receiving in those days—the late 1930's.

The newspaper Red Sport in the period 1935–38 mentions several athletes being paid from 500 to 750 rubles monthly, simply for representing their particular trade-union

athletic club in competition and doing little or no coaching work, even though their names appeared on the club register and payroll as coach of some sport or other.

SPORT AS A PROFESSION

Is sport considered to be the profession, the life's work of these top Soviet athlete-coaches? Yes, indeed. Since 1937 the ruse of having outstanding athletes pose as legitimate factory workers was dropped. I. I. Kharchenko, chairman of the All-Union Committee on Affairs of Physical Culture and Sport, declared at that time: "In our country the best athlete is evaluated as a leading person of our motherland, and there is nothing to be ashamed of in the fact that athletic work was his profession in life."

Since the end of World War II the Communist Party leaders in the Kremlin have been careful not to publish the text of their official decress pertaining to sports.

The most important decree on Soviet sports of recent years, that of December 27, 1948, has not appeared in either the Soviet press or in collections of party decrees.

Culture and Life, organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, did publish an expurgated summary of the December 27 decree on January 11, 1949, but absolutely no mention was made of the masters of sport—the most outstanding Soviet athletes.

GOVERNMENT SECRET?

Evidently the fact that they are being subsidized through various state and Communist Party channels is considered to be just as much of a government secret as are their pay scales.

Even though no official documentary proof of Soviet professionalism in athletics is available for the postwar period, decrees dating from 1937 confirm its existence.

Consider Decree No. 155, dated March 14, 1939, part of which has been produced on this page.

This decree putting athletic subsidies on a more businesslike basis was issued by the All-Union Committee on Affairs of Physical Culture and Sport attached to the Council of People's Commissars of the U. S. S. R. and appeared over the signature of its chairman, V. Snegov.

DECREE QUOTED

Paragraphs No. 2 and 3 read, when translated:

"To the most outstanding masters of Soviet sport, who are systematically working to raise their athletic, technical, and cultural level, and to train qualified athletic cadres, I order to be rendered material aid, arising from the proven necessity of this in order to guarantee their further growth. Material aid is to be rendered only in exceptional circumstances, and on approval of the All-Union Committee on Affairs of Physical Culture and Sport attached to the Council of People's Commissars of the U. S. S. R.

"I order the chairman of republic, regional, oblast, and city committees and of volunteer athletic clubs to scrutinize personally questions concerning further work regarding the basic profession and specialty of athletes who are signed up to receive stipends and also to get subsidies."

ADVICE TO BRUNDAGE

While there is still time to avoid another debacle like Yalta from occuring at the 1956 Olympic games, steps should be taken by Mr. Brundage's International Olympic Committee to determine whether Decree No. 155 and others like it are still operative in the U. S. S. R.

If they are, then Soviet masters of sport should be termed "professionals," and banned from Olympic competition.

How about it, Mr. Bundage?

The Unity Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, earlier this month there assembled on the campus of Northern State Teachers College, at Aberdeen, S. Dak., the 13th annual Boys State, sponsored by the American Legion. Some 370 representative juniors from the high schools of the State, selected on the basis of leadership exhibited in their respective schools, learned of government, not from books, but from active participation and observation.

The delegates to Boys State were divided into two parties, the Nationalists and the Federalists. Each party held nominating conventions. The candidate of the Nationalist Party, Wayne Hines, of Madison, S. Dak., was declared the winner only after intense and active campaigning by his supporters.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the inaugural speech which Wayne made on that occasion. One who reads the address is assured that America will be in safe hands as the younger generation take over and approach their task with the determination, the good will, and the humility which reflect a true sense of responsibility.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Lieutenant Governor Muller, Governor Kineen, citizens of South Dakota Boys State of 1955, friends, and mother and dad, today, 150 members of the Boys State legislature, 5 supreme court judges, and 11 constitutional officers of boys have taken the oath to support the constitution of Boys State, and to discharge faithfully the duties of their respective offices. On behalf of all of them, let me thank all of you for the confidence that you have shown in us, and assure you that every one of these officials regards his as a position of trust.

Let me begin by thanking the nationalist party for supporting me as candidate for governor. Without their unified support, victory would have been impossible. Particularly, may I thank Eldon Eisenach, my campaign manager, and chairman of the party, whose capable direction was demonstrated in this triumph. My thanks also to my running mate, Noel Muller, and to the other nationalist candidates who campaigned long and well on behalf of the party.

However, now the election is past, and there is only one political party in Boys State—the unity party. May I give my particular thanks to Gordon Bratz, a very worthy and honorable opponent, for pledging his full and unqualified support to this administration. It is through his pledge of support that we have attained unity, and I can assure him, and all federalists, that all of my appointments have been made from the membership in the unity party, regardless of former political affiliation.

Now may I speak for all 1955 Boy Staters, and direct my words to the persons and groups who have made possible this week of practable experience in democracy. To you, Commander Clifton, and to the American Legion you represent; and to you, Dr. Lovinger, and to the Northern State Teachers College staff, our sincere thanks. And particularly to you gentlemen of the Boys State staff, who have worked long and hard that we may learn—and enjoy the process of learning—we all owe our utmost gratitude.

This afternoon, a plaque will be dedicated to the five principal founders of the South Dakota Boys State. Speaking for all 1955 citizens of the organization you founded, may I say simply that we shall try to uphold, now and in the future, the ideals you exemplified by starting this great institution of Boys State.

Probably none of us yet understands, or fully appreciates, the experience of this week. When we think of it, we think of the friends we have made, from all corners of South Dakota, from cities, towns, and farms, from backgrounds as diversified as the "land of infiite variety," which is South Dakota. We think of the friendly competition in political campaigns as we progressed through city, country, and State elections, and also on the basketball court and softball diamond. These things we think of now.

But there is a greater and deeper experience gained at Boys State. We have experienced government—we have lived democracy in action—we have actually been the governing bodies, and the citizens, in a functioning, operating system of government. Although at the moment we may not comprehend fully the impact of this experience, as we later reflect on this week—and we will as we go through life—we will understand the importance of these 6 short days at Boys State.

We have been given an unparalleled opportunity in leadership. We must accept the challenge it offers and assume the responsibility to work within the framework of democracy, for the preservation of democracy, and the perfection of democracy.

The First City Troop of Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the First City Troop of Philadelphia, is the oldest military organization in the United States with continuous service to the present time from preceding the Revolution. I have in my hand an article from the Pennsylvania Guardsman which contains a very brief history of the organization. I feel it will be of interest to my colleagues. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENTING THE 1ST CITY TROOP OF PHILADELPHIA

The 28th Reconnaissance Company, 28th Infantry Division, Pennsylvania National Guard, known throughout the Nation as Philadelphia's 1st City Troop is one of the most colorful National Guard units in the country.

The marked enthusiasm, devotion, and jealous regard for the honor of the group

marks the troop as a unique part of the Commonwealth's military forces. Operating from a privately owned armory, built from the personal funds of its members, these troopers fulfill all the requirements of a federally recognized unit.

Some of its members represent the sixth generation serving in the organization. Their distinctive-type full-dress uniform, worn only on the occasion of George Washington's birthday and November 17, the anniversary date of the founding of the troop, is one of the most colorful military uniforms seen in the Nation today. In the Quaker City, a public appearance of the 1st City Troop in full regalia and mounted, marks any occasion with a display of pomp and ceremony rarely seen in present-day America.

The full-dress uniform, designed in 1774, is worn in replica today with little modification. The striking Hussar-type metal helmet with its large flaring black plume, the blue and silver-trimmed jacket, the tight fitting white trousers and the high knee-gauntlet black cavalry boots constitutes part of the esprit de corps nearly 2 centuries prolonged. The cost of the uniform and its upkeep is borne by each trooper as is the saddle equipment used by these history-rich soldiers.

For many years the 1st City Troop maintained its own stable of horses, but with the modern transition from mounted to mechanized cavalry in the Pennsylvania National Guard, the troop considered it unfeasible to continue the practice. At present, mounts are rented when the occasion demands.

It is of interest to mention that the only difference that exists between the officer and that of the enlisted men is in the knot-and-loop formation on the lower sleeves ornamenation. Each trooper wears, as did those in colonial times, a silver sword and scabbard and silver handwrought spurs. Each officer and enlisted man wears similar rank designations as comparable to those he holds in the Pennsylvania National Guard.

The only individual member of the proud Pennsylvania unit who wears a different uniform is the troop bugler. Of similar design and pattern as the others, it is entirely red with silver adornments. In keeping with tradition and incorporated into the regular weekly scheduled drills as the 28th Reconnaissance Company, all formations are executed by prescribed Army bugle calls. This practice dates back continuously to the time of its origin as a military unit.

To the troop goes the honor of escorting 25 Presidents of the United States and numerous leaders of many nations throughout the world at the time of their visits to Philadelphia.

The Pennsylvania National Guard is proud of the 1st City Troop and holds this guard unit in high esteem. Continuation of traditions established by their early forefathers is a manifestation of the missions we all share as modern Minute Men today.

HISTORICAL NOTES

Organized as the Light Horse of the City of Philadelphia November 17, 1774, the troop is the oldest active military component in continuous service in the United States. The first volunteer cavalry troop organized in defense of the Colonies, it has taken part in every war in which volunteer cavalry has served.

Under Captain Morris throughout the Revolution, the troop was engaged in the Battles of Trenton, Princeton, Brandywine, and Germantown, and was twice honored by General Washington with personal letters of thanks.

In the War of 1812, after the burning of Washington, the unit was on duty for 4 months in Maryland.

In the Civil War the troop was the only volunteer cavalry accepted under Lincoln's first call for 3 months' service. It served twice during the war as a unit and rendered great assistance in raising other units. Sixty-eight members were commissioned officers, 2 becoming major generals and 9 brigadier generals.

In the Spanish-American War, the troop volunteered as a unit. It left Philadelphia April 28, 1898, for Mount Gretna where it was sworn into the United States service. Sailing on the *Massachusetts* on July 28, it joined General Brook's command in the Puerto Rican campaign, the first volunteer troop to land on the island. The unit, without a single loss, was mustered out November 21, 1898.

During the disturbances on the Mexican border the troop was on active duty from June 23, 1916, to January 23, 1917, near Fort Bliss, El Paso. Tex.

During World War I, the troop accompanied the 28th division to Camp Hancock, Ga. It was converted to the 103d Trench Mortar Battery and it took part in the Oise-Aisne and Meuse-Argonne offensives and supported the 91st Division in Belgium. In all, 242 members served in the war, 183 of whom were commissioned.

In World War II, the troop was called into Federal service February 17, 1941. Most of the unit was already commissioned and a new troop of 146 men was organized as Troop A of the 104th Cavalry Reconnaissance Regiment. It's history is marked by service at Indiantown Gap, maneuvers in the Carolinas, and duty in Philadelphia, and on the west coast. Sixty-nine members served in World War II and 232 were commissioned.

During the Korean emergency the troop which was the 28th Reconnaissance Company was federalized on September 5, 1950, and was stationed at Camp Atterbury, Ind. until November 15, 1951. It accompanied the 28th Infantry Division to Germany where its members served until rotated to the inactive National Guard upon the expiration of their Federal service.

The troop today, under Capt. William S. Stokes, Jr., has been reorganized as the 28th Reconnaissance Company of the 28th Infantry Division and is entirely mechanized.

Since its inception, over 40 members of the troop have given their lives in the Nation's service. From 1774, to date the troop has elected and enrolled 1,500 members, and the officers elected in that period have without exception first served in the ranks of the troop. There are today nearly 500 living members on the active, nonactive, and honorary rolls.

The original troop standard, presented by Captain Markoe in 1775 is the earliest example of 13 stripes being used on an American banner.

The troop has acted as escort on official and State occasions to 25 Presidents.

Danger to Independent Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an enlightening and interesting editorial published in the Triumph-Monterey Progress, entitled "Danger to Independent Business." The editorial analyzes the Attorney General's Committee To Study Antitrust Laws.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANGER TO INDEPENDENT BUSINESS

Small, medium size, and even what most of us would consider fairly large businesses will soon feel a new squeeze if plans of Attorney General Brownell are put into effect. Brownell recently appointed a committee on antitrust laws whose report has just been published. Members of the committee included the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission and the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division.

The report would, in effect, scrap much of our antitrust laws and in the name of promoting competition, would actually promote monopoly and stifle competition by eliminating independent businesses. And independent businesses include many million-dollar corporations which are competing with billion-dollar near monopolies.

Basically, the committee's report stems from a distorted interpretation of what is meant by free enterprise and competition. To Brownell's committee free enterprise is a throwback to the economic days before the turn of the century and the era of America's "robber barons" of industry. It means in short that a corporation should be permitted to grow and expand by any means short of murder and may wipe out its competitors regardless of the consequences to the national economy, to the consumers, or to our society at large.

If we remember our history, it is this economic theory that produced the vast economic empires of the Rockefellers, Morgans, and Vanderbilts. The abuses of this period led to the passage of the antitrust acts starting with Sherman Act in 1890 and continuing with the Clayton Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, Robinson-Patman Act, Miller-Tydings law, and McGuire Act.

The theory of the antitrust laws is that the public and our economy is best served placing as many businesses as possible in reasonable competition with each other. To that end, regulations are made to prevent monopoly and unfair competition. The Government looks askance at cartels or tendencies of any one company or combine to control an industry or trade market.

This has been public policy of both Republican and Democratic administrations since the trust-busting days of Teddy Roosevelt. Therefore it is disturbing to find a report by high Government officials advocating a return to the days of jungle tactics in business.

In the guise of ending Government regulations of business, the committee would scrap much of the present protection given independent business. For example, the committee would abolish fair-trade laws claiming that they are at odds with a dynamic free-enterprise system. Actually an end to fair trade would put the average businessman on Main Street at the mercy of the large chains and the discount houses.

The committee would also end the provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act which protect retail distributors against discriminatory pricing practices by manufacturers by which manufacturers are not permitted to work out deals with favored customers that would put other distributors in an unfavorable competitive position. This is designed to prevent collusion to wipe out competition.

So-called reasoning behind the committee's attitude has both a familiar and ominous ring. According to the report, the relaxation of the antitrust laws would only squeeze out unprofitable businesses. Even further, Brownell's committee claims that the fair-trade laws result in "subsidies for inefficient operators," in the form of higher prices paid by consumers.

Printers Ink, the national advertising and marketing trade magazine, says bluntly that "phrase (in the report) is more an argumentative exercise in semantics than in logic." It states that fair trade "is a protection against monopoly at retail levels, it improves the national purchasing power by enabling large numbers of people to earn a living by operating numerous small-business enterprises which would otherwise perish, and it implements a fundamental American psychological concept of the desirable way of life, by obstructing a process under which smaller retail establishments—many of them operated on a family basis—would otherwise be increasingly absorbed by ever-enlarging, impersonal retail giants."

The marketing magazine then points out that by encouraging small business with fair-trade laws, a large number of outlets are provided for manufacturers' products. This provides an expanding market and permits a manufacturer to set lower prices based on greater volume of production. On the other hand, while cutthroat competition may result in lower prices momentarily, in the long-range picture the chains and monopolies always raise prices to high levels as soon as they have eliminated their competitors.

While there seems little likelihood that the present Democratic Congress will change any of the antitrust laws for Brownell and his committee, businessmen can wonder at what kind of enforcement those laws will receive at the hands of officials so dedicated to monopoly.

It would appear that the aim of the Eisenhower administration is not only to squeeze out small farmers, but intends to use the same tactics to squeeze out independent businessmen. It explodes the myth that the present administration is for the businessman. It is not. The administration is against the interests of most businessmen. It is for the giant monopolies and cartels and should be branded as such.

Flag Day Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday it was my privilege to address a Flag Day celebration in Baraboo, Wis. One of my themes was the importance of strengthening United States preparedness.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUE LOYALTY TO OUR FLAG IN THIS DYNAMIC AGE

It is a great privilege to join with the citizens of Baraboo and the surrounding area in this proud, patriotic observance.

I am particularly pleased to appear here under the auspices of our friends in the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. Their constant demonstration of their fraternal creed of charity, justice, brotherly love, and fidelity is an inspiration to us all.

Certainly, too, Elks lodges have always been model centers of American patriotism, centers of fervent loyalty to the Stars and Stripes.

Today, more than ever before in our history, the beloved banner of our country holds a manifold deep meaning for us and for all mankind.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF OLD GLORY

Just what does Old Glory signify to us today.

First, the Stars and Stripes symbolizes the generations of Americans who have fought and died that it might wave high over the land of the free and the home of the brave.

It symbolizes the men who carried the Stars and Stripes through the bloodstained snows of Valley Forge.

The Union battalions which held firm to it on the ridge of Gettysburg.

The Rough Riders who held it high, as they stormed up San Juan Hill.

The Doughboys who clutched it to them as they braved the machinegun nests of the Argonne Forest.

The Leathernecks who planted it high above the bloodstained slopes of Mount Suribachi.

The patriots who carried it ashore when they stormed Inchon—these are the heroes to whom you and I are eternally indebted.

By their sacrifices they kept this Republic free and independent and indivisible.

HOPE FOR ENSLAVED MILLIONS

Secondly, the Stars and Stripes symbolizes the hope of enslaved hundreds of millions.

More than 900 million people throughout the civilized world today are enslaved under the greatest despotism in man's history.

To them the red banner of the Communist Kremlin is the most hated symbol of tyranny, while the red, white, and blue of this constitutional Republic is the foremost symbol of freedom—of eventual liberation.

It is only by virtue of our very existence—it is only by virtue of our unalterable dedication to man's freedom everywhere—that hope remains undimmed behind the Iron Curtain.

SYMBOL OF OUR PREPAREDNESS

Thirdly, Old Glory today is a symbol of vigilant peace.

Today Old Glory flies in more than four dozen countries throughout the world at the outer ramparts of United States defense.

You can see it at Air Force bases from Morocco to Greenland, from Turkey to Okinawa. You can see it on destroyers and aircraft carriers of the 7th Fleet ready off the embattled coast of Formosa.

You can see it in the bases of American ground forces—totaling more than 1¼ million men who are stationed throughout the world.

They are the "minutemen" of 1955. They are sentinels of peace.

By their presence abroad, they serve notice to the Kremlin that we will tolerate no further aggression. They serve notice that we will retreat no further. We will permit the Soviet bear to gobble up no more subject peoples.

By our military preparedness, by our mighty Strategic Air Force, and by our tremendous stockpile of nuclear weapons, we serve notice that we are ready for any emergency.

We tell the Kremlin in effect that we despise war, but that we are prepared for war because we despise slavery even more than we despise conflict.

America's vigilant preparedness is the greatest deterrent to world war III, and Old Glory's presence throughout the world proves that we Americans are instantly alert to our farflung responsibilities.

THE AGE OF SUPERSONIC SPEED

We prove that we know we are living in a contracted world—in an age of supersonic speed.

The American continent can be crossed by jet planes in less than 3¾ hours. The Atlantic Ocean can be crossed in approximately the same time. Here in Baraboo we are no more than 7 hours away from Soviet airbases, even if you compute the travel time in terms of very slow bombers.

And by the speed of a guided missile—which may someday travel at 10,000 miles per hour—Baraboo may be only one-half hour away—I repeat—one-half hour—from Soviet launching sites at the Arctic Circle.

Already for purposes of defense around the city of Milwaukee is being built our own nest of guided-missile sites—Nike sites. Near Kansasville, 30 miles southwest of Milwaukee, is to be built a new $16 million Air Defense Command jet base.

I have suggested that this new base be named in honor of the late Maj. Richard Ira Bong, Wisconsin's ace of aces, in World War II, and Secretary of the Air Force Talbott has responded by stating that he regards my suggestion as "a most meritorious one."

The NIKE sites, the jet air base—these are grim reminders to us today that there is no possibility that we can be isolated from the world by the mere oceans.

Our country is in every other nation's backyard whether we like it or not. What happens to other nations beyond our borders crucially affects us here in Baraboo. We cannot stick our heads in the ground like ostriches. We cannot evade our responsibilities.

Either we help lead the world to peace and freedom, or the Kremlin will lead the world to war and slavery. That is the only alternative; that is the only choice.

DON'T TREAD ON US

Under our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, we are, however, amply fulfilling our responsibilities. We are not shirking our obligations. We are fulfilling the deepest meaning of the Stars and Stripes to all mankind—a meaning of preserving the dignity of man, a meaning of vigilance.

We are fulfilling, too, a meaning which was conveyed by a colonial flag in the war of the revolution, a flag which showed a coiled rattlesnake. Under it was the inscription: "Don't tread on me."

So, today, we say to the Kremlin, "don't tread on us; don't try pushing us around; and don't try pushing our friends around."

THE SOVIET PEACE OFFENSIVE

Of course, we know that the Soviet Union is engaged on a mammoth so-called "peace offensive" today. It is trying to keep West Germany in a state of neutralism; it is trying to establish so-called "normal and cordial" relations with Japan.

It is trying to build up support for its phony "disarmament proposals."

It is trying to convey the impression that the "leopard" is changing its spots.

As for ourselves, we are prepared to confer, to negotiate, to explore all possibilities of peace without appeasement. But we definitely are not building up our hopes for "an awful let-down." We are not blindly assuming that the "millenium" has come in the East-West relations.

We remember the dismal Soviet record of doublecrossing in the past.

We remember that the Reds have broken 50 out of 52 major agreements which they have made with the West since the recognition of Russia 22 years ago.

We are hopeful that some progress may be made in relieving tensions. But we are not going to delude ourselves into forgetting that the Soviets have never altered their fundamental plan to dominate and conquer the world.

NO SO-CALLED LAST CHANCE OF PEACE

Nonetheless, in the months up ahead, we will have several excellent opportunities to try to improve East-West relations.

We will have an opportunity at the San Francisco Conference which will open a week from now, on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter.

—We wil have an opportunity in July at the big four "meeting at the summit," in Geneva.

We will have an opportunity again a month later at the United Nations Atoms for Peace Conference in Geneva.

And there will be other opportunities. We must capitalize on all of them in order to prevent a third troubled world war.

There is no so-called "one last chance" for peace, any more than there is a so-called "one last chance" to enjoy life.

Every single day offers us new opportunities for living and new opportunities for peace. Let us not become downhearted or filled with thoughts of gloom or doom. There is no need to exaggerate our difficulties with the Soviet Union.

Our difficulties with godless, imperialist communism are many and they are deep and they will be long lasting.

But they are not unsolvable; they do not mean a so-called inevitable war, provided we are strong, provided we are ready, provided that we are vigilant, and provided we do not lose faith.

PATRIOTISM BY DEEDS, NOT JUST WORDS

I have stated earlier, my friends, that we should so live our lives as to prove that we are truly loyal to Old Glory, to the 48 beloved starts in a field of blue, with 13 alternate red and white stripes.

I have pointed out how every day we may symbolize our pledge of allegiance to the flag which was beheld through the "rocket's red glare."

To my way of thinking, the finest way to prove our faithfulness to Old Glory is by our constant deeds, not simply by our occasional words.

To my way of thinking, it is inconsistent to pledge allegiance to the flag and then to allow our country to take actions which are harmful to the cause of the flag.

THREE PROBLEMS OF DEFENSE

In the few moments remaining to me I should like to list three of the fields which I think need remedying—three of the actions and inactions which impair the well being of our Armed Forces, and in effect of our flag and our country.

NEED FOR RESERVE BILL

One of the most critical such situations is the present tieup in the Congress on the military manpower program.

It is an unfortunate—indeed, it is a shocking—fact that the crucial legislation to build up a 2,900,000-man Ready Reserve by 1960 is snagged in the House of Representatives on the issue of racial relations.

I earnestly hope—as the President of the United States hopes—that this issue can be quickly resolved. I ask you, my friends, How can the Soviet Union believe that we really mean business; how can it believe that we are really alert when it sees us tie ourselves up in parliamentary knots on a crucial bill like this, absolutely necessary for our own survival?

But regardless of Soviet attitude, this bill, in present or slightly revised form, will assure justice for draftee and volunteer. It will assure justice for our reservists (who too often have been shabbily and arbitrarily treated by our Government). It will bring units up to strength which are now mere skeletons. It will help minimize casualties in the event of conflict.

The military manpower plan must, therefore, pass within the next 30 to 45 days.

Somehow the parliamentary issue of a segregation or nonsegregation amendment must be resolved. I personally believe that Americans of all races, sharing the same uniform, should share opportunity to serve in the same—Regular, Reserve, and National Guard units.

But I do not believe that this issue, however important it is, is bigger than the very survival of this country. And I do not believe that men of reason are so inadequate that they cannot settle it in good faith.

PROVIDE INCENTIVE FOR MILITARY CAREERS

A second problem likewise arises in connection with the men of our Armed Forces.

I refer in particular to the skilled pilots of our Air Force. The fact of the matter is that we have been running a stop-an-go, on-again, off-again program.

We have been alternately recruiting thousands of pilots and then discharging them or complacently watching them bid us good-bye.

We have been spending literally billions of dollars in training young men in modern high-speed aircraft. Then, for a variety of reasons, we have failed to provide sufficient incentive for these men to make a career of the Armed Forces.

As a result, our billions of dollars of investment in them has virtually been lost. In some instances, there have actually been wholesale releases of pilots and pilot trainees.

This stop-and-go situation—this alternate dumping and replenishing of our air-pilot supply—is utterly wasteful and utterly harmful to the national well-being.

I say to you that only a 5- or 10-percent rate of reenlistment is a fantastic commentary on our failure thus far to solve this uncertain problem for our servicemen—in Air Force, Army, and Navy.

The problem must be met once and for all.

MILITARY RESEARCH MUST BE STRENGTHENED

There is a third problem as regards our Armed Forces, and it is the problem of how to accelerate and strengthen their research programs.

Recently, the famous Hoover Commission commented very pointedly on Defense Department research. What it said was unfortunately not too encouraging. The Commission did praise certain advances which have been made by our services.

At the same time, it reported that the services do not have a good and consistent overall record in adopting new suggestions.

The plain fact of the matter is that many of the greatest advances of military technology in our country have been adopted—not because of the eager acceptance of the services, but at the least despite their reluctance, and at the most, despite their bitter opposition.

From the days of our own pioneering Gen. Billy Mitchell down to the present days of Adm. Hyman Rickover, the services have at times bitterly resisted some of the foremost military prophets in their own ranks. They didn't want Billy Mitchell's bombers, and they didn't want Admiral Rickover's atomic submarine.

There is disturbing evidence to indicate that some of the brass have their doubts about the real significance of an atomic-powered warplane, and that they are not revising overall strategy as fast as possible—based upon the impact of atomic-powered surface and underseas craft.

Now, I want to be fair to our Armed Forces. I am proud of our services, proud of their gallantry and fidelity. And I certainly do not believe in blanket criticism.

But I do not believe in their infallibility and I do not believe in closing my eyes to reality.

So, I say that the able Hoover Commission recommendations for strengthening research in the Armed Forces must be adopted.

Military bureaucracy can be twice as strangling as civilian bureaucracy. That is because of the necessary military element of strong discipline and the relative inability of lower ranking officers to appeal against an unwise decision from above, if it is adopted.

I am not dismissing conventional strategy and weapons and units. I am not one who believes that magical push-button instruments are going overnight to take the place of all ground forces or sea units or air units.

But I do believe that the greatest single superiority which we have over the Soviet Union is the superiority in the brainpower and the industrial power of freemen. And recent evidences indicate that we are allowing our margin of technical superiority to disappear. Recent evidences confirm that the Soviet Union is successfuly racing to catch up with us in every field in which we have had supremacy.

Let us bring United States science to the fore again. So-called "ivy-towered" scientists, often working in American universities, have time after time come up with better ideas, more practical ideas, than some of the leaders of our Armed Forces.

I believe that we need a totally new attitude in relation to the great scientific asset of our country. I believe that we should find out what the scientists really think about current military planning.

I do not believe, of course, in ignoring years of experience in uniform, which have been built up by our military leaders. They are entitled—truly entitled—to our respect. But when, as, and if they show themselves as lagging in imagination and in enterprise, I do not believe that they should be allowed to have a stranglehold over new inventions and technology.

We need top scientific brains to go all-out to cope with the problem of radar defense. We need it for new intercontinental guided and ballistic systems. We need it in a thousand and one other ways, and I say we have got to get it, if we are to survive.

CONCLUSION

These, then, are some of the steps necessary for our survival.

By taking these actions, we may truly prove our allegiance to the Red, White, and Blue.

It has been a great privilege to be with you today at this patriotic assembly.

I know that our faith and confidence in America's future is even stronger now than ever before, by virtue of our coparticipation in this great event.

The Cry Is Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. James F. O'Neil, past national commander of the American Legion and at present the publisher of the American Legion Monthly, at the national convention of the Yankee Division Veterans' Association held in Manchester on June 11, 1955.

This is an outstanding address, and one which I think Members of Congress and the general public of this country will definitely be interested in.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRY IS PEACE

(By James F. O'Neil)

What I am going to talk about tonight may be summarized in seven words that were uttered many centuries ago by the Old Testament prophet Jeremiah. Those words were: "Peace, peace: and there was no peace."

Those words appear in the 14th verse of the sixth chapter of Jeremiah. Now I'd like to quote the 12th verse of that same chapter.

"And their houses shall be turned over to others, with their lands and their wives together: for I will stretch forth my hand upon the inhabitants of the land, saith the Lord."

Since history has a way of repeating itself, it is interesting to recall what was happening in Jerusalem in Jeremiah's day. It was indeed a time for lamentation since Palestine was under attack from powerful enemies, and Jeremiah predicted the destruction of the temple if the people did not change their ways. For attempting to warn his people against government policies and personal practices which he felt would prove disastrous, he was persecuted and imprisoned, and finally he fled to Egypt.

There are some parallels in our present day.

It does not require the gift of prophecy today to realize that while the cry is peace, there is no peace; and we are well aware that we have already been invaded—infiltrated is the word. Further, we all realize that the enemy is not using his armies at present, only because his usual strategy of infiltration is working quite satisfactorily. We know these things not only because we see them happening but because our Communist enemy has spelled them out for us.

But what happens when someone calls attention to those things? He gets the same treatment in some quarters that was meted out to Jeremiah back in 600 B. C. If you think I exaggerate, may I remind you what happened to Vice President Nixon, Douglas MacArthur, Senator Knowland, Martin Dies, and a few others? None have been imprisoned as the Old Testament prophet was, but they have been given some pretty shabby treatment in important places by some important people.

So, even though we all know it's a snare and a delusion, the popular thing to do now is echo the slogan "Peace, it's wonderful," and hope that the 1955 model dove of peace will have a slightly longer life than the one that was hatched by Prime Minister Chamberlain in 1938. You will recall that that red-coated British pigeon fluttered forth under the motto "Peace in our time." I don't know what the normal life expectancy of a dove may be, but I think that Chamberlain's bird was knocked off by a German Mauser long before it reached maturity.

Now, just as the world applauded the Prime Minister when he shoved his umbrella under his arm and flew off to Munich, so we are expected to cheer as our leaders start climbing upward, ever upward, to a foggy summit for still another pilgrimage to promote peace. However, I wish they would carry with them a large framed sampler, to be hung on the conference room wall. On it should be these words, from the Communist Manifesto:

"The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their aims can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all the existing social conditions. Let the ruling class tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workers of all countries, unite."

Unfortunately, no one is likely to be so impolite as to bring up any such embarrassing subjects as that. The talk will doubtless be on a higher plane, dealing with such dazzling prospects as world trade, disarmament, peaceful coexistence, and who knows? We may even get a few more of our imprisoned flyers back. At the conclusion of the festivities, to the trumpeting of the propagandists we will be informed that certain papers have been signed and we can stop worrying about such fairy tales as Soviet aggression.

Only last year, that great American patriot, William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party, United States of America, told what we could expect in an article in the official party-line magazine Political Affairs. Not only did he say it was possible to coexist with the U. S. S. R., he proclaimed it as a necessity—for the good of the United States, of course. This country had finally recognized the failure of its war policy, said Foster, because it was evident that Wall Street couldn't lick the Soviet fatherland. Also, he said, there was growing concern about "the sinister growth of McCarthy fascism in the United States." Those are Foster's words. So, obviously, the time had come for Americans to coexist with the nice people in the Kremlin.

However, there was just one fly in the William Z. Foster ointment, and the fly was slightly larger than a B–42 bomber. To coexist it would be necessary for the so-called democratic people residing in this country to kick out the Wall Streeters and warmongers running the country and give it new management. In other words, turn the country over to Commissar Foster and company. These little technicalities always manage to come up whenever Communists hold conferences, and the chances are that something of this general nature may make the upcoming Summit sessions no more productive for our side than were Yalta, Teheran, and other meeting places.

The very fact that William Z. Foster is speaking for the Kremlin fathers is proof of that. Let us not forget that Foster is the mouthpiece who specializes in the hard, anti-capitalist, anti-American commie line. For a time they had a fellow named Browder working as boss man of the Communist Party United States of America. Browder was the 100 percent, superpatriotic, flag-waving type of American Communist. He thought the revolution should be fought with cream puffs instead of hand grenades, and was willing to postpone it until after we made it possible for Russia to fight off the Germans. But after we won the war for the Russians, you'll recall, Stalin went back to his nasty habits and Browder was booted out of his job as Commissar of the United States. And back came Toughy Guy Willie Foster—the man whose poor health made it impossible for him to stand trial as a Communist leader.

Anyway, bad heart notwithstanding, Foster is now in there calling the plays for the big Red team. And Foster is a hard man, determined to see that the United States of America gets its come-uppance.

The strangest thing of all is that almost everybody knows what's cooking except those who refuse to see. It reminds me of attending a football game at the Yale Bowl or the Harvard Stadium. Up in the stands, tens of thousands of spectators can see the signals being called and followed, and it's hard to understand why the players down on the field can't see what is being set up for them. Suddenly—Bam—they're caught flatfooted as the out-of-towners take the ball over for a touchdown on a sneak play. Didn't our fellows see it coming? Didn't the coach warn them about such an offensive? Didn't they know that Khrushchev and Bulganin and all those other Irish always play it that way?

Apparently not. Not even when our home team can read all about it, and study in advance the diagram that their opponents are going to use.

Here it is, spelled out in simple language by Lenin:

"The strictest loyalty to the ideas of communism must be combined with the ability to make all the necessary compromises, to 'tack,' to make agreements, zigzags, retreats, and so on, in order to accelerate the coming into power of the Communists."

And does it work? That Russian razzle-dazzle has given the big Red team of diplomats an unbroken string of victories against every opponent. And in all the seasons they've been playing they haven't lost a man. That is if you except a few fellows such as Beria, Trotsky and several others who got clipped in the locker room or under the grandstand by some of their teammates.

If you'd like to have the score on what they've accomplished, here it is, courtesy of the U. S. News & World Report, which reported it in detail a few weeks ago:

"Talks with Russians to date: 106 million words. Agreements reached: 52. Agreements violated by Russians: 50. Agreements kept: 2."

The two they kept were on matters which were of benefit to the Russians. Naturally.

Anyway, as Father Divine would say, "Peace, it's wonderful."

What is the bait this time? It's pretty obvious since we've seen it being cooked up by such fine fellows as Krishna Menon, Pandit Nehru, and other global troubleshooters. To date we have received back four out of several hundred Americans illegally imprisoned. We may get 11 more. Austria is given a treaty that is overdue by many years. We hear about a neutral zone, and are getting hints that Russia is going to ease up on its program of murder and mayhem in its slave countries. We hear that there may be a lot of money in it, for us, as for the British, in the form of trade. We hear a lot of other "malarkey," too.

However, the fact is that Khrushchev is in trouble, and so is his No. 2 boy, Mao Tse-tung. There is trouble within both Russia and China, serious trouble, because of crop failures and because the enslaved peoples in the satellite countries are acting up. They want us to give them another breather, long enough to fasten the lid. They want us to help destroy ourselves by conniving with them in setting up a so-called neutral zone across Europe, and we are also expected to concur in neutralizing and thus destroying the force which might deliver China from Red domination. And along with this they want trade. In their language that means food and other things which they desperately need. And they all know us well enough to realize that we will probably give them these things, free, gratis, for nothing, and no strings attached.

Farfetched? Wait and see. In return we will get some lovely scrolls, suitable for framing, which will make us nauseous a decade or so from now. In them the word "peace" will appear repeatedly, in Russian and English, but there won't be a single clue to what the Russians really have in mind. No, you have to go to Lenin, the master, for that. Here is Lenin's dictum, never countermanded:

"We are living," he said, "not merely in a state but in a system of states; and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialistic states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile, a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable."

But, despite everything that has happened since the Bolsheviks stole the Russian Revolution in 1918, we still have among us people who are capable of thinking that this time they really are sincere. This time they really want peace. Never mind the 50 treaties they have violated to date. This may turn out to be one they will honor—the third.

You will pardon me if I remain unconvinced, and believe that while Russia's right hand is extended in friendship, her left hand continues to carry a well-used dagger.

Further, I believe that most people think as I do, and question the wisdom of even setting down with these treacherous people, let alone coaxing them to such a meeting. I am well aware that everybody is sick and tired of hot wars and cold wars, too, but has Soviet Russia really done enough to justify all this hullabaloo about peace? I see little sign of it. Even the concessions that she

appears to be making are considerably less than when you look beneath the surface. And in most places she is still the same incorrigible Soviet. Even in the relatively minor things, such as the toll she arbitrarily slapped on trucks using the autobahn between Berlin and the free world.

We had a great New Englander who had a genius for expressing truth simply and forcefully. Our diplomats should read Ralph Waldo Emerson before they leave for Geneva. He, too, wrote about peace, and said: "Nothing can bring you peace but the triumph of principles." It's something to think about, but when we think of some of the things that have come out of our global meetings and conferences, it is ironic even to use the phrase, "the triumph of principles." Instead, our present mess can be attributed to the fact that we have had too many negotiations with people of no principles, and in our dealings we have shown ourselves as unprincipled as they are. That, I recognize, is a terrible indictment of certain people who have served as diplomats and statesmen, but the facts stare at us. And we are doing penance for their sacrifice of principle, and our children and grandchildren will continue to suffer for their sins.

Well, what should we do about it?

There are those who think we should ignore the present siren song from the Kremlin, and refuse to participate in any further meetings until the Russians show more evidence of good faith.

I am not one of those. But I think we ought to approach any dealings with Khrushchev and company much as we'd approach a fellow like Serge Rubinstein in a business deal. We should recognize that we're dealing with a vicious, predatory bunch who are out to fleece us and cut our throats in the bargain, but knowing that we can at least listen while they speak their piece.

As a matter of fact, we have no alternative. Diplomatically, we have been backed into a position where we cannot refuse to meet the Reds. We have been put on the defensive as warmongers, and the Communists have sold that idea to vast segments of the world's population. To hold back when the Kremlinites make peaceful overtures would merely confirm their propagnda and alienate a lot of peopel whom we don't want against us, even though we know they aren't actively on our side.

One or the arguments against meeting with the Russkys is that this indicates to the enslaved peoples that we are continuing to acquiesce in their enslavement. That is a point, and we have at past conferences acted in a way that makes that point a valid one. However, if proper statesmanship is exercised, this meeting could well mark a turning point. Knowing that the Russian's don't hold the top cards, our summiteers ought to do some good Yankee, New Hampshire type bargaining. Instead of acting like city yokels and buying whatever the Russians have that corresponds to the Brooklyn Bridge.

If, in some of my earlier remarks, I seemed pessimistic, it was because I am. I wonder about the outcome when I see not just a willingness to meet with the Red leaders but an eagerness to do so. I think Tito did it much better when he permitted the big Red bosses to come and talk to him in Yugoslavia, but didn't knock himself out trying to be cordial.

One might as, what is it that Tito and Yugoslavia have that President Eisenhower and the United States of America don't have? I don't recall having read that Tito had emissaries and intermediaries rushing around the Kremlin craving an audience. In fact, my recollection is that Tito was pretty stiff-necked about it, and informed the Reds—and the world—that if they wanted to talk turkey he'd listen, but not to bother if they didn't intend to send their top team. You know what happened, and how the Reds meekly ate crow.

But Tito understands Communists, since he is one himself. We obviously do not, so we continue to make errors. And I just hope that this upcoming session will change the usual pattern.

Certainly President Eisenhower ought to know the score. A faux pas could be disastrous in its moral effect upon a world that is hanging on every syllable and every inflection.

Obviously, too, this President will not have an Alger Hiss advising him and doing the spadework. However, I hope that every last member of his entourage is dedicated first, last and always to the welfare of the United States of America, without any reservations as to our place in the world as against the Soviet Union, Great Britain or any other power. In other words, let our diplomats be as jealous of the rights and the welfare of the United States as the British diplomats will be about Great Britain, the Russians about the U. S. S. R. and the French about France. And if concessions must be made, let us hope that our diplomats will be less generous and less pliable than some previous performers have been.

However, our approach to this conference shuold not be negative. That is what the Red strategists expect, and we will catch them off guard if we take the initiative in setting forth a positive program. How can this be done? The answer can be found in those words of Emerson's I quoted a few moments ago:

"Nothing can bring you peace but the triumph of principles."

If our diplomats are guided by that thought, we shall indeed make progress in bringing to the world hope for a genuine and lasting peace.

Our Moral Obligation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from a dispatch of the American Committee on Italian Migration calling our attention to the urgent need for assurances required to accomplish the objectives of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953:

THE URGENT NEED FOR ASSURANCES

Elsewhere in this issue are printed the simple procedures to be followed for sponsoring Italian refugees. We cannot urge too strongly the need for redoubled efforts in the task of increasing substantially the number of job and housing assurances for these refugees in keeping with the intent and spirit of the act.

Americans of Italian origin who are conscious of the serious problem of the Italian manpower clot that besets Italy, have a moral obligation in helping to make the Refugee Act a success. Assurances for unnamed refugees are needed desperately and although the law has been revised to admit, if need be, 60,000 close relatives of American citizens, it is nevertheless of the utmost importance that at least 15,000 visas of this quota be utilized for refugees.

You may not be in a position to be a sponsor, but certainly in your community there are many who can be. You can be instrumental in bringing this problem to their attention and influencing their decision.

Remember that there are thousands upon thousands of Italians who have lost all personal possessions as a result of disastrous floods, who have been dumped back on the mainland of Italy from the former colonies, who have fled communism from countries behind the Iron Curtain and who are languishing in refugee camps, in caves, hovels, and shacks. The future of these people is dim since Italy's economy cannot absorb them.

We held out the hope to some of them that a new life could be theirs through the Refugee Act. We cannot dash these hopes by standing by without giving them the instrument they need—job and housing assurances—to help them fulfill their dream.

Montgomery and Conflicting Philosophies of Sea Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "Montgomery and Conflicting Philosophies of Sea Power," from the May 1955 issue of the United States Naval Institute Proceedings. The article was written by Col. J. D. Hittle, of the United States Marine Corps.

All of us who are Members of Congress and know Colonel Hittle have developed a high regard and real affection for him in connection with his services as legislative assistant to the Commandant of the United States Marine Corps. His modesty is such, however, that very few of us know of his scholarship and reputation as a historian. It is a privilege for me to bring that fact and this article therefore to the attention of Congress.

The article was particularly significant because it is the first really fundamental rationalization for our Navy's concept of the modern aircraft carrier. This defense of naval aviation and exposition of the nature and advantages of our balanced-fleet concept admirably explains the role of the Navy in our overall strategic striking power. I am personally pleased with the article because it is written by a marine officer in defense of naval concepts and illustrates the common bond of loyalty and understanding between the Navy and the Marine Corps. This is a reassuring example of a genuine interservice cooperation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTGOMERY AND CONFLICTING PHILOSOPHIES OF SEA POWER

(By Col. J. D. Hittle)

Few speeches in recent times have touched off such a widespread and heated controversy as those recently delivered by Field Marshal Montgomery.

* * * * *

Although, in keeping with his reputation for clarity of thought and expression, Field

Marshal Montgomery undoubtedly presented the thoughts more pointedly than they have been previously voiced, the fact remains that essential features of certain strategic observations stated in his recent speeches are neither original with him nor of recent origin. Many will recognize a familiar theme running through the following excerpts from Field Marshal Montgomery's November 29, 1954, speech before the California Institute of Technology which aroused such wide discussion as to defense strategy and particularly naval policy:

"Naval forces require air support in the same way as do land forces. It is vital in the conditions of today, that navies called on to operate in the great oceans should have their own air forces.

"If it is true that the seas will in the future be controlled mainly from the air, then it is for consideration whether this control would not be best exercised by national air forces and not by naval forces. If this is the case, then navies will not in the future require their own air forces. * * * If this is true, then we should at once stop building any more aircraft carriers, because they are very expensive and will not produce a dividend. * * *

"Today the navies must handle this war (the war at sea). They must have the minimum means to insure control of the seas and of the approaches to essential ports and no more. It is essential that they should not dissipate those means on tasks which do not affect the war at sea."

Field Marshal Montgomery's assertion as to the carrier's impending day of doom as a useful instrument of war involves far more than the pros and cons of the future combat utility of that type of vessel. Actually what is involved, and what is reflected throughout the field marshal's recent dissertations, is a reenunciation of a philosophy of war that has been repeatedly, since World War I, the source of doctrinal conflict in this country and, to a lesser extent, abroad. This general assemblage of dove-tailing strategic concepts condemning the carrier as an inutile weapon of future war, the questionable future value of naval aviation, limitation of naval activity to the geographical limits of the sea, and primacy of one weapons system—in this case the air forces—constitutes the essential attributes of what has long been recognized as the "continental" philosophy of war.

That this philosophy should clash with the fundamental concepts which have guided the development and utilization of our Nation's naval power should be no surprise. The reason is simple: Continental European strategic thought has evolved in accordance with the apparent requirements of European warfare, geographically attuned to land areas. To continental European military thinking, the sea is a peripheral matter, and in this philosophy of war the sea is likewise a peripheral, or secondary, consideration.

* * * * *

This limited recognition of sea power, in turn, placed artificial limitations on its role and weapons. The result was that naval development by continental European nations was focused primarily upon the weapons system required to wage war at sea, precluding the realization of the strategic dividends that could be realized from a kind of naval power capable of projecting its military power from the sea against land objectives.

Thus continental strategic thought, shackled by the artficial limitations imposed by a land-locked philosophy of war, produced the kind of naval power designed to fight at sea, and which proved to be virtually incapable of projecting power from the sea against shore and inland targets.

* * * * *

In contrast to the doctrinal limitations traditionally imposed by continental naval thought, the United States developed, beginning in the latter 19th century, a bold and unlimited brand of seapower thinking, culminating in the balanced naval forces which demonstrated their unsurpassed strategic mobility, versatility, and shocking power in World War II and in the Korean war. Sparked by the intellectual genius of Alfred T. Mahan and responsive to the naval nature of the Spanish-American War, United States naval thought took its departure, in the latter years of the 19th century, from the artificially limited naval concepts of continental Europe. From the Navy-Marine landing at Guantanamo Bay in the Spanish-American War there evolved the uniquely American concept of balanced fleets. In accordance with this concept, American naval power adopted and developed every kind of combat tool required by naval commanders to exploit, in the technologically advanced atmosphere of the 20th century, the full combat potentialities of sea power.

Stimulated and guided by such philosophy, American seapower developed, and brought to a high peak of combat proficiency, naval aviation and amphibious warfare. These two integral elements of our Nation's balanced naval power serve as constant reminders of the extent to which American philosophy of seapower surpasses the continental in terms of scope, flexibility, malleability, and accumulative striking power. It is precisely these two indispensable attributes of United States balanced fleets that illustrate and dramatize the divergence of United States seapower concepts from those of continental Europe. It should be no surprise that continental strategic thought, preoccupied today, as it has been through modern history, with the Northern European plain, should continue to doubt the wisdom of the aircraft carrier and all that it implies with respect to American seapower.

* * * * *

Viewed in historical perspective, Field Marshal Montgomery's recently voiced doubts as to the future value of the carrier appears as a continuation of England's naval air policy of 36 years ago. It was between World War I and World War II that British defense policy evinced a lack of faith in the future of naval aviation and carrier warfare. Because Field Marshal Montgomery's opinions on that subject are so consistent with the official British pre-World War II policy regarding naval air and carriers, a brief review of such British policy and its results should be of value in explaining the philosophic background and identifying the origin of his present opinions.

Britain in World War I had again provided the organizational foundation for development of balanced naval power. In that war the British air weapon developed two distinct and separate organizations—the Royal Flying Corps and the Royal Naval Air Service. The latter was an integral element of the Navy and included land and sea planes.

The echo of the final shot of World War I had scarcely died away before the British defense policy makers decided that the Navy would not require its own naval air weapon. In implementation of that policy decision, the Royal Flying Corps and the Royal Naval Air Service were merged into the Royal Air Force. By that single act England accomplished a number of things: a single Air Force, a turn toward continental concepts of naval power—the means to fight at sea so as to control the sea flanks of land operations, clearance of sea lanes and guard approaches to necessary ports—and another British rejection of balanced naval power.

* * * * *

In spite of protests by the more enlightened naval officers who sensed the potentially disastrous consequences of what was taking place, naval air material and carrier warfare continued to be retained as an integral part of the Royal Air Force. In such a predicament the art of naval air war intellectually and physically withered and wasted to the point of comparative ineffectiveness.

This condition, reflecting official British lack of faith in the future of naval aviation and the carrier, continued for 21 years. It was not until early 1939, when the clouds of imminent war were gathering low on the horizon, that naval aviation was reconstituted as a part of the Royal Navy. But as events were soon to demonstrate, this remedial action came too late.

Six months after emancipation of naval aviation from the Royal Air Force, World War II began. Britain paid a high price for her failure to push the development of naval aviation (including, of course, carier design and techniques) during the interim between wars, for, according to British naval sources, the Royal Navy's air arm on the eve of World War II was at least 15 years behind that of the United States. As World War II was to prove, England's dereliction of carrier development was a 21-year strategic sin that could not be expiated and rectified by recognition of the error on the eve of global war.

The late James Forrestal, one who grasped the inherent genius of our concept of balanced naval power, succinctly summed up British post-World War I policy toward naval aviation by stating:

"The consequence of this neglect was that the British went into the war with a totally inadequate naval air force." Mr. Forrestal in his indictment of that erroneous policy, attributed the great British sea disasters—loss of the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse*, the sinking of the *Glorious* off Norway, the 1942 escape of the *Scharnhorst*, *Gneisenau*, and *Prince Eugen* from Brest—to lack of an adequate naval aviation.

Unquestionably, Mr. Forrestal by personal observation and study understood well the dire consequences that resulted from England's post-World War I policy toward the naval air weapon and amphibious warfare. He spoke with great conviction as he warned against the great risks to which our Nation would be exposed by following the British example in naval aviation. He saw, as an observer in England in 1941, the results of the "complete oblivion which had been forced on naval aviation." Such a policy toward the fleet air arm was the basis for Mr. Forrestal's blunt statement that "the British never got one."

The reason for the absence of a strong British naval aviation was clear to Mr. Forrestal, who placed the blame upon "the iron hand which the Aircraft Ministry and the RAF had clamped upon British naval aviation, and had thereby prevented the development of modern carrier aircraft."

* * * * *

Evaluated in the cold light of historical perspective, England's decision in 1919 to choke off naval aviation—and with it carrier development—stands as one of the most stupendous strategic errors of modern military history.

The hard but inescapable fact is that such failure to exploit—as did the United States—the air weapon as an integral instrument of sea power, created a situation so broad in its scope and dire in its potentialities that it was beyond rectification in the 6 short months that intervened between the reestablishment of naval aviation within the Royal Navy and the outbreak of World War II. That 21-year British policy of stifling the development of carrier warfare had ramifications that extended even further than the sea disasters that befell the Royal Navy.

In the early years of the war when the very survival of England depended on winning the battle of the North Atlantic sea

lanes against the Nazi submarine wolf packs, England simply did not possess the carriers that were so vitally necessary to achieve victory. Probably no one will ever be able to calculate what England's 21 years of derelection of naval aviation cost in ships, cargo, men, and effort. While the cost of such an erroneous policy may be incalculable, it is justifiable to state that England's 1919 wrong guess on the future of naval aviation could well have cost much more: the loss of the war for England, had not the Nazis made a similar error in failing to provide for close coordination of the Luftwaffe with the U-boat fleet.

Such could well have been the case had it not been for one thing—the United States had not followed the example of British naval air between the great wars.

* * * * *

The British concept of placing arbitrary limitations on the weapons available to her naval power has the demonstrable effect of reducing not only England's naval air development but her amphibious potential as well. Her failure to develop a strong amphibious capability is one of the towering paradoxes of modern military history. Yet, fundamentally, England's negative policy toward amphibious warfare is a corollary of the post-World War I attitude toward naval aviation.

It will be recalled that England conducted at Gallipoli the largest amphibious operation of World War I. Unfortunately for England, and the future course of world events, Gallipoli was a British failure. As such, Gallipoli served to "confirm" the long-standing belief of continental strategists that successful amphibious operations against fortified positions were not possible in the face of modern quick firing and heavy caliber, long range weapons. The result was that European military strategy accepted the false lesson of Gallipoli, and amphibious warfare ceased to be recognized by European thought as a major instrument of strategy.

* * * * *

Parenthetically it should be recognized that no such negative attitude toward amphibious operations existed in the United States. At the very time European strategic thought was condemning amphibious operations as a major way of war, the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps were analyzing Gallipoli's failures, devising solutions, and amassing a comprehensive amphibious doctrine. To England and the other principal European powers, Gallipoli was failure; to the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps, Gallipoli was the modern genesis for the successful amphibious doctrine that was so indispensable in achieving victory in World War II.

Why, then, did England accept the failure of Gallipoli as a final verdict of doom for amphibious operation?

In the first place England never had accepted "the balanced fleet" concept of naval power. Instead, she had largely adopted the continental philosophy of naval power predicated upon the idea that navies should have only those weapons required for fighting at sea. Accordingly, this line of thought did not provide an intellectual atmosphere conducive to acceptance of any kind of weapons system involving more than the orthodox combatant and supply vessels designed to fight at sea. Thus, amphibious warfare, by which a nation's military power is projected from the sea against land targets, could not be harmoniously integrated into the prevailing philosophy of naval power. Therefore it was, for all practical purposes, abandoned.

In a sense, the British rejection of amphibious operations was even more final and conclusive than was that of naval aviation. It will be remembered that in the latter case, British policymakers belatedly sensed their error, and reconstituted naval aviation as a part of the Navy in 1939, on the eve of World War II. Not so with respect to amphibious operations. As late as 1939 a prominent British naval official reportedly observed that he could foresee no extensive use of large amphibious operations in future war. At least his erroneous estimate of the nature of World War II was fundamentally consistent with European theory.

World War II was in large measure a rebuttal to previous British thought both on naval aviation and on amphibious warfare. The late Secretary Forrestal pointedly emphasized the failure of England to develop adequate amphibious doctrine by referring to the British defeat by the Germans in Norway. "That disaster," Mr. Forrestal testified, "which profoundly affected the course of the entire war, was more than a failure of 16,000 men, it was a failure in the exercise of sea power on the part of the then largest Navy in the world, and it was due entirely to the lack of a small, specially trained amphibious force such as we have in the form of the United States Marines, to supplement ashore the action of the fleet at sea."

* * * * *

The result of the neglect of amphibious warfare would have been disastrous for the British—and Allied—war effort had it not been for one fact: the United States had, in amphibious warfare, as in the case of naval aviation and carrier warfare, refused to follow the British example. Consequently, because of the vision, imagination, and work of the United States Navy and the United States Marine Corps this Nation had a proven amphibious doctrine and a meaningful and growing amphibious capability at the outbreak of the war.

* * * * *

There are some additional factors that have, since World War II, strengthened British orientation toward continental sea power thinking, thus further sharpening the contrast betwen British and American attitudes toward the carrier and amphibious warfare.

The first of these influences is the closer association of England with continental Europe. This has been the result of many factors, the most basic perhaps is the "narrowing" of the English Channel due to technological advances in warfare. No longer, as in the Napoleonic era, can the cross-channel approaches from the continent be guarded by a "thin line of wooden ships," or any line of ships, for that matter. World War II and its buzz bombs brought England within artillery range of the continent. By comparison with present day and foreseeable missiles, the German buzz bomb was primitive. With England well within range of continental missile bases, the channel has lost much of its military significance. Thus England has a greater and more vital interest in continental land warfare, for her fate could well be settled by whether a friendly or enemy nation controls the areas suitable for locating missile-firing batteries within range of Britain's industrial heart.

* * * * *

Another factor that has the effect of tending to minimize British requirements for balanced naval power, as it is understood in the United States, is the loosening of the bonds of the British Empire which has occurred since the end of World War II. It was sea power that held the Empire together. The present status of India and the loosening of the ties as vast and small areas move from colonial to more independent status has created a corresponding slacking in the obligation, incentive, and economic ability to give British sea power the priority accorded it in pre-World War II times.

While other reasons certainly exist, the gradual dissolution of the Empire is one of the prime underlying factors in the corresponding smaller emphasis given naval power in current British strategy. This reduction in the scope of Empire obligations, together with closer orientation with the continent, provides a fundamental clue as to why England's navy, which passed sea power supremacy to the United States in World War II, has now been numerically superseded by the Soviet Union as a sea power.

* * * * *

In the light of such circumstances the recently expressed views of Field Marshal Montgomery appear more understandable, for not only was he reenunciating the essentials of a longstanding British philosophy of seapower, but he was also attuning his observations to England's current strategic and economic status, which, because of the technological narrowing of the channel and the reduction of Empire imposes a lower priority on naval power. This change in British strategy places a limitation on the kind of naval power appropriate to England's world power status, which has changed since the beginning of World War II. Thus what has happened is that the continental philosophy of limited seapower, so unsuitable to England and the Empire prior to World War II, is now more appropriate to England's present reduced role and capabilities.

It is precisely England's decline as a world ranking seapower nation which imposes an added burden and obligation on the United States to fill the seapower vacuum created by England's reduced naval potential. While this condition has global implications, it poses particularly severe problems and requirements in the western Pacific. There, in Pacific Asia, Russian seapower is on the rise and threatens to fill the vacuum resulting from withdrawal or reduction of British seapower in that area. The obligation of countering the rise of Russian seapower in the western Pacific now falls squarely on the United States.

Balanced naval power—based on carriers and amphibious forces—provides the power, mobility, and flexibility so responsive to the modern strategic requirements of the Pacific. Thus the reduction in British seapower, a salient concomitant of which has been the belief in the future uselessness of carriers and the virtual abandonment of amphibious warfare, has the direct and immediate effect of making it imperative that the United States place even greater emphasis on those basic attributes of balanced naval power. The rise of Russian seapower makes it mandatory, in the interest of our national security and the safety of the free world, to depart completely from the philosophy and pattern of British seapower.

All of our experience in World War II and since seems to underline the wisdom of the United States in continuing to fashion her naval power in accordance with our own national concepts and responsive to our own national security requirements.

Peace Depends on People Knowing People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by W. E. O'Brien, the administrative assistant to the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. The article was published in the June 11 issue of the magazine America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE DEPENDS ON PEOPLE KNOWING PEOPLE

(By W. E. O'Brien)

(On May 31 the Senate approved intact the State Department's request for $22 million to expand the exchange of persons program, which the House had cut to $12 million. Mr. O'Brien, administrative assistant to Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, a post he has held for many years, explains why the conferees meeting this week should provide generously for this increasingly important program.)

A new phase in the struggle to preserve world peace has set in. Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND presaged its advent in his somber statement, interrupting the Senate's special session last November, on the atomic stalemate which he foresaw.

The rush of events this spring has largely confirmed the belief that the world has moved into a period of intensified nonmilitary competition between the Communist and free nations. It is, as the saying goes, a battle for men's minds. How decisive victories over men's minds can be was underlined at the Bandung Conference in Indonesia a couple of months ago. The courage and conviction with which leaders of non-Communist Asiatic peoples challenged the apologists for Red imperialism, masquerading as apostles of peace and anticolonialism, seems to have blunted the edge of Red China's ambitions to corral the uncommitted peoples of the Orient in its camp.

The Soviety Union's sudden agreement to an Austrian treaty, which came in the wake of the defeat of its drive to forestall West German membership in NATO, proved that Soviet policy has definitely shifted gears. Stalin's policy of antagonizing the free world at every turn had plainly backfired. The amazing buildup of anti-Communist military power, achieved through United States leadership, at least seems finally to have persuaded the tacticians of aggressive Marxism that their bellicosity was heading them into a military showdown. Their new tactic is to muffle the drums of war and to rely on nonmilitary political, economic, and propaganda measures to win the struggle of competitive coexistence with the forces of freedom.

This global shift in Communist tactics requires a reexamination of American foreign policy. Everyone is agreed that for us to drop our military guard would be to tumble into a Marxist trap. On the other hand, the time has come to go all-out on nonmilitary phases of our foreign policy. Our military strength has erected a shield behind which we can compete against the Communist world for the deep-down allegiance of people's souls. The final outcome of the cold war will be decided largely by the success with which we carry through the nonmilitary phases of the postwar counteroffensive we have devised to prevent Marxists from enveloping any more peoples than they already have enveloped.

EXCHANGE OF PERSONS DIPLOMACY

One of the most important nonmilitary components of American foreign policy since the war has been our exchange of persons program. Under this, foreign students, teachers, journalists, social-welfare specialists, and other leading personalities have been invited to visit the United States as guests of our Government in order to become acquainted with typical American personalities and agencies doing the kind of work in which our guests are themselves engaged in their homelands. These are two-way programs, with properly qualified Americans enjoying a similar opportunity of visiting foreign lands at the expense of the United States Government for similar purposes.

During the past year 7,121 of these exchanges have been arranged. Two-thirds of the exchangees were foreigners invited to the United States to study, teach, lecture, carry on specialized research or gain work experience. The other third were Americans who went abroad on the same type of mission.

The Department of State, which conducts these programs, calls attention to the fact that "many of these exchanges were planned within the framework of projects to meet special situations in different countries." For example, a couple of years ago, Hispanic specialists in international law met in Latin America to promote the study of international law among the Spanish-speaking peoples of the world. Prof. Antonio de Luna, director of the Institute on the History of International Law at the University of Madrid, took a leading part in the discussions, emphasizing the natural-law basis of international law. The Madrid institute was named a center of the group's international project.

Dr. de Luna thereby attracted the attention of officials in the exchange of persons program, who promptly invited him to visit this country in order to see for himself how American universities went about the study and teaching of international law. As a result of his visit, Dr. de Luna has agreed to join the faculty of a large American Catholic university as a visiting professor. No doubt he will contribute toward a much better understanding between the people of the United States and those of Spain and other Hispanic countries. In such concrete ways the peoples of the free world can come to understand each other much better. This common understanding of one another, of course, is essential to greater cooperation between various nations in the achieving of stable, peaceful relations between them.

HISTORY AND STATUS OF THE PROGRAMS

The postwar exchange of persons program has its legislative roots principally in the Fulbright Act of 1946, the Smith-Mundt Act of 1948 and a number of other legislative measures setting up special exchange programs with Latin-American countries, China, Korea, Finland, Iran, Germany, Austria, and India. These special authorizations met special needs in sensitive areas of the world where international problems of high priority challenged our ingenuity. The programs are financed both through congressional appropriations in dollars and through the use of money that we have at our disposal in foreign currencies. These are funds which foreign governments credited to our Government from the sale of surplus war materials abroad. Under the Fulbright Act the United States Government can assign these funds to support Americans we send abroad to study or carry out other purposes of this phase of the exchange program.

These are Federal cultural-interchange programs outside those run by the Department of State, but our present interest lies in these latter. The proposed appropriation for continuation of the department's exchange of persons program under the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts for the fiscal year 1956 is $22 million, of which $8.3 would be in foreign currencies. This is an increase of $6.5 million over the present year's appropriation, largely to cover the cost of exchanges with the Middle East, Far East, South Asia, and Africa as recomemnded by congressional committees, Vice President NIXON, Dr. Milton Eisenhower and others.

Instead of expanding the program, the House cut the appropriation from $22 million to $12 million, of which $8 million must still be in foreign currencies. This would leave only $4 million for activities costing dollars and for the administration of the entire program. The Senate on May 31 approved the $22 million intact. The two bills were to be ironed out in conference this week.

It is important to note that private groups supplement the facilities provided by the Federal Government in carrying out these programs. Last year, for example, it is estimated that at least $7.8 million was contributed in this way from nongovernmental sources. This contribution helped to defray the costs of 450 projects involving 3,400 exchanges of persons.

VALUABLE RESULTS ACHIEVED

What evidence have we which would prove that the Exchange of Persons Program in its various phases has actually achieved its purpose of creating better understanding and a greater spirit of friendliness between Americans and other free peoples? In answering this question we must distinguish between the short-range and long-range phases of this experiment. It is too soon to judge of the long-range results. The younger people from foreign lands who have had the opportunity to visit the United States were selected because of the promise they gave of rising in influence at home as their careers unfolded. In most cases they have not yet had time to achieve much influence.

But we can tell from the good results of the short-range phases that the experiment is achieving its purposes. For example, nearly every one of the Asiatics of real prominence who spoke up at the Bandung Conference in defense of the peaceful purposes of United States foreign policy and in condemnation of the aggressive purposes of Red expansionism has been educated in one of the Western countries. In fact, the Bandung Conference went on record in favor of international exchanges of persons by adopting a resolution declaring that "the most powerful means of promoting understanding among nations is the development of cultural cooperation."

Last November, at the meeting of the National Council of Catholic Women in Boston, President Eisenhower testified that the exchange programs are "increasing interculturual understanding and thereby forging the bonds of brotherhood and good will among men. They are thus serving the cause of peace in a troubled world." Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON recently told the Senate Appropriations Committee that his "look-see" tours through Asia and Latin America had proven to him the effectiveness of these exchanges. "If I had to pick one program in the foreign field which was the most effective," he said, "if I had to pick one that was indispensable, this would be it."

A survey by the Bureau of Social Science Research of American University, Washington, D. C., reported that foreign students, after visiting the United States, were favorably impressed by their experience. They thought Americans were "cordial, warm, kind, and hospitable * * * and that this was experienced as quite a surprise." The same survey indicated that foreign students credit us with a high cultural level and strong attachment to noneconomic values. In other words, their experiences here had caused them to revise the stereotype distant peoples often have of Americans as a money-mad breed of vulgar tastes.

A survey which the Department of State itself conducted of about 1,000 returned grantees in 17 foreign countries showed that the majority of them after returning home had engaged in activities favorable to the purposes which the United States is pursuing in the world at large. This was particularly true of our foreign policy, of which the visitors acquired a much better understanding during their stay with us.

Ranbir Singh, editor of the Daily Milap of New Delhi, the capital of India, has gone on record about the way his visit to America changed his attitude toward us. He said that his impressions of Americans previous to his visit—impressions gained mostly from American movies and Communist propa-

ganda—were that most Americans were either crooks or millionaires or both. On our home grounds, however, he found Americans to be neither, but friendly and kind, much like the folks he knew at home. Mr. Singh makes as many as nine talks a day to various groups in India. The newspaper he edits is full of accurate information about us and his editorials are friendly. This kind of offset to the malicious anti-American propaganda Soviet agents pour into India is invaluable to the cause of freedom and peace.

Dr. Elizabeth Burger, counselor in the Catholic Chuch's women's affairs program in Germany, has informed almost a million Germans, through her magazine articles and lectures, about her impressions of America. She keeps insisting on the fact that, though the New York skyline is picketed by skyscrapers instead of church spires, as in Europe, it is a mistake to minimize the importance of religion in the United States.

Our diplomats abroad who see the exchange programs in operation overseas are enthusiastic witnesses to its value United States Ambassadors polled on the subject agreed with Mr. NIXON'S estimate: "This exchange of persons is our most effective program abroad."

Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt, director of the department of education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, who has had considerable experience with these programs, wrote to the Senate Appropriations Committee urging continuance of this experiment.

Finally, we know how important the Kremlin regards its own exchange programs as weapons in its cold war against freedom. All the key people in the Guatemala revolt, according to Mr. NIXON'S check, had been sent either to Russia or to Iron Curtain countries to study.

MINOR CRITICISMS

One criticism of the exchange of persons program is that enough foreign students come to the United States to study (30,000 in 1954) without our paying their way. The answer is that the Department of State selects young foreigners of proven competence and could get many more from the sensitive areas. It gives preference to those who are particularly interested in such subjects as American history, the social sciences, and law, and studies which will enable them to promote the well-being of their own people through engineering, medicine, and social welfare. The ability of foreign students to come here without our help depends on many circumstances which have no relevance to the purposes of this special program, such as the financial standing of their parents.

Another criticism is that we do not need to make more friends in already friendly countries. In view of the ingenuity of the Soviet Union and Red China in creating friction between us and our allies, this criticism hardly carries much weight. We cannot have too many or too well-informed friends in foreign countries. Besides, who knows whether the younger persons now working their ways toward positions of leadership abroad will be friendly to us when they wield great influence within a few years?

UNWISE ECONOMY

The desire of Congress to economize is always understandable. Before accepting such a deep cut as the House has approved, however, proponents of the program hope the Senate will carefully weigh the value of the particular phases of it which will suffer most. When we consider it a bargain to be able, by multiplying orders, to build a single intercontinental B–52 jet bomber for $8 million, is it wise to refuse less than three times that amount to continue in full force for another wear our best weapon in the battle for men's minds? For in the end, as the Bandung Conference must have convinced us, it is what the peoples of the world think that will decide who wins and who loses the cold war. Why take chances on losing that battle merely to save a few million dollars?

Celler Scores Immigration Policy of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address of Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, at a Willard Hotel dinner by the Washington Committee of United Hias Service, the international Jewish imigration agency, on Tuesday, June 14, 1955:

THE IMMIGRATION CRISIS

Nowhere except possibly in the area of international trade, do the lines of domestic and foreign policy cross and meet as they do in immigration. This is a subject, therefore, that we must in all self-interest deal with soberly, sensitively, and above all, seriously.

For the more than 32 years I have been in Congress, I have watched the policy of immigration become ensnarled in the waves of fear produced by hot and cold wars. This was as true in 1954 as it was true in 1952 and is true in 1955. Our immigration policy is as much an aftermath of World War II as it was an aftermath in 1924 of World War I and the Russian revolution which was part of the seething history of those years. In between was a major depression.

At no one time since 1924 have we summoned sufficient objectivity to examine the consequences of our immigration policy in the light of our world leadership, in the light of the guiding principles of our democracy, and in the light of established scientific and political fact.

We who pride ourselves as a forward-looking people in tune with the march of events and progress, have remained mystifyingly divorced from reality in the whole immigration picture. We have, instead, married fact to fancy, delusion to data, and embraced the hybrid offspring—our immigration policy—with nondetachable fingers. For, make no mistake about this, the prevailing sentiment throughout this country is against any basic revision of our immigration law, and this resistance to change is reflected in the Congress. Only a handful of States in this Union, who have had continuing experience with receiving immigrants from other lands to their own enrichment, have understood the flaws in our immigration policy. If we understand this fact of resistance, we are then better equipped to understand the nature of the difficult job before us. There are not enough people who understand the consequences of our immigration policy. The immigration law at best is an intricate subject, necessarily dependent upon interpretation of language, since immigration law can never be written with the exactness of, shall we say, a tax law. I know, for example, of many Members of Congress, when faced with an actual case of deportation and the absence of a statute of limitations in our law, have expressed surprise. "Is that in the act?" they ask, again and again. We have, for example, pending before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, of which I am chairman, over 2,000 private immigration bills, introduced by Members of the House of every shade of political opinion, including those who are in principle opposed to liberalization of the immigration law. Every one of these cases represents an exception sought from the provisions of the rigid Immigration and Nationality Act. That is because the authors of these private bills see each beneficiary as a human being, not as a statistic. Perhaps that is the major obstacle that when we talk of immigration abstractly, it becomes difficult to translate the figures into human beings. You of HIAS, who work with immigrants, see each case as individualized, see the hopes, frustrations, the tragedies of human beings who seek a home in the United States. I believe it is part of your job to translate for the major segments of our population these statistics into the human story.

It is particularly gratifying to me that HIAS in these times concerns itself so intimately with the whole question of our immigration policy. Today, with 6 million Jews exterminated through Nazi massacre, with 2 million Jews behind the bars of the Iron Curtain countries, and with little Israel bravely straining all its resources to give a haven to those Jews who seek entry, HIAS nonetheless continues its concern with the general immigration problems, for it is aware that our immigration policy is a weak link indeed in the chain of democracy, and to the extent we ignore our weaknesses, to that extent democracy is vulnerable.

Basing our immigration quotas on the accident of national origins, we reach an untenable, if not, shall I say, an absurd conclusion. For example, the quota for Germany is 25,814, for Italy, it is 5,645, for Greece, 308, for Turkey, 225. Is, therefore, a German 80 times more worthwhile than a native of Greece? Or 4 times more worthwhile than a native of Italy and 115 times greater than a man or woman of Turkish origin? Or is one man of English origin 9 times as meritorious as a man of Polish origin?

In the Senate and in the House there have been introduced a number of identical bills which have for their purpose basic revision of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The Lehman-Celler bill, as it has come to be known, seeks primarily to:

1. Eliminate the national origins quota system with its built-in discriminations based on place of birth;

2. Eliminate statutory discriminations and distinctions between native-born and naturalized American citizens;

3. Eliminate present insubstantial grounds for revocation and denial of citizenship;

4. Eliminate fractious and arbitrary grounds for denial of admission to the United States;

5. Make a clear distinction in requirements for entry between (a) aliens seeking permanent residence here, and (b) alien visitors coming here for scholarly or scientific purposes, for pleasure, or for business;

6. Eliminate special immigration barriers against orientals and Negroes.

7. Establish an annual immigration ceiling of approximately 250,000 per year, but permit immigration up to that limit;

8. Require all ordinary immigration from the Western Hemisphere to be included within the annual quota limits;

9. Establish a unified quota system, based on national need, individual aptitude, and the requirements of our foreign policy;

10. Establish statutory review and appeals procedures in all cases of deportation and exclusion, and for denials of visas.

I am frankly doubtful of passage of the Lehman-Celler bill this year or even next. Realistically these are maximum demands which the Congress is not prepared as yet to accept. I might add, not sufficiently edu-

cated to the mischief arising from the present act to accept. While President Eisenhower twice has asked for revision of the McCarran-Walter act, there has been no pressure from the administration to go forward.

We have seen the miserable failure of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. There are those of us, Senator LEHMAN in the Senate and myself in the House, joined by others, who have sought by legislation to make this act workable. And, while it is imperative that this act be made to work, we must not accept any revision of the Refugee Relief Act as a substitute for revisions of our immigration law. The Refugee Relief Act is emergency legislation, necessary and humanitarian in purpose, but it is certainly not any answer to the major difficulties.

There we have it, then, a Refugee Relief Act which does not work, and an immigration policy which offends against our natural generosity, and, at home and abroad, thrusts the United States into cariacature pose.

As the cold war deepened, so our fears deepened. In 1948 we were capable of enacting a Celler Displaced Persons Act which admitted some 400,000 refugees. But even then Congress saw fit to mortgage future quotas. There are some low quota countries where 50 percent of the quotas are mortgaged up to the year 2000. It is ironic that in passing the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, Congress provided that these be nonquota immigrants, yet kept intact the cruel mortgage provisions of the earlier Displaced Persons Act. I sincerely believe that perhaps not 1 person out of possibly 10,000 in the United States is aware of this mortgage provision. Out of the 679,940 quota immigration visas issued by American consular officers abroad from 1948 to 1952, 355,971 had to be charged against future quotas. The quotas of 25 countries have thus been preempted up to 50 percent of their annual allotment; 50 percent of the Polish quota is mortgaged until the year 2000. The Yugoslav quota is mortgaged to the year 2015; the Greek quota 2017; the Estonian quota until the year 2146, etc.

During fiscal years 1925 to 1952 2,438,845 quota numbers were unused because they could not be redistributed under the law.

We go a step further and note that during the fiscal year 1953–54, quota visa immigrants amounted to a total of 94,098 out of 154,657 total permitted by the law. Since Great Britain and Ireland use so little of their quota, those unused go to waste. Some 60,000 visas this past year which could have been used to alleviate human suffering throughout the world went down the drain. Would it not, therefore, make sense, good sense, as perhaps a preliminary step, to work toward and to concentrate on the elimination of the mortgages imposed and to work toward the distribution of the unused quota? This is not to say that we should lose sight of our maximum goal, involving many basic changes. This is to say, that there is a more probable success in attempting these modifications plus the elimination of certain administrative procedures which have worked so much hardship on the immigrant both here and in countries abroad. This would be a realistic approach. It will succeed.

It is well to keep our sights trained on the major objective—indeed we must not at any time turn ourselves away from the larger vision.

But let us keep in mind, so that we can give relief presently, now to thousands of human beings by liquidating the mortgages on quotas and causing a distribution of unused quotas among the low quota countries.

This relief, I believe, the Congress will accept and in this session

It is not lightly that I make these proposals. I have this in mind: With the possible easing of tensions the time may not be too distant when the Iron Curtain countries may permit those of Jewish faith to emigrate. Therefore we must now work to bring about availability of quota numbers, even if in limited degree, so that we shall not fail them at their moment of greatest need.

I say, too, if we can bring about these modifications in this Congress we shall at the same time be modifying the heretofore resisting attitude against change.

Let us come back to the consideration of the major changes. Now let's take a fresh look at the flow of immigration into this country and try to understand its meaning. The volume of immigration has risen from a low of 38,000 in 1945 to more than 208,000 in 1954. This, of course, is immigrant volume. The flow of nonimmigrants, that is, those who do not come to stay permanently, has increased manyfold. In 1954 we found more than 59 million entries of nonimmigrants. This includes agricultural laborers, seamen, and those crossing the Canadian and Mexican borders. The influx of 208,000 in 1954 arises primarily from the nonquota status accorded natives of independent Western Hemisphere countries. Out of that 208,000 some 94,000 are accounted for by quota immigrants and the remainder, 114,000, by nonquota immigrants, mostly from Western Hemisphere countries. Hence, we see clearly that there is an increase in nonquota immigrants while the flow of quota immigrants is on the decline. The national-origin provisions and the mortgage provisions of the Displaced Persons Act contribute in large fashion to this picture. If that is so, then what real purpose does our quota system have? The immigration picture is not based on any realistic study of absorptive capacity in this country. It is no longer even based on what the opponents of liberal immigration policy call "assimilation potential." In other words, the population composition is not the determining factor in nonvisa immigration. Hence the national origin quota system serves only to discriminate against people of southern Europe.

I am convinced that if the country at large understood the facts I have presented to you, understood them as you understand them too, that resistance to change would soon disappear. I believe also the time is not far off, though it is not yet, when Congress will reflect the changing attitude and will rewrite the laws in accordance to the principles of equality of peoples and wipe out the differences in treatment between native-born and acquired citizenship now existent in our law. I submit that we proceed to educate, not in bitterness, not in rancor, but alive always to challenge (in rational debate) the blind barriers of immigration.

First Senior Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on May 27, 1955, the Catholic Standard of Washington, D. C., published an editorial entitled "First Senior Day." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, together, with an address by the Honorable James P. McGranery, recently Attorney General of the United States, and formerly Judge of the United States District Court, delivered on May 22 at the Senior Day Ceremony of the Catholic Schools, Archdiocese of Washington, D. C., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Catholic Standard of May 27, 1955]

FIRST SENIOR DAY

The first senior day for the Catholic high schools held at Constitution Hall last Sunday was a very enjoyable as well as a stimulating event. Through the ingenuity of the planners and the excellence of the speakers, a very significant and well-paced program was completed that must have impressed everyone who attended.

The principal speaker, the Honorable James P. McGranery, admirably expressed the theme of the event—responsible Catholic citizenship: "For the American citizen serves with heart and mind, soul and body his country who is obedient to the authority of God—and as delegated to the Government of the country, parents, and their representatives while loving and respecting God's image in his neighbors and in himself." The speech of the former Attorney General was excellently complemented by the splendid pledge to our country recited by all the graduates. Although a lengthy pledge generally loses force as it proceeds, the cadence of the phrasing built up to an inspiring climax in the recitation of the Apostles' Creed.

All this served as a fitting prelude to the presentation of the citizenship awards by his excellency who then gave a brief but inspiring exhortation to all the graduates.

The whole event, though hardly over an hour in length, grandly epitomized the aims of Catholic education which were summed up in one of the phrases of the pledge, "To accord, to all men, all that I justly claim for myself as human rights, consonant with the dignity of man, and, not content with the mere rigor of justice, to pursue in all my life and acts the supreme Christian ideals of love of man for the love of God. * * *"

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES P. MCGRANERY, RECENTLY ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES AND FORMERLY JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, AT THE SENIOR DAY CEREMONIES OF THE CATHOLIC SCHOOLS OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF WASHINGTON, D. C., IN CONSTITUTION HALL, MAY 22, 1955

With the permission of your excellency, Monsignor Spence, right reverend and very reverend monsignori, reverend fathers, religious and lay members of the faculties of the archdiocesan schools, parents of the students, and other guests, I deem it a distinguished privilege to speak to you—who are members of the senior classes of the Catholic Schools of the Archdiocese of Washington, on this happy occasion when your appreciation of your responsibilities as American citizens and your practice of the American way of life have been recognized by your school faculties and honored by his excellency, our most reverend archbishop.

It is fitting that these good-citizenship medals should be presented to you by our revered and beloved Archbishop O'Boyle who, by his wise and far-sighted direction of the schools in which you are being educated; by his inspired spiritual guidance of the churches, the parishes, the charitable institutions and societies for the aged, the orphaned, the ill and the afflicted of Washington; and by his own life, as well as his personal and apostolic participation in our community and national civic life, has exemplified the essential qualities of the American citizen: Courageous and constant devotion to God, to his country, and to his fellowmen.

It is suitable, too, that this assembly should be held in our Federal City on land which has been described as "the only home of religious freedom in the wide world," the former domain of the Catholic barons of Baltimore; in the shadow of our National Capitol which crowns an eminence deeded by Daniel Carroll of Duddington who parted from it at a figure which, even in those early days of our economy, "made it a virtual gift," his generous response to the request of George Washington at a meeting of landowners in Georgetown. Even the ground plan of this most beautiful city in the world was conceived by the renowned Catholic engineer, Pierre Charles L'Enfant.

It would, perhaps, have significance to trace, briefly, in inverse order, recorded Catholic contributions to our country's discovery and exploration. We remember well that Jesuit missionaries from new France preceded the Puritans and the Pilgrims in New England by almost a century. The cross of Christ and the lilies of France had been planted in the Mississippi valley from the Gulf of Mexico to Canada almost two centuries before Louisiana entered our Union. The great American cities named for Holy Mary, Queen of the Angels, and for St. Francis bear eloquent testimony to the generations of Catholics who, with Jesuit and Franciscan missionaries, settled beyond the Rockies scores of years before the Gold Rush. Florida, Georgia, and Alabama were hallowed by the footprints of missionary fathers from Spain who came to bring the word of God to the Indians. And the familiar, well-loved names, America and Columbia, are perpetual reminders that our Continent and our country were discovered by two brave Catholic gentlemen.

While Catholic pioneering was an important factor in preparing the land that was to cradle these United States, the infant Nation was endowed with the Catholic legacy of democratic principles, an inheritance that was to constitute her unique: The only nation ever to be conceived in the spiritual ideal of liberty under God.

When Jefferson drafted the Declaration of Independence, he expressed the beliefs of his contemporaries, men of religious faith and courage. These immortal words of Jefferson preserved for posterity our forefathers' awareness of the dignity of individual man as created by God and at the same time revealed Jefferson's own familiarity with truths enunciated by Cardinal Bellarmine whose writings upon the equality of men, their natural endowment of freedom and liberty to choose their own form of government, were commented upon by Filmer in a volume still among the books of Thomas Jefferson and reposing in the Congressional Library.

Truly, the phrases of the Declaration echo those of St. Robert Bellarmine, student of St. Thomas; and they have enshrined for all time the fundamental teachings of Christ who became a citizen of the earth in order to make possible for man his attainment of eternal citizenship in Heaven.

True, the Christian view of man has its beginning in the first chapter of Genesis:

"So God made man in his own image, made him in the image of God." Fulfilling the promises of the Old Testament—whose theme was justice—the New Testament, whose theme is love, recounts the incarnation, when God took unto Himself the likeness of man and raised individual man to a new dignity.

With the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, our Nation was dedicated to the Christian ideal of government, guaranteeing to man his inalienable, God-given rights; asking only that he recognize his obligations as a citizen.

The Constitution, with its amendments, implemented the Declaration, and has continued to make possible our Republic a Government of the freely elected representatives of the people, acting for the people under the authority of God. Whenever the interpretation of the Constitution has varied from the philosophy of the Declaration, our citizens in their wisdom have so amended and clarified it that women have been restored to their rightful place of influence in accordance with the Christian tradition; and men of all races, creeds and color have been recognized as equal in nature, origin and destiny: creatures of God eternally entitled to the full opportunities and privileges of citizenship.

It was William Penn who said that "Men must either be governed by God or they must be ruled by tyrants." And so, in our world, that is today more than half-enslaved by the godless men of the Kremlin, the United States of America must hold fast to the basic spiritual ideal which has been her heritage.

Materialism, secularism, bigotry and atheism have, during our brief history, again and again struck blows at the foundation of our democratic way of life. But there have always been good men of religious faith who have been true to the American tradition. Every President of the United States since the father of our country has publicly asked divine guidance and urged our citizens to place their trust and faith in the eternal source of all authority—God.

We have indeed been reminded that it is not possible to be a citizen of the kingdom of God without performing to their fullness our obligations as citizens of the United States.

For the American citizen serves his country who is obedient, with heart and mind, soul and body, to the authority of God—in His divine persons and as delegated to the government of country, parents and their representatives; while loving and respecting God's image in his neighbors and in himself.

The good citizen is loyal, valiant and vigilant on behalf of America's destiny; the protection of freedom in which all men may find their way to God.

You—who are about to be graduated from the high schools and academies under the auspices of the Catholic archdiocese—have been well prepared for citizenship. For your instructors are dedicated men and women who have endowed with their lives these institutions of learning in order that the citizens of tomorrow will be educated in the true meaning the word.

They know well that a youth has intellect and will, and that, if he is to develop his powers to fruition, then the training of his mind must be accompanied by the training of his character, and the acquiring of good habits.

Catholic education is never merely the presenting of information: Rather, it is aiding and directing the individuals' development of his powers; spiritual, intellectual, moral, and physical, in preparation for his religious, civic, and social life on earth and his eternal citizenship in heaven.

The teachings of Christ, transmitted through the Roman Catholic Church, in her apostolic mission, cast the light of truth, justice, and charity upon art and science, upon learning and living alike.

You are blessed to have had teachers who, while skilled in every advance technique of pedagogy and educated in the accredited colleges and universities of our country and others, have consecrated their entire lives to their religious vocation of making you ready for your responsibility in American Catholic living.

Your gratitude to these holy men and women is a reflection of your gratitude to your parents, who have chosen the religious to guard and to guide your growth of mind and heart and soul; and who, while contributing through taxes to the support of the public schools, have sacrificed to make financially possible the schools of the archdiocese of Washington.

Your parents have thus fulfilled their own obligations to you, to the community and to God, and have decreased the burden of taxation for their neighbors.

Most of all, your parents have rendered signal service to our country. For you have been made ready for citizenship in the true American tradition.

Perhaps some of you may follow in the footsteps of Chief Justice Taney or Chief Justice White to interpret the law of the land. Others may seek to bring the tranquility of order to labor relations in the spirit of Philip Murray, whether you take, as your exemplar, Commodore Barry or General Sheridan, Mother Katherine Drexel or Father Thomas Merton, you will labor and live through the days ahead for the greater honor and glory of God.

And you will join a long procession of illustrious Catholic citizens who have served our Nation with valor and distinction; for, in the words of John Donne:

"No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main."

Iowa—Agricultural Center of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

IOWA: AGRICULTURAL CENTER OF THE WORLD

The eminence of Iowa as the pantry and storehouse for the whole country and the agricultural center of the world has been further substantiated.

Figures from the Iowa Crop and Livestock Reporting Service and from the United States and Iowa State Departments of Agriculture show that Iowa ranks first in—

Livestock income, 10 percent of the United States total.

Value of beef marketed, 12 percent of the United States total.

Corn production average, 17 percent of the United States total.

Egg production, 8 percent of United States total.

Grade A land, 25 percent of United States total.

Total area of State in farms, 95.5 percent.

Number of cattle on feed, January 1955: 20 percent of United States total.

Hog numbers—more than any other two States and 20 percent of United States total.

Hog production, 24 percent of United States total.

Livestock and poultry value, 9 percent of United States total. Total estimated value of Iowa livestock and poultry on farms January 1, 1955, was $1,079,803,000.

Marketings of cattle.

Oat production average, 15 percent of United States total.

Popcorn production average, 23 percent of United States total.

Chicken numbers, 7 percent of United States total.

Chicken production, 8 percent of the United States total.

Timothy seed production, 25 percent of United States total.

Iowa stands in a class by itself as an agricultural State. Often the State's productivity brings it the largest agricultural income in the Nation, and the total tonnage of Iowa food products is greater than that of any of the 48 States. Iowa fields and feedlots nourish six times the State's popu-

lation, producing 10 percent of the Nation's food supply.

Iowa's food products are as balanced as her total economy—the seven basic foods necessary to good health and adequate nutrition are produced in Iowa in abundance.

Civil Defense—All But Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, the added problems faced by officials and volunteer citizens interested in civil defense during these times are extremely difficult and deserve the sympathetic understanding of every official of Government at all levels.

Some people are inclined to view all such activities and preparations as silly and as an unnecessary waste of taxpayers money. Yet they are also the folks who would raise serious criticism if such training should become necessary and nothing had been done.

It is my feeling, Mr. Speaker, and based on my experience as executive secretary of the Dayton Civilian Defense Council during World War II, that proper plans and training programs should be encouraged throughout the Nation. Not the least of the advantages is the esprit de corps and neighborliness that is created among citizens by their association together in such programs. Their feeling of responsibility and satisfaction makes for better understanding and participation in community affairs which is another good mark of citizenship.

The direction and management of these programs, however, places an extra responsibility upon the proper officials to guard against wasteful and unnecessary expenditure of public funds. If the public in general begins to feel that such expenditures are foolish and not properly justified then irreparable damage to the program can easily result. The avoidance of such mistakes calls for the most careful planning and thorough consideration by every civil defense official regardless of his rank and regardless of whether he is a paid official or a volunteer.

There is little question in my mind, Mr. Speaker, but that the nationwide civil defense alert planned for today will have many lessons which will be studied by all civil defense officials and which will result in much helpful information. I am also convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the executive branch of our Federal Government will learn many necessary factors that will need further consideration to guard against any exigency. For these reasons and also because of the effect it may have on public opinion in this matter, I regret that this exercise was not planned to include Members of Congress and their staffs. Many newspapers throughout the Nation have commented on this phase editorially. I am sure they did not do so facetiously, but only because they also are concerned over these problems and are concerned in the public interest.

The Cincinnati Enquirer published an excellent editorial on this subject and pointed out also the question that is uppermost in the minds of every American—that our greatest effort is to have peace in the world and do this with honor and credit to our great Nation. I ask unanimous consent to include this editorial as part of my remarks.

It is my constant hope and prayer, Mr. Speaker, that all of us will be granted divine guidance so that we can meet the great responsibilities and challenges we face with credit and honor to our Nation.

The editorial follows:

ALL BUT CONGRESS

On June 15 higher-ranking personnel of virtually all Government agencies will clear out of Washington and disperse to their wartime posts. For 2 days they will continue operations as normally as possible in rehearsal for a bombing attack on the Capital. For 6 weeks in advance skeleton crews will have been at these various remote stations making preparations for the conduct of the public business in the simulated emergency.

"Virtually all Government agencies" is the phrase. But one exceedingly important arm of Government is omitted. Members of Congress, their staffs, and officials of the House and Senate will continue to debate, investigate, and generally carry on in the midst of the (imaginary) rubble of a city prostrated by enemy attack.

The reason for the omission of Congress is simple enough. Finding a suitable place for a Senate of 96 Members and a House of 435 Members, with their staffs, has been too much for the Office of Defense Mobilization. A very large resort hotel far from any industrial center is clearly indicated. Arthur S. Flemming's people at ODM still are shopping around for a site.

The difficulty is that the legislative branch, unlike the executive, cannot very well do business with a skeleton force. If you don't have virtually all Members present, or at least a clear majority, you really can't do anything, legislatively.

In contrast, the executive branch can do business, under the Constitution, with only one man on the job. For the President has a virtual monopoly of the power of that branch. Given a number of subordinates to provide information and advice, the President and his Cabinet can get on with the business of making policy and handing down decisions and orders.

In practice, of course, it would not be that simple. Many vital Government activities involve the knowledge and skills of thousands or tens of thousands of qualified people. The plans formulated by ODM at this stage involve the dispersal of 15,000 persons. The main business of the Government still will be carried on in Washington, in the (imaginary) rubble June 15 to 17.

This may indicate the need for further expansion of dispersal plans, to insure continuity of Government. But it also indicates the utter impossibility of moving all the essential personnel and equipment away from Washington no matter how grave the emergency.

And that reminds us that we should lend our greatest efforts to averting war, with its hazard of atomic attack, rather than to preparing for continuity of government, in case such an attack comes.

Social Security and the Medical Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two interesting articles by Dr. Souren H. Tashian, of Seattle. These articles, which originally appeared in the Bulletin of the King County Medical Society, discuss the pros and cons of extending the social-security system to include members of the medical profession.

There being no objection the articles was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY

(By Souren H. Tashian)

To me has fallen the task of making a survey of old-age and survivors insurance (OASI). Social security already covers 90 percent of wage earners and self-employed, including managers and executives in the highest financial brackets. It is accepted by both political parties, and is described by President Eisenhower as a cornerstone of the American way of life. It is an effective weapon against family insecurity caused by old age or death.

WHAT IT IS

1. It actually is a form of enforced savings for an annuity-type benefit at retirement, and an insurance for one's survivors.

To my surprise, I have found that a large majority of local physicians privately approve of OASI. However, collectively through our representatives, we have put ourselves on an island together with dentists, osteopaths and lawyers, refusing to participate on the ground "we seldom actually retire." But, we must admit, thousands of doctors and lawyers already are covered by social security through part or full-time salaried positions.

2. OASI is a hedge against past and future inflation.

a. This insurance benefit can help offset the loss in purchasing power of private retirement plans already in force—a loss brought about by inflation.

b. As inflation occurs, the tendency is for social security benefits to be increased, with, of course, some corresponding increase in social security taxes. Recent increases in OASI have been made to compensate for the continuing falling-off of the buying value of the dollar.

3. Self-employed individuals who are covered under the social security law are required to indicate on their annual income tax report their net earnings, from a minimum of $400 up to a maximum of $4200, and they pay a 3 percent social security tax together with their regular income tax. This is three-fourths as much as an employee and his employer would pay on the same amount of earnings.

4. On retirement at age 65, the maximum benefit is $162.80 for the insured and wife. The maximum death benefit to the widow and two dependent children is $200 per month.

(a) If one retires at age 65, he can still earn up to $1,200 a year and at the same time receive the full retirement benefits. Outside income from stocks, investments, real estate,

and insurances have no bearing on social-security benefits.

(b) After age 72, the insured receives all social-security benefits regardless of the amount he earns in gainful employment.

5. Benefits are based on the number of quarters of gainful work. Each calendar year has 4 quarters. Minimum eligibility requirements are 6 quarters of work during the 3 years immediately preceding retirement.

To be fully covered, one must be gainfully employed for 40 quarters, if born since 1906. For those born earlier, less quarters of work are required, i. e., birth date 1891, 10 quarters; birth date 1901, 30 quarters, etc.

You are eligible for old-age insurance payments if your profession is covered under the social-security law, if you are 65 years of age or older, if you are fully insured (i. e., you have earned the required quarters), if you have either retired or reached 72 years of age (it is not necessary that you retire to receive payments).

Your survivors receive OASI benefits at your death if you have currently earned the minimum of 6 quarters.

THE TRUST FUND

The social-security taxes collected by the Internal Revenue Service are deposited in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and are used to pay all the benefits and administrative expenses of the program. The reserve portion of the trust fund—that is, the part not required for current disbursement—is invested in interest-bearing United States Government securities.

The schedule of tax rates is designed to meet the future obligations of the program and keep it on a self-supporting basis.

THE NEW LOOK—1955

Among those brought under the law for the first time are clergymen who, for example, can individually join the program. To obtain coverage, the individual minister must file a certificate with the district director of internal revenue indicating his desire to come under the law. He has 2 years in which to make his choice, but once made, it cannot be revoked.

Others also recently covered are professional engineers, architects, accountants, and funeral directors.

PERTINENT OBSERVATIONS

1. One does not have to retire at age 65. (By continuing gainful employment, the benefits increase.)

2. Bankers, industrialists, and insurance executives come under the social security program, and, as far as I have found, they consider it a good and sound insurance. Some may resent the enforced participation.

3. Currently there is a tendency for privately organized nonprofit retirement plans to switch to, or combine with OASI.

OBJECTIONS

There are some physicians who state in no uncertain words that they feel OASI is a "handout." Some think it is an intrusion of bureaucratic government into private enterprise and that it would weaken personal initiative—that it could possibly be a step toward socialized medicine—that it is the "child of the New Deal"—that doctors do not actually retire but die in their boots.

WHICH IS WHICH?

At the congressional hearings on physician participation in social security, witnesses imply in one breath that physicians and dentists do not want from the Federal Government "something for nothing"—yet in the next breath they express the fear that the Government will make a profit on this plan because doctors seldom actually retire.

THE WAY IT LOOKS FROM HERE

1. Doctors object to being dictated to by the Government to join OASI. Doctors are equally resentful of being told not to join by the AMA. It would be a simple matter to take a secret written ballot of the membership at large.

2. The AMA has accepted the principle of social security for physicians, provided it is offered to individual physicians on a voluntary basis.

"The board of trustees of the AMA determined that no objection would be raised to the extension of the old-age and survivors insurance provisions * * * so as to permit voluntary coverage of physicians." (Quotation from Social Security Amendments of 1954, hearings before the Committee on Finance, U. S. Senate, 83d Cong., 2d sess., on H. R. 9366, p. 422, statement by Dr. F. J. L. Blasingame, member of the board of trustees of the AMA.)

3. We are facing a lost cause. The best we can do is to accept peaceful coexistence with OASI.

SOCIAL SECURITY

(By Souren H. Tashian)

LAWYERS FAVOR SOCIAL SECURITY

Voting in a nationwide poll, State and local bar association presidents favor inclusion of lawyers in the Federal Social Security System by a majority of 4 to 1.

The results of the poll were recently presented to a meeting of the conference of bar presidents held under the auspices of the American Bar Association.

(With men who know the angles best, it's social security 4 to 1. Read on.—Editor.)

SOCIAL-SECURITY AND TAX-DEFERRED ANNUITY PLANS

The Federal Government's acceptance of a certain measure of responsibility for the protection of our physical and financial well-being is understandable. The degree of responsibility the Government should assume is subject to debate.

The scope of my survey is concerned with facts and figures of old-age and survivors insurance (social security), and tax-deferred annuity programs, and the sentiments expressed by some local physicians.

Under the Jenkins-Keogh type tax-deferred annuity bills, a self-employed person would be allowed to deduct from his taxable income limited amount which he could set aside in a private annuity or retirement plan—an arrangement which is already enjoyed by a great many groups such as corporations, civil-service employees, et al.

Extension of annuity programs may well be in the offing. President Eisenhower has promised a reasonable tax break on moneys set aside for retirement. It should be clear and always kept in mind that annuity plans are not substitutes for old-age and survivors insurance.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question. Why can't physicians be covered by Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI) on an individual optional basis like the clergy?

Answer. Congress has judiciously allowed clergymen optional coverage, because payment of social-security taxes might be contrary to the beliefs of some denominations. The enforced collections of such taxes from the clergy of those denominations—and from their employers, the churches—might be construed as a violation of the long-established principle of separation of church and state.

Question. You speak of survivors insurance. Is there a binding contract as in private insurance?

Answer. OASI is the strongest and safest insurance contract, for it bears the seal of the United States of America. No political administration is going to commit suicide by reneging on the promises made and benefits paid for.

Question. Is there a precedent for Government insurance?

Answer. Yes, Workmen's Compensation Insurance.

Question. But it is a step to socialism, it is against the American principle of freedom of choice, private initiative.

Answer. It all depends on how you look at it. We all look with nostalgia at the good old days. Which is less socialistic—to support the elderly by old-age assistance grants (pensions), or to induce people to make minimum provision for their old age through social-security tax payments made from their earnings? Having contributed from his own earnings to social security, the retired wage earner is not subject to the indignity of receiving eleemosynary handouts when his monthly benefits arrive—he is just getting back what he and his employer paid into OASI. Furthermore, the Government, and the taxpayer, are relieved from the great financial burden of old-age pensions.

Question. But our children will have to pay higher and higher taxes to provide the Government enough money to meet its ever-increasing obligations to pay social-security benefits.

Answer. Social security has been in force almost 20 years. The most recent annual report of social-security tax collections and disbursements shows a large surplus accumulation in the trust fund. When our children are grown and have dependents, they would be buying under social security up to $55,000 worth of insurance at a very modest rate.

Question. But I don't like the compulsion, it is autocratic.

Answer. In order to be covered, the medical profession will have to request Congress for inclusion in the program. It takes an act of Congress to extend coverage to any professional group.

In a sense, there is compulsion. Once physicians are covered by social security, we will have to pay until we die or retire. It is like taking a nonstop flight, once you are in the plane, you alight only at your destination.

Question. Suppose I get sick or disabled, do I lose my benefits?

Answer. There is a freeze clause in social security which allows periods of sickness or disability to be frozen out, so that social security insurance and retirement benefits are not lost.

Question. Can service in the Armed Forces accrue for social security benefits to physicians?

Answer. You will receive 4 quarters credit for each year served in the services after 1941.

Question. I was in the Korean war for 3 years. Am I covered?

Answer. Yes. For each year of military service after 1951, you received 2 years of social security coverage. Since you served 3 years, your family is covered for 6 years following your discharge by the survivors insurance part of social security, that is, if you die during those 6 years, they receive the monthly benefits. However, if and when the medical profession comes under social security, you will receive 12 quarters credit toward your retirement benefits for those 3 years of military service.

Question. The AMA is sponsoring an annuity tax postponement bill. What is it anyway?

Answer. 1. The Jenkins-Keogh type bills are not a substitute for social security. They are adjuncts to it.

2. They are designed to allow physicians and other self-employed persons to defer income-tax payment on that part of their income which is invested in restricted annuity programs—limited to $1,000 the first year, $2,000 the second year, and $3,000 every year thereafter.

3. Modifications of the above are H. R. 2092, and the Ray bills, H. R. 9618 and H. R. 9754. The preamble for each bill reads: "A

bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals, to promote thrift, and to stimulate expansion of employment through investment."

Question. Annuity—that's what I want.

Answer. That's what I want too, for my personal needs. But the younger man wants primarily the assurance that his widow and children will have the monthly insurance benefits of social security which may amount to as high as $200 a month if he has been paying social-security taxes of $126 a year (3 percent on earnings of $4,200 annually). Later on, he can invest in tax-deferred annuities when he can afford to.

Question. I am almost 70 years old. Will I be covered by social security?

Answer. Yes, when the medical profession is covered, provided you keep on practicing another 18 months. At age 72, whether you retire or continue working, you will receive your monthly benefits, $162.80 for you and your wife.

Question. Well, what can we do about it?

Answer. Don't blame the AMA. Your elected delegates do the best they can under the circumstances. To be a delegate is an arduous and thankless task. The United States is a representative constitutional Republic. The ship of state is steered by our representatives. We, the people can default our votes, or, an alert, interested, informed, and aroused citizenry can instruct their delegates or representatives on particular issues. See what the New Jersey State Bar Association has recently done. The following resolution was adopted at its midyear meeting December 11, 1954:

"NEW JERSEY STATE BAR ASSOCIATION,
"*Trenton, N. J.*

"*To the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:*

"Whereas the younger members of the legal profession are desirous of obtaining for themselves and their dependents survivor and insurance benefits under the provisions of the social-security program; and

"Whereas a large number of members of the legal profession suffer a declining income in later years, and under the present high income-tax rate find it difficult to provide a means of retirement income for themselves and their dependents after the age of 65: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved:*

"1. That it be declared the sense of the membership of the New Jersey State Bar Association that the benefits of the social-security program be extended to include the members of the legal profession on an optional basis.

"2. A copy of this resolution shall be sent to all of the United States Senators and Congresmen."

Result, a bill was introduced in Congress, H. R. 855, designed to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to individuals engaged in the practice of law.

The Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 83, on June 14, I voted yea on the conference report for H. R. 1 to extend the Trade Agreements Act for 3 years.

The record will indicate that I have not supported the Trade Agreements Act on previous rollcalls.

In this instance I still feel that the American producer and the American laboring man is entitled to protection and consideration. I felt that the conference committee's report strengthened the measure in certain respects over that which was passed by the House.

First. The bill in its final form gives the President greater authority to impose higher tariffs on import quotas if he finds that imports threaten national security. I have confidence in President Eisenhower that he will recognize in this clause that the national security is dependent upon the prosperity of our people.

Second. The bill passed by the House on rollcall No. 83 also strengthens the escape clause by providing that claims could be made if the industry thought it had suffered substantial damage from imports. In fact, this new provision makes it possible for the President to come to the aid of the industry without the recommendation of the Tariff Commission.

In fact, amendments 28 and 29 seem to make this necessary correction, at least in part, and this was not possible under the limited rule under which the bill was considered before the House.

Thus, I am supporting this measure with a prayer in my heart that the many industries in this country that are so much in need of protection will be recognized.

Apparent Change in Administration's Attitude Toward Yalta Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, when the Yalta papers were released in March, we heard the cries of our Republican colleagues that at last proof was available to show that President Roosevelt had sold out to the Russians at Yalta. At that time I commented that such claims were only a smokescreen to hide the inability of the Republican Party to give the American people positive domestic and foreign-policy programs. I am glad to see that the Republicans are now agreeing with me because, according to press reports last week, their chief foreign-policy maker, Mr. Dulles, apparently feels that the Yalta agreement is not as bad as they originally wanted the public to think and is going to insist that the Russians live up to it. At least we can say that the Republican Party is following its firm policy of not having any policy at all because this latest statement once again is a contradiction of earlier ones. These turnabouts of which this is only one must confuse not only the members of the Republican Party but must also cause the American public to wonder whether or not the present administration knows what it is doing.

I have been very much interested in the effects of the Yalta agreement, and as an American of Polish descent, I have been particularly interested in how it affected Poland. You will recall that the Yalta papers clearly showed that President Roosevelt insisted on free and unfettered elections in Poland and in other satellite countries. I hope that those who have urged that the Yalta agreement be repealed now change their tunes, as Secretary Dulles has, and realize that this agreement is the only means available at the present time to bring about such free elections. I am sure that they will agree with me that if the people of Poland and other satellite countries were given the opportunity as provided in the Yalta agreement, they would quickly elect their own officials and get the democratic republic they so deeply desire.

Mike Hennessy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Michael Hennessy, for so many years a truly outstanding political commentator and writer for the Boston Globe, deeply touched me and his friends.

Mike Hennessy was in a class by himself. To begin with, he was a fine human being, broad, humane, and sympathetic. He was warmhearted and friendly and his loyalty to his personal friends knew no bounds.

A meticulous, painstaking searcher for news and a political analyst of great skill, vision, and ability, Mike Hennessy was one of the great newspapermen of our times. He was a distinguished author and his book, written sometime ago on Massachusetts' politics, is a standard authority. His column in the Boston Globe on political matters in the Bay State, New England, and, indeed, in the Nation, was widely read. His friends were very many, his contacts widespread, his information accurate, and his ability to draw sound conclusions almost uncanny.

He was intense in his outside contacts and interested in many worthy causes. His activities in the fraternal life of Boston was especially noteworthy and fruitful.

His passing removes from the scene a colorful newspaper figure, whose life and work covered a span of more than three generations. His readers will sorely miss him. But more than that, his aggrieved family and friends will miss him for he was kindly and human—a sage in a journalistic tower, pontificating the truisms and sometimes harsh realities of Massachusetts politics and casting a warming beam of friendship

along the way. I extend his family my most heartfelt sympathy.

May he find in his eternal reward lasting happiness and peace.

The Story of Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ORVIN B. FJARE
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an article by Col. Wallis Huidekoper, of Big Timber, Mont. The thoughts of Colonel Huidekoper have particular significance in connection with our Flag Day celebration and were presented in a pamphlet made available on the occasion of a Flag Day reception given by the Secretary of the Army and Mrs. Robert T. Stevens at Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington, D. C. on June 14, 1955. Mr. Stevens has written the foreword.

FOREWORD

We are today, June 14, 1955, celebrating the 180th Anniversary of the United States Army and the 178th Flag Day. The Story of Our Flag by Col. Wallis Huidekoper is the inspiration for this particular Flag Day reception. Colonel Huidekoper is a pioneer of the old West. He was born in Pennsylvania in the year 1870. He first went west as a young man in the middle 80's but returned to finish school and college in Philadelphia.

Among his first neighbors in the Dakotas were Teddy Roosevelt and the Eaton brothers. Later the Eatons started their famous ranch at Wolf, Wyo. Colonel Huidekoper then moved to Montana where he successfully ran his well-known and beautiful American ranch at Two Dot which he acquired in the year 1905, just 50 years ago. He collected over a period of years fine paintings of the old West, Indian relics, guns, and he has given most of his valuable collection to the State of Montana. During World War II he sold to us the ranch that had meant so much to him for so much of his lifetime. He now lives in Big Timber, Mont., where he keeps up his interest in ranching, his home town, State and county. He is a veteran both of the Spanish American War and World War I, is active in the American Legion and continues to be greatly interested in the military today.

Colonel Huidekoper's father, Col. Henry S. Huidekoper, was a Civil War veteran. He was desperately wounded at Gettysburg on July 1, 1863, and received the United States Medal of Honor. He served for a time as an aide to President Lincoln who was devoted to him and called him "my boy". Wallis Huidekoper, like his father, is a real patriot and one of Montana's most distinguished citizens. He is a friend and neighbor of ours in the Sweetgrass County of Montana and is highly respected by all those who have the privilege of knowing him. The story of the Flag of which he is the author, we would like to share with you and any younger members of your family.

DOROTHY W. STEVENS.

THE STORY OF OUR FLAG
(By Col. Wallis Huidekoper)

June 14 of every year is set aside by our Government and State as Flag Day. You will see later just why this day was chosen.

It is right that this anniversary should take place in order to remind the American people of what Old Glory (another name for the flag) stands for, and give them an opportunity to pay tribute to this great emblem, the world's most freely flying flag of democracy. As we look upon this banner of red, white, and blue, often trimmed and embroidered with gold, let us realize what lives of happiness and golden opportunities are ours and what a haven of freedom has been granted us. In all this world there is no symbol so full of meaning, for it stands for justice, life, liberty, and equality, with free chances for all regardless of position, race, religion, or color. As it floats in the breeze every fold seems to radiate security, contentment, and comfort.

The interpretation of the actual colors of our flag are as follows: The red stands for valor, zeal, and fervency; the white for hope, purity, and decency of life; the blue, the color of the heavens, for reverence to God, and loyalty, sincerity, justice, and truth. A great and well-known clergyman by the name of Henry Ward Beecher once said of the flag, "It is not a painted rag. It is a whole national history, it is the Constitution, it is the Government. It is the free people that stand in the Government on the Constitution." All so true, for our beloved banner is truly the living soul of our Nation.

And now follows a little of the history of this treasured emblem.

The United States flag is the third oldest of all national standards in the world, older than those of Great Britain or France, and was first authorized by Congress on June 14, 1777, the date now observed as Flag Day.

Its initial flying was from Fort Stanwix, in New York State, on August 3, 1777. It was first under fire at the Battle of Oriskany, near Utica, N. Y., on August 6 following, and was also carried into battle with General Washington's troops at Brandywine, Del., on Sepetmber 11.

It received its first recognized salute on February 13, 1778, coming from a French admiral. The proposal for the first flag was an emblem of a rattlesnake with the motto "Do not tread on me," but which was discarded for the 13 bars and stars, 1 for each Colony of the original 13. The stars, an ancient symbol of India, Persia, and Egypt, symbolizes dominion and sovereignty, and thus the constellation of the stars within the union—one star for each State—is emblematic of our Federal Constitution. Gen. George Washington interpreted the meaning of the flag as follows: "We take the stars from heaven, the red from our mother country, separating it by white stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her, and the white stripes shall go down to posterity as representing liberty."

Betsy Ross, in a small brick house in Philadelphia, made the first American flag by sewing together properly cut out colored strips, done at the suggestion of General Washington. So our flag became outstanding through its silent message to the world—a message proclaiming national independence, individual liberty, idealism, and patriotism for the American people. It was not the flag of a reigning family or royal house, but the flag of millions of free people banded together into a Nation and given the spirit of liberty and the glorious ideal of human freedom.

The flag assumed another historical part during our war with England in the early part of the last century. Throughout the years of 1813–14 the strong British Navy had gained control of Chesapeake Bay in Virginia and Maryland and during the middle of September of 1814 attacked Fort McHenry, guarding the city of Baltimore. Francis Scott Key, a Baltimore lawyer and Government agent, going aboard a British warship seeking release of an American prisoner, was detained by the British during their 25-hour shelling of the fort. He was greatly worried over the outcome but relieved at daylight on the morning of September 14 when he saw that the American flag was still flying over the fort. Drawing an old envelope from his pocket, he wrote on the back of a letter the first wording of the Star-Spangled Banner:

"Oh say can you see by the dawn's early light
What so proudly we hailed at the twilight's last gleaming,
Whose broad stripes and bright stars through the perilous fight
O'er the ramparts we watched were so gallantly streaming?"

Francis Scott Key shortly returned to Baltimore where within a day or two he finished writing the 4 immortal verses of the Star-Spangled Banner. In 1931 Congress passed the necessary legislation and President Hoover speedily approved, making these lines, already set to music, our National Anthem. The original flag that flew over Fort McHenry is still in existence and hangs in the United States National Museum in Washington. In this flag were 15 stars and 15 red and white stripes.

So this is your flag to honor, treasure, and respect, the flag of all true Americans, an emblem of victory during wars and of peace and contentment in tranquil times. The flag of a God-loving and free people.

Hundreds of thousands of our young men in uniform have given their lives, fighting under its folds, to preserve the principals of freedom and justice that it stands for. It was flaunted in the face of the British by our Minute Men at Concord and Lexington and encouraged Washington's ragged and starved army at Valley Forge during the Revolutionary War; it flew from the mastheads of our ships during the naval war with England in 1812 and was carried by General Scott's Mexican War soldiers through Vera Cruz to the City of Mexico itself; it encouraged the men of the North during the Civil War and was unfurled at Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines during our war with Spain; was successfully carried on high with resultant victory through our two World Wars and now today it floats proudly over the heads of our heroic fighting men in Asia.

But wars should end and human venom among nations as now existing cease and may God grant that our flag, still flying now after a century and three-quarters, may soon become the symbol of peace over our beloved land.

"Tis the Star-Spangled Banner, oh long may it wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

The Army is very strict in regard to the courtesies to be rendered our flag and the fond care that must be taken in the handling of it. The following are a few of the don't's that are demanded. Remember that the flag represents the living country and is itself considered as a living thing.

Never show or allow to be shown any kind of disrespect to the flag.

Never dip the flag to any person or thing, or place other colors above it or to its right.

Never let the flag touch the ground or floor or trail in water.

Do not use the flag as drapery in any form or as table or chair covers (use bunting of blue, white, and red) and hang no emblem or object ever above the flag.

Keep all flags clean and untorn and neatly folded when not in use.

All old, torn, or useless flags should be quietly destroyed by burning in a quick fire.

During the ceremony of hoisting or lowering the flag or when the flag is passing in a parade, everyone should face the flag, stand at attention and salute. Men in uniform give the military salute. Others, men and boys, remove their hats with their right hand

and hold it at their left shoulder so their hand is over their heart. Women and girls simply salute by laying their right hand over their heart. Men and boys without hats will also salute by laying their right hand over their heart.

When the national anthem is played without the flag all present should stand and face toward the music, remaining at attention, men and boys removing their hats. When the flag accompanies the rendering of the anthem the regular flag salute must be given.

The Significance of Bandung

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the principle of free governments scored one of its greatest victories when they were pitted face to face with communism at the recent Asian-African conference.

At Bandung many Asian and African nations showed a strong democratic alinement. It was so outstanding that it put both communism and neutralism on the defensive through the great spiritual power of democratic principles.

Among the leaders of this great movement was Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, member of the Philippine Cabinet and chairman of the Philippine delegation to the conference. General Romulo tells his own story of this important conference in the June issue of the Town Journal.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article by General Romulo.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL ROMULO'S OWN STORY—WHAT REALLY HAPPENED AT BANDUNG—AND WHERE WE GO FROM HERE

(By Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, member of the Philippine Cabinet and chairman of the Philippine delegation to the Asian-African Conference)

Asia and Africa have come of age. They can see clearly and think profoundly about the problems of peace. That is the dominant impression I carried from Bandung.

In that Indonesian city far down on the under side of the globe, a thousand Asians and Africans met during the third week of April. They represented more than half of all mankind—some 1.4 billion people. All but 1 or 2 of their 29 nations had until recently been dominated by western colonialism or imperialism. America and Europe might well have wondered whether the deliberations would be guided by ancient resentments.

Happily, I can report that in their newly won freedom, these people of Asia and Africa have discovered that though they have strength of numbers, their true power lies in moral greatness; the consciousness that they belong to the human family. They now possess the poise and confidence that go with strength, but they extend the hand of good will to all the world in the spirit of cooperation.

We had our arguments, of course, and all of us did not agree on all issues. For example, the Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru, presented a scholarly discourse on peaceful coexistence. But from Turkey, Pakistan, Iraq, Iran, Lebanon, Ceylon, the Philippines, and others came vigorous opposition. And significantly, the word "coexistence" is conspicuous in its absence from decisions at Bandung.

Another trap was avoided on prohibition of nuclear weapons. India and Red China fought hard for it, and so determined was Red China's espousal that it delayed the conference adjournment by 3 hours. But we felt that prohibition of nuclear weapons without general disarmament would play into the hands of the Communists. And again we won our point, as the final communique shows.

Even more dramatic was the fight over communism and colonialism. It began in the opening session when Iraq's chief delegate, Dr. Jamali, opened up the heavy artillery against Soviet imperialism. It continued to within minutes of the hour of adjournment. Powerful forces with prestige and influence were arrayed to block the mention of "other forms of colonialism." They insisted that there was only one form of colonialism—Western. Nothing else counted.

We took the position that the conference must condemn all colonialism, both overt and potential. We were opposed to every form of domination, subjugation or exploitation of peoples by men or other peoples. Everyone present knew we referred to communism.

Powerful support came from Ceylon's Prime Minister, Sir John Kotelawala, who with the caliber of a world leader could set aside restricted regional loyalties for a greater cause. Turkey's Deputy Prime Minister Fatin Rustu Zorlu also was a real fighter for democracy and so we were able to show the conference—meaning the representatives of half of mankind—that we spoke for the security and interests of all. And all finally rallied to stand with us—condemning not only Western colonialism but colonialism "in its various forms."

I had aspired to great things at Bandung but, even with my high hopes, I had two eye-openers.

The first was proof to all present that the forces of democracy, not only in our Asian region, but in the whole Asian-African area, are not only strong, but militant and determined; not only possessed of power, but definitely not muscle-bound.

In the opening speeches, leaders of the democratic forces took the ball and kept it. Nobody fumbled, nobody made a mistake of judgment or timing. From the beginning we had things so well under control that we even directed the conference procedure.

A second eye-opener was the case of the Colombo powers (Burma, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, and Pakistan). They had been accepted as the indissoluble Big Five. But when the Prime Minister of Ceylon joined the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Mohammed Ali, who also proved to be a real stalwart for democracy and a great fighter against communism, this solid front cracked. The 5 became 2 and 3. And because of the colonialism issue on which the split came, the conference was tremendously impressed.

At the concluding meeting of the political committee, composed of all the Chief Delegates in the conference, the Prime Minister of the People's Republic of China, Chou Enlai, proposed that the sponsoring powers (Burma, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, and Pakistan) should call another conference in 1956. The decision was left, on the initiative of the Philippine delegation, to the sponsoring powers in consultation with the participating countries. It was rumored that Cairo would be the next meeting place, but Egypt did not offer to be the host nation nor was it mentioned as such during the proceedings.

No permanent organization was created in Bandung. A regional bloc conference, if organized permanently, would be based on races with the color line clearly drawn. This was avoided.

We delegates who upheld democracy and freedom did so because that is where our peoples at home stand in resisting communism. It is not that we were pro-American or pro-West. In fact, it puts us on the defensive in our own countries for the American press to refer to us as pro-American or pro-West.

We are anti-Communist because we know communism endangers our liberties. That our position happens to be that of the United States or of most of the countries of the West, is only because the ideals of freedom as enshrined in the Magna Carta of England, the Declaration of Independence of the United States, and the Declaration of the Rights of Man by France, are universal.

Economic or military aid from the United States was not the decisive factor in the stand taken by the countries in the democratic alinement. Such assistance has strengthened their resistance against infiltration and/or subversion of communism. But their belief in the dignity of man, and in the four freedoms, in equality, justice, and in the Almighty has not been the result of help from the United States or any Western country.

After Bandung, the United States can best assist the countries that stood up and were counted for democracy by showing more consistency and vigor in supporting the ideals and aspirations of the non-self-governing peoples. For the United States to continue to abstain on the questions of Cyprus, Tunisia, Morocco, north Africa, and British Malaya, will embarrass her friends in Asia and Africa. America can best help such friends by making her preachments coincide with her actions.

It is not for the present to assess achievements at Bandung. Only history can make that judgment.

We who participated in the conference should like history to say that men from 29 nations came together when the pulse-beat of the world was erratic and dangerously fast, and that because of what we did, the health and vitality of the human communiy showed marked improvement.

We should all like hisory to say that though we did not provide the design for a perfect world, we did define the basis for hope. We should all like history to say that we not only observed the newly won freedom of half the world's peoples, but that we pooled our moral strength to help those not yet free to achieve this noble station.

We should like history to say that our freedoms were not merely celebrated at Bandung; they were made solid and given the substance of growth.

But we cannot in truth expect history to say all this, for the work at Bandung has only begun. What happens in the months and years to come will determine whether the mood created there was momentary and misleading or whether it was strong and clean and vibrant.

We who were at Bandung share a common historical experience. We belong to the community of hurt, heartbreak, and deferred hopes.

But even in the act of observing our release, it becomes important to define how we ourselves propose to maintain those freedoms and to fulfill those hopes.

What are the commitments made at Bandung?

I believe that we committed ourselves to a higher allegiance. We recognized that our allegiance is not merely to our own nations or to each other as Asians and Africans; our first allegiance is to the human community. We committed ourselves to something more important than to the accident of geography. We committed ourselves to the cause of a world seeking both peace and freedom, for one is meaningless without the other.

If the peace of the world is going to depend on concessions or mere abstentions, it will not be real. It is not what we refrain from doing that will create vital peace. It is what we freely give, how much each of us is willing to sacrifice, and what positive values we contribute that will determine whether the vision we saw at Bandung can be given life. And let me refer to the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi, who belongs not to India alone but to the entire world: "How much we put of ourselves into a common purpose will determine whether that purpose will be fulfilled."

We also committed ourselves to patience. And patience is related to the art of persuasion. No one can say that such an art can demolish fundamental differences, but certainly no issue can be settled without it. At Bandung we saw how understanding can be reached if full allowance is made for the vagaries of human personality. We were not defeated by petty behavior nor did we allow ourselves to become paralyzed by fatigue.

From Bandung we go to the uncharted sea of the future to test the unity that was forged in the conference. Can there be unity in spite of constant friction between conflicting ideologies? We will need more than patience. We will need determination, courage, faith.

In Asia and Africa the conference showed a strong democratic alinement. It was so aggressive from the start that it put both communism and neutralism on the defensive.

When the chief delegates delivered their opening addresses all, with few exceptions, invoked the Almighty at the beginning or at the end of their speeches. This spiritual offensive compelled the representative of the largest Communist regime in the world, the People's Republic of China, to plead for tolerance—for atheism. This revealed the depth of the spiritual power of democracy.

This is a precursor of what I firmly believe will continue to grow after Bandung. From Bandung, Asia, and Africa will rise to a greater and spiritual power. This is democracy's greatest asset and it was first demonstrated in Bandung.

It is possible that in Bandung a lasting organization was not created, but history will show a lasting effect. That lasting effect is the power of the spirit which a godless ideology like communism ignores; yet I believe that this force will lead Asia and Africa from Bandung to the ultimate triumph of democracy over communism.

Postal Pay Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I like the news release of June 10 of the president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, Mr. William Doherty. He points out very graphically the vacillation in the present administration. And I heartily agree with him that the administration's fight over pennies is certainly inexcusable. Mr. Doherty's statement is as follows:

President Eisenhower's approval today of the postal salary bill ends the game of postal-pay percentages. The insistence of the administration in haggling over pennies over a period of months is inexcusable.

For almost 2 years, the executive branch has been playing musical chairs with postal wages. While administration advisers called the tune, postal workers and their families were obliged to pay the piper. It is regrettable that President Eisenhower did not step in months ago and stop the music.

Last year the Postmaster General saw fit to label postal employees "treasury robbers" before a 5-percent postal pay was vetoed. Four months later the administration was on record as recommending a 5-percent increase.

In a matter of weeks word was sent out that President Eisenhower would regard any increase in excess of 7.6 percent with "grave apprehension."

The band played on. Postal employees and their families continued to be denied a wage increase which everyone agreed was in order and fully merited.

Less than a month ago the President vetoed a second postal bill calling for 8.8 percent. Today he approved an 8.4-percent bill. For the average letter carrier, as well as the great bulk of all postal employees, the difference between the bill vetoed on May 19 and the measure signed into law today amounts on the average to 4 cents a day per employee.

Perhaps the delay in approving a pay raise for 500,000 postal workers while haggling over a few pennies will be heralded as "fiscal responsibility." It is not unlikely that most people will prefer Senator BARKLEY's observation: "The lightning flashed, the thunders roared—and killed a chigger."

The Voice of Farm Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Nation's farm women are welcoming a new voice in their behalf in the Congress, in the person of Minnesota's new Representative, COYA KNUTSON. We in Minnesota are proud of Representative KNUTSON, and the important role she is now filling on the House Agriculture Committee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an article entitled "Meet the Farm Woman's Congresswoman," from the March issue of Better Farming, along with an editorial column of that same publication in its June issue and an article written by Representative KNUTSON for that issue entitled "Protect the Family Farm Now."

I also ask consent to have appear with these articles a prize-winning letter from a farm wife, selected from hundreds written to Representative KNUTSON and published in that same current issue of Better Farming.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Better Farming for March 1955]

MEET THE FARM WOMAN'S CONGRESSWOMAN

(By Fred Bailey)

Mrs. COYA KNUTSON, new Congresswoman from Minnesota, is the first woman to serve on the important House Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Despite this sudden fame you would find her as easy to talk to as your neighbor on the next farm.

Congresswoman KNUTSON, now in her early forties, is a pleasant, friendly woman who speaks from experience when she talks about farming and the farm home. She is a daughter of a North Dakota farmer; she married a Minnesota farmer and reared a family on a 160-acre farm near Oklee, population "under 500."

A Democrat in a normally Republican district, Mrs. KNUTSON says votes of farm women were a major factor in her election victory. Her most effective campaign "weapons" were two bottles of milk and a box of rolled oats. Reference to what has been called her "butter and egg 'lectioneering" brings a smile. "I guess you might call it that," Mrs. KNUTSON says. "The sale of poultry and dairy products makes up the greater part of the income of the farmers in my district.

"Last April, Secretary Benson reduced dairy price supports and by August farmers' incomes in Clay County, Minn., had been cut by $400,000. When farm spending went down, merchants in town were hurt, too. I don't know who was helped; certainly not city people who buy dairy products."

Mrs. KNUTSON campaigned on a promise to work for full parity prices for farmers. She isn't at all certain that high supports are the complete or final answer, but she insists that something must be done to raise farm income until a better answer is found. She thinks Congress should investigate the widening spread between prices farmers receive and consumers pay. And the most important job the House Agriculture Committee has now, she believes, is to set about reversing the trend of declining farm prices and income.

"When I see farm prices going down and down while folks in Washington argue over what to do about it, I get irked," she admits. "Something is wrong, maybe here in Washington, and I intend to find out what it is and help do something about it. That is why I wanted so much to come to the Congress and especially to be a member of the House Committee on Agriculture and Forestry."

Mrs. KNUTSON confesses to being pretty much a green pea in Washington, but she is no stranger to a legislative assembly, since she served 4 years in the Minnesota Legislature. Her experience also includes teaching school and serving as an AAA field woman.

The new Congresswoman wants more time to study farm problems from the national viewpoint before introducing any bills. She is primarily interested in legislation to: (1) raise support prices, (2) increase funds for the school-lunch program, (3) revive a food-stamp plan for distribution of surpluses, (4) improve conservation and fertility of the soil, and (5) strengthen the family farm.

She believes: "We have the most efficient, productive agriculture in the world. It is capable of providing consumers with an abundance at fair prices. It should provide farmers with a good income, security, a comfortable home with modern conveniences, education for their children, and the opportunity to lead rewarding lives.

"There is a lot more to farming than just raising crops and livestock. I think farm women often are more keenly aware of greater social, educational, recreational, and spiritual needs than men. Certainly the farm women in my district cherish the intangible values that strengthen farm-family ties.

"I want as much as I can to represent all farm women in my work on the House Agriculture Committee, not just those who helped send me to Washington. I would like to meet and talk with every farm wife in America, but since I can't, I hope they will at least write me about their problems and give me their suggestions for making farm living a better living.

"I want and intend to be, to the best of my ability, the farm woman's Congresswoman."

[From Better Farming for June 1955]

FRIEND AND NEIGHBOR: HERE ARE THE KEY POINTS OF A GOOD FARM PROGRAM

I have long felt that the farm women of America have been rather forgotten persons in the deliberations about farm programs and other legislation. They are the ones who suffer first when something like the present pinch of high costs and lowered farm income comes along. That is why I believe that every farm woman, and her husband and family, too, will be interested in the article by Congresswoman COYA KNUTSON, which starts on page 8.

You will remember that in our March issue we introduced the newly elected Representative from Minnesota—the first woman ever to be a member of the House Committee on Agriculture. In the article about her we quoted her as saying she wanted to represent all the farm women of America and asked that they write her about thier problems and ideas. They eagerly responded to that invitation with a veritable flood of letters. She has built her article out of them. These letters come from the very hearts of farm women and nobody can read them without being deeply stirred.

There are several million family-type farms and ranches in this country. They represent a manner of agriculture that has always been one of the sources of America's pride and strength. Although some are well set to weather economic storms, many others are feeling the effects of shrinking income and unshrinking costs. In Iowa, a State of superb farms and able farmers, some 56 percent of the farms reporting did not have to pay State income taxes last year because their net income dropped below the taxable level. Reports, too, come to us that young farm couples, who have started out in the past few years, are having serious trouble in the struggle with high capital costs and lowered incomes.

Congress is again engaged with the problem of a farm program. It is a tough job and this magazine has a great respect for those who are working on it, but we feel there is more to the question than how high price supports should be. Its editors believe a useful farm program must give those who operate our family-type farms better protection and a fair chance to make a good living. It should also give the young farmer more of an opportunity to become securely established.

The Republican Party had one admirable farm plank in its 1936 platform. It said: "Our paramount object is to protect and foster the family type of farm, traditional to American life * * * to provide * * * reasonable benefits. These payments should be limited to the family-type farm * * *." The Republican platform of 1940 repeated this last assertion. Both parties should revive this principle.

Twenty years ago, in the depression, only 57 out of every 100 farms were owned entirely or in part by the families living on them. Today that figure has increased to 75 out of 100. We cannot afford to go backward. Ownership of the land by those who live and work on it was urged in the great speeches preceding the Homestead Act as one of the strongest supports of free government. The first and greatest step then, in a farm program, is as complete protection of the family farm as possible.

The other day I visited Congresswoman KNUTSON in her office in Washington. You would like her, for she's just as natural as the folks in your own community. She's got plenty of scrap, too, especially where farm women are concerned. You'd never have any doubt about her determination to see that they get a fair break or her real interest in better farm living. "As long as I'm in Washington," she declared, "I'm going to stand up for the family-type farm and for the woman who lives on it. And I'm not going to stand idly by and watch what could be one of the tragedies of our age—the freezing out of young farm families who are struggling to maintain a precarious hold on their farms. They are our one great hope for the future."

In the months ahead this magazine pledges itself to wage an aggressive fight for these interests. It is now scouring the country for ideas that will be of practical help to all types of farming. It will use the influence it has to get the right kind of farm legislation in Washington. We invite all of you—men and women—to join in the fight for a long-range farm program that will safeguard the family farms of America.

ROBERT H. REED.

[From Better Farming for June 1955]

FARM WOMEN TELL WHY WE MUST FIGHT TO PROTECT THE FAMILY FARM NOW

(By Representative COYA KNUTSON)

The invitation, extended through Better Farming to the farm women of America to write to me about their problems and their ideas for making farm living a better living, brought a response that has fairly overwhelmed me. Letters have come from farm homes in 45 different States.

I have read all of them. They tell a story I wish every public official and every Member of Congress could know and feel as I do now. The spirit and courage they reflect, the brave struggle to stay in farming during these difficult times, makes me prouder than ever that I have the opportunity to represent the farm women of this country. They show clearly why we must take up the fight to protect the family-type farm. Some excerpts from the letters tell all this better than I can.

"I washed today," wrote Mrs. Jerry Urbanek, of Lusk, Wyo. "With the aid of an electric washing machine and REA power I washed quickly, but my washing machine is a secondhand model, and so ancient that I catch the oil which drips from the motor in a can. I hold the wringer together with one hand while I feed in the clothes with the other. Dangerous, perhaps, but it will be a long time before I can afford another.

"My husband and I have been farming for 25 years. I do a man's work in the fields because we cannot afford hired labor. We have a capital outlay of $45,000 invested in 900 acres of land, a full set of machinery, and 44 head of cattle. Until 2 years ago we were out of debt. Last year we planted 200 acres of grain and harvested enough to get our seed back because of drought. We cut enough hay for our cattle and were more fortunate than others, who have been buying hay at $40 a ton to keep their foundation stock.

"I like farming, but my husband and I worked 4,800 hours at farm work last year, for which we cannot show 1 cent of remuneration. While we were working we were also wearing out high-priced machinery and receiving less than 2 percent on the capital we had invested. We could have taken the loss of our grain crop without going into debt if the prices of the cattle we sold had been in line with the prices we had to pay for the necessities we bought."

Mrs. John E. Allen, of Mobeetie, Tex., tells of the situation from another angle of farming.

"We have 200 acres, 75 seeded to improved pasture. We raise and put up our own silage, raise our own grain, have a 50-cow herd and raise our own replacements. We are working hard to organize and establish a producer association to protect us against the big handlers. As it is now they can test and weigh our milk any way they like. A number of dairymen have had to take what they could get for their investments and quit. On our own herd we received $2,000 less money in 1954 for more milk shipped than in 1953. But the consumer paid the same price for what he bought, and our feed, groceries, and clothing were even higher."

The same experience is told in a letter from Mrs. Floyd Waldo, Route 3, Winona, in my own State of Minnesota:

"On our farm we produced 65,717 pounds more milk last year and received $204 less. Our costs remained inflexible while our markets were unstable. But consumers have not benefited from this farm price cut."

To this Mrs. Burnis Brigham, Route 1, Genesee, Idaho, adds:

"It's bad enough to see farm returns go steadily lower but it's even worse to know that consumers never benefit. * * * Last fall the processors of our grade A milk made a big thing of a cent a quart price reduction—made possible by producers getting that much less. The reduction in our price was very hard for us to absorb but we did feel good that milk would cost townfolk less. In exactly 2 weeks, the consumer price went back up but, of course, the producer price did not. This is the type of price usury that farmers are generally as helpless as babes to cope with."

Another phase of the low-price high-cost situation is described by Mrs. Mildred Reinhardt, of Palisade, Minn.:

"One of the most unjust and disheartening circumstances facing farm women today is the exorbitant costs of establishing and maintaining a laying flock as compared with the infinitesimal net profit eked out from egg sales." What this means is told by Mrs. Waymon Wood, of Spiro, Okla.: "On most small farms, such as ours, the wife takes charge of the laying flock and expects the profits to be her part of the family's spending money. How can she make any spending money when feed costs remain high while eggs go down to from 20 to 30 cents a dozen?" And Mrs. Sara E. Demaree, of Malden, Mo., wrote: "Feed prices remain the same while eggs have gone down, down, until farmers feel compelled to sell their flocks, keeping only enough for home consumption. So went the farm woman's income, thereby robbing her of her independence in helping out the family income."

Many, as did Mrs. Reinhardt, blame the indiscriminate grading of eggs, or lack of it, and the costly and backward system of egg distribution. As Mrs. Mary E. Brinson, Route 2, Gosport, Ind., wrote: "If we had a good graded egg market, as we do for grade A milk or livestock, I feel that egg prices to farmers would be much better, at least fairer. In our locality all eggs, regardless of how good or bad, bring the same price." Many pointed out that, with the inadequate grading methods in vogue, the dealers stood to reap the profits from better-quality eggs.

How this sometimes affects the farm family's life is told by Mrs. Elmer Whitney, of Oregon, Ill.: "The thing that hurts me most is that many of our rural women are taking town jobs to provide needed requirements of the farm family. * * * In the past farm families have all taken deep interest in mother's poultry and garden because they knew the surplus sold meant a new rug, new clothes, or perhaps a family trip. After continued disappointments, because there was no surplus profit, these ventures have been abandoned. In search for a way to provide these things the wife takes a town job. The brave little family tell her 'We'll do our best to keep things going at home.' But their best falls far short without mother. It can mean a crippled family life and a weakening of family unity, which is a vital and precious part of our way of life."

Oh, so often the letters tell of such sacrifices. One Fountain Run, Ky., farm woman

told of traveling 25 miles from home each day to work in a store to help her husband hold their farm. But she added, "I had to give up my job. It was just too much." And, as Mrs. Albert H. Holtz, Route 1, Holden, Mo., wrote: "In our community we have had falling prices, drought, grasshoppers, feed shortages until in nearly every family the husband or wife has had to get an outside job. This makes it difficult to farm efficiently. My husband has worked in town for the past 3 years and I handle all the chores alone. Why do families stay on farms under such circumstances? You would be surprised at how many of our neighbors (and ourselves) have given up much better livelihoods in the city because they believe they can bring up their children better on a farm, and are willing to make the physical sacrifices necessary for this."

The situation is forcing some hard decisions upon many, as this letter from Mrs. Dorothy Biggs, Route 1, Potwin, Kans., tells: "I am a Kansas farm wife with three children, ages 10, 7, and 3. I think being a homemaker is the most challenging and interesting career any woman can have. But I am facing a crossroad, which I imagine other farm women also face.

"I have much to be thankful for—a good home, a good husband, plenty of food and the ordinary comforts. But, like many other farm women, I'd like to be able to save a little or purchase a few bonds as I go along to help with the children's higher education that will eventually come. We raise and sell livestock and do make a profit each year; but after taxes, repair and maintenance, insurance, new machinery and immediate living costs, there is nothing left to save. I work hard, sew, mend and make over garments, can raise chickens, etc., to help make ends meet. This all takes time and does not leave enough time or energy to help train the children in stronger spiritual lives, which they need now, not later. This work, however, as a farm homemaker I must do.

"The crossroad I mentioned is this: As soon as our youngest is in school, I intend to go to work outside the home. I have had considerable business experience before marriage, plus training and hours for teaching. I would much rather stay in the home doing my own work and be a true homemaker. My choice is not my own for I want our children to have an opportunity to receive a higher schooling so that some time they may not be placed in the same position. While I do not want to raise all the funds (if that were possible) I do want to help so that each one can get a start and then they can go on for themselves from there."

The pressure of these conditions means extra burdens of all members of the family, sometimes to the heartache of the parents. This letter from Mrs. Elsie H. Bechtel, Manor Farm, Adams, N. Y., is expressive of that fact: "There is certainly something wrong in Washington and it is good to know that a real farmwife is working to get to the bottom of it. The greater part of the income of farmers in this district consists of proceeds from the sale of dairy and poultry products. Everyone in this section is feeling the price squeeze on farmers now.

"Many small farmers and some larger ones around here have been auctioning off their places and are being forced into terrific losses. Others, like ourselves, have had to see their wives go to work and have been forced to put small children to work beyond their years because the income from the place will not bear paying wages to hired labor. Our 11-year-old girl is doing more work than we would like to see her do, but she does it willingly and we don't know what we would do without her. It sounds terrible, like you are dependent on a child, but my husband and I are doing all we can (we have over 50 cows in the barn) and the help she gives us is the difference between being able to go on and quitting. A man does reach a stage where he can't add any more to his burdens."

Scores of other letters tell the same story of struggle and sacrifice, of a determination not to be forced out of farming and a feeling that something is terribly wrong at present. They reveal, too, how little consideration our policymakers have given to farm women and the farm home. They "do not want sympathy," as one after another wrote, only that "after all our labor and expense there will be something left for the needs of the family." Many letters contained useful ideas and suggestions for improving the situation. Some of these will be reported in the pages of Better Farming next month.

A RANCH WOMAN'S REMEDY FOR WHAT AILS AGRICULTURE

DOUBLE J RANCH,
Okanogan, Wash., February 26, 1955.

DEAR MRS. KNUTSON: Early this morning, my husband brought in a calf. We were too late. It died, frozen. I then made up my mind that I would, in some way, have to make up the cost of that calf, for it meant a lot to us. Braving a bitter north wind to feed and water the chickens, I came back in the kitchen to drink hot coffee and sat down to see if Better Farming would cheer my heart. It did with news of your election and the possibility of making up for that calf just lost. So, while the men are out feeding the cattle and trying to solve the problem of watering them, I will write to you. Water is a touchy problem for most farmers. We had a dry fall, the lake was low, and now the ice has frozen solid and there is no water beneath. I shall not go into this detail as I realize that you cannot legislate about wind and weather.

You can, however, legislate about water, and while I am a firm believer in voluntary associations and agreements, I truly feel that the time is coming when we shall no longer be wealthy enough to be easy and casual about soil and water. I say to myself, we must not only conserve, but increase our water resources and the must is so urgent in my mind that I am no longer tolerant of the man who allows water to flow off his land in deep gullies, lets his topsoil blow away, overgrazes the grass, cuts down the timber without replenishing the forests, wastes the heritage of this country.

I am a firm believer in the family-size farm, not only because I am presently devoted to one but because in the back reaches of my mind (or is it just a romantic notion?) I believe that the type of life and economy typified by the American family farm is a bulwark to the kind of democratic society we wish to preserve. It may be that large corporate farming would fill the Nation's shopping basket, but would it fill the heart of the man who produced it and the man who consumes it? Would a large corporate farm economy assist in making our national economy vigorous, expanding, and democratic? I think the answer is "No." But this question is one which many people, legislators like yourself, must not only answer but must be firm about it. If the family-size farm is what we really wish to preserve, then all of our thinking, planning, and agricultural legislation should assist in nurturing and protecting it.

It becomes harder and harder for an individual, while youth and vigor are with him, to "buy in" to many types of farming. This is due to the price of machinery, stock, available land. Unless he falls heir to a farm or money, a young man can seldom enter the field. One of the results is that the old experts in the Department of Agriculture grew up on farms and know their problems. The young experts have no experience outside of books and summer jobs at experiment stations or nurseries. This is not good.

Another result is that, unless a farmer has good luck with weather or outside fortune, he is unable to expand his first holdings. There is nothing like an RFC for the farmer-entrepreneur so that he could extend his investment to meet competition operate on a more equitable scale. The family-size farm is in competition with large corporate and city-controlled financing. Money made in Hollywood, on Wall Street, or in industry is mighty hard competition for the lone farmer.

I also confess to a great dissatisfaction in thinking of the Halls of Congress being battered down by tobacco men, wheat men, cotton men, peanut vendors, and the like. Our agricultural economy must be looked at as a whole—production, distribution, price, freight, advertising, perishables, livestock. Unless economists and right-thinking men sit down and think about the whole future—land, water, products, and the increasing populations of our own country and the world, and our Nation's economy that needs to get out of the "fix" we seem to be in, whether it be parity price or interest rate—it doesn't seem to me that we shall get very far. I do not believe that the top-flight men of farm organizations or of farm production groups should be consulted in building the first basic agricultural policies. They all have special interests and they are there to protect them.

We do need disinterested social economists and planners to grapple with the larger issues at stake. Somewhere along the line the farmer has to grapple with these problems too. He should be able to do so without feeling that he will lose his status in the community because he does not agree with the Secretary of Agriculture or the righteousness of the sugar-beet growers. He should be able to do so without being caught in a vise which is his vote to cut his acreage or get a lower price for his product. He needs straight thinking without pressure. This last item I know is hard, for the American people, including the farmer, are getting to the point where they can't act or react unless the radio and newspapers scream and the face on the screen threatens.

I must go and feed three hungry cold tired men a large noon dinner, so I close with these suggestions:

1. The formation of a nonpolitical, non-ax-grinding Agricultural Planning Board. Such a group should look backward as well as forward to see if this country really wants to preserve the family-size farm as part of our national life and livelihood and, if they do, to consider if and how it can be best subsidized and protected, and set up penalties for those who are not interested in doing it in such a way as to conserve our resources.

2. The creation of a Government agency, such as the RFC, to protect the small-size farm from being grabbed by the mortgage holder or corporation; to permit the small farm to grow and expand to the best economical operating capacity; to subsidize the man who wants to enter into the farm business.

3. To get the Department of Agriculture and farm organizations of all types to stop talking so much and scaring people and putting on pressure; to listen for a change and encourage people to think rather than carry a banner.

I feel as if I had been standing on top of a soap box and now need to get down and put dinner on and see to the children. It was a pleasure to take off time and to write to you.

Sincerely yours,

Sally Goldmark.
Mrs. JOHN GOLDMARK.

Log of a Sailor on U. S. S. "Yale" in 1898 Throws Light on House Joint Resolution 151

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is now before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs House Joint Resolution 151 to remove the discrimination in the matter of Spanish War pensions between the veterans of the Army and the veterans of the Navy. It all boils down to the fact that some of the Navy personnel during the period of the Spanish-American War were not officially mustered in until later dates. This situation arose from the confusion of that period, a situation difficult for those of the present generation to understand.

I am indebted to Harold D. Campbell, Rose Valley Road, Maylaw, Pa., for a copy of the log that he kept while a sailor on the U. S. S. *Yale*, covering the period from May 2 to June 16, 1898, a period for which the sailors on the *Yale* were not given credit. The *Yale* was the sister cruiser of the *Harvard*, both of which were in service in combat areas during the entire period of the Spanish-American War. This I know from personal experience since it was on the *Harvard* that I embarked for Cuba for service in the siege of Santiago and it was on the *Yale* that I returned after the successful termination of the siege and the surrender of the Spanish Army.

I am extending my remarks to include excerpts from Mr. Campbell's diary:

SOME DAYS FROM THE LOG OF HAROLD D. CAMPBELL ON THE U. S. S. "YALE" WHICH HE KEPT FROM MAY 2 TO JUNE 16, 1898

Friday, May 6, 1898: Sighted land about 6 a. m. (weather close and hot). Porto Rico Island dead ahead. Stood on for the land and hoisted the English ensign. At 8 a .m. running parallel to the land. At 10 a. m. a fort and settlement (San Juan) on starboard bow. Two small schooners abeam in shore. About 5 miles off the fort at 3:55 p. m. (G. M. T.) hoisted the *City of Rome's* number flags (W. C. G. N.) at the fore monkey yard. Note: (The *City of Rome* was an Anchor Line British ship, which we resembled very much, and which we were attempting to make the Spaniards believe we were.) At 10 a. m. had rifle drill. Position Latitude 19–04 N., long. 66.30 W. Engines slow ahead. Passed Fort San Juan and had a view of harbor with 5 or 6 merchant vessels. A vessel which looked like a man of war flying Spanish flag. Signal fires burning all along the coast. At 12:30 passed another schooner headed toward San Juan. The fort signaled a storm coming.

Sunday, May 8, 1898: Early this morning sighted a sloop on starboard bow and a steamer on port bow. She came on towards us and we hoisted the English ensign and the signal "St. Thomas our destination." About 7:15 a. m. engines full speed ahead. She thinks we are after her. She is a Spanish man of war. Our bluff has worked—she edges away, although she has us between Fort San Juan and herself. We are clear and leave her astern about 8:30 a. m. Sighted the cargo steamer *Tyr* (Danish flag) and sent a boat with senior lieutenant in charge to examine her papers. Saw a steamer ahead about 11 a. m. heading to the northward and westward. When about 8 miles ahead, she turned and made off trying to make St. Thomas. We overhauled her in 1 hour and 30 minutes. Fired five shots from our starboard bow gun before she would heave to. Last shot went through rigging. She stopped and hoisted the Spanish flag. Our first prize. She was the S. S. *Rita*, of Bilboa, a fine-looking steamer. We learned from her that our first chase was loaded with arms and ammunition and other valuable cargo. Passengers on *Rita*. No one transferred to our ship. Her captain slightly injured. Sent her into Charleston, S. C., with prize crew.

Monday, May 9, 1898: This morning early made out a large steamer coming up on the starboard beam. As soon as we made her out we turned tail and went full speed ahead. She appeared to gain at first but finally dropped astern and gave up the chase. She flew the Spanish flag. Had four masts and one funnel, built on the same lines as the *Yale*. She was, no doubt, heavily armed.

Heard from them that they were hemmed in Martinique, also chased by U. S. S. *Minneapolis* by mistake in heavy rain. At 1:48 p. m. returned to *Yale*. At 2:17 p. m. Morro Castle, bearing N. 35 E. Cloudy weather. Marines sleeping by their guns all night now.

Tuesday, May 24, 1898: Heading West. All lights extinguished and perfect silence maintained throughout the ship during last night. Rainy as usual. U. S. S. *Minneapolis* sighted at dawn. At 9:15 a. m. sighted U. S. S. *St. Paul* cruising to Northward. At 9:35 a. m. made U. S. S. *Harvard* cruising to Eastward. No signs of fleet. Later went in boat with Capt. Wise to *St. Paul* and took he and Capt. Sigsbee back to U. S. S. *Harvard* which has Senior Commander on board. 1:46 p. m. stopped engines. Ship drifting to N.W. At 1:46 p. m. sighted strange vessel bearing S x E. Half speed ahead. At 1:50 p. m. signalled *St. Paul* (2884) strange vessel in sight. *St. Paul* now in company. 2:26 p. m. slow engines. Heavy rain squalls. Lost sight of stranger. 2:40 p. m. clearing. Stranger in sight again bearing S. S. W. Half speed again. *St. Paul* going full speed—when about 5 miles ahead spoke to the stranger. At 4:40 p. m. *St. Paul* abeam of us and signalled "Strange vessel a friend." Marines sleeping by the guns. Four sentrys on gun deck watch. Silence throughout the ship. No lights allowed or set.

Wednesday, May 25, 1898: *St. Paul* alongside at 1 p. m.—signalled she had got a prize and sent it to Key West. We asked "What kind of a prize?" It was an English collier trying to run into Santiago. Rough sea—overcast. Heavy rain squalls.

Thursday, May 26, 1898: 5:15 p. m. sighted the flying squadron ahead under Commodore Schley in *Brooklyn*—Collier *Merrimac* (afterward R. P. Hobson's famous ship) to be taken in tow by us. She belongs to squadron. There are *Brooklyn, Iowa, Massachusetts, Texas, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Scorpion, Marblehead*, and our U. S. S. *Yale*. Sent to *Merrimac* for her tow-rope. Also got ours across. Proceeded slowly. 10:53 p. m. our capstan carried away—and colliers hawser parted. Up all night getting out our steel hawser. Thought we'd be ready in four hours.

Friday, May 27, 1898: Midnight. Tried hawser again and they lost it aboard the *Merrimac*. 4:22 a. m. Tried again. Lashing on *Merrimac* carried away. Rough sea running. 3:13 p. m. suceeded to get under way with our tow. Had no sleep for 34 hours working alongside executive officer. *Brooklyn* signalled *Merrimac* she was very bad in her movements. This made us feel better.

Tuesday, May 10, 1898: Rounded Island of Porto Rico after noon and stood along toward San Juan. Forts at San Juan fired shots at us which fell short. Noon 18—34'–15'' N.—66–01' W.

Friday, May 13, 1898: At 7:52 a. m. exchanged colors with Am. Yacht *Anita*—bound West. 10:15 a. m. spoke with U. S. S. *St. Louis*. She said she was bound to join Admiral Simpson's fleet having received orders from the U. S. S. *Montgomery* at St. Thomas. U. S. S. *St. Louis* proceeded heading W x N. Rain signals.

Saturday, May 13, 1898: 4:30 p. m.—Commenced to heave up anchors. Heard Spanish fleet was at Martinique. Full speed ahead out of Harbor at 4:48 p. m.

Tuesday, May 17, 1898: Proceeded toward Cap Haitien the U. S. S. *Minneapolis* following. Took pilot and came to anchor off town. Went ashore and bought two pounds of vaseline for guns with the paymaster's clerk. Had to pay £2. British for it. All they had in the town.

Sunday, May 22, 1898: Speed increased to 10 knots early this morning. At 5:40 a. m. sighted the U. S. S. *St. Paul* and reduced speed to speak to her. Going along the coast of Cuba which is here very hilly and full of deep ravines. *St. Paul* keeping in company told us that the *Harvard, Minneapolis* and supposedly the rest of the flying squadron would be here today. *St. Paul* proceeded to accompany us to the westward.

6:40—Light House on Santiago bearing N. W. x W. ¾ W. Off the forts at noon about 5 miles. No sign of any of enemy's ships about harbor. But the harbor runs so far inland behind some high land that it is impossible to see into it from the ship. None of our own fleet in sight. (The entire Spanish fleet was in there).

Sunday, May 22, 1898: Changed course at nightfall off shore. *St. Paul* on port quarter 10 miles distant. She will turn at dusk and go 10 miles to the Eastward and 6 miles off shore. We will both fire rockets in case of sighting enemy ships. Very dark hazy night.

Monday, May 23, 1898: No bells struck last night, ship in utter darkness. Light rain this morning continued all day. 11 a. m. Crew drilled with Springfield rifles. At noon signalled U. S. S. *Harvard*. Sent a boat to *Harvard*. I was in crew. Took Capt. W. C. Wise aboard. Heavy swell running.

Saturday, May 28, 1898: Off Jamaica at 12:56 p. m. Gave chase to Westward along North coast but could not gain anything. At 3:45 p. m. gave up chase. 7:30 p. m. Off Port Antonio 5 miles. Went ashore in life boat. English Man of War *Indefatigable* here.

Sunday, May 29, 1898: At 1:13 a. m. this day proceeded toward Key West. 10 a. m. passed S. S. *Delta* bound N. E. Noon—Lat. 19–42N. Long. 74–48W. 12:16 p. m. sighted U. S. S. *St. Paul*. She signalled us later that enemy's fleet was blocked in Santiago. At 5:53 p. m. after rounding Cape Magsi (E. end Cuba)—sighted 2 vessels on port bow which immediately altered their courses and headed for us. Hard a port to our helm heading and turning off shore and full speed away from the strangers—one of which appeared to be a foreign cruiser with two funnels and two masts with military tops. Neither of them was in our Profile Book U. S. Ships. Back around Cape Magsi—At 6:30 p. m. reduced speed to 16 knots. Strangers not in it. At 8 o'clock started to retrace our course. At 10 p. m. all lights out—standing by our guns suddenly saw one of strangers close. Hailed—Exchanged night signals with U. S. S. *New Orleans* which had chased us. Told her Spanish fleet blocked in Santiago and that we thought she was Spanish. At midnight Barcacon Lighthouse abeam. Gentle breeze. Cloudy and hot. Smooth sea.

Monday, May 30, 1898: All lights out last night. Strict silence. Nothing out of the ordinary this morning. Fell in with Admiral Sampson's fleet (U. S. S. *New York*) etc. on way to Santiago. Capt. Wise went aboard U. S. S. *New York*. I went in our

boat to bring him back. Working cola all day and night from No. 3 hatch into coal bunkers. Had rifle drill today.

HAROLD D. CAMPBELL.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,
County of Delaware:

On this 27th day of May 1955, before me, a Notary Public within and for said County of Delaware, State of Pennsylvania, personally appeared Harold D. Campbell who, being by me duly sworn on his oath, says that the above account is correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, this 27th day of May, 1955.

ARTHUR K. WARFIELD,
Notary Public.

My commission expires April 26, 1959.

Does the Present System of Military Justice Carry Out Its Purpose of Maintaining Discipline in the Military Service and at the Same Time Give the Individual Confronted With Punitive Action a Fair and Impartial Trial?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, much is being said about the effectiveness of the presesnt system of military justice while critics are pointing out its defects.

In the following article by Col. Thomas H. King, Air Force Reserve, and past president of the Reserve Officers Association, he reveals the merits and the defects in the Code of Military Justice which should merit the attention of Members of Congress:

(By Col. Thomas H. King)

The question has been asked many times "Does the present system of military justice carry out its purpose of maintaining discipline in the military service and at the same time give the individual confronted with punitive action a fair and impartial trial?" Depending upon the people with whom you talk, you can get just about any answer you look for. Some will say yes; some will say no; some will say it can be improved upon; some will say we should go back to the old system.

In our present system, we have nonjudicial punishment by the commanding officer provided by article 15 of the Uniform Code and summary courts-martial provided by article 20 of the Uniform Code, both of which deal with minor infractions. I don't have the figures for all of the services, but in the calendar year 1953, in the Air Force, there were 34,521 summary courts-martial. Heaven knows how many actions were taken under article 15. We must have discipline, and the commanders should be given the authority to control under their command responsibility the infractions which are covered by article 15 and 20. Insofar as the benefit to the individual is concerned, it is doubtful whether many of them (and I have no figures to support this statement) are acquitted. Undoubtedly, there are some acquittals. Under the provisions of article 20, the individual does not have to submit to trial by summary court unless he has been given the opportunity to refuse the right to punishment under article 15. To me this is an absurdity and should be abolished because it only requires more paper work in units of rather small size and accomplishes no real good. The summary court in my view should be abolished. I also believe that article 15 should be expanded to include specifically the punitive authority contained in article 20; article 20 should be abolished; and, if there is an appeal as provided in present article 15 (d), the legal officer or staff judge advocate of the next superior authority should be required to review the facts and the records in the case so that any illegal procedure may be detected and appropriate correction made. As can be seen from article 24 of the Code, a summary court may be convened by units in the Army of the size of a detached company or "other detachment of the Army." What size is a detachment which has such jurisdiction? This, of course, is handled by the administrative determination of the Secretary. Why not in the first instance give the commanding officer the authority to mete out the punishment which is necessary in this situation?

My next thought is to remove from special courts-martial the authority to impose a bad-conduct discharge. Under the present law a special court may, generally, adjudge any punishment except death, dishonorable discharge, dismissal, confinement in excess of 6 months, hard labor without confinement in excess of 3 months, forfeiture of pay exceeding two-thirds pay per month, or forfeiture of pay for a period exceeding 6 months. I believe that they should be given authority to impose confinement up to 1 year and should have jurisdiction similar to that of the civilian police courts handling what in civilian practice is referred to as misdemeanors. Again taking the Air Force as the example, there were 10,299 special courts which imposed no bad-conduct discharges and 3,740 in which bad-conduct discharges were adjudged. It is unimportant insofar as this latter group is concerned to consider whether or not the bad-conduct discharges were executed. From the standpoint of civilian life, a bad-conduct discharge imposes the same disability upon the individual as does the dishonorable discharge. They were not intended to be the same but the practical effect is the same. It is my view that for offenses in the nature of misdemeanors, command should have the total and complete authority to maintain discipline. There are the cases where the commander of an organization exercising his responsibility has to be able to impose speedy punishment, but this authority should stop short of imposing bad-conduct discharges. Too often, also, under current practice the bad-conduct discharge is used as a vehicle to eliminate from the service those individuals who have not committed any criminal act but are either not suited or are undesirable personnel. In my view, if the individual who is to be tried by a special court is an undesirable person for the military service, he should be eliminated from the service by administrative process rather than going through the form of a court-martial and be given a bad-conduct discharge.

With reference to general courts-martial, we are concerned with the very serious offenses. Prosecution and defense of such offenses require substantial time not only in actual trial but in preliminary detail as well. Again referring to the Air Force, in the year 1953, there were 2,133 general courts-martial in which 1,280 dishonorable discharges were imposed, 491 bad conduct discharges imposed, and in 362 there were no punitive discharges. In these cases, it is my view that preparation and development should be taken from command responsibility. It is a burden on a command to handle the processing of these cases for many reasons. Many officers are taken away from their primary responsibilities in a combat organization. Service troops should be fully utilized to relieve combat commanders of these tedious burdens. That is the purpose of service troops and the use of them to their full utility would permit combat commanders to devote their time and attention to the functions of combat responsibilities. The general court-martial system should be established on an area basis and all cases involving offenses which fall within general court-martial jurisdiction should be referred to the area court for development and processing. Past experience in dealing with this type of case indicates that such a system would allow more expeditious handling and would result in a speedier disposition. In other words, there would be less delay in imposing punishment or granting acquittal in appropriate cases. The officers assigned as law officers in such a system should have similar authority to that of a United States district court judge. They should have the responsibility for imposing punishment rather than have the court-martial itself do it. He could have the right to grant a new trial if there has been a miscarriage of justice. Furthermore, when witnesses are needed, they could be subpenaed or brought forward on proper orders. Panels of officers to serve on courts could be selected to serve as members for a period not to exceed 30 to 60 days, with a switching of panels in each area so that no individual would be called upon to sit on the court for more than a short period of any year. This would allow the line officer who is sitting on the court to know that he is away from the problems of his command for the specific period of time and once he has served his term he can get back to his unit and carry out his proper function. It should be unnecessary for any such officer to serve more than 1 in 3 years for such a period of time. With this I believe that the effectiveness of the general court would be improved materially and that there would be no opportunity to stack any court. The right of challenge would be present; officers from various commands would sit; it would be unlikely that individuals from the local unit would serve on a court; and the question of knowledge of facts in a case would be substantially eliminated. I can hear many screams at these suggested changes but I believe that they would provide better military justice on the general court-martial level.

From the foregoing, you can see that it is my thought to place on command the full authority to maintain discipline at the level nearest to the unit in which the alleged offender is serving.

Nobody in private life ever gets tried in a criminal court for not working. He is fired by his boss and under the conditions generally commensurate with the basis for the firing. Hence, such cases should be administratively disposed of where no criminal offense, and by criminal I am thinking of the true meaning of the word criminal, has been committed. An undesirable or similar discharge should be given. I also feel that the military should get away from the thought that the only offense committed which deprives one of his citizenship is the offense of desertion in time of war. The same basis for loss of citizenship should be applied to the military as is applied to the civilian courts. If a man commits grand larceny or murder, his citizenship should be taken away from him as the result of a court-martial trial. If a man commits other offenses which necessitate his being eliminated from the service, then he should be eliminated but without the criminal stigma attached to it. So with this thought it is suggested that dishonorable discharges be imposed only in those cases where the criminal offense is committed, which should take away the individual citizenship, and bad conduct or undesirable discharges should be imposed where the offense is one in which the rights of citizenship are not withdrawn.

Now when we come to the appellate review, it is my thought that the Boards of Review established in the Office of the several Judge Advocates General should be men who are selected from the military service who have a peculiar capacity or capability for being appellate judges. They should be appointed to the Board of Review in somewhat the same manner as are professors at the service academies. They should be permanently appointed as colonels with the full understanding that that is their job for the rest of their military career. They should have independence of thought and as appellate judges they should be primarily concerned with the legal aspects of the case and before the Boards of Review there should be public defenders and appellate Government counsel. They should be men thoroughly experienced in appellate trial work. Appeals to the Boards of Review should not be at Government expense unless it feels there is foundation for it. The mere fact that an individual wants to appeal his case should not impose upon the Government the financial burden of supporting each and every appeal which is demanded. If there is no foundation for an appeal, then the time and expense of such appellate work should be shifted from the Government to the individual and if he thinks enough of his case to spend his own money or if his family thinks enough of the case to spend their money to finance his appeal, then it should be permitted insofar as appellate Government defense counsel is concerned.

With regard to the Court of Military Appeals, except in death cases and in cases involving imprisonment for more than 10 years, any appeal to the Court of Military Appeals should be by petition, as is presently provided, and at the expense of the individual who wishes to go to that court. The Court of Military Appeals should be a part of the Federal judicial system where the opportunity for petitions to the Supreme Court of the United States by way of certiorari would be specifically provided.

We are too much concerned with protecting the minute whims of too many people. It is my candid belief that the administration of military justice should be so filled with a desire to protect the substantial rights of the individuals that the people selected to preside over these courts-martial and selected to sit as members of the Board of Review would have this desire so ingrained in them that there would be but little opportunity for criticism, as we have heard it in the past, of command influence. From my experience, command influence today is evidenced in but a small number of cases, but command influence is very necessary in the maintenance of discipline in the units. The experience with special courts has been that they are rendering substantial justice. As has been stated, summary courts are an unnecessary waste of effort, because if the individual with authority to appoint a summary court has primarily the right under article 15 to impose punishment and the individual refuses to abide by that punishment, obviously the summary court officer appointed by the same person who has the right to hand out article 15 punishment is not going against the whims, if they are such, of the officer with authority to dispense the punishment or appoint that summary court as a summary court. It is a total and complete waste of effort and provides protection for no one. The individual alone has the right to appeal to the next higher authority in just about every such case. If anything, he has less right of appeal from a summary court than he does from the punishment imposed by the officer acting under article 15.

Over all of military justice, as well as other aspects of military law, there should be in the Defense Department a judge advocate general who would be a sort of super judge advocate general with authority to supervise the operations of all three departments. The individual selected for such a position should be one who is not only well versed in the law but who has made a career of the law either in or out of the military service and who has extensive experience in military law, as well as other phases of the law. By this it is not suggested that the normal operations of the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the respective services should be encroached upon, but there certainly should be coordination with responsibility, as well as authority placed in some such experienced individual at the Defense Department level. That position should be a statutory position and the individual selected on a basis somewhat similar to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He would be an individual who has not only knowledge but perspective.

It is my belief that the time consuming, expensive system of military justice which we now have could be substantially abbreviated and retain all of the safeguards which are in the present system. We cannot legislate integrity in others. The system is no better than the capability and integrity of the officials administering it. Serious offenses are not a matter for local command action. They are a problem of servicewide importance and by presenting cases to area courts operating directly under the supervision, insofar as general courts are concerned, of the several military departments, it is believed that the trials would be more expeditiously handled and more uniformly considered and determined.

A Postwar Yank at Oxford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Postwar Yank at Oxford," written by Norman Adams.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A POSTWAR YANK AT OXFORD

(By Norman Adams)

Oxford University has been the seat of our Anglo-Saxon education since before the 12th century. During these 900 years it has constantly striven to be a mixmaster of the English and foreign students' personalities, interests, and cultures. It has been, and is now, a practicable United Nations—people from almost every country are here living and studying happily together. Every single area of the world has some representation.

Of the 7,000 students enrolled in Oxford University over 1,000 of these are foreigners to the United Kingdom. And because of this, much of the lasting benefit obtained from Oxford life is through group discussions where each imparts his national problems and beliefs to the others. How very fascinating it is for me, a southern Californian, to hear stories of Istanbul, Damascus, Bagdad, Singapore, Tokyo, Buenos Aires, Hong Kong, Cairo, and Casablanca from people who actually live there. I suppose that my tales of Hollywood, procured through a few "extra" parts, sound to them interesting and glamorous, too.

One day this spring as I was leaving my late afternoon seminar class and hurriedly buttoning up my overcoat as I walked through the evening fog toward my college, I found myself thinking how very typical that class was of Oxford. The subject was of a stimulating nature, Monetary Problems of Underdeveloped Countries, the instructor, Ursula Hicks, is a well-known economist, and the 11 graduate students enrolled in the class come from 10 different countries (India, Siam, Malaya, Jamaica, Trinidad, Northern Rhodesia, Nigeria, West Indies, England, and the United States). What a marvelous opportunity for interworld understanding. This conglomeration of peoples from every walk of life, interested in an enormously varied academic curricula, and representing races, creeds, and colors from every area of the world is, to me, the greatest asset that Oxford University offers its students. True, its scholastic maintenance is high, its professors rivaled only by Cambridge and Harvard, and its buildings and grounds are more beautiful than any university's I have ever seen. But its gift of international companionship is a thing that no American institution can currently hope to equal, and is the basic fundamental plank on which the Oxford educational system rests.

Recently, five students from Moscow University visited the campus and met many Oxford students representing nations from all over the world. The Soviets told about the educational facilities and vocational opportunities existing in the U. S. S. R. Of course, they also spoke at length about their modern industrial methods and its superiority to the capitalistic countries; citing, for example, this propagandized illustration: "The Soviets are constructing the Turkman Canal which is 1,000 miles long in 7 years. It took the inefficient capitalist nations 35 years to complete the Panama Canal which is only 85 miles long." (No mention is made of the 50 year time difference, construction difficulties, and free versus forced labor technique). But, generally their presence was most productive to all concerned. The Oxford students and the Soviets compared each other's social and economic systems and discussed impressions and beliefs of the Communist versus capitalist doctrines. This interchange of information was in concert with Oxford's overall policy of freedom of thought and international dissemination of ideas.

FACULTY CONTROL AT OXFORD

The initial and most obvious difference between the Oxford and orthodox systems is in regard to the university and college relationship. In America the colleges, schools, fraternities, and clubs are all part of the university and derive their power from it. Oxford University owns only a few negligible holdings and derives its authority directly from the colleges. Also, in the United States the universities are administered by boards and their chairmen; Oxford's "board" consists of 16,000 masters of arts and holders of higher degrees who have kept up their membership in the university by the payment of the necessary dues. These men and women (being tantamount to stockholders in a corporation) elect the chancellor, receive financial accounts, and confer honorary degrees. The university and each college was originally chartered by the Crown and they are still directly responsible to it. No town or county government has any authority over Oxford, only the Crown and Parliament can produce pertinent powers.

The 28 colleges for the 5,900 men, and the 5 women's colleges which contain over 1,100 female students each have their own tutors, e. g. instructors. The ratio of tutors to students is more than 1 to 10, which is considerably greater a ratio than found in American institutions. This tutorial system is the basis of Oxford's intellectual stimulation. Students are not required to attend any definite lectures, read any certain books, or do any specific nightly homework. The tutor

usually suggests activities in concert with the student's academic interest, but the centuries-old belief is "when a student is at Oxford he is mature enough to think for himself." Once or twice a week he presents an essay to his tutor on his assigned topic and the two discuss its merits and failings and then wander to allied fields for usually an hour or so.

There are multitudinous clubs and organizations which the undergraduate may join that may be either compatible with his academic curriculum or a means of broadening his interests. Many of my Rhodes Scholar friends were members of the Communist groups (along with the Conservative and Labor clubs as well) but very quickly resigned from them in January when Senator McCARTHY's group began their investigations of the Rhodes Scholarship programs. Members of parliaments, foreign ambassadors, traveling dignitaries, industrial tycoons, and academic immortals make visits constantly to Oxford to speak to the many numerous clubs whose notices of meetings fill even the largest bulletin boards. An average evening will present 7 club activities and 2 college plays, plus the 5 cinema houses and 2 professional playhouses. Every day there are college athletic functions and once or twice a week university sports are included in the students' agenda.

SPORTS AT OXFORD

Crew, rugby, soccer, and cricket are the most popular intercollege sports and "blues," e. g. American letters, are awarded to those who compete in them for the university. But, since most of we Americans at Oxford are here but for 1 or 2 years we have difficulty in making the university squads since the participants on those teams are often selected on a seniority basis of a 3 or 4 year attendance. Many Americans are on the college teams and are generally equal to any other national in athletic prowess even in the British games of rugby and soccer. The men from American universities such as California and Harvard, which have crew teams, are always on the first boats; and our bulldozing tactics in rugby, a la Doc Blanchard, are revolutionizing the game along with our 30-yard passes and fake reverses. The United States athletes excel, way out of proportion to their number, in the track and field games but are very surprised at the quality of Oxford's team. Many of the English Olympic athletes are here and their position is a very strong dual-meet competitor (somewhat similar to Southern California in the United States). Each college has its own playing field, which is larger than most American junior college areas, where simultaneously, 2 or 3 games of rugby, cricket, ground hockey, lawn tennis or soccer are in progress. But besides these fine fields, the sporting facilities are poor. There aren't enough tennis courts; there is just 1 swimming pool, and that is miles away; the sole badminton court is one-half hour distant; the squash courts are very inadequate; and the gold links are rather primitive.

The undergraduate gets most of his exercise running up and down stairs (usually to his friend's room for tea), hurrying from lecture to lecture at different colleges, and punting, e. g. boating, on the numerous rivers bisecting Oxford. Although the vacations are supposed to be utilized completely with studying, most students use some of their time for cycling in England or "tramping" in Europe. At Oxford there are 3 terms which last for 8 weeks each, divided by 6-week vacations. Students never consider employment either during vacations or terms. This accounts for over 75 percent of all the students being recipients of some type of financial assistance from government or private grants. I remember that when I attended my university in the United States I worked almost every afternoon and always during vacations as did all my friends; and, of course, very few students received financial scholarships.

THE CURRICULUM

Oxford considers the college years as a definite step in one's life while the American system considers it as a preparation for the next step. There are no business administration courses here, or anything resembling them. This institution is not based on practicable knowledge but on stimulating one's mind. They prefer one to mediate, philosophize, and think logically rather than to memorize lots of historical dates and theories. here is no course of instruction including salesmanship, advertising, marketing, problems of distribution, investments, and accounting which is so prevalent in our curricula. I personally think that more stress should be placed on practical worldly affairs and less on the Classics; many English students agree. The university, until recently, admitted only students of pecuniary distinction who generally followed in their father's businesses. But today all economic classes are represented. Many who have no contacts in the business world, and are not permitted to gain them by extracurricular employment, desire to learn less philosophy and Latin and more business management which will be of material benefit later. This feeling seems to be evolving into a university policy as more and more business courses are added, e. g., statistics, and successful industrial leaders are brought to speak or give advice on vocationl quandries of the students.

One of the rare delights enjoyed on a clear sunny day (these days are even more rare than the delight) is to wander through the 33 colleges and view their magnificent gardens, green velvet lawns, and the buildings standing proud and dignified. Troops of scholars walking through Christ Church College meadows discussing Plato or Aristotle's philosophies are surrounded by an ocean of dark green grass and tall, thick-branched trees now and then being blown by a caressing breeze coming from the bordering river. Men and women students are always found at Magdalen College. This college is the most spacious of all and provides a rendezvous for the Oxfordians who come to Magdalen's deer park carrying their weekly ration of sweets and cookies to feed the 80 head of deer. The college also has a cattle pasture surrounded by a circular walk sheltered by beautiful trees and lined with flowers. In the college grounds there are two rivers and a canal which provide a home for the many ducks and geese, which together with the flocks of birds and squirrels plus the deer and cattle produce a real zoological spectacle of noise and activity.

THE ARCHITECTURE

Each college has some outstanding feature whether it be its buildings, quadrangles, chapel, dining hall, grounds, traditions and history, academic standard, or athletic facilities. For the architecturally observant, he will enjoy finding traces of a 13th century hospital at Magdalen and a mid-14th-century quadrangle at Merton. New College's chapel and tower are authentic work from the last quarter of the 14th century. Fifteenth century buildings are quite common; the best being Lincoln's gateway, All Souls' front quadrangle, and St. John's gateway and chapel. The first quadrangles of Brasenose and Corpus are early 16th century as are the libraries at Balliol and Pembroke. The rest of the college buildings are of Early (English) and late (Italian) Renaissance. The city churches date considerably before the 12th century, and the City Castle was begun in 1071.

The Oxford students certainly see history in their buildings and traditions. While at Pembroke you are shown where Samuel Johnson lived; John Wesley, John Peel, and William Gladstone were at Christ Church; Adam Smith and William Pitt are from Trinity; the Prince of Wales and Oscar Wilde studied at Magdalen; Percy Shelley wrote his first poems at University College; Christopher Wren worked in another; John Locke philosophized in yet another.

RECREATIONAL LIFE OF STUDENTS

Last year, the Conference of Foreign Ministers was in session in London; a 29 year old Indian from Christ Church attended it as the leader of 2.5 million Indians living in his province. A wealthy friend of mine from Damascus wrote his father that he was not getting enough meat in his diet at Magdalen. His father now sends him roast chickens and lambs air mail in a heated container so that they arrive warm and ready to eat. Just last month I attended an evening tea party given by a 23-year-old Canadian, living on an annual $40,000 trust fund allowance. During the party I was perusing an English magazine which had many beautiful pictures of Princess Margaret. I remarked quite dreamily that I wished I could meet her. A casual acquaintance asked if I was serious and if so he would be pleased to introduce me. Thanking him quite sarcastically I immediately left this group to inquire of my friends just who this "joker" was. I was certainly taken aback to learn that his father is the Queen mother's brother and that both Her Royal Highness Princess Margaret and Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II are his cousins. These examples are typical of numerous Oxford students who are representatives of royal houses, or sons of Government executives and monetary magnates.

Most of the evening parties and dances don't allow the students time to return to their colleges by 12 midnight—the hour of the locked gates. So what ensues in a carnival of mirth. As all the colleges are surrounded by walls one can imagine the amazing and amusing antics of the students as they climb slowly and precariously up lamp posts, tall trees, and wobbly fences to enable themselves to hurdle the obstacle. The many students living in college apartments can be seen climbing up sheets and ropes held by their "partners in crime" from the second or third floor.

There are certain functions which Oxford students are not allowed to attend and are fined severely if caught there by the university proctors. Among these is the Carfax Dance Hall which serves as the rendezvous for hundreds of our American servicemen and questionable English girls (to give them the benefit of any moral doubt). The truth of the matter is that the influx of thousands of United States Air Corps personnel, with their stereotyped bulging wallets, have created a most unsavory problem all over England. This town, like many others, has been invaded by the American troops and has also had a proportional influx of prostitutes and opportunists who exploit the American's capital and apparent ignorance. Since it is generally considered somewhat lowering for nice girls to be seen with our servicemen (due to the drunken antics of a few) only the more loose women tend to associate with them. This drives the normal American into hibernation at his base and finds mostly the drunks and sexual perverts going into the town of Oxford for an evening of entertainment. They give a devastatingly horrible impression. The current local quip is, "The Yanks are overpaid, oversexed and over here."

Many of us Americans, in cooperation with the English Speaking Union, have successfully attempted to bring college girls to the dances at the Air Corps bases. The women, at first very skeptical, are now enthusiastic about these parties which have brought the hibernators running from their tents with shined shoes and pressed uniforms. We have also arranged to have bus loads brought to different colleges on Sundays where an Englishman sponsors each American, shows him the sights of Oxford, and invites him to din-

ner at his college. These plans are very satisfactory in ameliorating Anglo-American understanding, as well as to acquaint the serviceman with the beauty and traditions of Oxford and provide him with a day of interest and enjoyment.

Probably the most welcome change from pledging duties in an American fraternity is that here each man has a suite of rooms and a personal scout, e. g., servant. Each morning at 8 o'clock he enters my bedroom, opens the curtains, closes the window, turns on the electric heater, picks up my shoes and dirty dishes, and quietly closes the door behind him. At 8:30 he brings in my mail and produces my newly cleaned shoes. The room is now nice and warm so I get up and prepare myself for the 9 o'clock breakfast in our dining hall, which reminds me of an M. G. M. Robin Hood or Ivanhoe stage set. Upon returning to my room I find it completely cleaned with even the bed made and the washed dishes are again in their place in my cabinet.

SPECIAL EVENTS IN SCHOOL YEAR

There are so many marvelous memories I shall retain of this educational experience. Paramount among these are the crew team's eight week, when the annual Oxford against Cambridge titanic is held, celebrated with colorful demonstrations, an abundance of university spirit(sophisticated and somewhat latent, but very genuine), and many revered traditions which began at the first dual meet in 1815. Nor will I ever forget the May morning songfest, when over 150 singers praise the beauty of approaching summer from atop Magdalen's Tower overlooking thousands of people cramming the streets and filling the nearby rivers with punts as far as the eye can see. Also, Guy Fawkes' Night, similar to our Fourth of July, produced an Englishman very different from his usual quiet, reserved, and methodical mannerism. On this night he resembled any student from Oregon, Indiana, or Virginia. Everyone was yelling, throwing firecrackers, water bags, and confetti, and breaking lamp lights and overturning (so easily) those little British autos. And in the midst of all this ran the university proctor attempting to catch the noisemakers and impose a fine of about 50 cents, which added to the merriment all the more.

The charming chapel services held each evening in every college; the unbelievable facilities of the Bodleian Library, containing a copy of every book ever printed in the English language; the intellectual effect of the caps and gowns worn by all of us to our lectures and tutorials; the sterling quality of the Americans enrolled here, especially the Fulbright and Rhodes scholarship recipients; and the pride of all the university employees in this academic institution which is the model, as it was the cradle, for all intellectual elevation—these, and many more memories I shall always cherish.

ANGLO-AMERICAN RELATIONS

The Americans at Oxford live harmoniously and happily with our English hosts. I personally make a constant point of speaking most every week to a Youth Club on "Understanding America." Everyone is eager to know more about us, but we are much more difficult to understand than would at first appear. These Oxford students, people from all parts of the world, generally believe that Americans talk too much, are too forward, put too much emphasis on the materialistic, and find fault too readily with other countrys' social systems ignoring our own Negro and "Okie" problems. This is not to say that we are not liked, since we are. But our personalities are so much more effervescent that students from other areas that we are difficult to understand. For this reason, most of the Americans are genuinely attempting to be junior diplomats and to sell our way of life to others, tactfully and objectively, so that these students can better understand us personally and can therefore better deduce our foreign policy statements and international aims.

I'm very certain that the future years shall find Oxford University growing to even greater heights on its solid 800-year-old foundation. There are certain points in which I believe the American system of education excels, especially in its practical academic programs and superior social coeducational intermingling. But no American institution can approach Oxford University's greatest asset—the interchange of ideas and cultures between nationals from every single area of the world.

Oxford University is certainly the world's educational aristocrat.

A Little Drip of the Gravy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include an editorial in the June issue of the Textile Challenger, the official newspaper of the United Textile Workers of America, an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor, as follows:

NO GRAVY FOR WORKINGMAN'S BREAD

As President Eisenhower signed the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1955 and thus drew the curtain on the struggle of congressional liberals to lift some of the unfair tax burden from the shoulders of the working man, Representative BARRATT O'HARA, Democrat, of Illinois, rose on the floor of the House and voiced the feelings of millions of Americans.

"I cannot understand the philosophy of those who always slip the gravy to those who have the most and cry out in agony when someone wants to let a little drip on the bread of those who have the least," O'HARA said.

The Illinois Congressman was speaking directly to the big business-dominated Eisenhower administration and its errand boys in the Senate and House. They had fought, tooth and claw, against cutting $20 from every taxpayer's levies, plus $10 or $20 for each of his dependents. That would have helped wage earners most of all.

And they resisted with equal heat a move to eliminate a 1954 provision which enables the 8 percent of American families who are stockholders to escape paying taxes on all of their income like everybody else does; or to repeal other provisions which benefit only rich people and corporations.

The administration and its club car cronies screamed that stockholders and corporations need help. But just 2 days after the Senate voted to keep the screws tight on the little man, the Wall Street Journal reported that 726 companies in 33 industries made 3.4 percent more profits in 1954 than they did in 1953.

PETTY POLITICS VERSUS PROGRESSIVE MODERATION

The President said that the move to give every taxpayer a $20 tax cut was irresponsible.

But less than a year ago, his administration's successful effort to give relief to dividend-coupon clippers and corporations cost the Government more than what pro-labor Senators and Representatives proposed to do this year for people with small incomes.

The administration didn't say anything about politics in 1954. That is what big businessmen call statesmanship.

In short, when something is done for the little fellow that's petty politics. But when the congressional companions of Wall Street reduce the tax load on the wealthy, that's what the team in Washington calls progressive moderaiton or dynamic conservatism—or something.

America's Cultural Offensive Throughout the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a brief statement regarding America's welcome cultural counter-offensive throughout the world.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I have been pleased to comment previously on the Senate floor with regard to the need for a vigorous American cultural counter-offensive throughout the world—for getting across to foreign peoples the true story of American music, art, theater, literature, the ballet, and all the other aspects of American culture.

Our purpose is, of course, to demonstrate the absolute falsity of vicious Soviet propaganda to the effect that ours is a so-called barbarian materialist culture, allegedly interested only in the dollar sign.

Fortunately, we are making excellent progress in disproving Soviet lies and in making up for lost time by accentuating the positive as well.

All over the world, there are radiating American musicians, theatrical troupes and others, showing foreign peoples at first hand the real significance of American cultural pursuits.

Certainly, we can see clearly that there is a magnificent opportunity available to us when word comes in, as it has, from Tokyo, for example, that thousands of enthusiastic schoolchildren stood in line all night to buy student tickets to hear the American symphony of the air. Everywhere this orchestra is scheduled in the Far East, tickets are sold out far in advance.

I am particularly pleased that right now the House of Representatives and, in particular, its Appropriations Committee, has the opportunity to provide on a regular basis funds for this and similar cultural purposes.

I say that it should not be necessary to draw from the President's emergency funds either to send troupes overseas or to assure United States participation in trade fairs. These should be part and parcel of the regular program of the United States Government.

INCREASING INTERESTS IN CULTURAL EFFORTS

From all sides, I note, that evidences are pouring in of the increasing momentum of interest in this issue.

Not long ago, I arranged for a luncheon at which representatives of the American National Theater and Academy told many

interested Senators and Representatives the story of ANTA's work in this country and abroad. In particular a 40-theater circuit plan was discussed to vitalize the living theater at the grassroots of our own country.

Recently, Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff made a historic speech for a broad United States political, psychological, and cultural offensive throughout the world.

On the congressional front, Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey, has been tireless in his efforts toward this same objective and has introduced several highly significant bills along this line—particularly with reference to developing the city of Washington, D. C., as a great cultural center.

THREE EVIDENCES OF THIS WORK

I should like to cite now several additional evidences which prove, by the very diversity of their sources that, at long last, we of the United States are awaking to our responsibilities, to our needs, and to our challenges.

The first is a very splendid page which was carried throughout our country in the Hearst newspapers' March of Events Section last Sunday, describing the work of the American National Theater and Academy abroad. I want to congratulate the Hearst newspapers for their splendid contribution, as evidenced by these and many other articles and editorials.

The second consists of writeups in last Sunday's June 12 Milwaukee Journal, by Mr. Robert W. Wells, of the Journal's New York Bureau, and Mr. Laurence C. Eklund, of its Washington Bureau on this same cultural theme.

HONOR TO FATHER HARTKE

Thirdly, I point out that, of course, this cultural counteroffensive could never have gotten under way if it had not been for certain outstanding Americans who have with vision, and with industry, given of their able energies to this cause. One such individual who, I am pleased to say, is an ONTA director and attended the ANTA luncheon which I held, was honored yesterday here in our own city of Washington. Father Gilbert V. Hartke had only recently come back from abroad where his troupe had entertained American servicemen. Before his departure, no less a person than the President of the United States personally bade his troupe and him farewell, indicating the deep interest of our President both in the cultural entertainment of Americans and of foreign peoples.

I am delighted that Father Hartke, a great man of the theater, an honored servant of the cloth, a fine human being, was so honored, and so I include the brief text of tribute to him as carried in the testimonial program, and a list of the devoted committee members who prepared the luncheon. Mr. Ralph E. Becker was general chairman of the event, and Mr. Patrick Hayes was master of ceremonies.

[From the Hearst newspaper's March of Events section]

ARTS SELL THE UNITED STATES WAY—EXPORT OF AMERICAN CULTURE WINS FRIENDS AROUND GLOBE

We're giving the world a good look at American cultural achievement, to show we're not the mere materialists our enemies paint us.

And our export of United States culture is returning big dividends in good will and appreciation of the American way of life throughout the free world.

Some samples, like Porgy and Bess and Oklahoma, are uniquely American—as native as corn-on-the-cob. And on a more international level, our drama, ballet, music, and visual art match or surpass anything yet produced by Russian competition.

It's part of the United States counteroffensive against Soviet cultural propaganda. And the rave reviews and enthusiastic audience response is awakening Washington to the fact that exporting culture pays off.

Before summer's end, more Americans will have sung, danced, acted, and otherwise performed abroad than ever before in time of peace.

They're being financed in part by funds appropriated by Congress last August. Credit is due the American National Theater and Academy (ANTA) which is spearheading the State Department's United States drive.

BIG ARTISTIC SMASH

Currently the big United States artistic smash in Europe is Salute to France, a privately financed ANTA project which is offering Parisians the New York City Ballet plus top stage productions of Oklahoma, Medea, and the Skin of Our Teeth.

In addition, the program for France includes the touring Philadelphia Orchestra, which has already scored a signal triumph, and a visual arts exhibition organized by the Museum of Modern Art.

ANTA's international exchange program calls for sending the New York Philharmonic Orchestra to Europe, the Ballet Theatre to Latin America and Martha Graham's dancers to the Orient.

Now touring the Far East for ANTA is the American Symphony of the Air, the orchestra created by the now retired Arturo Toscanini. It was a sensation in Japan.

United States performers have made a good impression abroad, have outshone closely-guarded Russians by mixing socially.

Success of United States artists as goodwill ambassadors has pointed up the recommendation of William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor-in-chief of the Hearst newspapers, who last February 28, on his return from Russia, urged establishment of a National Planning Board to win the battle of competitive coexistence.

WHAT WE MUST DO

Noting the stress the Russians were giving to cultural propaganda outside the Iron Curtain, Hearst told the National Press Club in Washington:

"The lively arts are another field wherein the commissars are operating with the professed intention of proving * * * that Russian achievements surpass the West.

"Ballet, theater, literature—all are shaped toward aiding communism's long-range scheme of world domination * * *. It is not enough for us to advocate and appropriate large sums for foreign military and economic aid and think we have met the challenge."

More recently Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, of the Radio Corporation of America, called for a competitive coexistence strategy board along similar lines.

United States funds now available for sending performing artists abroad are a mere $2,500,000. Startling contrast with Soviet expenditures is shown in figures of the Institute of International Education. In 1950 the Russians spent $150 million for cultural propaganda in France alone, with 2,000 artists touring there. Current Soviet spending is at the rate of $1½ billion a year for all propaganda activities.

United States performers may prove our best envoys in winning friends and influencing people. But this will require much more money than we've put up so far.

As one Cairo newspaper commented on Porgy and Bess:

"If this is propaganda, let's have more of it."

HOW ANTA GOT THE BALL ROLLING

Uncle Sam's homegrown artists are carrying Broadway lights around the world on a scale wider than ever before.

Until Congress stepped in with funds to help finance American groups, export of United States art was carried out on a meager scale, financed by the American National Theater and Academy out of its own pocket.

The current "Salute to France" now going over big in Paris is being backed by funds raised by an ANTA committee under Robert W. Dowling and Mrs. H. Alwyn Innes-Brown, president of the Greater New York chapter.

No Government funds were available at the time the project was launched at the suggestion of the French Ministry of Fine Arts last fall.

CHARTERED IN 1935

Salute, although independently financed, is now an integral part of ANTA's International Exchange under impresario Robert C. Schnitzer, aided by United States Ambassador C. Douglas Dillon. Most of the groups appearing in Paris will now be sent on to other European capitals, financed, if need be, by Washington.

A private nonprofit organization, ANTA has been operating under congressional charter since 1935 for the purpose of widening interest in the theater. After a number of lean years, it now has a membership of 2,000 individuals and theaters in the United States, Hawaii, and the Canal Zone.

For the past 5 years, ANTA has expedited the exchange of performing arts between America and foreign countries. During that time it has sponsored United States participation in the Berlin Festivals of 1951–53, the Paris Festival of 1952, the Denmark-Hamlet Festival of 1949, and the Ballet Theatre's 1950 European tour.

THE SPORTING THING TO DO

Some of the best salesmen for the United States way of life have been American athletes sent abroad by the Amateur Athletic Union in cooperation with the State Department.

Among them are two great Negro track stars, Mal Whitfield and Harrison Dillard, both two-time Olympic champions, who got tumultuous receptions in tours of Africa and South America.

Olympic diving champion Maj. Sammy Lee, an Army doctor of Korean parentage, was similarly hailed when he performed in the land of his ancestors.

Still another good-will athlete is the Reverend Robert Richards, the preacher who won the Olympic polevault title in 1952.

The athletes won friendship for the United States by being free and easy mixers, lecturing, and coaching native youngsters wherever they went.

WHEN MUSIC BROKE THE ICE

A sample of how exporting our culture can assist in cementing relations with our allies was vividly demonstrated in Iceland early this year.

Since the establishment of United States bases on this key outpost of Atlantic defense, Russia and the local Communists have conducted a continuous propaganda offensive, stirring hatred of American troops stationed there.

The Soviets strengthened their campaign with a parade of artists and intellectuals who toured the island to acquaint the population with Russian culture.

United States-Iceland relations were at their lowest when ANTA sent famed violinist Isaac Stern and pianist Ervin Laszlo on concert tours, highlighting the works of American composers.

Iceland's hearts were thawed, relations have been less frigid since.

United States Minister to Iceland John J. Muccio announced the impact of the recitals upon the Icelandic people was "the greatest of any to date."

[From the Milwaukee Journal of June 12, 1955]

UNITED STATES CULTURAL COMMANDOS ABROAD

An American cultural counteroffensive—quietly and somewhat timidly launched by the United States State Department in cooperation with private groups—is gathering worldwide momentum.

For too long, many observers feel, the Russians have paraded their ballet troupes, theatrical companies, musicians, and athletes over the face of the world, virtually unchallenged in their claims of superiority to the culture of the "decadent capitalist world."

Recently the Red Chinese have elbowed into the act, with the successful Paris run of a Peiping theatrical troupe which had never before performed outside China.

The Communists are working hard to perpetuate the myth—widespread among many otherwise sophisticated Europeans and Asians—that the United States is a nation of gadgetmakers, clever in turning out bathtubs and ovedecorated automobiles, but barbarians in their indifference to the finer products of the mind and spirit.

Now at last the United States is striking back with what amounts to exploratory raids by a few cultural commandoes. The money so far assigned to these operations is petty cash by comparison with outlays for military and economic programs abroad, but it has produced results little short of amazing.

In order to conduct the program through private channels insofar as possible the State Department has been working with the American National Theater and Academy, a nonprofit organization, headquartered in New York. The ANTA acts as agent, selecting the best talent to send abroad, and arranging the overseas bookings through its international exchange program.

To get the facts about the new American cultural export program, Milwaukee Journel Bureau men in Washington and New York talked to State Department officials and personnel of the American National Theater and Academy. Their stories appear below.

(By Laurence C. Eklund, Journal Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—There is a growing feeling here that in the prosecution of the cold war not enough emphasis is being placed upon some of the ideological aspects of the world struggle. The complaint is that the finest products of American civilization, of the artistic variety, are too little known beyond our shores.

Something is now being done about this deficiency with the help of President Eisenhower's emergency fund for international affairs, a $5 million purse appropriated by Congress last August "to meet unusual circumstances arising in international affairs."

PORGY AND BESS TOURED MEDITERRANEAN

The President asked that the fund be used as "seed money" for two purposes: To encourage American industry's participation in international trade fairs and, second, to support an expanded program of performances overseas by outstanding American musical, acting, dancing, and performing groups and sports figures. This year the money has been equally divided between these two phases.

The most spectacular success of the program so far, in the eyes of the State Oepartment people in charge, has been the 9-week tour of Yugoslavian and Mediterranean cities of the Porgy & Bess Co.

Communist propaganda long has fostered the notion that American Negroes live under the conditions described in "Uncle Tom's Cabin." But the talented, well-educated, and prosperous Negro actors in the Gershwin opera refuted that propaganda. They did much to overcome the impression that Negroes in America are a persecuted race.

PRAISED BY NASSER

Porgy & Bess was in Europe anyway last winter, but the State Department and the American National Theater and Academy made it possible to extend the show's tour to such cities as Zagreb, Belgrade, Alexandria, Cairo, Athens, Tel Aviv, Barcelona, and Naples. The company had 14 curtain calls the opening night in Zagreb and a half-hour ovation on closing night.

In Cairo on their last day, the Porgy and Bess performers were summoned to President Nasser's office to receive his personal expression of appreciation. Even a Communist paper in Italy called the show one of the masterpieces of the lyric stage. The American show will close its European travels in Antwerp June 30, having played 24 stands on the continent and in Africa.

Next the State Department and ANTA are sending Porgy and Bess on a four month South American tour to open in Rio de Janerio, Brazil, on July 4.

Perhaps an even more surprising smash hit has been scored abroad by the American Symphony of the Air, which the State Department-ANTA program is currently sponsoring on a Far Eastern tour: Japan, Korea, Okinawa, Formosa, Manila, Hong Kong, Singapore, Bangkok, Colombo and Honolulu. The 94 piece orchestra is being transported in a single military plane, a huge C–124 Globemaster.

SYMPHONY OF THE AIR CAPTIVATED JAPAN

The reception in Japan, where no major western symphony orchestra had ever played before, was beyond the sponsors' wildest dreams. Every performance was sold out weeks before the orchestra arrived. Concerts were played in every major Japanese city. Scalpers were getting $25 for $5 tickets for opening night.

Thousands of Tokyo school children stood in line all night to buy student tickets. Orchestra members got writers cramp signing autographs for 1 to 3 hours after each performance. Restaurants refused to accept money for the meals served to the musicians.

The Symphony of the Air is the former NBC orchestra which was under the baton of Arturo Toscanini. It is being conducted on the tour by Thor Johnson of the Cincinnati symphony and Walter Hendl of the Dallas symphony. Johnson is a native of Wisconsin Rapids, Wis., and each summer directs the Peninsula music festival at Fish Creek in Door County.

STRESS UNITED STATES MUSIC

The symphony has been playing much American music on its tour, particularly Gershwin's, and its beauty has amazed Asiatics who had been told by the Communists that American culture consisted of comic books and gangster movies.

The first group of performers sponsored under the President's fund was Jose Limon's troupe, a top American modern dance company, which toured South America last November and December.

FROM ELEANOR STEBER TO SAUTER-FINEGAN

The Jubilee Singers, a famed Negro choral group, toured Near and Far Eastern cities under the cultural program, and United States track and field stars toured Latin America following participation in the pan-American games in Mexico. A soccer team picked by the American Amateur Athletic Union spent a week in Iceland, where soccer is a national sport.

Among other endeavors that the State Department-ANTA team plans to sponsor are six concerts by Eleanor Steber, the opera star, in Yugoslavia. Officials also are considering—on a somewhat different cultural plane—backing a Latin American tour by the Sauter-Finegan orchestra.

(By Robert W. Wells, Journal New York bureau)

NEW YORK, N. Y.—If the French aren't forced to agree this summer that the United States produces something besides H-bombs, politicians, and Coca-Cola, it won't be the fault of the American National Theater and Academy.

That institution, with the support of most segments of the local theatrical world and the assistance of some private pocketbooks besides, is sponsoring the current American Salute to France. This endeavor is supplementary to ANTA's efforts on behalf of the Government-subsidized program of sponsoring United States musicians and other artists on tours abroad.

WISCONSIN WORKS SHOWN IN PARIS

Joining with ANTA in the current attempt at carrying culture to the Parisians is the Museum of Modern Art, which recently sent over 500 art objects that ranged from paintings to cake pans. Among these examples of American life that were presented to the French, were pictures and models of some of Frank Lloyd Wright's works, including the Johnson Wax Co. tower at Racine, as well as a wire abstraction by former Milwaukeean Richard Lippold called Variation No. 7: Full Moon.

French critics did not greet the museum's offerings with universal acclaim by any means, but ANTA is hoping for better luck with its share of the venture. The first of its offerings was a series of three concerts by the Philadelphia Orchestra under Eugene Ormandy. Currently showing are eight performances by the New York City Ballet, with Maria Tallchief—an Indian maiden and therefore about as American as you can get—and Andre Eglevsky.

Next Tuesday through Saturday, Judith Anderson will star at the theater Sarah Bernhardt in Robinson Jeffers' Medea, a poetic recreation of the Greek classic that is considered one of the high points of American theatrical history. And 10 days after Medea closes, the Sarah Bernhardt will be the scene of Thornton Wilder's The Skin of Our Teeth with a cast headed by Helen Hayes and Mary Martin.

NEXT WEEK: OKLAHOMA

From June 20 to July 3, the theater Champs Elysees will echo to the unaccustomed strains of songs about corn that's as high as an elephant's eye, and the advantage of doing your courting in a fringe-topped surrey. What the Parisians will make of Rouben Mamoulian's staging of Oklahoma, is still a moot question.

The theatrical organization has raised over $300,000 to send its salute to France, mostly from sources in the theatrical, labor, business, and society world. The Government is all for the project, but hasn't kicked in a dime to help this particular phase of the cultural export program.

Washington has come through with some cash for a somewhat similar venture in which ANTA has a hand, however.

As an example of the kind of thing that is being done under this program, take the case of "Porgy and Bess," which made a Government subsidized tour of the eastern and western Mediterranean. The results were good, as indicated by the reaction of one Cairo reviewer.

"If this is propaganda," he wrote, "let's have more of it."

TESTIMONIAL LUNCHEON FOR FATHER GILBERT HARTKE, O. P., JUNE 14, 1955, NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

IN HONOR OF FATHER HARTKE

As a tribute to his cultural contribution to the community and the Nation as head of the department of speech and drama at Catholic University, and as founder of Players, Inc., with its national touring company—

now in its seventh season—and its summer companies at St. Michael's Playhouse, Winooski, Vt., and Olney Theater in Olney, Md.

And as a tribute to his personal contribution to all of us as priest and man.

In the hope that this occasion will encourage him to realize a permanent repertory company to keep alive in the Nation's Capital the enduring treasures of the drama.

ARRANGEMENTS

By Ralph E. Becker, Leo Brady, Jay Carmody, Richard Coe, William Coyle, Patrick Hayes, Herman Lowe, James O'Neill.

PROGRAM OF ENTERTAINMENT

Tony Donadio, Virginia Bradley Keefe, Rickie Rudel Kubiak, Carole Macho, Dee McHugh, Danny Ruslander, Sid Seidenman, Jr., at the piano.

GENERAL COMMITTEE

Harry Anger, Dr. Robert Baier, Ralph Bellamy, Byron Bentley, Arthur Bergman, Jack J. Blank, Hon. and Mrs. Robert Woods Bliss, Roy Bode, Frank Boucher, Bernard Bralove, Richard Brecke, Joseph D. Brennan, Barnee Breskin, Julius Cahn, Dr. Josephine Callan, Warren Caro, Pat Carroll, Msgr. John Cartwright, Ethel Casey, Milo F. Christiansen, Mrs. Blake Clark, Anita Colby, James E. Colliflower, Dr. Ann Cooke, Jack Cost, Dr. James R. Costello, Mrs. Rose Cowan, William Coyle, Orville Crouch, Therese Marie Cuny, Hon. Edward M. Curran, Mary Tinley Daly, Clarence Derwent, Robert W. Dowling, Alvin Ehrlich, Mark Evans, Robert Farquharson, Irving Feld, Israel S. Feld, Bernie Ferber, Zelda Fichandler, Arnold Fine, David Finley, Jack Foxe, J. George Frain, George Freedley, Eddie Gallaher, William Graham, Thomas Groom, John Hayes, Melvin Hildreth, Orville A. Hitchcock, Burl Ives, Francis J. Kane, Carroll Kearns, Edward J. Kelly, Walter and Jean Kerr, Scott Kirkpatrick, William E. Leahy, Herman Levin, Monroe Lippman, Mrs. Florence Lowe, James Magner, Hazel Markel, Hon. James P. McGranery, Simon F. McHugh, Dr. Howard Mitchell, George Murphy, Robert V. Murray, Hon. George D. Neilson, Lee Norvelle, Bibi Osterwald, Maxwell Rabb, Isadore Rappaport, Bryson Rash, James Reilly, Horace W. Robinson, Mrs. H. Chapman Rose, Robert Ryan, Ernest Schier, Hazel Scott, Samuel Selden, Elton Sheiry, Bess Schreiner, Hon. Samuel Spencer, Milton Starr, C. Y. Stephens, Ben Strauss, Irving Strouse, Leo Sullivan, Don Swann, Jr., Willard Swire, Hon. Edward A. Tamm, Frank Thompson, Pierson Underwood, Mrs. Martin Vogel, Gerald Wagner, Thomas Whelan, George P. Wilson, Jr., Duke Zeibert.

Interfaith Night in Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, last night in Baltimore the 10th annual interfaith game was staged at Memorial Stadium, at which the Baltimore Orioles played the Chicago White Sox.

This annual event is sponsored by the B'nai B'rith, the Knights of Columbus, and the Boumi Temple to demonstrate that men of good will, no matter what their religion, can work together and play together. The proceeds of the game are divided between the three organizations, which, in turn, distribute the money among the charities of their choice. Many other cities over the Nation now stage similar nights, having picked up the Baltimore idea.

The program started at 6 p. m. with a concert by the 29th Infantry Division Band, followed by a parade of 1,500 members of the sponsoring organizations. The interfaith award for 1955 was presented to Governor McKeldin. Mayor D'Alesandro and fraternal leaders spoke briefly. The game began at 8 p. m., and the fact that the Orioles lost 0–1 was incidental.

The interfaith award committee also sponsored a poetry contest, and to promote the affair, one of my constituents entered a poem, which I would like to insert at this point, under leave to extend my remarks:

INTERFAITH FOR U. S. A.

(By John A. Rupp)

In God our faith forever we place
No matter what creed, color, or race,
The goal for all is heaven above
Each to share universal friendship and love
Roman Catholic, Protestant, Jew, together band
For America's good—the freedom land.
All for one and one for all
In life's tolerant path 'till death doth call.
Then, when summoned to our Father's throne,
Happiness will continue in our eternal home.

Continued Preparedness Essential to National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered at the graduation exercises of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces on Wednesday, June 15:

Members of the class of '55, your families and friends, Admiral Hague, and the faculty of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, heartiest congratulations to all of you on this greatest day in the life of any school.

It is my understanding that the mission of this college is to prepare its graduates, civilian and military, for important command, staff, and planning assignments in economic management of the public administration of our Federal Government so as to obtain the maximum effective use of our national resources during any emergency. I am further told that this great institution has as its motto the statement that "Industry and defense are inseparable." No person with the slightest understanding of the nature of modern warfare could take exception to that motto nor could any such person exaggerate the importance of the mission of this college.

It is in a way one of the great paradoxes of modern world politics that the United States of America—the most advanced industrial Nation in the world—has been at the same time the Nation which found itself least prepared to mobilize its national resources during times of emergency. This was true during the First World War, when we discovered that the process of converting from a peacetime to a wartime economy was far more difficult than we had ever imagined. This was true also in World War II, when almost a full year elapsed between Pearl Harbor and the time when our munitions permitted us to begin taking the initiative on the far-flung battlefields of that conflict. It was true also in Korea, when our meagerly equipped forces were almost hurled into the sea before we could stabilize the battlefront.

A historian could no doubt advance good reasons to account for America's traditional unpreparedness in times of conflict. We are, after all, a nation of profoundly pacific people. We will fight—and fight with all our hearts and might—when the survival of freedom is clearly at issue. Yet it has not been our way to prepare in time of peace against the threat of war. We have been spared the historic anamosities and the age-old rivalries which have for so long plagued Europe. Nor have we ever taken naturally to the impressionable calculations of balance of power politics. We might say, with a Gen. "Jeb" Stuart, that wars are won by getting there "fustest with the mostest." But our record of performances was actually quite different. In time of war, we have never been "fustest." Instead, we have prevailed by getting there eventually with the "mostest." After hostilities began, we were able to convert our industries to the production of munitions, and to begin a trickle of war goods which eventually flooded into a torrent and overwhelmed our enemies.

Historically, in short, our Nation has enjoyed the tremendous advantage of what has been termed a cushion of space and a cushion of time—time which sufficed to awaken a slumbering America, time which permitted us to mobilize the unparalleled national resources and the tremendous productiveness of our Nation on behalf of the production of armaments. When our Republic was founded, weeks, or even months, of travel separated our country from the cockpit of Europe's antagonisms and rivalries. Three thousand miles of the Atlantic Ocean stood between us and any potential European aggressor. On the West, the vast stretches of the Pacific stood as a shield between us and the Japanese Empire. As a result, we were not required to match the military strength of our potential rivals during time of peace. Our needs were far less demanding—a navy strong enough to defeat any expeditionary force which might be launched against our own shores, and an army sufficiently powerful to fight a delaying action against an aggressor while we converted from a peacetime to a wartime footing.

But today, we can no longer enjoy such a cushion of space and time. In this age of jet bombers, only a few hours separate us from the long-range Air Force of our Soviet rivals. And if the intercontinental ballistic missile comes to fruition, as it ultimately will, our cushion of time will be measured—not in months, days, or hours—but in minutes.

Nor is this all. It is no secret that military technology has witnessed a revolution in delivery systems—as manifested in the transition from naval vessels to conventional aircraft to jet bombers and now to missiles and rockets. Military technology has witnessed also a revolution in firepower. Permit me to draw an historical analogy. The retribution inflicted upon Germany during World War II through bombing raids was beyond question terrible to contemplate. Yet 6 years of sustained bombing was needed to bring Germany's industries to a halt. Today, a single plane, with a single hydrogen weapon, can carry a destructive cargo whose force exceeds that of all the bombs dropped by all the planes of the Allied Nations upon all of Germany throughout all of the Second World War.

Today, 100—or even fewer—nuclear bombs actually dropped on the urban and industrial targets of our Nation might well suffice to destroy our civilization as we know it. In a matter of days, or even hours, every industrial complex in our Nation might be destroyed.

The moral of this for mobilized planning is amply clear. Today, our Nation confronts a situation in which mobilization after hostilities begin might well be impossible—a situation in which we would have to fight a war with the materiel and munitions available on the day the complex started.

Naturally, no man can predict the future with certainty. It is conceivable, in the years ahead, that the prospect of an all-out atomic war may be so appalling, for all the belligerants concerned, that even the most hardened aggressor would be reluctant to commit his atomic stockpile to battle. It is therefore conceivable that future warfare take the pattern of past conflicts, and that our Nation would again have time to mobilize after the outset of hostilities. But national defense planning must be based on the worst, and not the best, of possible contingencies. As realists, I think we must presume that post-hostilities mobilization would be impossible, and that preparedness against the threat of war must take place in time of peace.

What this amounts to is no less than a historic change in the balance of world politics and military power. Hitherto, we could always increase—even justify—our comparative weakness in time of peace by asserting that no other nation could match the output of our munitions factories in time of actual war. We could argue, in the councils of the world, that aggressors would indeed be foolish to goad the American industrial colossus into action—and we could point to the results of two world wars in supporting our contention.

Today, however, such arguments carry far less weight. Today, we must presume that a nuclear Pearl Harbor, if carried out with skill and ruthless determination, could prevent the military potential of our Nation from being translated into guns and tanks and bombs. Today, in other words, the real yardstick of national military strength must more and more be measured in terms of strength before the onset of actual conflict.

How do we now compare with our Soviet rivals when measured by this yardstick? In such a comparison, certain advantages appear to lie within the Soviets.

A dictatorship can always have a more flexible—and on the surface, at least—a more unified foreign policy than a democracy. The Soviet dictatorships need not be concerned with public opinion. Far more readily than we can, they can mobilize their resources toward any objective at any time. Contrast with this, our democratic process—which must harmonize sectional interests in a larger national interest, and which depends for its support on an informed public opinion—must oftentime appear indecisive and confused.

Moreover, the Soviets could, if they choose, attack our own Nation with no warning whatsoever. For a democracy, such a course of action would be morally repugnant and well-nigh impossible to carry out as a practical matter.

Yet a third advantage lies with the Soviets. For a full generation the Russian people have been denied the rewards of the tremendous industrial revolution which has taken place within the Soviet Union. They have been denied the material comforts which we Americans take almost for granted—our automobiles, our refrigerators, and our television sets. Instead, the ominously increasing industrial output of Soviet factories has been channeled overwhelmingly into the production of the goods of war. The Soviets now produce only half as much steel as we do, and their total electric-generating capacity is less than one-third the size of ours. However, a far greater proportion of their industrial output goes directly to their armed forces, and this fact serves to cancel out the advantages which might be ours because of our more productive economy.

A final advantage enjoyed by the Soviets and their satellite nations is their decisive superiority in number of men now under arms. In Western Europe, for example, 42 NATO divisions confront 175 Communist divisions, and the disparity between the size of the arms of the free and slave worlds on a global scale is at least as great.

As against these considerations, however, we, ourselves, possess certain deeply impressive advantages. I will ignore for the moment the great contributions which our allies are now making to the common cause of the defense of freedom. I will also ignore the fact that this cause is a good cause which can command the allegiance of men of good will, and which will eventually prevail. I will confine my remarks instead to the material indexes of national power. Our great material advantage in the contest with the slave world, of course, has been the size, the productiveness, and the overall excellence of our American economy. Even here, our superiority is not as great as it once was. Our annual output of goods is increasing rapidly, but not so rapidly as in the Soviet Union. Nonetheless, we are still able to outproduce—to manufacture more and better goods than the Soviets—virtually across the board. It is not without reason that American industrial productiveness has been called the free world's trump card in its struggle against the foes of freedom.

Our task today and in the future is to make sure that our productiveness continues to be such a trump card.

I am not one of those who maintain that the recent Moscow flyovers mean that we have suddenly lost our air-atomic superiority. But neither will I seek to minimize the serious future implications of the recent plane demonstrations within the Soviet Union. The plain fact of the matter is that we have once again underestimated Soviet technical competence and progress. We underestimated their progress in 1949 when they exploded their first atomic bomb long before the anticipated date. We underestimated their progress in 1953—when the Soviets achieved a thermonuclear explosion only 9 months after our first full-scale hydrogen test. And we again underestimated their progress 2 months ago, when the Soviets displayed fighter aircraft of impressive appearance and when they flew operational numbers of long-range jet bombers way before we expected them to be in existence.

None of this should give us cause for unreasoning panic. As of today, I believe that our Strategic Air Force is superior—both in overall quality and quantity—to that of the Soviet Union. Moreover, I believe that as of today we are substantially ahead of the Soviets in the efficiency, versatility, and number of our nuclear weapons.

But you will note that I have said "as of today" in making these estimates. In my opinion, we cannot assume that our present margin of superiority over the Soviets in military technology will continue into the future. In my opinion, we cannot take it for granted that—say in 1960—we will still be ahead in the race for technological discovery. In my opinion, a continuation of the present trend may mean, although not necessarily, that 5 or 10 years hence Soviet weapons systems may be ahead of ours, both qualitatively and quantitatively. I fear, in short, that unless we are able to employ our economic resources more skillfully than we have done in the past, America's superiority in military technology—the free world's trump card—may soon be no more.

Two weeks ago, Mr. Allen Dulles, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, delivered an extremely important address which dealt in part with scientific and technical education in the Soviet Union. I wish that the remarks of Mr. Dulles could be made required reading for all Americans since they highlight one of the greatest threats faced by our Nation today—the fact that the scientific and technical gap between the Soviet Union and the United States is rapidly narrowing. Mr. Dulles pointed out that, in the present year, Soviet universities will turn out about twice as many graduates in the sciences and enginering as will our own universities. He went on to estimate that—in the decade from 1950 to 1960—the Soviets will graduate about 1,200,000 students in the sciences, as compared with about 900,000 graduates in our own Nation. Mr. Dulles then goes on to say that the quality of the training in the Soviet Union is of a very high level. His disturbing conclusion is that, unless we quickly take steps to increase our own facilities for scientific education, Soviet manpower in vital areas may well outnumber ours within the next decade.

Some skeptics may discount the importance of this. They may say: It may very well be true that the Soviets can produce more scientists and engineers than we can, but will all this be reflected in the end products of the Soviet industrial systems—in the quality and quantity of their armament. I myself believe it will. For example, the Soviets, by and large, have moved more quickly from the design of prototype weapons to production levels than we have—and this at a time when they are well behind us in over-all industrial competence.

My point is this—and I am sure it is a conviction shared by all who are graduating here today. We can no longer regard economic mobilization as simply the study of how to convert assembly lines from the production of automobiles to the manufacture of tanks in the event of war, with a minimum of inefficiency and the maximum of speed and economy. Today, the study of economic mobilization must increasingly become the study of how, in time of peace, to operate our economy so that we can stay decisively ahead of our rivals in the excellence of our armaments, while maintaining, to the greatest degree possible, our traditional American standard of living. Today, the stockpiling of scientific and technical talent looms as important as the stockpiling of critical materials. Today, the proper use of scientific and technical brainpower may be more vital than the proper allocation of metals and minerals. Today, the search for young men and women of talent—the scientific and technical leaders of the future—may be more important than the search for new uranium.

You who graduate here today will play a crucial role in determining how well our Nation meets the growing challenge of Soviet power. Good fortune to all of you, and God's speed in the years ahead.

Chairman Vogel's Views on TVA Prior to Confirmation Are in Conflict With His Actions Since Becoming Chairman of the TVA Board

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower indicated, in selecting a successor to Gordon R. Clapp, former Chairman of the TVA Board, that he would

seek a man for the post whose views coincided with his own.

Following his nomination, General Vogel was the subject of close cross-examination as to his views and attitude toward TVA and the policy of the law which he was appointed to administer.

General Vogel indicated before the Senate committee considering his nomination, a belief in the wisdom and feasibility of the TVA Act and the soundness of the public policy expressed in the law. He pledged himself to a belief in the wisdom and feasibility of the philosophy of the TVA law.

I am advised that former TVA Chairman Lilienthal and former Chairman Clapp could not have been better pro-TVA witnesses than was Chairman Vogel at the time of the Senate confirmation hearings. General Vogel, accordingly, was confirmed by vote of the Senate which included the vote of many Senators from the TVA area.

Since assuming chairmanship of the TVA Board, General Vogel has evidenced an about-face attitude with respect to TVA. He has disagreed violently with the majority membership of the Board.

He has advanced the Dixon-Yates scheme—the so-called "partnership" invasion of the integrity of TVA.

He has opposed increased appropriations for TVA programs.

He has advanced and advocated the Corps of Engineers contract method of construction for TVA rather than the use and employment of the TVA's force method of construction.

He has favored reduction of the fertilizer and resources development program for TVA.

He has suggested that TVA reduce its resources development work, turning these programs over to State conservation departments.

He opposes the promotional work of TVA—advocating that these educational functions of TVA be performed by local chambers of commerce.

He has, according to press reports, assumed the attitude of a dictator and undertakes to direct and order his fellow Board members.

He has spoken adversely and been severely critical of Citizens for TVA—a nonprofit citizens group organized to rally support in behalf of TVA and to counteract the propaganda efforts of the private power lobby.

General Vogel has expressed strong opposition to TVA spending any appropriated funds for receiving and entertaining visiting foreign dignitaries who view and visit TVA as a program of great international significance and importance. He has referred to visitors at TVA as a burden upon the Agency.

General Vogel has been charged by Chairman CANNON of the House Appropriations Committee with atempting to establish a one-man dictatorship in TVA management by securing from the Bureau of the Budget a recommendation of a $100,000 contingency fund for the purpose of establishing a separate management staff to report directly to him—this clearly being an effort to establish for himself additional powers as Chairman and to short circuit or scuttle the joint efforts of the other Board members.

In a speech on October 23, 1952, shortly before the national election, General Eisenhower stated:

> River development projects, such as TVA, should be worked out in the way the people of the region want it done.

The people of the area want it done the way the TVA has operated in the past and by building the necessary generating capacity to take care of the normal growth and needs of the area. That is how they want it done.

How is President Eisenhower carrying out that pledge?

The people of the area are now confronted with a TVA Board Chairman—appointed by the President and said to "think alike" with the President on TVA—who reflects a contrary view to that originally expressed by the President.

General Vogel, more recently, following the action of the House Appropriations Committee in voting funds to start construction of the Fulton steam plant, testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee and recommended that this plant not be built. The about face of the general indicates that he possesses traits of an earlier noted general in this country.

General Vogel was appointed to the TVA Board for a specific purpose and he has with apparent willingness become the pliant tool of the Bureau of the Budget whose ultimate goal is the scuttling of TVA, the throttling of its programs, the milking of its corporate funds, the raising of the rates to the consumer, the reducing of the TVA to the lowest possible book value—thus permitting its ultimate capture and sale by private power trusts and utility holding companies.

The utilities, which the late Wendell Willkie represented, sold their limited holdings to the Government and now they wish to recapture the rich assets of TVA at a minimum cost—thus reaping huge profits at the expense of the Government, the taxpayers of the Nation and the consuming public.

Chairman Vogel is aiding their objective to this end.

Kurtz Hanson, Youthful President, Champion International Co., Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Sunday Post, June 12, 1955, Boston, Mass.

This is a very interesting writeup on a young man who has recently located in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and one whom we in the greater Lawrence, Mass., area are most proud.

He has established himself as a most sincere, conscientious, and aggressive executive with genuine interest in the community problems.

The article is as follows:

KURTZ HANSON, PAPER MAN, IS ONE OF AREA'S YOUNG LEADERS

(By Frederick D. McCarthy)

Kurtz M. Hanson, youthful president of the Champion-International Co., producers of fine-quality papers in Lawrence, was brought up in Bethesda, Md., but is a real New Englander in everything but the matter of birth.

"I expect to be around here for a long time," he smiled as he chatted about the great potential of the New England economy.

Attesting that his devotion to this section is more than mere lip service, his business affiliations include the following: vice president and member of the executive committee of Associated Industries of Massachusetts; director of Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce; and member of the Greater Lawrence Citizens Committee for Industrial Development.

AIDS NEW INDUSTRY

He was one of the original steering committee which established in 1953, under the aegis of the Commonwealth, the Massachusetts Business Development Corp. He is currently serving as a director and member of the executive committee.

This organization, to which the 41-year-old paper company executive devotes considerable time—along with other public-spirited Bay State citizens—was created to aid in location of new business and industry in this Commonwealth and to rehabilitate and assist in the expansion of all kinds of business activity which will tend to promote the business development and maintain the economic stability of this Commonwealth.

The MBDC to date has loaned more than $6 million to new industries and to firms already established here, and has created between 5,000 and 6,000 new jobs.

Dedicated to fighting outside interests who seek to dispense gloom and doom about New England, the affable chief executive of the Champion-International Co. stressed: "If New England people would sell New England, wherever they are, and try to clear up misunderstandings about our section—particularly among New York financial people—we would be much better off."

Champion-International Co., incidentally, has the distinction of being the steadiest employer of labor in the Lawrence district. With a payroll of 725, the company operates 6 days a week on a 3-shift basis.

The company operates one of the two pulp mills in Massachusetts; the other is in the Holyoke area.

PULP MILL IN LAWRENCE

Champion's properties in Lawrence comprise a pulp mill, paper mill and a converting mill. The output is 120 tons a day, of which 40 percent takes care of the coated paper requirements of the National Geographic Society.

The company also maintains a forestry operation in New Hampshire. The wood procurement agency has its headquarters in Concord, N. H., and operates a modern debarking mill and pulpwood yard at Bow, N. H.

National Geographic owns the stock of the Champion company, but the plant is operated as a completely separate entity.

The remainder of the output is purchased by magazines and other users of high-quality papers.

Hanson served on American Woolen's board of directors before the giant textile firm was merged with Textron.

A stanch advocate of sound labor relations as well as wholesome community rela-

tions—they should be tied together, Hanson explained—the Champion Co. is in the enviable position of having a waiting list of 3,000 for jobs in the organization.

Entertaining the belief that good employee relations are aided by good employee communications, the management publishes a magazine for the workers and holds monthly meetings with supervisory forces to give them information on economic matters and to keep them in touch with plant affairs. They, in turn, can enlighten the workers.

As Hanson visualized the industrial situation, "There are three basic ingredients—raw materials, machines, and people, and the individuals are, of course, the most important."

No organization is going to get very far unless there is a good spirit and a proper degree of understanding on the part of the workers.

A community-minded person who is actively interested in the welfare of the city in which his company is domiciled, Hanson pointed out that 100 new industries have been brought into Lawrence in the past 6 years, or since the debacle in the textile industry there in 1949. The number of jobless has been cut in half in the interim.

Property of Champion-International has been located in Lawrence since 1846. Formerly operated under the name of the Russell Paper Co., it then was a unit of the International Paper Co. It became a separate organization in 1901.

This area's bountiful research facilities will be of inestimable help in strengthening the New England economy in the future, the Champion president is convinced.

He is interested in so developing our research talents that smaller companies will be able to share in them more abundantly through some sort of a cooperative program.

CORNELL GRADUATE

Educated at the Episcopal High School, Alexandria, Va., and Cornell University, Hanson was a star football player during his school days and in his freshman year at Cornell.

While playing as quarterback on the Cornell freshman team, "I broke a couple of vertebrae," he disclosed, "and that finished my football career."

A husky six-footer who keeps his weight down to the 188-pound mark of his college days, the handsome paper executive retains a keen interest in sports.

Married to the former Helen L. Davis of New York, they live at 169 Chestnut Street, North Andover, and he finds time for an occasional game of golf at the North Andover Country Club.

Pressed for his score, he grinned: "I go around in the middle 80's; I manage that most of the time."

During the warm weather he enjoys swimming in the saltwater pool at the Eastern Yacht Club at Marblehead. "I also get in a bit of sailing there," he added.

His other clubs are the Chevy Chase Club, Chevy Chase, Md.; Cornell Club of New York City, and Monday Night Club, Lawrence. He has one daughter, H. Louise, who is a student at Rogers Hall, Lowell.

WAS OFFICER IN MARINES

Hanson was elected vice president of Champion-International Co. in 1948, and became president in 1950.

Prior to World War II he had served in the editorial research department of the National Geographic Society, later transferring to the business department. He was named assistant secretary of the society on his return from war service.

His military tour of duty involved 43 months of service with the United States Marine Corps, 14 months of which represented overseas service in the Pacific.

He served with headquarters, Fourth Marine Aircraft Wing, and headquarters, Second Marine Aircraft Wing, in the capacity of assistant wings operation officer, aide to the commanding general, administrative assistant to the commanding general and assistant chief of staff G–1.

Hanson was awarded the Bronze Star Medal for meritorious service in connection with the operations against the enemy in the Pacific theater.

Proposed Review of Government's Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the June 4, 1955, issue of the Christian Science Monitor in support of Senate Joint Resolution 21, the Humphrey-Stennis resolution to establish a nonpartisan commission on Government security. I welcome the support of the Christian Science Monitor, a distinguished newspaper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR A "BLUE RIBBON" COMMISSION

A subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations composed of 4 Democrats and 3 Republicans has approved unanimously a resolution calling for a "blue ribbon," nonpartisan commission to review the Government's security program and to take the issue out of politics.

The security program as now set up and administered, says former Senator Harry P. Cain, now Subversive Activities Control Board chairman, has "taken the dignity and self-respect to which every human being is entitled and twisted it * * * into forms which are as unrecognizable when judged by historic American standards of fair play and simple justice as they are totalitarian in practice and result."

Well over 2 years ago this newspaper was calling for creation of just such a commission. We said then:

"Here would be a sound basing point for confidence * * *. It seems to us that this is one measure on which earnest people on both sides of the present controversy over investigations could unite."

And later:

"Only so, it seems to us, can residual suspicions and controversies over laxities or partisan abuses of the program be removed."

The unanimous action of this Senate body, therefore, is most encouraging. But within the administration itself Attorney General Brownell is reportedly urging the President to oppose such a commission, contending that all that is wrong with the system can be corrected by improvements in administrative procedures.

It cannot. The trouble goes deeper than that. The fact that Mr. Brownell's more than 2 years in office have not cleared up the evils Mr. Cain denounces belies this contention.

The fate of this resolution in Congress may easily hinge on the President's attitude. We urge that he recognize this longstanding situation not as a partisan "mess" but as an American scandal, and that he act accordingly.

Music Industry Should Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an excerpt of an article by the able columnist, Harriet Van Horne, on the question of current popular music.

In the light of what is happening in the music industry, this article sums up the situation so succinctly and wisely that I believe every Member of the Congress should carefully read it.

These conditions cannot be corrected until real art shall infuse, motivate, and direct all important radio and television programs, the stage and the theater and the music business.

Of course, the Congress obviously should not dictate to entrepreneurs and exhibitors the type of program that they shall present, because that would involve interference with individual rights and also assume broad censorial powers which Congress does not possess. However, over a period of time unquestionably such programs as are in bad taste or reflect inadequate standards will become offensive to larger numbers of the American people and the situation must be viewed with the hope that speedy corrective measures will be applied voluntarily by the music business and operators who reproduce our music for profit.

The other phase of this question is the palpable injustices that beset the music industry, and particularly those which are daily visited upon the American composers of popular music. This may well be at the root of the deterioration of artistic programing. It certainly is responsible to a great extent for the decline in the quality and appeal of current popular music and when one contemplates the shabby way songwriters are treated these days, one can better understand the lack of popular response to current offerings.

Merit, not favoritism, should determine the presentation of composers' offerings. Justice and equity, not overreaching monopolistic practices and rank discriminations, should rule. To the contrary, abuses become more entrenched every day and seem to multiply. A glaring example of the injustice I refer to is provided by the experience of the great Leroy Anderson, one of America' outstanding popular composers, the author, among other notable hits, of Blue Tango. On that song alone the companies are authoritatively said to have reaped a gross of $12 million, but the sad, stark fact, as reported, is that of this huge sum, Mr. Anderson did not get one cent, although if he had not composed it, it would not have been possible for others to realize gigantic profits for themselves and their companies.

That is a fact that is not apparently appreciated by the monopolists and manipulators in the music industry. Such

a situation outrages the public conscience. The deterioration in the quality of popular songs because of dictatorial control is in time bound to diminish and greatly reduce the income of this entire industry. If those directing its destiny would only stop to realize this fact, they would speedily move to effect arrangements whereby composers, writers, and publishers would be given their just share of the huge profits that gleaned by the music industry and its affiliates.

I am also including in my remarks an article from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle which is my authority for the above statement that from a gross of $12 million income on one song hit the composer, Mr. Leroy Anderson, did not receive a penny from its reproduction for profit.

As I have pointed out before, I am very friendly disposed toward the great music industry. I am eager to see it prosper and grow in every legitimate way. But in view of many evidences of gross abuses, flagrant injustices, ruthless methods, and monopolistic patterns, I am again urging its leadership to clean house and banish these unjust practices of its own motion before the Congress is constrained to apply drastic remedies that may occasion more or less rigid control of activities that are violative of good conscience and equity, and contrary to public interest.

The articles follow:

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO POPULAR SONGS?

(By Harriet Van Horne)

Granted, the old order must constantly change. But extend that word "change" to denote corruption and decay and you have the key to what is happening to one of the loveliest tokens of the old order—namely, the popular song.

Were I a wandering minstrel in the boundless spheres of radio and television, I'd make it a point of honor to sing the old songs. The gay and gentle songs with their true melodic lines, their modest, thoughtful lyrics, their haunting grace.

I'd avoid—in the same fastidious way I'd avoid looking at a dog run over in the road—the songs that have been jukebox hits in the past few years. I mean the hillbilly laments, the nonsense syllables set to imbecile tunes, the lascivious lyrics sung with a leer, and the songs that rely on special sound effects, echo chambers, and the like, for their musical appeal.

"O, play me a tune on an unbroken spinet," sang Tom Wolfe. And I would add, sing me a song with an unbroken melody, with a lyric tender and true. And in a voice free of the rasp and snarl, the affected vibrato and the low, sickroom moan, that are the hallmarks of today's popular vocalists.

A musician of my acquaintance tells me that the blame for today's miserable and ugly songs can be laid directly at the door of the record companies. It is they who select the songs to be recorded. And it is they who decide the artist who will make the recording and the style in which he shall do it. The prime consideration in all these decisions is: Will the kids like it?

"The great bulk of records," he explained, "is bought by youngsters between 13 and 18. They keep the record companies solvent. And today's kids, for some reason, hate sentiment. They want to hear new sounds. They like their music lusty. Tasteful singers—Dinah Shore, for example—are too good, too refined for them. So Dinah never has a hit record any more."

It isn't bad enough that singers of talent must bow to the low taste of the hour and sing Tweedledee and Dance With Me, Henry. Now there's a new form of desecration. I first became aware of it when I heard Miss Kay Starr bleating, No ma-yan is an islaaaand * * * and recognized, with a cry of pain, one of John Donne's loveliest devotions (the one that reminds us for whom the bell tolls).

Then, a few days later I heard the same strident, yodelling tones pronounce, Where thou goest I shall go. I felt suddenly ill. Even the Old Testament, it seems, isn't safe from the spoilers and depredators of Tin Pan Alley.

The fact that an occasional soft and sentimental song—for example, Hey, There—does become a hit ought to embolden the record companies to venture into the deeper waters of honest music. There's also the thought: How are the teenagers going to develop taste if they're not exposed to better music?

As for reactionaries like me, who want to hear Cole Porter, Gershwin, Jerome Kern, and Richard Rodgers, well there's always the phonograph.

SAD NOTE ON A JUKEBOX

Something like a billion dollars in nickels and dimes, according to estimates, are dropped every year into the Nation's 500,000 jukeboxes. Pretty nice velvet for the composers and song writers, you say. Yes, except that the composers and song writers get none of it. The profits go to the operators who install the jukes, minus rental charges. All the composer gets is the royalty, amounting to not more than 2 cents, paid on the purchase of each record.

The record may be played over and over, as most of them are, but all the composer knows about it is what he reads in the financial reports of the operating companies. As an example of how profitable one successful number may be, the Composers and Authors Committee estimates that Leroy Anderson's Blue Tango grossed more than $12 million, of which he received nothing.

The reason for this strange situation goes back to the copyright law of 1909, which specifically exempted coin operated machines from the provisions requiring payment of performance fees to composers. This was for the benefit of the penny arcade machines of that period. No one foresaw the rise of the jukebox.

In Congress Senator Pat McCarran had been leader in a battle to change the copyright law to end what he calls the special treatment in favor of the jukeboxes. His bill for this purpose died in committee last year, but ASCAP (American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers) is pushing for new action. It is backed by many other national organizations, including the American Bar Association, American Patent Law Association, General Federation of Women's Clubs.

What an equitable agreement between the jukebox operators and the composers may be, we do not pretend to know. The operators insist that by paying a royalty for the purchase of the records, they have done their duty to the composers. The latter retort that other musical enterprises, such as broadcasters and other commercial users of records, pay a performance fee in addition to the royalty.

Like other giants that have sprouted from small beginnings, the jukebox business has reached the point where some sort of sensible agreement, preferably by free action of the parties concerned, ought to be made.

Rearmament of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from the president of the West Culver City Democratic Club of Culver City, Calif. The members of this club, who are part of the outstanding citizenship of the district that I have the honor to represent, have expressed a point of view with which I personally have the greatest sympathy. I hope that my colleagues will give it serious consideration.

The letter follows:

WEST CULVER CITY DEMOCRATIC CLUB,
Culver City, Calif., May 23, 1955.

Mr. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: At our May meeting we discussed the rearmament of Germany. Some aspects of the discussion were depressing, others heartening.

We were chagrined and pained to learn that many of the Nazi war criminals have been granted their freedom, and that many of the former leaders have regained their positions of power in both the industry and government of present-day Germany. A rearmed Germany will find these men once again assuming leadership.

The hopeful aspect is what we wish to pass on to you. The rearmament of Germany is not yet an accomplished fact. To gain the signatures of the Western European countries has taken 9 years, during which time our country has exerted tremendous economic pressure through the Marshall plan, forcing these nations to become unwilling signers of the pact. That it has taken 9 years, however, attests to the fact that the opposition to the rearming of Germany has been strong and active.

It is not without good reason the people of Europe have come to hate and fear the German Wehrmacht, for twice in a single generation this military might has invaded and devastated their homelands. In the 1910's it was the Prussian Army—in the 1930's, the Nazis. Is the world to know it by another, more fearful name in the 1960's?

When you were here in April, you spoke of the rearmament of Germany as an unwise, but accomplished fact. We believe, however, that there is still time to correct this terrible mistake—still time to end this threat to world peace. The European and the German people themselves have voiced their opposition to a rearmed Germany, and they will continue to resist it. If we didn't believe this, we wouldn't ask you to do all in your power to stop the creation of a militarized Germany by your vote on the various bills and appropriations to come before Congress.

The tremendous amount of time and effort you are devoting to your work for the small-business men, your work to protect and advance civil rights, for a Federal FEPC—all these have not gone unnoticed or unappreciated. We may not always express our thanks as we should, but we hope that you are aware of our loyalty and our support for all legislation intended to promote the Democratic platform. May we therefore also

urge that your efforts in behalf of world peace be no less energetic?

With our thanks and sincerest good wishes, we are,

Respectfully yours,

WEST CULVER CITY DEMOCRATIC CLUB,
SEYMOUR GOLDMAN, *President*.

The attached letter was drafted in accordance with a resolution unanimously passed by the membership of the West Culver City Democratic Club at its meeting of May 4, 1955, by the following committee: Abraham Cahn, Fay Dichner, Eleanor Jacobs, and Rose Zeid.

Educational TV Progresses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, Hazel Cooley, author of Vision in Television, has written an article on educational TV which, in my opinion, is excellent and most informative. Miss Cooley gives us valuable information on the important subject of the contribution of TV in the educational field and her article is based on careful work and research.

I am inserting the article, which appeared in the May 28, 1955, issue of The Nation, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Members of Congress may have the opportunity to read it:

SCHOOLROOM ON THE AIR—EDUCATIONAL TV PROGRESSES

(By Hazel Cooley)

Misconceptions abound about education in TV—about the need for it, about its possibilities, about who is going to support it. But one thing is certain: it is not a failure. It is not sliding backward into disintegration; it is going forward, even if slowly in comparison with other current developments.

This fact takes on significance in the light of the present teacher shortage. Dr. David O. Henry, executive vice chancellor of New York University, recently stated that education cannot hope to cope with the rising tide of students unless such aids as educational TV are moved into the center of current practice.

Barely 3 years ago the Federal Communications Commission reserved exclusively for noncommercial educational use 252 TV channels in as many separate communities. Ownership and operation of these channels was restricted to nonprofit educational organizations, the only exception being a municipality whose school system was under the control not of an independent body but of the township itself. The FCC distinctly specified that operation of these channels was to be in no respect commercial, since otherwise the objective of a genuinely educational type of service would not be attained. Educators recognized that this action of the FCC was only the first step, that enormous difficulties lay ahead.

Since then, 15 educational TV stations have been established, reaching some 25 million people. Eight others are under construction and will be operating soon. Seven additional communities are completing plans and collecting funds to start construction. Ralph W. Steele, executive director of the Joint Committee for Educational Television, a national clearinghouse for aid to educational broadcasters, believes that by the end of 1955 there will be 30 such stations in 18 States, reaching 40 million people.

A single educational organization can seldom swing TV by itself; usually a number combine and share the cost. Before a station can get started, innumerable, almost endless, negotiations are necessary. The obstacles to be surmounted include the operational budget, building and expansion requirements, the hesitation of universities to commit university funds, and the fact that 186 of the 252 educational channels are in the ultrahigh frequency. (See my article in the Nation for February 19, 1955.) That 15 stations are already on the air, 8 about to begin, and 7 well on their way, in scarcely 3 years' time, conclusively proves that educators have what it takes—courage and persistence.

When a commercial TV station is organized, it can obtain working capital by the various means available to business enterprises. It makes a profit or suffers a loss, depending on the demand for what it offers. Like any entrepreneur, the commercial operator goes into TV because he thinks he can make it pay. For the noncommercial, educational station, however, there can be no dollars-and-cents profit. No matter how good a TV job educators may do, it does not add a penny to their personal income or their school budget. Their incentive is entirely different from that of the businessman who goes into TV.

The educator has always been a servant of the people and is dedicated to the goal of furthering social progress. It is a never-ending assignment. He must be always helping the inquiring mind to seek and to learn. He cannot neglect, therefore, the new force—TV—which is at work on the thought, emotions, and actions of society. One of his responsibilities is to be alert to new ways of doing an old job. Attempts by educators to use the earlier medium of radio won a tremendous following. But they proved that to be successful, educational programs must be given at specified hours of specified days and continue without interruption month after month and year after year. Since there were no noncommercial radio stations for education exclusively, such programs suffered from the growing demand for radio time. Then came the war, followed by television development and experimentation and a freeze on the granting of new TV licenses. At this point, warned by their experience with education by radio, educators organized to claim a share of the TV channels. The result is known—252 channels reserved for educational purposes.

While educators are grateful for the opportunities provided, they are aware of the problems they face. These can be lumped in three major categories: (1) making the public aware of the educational values involved; (2) getting money to build and operate educational TV stations; and (3) developing talent and programs.

Educators recognize the usefulness of TV to any institution of learning and to the community. The Dartmouth Television Committee, reporting to the president of the college in January 1954, said:

"Despite a fundamental reluctance to encourage an adventure by the college along a course * * * largely untried * * * in the entire sphere of American education, * * * despite knowledge of the very considerable outlay of funds and manpower inevitably involved, the committee has come gradually to the conclusion that the potentials of TV in education are so enormous that * * * the only real question to be resolved * * * are how far and how fast Dartmouth should go in adapting TV to its end. * * * We can fail to understand its meaning at our peril."

While educators are aware of the potential of TV in education, the general public is not. If there is a peril in failing to understand, why has the public not been enlightened? Why have not the educators tried more vigorously to obtain the cooperation and support of the public? Do they feel that once the public gives its support, it would want to share in or dictate policy? Activating these 252 channels is actually the responsibility of all the people in the country, not of the educators alone, though only the educators may file for license to operate. It is up to the educators to bring educational TV to the people, but they will find it tough going if the people don't back them.

The lack of substantial financial support for educational TV shows that people generally are unaware of their responsibility. To bring this home to them should have been the first objective of the crusade for education in TV. Of course there are many enlightened citizens who are anxious to have educational channels in operation in their communities and are willing to work for it. A National National Citizens' Committee for Educational Television was established in 1952 for the purpose of stimulating public support for educational TV. But where is it? It may be known in certain parts of the country, but in many others it is not at all known. Surely, after 3 years, one might expect to have heard of its accomplishments.

People don't seem to realize that educational programs over commercial networks often get greater response than commercial programs. When Macbeth was presented one Sunday afternoon in November 1954, a Nielson rating indicated that 6,500,000 sets were tuned in, with an average of 2 people to a set, or 13 million listeners.

The 15 stations now in operation got their start with money from a variety of sources—State legislatures; Government agencies; school budgets; foundations, large and small; commercial broadcasting stations; business firms; charitable, religious, and public-welfare organizations; and individual donors. Lack of money is still the chief difficulty. Most colleges would be able to go ahead with their own transmitters if they had the funds. It is interesting that 8 of the 15 stations that have been set up are supported largely by public funds. Their success proves that when the people of a community know what education over the airwaves is like, they want it, they will back it with their money, and they will specify exactly what they want in programing.

There is no question that the colleges are hindered by the ultra-high-frequency (UHF) assignments. The lack of viewers who can pick up the UHF signal has forced Michigan State College to curtail operations. Its programing was good and its potential audience large, but they had no UHF sets. It is now reduced to the position of an auxiliary station feeding nine commercial stations in the State.

The colleges have an advantage in their command of talent. Naturally the talent has to be channeled into TV fare, but it is there, on the campus. Educational TV, moreover, is really an extension of the colleges' regular work. Teachers before the TV camera are not "performers" in the sense that commercial programs require performers; they are teachers, and they are on familiar ground. They must develop certain techniques, use more visual objects to point up the lesson, but they are still teaching. A good teacher is as good before the camera as in the classroom and a poor teacher has a chance to improve by watching one who is superior.

College programs have proved tremendously popular. An outstanding example is the work of Dr. Frank Baxter, a professor of English at the University of Southern California, quite unknown outside of California a year ago and today a national figure. He has presented Shakespeare as only a scholar could to an audience estimated at 400,000. But this was not over the college transmitter. It came Saturday mornings over CBS station

in Hollywood, which presented Shakespeare on TV as a public-service sustaining feature. Why didn't the program come over the college transmitter? Station KTHE, Los Angeles, licensed to the University of Southern California, is another UHF calamity: no sets, no funds, no audience. Late in 1954, the station was granted special temporary authority to remain silent pending further developments.

Group-instruction techniques are being used for the teaching of piano by television. Courses in elementary psychology are being given by many stations—the subject seems a "natural" for the medium. Farm women and town women are enrolling enthusiastically for courses in "Let's Make a Dress TV"; women are always interested in programs that point to better living for the family. Many studies indicate that programs based on community interests have the greatest appeal—interviews with local people, stories of local products, solutions for common problems.

Heart-warming stories about what TV instruction has accomplished are coming in. A farmer who, for 15 years, had refused all advice to lime his land was convinced by a television demonstration. An insurance salesman who knew nothing of farming but had farmer customers, watched a college TV program on insect control and with this to talk about was able to "get his foot in the door." A teacher reported that after one TV lesson in art she found her pupils much more receptive to her instruction.

At the annual convention of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, held in February of this year, the president of the Montclair State Teachers College, Dr. E. DeAlton Partridge, convinced more than 800 educators that television can be a most effective classroom device. Its use lightens some of the teacher's burdens, raises teaching standards, and enriches the lives of pupils. The dynamic Dr. Partridge proved his points with visual demonstrations.

One of his purposes was to show how valuable TV can be in the present teacher shortage. There are 7,307,000 more pupils in our elementary schools today than there were in 1947–48. There will be 2,140,000 more high-school students by 1960. Last year there were 1,032,000 elementary and high-school teachers in the United States. In 1959–60 more than 1,670,000 will be needed. And these figures leave entirely out of account the large annual replacement demand for teachers. Educators are justifiably concerned over this situation, and those who have experimented with TV in the area of teacher education believe that it offers some answers.

The lesson that comes over TV has been planned and prepared by a number of good teachers. It has been revised and improved. It is built of materials derived from the experience or gathered by the research of several persons. It has been enriched by discussion and rehearsal. Nothing like as much care can be given to the preparation of the ordinary run of daily lessons. No single classroom teacher could have access to the material from museums, libraries, historical collections, and the like that are drawn on for TV lessons. TV relieves the teacher of many hours of preparation and lets him conserve his energies for the important task of building his personal relations with his pupil. The teacher with genius can reach thousands of children over TV. Other teachers are quick to learn from the TV teacher who has a better way of presenting a lesson. The quick insight of a gifted teacher for the best way to make a point is never lost to the camera. Suppose it becomes possible to focus the TV camera on such a teacher and transmit his personality and technique from one classroom to a number of classrooms, from 100 children, to 10,000, to 1 million. The possibilities are enormous. With further research, demonstration, and practice it is inevitable that TV will be widely used to help education out of its present dilemma of increasing pupil demand and decreasing teacher supply.

The use of educational TV for the enrichment of the individual in every community in the United States is only beginning. With support by the public, this supplementary educational system may point the way to the rediscovery of basic values which have been lost or buried under a mass of shoddy substitutes. For example, young people who think of themselves as glamor girls or boys may be brought to the realization that there are more worthwhile attitudes. In this respect educational TV has a unique opportunity, for it is able to reach the vital spot, the home, and to affect the thinking of practically everyone in every corner of the country.

A National Calamity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following factual and interesting editorial from the Textile Challenger, the publication of the United Textile Workers of America:

INDUSTRIAL MIGRATION

After 2 years of intensive study by a subcommittee, a special report on industrial migration has just been completed and submitted to the National Legislative Council of the American Federation of Labor, but requires a continuing study, preferably by the congressional Committee on the Economic Report as a basis for legislative action.

The research department of the AFL assisted the committee in organizing the structural material formulating the recommendations and the preparation of the lengthy report.

While the main purpose of the investigation was "migratory subsidies," the report is comprehensive and detailed as to the causes and influences responsible for the uprooting of industry, community dislocation, and the scourge of unemployment left in its wake.

TEXTILES

While the textile industry is the most seriously affected by migratory subsidies, other industries are now feeling the brunt and the pattern is changing. Large scale mergers in textiles with a diversification of fibers and fabrics results in liquidations and unemployment in the North, relocation in the South with subsidies in the form of tax exemptions, cheap labor, inadequate labor legislation, vicicous right-to-wark laws, and child-labor violations.

This rash of textile combines is now becoming feverish. We are witnessing a battle of the textile giants whose only consideration is corporate profits with no regard for the victims—the lifetime workers of such textile centers as Sanford, Maine; Lawrence, Mass.; and other sections of New England and the Middle Atlantic States.

As the report demonstrates, this is not a local or sectional problem. It belongs to the Nation and this means that Congress and the administration can no longer close their eyes to the industrial conspiracy which is pauperizing the men and women who gave their lives in the mills now abandoned while their owners seek new fields of exploitation.

We expect this report on migratory subsidies will pave the way for serious consideration and remedial action by the Nation's lawmakers. It is not entirely a question of losses in the North and gains in the South. It is a national calamity, destined to create havoc in the Nation's economy. Labor is not alone in this opinion. Financial institutions, trade associations, economists, and Government authorities have noted the danger signs.

The moneychangers have been driven from the temple more than once, and even in our own time.

This is the time and the day when the candidates for political office will be called upon to prove by deeds, not words, that they are really concerned about the workers' welfare. It is getting late.

An American Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Arizona Republic, Phoenix, Ariz., June 9, 1955:

AN AMERICAN RIGHT

A good many Republic readers probably were startled to learn, from Jerry Poole's story on page 1 Tuesday, that an American airman born in Phoenix, will be tried under French law for his part in a stabbing affair at Fontainebleau, France. If he is found guilty, he may have his head chopped off by a guillotine. If the French authorities so decide, they can keep him in jail indefinitely. He isn't entitled to bail. When he is tried, an American military observer will be in court, but he won't be able to take part in the trial.

How did Jose Montijo, Jr., get in this fix? Partly, of course, by indulging in a barroom brawl over a girl. Soldiers have been doing that for centuries. But why should an American, sent abroad through no desire of his own in order to help defend France, not be tried by American law? Simply because the American flag followed Airman Montijo to France, but the American Constitution didn't.

Under the NATO Status of Forces treaty, negotiated under President Truman and ratified under President Eisenhower, American military personnel abroad are tried under domestic law. On February 10, 58 American servicemen were serving sentences ranging up to 15 years in the jails of friendly nations in which they were stationed.

Some of these nations do not presume innocence until guilt is proved. Others have no provision for trial by jury, or requirements for a public or speedy trial. There is no writ of habeas corpus, no right of appeal, no privilege against self-incrimination in some of them. Yet American servicemen can be forced to stand trial under the law of these nations.

The NATO Status of Forces treaty should be renegotiated immediately. No such provision was in effect in World War II, or in the Korean war, and it should not be in effect now. Americans who are drafted and sent overseas should be given the protection of the Constitution just as much as their fellow citizens who stay at home.

Hardest Working River Needs No Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of talk about the necessity of the Federal Government going in and building power projects in various sections of our country. The advocates of public power are asking for outright grants of Federal funds in several sections of this country. They are not even building these power projects under the Rural Electrification Administration, but are asking for complete Federal grants.

I am proud to represent the Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin through which the Wisconsin River flows. The Wisconsin River is the hardest working river in our Nation and generates more power on the basis of its fall than any other river in the United States. All the generating plants on the Wisconsin River have been completely financed by private capital. No Government handouts have been requested to develop this mighty river.

On June 13, 1955, an editorial appeared in the Stevens Point Journal, of Stevens Point, Wis., and I ask unanimous consent to include this editorial in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

The editorial follows:

HARDEST WORKING RIVER NEEDS NO FEDERAL AID

Sharp differences of opinion exist as to whether authority should be granted to create the Little Eau Pleine Reservoir, to provide additional hydroelectric power for the benefit of industries along the Wisconsin River Valley. The decision rests in the hands of the State public service commission, with the Wisconsin Valley Improvement Co. hoping for a favorable ruling and objectors holding to the opposite viewpoint.

There is one thing, however, about which no dispute exists—the boast that this is the hardest working river in the Nation and that it has never received Federal funds for its development. This rather unique status is again currently receiving public attention. According to word from Representative GLENN DAVIS, of Waukesha, in Washington, it isn't likely that any Federal money will go into improved navigation or flood control on this stream in the foreseeable future.

The Army Corps of Engineers is submitting a report to the State public service commission for review and comment, prior to transmission of the report to Congress, expressing the belief that navigation improvements on the Wisconsin River with Federal funds, and development of any Federal flood-control projects on the river, are not advisable at this time. Advance copies of the report have been made available to Mr. DAVIS, who is ranking Republican member of the Public Works Appropriation Committee. The findings were signed by Maj. Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Jr., Chief of Engineers. He is a native of Wisconsin and quite familiar with the history of the Wisconsin River.

Army engineers were asked in a 1946 resolution by the House of Representatives Commitee on Rivers and Harbors to review the Wisconsin River situation to determine if Federal projects on this river were deemed necessary. The report now is submitted is the result of that survey.

It was back during the administration of Gov. Robert M. La Follette, Sr., that management of the Wisconsin River was turned over by State law to the Wisconsin Valley Improvement Co. for development by private enterprise, under State supervision. Since then a series of dams, reservoirs and flood control work has been carried on and financed entirely by private funds, with industry paying for the water power that is developed and used.

The Wisconsin River story stands as an outstanding example that Government aid is not always necessary for development and use of natural resources.

Conference Report, H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, while the other body has improved this legislation in some respects, it is still most objectionable since under its operation many home industries can and will continue to be adversely affected. The recent adoption of the Swiss and particularly the Japanese trade treaties, effected after agreement on this bill, is the best illustration of that fact. In the Japanese treaty the average decrease in rates was in the neighborhood of 27 percent and the largest was over 40 percent. Massachusetts industry cannot stand against such competition. In the long run American industry cannot stand against it.

The administration supported several amendments which were protective in nature and could possibly given proper direction, strengthen the operation of the escape clause and the peril-point clause. These amendments were bitterly opposed, let it be noted by those who favor unrestricted free trade. Most deplorably, even the amendment protecting the national security was vigorously opposed by confirmed and vigorous advocates of such unrestricted free trade.

In my opinion the bill has not been improved sufficiently in the other body to warrant the support of those who believe in international trade for mutual advantage between our own and other nations, but oppose opening wide the doors of this Nation to the products of sweatshop and peonage conditions of production that obtain in many other countries.

Under this bill the industries of my district, State, and region will be at the mercy of foreign imports produced in some instances at wages of 9 cents an hour under conditions little, if any, better than slavery. If anyone here or elsewhere believes that any industry, however healthy and vigorous, can long stand up under this type of cutthroat competition, I submit that they are not considering all the facts.

The present pattern of our international trade is a veritable crazy quilt. Let me state that I favor trade and friendly commerce with all nations of good will provided the interests of American industry and labor and the Nation are not jeopardized. But how can we possibly justify billions in grants of American taxpayers' cash to build up industries overseas in competition with our own industries and then throw open the gates wide for cheaply produced foreign goods and products to come into our markets to demoralize our economy, stagnate our industries, and displace American workers?

In conscience, after careful, mature consideration, I cannot subscribe to such a policy and program.

Warrior Lock and Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, last year Congress approved an appropriation of $1,800,000 to begin construction of the Warrior Lock and Dam which is located between Hale and Greene Counties in the Sixth Congressional District of Alabama. Construction on this vital link in the Warrior-Tombigbee waterway was begun last October and, I understand, is progressing on schedule.

The budget for fiscal year 1956 included the sum of $4,100,000 for the continued construction of the Warrior Lock and Dam, and the House Appropriations Committee has wisely included this sum in the Public Works appropriations bill now under consideration.

The new Warrior Lock and Dam will replace locks and dams 8 and 9 on the Warrior River which were built in 1903 and 1902, respectively. Not only are these present locks and dams dilapidated and obsolete, but many believe they are in danger of partial, if not complete, failure.

Mr. J. M. Faircloth, an outstanding civil engineer of Alabama, made a study approximately 18 months ago of the condition of lock and dam 9. This study, made with the permission of the Mobile district office of the United States Corps of Engineers, revealed the dangerous condition of these structures.

In this report, Mr. Faircloth said:

Both the lock and dam No. 9 are in exceedingly poor condition. To keep these structures in even a reasonable state of repair, that will permit the operation of the lock, must involve a tremendous maintenance effort. To put them in acceptable state of repair is obviously impractical and probably impossible. While this report does not intend to suggest imminent complete failure of either the lock or dam, it does not rule out the possibility of such failure.

There is, however, basis for the premise that even now there is not time for adequate replacement before failure. Structural failure to any degree will probably involve very little risk of direct damage to life or personal property, but one cannot refrain from contemplating the effect that even partial

failure could have on the multi-million-dollar Government investment in the present Warrior River system as well as the effect upon private industry and the large geographical area dependent upon the facility.

There is every reason to believe the present installations have deteriorated even further since Mr. Faircloth's report of 18 months ago.

The Budget Bureau, the Appropriations Committee of both the House and the Senate, and the Congress last year approved the necessary funds to begin construction on a modern lock and dam to replace locks and dams 8 and 9. This work is now underway and I trust the new Warrior Lock and Dam will be fully completed before any failure occurs at either lock and dam 8 or lock and dam 9.

However, the earliest possible completion of the Warrior Lock and Dam is, in my opinion, very necessary, and I cannot over-emphasize the urgency of adequate funds to continue on schedule the construction of this important installation. Therefore, I urge the House to approve the sum of $4,100,000 which is included in the Public Works Appropriations bill for scheduled work on the Warrior Lock and Dam.

Upper Colorado Versus the Silent Taxpayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, an interesting analysis of the attacks on those who argue against the proposed Upper Colorado River storage project is contained in a recent column by Mr. Raymond Moley which appeared in the Los Angeles Times.

Since I am one of those subjected to such attacks, I have asked that the Moley column be printed here so that the arguments may be analyzed by the membership:

THE SILENT TAXPAYER

(By Raymond Moley)

In the report of the first Hoover Commission 6 years ago there was a strong recommendation that an independent technical board should be set up to provide Congress and the public with reliable figures on all reclamation projects.

This recommendation was based upon the obvious fact that the Department of the Interior and its Bureau of Reclamation is a party of interest which, like all bureaucracies, is intent upon getting as much money as possible from Congress and thus building its power more and more.

In the midst of a mad jumble of engineering and accounting facts and figures the Senate passed an upper Colorado storage bill in April which called for an initial expenditure of $1,600 million, an increase of more than $600 million over the original plan submitted by the President in 1954.

The project then went to the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which is in executive session this week, apparently rewriting the bill.

No one can tell what the Interior Committee will recommend, but it is now rumored that the proponents of the bill, including the Senators and Congressmen from the arid States working with the Interior Department, will eliminate the Echo Park Dam from the project.

This move, it is hoped, will lead the conservationists, who all along have fought the invasion of the Dinosaur National Monument, to lessen their opposition. If that can be accomplished, the conference agreement with the Senate will restore the Echo Park feature, and in the final rush at the end of the session get through the two houses exactly what the interested parties want.

Meanwhile the Bureau of Reclamation has loosed its heaviest propaganda guns at those who have opposed this measure and who have presented the cold facts concerning it.

What happens is that the Bureau of Reclamation prepares the broadsides with, in at least one instance, the name of Commissioner Dexheimer attached, and then some Congressman or Senator slaps the material into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the release to which I refer from Dexheimer the main object of attack is former Gov. Leslie Miller of Wyoming. In addition to Governor Miller I am brought into the picture because of various articles I have written.

It is difficult for either Governor Miller or me to keep up with this propaganda because the Bureau and the Senators have unlimited taxpayers' money to use in their attack.

I shall, therefore, not try to answer the multitudinous data presented by the Commissioner but merely not here for such taxpayers as may wish to take note, some incontrovertible facts:

The Tax Foundation, using Government income-tax figures, has compiled the percentages of the total tax intake which are collected in each of the 48 States.

With those percentages, I am able to present the cost of the upper Colorado project to a number of selected States. Ohio, for example, bears 5.9 percent of the Federal tax load. It would therefore pay $94,400,000 of the $1,600,000,000 estimated cost. But the hidden interest subsidy on the project would be $1 billion, which would bring the Ohio cost to $153,400,000.

Any taxpayer in Pennsylvania may, if he chooses, calculate his cost because his State pays 6.94 percent of the Federal tax burden. California pays 9.32 percent, and Illinois 6.9 percent.

The recommendation of the first Hoover Commission, that there be an independent technical board to guide Congress in matters such as this was ignored. The result has been legislation in a darkness illuminated only by the treacherous flashes of light from the interests involved in spending more and more of the public money.

Bananas on Pikes Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the Paonia irrigation project in Colorado.

The Paonia project is a part of the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The cost to the Nation's taxpayers of the Paonia project would be $2,400 an acre.

The project would grow agricultural products now supported by the taxpayers and in great surplus. Among these are grains and dairy products.

House Joint Resolution 309

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, "Do you approve the status of forces treaty?" was the question discussed on a recent broadcast of Facts Forum, one of the most interesting and informative programs now available to radio and television audiences.

Moderator Dam Smoot in the second section of his broadcast presented an unusually clear and sound argument for the modification or denunciation of the treaties under which our American men overseas may be and are being tried and imprisoned by foreign governments. Believing that it is a persuasive argument for adoption of House Joint Resolution 309, I ask leave to include it as part of my remarks:

The Status of Forces Treaty abrogates basic constitutional rights of American soldiers serving on foreign soil. It repudiates one of America's oldest and finest traditions, namely, that the American flag and the protection of the American Constitution follow our soldiers wherever they go.

In America, any spy, subversive, or criminal of whatever kind is guaranteed a fair jury trial in open court. He can invoke the fifth amendment, refuse to testify, and heap abuse upon official representatives of our Government. But an American soldier who is drafted and forced to serve abroad can now be arrested on trumped-up charges by foreign police officers, tried in a foreign court, sentenced and punished, without even having an American official present at his trial.

American soldiers, stationed in some 49 foreign nations, have been forced to give up their own careers, their own families, their own homes, to go abroad and serve the interests of foreign people. But this apparently is not enough. They must also be deprived of their most precious constitutional rights in order to keep our foreign friends friendly.

In the present administration, as under the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, it is bad taste for America to stand up for American rights. We must always yield to the demands of our allies, or we will lose the privilege of squandering American blood and American treasure to defend our allies.

Administration leaders and internationalists in the Senate argued that if we did not accept this Status of Forces Treaty and permit American soldiers to be tried in foreign courts, our NATO alliance might break up. To an American who knows and cares anything about our constitutional system, and who has any pride in American tradi-

tions, it should be obvious that an alliance which can be held together only at the cost of destroying the inalienable rights of our own soldiers is not worth maintaining.

When urging the ratification of the Status of Forces Treaty, State Department officials promised that the treaty provisions would not set a precedent for agreements with any other nations except those in NATO.

The promise was silly and dishonest on its face. If the United States Government will give away the rights of its own soldiers to 13 of its so-called allies, what will it say to all its other allies who want similar arrangements?

The answer has already been given. Within a matter of weeks after the Status of Forces Treaty was ratified, our State Department—ignoring its own "no precedent" promises—used the treaty provisions as a precedent for negotiating executive agreements with Japan, giving the Japanese criminal jurisdiction over American servicemen and their families stationed in Japan.

Reflect on that for a moment. Some American serviceman who fought the savage Japanese from Guadalcanal to Okinawa now gets arrested by the Tokyo police and accused of committing a crime.

The American Army can no longer take that soldier into custody and give him a fair trial in an American military court. The American Army cannot even counsel with him or observe his trial to be sure that he gets a fair one. The Army simply has to turn its back on the American soldier and let him get whatever Japanese justice wants to give him.

When the soldier's people back in the States discover that he has been sent to a Japanese prison for 2 years or 5 years or life, they frequently cannot even find out from their own government what the soldier did or what he was charged with. All that his wife and children know is that their Army allotment has been cut off.

No one really knows how much of this has been going on. The Pentagon will not release figures—even to Congressmen—on the number of American soldiers sentenced by foreign courts as a result of the Status of Forces agreements.

POLITICAL HEADS WOULD ROLL

Foreign governments, of course, already have these figures. They know how many Americans they have in jail.

Why, then—since they are not trying to keep this information from foreign governments—do Pentagon officials label it "top secret"? Obviously, to keep the American people ignorant of what is going on.

If the American public knew how many of our servicemen—and their wives—are in foreign prisons, with no American constitutional protection, political heads would roll.

The American voters would drive out of public office every person who recommended the Status of Forces Treaty, every Senator who voted for it, and every Senator who was either too cowardly or too busy to get up on the floor and register his vote on July 15, 1953, when the Status of Forces Treaty was ratified.

From the scanty bits of information that have leaked out, we know that over 400 American citizens were sentenced by foreign courts in 1953.

We know that by November 1954, over 1,200 Americans were imprisoned in Japan alone.

We know that Mrs. Antonie Pierre, wife of an American serviceman in Japan, was indicted by Japanese authorities because her rented house accidentally caught on fire.

We know that two American Army privates (Scott and Crews), involved in a beerhall brawl in Sopporo, Japan, in April 1954, were still in jail 9 months later (and may still be in jail)—without ever having had a trial. You see, in Japan criminal cases are frequently adjourned and interminably delayed; and a defendant—even though he may later turn out to be innocent—stays in jail until the verdict is finally in.

Families of servicemen protest that their relatives are subjected to indignities, suffering, and denial of their rights as American citizens in Iceland—where the biggest political party is the Communist Party; where the second biggest newspaper in the nation is a Communist newspaper; and where anti-American feeling is intensely bitter.

American servicemen are subjected to abuse and injustice in France—where 1 out of every 4 public officials is a Communist.

We have these status of forces agreements with Moslem countries, where the penalty for petty theft is to cut off the right hand of the offender.

In America, the Constitution protects everybody, citizens and aliens alike, from cruel and inhuman punishment. But if your boy is drafted and sent overseas, he doesn't have that protection. He could have his right hand cut off if he got involved in a silly prank and stole somebody's chicken.

We have this status-of-forces agreement with the Communist government of Yugoslavia. In every Communist country, of course, it is high treason to criticize the government in power. An American soldier who is caught in Yugoslavia criticizing communism could be sentenced to die.

There was absolutely no precedent in American tradition—or even in international law—for the thing we did in July 1953, when we gave away the constitutional rights of our own soldiers.

When America was an infant Nation, the great Chief Justice John Marshall—father of American jurisprudence—carefully spelled out the constitutional principle that service in the military forces shall not abridge or nullify an American's constitutional rights.

Our high officials today hold that it is all right to nullify constitutional rights of our soldiers overseas, because we can trust foreign governments to be fair.

No one wants an American soldier who commits a crime to go unpunished. But if our Constitution means anything, it means that every American, including soldiers, has a right to a fair public trial before fellow Americans.

It is true that some American soldiers stationed abroad are tough characters who do willfully violate law. But it is also true that most American soldiers stationed abroad are decent, homesick, frightened, and bewildered boys who were forced into military service and who have no means of defending themselves before a hostile court in an alien land.

President Eisenhower says that the Status of Forces Treaty is justified because it is reciprocal—that in giving up jurisdiction over our own soldiers, we acquired jurisdiction over foreign soldiers stationed here.

What every American ought to know is that American constitutional rights are not for sale or trade on any terms.

If the American Government acquired jurisdiction over 100 million foreigners in exchange for sacrificing the constitutional rights of one American citizen, it would still be an immoral and unconstitutional deal.

But the Status of Forces Treaty was a bad bargain for America—even if we ignore principles and make a factual comparison of what we gave with what we got.

There are no foreign troops stationed in America. Altogether, there may be in the United States as many as 15,000 foreigners here on some kind of military mission—as observers, experts, or special trainees. On the other hand, there are approximately 1 million American troops stationed abroad. In acquiring jurisdiction over 15,000 visiting foreigners, we nullified the constitutional rights of more than 1 million American soldiers.

Suppose 1 of the 15,000 foreigners does get in trouble here in the United States?

Whoever he is, he gets the full protection of the American Constitution. He must be represented by counsel; he must have time to prepare his defense; he must have a full explanation of all charges made against him; he must be faced by his accusers in open court; he must be permitted to subpena, at Government expense, whatever witnesses he needs to defend himself; he cannot be compelled to testify against himself.

But an American soldier in trouble abroad is at the mercy of people whose language he may not speak, and who may hate him merely because he is an American.

He has no guarantee of a public trial, or even a trial by jury; no right of appeal; no guarantee of freedom of speech; no protection against unreasonable searches and seizures: no protection against excessive bail or excessive fines; no presumption that he is innocent until he is proven guilty; no requirement that his guilt must be proven beyond reasonable doubt.

That is how reciprocal the Status of Forces Treaty is.

If the Senators who betrayed the rights of American soldiers by ratifying this treaty need to salve their conscience, they can, of course, remember the warning of Bedell Smith, old Army friend of Eisenhower, who was Undersecretary of State when the Status of Forces Treaty was under consideration.

While testifying before a Senate committee in behalf of this treaty, Bedell Smith let the Senators know that they might just as well ratify the thing, because if they didn't, the executive would continue handling the problems as it did during the Truman administration—by secret agreements.

We are approaching the midnight hour in the history of American consitutional government; but the hour is not yet too late. The American people can have their Republic and their Constitution back if they are not too lazy and indifferent to find out what is going on, or too cowardly to stand up and be counted.

They can demand the revocation of the Status of Forces Treaty and of all the other shadowy, ill-conceived, and evil entanglements which are sucking this Nation into a bottomless quicksand of war and international power politics.

Male Nurses Should Be Commissioned in Our Military Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for many year the armed services have given officer commissions to female nurses, but the male nurses have had to serve in enlisted ranks. We hear much of equal rights for women which I, of course, strongly support; but certainly there is no logical reason why we should not have equal rights for men, as well.

Our colleague, FRANCES P. BOLTON, has introduced H. R. 2559, a bill which will give officer commissions to male nurses and medical specialists in the armed services. It seems to me it would be most appropriate to have this legislation enacted, not only to remove the existing inequity by giving equal treatment to all nurses and medical specialists serving in the military services, but it appears that if the military services recog-

nized this highly specialized training on an equal basis, it would serve as an added incentive to male students to enter nurse's training schools and would ultimately tend to lessen the nationwide shortage of nurses which exists in our country today.

Laird Questionnaire Produces Some Interesting Reactions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of today's RECORD an editorial from the Wisconsin Rapids Daily Tribune of Thursday, May 26, 1955. This editorial discusses the results of a poll which I took during this session of Congress of my congressional district.

The editorial follows:

LAIRD QUESTIONNAIRE PRODUCES SOME INTERESTING REACTIONS

The results of more than 15,000 responses to questionnaires distributed early this year among citizens of the 7th Congressional District by Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD have now been tabulated by the Congressman's office, and they give an interesting insight into the thinking of central Wisconsin people on a number of important public questions.

The breakdown of replies according to occupation reveals that farmers contributed the greatest number of responses—4,092. Also heard from were 2,475 hourly wage employees, 2,452 men and women in the field of business, 2,166 salaried employees, 1,573 housewives, 996 professional people, 996 retired individuals, and 692 persons who did not disclose their occupations.

There are a number of surprises in the answers given to specific questions. At least the answers, with due regard for the diverse interests of the respondent groups, do not always jibe with what the political pundits have tried to tell us the people believe.

For instance, on the question of agricultural policy, 43.9 percent of those filling out the questionnaire expressed themselves in favor of the flexible price support program for basic commodities, another 28.3 percent favored no support program at all, whereas only 19.1 percent went on record for high mandatory price supports with production controls. The remaining 8.7 percent had no opinion on this particular subject.

Concerning their attitude on a 5-percent pay increase for Federal civil service and post office employees (which was the figure being advocated by the Eisenhower administration at the time the questionnaire was distributed), 46.4 percent endorsed such a raise, but 42.5 percent opposed it, and another 11.1 percent expressed no opinion.

It is interesting to speculate, in the light of subsequent developments, whether those who opposed the 5-percent increase thought that Federal employees deserved a bigger raise, a lesser one, or no raise at all. One would have to know what weight to give each of these three alternatives before interpreting public opinion in the Seventh Congressional District concerning the President's recent veto of the 8.6-percent pay boost voted by the Congress.

There is no doubt, on the other hand—if the 15,000-plus replies to the questionnaire constitute a representative cross-section—that Seventh District residents lacked sympathy for the major salary increases for Supreme Court Justices, Federal judges, and Members of Congress which have already been enacted into law. For 73.6 percent registered a flat "No" on the question of whether they favored such increases. Only 21.2 percent said "Yes" and there were 5.2 percent without an opinion.

This attitude is symptomatic of the general conservativeness shown by the respondents on questions relating to Federal expenditures. They voted 44.5 to 39.6 percent against continuing foreign military, technical assistance, and economic aid programs at present levels. But, on the other hand, they approved Federal financial aid to the States for public school construction, though by the very narrow margin of 43.5 to 41.6.

They were strongly against lowering tariffs in order to increase world trade and strengthen the economies of friendly nations abroad, voting 65.3 to 19.5 to continue to protect American labor, industry, and agriculture from foreign competition.

While favoring the continuation of selective service, by the impressive margin of 69.4 to 23.7 percent, as long as there are not enough volunteers to meet quotas of the armed services, they went on record 47 to 39.7 in opposition to universal military training.

Asked for their views on the Taft-Hartley Act, 64.2 percent considered the law "fair and just," 16.9 percent held it to be "not strict enough" in its regulation of unions, and 9.3 percent deplored the law as being "unfair to unions and the average workingman."

Finally, these seventh district citizens who took the trouble to advise their Congressman of their opinions showed in no uncertain terms that they want to see the Federal budget balanced, and that they are willing to forgo tax relief until that goal is achieved.

They favored maintaining Federal taxes on individuals at present rates until the budget can be brought into balance, the showing on this question being 78.6 percent "yes" and 19.9 percent "no." To implement this stand, they voted 62.7 to 32.9 percent against increasing personal tax exemptions if to do so would raise the national debt, and 86.9 to 9.1 percent against a reduction in corporation income taxes which would add to the Nation's indebtedness.

It is to be expected that the Laird questionnaire will encounter challenges from politicians and others whose convictions run counter to its findings. But it does represent an attempt, on a rather extensive scale, to find out what the people are thinking. Would that more officeholders felt an obligation to make such inquiry among their constituents.

A Program of Research and Treatment of Chronic Alcoholism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, one of the costliest diseases in our Nation is that of chronic alcoholism. Usually, alcoholism is thought of mainly as a social or moral problem, but its devastating impact upon our economy should by no means be underestimated. Diminished production in industry due to absenteeism, increased cost of operation of police departments, courts, jails, and hospitals, as well as the provisions necessary for aid to needy children are reflected in huge dollar figures. So are the costs of increased disability and unemployment insurance and the increase of juvenile delinquency caused by alcoholism. It has been estimated that the problem of alcoholism costs the industry of our Nation alone in the neighborhood of $1,250 million per year. In my own State of California, the costs to the taxpayers are estimated at $150 million per year.

The State of California, and several other States, have created alcoholic rehabilitation commissions and similar institutions to undertake a program of research and study in the field of chronic alcoholism. Though these attempts to find a solution to the problem are notable in scope and purpose, we cannot fail to realize that this is a nationwide problem, and that the Federal Government should assume its proper responsibility in the same manner as it has done in the case of such diseases as mental health, cancer, heart disease, arthritis, poliomyelitis, leprosy, and many others.

The Honorable Glenn E. Coolidge, a prominent member of the California State Legislature from the 28th Assembly District, has long been most active in furthering legislative action designed to cope with the menace of chronic alcoholism in our State. He has recently sent me a copy of Assembly Joint Resolution No. 36, which he has authored and which was adopted by the Legislature of the State of California, calling upon the Congress of the United States to institute a program of research and treatment of chronic alcoholism and to provide assistance to and cooperation with the several States conducting such programs.

Cognizant of our Federal responsibilities in this matter, and in compliance with the request expressed by the Legislature of the State of California, I have today introduced a bill which will direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service to initiate the necessary steps. The powers to do so already are vested in the Secretary and the Surgeon General by previous legislation. It is my sincere hope that early action may be taken on this bill. In a problem facing all America, the States should not be left to shift for themselves.

Fluoridation—The Crime Against All Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend

my remarks and include therein a very provocative article entitled "Crime Against All Civilization" by Rev. Lyle F. Sheen, of Genesoe, Ill.

This article was forwarded to me by my friend, Miss Florence Birmingham, president of the Massachusetts Women's Political Club who has rendered distinguished service in many fields and who has been especially interested in this question. I commend the article to all the Members of the Congress and to the American people:

FLUORIDATION—THE CRIME AGAINST ALL CIVILIZATION

(By Rev. Lyle F. Sheen, pastor of St. Malachy's parish, Geneseo, Ill.)

Everything intended by the Creator for human nourishment was once alive itself.

Rev. L. F. Sheen offers $1,000 reward for evidence that will be accepted by Christian biochemists proving any of these statements:

1. Sodium fluoride will prevent decay of human teeth.

2. Sodium fluoride is not poisonous in small amounts.

3. The moon is made of green cheese.

The July 19, 1954, issue of Newsweek quotes Goethe as saying "There is nothing more frightful than ignorance in action." It is quite possible that in its broad interpretation, this statement is correct, but in a practical sense, I consider malice in action even more frightful. It is with this thought in mind that I wish to add my voice to the constantly increasing clamor of protest against the completely develish and un-American plot to fluoridate the water of American cities.

In order to avoid the confusion that I find even in excellent articles against this vile communistic plan, let me define the terms as I see them. These definitions may not be curently used in the language of science, but I think they should be the basis of a very necessary distinction. To me, fluorine is the chemical as found in nature, always in combination with calcium. Fluoride is the raw synthetic chemical without the protective calcium which the creator of the universe has so mercifully set as a guard over this violent element. To me, the N in fluorine signifies nature. The D in fluoride signifies death. This makes the distinction easy to remember.

This short article appeared in substance originally in the Geneseo, Ill., Republic on May 27, 1954. It was written at the request of hundreds of citizens who were outraged by the injection of sodium fluoride into the drinking water of this city, without their permission, or even knowledge. Regardless of the intrinsic merits of the program, we maintain that the procedure was illegal, immoral, and irresponsible. It was the typical procedure of all totalitarian nations, past and present. It violates everything legal and moral, in the principles upon which the United States of America were established, and until recent years, have fairly well succeeded in securing the blessings of liberty to this Nation.

In writing this article, I do not presume to speak for the Catholic Church, but simply as an American citizen, who is a priest, and who is therefore, by nature and by training, an uncompromising lover of truth, an hater of falsehood. I regard this utterly vicious effort to poison the water supply of American cities as a crime that cries to Heaven for vengenance, and I hereby place my name on the list of those who do so cry.

Fluoridation of city water supplies did not originate with doctors or dentists, but with politicians and businessmen. How the medical and dental professions became fouled up with this dirty business is another story. There are some 80,000 men in America who boast the degree of M. D. To most of us laymen, this means Medical Doctor. Also, Merciful Deliverer, and Man of Distinction. But as one small voice, I would take this opportunity to warn about 79,500 of these men that if they persist in giving the tremendous weight of their science and personal honor to the nefarious business of poisoning American citizens, their degree may yet come to signify Merchant of Disease, Moral Degenerate—even Mental Defective.

To us laymen, the American Medical Association has ceased to be either Medical or American. If this be true, then the only word left is "Association" and that too, should be dissolved. If their "Ruler" is a Dictator, then their organization has no right to exist in this country, and its members are no longer freemen. Honest, God-fearing doctors have always been held in great respect and affection by the American people, but what now, if they have sold their honor for a mess of poisoned pottage?

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY THE TERM "FLUORIDATION OF WATER"?

We mean the injection into the city water supplies of sodium fluoride (or a variation) for the alleged purpose of helping to prevent cavities in the teeth of very young children.

I would give the arguments of the fluoridators, but I have never found one that would hold up under the examination of and by a scientific or mental microscope. They have no proofs beyond their own torrents of words and their own statistics. What they say is "Science" and all objections are "Drivel." Installations in the victim cities are always made in secret, which means in the dark, so far as the light of either science or human rights are concerned. The procedure alone is enough to damn the plan completely in the minds of intelligent American people. This is the only weapon we citizens have or need; the use of reason. I appeal to the commonsense of the average man, since a man who will not think is not worth fighting for anyway.

Hence, armed with the use of reason, aided by faith in God who created the universe, which includes chemistry in medicine. I wish to go on record as condemning fluoridation unequivocally. A few of my reasons are contained in the following paragraphs.

Floridators allege: Sodium fluoride, injected into the watersupply, will help prevent cavities in the teeth of children under 10 years.

Fluoridators allege: That sodium fluoride, an acknowledged poison in itself, is not poisonous in small amounts, but helpful to teeth.

Speaking now for people who have written to me from all over the United States, and from Alaska, I deny both statements absolutely.

Sodium fluoride is a violent, metallic, inorganic synthetic poison, and no human power or human flood of words can change it. It is sufficient to consider the word "inorganic." By that we mean that it does not belong in an organ of the human body. For some 6,000 years of human history, the original plan of Almighty God, Who designed and created the human race, has been accepted and practiced with reasonable success. The failure was not his. Namely: The elements of food for the human body have always been either a plant or an animal, never a raw chemical. Food plants grow in the fertile soil. We, and animals, may eat the plants and maintain health. We also eat the animals. But we never eat the soil. This includes everything taken from it. Salt is a condiment, not an essential food.

Certain minerals are absolutely essential to human life. But they must be processed by a plant before they can become a functioning part of the human body. This is also true of animal life. And no man will dare question the wisdom of the Almighty if he values his soul. "Man" himself is divine revelation, and so is his food. A grain of wheat or rice is divine revelation and a person who interprets divine wisdom through a flour mill that eliminates almost all vitamins and minerals, and embalms the residue, indicates that he is wiser than his Creator. Yet, this is our situation today. About 98 people of every 100 in America today are trying to keep alive on refined, embalmed foods in the cereal line. They would be better off if they ate no bread whatsoever. The same is true of refined sugar and rice. Fortunately, cattle and hogs cannot live on refined foods, and humans get some true nourishment by eating cattle and hogs which are divinely protected by instinct.

Animals, wild and domestic, seem to have very little tooth trouble. "Clean as a hound's tooth" has become axiomatic. Lions and tigers are feared because of their excellent incisors.

But, lo, the poor human child—he must have mixed in his drinking water, one of the most violent poisons known to man; one for which there is no known antidote; one which will destroy the very glass in which it is served; one which is currently destroying the windshields of automobiles; one which eats up the city water mains, and all other elements except oxygen. Who says so? Why the anonymous unanimity of "Associations" from Government Commissars on down. Everybody, that is, except the people who are forced to drink the vile stuff, or spend at least a $1,000 to install their own water systems.

Fluoridators maintain that it is lack of fluoride in the teeth that is the cause of dental cavities. This assertion might be safely made in areas where people cannot read. I have learned to read, and I have abundant material from universities in the Southwestern States, and the evidence is entirely against this insane thesis. The most forceful document I have ever read is a letter from Dr. George W. Heard, D. D. S., a practicing dentist in Hereford, Tex. The letter is reprinted elsewhere. His city has an abundant supply of flourine in its water, and yet the children of the city have about the same incidence of dental decay as those in other cities which do not have any at all. They also have organic fluorine in the foods grown in that area, but even this does not prevent decay. Moreover, there is ample evidence that fluorine is not an essential element of the human body under any circumstances. It is an important element in the life of the soil itself, in preparing plant food for plants only.

Not even natural fluorine will prevent cavities. And who will be so idiotic as to maintain that inorganic, poisonous fluoride can turn the trick? Who? The answer to this question is not really who, but rather why? We have plenty of answers, but none of them tie in even remotely with Lincoln's idea of a "Government, of the people, by the people, and for the people."

I am not a professional chemist, but I am a professional thinker and believer. Since we must believe someone, I prefer to accept the authority of men whose believed thoughts agree with the ideas I obtained by personal knowledge. In this connection, I believe the statement of Charles Brusch, M. D., of Cambridge, Mass., who says: "Sodium fluoride is an inorganic, protoplasmic poison, for which no true medical acceptance has ever been expressed."

A poison is an element that cannot be useful to the human organism, but is essentially destructive. Fluoride satisfies this definition completely. Even fluorine, in nature, is harmful to the body of a human or an animal, yet this substance gave the commercial chemists their sophistic argument. But fluoride, the raw chemical, is from 10 to 50 times as harmful. In nature, fluorine is never alone, but always in combination with calcium, like a policeman, holding a

murderer's hands behind him. However, the water poisoners still persist in injecting one part per million of fluoride, which is about the percentage found in nature. That means that they put in artificially from 10 to 50 times as much as the natural incidence. Also, in most instances, they inject it directly into the water mains, for there is no reservoir, which makes it easily possible for a consumer to draw out a concentrated dose. This does not give the victim even a sporting chance.

In cities where fluoridators are clever enough to cover their villainy, they warn those with kidney or liver disorders, heart ailments, nervous trouble, or who have ever had polio, not to drink the stuff. Sensing the danger of damage suits, they shrewdly disclaim responsibility. This is an open admission that material is poison, and will show up immediately in those of weak constitution.

Second allegation: In small amounts fluoride is not poisonous.

This statement will not pass through a logical mind. In small amounts, it is still a small amount of poison. And it is the kind of poison which remains in the body. This small amount does a small amount of damage, which the system can tolerate for a time. But continued for long, even the victim soon realizes there is trouble. You cannot drown in a drop of water, but a drop is just as much watery as is the ocean.

I have on my desk a can of fluoride, such as anyone can obtain at a drug store. It is plainly labeled "poison" and carries the skull and crossbones, as required by law. The Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts warns: "Its greatest disadvantage is that it is poisonous to man and animals, but when directions are carefully followed, no fatalities have occurred to stock eating medicated foods." Also, directions warn not to give to pregnant sows, or sick pigs. Veterinarians are humane enough, being also good businessmen, to warn farmers that sodium fluoride will cause animal abortion, and even death. Are medical doctors equally considerate of pregnant women and sick people? So far as I am able to learn, the AMA has given no such instructions.

CHEMISTRY OF FLUORIDE

Dictionary definition: "Fluoride: An element of the chlorine family isolated as a pungent, corrosive, pale greenish yellow gas. It combines with every element except oxygen."

It is the most powerfully reactive element known. It decomposes all organic solvents with violence, and also decomposes water. The vapor of fluoride, even when highly diluted, is extremely injurious to the respiratory tract. (The man who puts the stuff in the hopper of the stainless steel fluoridating machine must wear a mask, rubber gloves and boots.) It is far worse than arsenic to the body.

Notwithstanding the fact that fluorine is found in the teeth, bones, and most tissues, it is not a normal or necessary element of the human body. It exists in the body as an invading poison, and its presence in any amount is detrimental to the economy of the body as a whole, and certain tissues in particular. Nerves primarily suffer.

POLITICAL ASPECTS

Sodium fluoride in the water supply is used in Communist countries to keep people in subjection. It attacks the nervous system, producing a dullness of mind and a wierd sense of weariness. It has been used in asylums to keep patients quiet and in circuses to keep beasts tame. Years ago it was used to cause abortion. It would not only prevent caries in the teeth of children, it would prevent children completely.

J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of the FBI, in a nationwide statement against possible sabotage, warned us of the poisoning of water supplies. He no doubt referred to men who were traitors, who would furnish their own poison, and dump it into reservoirs. Adoption of fluoridation by any community would provide our enemies with a perfect weapon. A turn of a valve and the city is at their mercy. Fantastic? It is happening all over the world, but appears to be most common in America. Why should Communists spend millions of men and billions in money to conquer us if they can persuade us to commit suicide? The men who push this cruel practice may not be themselves Communists but what is the difference if they accomplish the same thing? Communists at least admit that they are trying to wreck our once great Nation.

VIEWPOINT OF THE PLUMBER

"Fluoride combines with every element except oxygen." Definition. What about the soft metals, lead and copper that compose much of the plumbing systems, heating pipes, water heaters, radiators embedded in plaster, etc.? Lead and copper are also inorganic poisons, and are dissolved into the water by the fluoride. (Our bodies are full of "pipes" and they are even softer than copper.)

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Only a few years ago American doctors spent millions to defeat the socialized medicine law. How is it that today, they risk their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to promote communized medicine? If fluoride is medicine, we have mass medication, compulsory at that.

But since it is not medicine, but poison, what else have we but mass poisoning? And promoted by the guardians of our health. To me the whole procedure has all the elements of a nightmare in a madhouse.

MORAL ASPECTS OF THE QUESTION

Apparently the law which punishes with 10 years in prison and a fine, anyone who "puts poison into a well, spring, or reservoir of water," is still on the Federal, State, and city books. I have never heard of the law being repealed. What, then, has happened to law enforcement in America? Do we still have a Government—or does the Government have us? By divine and civil law, the act of shortening human life by as little as 10 minutes is classed as murder. Scientists worthy of the name insist that fluoridation of drinking water can shorten life by 10 years. Why are the vital statistics of Grand Rapids, Mich., so carefully covered up? Why do newspapers refuse to print material that carries any real argument against fluoridation? Do we not have freedom of the press? Is not the blackmail of editors immoral?

In the days of law and order, doctors did not medicate patients without their permission, real or presumed. Has that changed? According to the moral law, a doctor may not experiment unnecessarily with a patient. It could be murder. A patient is not permitted to allow an experiment. This might be suicide. What has happened to our Constitution and Bill of Rights, which formerly allowed a man to decide for himself whether he should die by violence or naturally? Even Hamlet knew that the "Almighty has fixed His canon against self-slaughter."

Economic Aspect of Fluoridation. (Even if it did the work.)

It is commonly admitted that only 1 gallon of every hundred pumped is used as drinking water. But those who are supposed to benefit, are children under 10 years of age. That means, 1 gallon in 1,000 is drunk by children. A few strategically placed decimal points will show that $1 of every $1,000 spent ever reaches a child. Last year, by my report, Washington, D. C., spent $130,000 on fluoridation. That means that less than $130 benefited children. What price fluoridation. At that rate a sum equal to the public debt of $275 billion would be required to partially prevent children's cavities. Frankly, I object. That doesn't leave enough money to bury the rest of us.

In conclusion, let me say that a 500-page book would not contain all the objections in detail, to this hideous attack upon the health of Americans, made by the fluoridators. There is so little health left, due to refining of foods, sterilizing and poisoning of foods with sprays, that few Americans could pass a microscopic health examination. Rotten teeth are all the proof a good doctor or dentist needs of poor health. Until the American Medical Association moves against the processing of foods in real earnest, M. D. will signify "miserable diet," the source of so much "unearned income."

I know my words will cause enmity—they already have done so. But my concern is not primarily with men, but with God. I am aware that St. John the Baptist had his head cut off for less—but what wonderful company to be in, on judgment day.

New England's Statesmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the very laudable article from the columns of the Lynn Telegram News, Sunday, June 12, 1955, including the commencement addresses of Congressman JOHN MCCORMACK, majority leader, and Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., minority leader at the Stonehill College, North Easton, Mass., commencement exercises when each was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Their inspiring addresses and the editorial from the Lynn Telegram News follows:

TWO GREAT AMERICANS

Stonehill College in North Easton honored two great Americans recently as Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Boston, House majority leader, and former Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Attleboro, were presented with honorary degrees.

In selecting two such stalwart Americans for recognition, Stonehill did more than pay tribute to two of the Nation's most astute political leaders. They were honoring two gentlemen who stand for everything that is fine and noble in our land today.

In Washington and throughout the Nation, the names of MCCORMACK and MARTIN are synonymous with honor, integrity, and character. True they enjoy different political opinions, but never can it be questioned that each isn't doing what he thinks is absoltuely best for the United States.

It is a tribute to Massachusetts and to New England that of all the Members of the national House, two of its sons should enjoy positions of such power and prestige. In the long years of Roosevelt and Truman, it was Congressman MCCORMACK with his brilliant and intuitive mind helping shape policy. When Preisdent Eisenhower assumed the helm in the Naton's Capital, Congressman MARTIN as Republican Speaker became a dominant figure.

Despite the tremendous importance of their respective positions. Congressmen MCCORMACK and MARTIN have always enjoyed extreme popularity with Washington

officialdom, the press, and with the people of the Nation. They are great Americans ever striving to do whatever possible for the betterment of the Nation and the people.

So far as the two personally are concerned, Congressman MARTIN summed it up rather well when he told the Stonehill commencement gathering "As you might imagine, holding the positions we do, there have been some occasions whetn John and I have had our battles on the floor of the House of Representatives. But though John is and has always been a hard fighter for his principles, he has always been a fair fighter and a clean one. Our differences have never marred our old personal friendship nor the affection and esteem which I hold for him and his good wife."

CONGRESSMEN MCCORMACK AND MARTIN DELIVER STIRRING ADDRESSES AT STONEHILL COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT

Two outstanding Americans and statesmen from Massachusetts, Congressmen JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader, and JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., minority leader, were highly honored this week at the Stonehill College, North Easton, Mass., commencement exercises when each was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Both delivered commencement addresses.

Congressman MCCORMACK touched briefly on the atomic age in his stirring address which follows:

Your excellency, Most Reverend Bishop Brady, very reverend father president, right reverend and very reverend monsignori, reverend fathers, reverend brothers and sisters, distinguished and invited guests, fellow members of the class of 1955, friends of Stonehill College, it is at once a high privilege and a great pleasure to be with you here today at the commencement exercises of Stonehill College, a pioneer institution of its type and quality in southeastern Massachusetts and in the diocese of Fall River.

I am aware, in view of the presence of my distinguished and honored colleague from the 14th District of Massachusetts, former Speaker MARTIN, that it may also now be accused of being the conscious promoter and abetter of what our free press is wont to call the American bipartisan policy.

I am sure, however, that my honored friend from the Attleboros (as people hereabouts call his home territory) despite any partisan differences, will agree with me today that we are on neutral and somewhat hallowed ground. And that all of us are humbly proud that, in common kinship we are permitted to participate today in these impressive ceremonies which mark the progress and advancement of Stonehill College along another academic milestone.

I glory in the background, ideals, and aspirations of your college, to which I wholeheartedly ascribe.

I am here, and happily so. And as all commencement speakers, I am here in the unenviable position of not merely having to justify my presence, but, at the same time, I am charged with the task of conveying to my fellow graduates of the class of 1955 some message which will more than justify my inclusion within its intellectual ranks.

I trust you will believe me when I say, more out of a sense of inadequacy than simulated humility, that I realize how little qualified one of my generation is to speak with authority to those of you who, with your contemporaries, will shape the destiny of the generation to come.

You graduate today into what is fearfully described as the atomic age. In past centuries, when descriptive terminology has been ascribed to an era or a period of time, it has generally been couched in words expressive of progressive, constructive, or even spiritual connotations.

For example, we have all learned in our history books of the golden ages of Greece and Rome, the age of the Apostles, the period of the Crusades, the age of the Renaissance, the age of invention, and the era of good will. True, we have also learned of wars and plagues. But these descriptive periods such as the Thirty Years War and the time of the bubonic plague, have always been limited in concept and duration.

It has remained for this generation to come forth, unfortunately, with an historical description for its time which primarily connotes destruction and annihilation.

The ugly and shuddering fact is that today man can destroy in seconds what it took his fellow man centuries of toil and struggle to build.

In the past, when man has plumbed the depths of the elements, or harnessed the forces of nature, or invented mechanical contraptions, it has mostly been to achieve good ends. Control of fire, harnessing of steam, invention of gunpowder, conquest of the air by flight, undersea travel by submarine—all these were principally for peaceful purposes and constructive ends. True, indeed, some of them have been perverted to destructive uses—but it remains that the atom bomb was conceived and constructed to destroy, and its enormous peaceful potentialities are still the subject of our search and exploration.

This tremendous fact—the fact of atomic power—produced as the terminating agent of the most horrible and devastating war in history, is at once the fear and the hope of the age it characterizes.

It will continue to be a "fearful thing" if it is viewed only as a physical discovery and a mechanistic device with merely materialistic implications.

On the other hand, I submit that it may be the "hope of our future," if the secrets which it unlocks and the marvelous wonders of nature which it unfolds, can, as they already have in great measure, undermine the religious skepticism and philosophical materialism of modern science.

As I see it, it is young men and young women like you who graduate today, fortified with rightly formed consciences and the armor of Christian education, who can bring about the ultimate choice of the second, and far more desirable, alternative.

Out of the welter of destruction it has wrought, out of the sense of awfulness which it inspires, nuclear knowledge and its cosmic implication may finally bring modern man to the realization that the periodic tables of the elements and the molecular and atomic theories are merely a human discovery of a very small and very finite portion of the infinite intellect of Almighty God.

Such realization will undoubtedly mark the greatest forward step in the true education of this and succeeding generations.

You who leave these learned precincts today are already blessed with this realization. You will discover, however, that the majority of your contemporaries are ignorant of it.

As so eloquently expressed in the statement of the American hierarchy last year—a statement, incidentally, to which our classmate Bishop Brady was signatory—you will find that "it is not that the existence of God is expressly or generally denied; it is rather that so many men ignore him and his law in their absorption with the material world which he created. There is not yet a deliberate turning away from God, but there is an excessive preoccupation with creatures."

It is this "preoccupation with creatures" which the bishops have summed up in the one word which characterizes our secular age. That word is "materialism," and the ironic fact is that everything represented by that one word can be blasted into infinity by the atom bomb.

It is this latter terrible realization which should cause modern man to reexamine the bases of his education and his philosophy, and so reform them that, by the light of faith and grace, he may come to that more renign realization that God also created the atom, that as his creation it is basically good, and that its evil lies only in the perversity of its use by man himself.

Once man realizes these elemental facts, the terrors of the atomic age can be dissipated; and if he will then devote as much time and energy to the science of God as he now lavishes on the science of God's creation, perhaps harmony and balance shall be restored to the will and intellect which constitute his soul.

Unless this harmony and balance are achieved, the new age will be one of finite knowledge without faith, human yearning without hope, and mere civility without charity.

For, in the final analysis, it is these three great fundamental, theological virtues which are the crying need of the world today.

They need to be inculcated in the schools and colleges, they need to be practiced in Government, politics, business, the professions, and in the home. Taken together, their needs must be permeated throughout our society to save our Western civilization and its Judeo-Christian foundations.

You members of the class of 1955 at Stonehill College have been thoroughly grounded in the wisdom and necessity of these virtues. They are the cornerstone of your education, the firm foundation of your secular knowledge, the distinguishing mark of your character.

Without them, you would leave here informed but not educated; trained but not disciplined; mentally alert but spiritually unarmed.

Sincere belief in these virtues and diligence in their practice will convince you of what modern man is now sadly coming to realize, and that is, that he cannot live by his own standards alone.

He needs, rather, the inspiration of the standards set forth in the canons of 10 commandments, in the sublime pattern provided by the life of the God-man, Jesus Christ, on earth, and in the sound teaching of Holy Mother Church for over 19 centuries.

You here today, with the deposit of learning imparted by your dedicated teachers, and by the example you can give as truly educated citizens, can help enormously in furnishing such inspiration.

If you will but do it, and if the rest of your generation is wise enough to respond to it, the deadly fears of the "atomic age" will vanish in a revitalized era of true Christian concord built upon God's ordering in faith, hope, and charity.

To each and every one of the graduating class, I offer my sincere congratulations and best wishes. Yours is an accomplishment of which you may well be proud. You have studied and prepared yourselves for the journey through life. Let each of you be true to yourself, your college, your country, and to God.

I salute you and wish you Godspeed.

CONGRESSMAN MARTIN'S ADDRESS

Congressman MARTIN emphasized in his great address the opportunities in a free country in contrast with those dominated by communism. He stated "The free world possesses certain advantages which our antagonists lack. These advantages lie in the fact that men and women of every race, of every creed and color, of every nationality are spiritual beings."

His address follows:

Reverend Fathers, distinguished guests, members of the graduating class, and friends: This is a fine occasion for me. To have been

selected to receive the award of an honorary degree from this excellent institution is indeed one of the finest honors that could be paid to me. Throughout the rest of my life, it will remain forever as it is of this moment—a source of great satisfaction and pride.

In its short career, Stonehill College has made remarkable—yes, almost spectacular progress from the days of its small beginnings. Stonehill is a young, vibrant, thriving institution. It has already taken its place among the front ranks of American colleges. Yet however illustrious its progress has been in the past, the outlook for its future is even more promising. Within the lifetime of these graduates of today, I predict that Stonehill College will be known throughout America as one of the leading educational institutions in our great Nation. That it is situated within the congressional district which I have the honor to represent is a source of great gratification and pride, and I know everybody in this section of the State feels richer for its presence.

DOUBLY HAPPY

This occasion is doubly happy for me because Stonehill College has elected to honor not only me, but also a close personal friend of mine of many years—the distinguished Majority Leader of the House of Representatives, Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK of Boston. I am delighted to share honors with this outstanding American statesman.

As you might imagine, holding the positions we do there have been some occasions when JOHN and I have had our battles on the floor of the House of Representatives. But though JOHN is and has always been a hard fighter for his principles, he has always been a fair fighter and a clean one. Our differences have never marred our old personal friendship nor the affection and esteem which I hold for him and his good wife. I congratulate him upon having been designated to receive a degree from Stonehill.

This is a wondrous country. It gives youth rare and limitless opportunities. This precious heritage was not easily won. It came about through struggles and sacrifices. It can be sustained only through vigilance and the same patriotic devotion that brought it into being.

You who graduate today are part of the great army of young men and women who are going forth into the world to bear its burdens, to enjoy its benefits, and to share its responsibilities. You can make this an even richer heritage, or you can dim its luster, halt its progress, and eventually bring about its collapse. Yours, indeed, is a great responsibility.

Naturally there exists in everyone the desire to go ahead. It is that spirit that has made America the great Nation it is. But in our desire to improve ourselves, we must not forget that sometimes when we accept a personal sacrifice, we may eventually reap greater benefits if our sacrifices are for the welfare of our country.

The wise forefathers of this country knew that it was not good judgment to milk a country and jeopardize its stability. They builded the strength of the Nation and today it is pretty much the one hope of the civilized world.

If it were not for the generous and noble efforts of the American people we would not be in the position we are today—free, strong, and looking forward to an expanding world that will bring greater benefits to people everywhere.

Following frightful World War II, there was litle light, very little hope anywhere. In nearly every country there was black despair.

EUROPE ON ITS FEET

Today we find Europe once more able to stand on its own feet. There is a higher living standard in every country outside of the Iron Curtain. Our problem in Europe now is not to restore prosperity. It is to make sure these countries are not gobbled up 1 by 1 to the reactionary philosophy of communism. That is why we have been forced to contribute to their military armaments—modern instruments of war which are very expensive.

These countries at the moment were unable to pay the heavy costs of maintaining their freedom. And so we helped because we did not—yes, we could not bear the whole burden of military defense from communism. We aided other countries because we knew they made our defense impregnable. A united free world cannot be defeated, and so we worked to bring about that necessary unity.

Now we are beginning to realize the success of our efforts. With Germany once more free and able to arm, it is a much stronger free world. A united Germany, armed sufficiently to defend its freedom, will allow Europe to breathe freely once more.

While we rejoice over this progress, our hearts become heavy when we realize that Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and other Eastern European nations are no longer free. These brave people have fought nobly but without success. Yet they do not despair. They know eventually they will be successful. Foreign domination of any people is not in keeping with modern thoughts and hopes.

The right to be free, to govern oneself in one's own way, is an inherent right of all peoples. This fight for freedom is a ceaseless one and will never end until real freedom is enjoyed by all people.

Yes, we find gratification and hope in Europe. But in Asia, we find a situation more tense and more uncertain. It can only be changed when the free world banishes fear and substitutes rugged courage and determination.

The philosophy of Theodore Roosevelt—"Speak softly but carry a big stick"—is the doctrine of success.

SACRIFICE FOR PEACE

We all want peace. We are all ready to make sacrifices to achieve this end. But we must not make concessions that bring no peace and merely add to the power of the one to whom we give the concessions.

Red China wants to talk peace at this time; peace that will add to their strength in Asia; a peace that will make them eventually the master of all Asia. America cannot and will not agree to any such terms and neither eventually will the free world nations that at the moment are cringing before the Red bandits.

Before we have any discussions with Red China, we have a right to demand that they release all of the American airmen whom they have illegally imprisoned. We all rejoice in the release of four fliers last week. But why only four? The release of these airmen, while still imprisoning their fellow fliers, is a typical example of the cruelty and inhumanity of the Communists.

Furthermore, the Communists should immediately release the scores and scores of American missionaries and missionary workers who were behind military lines when the Reds conquered China.

Let Red China show by its deeds it has given up the way of the bandits before we talk with them.

We hear Russia talk about the admission of Red China to the United Nations. They seek its admission merely to get another vote. Yet you hear nothing about the admission of Italy, Spain, Germany, Japan, and other countries allied with the free world. We should strongly advocate their admission if we are to achieve the purpose for which the United Nations was founded.

As we view the future, we must face certain undeniable realities. We must recognize, first of all, that the basic aims of international communism have not changed. And they will not change. Their unalterable purpose is to dominate and to rule the world. Their purpose is to destroy Christian principles and religion, and everything we recognize in America as decent and precious.

There may be occasions, suitable to their purpose or the moment, when they will appear to deviate from this goal; when they will appear to be seeking peaceful coexistence and to reduce international tensions. Let us not be deceived by their pious pronouncements. The leaders of the free world will be well advised to appraise their apparent intentions with the deep suspicion which their past history warrants. By their deeds, ye shall know them. In other words, we must not be fooled by them again.

Whenever the Communists indicate they desire to reduce international tensions, which they alone have created, we can only conclude it is because they fear and respect the strength of America and the free world. It must be because they fear their own weakness. There can be no other reason.

Our country and the other major powers are approaching a conference with Soviet Russia. We Americans cannot live alone in the world. We must recognize that our war-weary and war-conscious friends overseas overwhelmingly favor a peaceful accommodation between the forces of the free world and the forces of communism. We are not dictators. We are merely partners in a coalition of free nations which desire to maintain freedom and peace.

But, as we prepare for this conference, let us ask ourselves—why, in view of the aggressive history of communism, are they willing to negotiate? Can there be any reason other than the fact that they fear our strength and their own weakness? I do not believe so.

They fear the inadequacy of their own domestic economy. They fear their deficiencies in agricultural production. They fear that their vast land armies are no match for the growing nuclear power of the United States. They fear that when the chips are down, they will not be able to hold the struggling peoples of their satellites who hate their Soviet masters and who are unhappy and discontented in their servitude. Moreover, they fear the growing military power and economic power of the United States of America—which have defied every Marxist prediction of capitalism's collapse.

FREEDOM FROM STRENGTH

So communism will lead from weakness. Freedom will lead from strength.

We must strive constantly to maintain that strength. We must seek constantly to stay out in front of the forces of communism economically and with the strongest, best equipped, and most modern military weapons. We must never drop our guard. We must be alert and on the ready. We must be well prepared for any eventuality at any time. And that is what your Government is doing.

Yet I would be remiss in my obligations as a Member of Congress if I did not sound a note of warning. We cannot forget that in the 36 years the Soviet Government has been in power, it has broken every single agreement or treaty that it has made with the free nations of the world; that it has used every conference table and every international forum to stall, disrupt, and divide.

The entire history of communism from beginning to end reveals no regard for democratic processes, no respect for law, not a single tenet of morality, or a single expression of regard for human liberty.

With such a past it is difficult to believe much good can come out of the conference. It is only because of our ardent desire for peace that we grasp every chance to bring it about. We go into the conference aware of the difficulties we face. A miracle may

happen. We hope so, but we must be alert and strong. In strength lies our only hope for peace.

STRIVE FOR PEACE

We must diligently strive for peace. History is replete with tragic examples of the fact that war does not settle anything. Superiority in the field of atomic and hydrogen weapons does not necessarily insure victory for the ideals of Christian freedom and brotherhood over Godless Communist slavery. We must avoid reducing the world to a radioactive cinder.

We can prevent the cold war from becoming a hot war and we can win the cold war. We can win the cold war with peaceful weapons which have not yet been fully employed.

Sometimes I wonder if we have not been too much concerned with governments and too little with people.

The free world possesses certain advantages which our antagonists lack.

These advantages lie in the fact that men and women of every race, of every creed and color, of every nationality are spiritual beings. No one can be content to live bound in the chains of slavery if he can achieve freedom. And that is so whether these men and women inhabit darkest Africa or the lands behind the Iron Curtain. The soul of every man yearns for the dignity of liberty. Still other advantages which the free world offers are richer material blessings, more of the comforts of life, more leisure, more happiness. Most of the little luxuries enjoyed by the people of the free world are prohibitively priced in the countries ground under the heel of ruthless communism. A 3-ounce cake of chocolate in Warsaw under Communist domination costs the American equivalent of $2. That is just one example of life behind the Iron Curtain.

But the free world offers another advantage far more important, of far greater significance, than any physical comfort or convenience. It offers men, women, and children an opportunity to establish a closer relationship with Almighty God through our churches and through our prayers.

This story of our advantages is a weapon of ideological warfare which can defeat the philosophy of communism which is based on the thin reed of fear, the secret police, and Godless materialism. Let us put it to its fullest use. If we do, we will not fail. Eventually, people in every land will rise and bless us. Ours is a priceless opportunity for world service, to lead this world of ours to finer and greener pastures.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.